



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REMOTE ONLINE MEETING
Meeting October 14, 2020, ROOM 280 + WebEx

MINUTES

- MEMBERS PRESENT:** Ms. Kim Parati (Chairperson)
Mr. PJ Henningson (Vice Chairperson)
Ms. Jessica Hindman (2nd Vice Chairperson)
Mr. Chris Barth
Mr. Jim Haden
Ms. Christa Lineberger
Mr. Chris Muryn
Ms. Jill Walker
- MEMBERS ABSENT:** Ms. Nichelle Bonaparte
Mr. Damon Rumsch
Mr. Jim Jordan – Resigned Prior To Meeting
- OTHERS PRESENT:** Ms. Kristi Harpst, Administrator of the Historic District
Ms. Candice Leite, Staff to the Historic District Commission
Ms. Cindy Kochanek, Staff to the Historic District Commission
Ms. Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission
Mr. Thomas Powers, Assistant City Attorney
Ms. Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

With a quorum present, Chairperson Parati called the October 14th Remote Online Historic District Commission Meeting to order at 1:36 pm. Chairperson Parati began the meeting by introducing the Staff, the Commissioners, and explaining the meeting's procedure. Participants in today's evidentiary hearings were required to submit a copy of any presentation, document, exhibit or other material that they wished to submit at the evidentiary hearing prior to today's meeting. All such materials, as well as a copy of City staff's presentations and documents, were posted online prior to today's meeting. No case is proceeding today in which anyone contacted the City to object to the remote, online meeting platform. The review of each application consists of the Presentation of the application and Deliberation: The application is presented by the HDC staff. The Commission will first determine if there is enough information to proceed with the hearing. The applicant will present their testimony for the application. Other parties wishing to speak, for or against, will be given reasonable time to present factual sworn testimony based on the HDC Design Guidelines. The HDC may question the applicant and HDC staff members. HDC staff and the applicant will be given an opportunity for rebuttal and final comments. The HDC shall close the hearing for discussion and deliberation. During discussion and deliberation only the Commission and staff may speak. An HDC member may request the hearing to be

opened for further questioning. The HDC will craft a motion for Approval, Continuation, or Denial. The majority vote of the Commission present is required for a decision to be reached. A final vote by the HDC will end the hearing. Chairperson Parati asked that the following guidelines be followed during the meeting; mute your audio when you're not speaking. Use only one source of audio (computer or phone), do not put your phone on hold, make sure you are in a quiet area, please turn off or silent electronic devices and do not speak over the person talking or you will be asked to leave the meeting, use the "raise your hand" tool. Please do not speak unless recognized by the Chair or Staff. Because the Commission is a quasi-judicial body, any speaker FOR or AGAINST an application must be sworn in. Due to the hybrid nature of today's proceedings, any individual wishing to speak for or against an application was asked to sign-up and provide any additional evidence in advance of the meeting. During the hearing Chairperson Parati will further open the floor to anyone who has joined the meeting by telephone. When it is your turn to speak, please begin by stating your name and address. Chairperson Parati swore in all Applicants and Staff and continued to swear in people as they arrived for the duration of the meeting.

INDEX OF ADRESSES:

CONSENT AGENDA

HDCRMI 2020-00442, 1142 Berkeley Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2020-00446, 2131 Park Road	Dilworth

NOT HEARD SEPTMEMBER

HDCRMA 2020-00311, 216 S. Summit Avenue	Wesley Heights
---	----------------

CONTINUED FEBRUARY

HDCRMI 2019-00823, 821 Walnut Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDCRMA 2019-00827, 1316 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood

CONTINUED SEPTEMBER

HDCRMA 2019-00762, 1028 Isleworth Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2020-00277, 1106 E. Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2020-00324, 1513-1521 S. Mint Street	Wilmore

NEW CASES

HDCRMI 2020-00388, 405 Heathcliff Street	Wesley Heights
HDCRMI 2020-00317, 1827 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore
HDCRMI 2020-00470, 2409 Charlotte Drive	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2020-00356, 712 E. Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRDEMO 2020-00378, 1533 Wickford Place	Wilmore
HDCRMA 2020-00467, 2010 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood

CONSENT AGENDA

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00442, 1142 BERKELEY AVENUE – ADDITION

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: JORDAN, RUMSCH, BONAPARTE

RECUSE: BARTH

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing building is a two-story Colonial Revival brick building constructed in 1939. Architectural features include a symmetrical façade, a front gable on hip slate roof, a central portico supported by thin round classical columns, 6/6 and 8/8 double-hung wood windows with wood shutters and paired exterior brick chimneys. Lot size is approximately 80 x 160. Adjacent structures are single family buildings that range in size from one-story to two and one-half stories.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is to remove an existing rear portico and install a new larger patio roof. The new roof will be metal, same as the existing portico, and supported by round wood columns inspired by the design of the front portico columns. The design of the proposed patio incorporates architectural details (columns, beam, trim, etc.) of the house. Patio material is brick with a brick rowlock and brick steps to the rear yard. The covered patio measures approximately 23'-3" x 22'-11". The project does not include any changes to existing window/door openings. One door will be replaced with a new full glass door in a design that coordinates with the windows, see right elevation. A new brick chimney and outdoor fireplace will also be constructed. Post-construction the rear yard will be approximately 40% impermeable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Additions, 7.2
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the rear porch addition for meeting all Guidelines and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with permit-ready construction drawings submitted to staff for final review.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Ms. Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED 1st: WALKER 2nd: HADEN

Ms. Walker moved to approve this project based on its adherence to guideline 7.2 for additions.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN,
LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: JORDAN, RUMSCH, BONAPARTE

RECUSE: BARTH

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00446, 2131 PARK ROAD – RESTORATION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing building is a one-story Craftsman bungalow construction in 1925. Architectural features include a side-gable roof with an engaged front porch and porte cochere, a small gable dormer and 6/1 and 4/1 double-hung wood windows. Lot size is approximately 50 x 180. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5 and 2-story single and multi-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is to restore a portion of the original front porch. The 6/1 window on the front elevation will be re-located to the new exterior wall. The new handrail will be wood to match the existing handrail on the left elevation. All new siding, trim, and details will match existing historic material. The local district designation survey photo shows the porch was enclosed before the establishment of the Dilworth local historic district. Evidence of the original brick piers are visible on the front elevation foundation. The 1953 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map indicates the presence of a full-width front porch.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. Based on the evidence provided, the project appears to be a true restoration of a portion of the front porch which is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Porches, 4.8 #1, 2, and 3.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the porch changes for meeting all Guidelines and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with permit-ready construction drawings submitted to staff for final review.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Ms. Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED

1st: HADEN **2nd:** LINEBERGER

Mr. Haden moved to approve this application as drawn.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN,
LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR RESTORATION APPROVED.

NOT HEARD SEPTEMBER

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: JORDAN, BONAPARTE, RUMSCH

LEFT: LINEBERGER, 1:50 PM

RETURNED: BARTH, 1:57 PM

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2020-00311, 216 S. SUMMIT AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The property is a vacant lot that measures approximately 54' x 187.5'. A 10' alley is located at the rear of the lot. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single-family structures. There are three large canopy trees on the lot – a 36" evergreen located at the front corner, a 24" pecan mid-lot, and an 18" pecan in the rear.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is new construction of a single-family structure and detached accessory dwelling unit (ADU).

Single-family structure:

- Proposed height is 28'-0" as measured from grade to ridge.
- Proposed width is 39'-4"
- Front porch is 8' deep, wood t & g flooring perpendicular to the front wall of the house.
- Proposed materials are fiber cement siding (Hardie Artisan smooth or Nichiha Savannah smooth) and brick in a traditional color. Windows will be aluminum clad with Simulated True Divided Lights (STD L).

ADU:

- Proposed footprint: 25'-0" x 35'-4"
- Proposed height: 23'-5"

Trees:

- Both the 36" evergreen and the 18" pecan are proposed for removal.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Context References:
 - a. 413 Grandin is not considered historic as it has had a major second story addition.
 - b. Garages at 512 Grandin, 601 Walnut and 304 S. Summit were all approved under old guidelines.
2. Height, Width, Scale References:
 - a. Scale and height are much larger than other single family buildings on the block. 216 has much less roof and higher eave lines than even the multi-family buildings on the block.
 - b. 220 and 208 S. Summit are multi-family buildings.
 - c. 201 S. Summit is a single-family building.
 - d. Both 515 and 517 Walnut Avenue are additions to existing structures; not new construction.
 - e. Houses in Hermitage Court are much grander and at a larger scale and massing than the buildings that comprise the Wesley Heights neighborhood.
 - f. The front porch appears to be more a $\frac{3}{4}$ width than a full width front porch, which is out of proportion for the style house proposed and affects the scale and massing.
3. Fenestration and rhythm on right elevation first level.
4. Tree removal of the 36" evergreen at the front of the lot.
5. ADU.
 - a. Setback may need to be adjusted by a 1' or so because setbacks on accessory buildings are measured to the furthest projection, which is the eave line, not the foundation.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

Ms. Bergmann, adjacent property owner, spoke in opposition of this application due to the tree removal request.

MOTION: CONTINUED

1st: HENNINGSON

2nd: HADEN

Mr. Henningson moved to continue this application for the following: Height, per guideline 6.6, number 2, reduce the height to be no taller than the tallest historic single-family house within 360-degree view. Trees - provide accurate tree sizing and a planting plan that does not leverage the planting strip. Provide a tree protection plan for the front trees and evaluate other construction or foundation techniques to minimize the impact on the root structure. Fenestration - add a shared jamb for clustered windows. On the main level on the front elevation, the windows should be larger and align to a hierarchy in window size and dimension between first floor and the second floor, and the windows on the right and left elevation towards the front of the house should be larger, and the second-level windows need to be better aligned with the height. Foundation - Per guideline 6.9, number 1, relate the height of the foundation to the height of the foundations on the historic buildings within the context. Porch - Increase the width of the front porch. Overhang - Ensure that the eave overhangs on the porch match the main house. ADU - Ensure that you follow guideline 8.9 when revising the height of the main house.

Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment, the level two window height is relative to the context specific to the house and surrounding houses. The porch width is related to the tightness to the windows on the main level. Porch width is relative to the breathing room to the location of the main level windows. To protect the tree in the front is the coordination between the architect, engineer and the arborist.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BARTH, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN,
MURYN, PARATI, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED.

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2019-00823, 821 WALNUT AVENUE – TREE REMOVAL
Applicant deferred to next meeting.

CONTINUED FROM AUGUST

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: JORDAN, BONAPARTE, LINEBERGER, RUMSCH

APPLICATION:

HDCCMA 2019-00827, 1316 THOMAS AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

This application as continued from the August 12, 2020 meeting for the following item:

- ***Guideline 6.6, number 2:*** *The proposed height of the building should be no taller than the tallest historic building on the block with a 360-degree view, and*
- ***Guideline 6.1, the preamble:*** *which speaks to context, as well as commercial on the fringe, whereby scale reducing techniques should be used to help minimize the impact on the neighborhood.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The proposed project site is currently a vacant lot being used for parking. It is located at the edge of the Plaza Midwood local historic district. Lot size is approximately 50' x 150.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is the construction of a new commercial building. Proposed height as measured from grade to ridge is 26'-9". Materials include James Hardie Artisan lap siding with a 5" reveal, Hardie corner boards and frieze trim, and areas of Hardie shingles in the gables. Porch columns proposed to be 8" square wood. Windows proposed to be Jeld-Wen Sitrine, aluminum clad, double-hung with 7/8" Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL).

Revised Proposal – October 14, 2020

- *Front elevation – completely revised scale and massing, front porch changes, various siding elements incorporated, window size/proportion adjusted.*
- *Right elevation – the incorporation of the turret helps to break down the scale of the right corner which will be highly visible from street view.*

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Material clarification needed: is the Hardie siding going to be the Artisan line? Fiber cement shake siding has not been approved by the Commission due to dimensions, shadow-lines, and uniform appearance.
2. HVAC location/screening.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS 1st: HENNINGSON 2nd: BARTH

Mr. Henningson moved to approve this application with the following conditions: The location of the AC units should be documented on the site plan, wood cedar shake to be used on the house, and add a planting strip, vegetation strip, grass strip, something in between the concrete and the house.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BARTH, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MURYN, PARATI, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

CONTINUED FROM SEPTEMBER

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: JORDAN, BONAPARTE, LINEBERGER, RUMSCH

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2019-00762, 1028 ISLEWORTH AVENUE – ADDITION

This application as continued from the September 9, 2020 meeting for the following items:

- ***Trees.*** Trees to remain need an adequate protection plan, including a site plan map. The trees to be removed need formal documentation from a certified arborist's analysis.
- ***Rear Yard.*** Screening at the HVAC units. Historic rear yard calculations to staff to include the future garage.
- ***Side porch.*** The second story massing is not approvable as drawn. It does not meet 6.5; 6.10; 4.8, numbers 5 and 6; and 2.5. More detail is required for the expression of the columns and beams at the historic side porch.
- ***Addition.*** More detail is required for brick compatibility for head, jam, sill, and corner board details with material specification.
- ***Fenestration.*** The I, as in Isaac, and H, as in Henry, windows are to match the historic size and light proportion of the small historic window on the front second story elevation. The rear elevation doors, STDL must match the proportion of the historic windowpane.

- **Shutters.** *Front elevation at the cluster windows are to be reviewed by staff.*
- **Material specifications.** *Including, but not limited to, the siding, windows, and brick.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a two-story, Colonial Revival House constructed c. 1930. The house has a few minimal Colonial Revival elements visible in the side gable eave returns, gable end chimney, and the symmetrical façade. There is a one-story rear ell, and a one-bay, one-story side porch projection, which has been enclosed with windows to create a sunroom. Exterior material is unpainted brick. A two-car frame garage is located behind the house. Lot size is 55' x 200'. Surrounding structures are one and two-story single-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project has multiple elements, including:

1. Front portico design change.
2. A second-level addition to the existing one-story side porch projection.
3. Rear addition. Details and materials to match existing.
4. Request to paint the entire exterior of the house.
5. Demolition of the existing garage.
6. Construction of a new two-bay brick garage – may be eligible for Administrative review due to location.
7. Replacement shutters on the front elevation –eligible for Administrative review.

Revised Proposal – July 8, 2020

- *Front Elevation: portico re-designed*
- *Right Elevation: Window placement on original house is shown to remain. Fireplace on addition changed to interior only with vent shown*
- *Left Elevation: Roof redesign on the side porch addition*
- *Rear Elevation: Roof height lowered*
- *Information provided about footprint dimensions of surrounding structures*
- *Additional information provided about converting the side porch to heated square footage*
- *Request to paint brick and replace original wood windows has been rescinded*

Revised Proposal – September 9, 2020

- *Trees shown on site plan and tree protection plan provided*
- *HVAC units shown on site plan and first floor plan*
- *Rear yard permeability calculations provided*
- *Front portico columns are round*
- *Side porch design changed*
- *Rear addition massing changed*
- *Fenestration changed*

Revised Proposal – October 14, 2020

- *HVAC units shown on site plan and first floor plan*
- *Side porch design changed*
- *Materials information provided*
- *Fenestration changed*

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Windows will be aluminum clad wood; specific manufacturer may be approved by staff.
2. Apron trim under windows in wood siding should be eliminated.
3. Minor changes may be approved by staff (ex. final selection of HVAC screening material).

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED 1st: HINDMAN 2nd: HADEN

Ms. Hindman moved to approve this application as drawn.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BARTH, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN,
MURYN, PARATI, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: JORDAN, BONAPARTE, LINEBERGER, RUMSCH

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00277, 1106 E. WORTHINGTON AVENUE – ADDITION

This application as continued from the September 9, 2020 meeting for the following item:

- *Replacement windows. Guidelines 4.14, number 1, 2, 3. Work with a reputable contractor or business, organization to prove that the windows are beyond repair and support with the evaluation with photographic evidence that the windows are in fact beyond repair.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1.5 story Tudor Revival brick cottage constructed c. 1930. Architectural features include an asymmetrical façade with a large chimney and pair of façade gables one of which contains an arched entry with keystones and the other a diamond pane window, steep-side gables with stucco accents, 6/1 double-hung wood windows, and a one-story rear ell. Lot size is approximately 60’ x 155’. Adjacent structures are a mix of one- and two-story residential buildings. A rear screen porch addition, window restoration, retaining wall and front walk repairs were approved at the staff level under COA# HDCADMRM-2020-00278.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is for a dormer addition, changing wood vents to windows in the gables on the left and right elevations, and window replacement. The proposed dormer is slightly taller than the side gable on right elevation but ties in beneath the main ridge of the house.

Revised Proposal – October 14, 2020

- The dormer was Approved for probable staff approval with the conditions that the triple windows be ganged with mullion trim and the roof form changed to a shed with a 2/12, 3/12, or 4/12 pitch and hinge 6” below the existing ridge.
- Due to the interior stair configuration, the dormer was redesigned to have a ¼/12 pitch, which is outside of the parameters for staff approval. The revised dormer design is before the Commission for review.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Dormer:
 - a. Trim details needed, including mullion dimensions.
2. Replacement Windows: No longer being requested, the windows will be repaired.
3. Minor changes may be approved by staff, such as window trim details.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

1st: HINDMAN

2nd: BARTH

Ms. Hindman moved to approve this application with the qualifier that with the unique condition of the home, and in the effort to preserve this home, and in order to proceed with this minimal intervention in the home and comply with the guidelines, we are allowing a flat roof dormer within the contemporary massing. We approve the massing with the applicant to work with staff on either a dormer in the stylistic expression of a flat roof Tudor dormer or the stylistic expression of a contemporary flat roof dormer with detailing consistent with the stylistic expression.

Ms. Parati made a friendly amendment to the qualifier that the dormer is not visible from the street.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BARTH, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MURYN, PARATI, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: JORDAN, BONAPARTE, LINEBERGER, RUMSCH

APPLICATION:

HDCCMI 2020-00324, 1513, 1515, 1521 S. MINT STREET – COMMERCIAL BUILDING REHABILITATION

This application as continued from the September 9, 2020 meeting for the following items:

- *Provide accurate drawings and more detail on the clerestory addition, on any fenestration changes, on the awnings and murals. Dimensions and materials must be noted on all elements (windows, awnings, murals, etc.).*
- *The presentation should show side-by-side, on the same page, elevations of the existing building, what was previously approved, and a new proposed elevation of what is being changed/asked for now.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing properties are connected brick Industrial/Commercial buildings. 1513 was constructed c. 1927 and 1515 was constructed c. 1946.

1513 is a three-bay building. Material is brick running bond (painted) with a parapet roof with decorative soldier course brick at the roofline and above the storefront openings. Most of the original storefront openings have been infilled over the years with a combination of glass block and wood paneling. The transom windows over the left and center bays appear to retain the original metal windows framed in wood trim. The three signage spaces appear to be later additions. The rear third of the building appears to be a later addition. The lot size is approximately 50' x 150'.

1515 is four-bay building with smaller storefront windows, recessed front entry, and a garage bay. Material is brick common bond, painted. A soldier course of inset brick runs the length of the building above the windows and doors giving the storefront a modified tripartite design. The top third of the building has inset header bricks that form a rectangle across all four bays, likely originally intended as an area for signage. The lot size is approximately 50' x 150'.

1521 is a vacant gravel lot used for parking. Adjacent structures are commercial buildings, parking lots and single family residential to the rear along Westwood Avenue and Wickford Place.

On September 11, 2019, the Commission approved fenestration changes, existing windows storefronts and doors, painted brick, restoration of historic transom windows, parking area improvements, and the demolition of a non-historic rear addition at 1513 S. Mint. The approval did not include signage, murals, awnings, or lighting.

PROPOSAL:

1513 S. Mint Street

- Rear Addition. A clerestory addition of 3'-2" will be added to the rear portion of the building to allow for natural light and proper roof drainage at the addition. The height is no higher than the top of the adjacent building's barrel roof.
- Lighting.
- No changes to front elevation.

1515 S. Mint Street

- East Elevation – storefront window and door changes.
- No change to front elevation.
- South Elevation – new door and canopy removed.

Revised Proposal – October 14, 2020

- Detailed drawing of clerestory
- Fenestration changes, awnings, lighting changes shown side-by-side on same page with dimensions and materials noted.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Minor changes may be approved by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED 1st: HENNINGSON 2nd: HADEN

Mr. Henningson moved to approve this application as written. We approve the painting of the brick on the clerestory and the rear elevation on 1513 because painting the brick will unify the CMU or non-historic additions with the historic building.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BARTH, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN,
MURYN, PARATI, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR THE REHABILITATION OF A COMMERCIAL BUILDING APPROVED.

NEW CASE

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: JORDAN, BONAPARTE, LINEBERGER, RUMSCH

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00388, 405 HEATHCLIFF STREET – ADDITION/ACCESSORY BUILDING

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one-story, American Small House constructed c. 1958. According to the Wesley Heights National Register Nomination, the house was moved to this lot in 1994. The house is wrapped in vinyl siding and had vinyl 1/1 replacement windows. It is unclear if the front stoop is original. Based on the design, size and scale of the porch supports, these appear to be later additions. There are very few original distinguishable architectural features on this house, which may or may not be present under the vinyl siding. Lot size is 63’ x 150’. Surrounding structures are 1 and 1.5 story single family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project has multiple elements, including:

1. Front portico design change.
2. Rear addition of heated space that ties below the original ridge.

3. Remove the vinyl siding and replace any original siding with new Hardie siding. Replacement window and door trim is also proposed.
4. Construction of a new garage with living space above at the rear of the lot. Footprint is approximately 23'-0" x 32'-0' and height is 22'-6" as measured from grade to ridge but sits below the house due to lot topography.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Front Elevation:
 - a. Replacement front door – dentil molding is incongruous for the architecture of this house.
 - b. Porch flooring is wood decking, not tongue and groove flooring.
 - c. Design of porch columns are incongruous with the architecture of the house. Full length square wood columns would be more appropriate to the house.
2. Left Elevation:
 - a. Loss of roof return and rear corner board at transition between original house and addition.
 - b. 8 x 8 column noted at rear corner of addition but not drawn.
 - c. Eze-Breeze noted; however, plans show siding and double-hung wood windows.
3. Rear Addition
 - a. Clarification needed. Eze-Breeze noted; however, the plans show double-hung wood windows as drawn. Eze-Breeze has not been approved by the Commission.
4. Accessory Building
 - a. Located at the lowest point of the yard as far away from 4th Street and Heathcliff as possible.
 - b. Co-planer rear dormer.
 - c. Potential setback issue needs to be clarified with Zoning staff. If Zoning considers the building and Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU), then it will need to be 15'-0" off the rear property line instead of 3'-0".
5. Minor changes may be approved by staff, including setback of the accessory building.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Ms. Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: CONTINUE

1st: BARTH 2nd: HINDMAN

Mr. Barth moved to continue this application. One, per Section 3.22, front porch, front door has to be restudied to be in keeping with the American Small House style, as well as the addition to be in keeping with the style, including the windows to be mulled together to read as an enclosed porch with column and beam details on the corners, as well as an enclosed soffit versus an open soffit, and the left elevation addition wall to be offset from the existing house wall by six to 12 inches. Per Section 6.9 and 4.4, we would also like to see masonry foundation underneath the addition versus open air. We would like to deny any use of Eze Breeze product on this application with windows to be approved by staff. We would like to indicate that we are requesting T and G flooring on the front porch only versus decking. We would like the main fence line on the left elevation in the front yard to stay the same, in the same location. The addition will be offset per Guideline 7.2, number 3. As for the ADU in the rear of the yard, we would request that the applicant offset the shed dormer on the rear elevation on the ADU at least 12 inches from the wall below it on the main floor.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BARTH, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN,
MURYN, PARATI, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION/ACCESSORY BUILDING CONTINUED.

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00317, 1827 WILMORE DRIVE – DRIVEWAY
Application withdrawn by applicant.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: JORDAN, BOONAPARTE, LINEBERGER RUMSCH
LEFT: WALKER, 6:06 PM

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00470, 2409 CHARLOTTE DRIVE – PORCH CHANGES

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing building was originally a one-story Picturesque Revival constructed in 1925 with a major two-story addition at the rear. Architectural features include an asymmetrical façade with a catslide roof over an engaged recessed entry. The existing front stoop is a small concrete area at the front door. The entire house is wrapped in vinyl siding. Lot size is approximately 50 x 155. Adjacent structures are one and two-story single-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is to expand an existing front stoop to the left edge of the house. Proposed materials are bluestone with a brick rowlock edge and brick steps. A small brick walk will connect the expanded patio to the existing driveway.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. With the exception of the bluestone flooring, the porch design is not incongruous with the District. If the porch floor material was changed to concrete, broken-terracotta tile, or brick, then the proposed project would meet the guidelines for Porches, 4.8 and Additions 7.2.
2. Additional information about the addresses provided by the applicant that have bluestone on the front porch or front walk:
 - a. The example image, labeled 1B, on the site plan is 2325 Charlotte Drive. In reviewing Google street view, the original patio at 2315 Charlotte Drive was broken terracotta with a brick rowlock.
 - b. 1926 Ewing - Approved in March 2012 under old guidelines, HDC 2012-042.
 - c. 2125 Dilworth East – According to Google street view, the front walkway was the original concrete in 2011. Sometime between 2011 and May 2014 the front walk was changed to

brick. By March 2015, the walkway was widened and steps to the street both changed from brick to stone.

- d. 1215 E. Worthington – According to Google street view, the bluestone has been present since at least 2007. According to property tax records, the house was extensively remodeled in 2006.
 - e. 2137 Dilworth East – Difficult to see but appears to have been stone since at least 2007 (as indicated by Google street view).
 - f. 2111 Dilworth East – Approved in November 2010 under old guidelines, HDC 2010-118
3. Minor changes may be approved by staff (such as floor material).

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION 1: APPROVED 1st: HENNINGSON 2nd: HADEN

Mr. Henningson moved to approve the widening of the front porch as designed.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: BARTH, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN,
MURYN, PARATI

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR WIDENING OF THE FRONT PORCH APPROVED.

MOTION 2: DENIED 1st: HENNINGSON 2nd: HADEN

Mr. Henningson moved to deny the use of bluestone because it is incongruous with the architectural style of the house and does not align with the Secretary of Interior Standards, number 2.5.

VOTE: 5/1

AYES: BARTH, HADEN, HENNINGSON,
MURYN, PARATI,

NAYS: HINDMAN

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR THE USE OF BLUESTONE DENIED.

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00356, 712 E. TREMONT AVENUE – FRONT WALKWAY

Due to no quorum present, this case could not be heard and was deferred to the next meeting.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: JORDAN, BONAPARTE, LINEBERGER, RUMSCH, WALKER

APPLICATION:

HDCRDEMO 2020-00378, 1533 WICKFORD PLACE – DEMOLITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one story, brick American Small House constructed in 1941. Architectural features include a symmetrical three-bay façade with central entry portico with a broken terracotta tile porch floor and a central chimney. Exterior material is brick and with the gable ends wrapped in vinyl. All doors and windows appear to be replacements. The lot is a unique pie-shape measuring approximately 134’ x 128’ x 114’. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5 story single-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is full demolition of the main building and smaller accessory building; the larger accessory building/garage is to remain. The following information is presented for the Commission’s review and consideration:

- Digital photos of all sides of building
- Digital photos of significant architectural details
- Property survey
- Zoutewelle survey

STAFF ANALYSIS:

1. The Commission will determine if the application is complete.
2. The Commission will determine whether or not the building has special significance to the Wilmore Local Historic District. With affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to 365-Day Stay of Demolition.
3. If the Commission determines that this property is does not have any special significance to the district, then demolition may take place without a delay or upon the approval of new construction plans.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION 1: APPLICATION COMPLETE 1st: HADEN 2nd: HINDMAN

Mr. Haden moved to determine that the application is complete with all the required documentation provided by the applicant.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** BARTH, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN,
MURYN, PARATI

NAYS: NONE

MOTION 2: APPROVED 1st: HADEN 2nd: MURYN

Mr. Haden moved to determine the building has special significance and value toward maintaining the character of Wilmore local Historic District because of the year of construction and architectural style.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** BARTH, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN,
MURYN, PARATI

NAYS: NONE

MOTION 3: APPROVED

1st: HADEN 2nd: MURYN

Mr. Haden moved to approve the demolition with a 365 day stay due to its special significance and value toward maintaining the character of the district.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: BARTH, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN,
MURYN, PARATI

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION APPROVED WITH 365 DAY STAY.

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2020-00467, 2010 THE PLAZA – NEW CONSTRUCTION TOWNHOMES
Application deferred to next meeting due to time constraints.

Mr. Haden moved to approve the July 8, 2020 minutes. Mr. Barth seconded, and the vote was unanimous.

Chairperson Parati: We have reached the end of the agenda, and with no further business to discuss, this meeting is adjourned at 6:54 p.m.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission