



**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REMOTE ONLINE MEETING
October 13, 2021
ROOM 280 + WebEx**

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. P.J. Henningson (Vice Chairperson)
Ms. Jessica Hindman (2nd Vice Chairperson)
Mr. Chris Barth
Ms. Nichelle Bonaparte
Mr. Phil Goodwin
Mr. Jim Haden
Ms. Christa Lineberger
Mr. Chris Muryn
Ms. Jill Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ms. Kim Parati (Chairperson)
Vacant
Vacant

OTHERS PRESENT: Ms. Kristi Harpst, Administrator Historic District Commission
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
Ms. Jill Sanchez-Myers, Senior Assistant City Attorney
Ms. Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

With a quorum present Second Vice Chairperson Hindman called the October 13, 2021 remote online meeting at 1:01 p.m. Second Vice Chairperson Hindman 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 Standards. 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. Second Vice Chairperson Hindman 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 Vice-Chairperson Henningson will further open the floor to anyone who has joined the meeting by telephone. Speakers will begin by stating their name and address. Vice-Chairperson Henningson swore in all Applicants and Staff and continued to swear in people as they arrived for the duration of the meeting.

INDEX OF ADDRESSES:

CONSENT AGENDA

| | |
|---|----------|
| HDCRMI 2021-00836, 2003 Dilworth Road E | Dilworth |
| HDCRMI 2021-00492, 1940 Park Road | Dilworth |
| HDCRMI 2021-00601, 1945 Park Road | Dilworth |
| HDCRMI 2021-00764, 801 East Boulevard | Dilworth |

NOT HEARD AT THE SEPTEMBER 8 MEETING

| | |
|--|----------------|
| HDCRMA 2021-00493, 716 Woodruff Place | Wesley Heights |
| HDCRMA 2021-00451, 18836 The Plaza | Plaza Midwood |
| HDCRMA 2021-00494, 729 Mt. Vernon Avenue | Dilworth |

CONTINUED FROM JULY 14TH MEETING

| | |
|---|---------|
| HDCRMA 2021-00150, 320 W. Kingston Avenue | Wilmore |
|---|---------|

CONTINUED FROM AUGUST 11TH MEETING

| | |
|--|----------|
| HDCRMA 2021-00235, 1913 Cleveland Avenue | Dilworth |
| HDCRMA 2021-00313, 1418 Lexington Avenue | Dilworth |

CONTINUED FROM SEPTEMBER 8 MEETING

| | |
|---|----------------|
| HDCRMA 2021-00150, 320 W. Kingston Avenue | Wilmore |
| HDCRMI 2021-00355, 821 Woodruff Place | Wesley Heights |
| HDCRMI 2021-00234, 611 W. Park Road | Wilmore |

NEW CASES

| | |
|---|----------------|
| HDCRMI 2021-00600, 805 Walnut Avenue | Wesley Heights |
| HDCRMI 2021-00311, 554 W. Kingston Avenue | Wilmore |
| HDCRMI 2021-00147, 2221 Ledgewood Lane | Dilworth |

CONSENT AGENDA

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: HENNINGSON, LINEBERGER, PARATI

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2021-00836, 2003 DILWORTH ROAD EAST (PID# 12111112) – FENESTRATION CHANGES

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is new construction house built c. 2000. The site is a slightly irregularly shaped corner lot at Dilworth Road East and Ideal Way that measures approximately 70' x 185' x 65' x 158'. The site slopes down from Dilworth Road East to the rear of the property. Adjacent historic houses are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project includes changing an existing window opening to a door and adding a new egress window on the right elevation, lower level. All materials and dimensions of any new material will match existing.

Staff has already approved the new egress window because it is proposed in an inset area and not visible from the street. Due to visibility of the window opening proposed to change to a door Commission review and approval is required.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets guidelines for Doors and Windows, page 6.12.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the project 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. Hindman's invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED 1st: BARTH 2nd: HADEN

Mr. Barth moved to approve this application as presented.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HINDMAN, MURYN, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR FENESTRATION CHANGES APPROVED

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: HENNINGSON, LINEBERGER, PARATI

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2021-00492, 1940 PARK ROAD (PID: 12108704) – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure was originally a 1.5-story Craftsman bungalow c. 1925, a new second level addition was constructed c. 2005. Original architectural details that remain include the front porch with square columns on brick piers and bracketed front porch roof. The building is located at the corner of the Park Road and Tremont roundabout. Lot size is irregular and measures approximately 103'x 171' x 185'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single and multi-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is the removal of an existing deck and the construction of a new, slightly larger, covered screen porch in the same location. A small brick patio will also be added. While the addition is not taller or wider than the original house, the building is a corner lot which requires full Commission review. Proposed materials include traditional materials to match existing, including roof trim and brackets. Post-construction the rear yard will be 15% impermeable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets guidelines for Additions, page 7.2 and New Construction, Chapter 6.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the project 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, with the following Conditions:
 - a. Column Option 1 is to be used, and
 - b. Right elevation wall height dimensions and trim to be coordinated with staff.
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. Hindman's invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

1st: GOODWIN 2nd: WALKER

Mr. Goodwin moved to approve this application because it meets the standards for Additions, Chapter 7. The applicant to provide permit-ready drawings to the staff for final review with minor clarifications to use column option one and the right elevation wall height dimensions and trim to be coordinated with staff.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HINDMAN,
MURYN, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: HENNINGSON, LINEBERGER, PARATI

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2021-00601, 1945 PARK ROAD (PID: 12108827) – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1.5-story Craftsman bungalow constructed c. 1920. Architectural details include a front bracketed gable roof, full-width engaged front porch with slightly tapered columns on top of brick piers, small side-shed dormers located between brick chimneys, exposed rafter tails and small brackets. Lot size measures approximately 50' x 184' x 55' x 171'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single family buildings. The removal of the aluminum wrap and restoration of the original wood siding and trim was approved under COA# HDCADMRM-2021-00181.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is one-story rear addition which includes enlarging the existing side gable roof of the bump-out, which will be raised by 14 ¾" due to that room needing to be deeper.

Window configuration will also be slightly changed on the bump-out to incorporate a new transom window between the existing, original 4/4 windows.

Four of the original 6 oversized 4/4 windows on the right and rear elevation are being reused in similar locations. The other 2 of the original 6 were discovered to be missing when the asbestos was removed.

All original windows are in excellent shape because of existing storm windows and will be retained and repaired. Existing or new storm windows will be employed.

Proposed materials are all traditional to match existing. New windows will be double-hung wood or aluminum clad Simulated True Divided Light (STDL) in a pattern to match existing. Roof trim will match the original house details.

The original trap door in the floor and the winder stair that leads to the basement is being retained. The original garage is being relocated to the opposite corner of the lot. This proposal has been approved for Tax Credits by NCSHPO.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets guidelines for Additions, page 7.2 and New Construction, Chapter 6.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the project 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, with the following Condition:
 - a. On the right elevation, the header height of the new art glass transom window should be aligned with the headers of the two 4/4 windows.
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. Hindman’s invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS 1st: HADEN 2nd: BONAPARTE

Mr. Haden moved to approve this application because it meets the Standards 7.2 for New Construction (additions) with the condition that on the right elevation, the header height of new art glass transom window should be aligned with the headers of the two four-over-four windows.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HINDMAN, MURYN, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: HENNINGSON, LINEBERGER, PARATI

APPLICATION:

HDCCMI 2021-00764, 801 EAST BOULEVARD (PID: 12311903) – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a commercial office building constructed c. 1976, located on the corner of East Boulevard and Lennox Avenue. The front elevation facing East Boulevard is 1-story and transitions into a 1.5-story building in the rear. Exterior material is unpainted brick. Roof forms are irregular and asymmetric. Lot size is 200’ x 200’. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, 2 and 2.5-story single-family, multi-family and commercial structures.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is the addition an exterior cladding system on the front elevation and right rear elevations. The faux walls and roof parapet are proposed to be copper and stucco paneling. The entire system is completely reversible and does not change the existing building structurally. Landscape trellis are proposed to further define the front elevation. No changes are proposed to the existing windows. The only structural change to the building is at the front entry where existing brick wing walls will be removed, and the existing storefront entry will be replaced with a new storefront entry (AD3.01 and A4.01). A new ADA-accessible front walkway will be installed and edged by a small landscape wall measuring approximately 1’-6” in height (A0.01 and A4.01). On the front elevation, signage is proposed in two different zones (A4.01). The building address numbers will be installed in one of two possible locations (A4.01). On the rear elevation, signage will be placed in one of two possible locations (A4.02).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets guidelines for Additions, page 7.2 and New Construction, Chapter 6.

2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the project 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. Hindman’s invitation to speak for or against this application.

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

Mr. Muryn moved to approve this application because it meets the Standards for Additions, 7.2 and New Construction, Chapter 6.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HINDMAN,
MURYN, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

NOT HEARD AT THE SEPTEMBER 8TH

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: HENNINGSON, LINEBERGER, PARATI

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2021-00493, 716 WOODRUFF PLACE (PID 07103509) – ACCESSORY BUILDING

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Known as the Ott House, the one-story frame house was constructed in 1939. Architecture features include a side-gabled roof, a partial width front porch with a front-facing cross gable supported by square wood columns, and an exterior chimney on the front façade. Siding material is wood lap. Existing brick steps and chimney are not painted. Brick foundation is painted. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single family houses.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is the construction of a new accessory building. The building is 19’2” in height as compared to the main house which is 19’-9”. The footprint dimensions are not labeled. The new structure sits proud of the existing house and will be partially visible from the street. Proposed siding material is fiber cement board and batten. Post construction the rear yard will be 40.6% impervious.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Height + Size + Massing
 - a. Footprint dimensions needed.

- b. Property section needed to show relationship between primary structure and proposed new accessory structure. Lot topography unknown, so unclear if the ADU will truly be shorter than the house when constructed.
- 2. Front Elevation:
 - a. Window trim details need adjusted. Windows shown with standard trim and an additional mullion.
 - b. Garage Doors: Appear to be one-large double-door instead of authentically separate doors. When visible to the street are typically required to be wood.
- 3. Rear Elevation:
 - a. Window details of paired windows need adjusted; same note as above for front elevation dormer.
 - b. Glass proportions- single windows are horizontal instead of vertical.
- 4. Right Elevation:
 - a. 6x6 wood posts appear undersized.
 - b. Beam/column alignment.
- 5. Left Elevation:
 - a. Glass proportions of window is horizontal instead of vertical.
- 6. Roof:
 - a. Dormers are co-planer to first level.
 - b. Dormer pitch too shallow.
 - c. Do any of the roof pitches match the main house?
- 7. Foundation:
 - a. Typically, more than a few inches concrete slab is required on the exterior; siding is not usually run so close to the ground.
- 8. Materials:
 - a. Siding material appears incongruous with the primary house. Possibly okay as a feature on dormers, but not for the main body of the structure.
- 9. Tree protection plan for the Maple tree is needed.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: CONTINUED 1st: BARTH 2nd: GOODWIN

Mr. Barth moved to continue this application for the applicant to provide accurate dimensions for the ADU addition with relation to its architectural elements as well as dimensions to property lines. The applicant to show the ADU relation to the existing house in elevation form to study massing and scale. The applicant to provide a tree protection plan for all trees being saved on the property. For the materials used on the exterior of the structure, the siding on the main form of the garage should relate back to the existing house, as well as the light configuration pattern of the windows relating back to the house with a more vertical emphasis. Applicant to provide more details of materials between windows, spacing between windows and their mull configuration, trim on the head, jamb, and the sill condition of each window. For the two dormers, the slope side of each dormer should be misaligned with (inset from) the thermal wall below by at least six inches.

Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment a to clarify that the pitches of the ADU roof should be relative to the main house roof.

Ms. Walker made a friendly amendment to the second request (showing the ADU in relation to the existing house in elevation form to study massing and scale), to also add a view from a street perspective. Provide more clarity on the garage doors appearing to be clearly double, whether they are or not.

To clarify Ms. Walker’s friendly amendment, Ms. Hindman stated the Commission is requesting the applicant to provide a site section through the site showing the garage relative to the main house and topography but also the view from the street.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HINDMAN
MURYN, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY BUILDING CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: LINEBERGER, PARATI

ARRIVED: HENNINGSON, 1:46 PM

MS. HARPST HAD TO RECUSE FROM BEING POINT PERSON DUE TO A CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2021-00451, 1836 THE PLAZA (PID: 09506132) – NEW CONSTRUCTION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing parcel is a vacant lot. The lot was previously part of 1830 The Plaza. Lot size is approximately 66’ x 170’. An alley runs behind the property. Adjacent structures are a 2 story multi-family apartment building and 1, 1.5 and 2 story single-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal includes the construction of a new single-family structure and detached accessory building. The proposed new 1.5 story structure has a height of 27’-11 15/16”. The building width is 45’-11 ½”. Proposed siding materials are brick veneer, lap siding with trim, and decorative brackets. Shake siding is used as an accent in many of the gable ends. Proposed windows appear to be a mix of double-hung and fixed/awning aluminum clad wood windows. Roofing is asphalt shingle with metal shed accent roofs on the front and rear. The accessory building is proposed for the right rear corner of the property and matches the design & style of the proposed main structure.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Cover page & streetscape page have the front elevation reversed.
2. Porch wall setbacks are needed for adjacent properties along with thermal wall setbacks.
3. Massing & Height
 - Building is both tall and wide; building seems tall for proposed Craftsman style bungalow.
4. Scale & Foundations

- Does the foundation, fenestration, etc. line up with adjacent properties?
5. Windows
 - North elevation – rhythm, placement of second window from rear, narrow windows are not typical of Bungalow style.
 - South, East & West elevations – top trim on windows is not visible due to roof overhang.
 - East Elevation – 2/1 window on the left.
 - Aprons under the 2nd level windows (main & accessory structure).
 - Mullion trim is needed/should be wider between the paired and triple windows.
 6. Materials
 - Partial brick cladding above the foundation is not typical on the thermal walls of the proposed Craftsman style.
 - Is wood proposed for siding & shakes? Individually applied shingle/shake siding is required.
 - Brick color/sample.
 - Metal shed roof on front porch.
 - Additional trim band needed for delineation between floors on North elevation.
 - Garage door materials.
 7. Further details are needed for the following:
 - Width & Spacing comparison to adjacent properties.
 - Porch depth.
 - Column & beam section detail.
 - HVAC location.
 - Locations & photos of all existing canopy trees on site.
 - Landscape plan.
 - Accessory building – height & dimensions.
 - Rear yard open space.
 8. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Mr. Henningson’s invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED 1st: BARTH 2nd: HINDMAN

Mr. Barth moved to continue this application for the following in regard to the site, the applicant proved more information for the accessibility or use of the alley as requested. Applicant to provide a north arrow on the site plan. Applicant provide HVAC locations indicated on the site plan, a tree protection plan, as well as trees to be removed indicated and photographed. Applicant provide the rear yard impervious area noted from the rear thermal wall of the new home indicated on the site. The applicant show the house as it relates in plan and sites to adjacent properties and structures. Applicant provide accurate house plans with dimensions, windows and doors shown. The applicant update the drawings to reflect proper orientation with regard to the plan site and elevations. If trees are to be added back into this site, the applicant reflect those on the site plan. The applicant provide additional photos showing site elements. Regarding the project's architecture and detailing, for windows the applicant review the windows on the labeled north elevation, the two windows toward the back and toward the middle be viewed as wider windows, more aligned with what is typically seen in the neighborhood and ganged windows need to be separated with wider mulls, reflecting traditional details. The applicant to remove the apron trim below the sills of all windows, specifically the upper windows and dormer windows on the front, two sides and also on the rear. Add divided plate to the pedestrian door side entry on the south elevation. Regarding material specs and details, more

information on gable ends, particularly towards the ridge in the upper part of gables. No solid paneling in these locations. A consistent relationship throughout the design regarding storyboards and trim bands. On the eaves and soffits show plumb cut rafters with open soffits and exposed rafter tails and on porch ceiling material show the appropriate material whether it be tongue and groove, V groove, bead board on the ceiling surface and the exposed soffit material. Applicant to provide details regarding the column and beam construction and detailing on the porches and request the top of the column neck be aligned with the face beam. The applicant provide precedent for adding brick water table and brick veneer details for the base of the house, or if none are found to only indicate brick being used in a foundation treatment. The chimney is requested to be a straight chimney versus tapered. Requesting that the brackets be engaged with barge rafters, they need to be arch rafters. All alternative materials be submitted to staff as well as attic vent detail specs. Regarding site comments the applicant should reference standards 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7, 6.8 and chapter 8.1 through 11, landscaping 6.12 for site. Regarding doors and windows, applicant reference 6.12, trim 6.11, foundation 6.10, material changes 6.15.

Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment for spacing, height, and width, accurate placement of the elevations on the Zoutewelle surveys. For roof forms, reconciling the alignment or rakes and eaves and fascia around the corners of the elevations. The actual width of the common jambs between the windows, provide a little guidance on what is seen in the neighborhoods, is two jack studs and a king stud which ends up being approximately six to seven and a half inches of trim whether that's a nominal wood or not. A correction for the record for foundations, 6.9.

Mr. Henningson made a friendly amendment that the applicant provide a brick sample for staff to approve.

Mr. Barth friendly amendment, the awning over the shed awning over the porch be omitted from this scope.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MURYN, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: PARATI

LEFT: HINDMAN 3:02 PM

ARRIVED: LINEBERGER 3:02 PM

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2021-00494, 729 MT. VERNON AVENUE (PID: 12305105) – NEW CONSTRUCTION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing site is a vacant lot. The former structure was a Colonial Revival 1.5-story single family house constructed in 1951. Demolition of the house was Approved with a 365-Day Stay at the February 13, 2019 HDC meeting (HDCRDEMO-2019-00009). An application for new construction at this site was

Denied in March 2021 for further study of the project's scale, height, width, rhythm, massing, and foundation, a spacing and setback exhibit, design feature review, landscape and tree protection plan, material data or specifications and review of the guidelines referencing spacing, rhythm, massing as it responds to the context of the street.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal includes the construction of a primary structure and accessory building.

- The proposed primary structure is two-stories with a height of 28'-6".
- The total house width is approximately 56'-7".
- Setback to front thermal wall, at the closest point is 44'-6".
- Front porch setback not provided. Front porch patio appears to align with the 30' line on the plans with a planter encroaching past the 30' line.
- Setback to the front porch roof not provided. Front porch roof does not cover entire front porch.
- Proposed siding materials are fiber cement vertical and horizontal shiplap siding, wood shake siding, with a stone foundation and chimney. Proposed windows are aluminum-clad. Roofing is asphalt shingle and standing seam metal.
- The proposed accessory building with a height of 21'-7 ½". Materials are proposed to be the same as the main structure.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Massing, Rhythm, Width, Roofs, Materials, Porches. The overall form of the building is incongruous with the historic context of Mt. Vernon and greater Dilworth neighborhood.
 - a. Houses on the street that have similar widths are linear in form and shorter in height, or the main massing of the house is square with one-story wing(s) adding to the overall width.
 - b. Houses on the street that have similar heights are vertical in form and shorter in width.
 - c. Need clarity on height. The indicated grade line appears to be placed higher than foundation/grade shown on drawing, A2.00 and A2.01 (possibly a drawing error?).
 - d. Multiple roof forms and angles.
2. Front Elevation:
 - a. Lack of cohesiveness in design and large expanse of roof.
 - b. Porch roof in terms of material and design, with a shed design on the left and a large cantilever hip carport on the right.
 - c. Steel columns/beams.
3. Right Elevation:
 - a. Massing
 - b. Chimney – size, scale and massing.
4. Left Elevation:
 - a. Fenestration, roof forms, overall massing and materials, including angular wall, steel beam and tall, thin column.

5. Accessory Structure:

- a. Need clarity on height. The indicated grade line appears to be placed higher than foundation/grade shown on drawing (possibly a drawing error?).
- b. Fenestration, rhythm, materials, massing with two-story walls.
- c. Missing a side elevation.
- d. Window trim dimension are undersized for fields of siding.

6. Materials + Details:

- a. Stone, metal, horizontal and vertical shiplap, steel, and cedar shake. The combination of these together and use of both vertical and horizontal shiplap siding is incongruous with the existing historic context.
- b. Metal roofs on the front elevations.
- c. Window details/design.

7. Details about the hot tub, swimming pool, retaining wall, and other site features are not available and not under review at this time.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

Mr. Kevin Davis, adjacent property owner, spoke against this application.
Ms. Michelle Amoroso, adjacent property owner, spoke against this application.
Mr. Jason Murphy, adjacent property owner, spoke against this application.
Ms. Paula Kranz, adjacent property owner, spoke in favor of this application.
Ms. Alyson Cohen, adjacent property owner, spoke in favor of this application.
Mr. David Cohen, adjacent property owner, spoke in favor of this application.
Ms. Susie Jernigan, adjacent property owner, spoke against this application.
Mr. Ed Williams, adjacent property owner, spoke against this application.
Mr. Peter Fulton, adjacent property owner, spoke against this application.
Mr. Josh Lanning, adjacent property owner, spoke against this application.

MOTION: DENIED **1st: WALKER** **2nd: HADEN**

Ms. Walker moved to deny this application for the following: It does not conform to the spacing standards, 6.3, number 1, not rhythm, massing and form, standards 6.5, numbers 1 and 2, not for setback, standards 6.2, number 1, design conformity, standards 6.1, standard 6.12, number 1, fenestration, standard 6.6 for height and width, and roof form, standard 6.10, numbers 1, 3,4 and 5 or for the Secretary of Interior Standards, numbers 9 and 10.

VOTE: 7/1

AYES: BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON,
LINEBERGER, MURYN, WALKER

NAYS: BARTH

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION DENIED.

CONTINUED FROM AUGUST 11TH MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: HINDMAN, PARATI
LEFT: HADEN, 4:39 PM

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2021-00235, 1913 CLEVELAND AVENUE (PID: 12105619) – NEW CONSTRUCTION MULTI FAMILY

This application as continued from the August 11, 2021 meeting for the following items:

1. Massing, section 6.5, number 2; Height and Width section 6.6, number 1; Scale section 6.7, number 3.

Perform a study on the rear massing of the proposed building, exploring three separate options:

- Option one, stepping back the fourth floor at the rear at least 20 feet from the back.
- Option two, separate exploration at the applicant's discretion.
- Option three, reduce the overall length of the building but maintain the four-story.

2. Landscaping/Private Sites, section 8.1 through 8.11

Provide more refined and additional details with regard to the site for added or removed vegetation, dimensions, all property features, as well as setbacks.

3. Cornices and Trim, section 6.11

Provide additional architectural details complete with dimensions and notes for the cornice.

4. Porches, section 6.14

Provide porch details with regard to railing on all porches, including the front porch with the beam and column alignment.

5. Doors and Windows, section 6.12

Provide door and window dimensions, including sill, jamb, and head trim and conditions.

6. Signage, Appendix C.2

Provide additional details for signage.

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 for new construction of a multi-family building. The new structure is approximately 44' in height from grade to the top of the decorative parapet (three stories) at the front elevation on Cleveland Avenue and four-stories at the rear of the building, due to site topography. Exterior materials are brick, cast stone, and aluminum clad windows. Setback is 20' from back of curb and 6'-6 1/2" from back of property line. A full-width 9' deep front porch faces Cleveland Avenue. HVAC units will be located on the roof.

Revised Proposal – August 11, 2021

- Rear elevation revised.
- Additional information about the relationship of new building to Euclid and E. Worthington provided.
- Elevation drawings provided.

Revised Proposal – October 13, 2021

1. Massing, see pages 1-8.
2. Landscaping/Private Sites, see pages 9-11.
3. Cornices and Trim, see page 14.
4. Porches, see pages 14-15.
5. Doors and Windows, see page 13.
6. Signage, see page 16.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The Commission will determine if the proposed project meets the design guidelines for New Construction, Chapter 6.
2. The HDC adopted new Design Standards in 2017. Any project reviewed and approved prior to this is not an equitable comparison as the guidelines were different.
3. 325-331 East Boulevard, multi-family new construction, was required to step the rear of the building down away from East Blvd (a commercial area) as a transition into the residential areas of the district. The project was approved on September 8, 2021.
4. The VanLandingham Townhome project is located at the edge of the Plaza Midwood district. The units facing The Plaza and Belvedere Avenue were required to be lower in height. A height increase was allowed as the buildings moved away from the residential structures inside the historic district boundary and towards the edge of the district. The project was approved on May 12, 2021.
5. Front walkway, see page 9, unclear about the width/material of the walkway connection between the public sidewalk and front steps.
6. Porches, see page 15, information needed:
 - Column dimensions.
 - Porch rail dimensions (staff approvable).
 - Stone cap dimensions (staff approvable).
7. Patio, see pages 8- 9, 12, 19, information needed:
 - Dimensions of new patio area.
 - Patio not shown on Left (North) and Right (South) elevations.
 - Height of new patio area not provided on Rear (East) elevation
8. Doors and Windows, see page 13, information needed:
 - Muntin size and profile (staff approvable).
 - Window manufacturer specifications (staff approvable).
 - Mullion trim dimensions.
9. Signage, see page 16, information needed:
 - a. Clarity needed on locations of signage. The diagrams are not keyed to the overall front elevation.
10. See attached summary of required submission checklist components compiled by HDC staff for all three project submissions.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

Mr. Ken Raynor, adjacent property owner, spoke against this application.

Mr. Rick Cohan, adjacent property owner, spoke against this application.

MOTION 1: CONTINUED **1st: BARTH** **2nd: GOODWIN**

Mr. Barth moved to continue this application requesting the applicant study item 1 landscaping plan to incorporate larger plant material towards the rear of the property including shrub and hedge material against the building. Denial of the patio on the rear of the property so that we may include plant material in this space per continuance item number 2. Item 3, three cornices and trims the applicant explore a more appropriate material for the cornices and corbelled details as presented referencing other architectural features in the area providing historical architectural examples. Item number 5 requesting additional details with regard to head jamb and sill as it relates to sections, also requesting that head sill precast numbers extend beyond the edge of the brick. items number 4 and 6 are satisfactorily addressed. The patio is omitted from the next continuation.

VOTE: 3/4

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN,

NAYS: HENNINGSON, LINEBERGER, MURYN, WALKER

DECISION:

MOTION FAILED.

MOTION 2: CONTINUED **1st: MURYN** **2nd: BONAPARTE**

Mr. Muryn moved to continue this application for the six-points listed from August 11th, number one the applicant look to resolve the issue at the back façade height as it pertains to its rear lot line.

Number 2 for landscaping and private sites, applicant to provide a landscape plan. Number 3, cornices and trim explore cornice and corbel details with precast or stone materials with historical precedence. Number 4 and 6 have been resolved under the current application. Number 5 provide more details in sections on head jamb and sill and look to extend precast on header and sill conditions.

Mr. Barth made a friendly amendment extend the sill and head conditions beyond the brick.

VOTE: 5/2

AYES: BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HENNINGSON, MURYN, WALKER

NAYS: BARTH, LINEBERGER

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION MULTI FAMILY CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: HADEN, PARATI

LEFT: MURYN 6:37 PM

RETURNED: HINDMAN 6:37 PM

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2021-00313, 1418 LEXINGTON AVENUE (PID: 12309614) – NEW CONSTRUCTION

This application was continued from the August 11, 2021 meeting for the following items:

1. **Setback**, Standard 6.2, number 1 and 2, as it pertains to 1410 and 1422 Lexington Avenue.

2. **Massing and Complexity of Form**, Standard 6.5, numbers 1 and 2.
3. **Height and Width**, Standard 6.6, numbers 1 and 2.
4. **Scale**, Standard 6.7, number 1. Create human scale by including functional elements typical to the historic context, such as porches and porticos.
5. **Directional Expression**, Standard 6.8, number 1.
6. **Roof Form**, Standard 6.10, numbers 1, 2, and 3.
7. Standards 6.11 through 6.16 have not been reviewed

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Known as the Morgan B. Gilreath house, the existing structure 1.5 story, brick American Small House with Colonial Revival elements constructed in 1942. Architectural features include a front bay window and a lower side wing which contains the entry. Exterior material is brick (painted) and wood lap siding in the gable ends. The building still retains its original front door and original 6/6 windows. Lot size is measures approximately 75' x 145' x 58' x 164'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5 story single-family and buildings. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Dilworth National Register Historic District. On September 9, 2020, the HDC placed a 365-day stay of demolition on the property (HDCRDEMO-2020-00262).

PROPOSAL:

- The proposal is new construction of a single-family structure. The new single-family structure will be setback approximately 27' to the front thermal wall and 22' to the covered entry.
- Proposed height: 26'-5" from grade to ridge (25' from finished floor, not inclusive of foundation and grade measurements).
- Proposed width: 46' wide at the front thermal wall, not inclusive of the Porte cochere.
- Proposed exterior materials are brick with concrete accents and fiber cement lap siding and trim. Wood front door. Windows will be casement and fixed aluminum clad with Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL).

Revised Proposal – October 13, 2021

- Project re-designed
- Height, as measured from grade to ridge, is 25'-6".
- Updated setback exhibit. Porch setback is 28'-0" and front thermal wall is 33'-0".

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Window sizes, proportions, and rhythm.
2. Wall height/proportions between first level and second level.
3. Left elevation – materials transition. Lap siding appears to continue below the pent eaves.
4. Carport roof appears out of proportion to the support columns.
5. Materials specs and samples needed for brick, fiber cement siding and trim, and windows.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Mr. Henningson’s invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED 1st: LINEBERGER 2nd: WALKER

Ms. Lineberger moved to continue this application for: Provide a detailed site plan showing setback per standard 6.2 and elevations per 6.5, massing and form because these items relate to existing adjacent historic homes and also include street view elevations. Restudy the window and door details, to be consistent with standards 6.12 specifically the single light element, double stack unit to gable ends and front dormer and rear details, rear elevation details, and provide all design details of the door and windows of all fenestration. A restudy of roof forms per standards 6.10, to reduce the scale of the porte cochere and restudy the dormer details. Standards 6.11 through 6.16 are not reviewed in this application.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN,
LINEBERGER, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

CONTINUED FROM SEPTEMBER 8TH MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: HADEN, PARATI, MURYN

RECUSED: HENNINGSON

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2021-00150, 320 W. KINGSTON AVENUE (PID: 11908603) – ADDITION/ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

This application was continued from the September 8, 2021 meeting for the following items:

- ***Primary Structure Addition:***
 - ***Provide a roof plan that resolves the two roof pitches from front to rear. Resolve the funneling effect at the intersection of the gables on the right and the left elevations.***
 - ***Show the correct elevation height of 725.9 wherever elevations are mentioned in the submittal.***
 - ***Add the impervious area calculations to the site plan (as measured from the back of the original house).***
 - ***Provide a tree protection plan.***
 - ***Show the precedent for the front columns and if the Craftsman style is acceptable for this home.***
 - ***For the rear elevation, move the door at the balcony.***
 - ***Document materials for the roof.***
 - ***Show window trim and corner boards on primary structure and accessory structure.***
- ***Accessory Structure:***
 - ***No coplanar walls. The walls of the dormer need to move back.***
 - ***The upper windows need to be either resized or moved away from the rakes.***
 - ***The door needs to read as a two-bay not a one-bay door***

- **Provide specifications for the garage door.**
- **Provide the distance, exactly where the garage is positioned on the site plan with regard to its distance from the house.**
- **Show the second floor delineation with respect to the first floor.**

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one-story, American Small House with Tudor/English Cottage Revival elements constructed c. 1936. Architectural features include a front gable covering a partial width front porch, stucco and wood ‘half-timbering’ in the front facing gable, 6/6 double-hung windows, and an engaged left side brick chimney. The exterior is unpainted brick. Existing ridge height is 24.9’ from grade. Lot size is 50’ x 195’. Surrounding structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is for an addition, front porch column changes, a retaining wall and a replacement accessory building. The addition includes an increase in the overall building height of approximately 3’-2” with a deck on the 2nd level rear. The addition will be clad in lap siding with shingle-style siding in the gables. The rear deck will be supported by wood columns on brick piers. An existing concrete block garage will be demolished. The new accessory building will be a 2-car garage with a footprint of approximately 22.8’ x 26.8’ and a height of approximately 20’-3”. The existing partial carriage track driveway will be replaced with a new driveway.

Revised Proposal – September 8, 2021

1. **Height.** Reduced to an increase of 1’-2”.
2. **Massing.** Addition design changed.
3. **Fenestration.** Window locations changed.
4. **Porch.** Center column eliminated.
5. **Site Plan.** HVAC location and screening provided.

Revised Proposal – October 13, 2021

- *Applicant provided answers and plan sheet references per the Continuation letter in the attached revised presentation.*

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Addition
 - a. Add a small offset on one or both sides of the new addition roof to differentiate from
 - b. the original ridge. (Staff Approvable)
 - c. Proposed building should be shown on Streetscape survey.
 - d. Materials and architectural details specifications for the addition. Including, but not
 - e. limited to, window manufacturer/specs, trim material, columns, deck, etc. (Staff
 - f. Approvable, provided traditional materials are used)

2. Right + Left Elevations
 - a. Corner board trim needed on second level rear wall. (Staff Approvable)
 - b. Front porch columns: Clarify that column/beam alignment will match photo on A0700. (Staff Approvable)

- c. Rear porch columns appear undersized. (Staff Approvable with a column size(s) specified)
- 3. Windows
 - a. Dormers: mullion trim should be minimum of 5" or 5 ½" instead of 2". (Staff Approvable)
 - b. New windows in fields of siding: bottom trim/sill detail needs corrected. (Staff Approvable)
- 4. Site Features
 - a. Rear yard open space calculations, as measured from back wall of original house. (Staff Approvable).
 - b. New driveway width? (Staff Approvable)
 - c. Ensure new driveway is not run up to the foundation of the house, a minimum 12" planting strip is needed between the house and driveway. (Staff Approvable)
- 5. Minor changes may be reviewed and approved by Staff as noted.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS 1st: GOODWIN 2nd: BONAPARTE

Mr. Goodwin moved to approve this application with the following conditions: Show materials and architectural specification for the addition for staff to review. The right and left elevations, the corner board trim needed on the second level rear wall, we need details for that to ensure the corner boards stand proud of the siding, for staff to review. The front porch columns, clarify that the column beam alignment will match the photo on A0700, for staff review. Correct the rear porch column size for staff to review. The new windows siding, the bottom trim and sill details need to be corrected and add mullions between the windows that are joined together. Provide rear yard calculations from the back wall of the original house. Provide new driveway width and ensure the new driveway does not run up to the foundation of the house. A minimum of a 12-inch planting strip. Delete the arrow on slide 16 that shows an existing window that is not shown there. Correct elevation to show the correct triangular shape of the roof above the original ridge line. All for staff to review for approval.

Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment applicant to show headers and the sills in the brick, probably soldiers and rowlocks.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION/ACCESSORY STRUCTURE APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: HADEN, MURYN, PARATI

RETURNED: HENNINGSON, 7:30 PM

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2021-00355, 821 WOODRUFF PLACE (PID: 07102165) – ADDITION/PORCH CHANGES

This application as continued from the September 8, 2021 meeting for the following items:

- *Per Design Standards for Porches, 4.8 and Additions, 7.2:*
 - *Restudy the windows and French doors.*
 - *Restudy the details of the siding, transoms, and the amount of siding in relationship to the amount of openings for windows and doors.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is new infill construction built in 2002. The building is a one-story, front gable house with Craftsman elements. Architectural features include a three-bay, full-width front porch with wood columns on brick piers. Exterior materials are wood lap siding with wood shakes in the gables. Lot size is 40' x 149'. Surrounding structures are 1 and 1.5-story single-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The project is for changes to the front porch. The left bay of the front porch will be enclosed with casement windows, trim and wood lap siding on the front and right elevations. On the left elevation, which is interior to the porch, the applicant provided the option of windows or a pair of French doors. All porch elements, railing, piers/columns will remain.

Revised Proposal – October 13, 2021

1. Trim noted above windows.
2. Provided all various configurations studied for the windows and the doors. Applicant’s preferences are noted on the plans.
3. Provided perspective sketches and photos.
4. Provided information about history/evolution of sunrooms and enclosed porches.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The Commission will determine if the proposed project meets the design guidelines for Porches, page 4.8 and Additions, page 7.2.
2. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Mr. Henningson’s invitation to speak for or against this application.

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

Ms. Hindman moved to approve option C with eight foot doors. The front door eight feet, three quarter light, clear and the French doors, eight feet, three quarter light with STDs to match casements.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION/PORCH CHANGES APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: HADEN, MURYN, PARATI

LEFT: BONAPARTE, 8:00 PM

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2021-00234, 611 W. PARK AVENUE (PID: 11909609) - ADDITION

This application was continued from the September 8, 2021 meeting for the following items:

- ***Per Chapter 6, New Construction and Chapter 7, Additions:***
 - ***Provide an accurate representation of existing conditions.***
 - ***Provide thorough notes on existing materials and conditions and proposed materials and conditions.***
 - ***Provide clarity on fenestration changes at the front porch.***
 - ***The existing center pier at the front porch is to remain.***
 - ***Consult with staff on approvable materials, porch rails, the beam-column relationship.***
 - ***The right elevation needs fenestration.***
 - ***Clustered windows need shared jambs.***
 - ***No aprons at exterior windows.***
 - ***No pork chop eaves.***
 - ***Provide clarification on parging at foundation on existing and proposed.***
 - ***Provide documentation of non-historic windows.***
 - ***Provide information on siding under vinyl.***
 - ***Provide information on fence, HVAC screen, existing trees, and tree protection plans.***

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing one-story Bungalow constructed c. 1931. The building has a three-bay façade with a front gable main roof. Architectural features include a partial-width front porch with a front gable, supported by replacement metal columns on parged and painted brick piers. The house has been wrapped in vinyl and aluminum. All of the doors and windows are replacements. The lot size is small measuring approximately 74' x 66' x 74' x 55'. Adjacent historic structures 1 and 1.5 single family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is an addition to the right side. Due to the parcel shape and location of the historic structure on the parcel, a rear addition is not possible. The owner is seeking a variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) for side addition. The metal carport is proposed for removal. It is unclear if the vinyl/aluminum wrap will remain or be removed.

Revised Proposal – October 13, 2021

- Drawings updated.
- Detailed information about materials and dimensions provided about windows, columns, trim, proposed siding, front porch changes, HVAC location, fencing.
- Photos documenting existing conditions and architectural investigations into original conditions.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

1. Right Elevation:
 - a. Lack of fenestration. (Staff approvable, with specific direction from Commission)
2. Site Plan:

- a. Tree protection plan for Oak along property line, which is 12'-2" away from the closest point of the proposed addition. (Staff approvable)
3. Materials:
- a. Siding: Original siding appears to be present under the vinyl and should be retained, repaired, and painted. Adding Nichiha either over the existing wood siding or removing wood and replacing with Nichiha does not meet the Standards, see Building Materials: Wood, page 5.2 numbers 3 and 7.
 - b. Vents: original wood vents should be retained, if present.
 - c. Porch Ceiling: confirm no original materials beneath vinyl. If original materials present, repair.
4. Minor changes may be reviewed and approved by Staff as noted.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Mr. Henningson's invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED 1st: HINDMAN 2nd: GOODWIN

Ms. Hindman moved to continue this application based on the following: The right elevation needs fenestration. The site plan needs a tree protection plan. The materials should be to repair as possible and to replace in kind including the vents on the porch ceiling with staff to approve the scope of replacement. The windows should match the discovered rough openings, existing window openings should not change in size. Most likely three-over-one based on the age of the structure, the size in discovery, and the style of the house.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: BARTH, GOODWIN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN,
LINEBERGER, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.

Due to time constraints the following cases will be heard on November 10, 2021 at 1:00 pm.

- HDCRMI 2021-00600, 805 Walnut Avenue
- HDCRMI 2021-00311, 554 W. Kingston Avenue
- HDCRMI 2021-00147, 2221 Ledgewood Avenue

With no further business to discuss, Ms. Parati recessed the meeting at 8:16 PM.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission