



APPROVED MARCH 10, 2021

---

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REMOTE ONLINE MEETING  
February 10, 2021 ROOM 280 + WebEx**

**MINUTES**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Ms. Kim Parati (Chairperson)  
Mr. PJ Henningson (Vice Chairperson)  
Ms. Jessica Hindman (2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chairperson)  
Mr. Chris Barth  
Ms. Nichelle Bonaparte  
Mr. Phil Goodwin  
Mr. Jim Haden  
Ms. Christa Lineberger  
Mr. Chris Muryn  
Mr. Damon Rumsch  
Ms. Jill Walker

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Vacant

**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, Senior Assistant City Attorney  
Ms. Jill Sanchez-Myers, Senior Assistant City Attorney  
Ms. Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

With a quorum present, Chairperson Parati called the February 10, 2021 remote online Historic District Commission Meeting to order at 1:03 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. Speakers will begin by stating their 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 ADDRESSES:**

**NOT HEARD IN JANUARY**

HDCRMI 2020-00703, 1716 Winthrop Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2020-00707, 933 Berkeley Avenue	Dilworth

**CONSENT AGENDA**

HDCRMI 2020-00740, 400 S. Summit Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDCRMI 2021-00036, 1533 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore

**CONTINUED FROM NOVEMBER 18<sup>TH</sup>**

HDCRMI 2020-00210, 1827 Ewing Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMA 2020-00501, 628 Woodruff Place	Wesley Heights

**CONTINUED FROM JANUARY 13<sup>TH</sup>**

HDCRMA 2020-00467, 2010 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMA 2020-00633, 1913 Cleveland Avenue	Dilworth

**NEW CASES**

HDCRMI 2020-00743, 2000 Charlotte Drive	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2020-00719, 536 E. Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2020-00722, 251 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
HDCADMRM 2020-00671, 420 S. Summit Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDCRMI 2020-00702, 429 W. Park Avenue	Wilmore
HDCRMI 2020-00720, 1912 Park Road	Dilworth

**THE COMMISSION HELD A PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE OAKLAWN PARK DESIGN GUIDELINE SUPPLMENT. THE PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AT 12:57 P.M.**

**NO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC SPOKE AT THE PUBLIC HEARING.**

COMMISSIONER HINDMAN NOTED FOR THE RECORD THAT THE DESIGNATION OF OAKLAWN PARK AS A LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICT IS REFLECTIVE OF A PHENOMENAL AMOUNT OF WORK DONE BY THE RESIDENTS OF OAKLAWN PARK AND THE HISTORIC DISTRICT STAFF, COMMENDS EVERYONE.

AT 1:02 P.M., MR. HADEN MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MS. LINEBERGER AND THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS, 11-0.

---

NOT HEARD IN JANUARY

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:**

RECUSE: BARTH

**APPLICATION:**

HDCRMI 2020-00703, 1716 WINTHROP AVE (PID: 12308409) - ADDITION/ACCESSORY BUILDING

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1.5-story Dutch Colonial Revival house constructed c. 1920. Architectural details include a front gambrel roof with a full-façade porch supported by reeded square columns, and one-story side gable wings. Lot size is 50' x 190'. Surrounding structures are 1.5, 2 and 3-story, institutional, multi-family and single-family buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is an expansion of an existing one-story rear addition. Proposed materials are a brick foundation, wood lap siding with mitered corners, wood columns, wood trim and double-hung wood windows to match existing. The proposed roof material is standing seam metal, which is a new material for the building. On the rear elevation, one of the original windows will be moved slightly to accommodate the new second story addition.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Proposed roof form of the addition, particularly the two-story portion. Changing the existing incongruous rear addition is an opportunity to bring the roof forms into greater congruity with the architectural style of the house.
2. Lack of fenestration on the second level on the right elevation.
3. Minor changes may be approved by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>: RUMSCH 2<sup>nd</sup>: GOODWIN**

Mr. Rumsch moved to approve this application with the following provisions: staff review the second story addition and roof, with the gambrel roof reflected on the rear elevation, per guideline 7.2-additions, and the window of the second story conform to more of a dormer look. Staff to approve the location of the second-story window on the gambrel gable per guideline 6.10, #3 and the cottage-style windows on the second floor per guideline 6.12. The side yard elevation blank wall needs fenestration.

Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment, reference guidelines 6.10, #3 for the gambrel roof.

**VOTE:** 10/0

**AYES:** BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN,  
LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI, RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION AND ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:**

RETURNED: BARTH, 2:00 PM

**APPLICATION:**

HDCRMI 2020-00707, 933 BERKELEY AVENUE (PID: 12309209) – ACCESSORY BUILDING ROOF, NON-TRADITIONAL MATERIAL REQUEST

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a two-story brick Colonial Revival constructed in 1933. Architectural features include one-story side wings, 6/6 double-hung windows, and a classical cornice detail with dentil molding and pent eaves. The lot size is an irregular pie shape measuring 171 x 177 x 71 x 88. The Dilworth National Register Nomination specifically mentions a garage. However, the architecture of the existing carport indicates that it is not an original structure but built more recently to compliment the main house. In March 2020, the Commission approved the addition of a wood frame screen system to an existing rear porch on the main house and a one-story addition to the existing carport under application number HDCRMI-2019-00819.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a request to install an alternative roofing material, synthetic slate, on a previously approved addition and changes to the carport structure. The main house underwent a major addition in 2003. A new roof to match the existing material asphalt shingle was approved; however, an artificial slate roof was installed instead. The roof material change on the main house was discovered by staff in spring 2020 when the applicant requested to install the same material on the one-story accessory structure. The installation of alternative roofing materials is not eligible for Administrative approval.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The Commission will determine if the proposed project meets the Design Guidelines for roofs.
2. Minor changes may be approved by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION:** APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

**1<sup>st</sup>:** HINDMAN **2<sup>nd</sup>:** RUMSCH

Ms. Hindman moved to approve this nontraditional material request based on guidelines 8.9, number 3, 6.10, number 6, 4.5, number 5, the fact that the owners inherited this roof and is not of their own doing on the primary structure, and with the condition a sample is provided to staff for record.

Mr. Rumsch made a friendly amendment, provide a sample of the material and name of the material along with the specs so we know what we are approving.

Ms. Parati made a friendly amendment, we are not replacing a slate roof with an artificial slate but instead an architectural shingle roof.

**VOTE:** 11/0

**AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON,  
HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI, RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY BUILDING ROOF, NON-TRADITIONAL MATERIAL REQUEST, APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

---

**CONSENT AGENDA**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:**

**APPLICATION:**

HDCRMI 2020-00740, 400 S SUMMIT AVENUE (PID: 07102411) – REHABILITATION

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

Known as the Wadsworth House, 400 South Summit Avenue was the first house built in Wesley Heights. Designed by Charlotte architect Louis Asbury and built in 1911 in the Shingle Style, architectural features include a square mass, hipped roof with hipped dormers, a full-length porch with a Porte cochere, and multi-paned windows. The accessory structure, also constructed in 1911, is a combination carriage house and servant’s quarters which matches the main house in design and materials. Lot size is approximately 195’ x 187.5’. Adjacent houses are one- and two-story single-family structures. A rear addition was approved by the Commission on September 11, 2019 under COA# HDCRMA-2019-00507.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is in three parts:

1. Siding replacement. The existing siding on both the main house and the carriage house is completely deteriorated, and the applicant has detailed efforts to restore and reuse original shingles in the attached presentation. Proposed product: 3/8” wood shingles to match existing sourced from Waldun Forest Products, British Columbia, Canada. A few well-known historic properties that Waldun has supplied shakes/shingles for include Theodore Roosevelt’s house, Camp David, Edgar Allen Poe’s house and Independence Hall.
2. Front porch ceiling replacement. The original beadboard ceiling was deteriorated as detailed in the attached presentation.
3. Removal of access stairs from the front porch to the Porte cochere. The access stairs appear to be a later addition. The porch design will match the left elevation.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets guidelines for Building Materials, Porches, and Trim, pages 4.8, 4.11, and 5.2.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the projects 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 for or against this application.

**MOTION: APPROVED**                      **1<sup>st</sup>: HADEN**            **2<sup>nd</sup>: LINEBERGER**

Mr. Haden moved to approve this application as submitted.

**VOTE:** 11/0

**AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON,  
HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI, RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR REHABILITATION APPROVED.

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:**

**APPLICATION:**

HDCRMI 2021-00036, 1533 WILMORE DRIVE (PID: 11908227) – ACCESSORY BUILDING

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a one-story, Bungalow constructed c. 1931. Architectural details include a full-width, engaged front porch supported by stone piers and tapered columns and wood brackets. Siding is Dutch-lap wood with wood shake in the front gable. The front door and windows are replacements. Lot size is 50’ x 150’. Surrounding structures are 1 and 1.5 story single family buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is new accessory structure that incorporates a two-car garage, office space, and storage into a single structure. The building exceeds all required zoning setbacks (required = 3’, proposed = 5’) and size limits for accessory structures (see letter from Zoning staff). The building has a height of 17’-7 ¾” which is 1’0” lower than the ridge of the primary structure. All proposed materials are traditional to match existing including wood siding, trim, double-hung wood windows and brick foundation. Post-construction rear yard impermeable coverage will be 45%.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets guidelines for Accessory Buildings, page 8.9.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the project, with the recommendation that hardware on the garage doors be added to make them appear as two-separate doors, 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 for or against this application.

**MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS      1<sup>st</sup>: GOODWIN   2<sup>nd</sup>: RUMSCH**

Mr. Goodwin moved to approve this application with the condition the garage doors be changed and designed to look like two separate garage doors, to be worked on with staff.

**VOTE:** 11/0

**AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON,  
HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI, RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

---

**CONTINUED FROM NOVEMBER 18<sup>TH</sup>**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:**

LEFT: HENNINGSON, 2:40 PM

**APPLICATION:**

HDCRMI 2020-00210, 1827 EWING AVENUE (PID: 12111401) – ADDITION

**This application as continued from the November 18, 2020 meeting for the following items:**

- **Screen Porch.** *Per guidelines 4.8, numbers 5 and 6, provide additional details on the windows and the trimming out of the screened porch.*
- **Changes to Main House/Windows.** *Provide additional graphics and notes on any windows and other elements that are being replaced on the existing house. Mainly, the glass block window.*
- **Rear Addition.** *Per guidelines 6.7, number 1 and 6.8. Reanalyze the condition of the porch addition, including the basement door, to influence more of a human scale and proportion with respect to the slenderness of the columns and the inadequate base for the structure it's supporting.*
- **Accessory structure.** *Per guideline 8.9, number 3, reanalyze the accessory structure addition.*

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The property is a one-story Colonial Revival building constructed in 1928 located at the corner of Ewing Avenue and E. Worthington Avenue. Architectural features include a one-bay gabled hood at entry supported by round columns, a fanlight over the front door, 8/1 cottage-style windows, pent eaves, and a screened-in side porch. Lot size is approximately 66'x 140'. Adjacent structures are 1-, 1.5-, and 2-story single and multi-family structures.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is a gable addition on the rear elevation, and a second level addition to the historic garage structure. No trees are proposed for removal. Post-construction rear yard impermeable area will be 40% (not including the pool and plunge pool).

House Addition + Side Porch Changes:

- The addition ties in below the existing ridge and the massing is shifted to the left to provide a roof over an existing entry stoop on the left elevation.
- The rear wall of the addition is stepped-in from the original rear wall of the first level.
- Roofs are hip to match the rear hip roof on the house.
- New covered patio roof to be supported by brick piers and columns. Columns are the same dimensions as the original front porch columns.
- The screens on the side porch to be replaced with a panel/shutter system in traditional materials.
- Brick to remain unpainted.

Garage Addition:

- Height of the main house, as measured from grade to ridge, is approximately 22.9’ at the front and 24.3’ at the rear.
- Existing garage height, as measured from grade to ridge, is approximately 14.6’.
- The proposed height of the garage, as measured from grade to ridge, is 21.7’.

*Revised Proposal – February 10, 2021*

- Provided porch paneling detail and revised rear elevation for side porch changes.
- Rear addition. Added 4’ brick wall to create more defined patio space
- Revised addition to the accessory structure.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. House Addition
  - a. Clarification needed on which line of Hardie siding will be used – Artisan?
2. Garage Addition:
  - a. Garage door design + material. Two separate single-bay doors or should appear to be separate.
3. Tree protection plan for the 24” hardwood in the rear yard.
4. Landscape and site features may be reviewed at the Administrative level (fencing, pools, walkways, etc.).
5. Minor changes may be approved by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION: CONTINUED      1<sup>st</sup>: BARTH      2<sup>nd</sup>: RUMSCH**

Mr. Barth moved to continue this application; to clarify and remove the note on the porch enclosure for shutters, for consistency we need for those to say windows. We would like to see the applicant study the porch addition toward the rear of the house for elements such as scale, columns, human proportion in relation to the height of the porch, as well as, additional study on the relevance of pedestrian door at grade level as it applies to 6.9, number 1, 6.7, number 1, and 6.8. We also need to have the applicant do a



restudy of the garage door on the accessory structure to read as two separate doors, 8.9, number 6 and request the applicant provide us with a tree protection plan as noted in 8.5, number 4.

**VOTE:** 10/0

**AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HINDMAN,  
LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI, RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.

---

**APPLICATION:**

HDCRMA 2020-00501, 628 WOODRUFF PLACE (PID: 07103515) - ADDITION/ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU)  
Applicant deferred to March.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:**

RETURNED: HENNINGSON, 3:45 PM

---

**APPLICATION:**

HDCRMA 2020-00467, 2010 The Plaza (PID: 09506101, 09506131, 09506102) – NEW CONSTRUCTION  
(MULTI-FAMILY)

**This application as continued from the January 13, 2021 meeting for the following items:**

- *New Construction, guidelines on page 6.1 and page 2.5 for context. Particularly as the building that fronts The Plaza relates to its context, the street's character including what is located across the street.*
- *Look into further development of the building along Thurmond as it pertains to the stepping of the facade and other embellishments around the front door of the individual units.*
- *Separate the dormers so that they are true dormers and to provide a continuous cornice line at the second story and to eliminate any material transition at the exterior corners of the dormers.*
- *Please note on the plan for HVAC locations that was discussed to be in the roof -- or hidden by the roof parapets*
- *The Commission has not evaluated the project for guidelines 6.11 through 6.16 or Chapter 8. The applicant needs to provide details on architectural elements and trim.*

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The property at 2010 The Plaza is the Van Landingham Estate, a designated local historic landmark. The four-acre property has two accessory buildings with fairly dense landscaping. **PROPOSAL:**

The project is the construction of four new buildings that comprise a total of 22 townhomes.

- Ten (10) units are accessed from The Plaza and face the main house.
- Twelve (12) units are accessed from Belvedere Avenue and face Thurmond Place.
- Maximum roof peak is approximately 35'-10".
- Proposed material palette is Nichiha Savannah Smooth siding, Miratec (trim), brick, aluminum clad windows with brick mold trim/fiber cement trim.
- Roof details include wood fascia and brackets
- Other site features include landscaping, tree planting, and new driveways and walkways.

*Revised Proposal – January 13, 2021*

- Site plan with existing conditions and tree save shown
- Site plan with partial landscape planting plan shown
- Revised elevations
- Streetscape with elevations
- 3-D views

*Revised Proposal – February 10, 2021*

- *Height of units fronting The Plaza and Belvedere are 33'-6"*
- *Heights of all other units is 35'6"*
- *HVAC locations noted*
- *Architectural details provided (window trim, brackets, etc.)*
- *New 3-D views*

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Height/Scale/Context.

The tallest buildings on The Plaza are two-stories (1501, 2010, and 2100 The Plaza). When comparing these three properties the foundation heights, window header heights, and eave lines all generally align. The other similarity is the roof design. All three properties have hip roofs which recede from the tallest point. The alignment of the roof eaves would be a better measurement to consider when comparing the proposed townhomes to the existing historic structures. Height is one factor that cannot be separated from the overall scale/massing of the individual parts of a building.

- a. Guidelines, page 2.5: "In evaluating a project proposal, the HDC and its staff refer to the adopted design guidelines that are based on the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. They also examine the specific context of the property in question."
- b. New Construction Guidelines, page 6.1 "Charlotte's historic districts' distinctive character is derived not only from architectural style but also from the nature of the street created by building setback, spacing, mass, and height as well as the landscape quality. This street character and the surrounding properties are considered to be the context for any new building. As such, the block in which the new site is located should be carefully studied when designing a new infill dwelling. This context should include both sides of the subject street."

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION: CONTINUED      1<sup>st</sup>: RUMSCH    2<sup>nd</sup>: HADEN**

Mr. Rumsch moved to continue this application for a floor plan showing front porches, patios, walks, and the street connection, including the issue with the hedges. A survey of the surrounding elevations of the front features of the surrounding buildings which would include the height, the scale, the context, the foundation, cornices, porches, rhythm, and other site features as described in Chapter 8., A protection plan for any trees and landscaping that need to be protected during the construction process and dimensions put on the drawing so we can understand specific dimensions of roof heights, if they are not displayed.

**VOTE:** 10/1

**AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON,

HINDMAN, MURYN, PARATI, RUMSCH, WALKER  
**NAYS:** LINEBERGER

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION (MULTI-FAMILY) CONTINUED.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:**

LEFT: LINEBERGER, 6:00 PM

**APPLICATION:**

HDCRMA 2020-00633, 1913 CLEVELAND AVENUE (PID: 12105619) – NEW CONSTRUCTION (MULTI-FAMILY)

**This application as continued from the January 13, 2021 meeting for the following items:**

- *The project does not meet the guidelines for New Construction as outlined on page 6.1 regarding massing, roof form, height and width. The motion incorporates all the Commission’s discussion on the project regarding the concerns and desires to see what happens with this building.*
- *The Commission has not reviewed any other elements or guidelines including architectural details.*

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a one story, concrete block three-bay building. The c. 1960 building mentioned in the Dilworth National Register Nomination burnt down in the early 1990s. The current structure was built in 1993. The building has a shallow gable roof with a front parapet.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is new construction of a multi-family building. The new structure is approximately four stories along Cleveland Avenue and five-stories at the rear of the building, due to site topography. Exterior materials are brick and aluminum clad windows. A partial-width front stoop faces Cleveland Avenue.

*Revised Proposal – February 10, 2021*

- Front elevation redesign with full-width front porch
- Left elevation design changes
- Additional cornice and architectural details added to all elevations.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Height, Massing, Scale, Setback, Spacing, and Roof Forms.
2. Site plan with the proposed building that includes dimensions – setbacks, porch depth, the depth/length of the bump-outs on the left and right elevations, etc.
3. Landscape plan with HVAC locations noted.
4. The building maximizes the entire lot and will be directly adjacent to the existing multi-family structures on Euclid Avenue.
5. The applicant provided a Zoutewelle survey for E. Worthington; however, the proposed building at 1913 Cleveland is not shown behind it. An exhibit that illustrates the proposed building behind the existing properties on both Euclid and E. Worthington Avenue would help to illustrate the potential impacts to the district and existing structures.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

Ms. Karen and Mr. John Fletcher, neighborhood resident, spoke against this application.  
Mr. Ken and Ms. Lucy Raynor, neighborhood residents, spoke against this application.  
Mr. Rick Cohen, neighborhood resident, spoke against this application.  
Ms. Ellen Cittarella, neighborhood resident, spoke against this application.  
Mr. Benson Okley, neighborhood resident, spoke against this application.

**MOTION: DENIED     1<sup>st</sup>: MURYN     2<sup>nd</sup>: WALKER**

Mr. Muryn moved to deny this application because it does not meet the following guidelines: The Secretary of Interior standards 9 and 10 as it pertains to new construction, 6.5 as it relates to forms of construction in surrounding context, 6.6, height, 6.7, scale within the vicinity of the neighboring buildings, 6.8, directional expression of new residential buildings, 6.9, foundation, 6.10, roof forms, 6.11, cornices, 6.12, doors and windows. Under the qualification that information was not provided, 6.2, setback, 6.3, spacing, 6.4, orientation, 6.5, massing, 6.6, height and width and 6.1, context.

Ms. Jessica Hindman made a friendly amendment, the Zoutewelle survey giving us information about how all of the big-pictures guidelines are interpreted as one, and cannot be taken piecemeal; and that this particular Zoutewelle exhibit demonstrated that while the height above sea level may be lower than the adjacent building, the height of perceived in the context is taller than the adjacent building because of the space of wall. This incorporates my other comments about Slide 238.

**VOTE:** 10/0

**AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON,  
HINDMAN, MURYN, PARATI, RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION (MULTI-FAMILY) DENIED.

---

Due to time constraints, the following cases will be heard on March 10, 2021:

HDCRMI 2020-00743, 2000 Charlotte Drive  
HDCRMI 2020-00719, 536 E Tremont Avenue  
HDCRMI 2020-00722, 251 W Kingston Avenue  
HDCADMRM 2020-00671, 420 S Summit Avenue  
HDCRMI 2020-00702, 429 W Park Avenue  
HDCRMI 2020-00720, 1912 Park Road

Chairperson Parati adjourned the meeting citing the end of the agenda with no further items to discuss at 7:04 p.m.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission