



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
February 14, 2024 | Room 267

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Nichelle Hawkins (Chair)  
Kim Parati (Vice Chair)  
Chris Barth (2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chair)  
Shauna Bell  
Christa Lineberger  
Brett Taylor  
Jill Walker  
Sarah Wheat  
Scott Whitlock  
Heather Wojick

MEMBERS ABSENT: Vacant, At Large  
Vacant, Resident-Owner Hermitage Court  
Vacant, Resident-Owner Oaklawn Park  
Vacant, Resident-Owner Fourth Ward

OTHERS PRESENT:  
Candice Leite, HDC Staff  
Elizabeth Lamy, HDC Staff  
Jen Baehr, HDC Staff  
Marilyn Drath, HDC Staff  
JT Faucette, HDC Staff  
Jill Sanchez-Myers, Senior Assistant City Attorney  
Nicole Hewett, Assistant City Attorney  
Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

---

With a quorum present, Chair Hawkins called the February meeting of the Historic District Commission (Commission) meeting to order at 1:03 pm. Chair Hawkins began the meeting by introducing the Staff and Commissioners and explaining the meeting procedure. All interested parties planning to give testimony – FOR or AGAINST – must submit a form to speak and must be sworn in. Staff will present a description of each proposed project to the Commission. The Commissioners and the Applicants will then discuss the project. Audience members signed up to speak either FOR or AGAINST will be called to the podium for each agenda item. Presentations by the Applicants and audience members must be concise and focused on the **Charlotte Historic District Design Standards**. The Commission and Staff may question the Applicant. The Applicant may present sworn witnesses who will be subject to questioning by the

Commission and Staff. The Applicant will be given an opportunity to respond to comments by interested parties. After hearing each application, the Commission will review, discuss, and consider the information that has been gathered and presented. During discussion and deliberation, only the Commission and Staff may speak. The Commission may vote to reopen this part of the meeting for questions, comments, or clarification. Once the review is completed, a MOTION will be made to Approve, Deny, or Continue the review of the application at a future meeting. A majority vote of the Commission members present is required for a decision to be reached. All exhibits remain with the Commission. If an Applicant feels there is a conflict of interest of any Commissioner, or there is an association that would be prejudicial, that should be revealed at the beginning of the hearing of a particular case. The Commission is quasi-judicial body and can accept only sworn testimony. Staff will report any additional comments received and while the Commission will not specifically exclude hearsay evidence, it is only given limited weight. Chair Hawkins asked that everyone please silence any electronic devices. Commissioners are asked to announce, for the record, if one leaves or arrives during the meeting. Chair Hawkins requested that those in the audience remain quiet during the hearings. An audience member will be asked once to be quiet and the need for a second request will require removal from the room. Chair Hawkins swore in all Applicants and Staff and continued to swear in people as they arrived for the duration of the meeting. Appeals from the Historic District Commission are to the Zoning Board of Adjustment within thirty (30) days from the date of the decision to appeal. This is in accordance with Section 10.213 of the City Zoning Ordinance. The Commission discussed the At-Large Seat Applications and heard from one of the applicants. The Commission also deferred a decision on January 10 Meeting Minutes. Finally, the commission discussed the upcoming Preservation Awards.

**INDEX OF ADDRESSES:**

**CONSENT**

HDCRMA-2023-01203, 2315 Charlotte Dr	Dilworth
HDCCEMO-2024-00021, 1913 Cleveland Av	Dilworth
HDCRMI-2023-01173, 2127 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMA-2023-01125, 1926 Ewing Av	Dilworth
HDCRMI-2023-00744, 331 W Kingston Av	Wilmore

**CONTINUED FROM THE NOVEMBER 8 MEETING**

HDCRMI-2023-00588, 417 Heathcliff St	Wesley Heights
HDCRMI-2023-00583, 604 S Summit Av	Wesley Heights

**CONTINUED FROM THE DECEMBER 13 MEETING**

HDCRMI-2023-00612, 1314 Lafayette Av	Dilworth
HDCCEMA-2023-00283, 424-428 West Bv	Wilmore

**CONTINUED FROM THE JANUARY 10 MEETING**

HDCCEMI-2023-00667, 129 NPoplar St	Fourth Ward
HDCRMA-2023-00737, 2025 Charlotte Dr	Dilworth

**NEW CASES**

HDCRMI-2023-00739, 1532 Dilworth Rd	Dilworth
HDCRMIA-2023-00835, 2000 Patton Av	McCrorey Heights
HDCRMIA-2023-00834, 251 W Kingston Av	Wilmore
HDCRMA-2023-01160, 201 Grandin Rd	Wesley Heights
HDCCEMI-2023-00860, 311 East Bv	Dilworth

---

## CONSENT

---

### **ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: NONE

### **APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA-2023-01203, 2315 CHARLOTTE DR (PID: 12112610) – ADDITION – REAFFIRMATION**

### **EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1.5-story Picturesque Revival constructed c. 1925. Architectural features include a steeply pitched side gable roof with a cross gabled projection and lower front gables, one over the arched recessed entry. Other features include an unpainted brick exterior, 6/6 double-hung wood windows, pent eaves on the gable ends, and an uncovered partial width front porch that originally had a broken terracotta floor. The lot size measures approximately 60' x 161'. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1.5 and 2-story residential buildings.

### **PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a reaffirmation of a previously approved project. The Commission approved the project under application number HDCRMA-2022-00654 on January 18, 2023, for meeting the Design Standards for Windows, 4.14, numbers 1 and 6; Doors and Windows 6.15, numbers 2, 3, and 4; Additions, 6.20, numbers 1-7; and Masonry 5.5, numbers 2 and 4, with the following Conditions:

- a. The master bedroom windows should remain as they are currently.
- b. Muntins (on all new windows) redesigned to mimic the proportions of the existing, traditional double-hung windows.
- c. Approve the addition of the bay window with the original windows being reused in that structure.
- d. New masonry and mortar to be reviewed with staff masonry expert.
- e. Rear dormers should not be coplanar.

### *Approved project summary:*

The applicant is proposing a multi-part project. Proposed new windows on all portions of the project are Kolbe Ultra with Simulated True Divided Light (STDL) muntins.

Part A: Removing an original ganged window on the front elevation, constructing a new bay window on the front elevation, and removing a paired window to add an exterior chimney to the right elevation. There are foundation issues at the left front corner of the building which will also be fixed. Proposed materials include brick/mortar to match existing. The bay window will have 6" wood lap siding, a copper roof, and double-hung wood windows to match existing. See A-4.0 and A-4.1.

Part B: Removal of a dormer on the right elevation. Add dormers to the left and right elevations, behind the main ridge. The dormers will tie in below the main ridge and will not be taller than the original main ridge. Proposed materials include 6" fiber cement lap siding. The roof over the side entry door will also be extended. See A-4.1, A-4.2, and A-4.3.

Part C: Roof and window changes on the first level of the left elevation. Remove existing shed roof over entry door and extend the main roof over the entry door. Relocate a window from behind an existing bump out to flank the entry door. Brick/mortar to match existing will be toothed into the window opening. See A-4.1.

Part D: Right elevation changes include a new addition and new fenestration. A small bump-out addition will be constructed on the first level. The addition is behind the front thermal wall and chimney, not visible from the street. Proposed materials include brick/mortar to match existing. The historic window openings will be shortened, and the windows changed to be casement with tempered glass. New brick/mortar will infill the areas below the shortened windows. See A-4.3.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6; Windows, 4.14, numbers 1 and 6; Doors and Windows 6.15, numbers 2, 3, and 4; Additions, 6.20, numbers 1-7; and Masonry 5.5, numbers 2 and 4.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, Staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the Standards 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. The conditions of the previously approved project are to remain in effect.
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 Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>: WHITLOCK 2<sup>nd</sup>: WALKER**

Mr. Whitlock moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the district and it meets the Standards for new construction for residential buildings, Chapter 6. Mr. Whitlock also cited Standards 4.14, numbers 1 and 6 for windows, 6.15, numbers 2, 3, and 4 for doors and windows, 6.20, numbers 1 through 7 for additions, and 5.5, numbers 2 and 4 for masonry.

Ms. Walker seconded the motion.

Ms. Hewett offered a suggestion that Mr. Whitlock move to approve the application subject to the previously agreed upon conditions.

Mr. Whitlock accepted the suggestion and added that the conditions of the previously approved project are to remain in effect for this approval. Ms. Walker accepted this addition to the motion.

**VOTE: 10/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI,  
TAYLOR, WALKER, WHEAT, WHITMORE, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION – REAFFIRMATION – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCCDEMO-2024-00021, 1913 CLEVELAND AV (PID: 12105619) – DEMOLITION – REAFFIRMATION**

**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 proposed project is a reaffirmation of a previously approved project.

- The COA for demolition was issued and renewed but has expired due to project timing.
- The Commission previously approved demolition of the existing structure under application number HDCCDEMO-2020-00626 on December 9, 2020. The Commission voted that the building does not have special significance toward maintaining the character of the district and that demolition may take place the sooner of either the approval of new construction plans or the expiration of 365 days. The 90-day waiting period to submit new construction plans was waived.
- An application for new construction of a commercial building was approved on this site on March 29, 2023 under application number HDCCMA-2022-00954.

**Approved project summary:**

The proposal is full demolition of the building. 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 RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for Demolition 9.2, based on the facts that application is complete, the building does not have special significance toward maintaining the character of the Dilworth Local Historic District, and that new construction of a commercial building was approved at this site under application HDCCMA-2022-00954 on March 29, 2023.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, Staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the Standards and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item based on the facts listed above.
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 Chair Hawkins’ invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE**

**1<sup>st</sup>: PARATI      2<sup>nd</sup>: LINEBERGER**

Ms. Parati moved to approve the application for the reaffirmation of demolition because the building is not of historic significance and meets the Standards for demolition, 9.2.

Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 10/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, TAYLOR, WALKER, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION – REAFFRIMATION – APPROVED.**

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2023-01173, 2127 THE PLAZA (PID: 08119121) – ACCESSORY STRUCTURE**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1.5-story Craftsman bungalow constructed c. 1933. Architectural features include a steeply pitched side gable roof with a front gabled projection supported by square painted brick columns over the nearly full width front porch. Other features include wood lap siding with a painted brick foundation, 4/1 double-hung replacement windows, 4-pane paired wood windows in the gable ends, exposed rafters, and brackets. The lot size measures approximately 48' x 150'. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a detached accessory structure accessed via an existing drive at the rear of the lot. The existing shed will be removed.

The new structure is a combination single vehicle carport and storage shed which measures approximately 15'-4" in height as measured from grade to ridge. The height of the primary structure is approximately 18'-2" as measured from grade to ridge at the rear elevation. Proposed materials and details are traditional to match the primary structure. Siding is proposed as cementitious smooth finish with a 6.5" exposure.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for New Construction of Residential Buildings, Chapter 6, and Accessory Buildings, 8.10.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, Staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the Standards 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. On the site plan, add footprint dimensions of the new structure.
  - b. Right elevation (west elevation facing rear property line)
    - i. Work with Staff on beam/column relationship.
    - ii. Vent should be centered under the gable peak.
  - c. Materials
    - i. Confirm that the fiber cement siding will be smooth finish and either Hardie Artisan or Nichiha Savannah.
    - ii. Provide a window detail with trim dimensions.
    - iii. Note the plans to indicate all brick/mortar to remain unpainted.
    - iv. Standing seam metal should be used instead of corrugated metal for the shed roof on the left elevation (east elevation facing rear of the house).
    - v. Doors facing Mimosa Avenue should be wood.
    - vi. Provide specifications for new doors and windows for HDC Staff review and probable approval.
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 Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>: TAYLOR      2<sup>nd</sup>: BELL**

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the application for the accessory structure because it met Design Standards 8.10 for accessory buildings and 6.18 for materials. He added the condition that the applicant work with Staff regarding material, beam, and window trim details as well as the window and door manufacturer and materials.

Ms. Bell seconded the motion.

Mr. Barth added the friendly amendment that the applicant should work with Staff on all points under Staff Recommendations A through C outlined in Item #2, and that the motion make reference to Chapter 6 for new construction. Mr. Taylor and Ms. Bell accepted the amendment.

**VOTE: 10/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, TAYLOR, WALKER, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

**PULLED FROM CONSENT FOR FULL HEARING**

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA-2023-01125, 1926 EWING AV (PID: 12111715) – ACCESSORY STRUCTURE, FENESTRATION CHANGES, & REAR ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a one-story side-gabled cottage built c. 1930. Architectural features include Colonial Revival elements as visible in the in the 6/6 window configuration, the arched entry porch, and gable eave returns. An uncovered broken patio is located under the triple window to the right of the front entry. Lot size is approximately 57' x 178'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 2-story single-family houses.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is in three parts.

- Part 1: The demolition of a non-original accessory structure and construction of a new Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) in the rear yard. Proposed ADU height is approximately 22'-10" as measure from grade to ridge. Height of the primary structure is approximately 26'-4" from grade to ridge. Proposed materials are traditional to match existing.
- Part 2: Changing a gable vent to an egress window on the right elevation.
- Part 3: Rear addition of an open porch and masonry fireplace. The chimney is visible from the front elevation as shown on Sheet A-4.0, which requires Commission review. Proposed materials are traditional to match existing.

The proposed solar tube shown on Sheet A-4.3, is Staff approvable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the Standards for New Construction of Residential

Buildings, Chapter 6, and Accessory Buildings, 8.10.

2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, Staff recommends Approval of the accessory structure, window changes, and rear 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, with the following Conditions:
  - a. Confirm siding material and dimensions for accessory structure with Staff.
  - b. Provide a beam/column detail for the porch addition and the accessory structure.
  - c. Provide overall footprint measurements on the plans for both rear porch addition and accessory structure.
  - d. Provide specifications for new doors and windows for HDC Staff review and probable approval.
  - e. On Sheet A-4.0, correct height discrepancies on existing/proposed front elevation.
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 Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>: WALKER      2<sup>nd</sup>: PARATI**

Ms. Walker moved to approve the application noting that the Commission is making an exception in its approval of the change from a vent to window on the second story since it provides access without changing the exterior of the house or roof line.

Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

Ms. Bell suggested a friendly amendment to note that the application is being approved in order to meet the building code for egress. She also suggested adding the condition that the applicant provide permit-ready drawings, meeting the conditions outlined in Staff comments 2(a) through (e), to Staff for final review. Ms. Walker and Ms. Parati accepted the friendly amendment.

Ms. Parati suggested another friendly amendment that the window be made as small as possible to keep the opening close to the original while still meeting egress requirements.

Ms. Wojick also offered a friendly amendment that the style of the window should be a casement made to look like a double hung. Ms. Walker accepted those amendments.

Ms. Parati also accepted those amendments, adding that the motion should cite Standards 6.20 through 6.24 for additions, 8.10 for accessory buildings, and that they were making an exception to Standard 4.14, number 6 in order to approve the change from a vent to window.

Ms. Walker accepted Ms. Parati's language about Standards.

**VOTE: 10/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, TAYLOR, WALKER, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE, FENESTRATION CHANGES, & REAR ADDITION – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

**CONSENT**



---

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

ABSENT: NONE

RECUSED: TAYLOR, WOJICK

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2023-00744, 331 W KINGSTON AV (PID: 11907919) – ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1.5-story cottage constructed c. 1936. Architectural features include a side gable roof with triangular gable vents, a partial width front porch with a front gable roof, a central front entry, and an exterior brick chimney on the right elevation. The front dormer, rear left side dormer, and rear gable roof are later additions, which pre-date the designation of the Wilmore local historic district. The exterior is unpainted brick with wood, German lap siding on the dormers, and wood shake siding on the front and rear dormers. The house has 6/1 GBG replacement windows with trim and muntins that are too narrow; installation pre-dates the designation of the Wilmore local historic district. Lot size measures approximately 50' x 134'. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is the addition of a rear dormer on the right elevation behind the primary ridge. The existing dormer on the left elevation is proposed to be expanded to match the right elevation. A new cantilevered awning roof supported by an oversized bracket is proposed to be installed over the rear entry. Proposed materials are fiber cement siding, casement windows, and 6/1 windows. The plans are noted to match existing but existing materials, dimensions, and details are not provided. Elevations are shown on Sheets 5, 6, and 7.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the Standards for New Construction of Residential Buildings, Chapter 6.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, Staff recommends Approval of the 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, with the following Conditions:
  - a. New siding should be wood or smooth finish fiber cement siding (Hardie Artisan or Nichiha Savannah).
  - b. New corner board and window trim should be wood.
  - c. Provide a window and door trim detail for fields of siding. The trim and mullions between paired windows should be larger than as drawn. The existing windows and trim on the existing dormers do not meet the Design Standards and should not be matched.
  - d. Provide specifications for new doors and windows for HDC Staff review and probable approval.
  - e. The new dormer ridges should drop below the main ridge of the house by a minimum of 4" or no ridge vent should be used.
  - f. Leave all masonry unpainted.
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 Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>:     BARTH                      2<sup>nd</sup>:     PARATI**

Mr. Barth moved to approve the application for the addition because it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards in Chapter 6 for new construction of residential buildings, referencing Staff's recommendations in Item 2,

letters (a) through (f). He added that the applicant should work with Staff on the rear awning beam detail as shown on drawing 1, sheet 8. Mr. Barth also cited Standard 5.8 for unpainted masonry, requesting that all unpainted brick on the project, whether new or existing, remain unpainted.

Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 8/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI,  
WALKER, WHEAT, WHITLOCK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

**CONTINUED FROM THE NOVEMBER 8 MEETING**

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

RETURNED: TAYLOR, WOJICK

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2023-00588, 417 HEATHCLIFF ST (PID: 07103304) – SIDE PORCH ENCLOSURE & FENESTRATION CHANGES**

*This application was continued from the November 8, 2023 meeting for the following items:*

- 1. Continue for additional exploration of details for the possible enclosure of the side porch to provide specific information about door and window construction and/or specification of products to be used, per Standard 6.15.*
- 2. Consideration for this project is based on the reversibility of the construction, per Secretary of the Interior Standards, 2.5.*

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1-story American Small House with Tudor elements constructed c. 1936. Architectural features include an asymmetrical façade with a side gable roof with a small front-facing cross gable, large front chimney, open side porch with round columns, and 6/1 windows. The exterior is unpainted brick with a decorative basketweave water table. The lot size measures approximately 55' x 206'. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is fenestration changes on the left elevation and the enclosure of the side porch.

On the left elevation an existing door opening will be changed to a window. The access stair and shed roof will also be removed. Brick will be toothed in and both brick and mortar will match existing.

The existing open side porch is proposed to be screened. Non-original railing will be removed. The existing round columns are proposed to be replaced with new round columns. The areas between the columns will be infilled with trim and 2-panel glass doors.

*Revised Proposal:*

- Porch details shown on Sheet A146b.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Porch Changes
  - a. Confirm new trim will be wood.
  - b. Door specifications needed.
  - c. Confirm the existing brick steps are to remain and are not proposed to be rebuilt.
2. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVED**

**1<sup>st</sup>: WHEAT      2<sup>nd</sup>: BARTH**

Ms. Wheat moved to approve the application because it met Design Standard 4.8, number 5 for porches, and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5. Ms. Wheat also cited Standards 6.14 for trim and 6.18 for materials, noting that the new trim should be wood, that door specifications need to be submitted to Staff, and that the existing brick steps are to remain and not be rebuilt.

Mr. Barth seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 8/2**

**AYES: BARTH, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, TAYLOR, WALKER, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

**NAYS: BELL, PARATI**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR SIDE PORCH ENCLOSURE & FENESTRATION CHANGES – APPROVED.**

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

RECUSED: PARATI

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2023-00583, 604 S SUMMIT AV (PID: 07102333) – ACCESSORY STRUCTURE**

*This application was continued from the November 8, 2023 meeting for the following items:*

1. *Reevaluate the project to meet Standards 8.10, Number 3, and considerations of 8.10, Number 4. The style of the architecture is inconsistent with the existing house architecture.*
2. *Request additional information on measurements for the structure itself and the details to be more accurate, including sections, grade, and relationships of the foundation to the grade, per Standards for New Construction, Chapter 6, and how that will impact retaining walls and driveway access, per Standard 8.2.*
3. *Overall massing of the structure being secondary, referring back to the context that was provided, and working with the scale, overall height, and overall width of the structure to be more contextual with the neighborhood, per Standards for New Construction, Chapter 6, and Standards 8.10, number 7.*
4. *Provide additional details as far as window trim, door, and window material, as well as specifications.*
5. *Request that the applicant provide a floor plan and accurate site plan details that are consistent amongst all drawings.*
6. *Restudy the windows and dormers as being more vertical-oriented window panes, specifically looking at different types of windows.*
7. *Request that the applicant provide rear-yard calculations as taken from the historic rear thermal wall of the existing structure, pre-addition, and would like the applicant to provide more detail as far as any grading or retainage that must occur with respect to the accessory structure's foundation.*

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a one-story American Small House with Colonial Revival details constructed in 1937. Architectural features include a symmetrical three-bay façade with thin, paired columns supporting an arched portico, clipped gable ends, and 6/1 windows. Building height is approximately 19.9’ at its tallest point as measured from grade to ridge. Adjacent structures are a mix of 1- and 2-story residential buildings. Previously approved projects include the expansion of the front porch floor and roof (COA# HDCRMI-2020-00312) and a rear addition (COA# 2016-086).

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a new Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) in the rear yard to include a three-vehicle garage/carport combination with an attached storage shed. The existing storage shed in the rear yard will be removed. Proposed building height is 19’-9 ¾”. The building footprint measures approximately 38’-0’ x 26’-0”. Proposed exterior materials are wood German lap siding with wood corner boards to match existing on the main house. Information about windows, garage doors, and trim (other than corner boards) is not provided. Rear yard open space calculations are not provided. No trees are proposed for removal.

*Revised Proposal:*

- Shed added to site plan
- Rear yard open space calculations provided. Post-construction impervious area will be approximately 49.2%
- Window design changed in dormers and gable ends
- Project alternatives considered provided

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Height, size/width, massing.
  - a. Provide examples of three vehicle accessory structures in Wesley Heights.
2. Foundation – Provide a proportional foundation on the accessory structure.
3. Windows/Doors
  - a. Proportions in the dormers. Perhaps consider 6-light casements or awning windows, instead of 6/1 double-hung windows.
  - b. Provide a window trim detail with dimensions.
  - c. Provide window specifications that meet HDC requirements.
  - d. Provide garage door specifications that meet HDC requirements.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins’ invitation to speak.

**MOTION: CONTINUE**

**1<sup>st</sup>:     BARTH                    2<sup>nd</sup>:     TAYLOR**

Mr. Barth moved to continue the application and requested that the applicant further evaluate the items that the Commission asked for during the last review of the project. He directed the applicant to critically study the primary structure and use architectural features from it on the accessory structure to make them more consistent per Standard 8.10, numbers 3 and 4; that they provide the square footage for the accessory structure and the primary structure for reference; that they further reduce the overall massing of the accessory structure, including the overall width and second floor dormer massing, using scale-reducing techniques per Chapter 6 and Standards 8.10, number 7, 6.8 for massing and complexity of form, and 6.13 for roof form and materials; that the applicant work with Staff on the options for a top-sash-only or awning window configuration for the dormer windows per Standards 6.15 and 6.16; that the applicant provide accurate drawings depicting the foundation materials as well as the grade conditions on all four sides of the accessory structure in order to represent how the foundation material will be applied given the grade per Standards 6.12 and 6.18; and finally, that the applicant depict rear yard calculations on their site plan with an emphasis on the rear wall of the original house, not including later additions. Mr. Barth also directed the applicant to review Standards 6.10 for scale, 6.11 for directional expression, and 6.2 for context.

Mr. Taylor seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 9/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, TAYLOR,  
WALKER, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – CONTINUED.**

---

**CONTINUED FROM THE DECEMBER 13 MEETING**

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

RETURNED: PARATI

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2023-00612, 1314 LAFAYETTE AV (PID: 12309413) – ADDITION – SOLAR PANELS**

*This application was continued from the December 13, 2023 meeting for the following items:*

1. *Come back with a plan that shows the pedestrian point of view and pay attention to the private realm space.*

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a one-story Ranch constructed c. 1955. Architectural features include a low-hip roof with a large central chimney, an inset front door, large picture windows, and bands of transom windows on the front elevation. The exterior is painted brick. Lot size is approximately 75' x 176'. Adjacent structures are 1- and 2-story single-family houses. Previously approved projects include modifications to an existing accessory structure under COA# HDCADMRM-2021-00369 and a new in-ground swimming pool under COA# HDCADMRM-2022-00370.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is the addition of solar panels to the asphalt shingle roof of the main building and an accessory building. The panels will be flush mounted and no-tilt. Proposed locations are the rear elevation roof, a portion of the left elevation roof, and the left elevation of the c. 2015 accessory structure's roof. The exterior equipment will be installed on the left elevation of the main house.

*Revised Proposal – December 2023*

- Solar panel locations changed to the back portion of the exterior slope of the left elevation roof, the interior slope of the left elevation roof, and the rear slope of the main roof.
- 

*Revised Proposal – February 2024*

- *Street view perspective drawing provided.*
- *Photo from sidewalk street view perspective provided.*

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Confirm that no changes will be made to the roof structure.
2. Provide a more precise location of where exterior equipment will be installed and information about screening.
3. Minor revisions may be reviewed by Staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>: WHEAT      2<sup>nd</sup>: LINEBERGER**

Ms. Wheat moved to approve the application based on Standard 4.5, number 6 for roofs and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5. She also added the condition that the applicant make no changes to the roof structure.

Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 9/1**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, TAYLOR, WALKER, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

**NAYS: PARATI**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

LEFT: BELL

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCMA-2023-00283, 424-428 WEST BV (PID: 11907801) – NEW CONSTRUCTION & REHABILITATION**

*This application was continued from the December 13, 2023 meeting for the following items:*

1. *Phase 2: Townhomes*
  - a. *Chapter 6, Context, 6.2; Setback, 6.5; Spacing, 6.6; Orientation 6.7; Massing and Complexity of Form, 6.8; and Height and Width, 6.9.*
    - i. *Massing and Complexity of Form, 6.8, number 5, "Roof forms such as hipped and gable roofs help to break down the mass as do the complexity of form, architectural details, and materials."*
  - b. *Roof form and materials 6.13,*
    - i. *Number 1, which talks about gables and hips and combinations.*
    - ii. *Number 2 is specific to dormers.*
    - iii. *Number 8, for multifamily buildings in a corner location, where an additional story may be allowed, the roof form and design may help to reduce the scale of the building in relation to the other homes within its context.*
  - c. *Cornices and trim, 6.14.*
  - d. *Doors and windows, 6.15.*
  - e. *Porches, 6.17, and employing those to create more pedestrian interest.*
  - f. *Materials, 6.18.*
2. *Phase 3, Gateway Building*
  - a. *Chapter 6 and Chapter 7*

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The Wilmore Elementary School was designed by Louis H. Asbury, Sr. and originally constructed in 1925. Two additions were made to the school. In 1948, the building was expanded to the east to house a cafeteria, auditorium, one classroom, and nurses' room. The last addition was in 1970s when the rectangular wing was added to the front of the building and an addition at the rear of the building was constructed to contain a new library, workroom, lounge, classroom, administrative spaces, and two conference rooms. The 1948 addition was designed by architect Martin E. Boyer, Jr., and the 1970s addition by Tebee P. Hawkins & Associates.

The original building and 1948 classroom addition is two stories in height (34.4' including parapet), six bays long and one bay in depth. The building forms an L-shape with a one-bay by one-bay second on the northwest portion of the building.

The building is clad in unpainted brick with a metal-capped parapet wall and what appears to be a flat gravel roof. The original building has stone water tables on all elevations with additional stone details on the south elevation. Wood double-hung windows comprise the majority of the fenestration and are presented either singular or in groups of three. Above the windows are brick soldier course lintels and at their base, brick sills. The lot size is approximately 400' x 400'. Adjacent structures are 1.5 and 2-story residential buildings.

### **PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is in two parts.

1. Rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the 1925 and 1948 portions of the historic Wilmore School building. The 1970s addition on the front will be removed and the original front façade restored. The 1970s rear addition will also be removed. The proposed project includes replacement of all windows.
2. New construction of mixed-use building on the vacant land (currently an asphalt parking lot) surrounding the school building. The proposed new buildings are proposed to range in height from 37' to 65'. Proposed exterior materials include red brick to coordinate with the school building and fiber cement lap siding on the uppermost level. Cast stone accents will be used at the foundation, roof/setback parapets, and entries. Proposed windows are vinyl single-hung with divided lights in a dark bronze or black color.

### *Revised Proposal – November 8, 2023*

- Project is in three parts:
  1. Wilmore school building rehabilitation and adaptive reuse.
  2. New construction of a mixed-use building along S. Mint Street and a portion of West Boulevard.
  3. New construction of multi-family townhouses along W. Kingston Avenue.
- Context setback exhibits provided for S. Mint Street, W. Kingston Avenue, and West Boulevard.
- Revised site plan.
- Original plans for the Wilmore school building provided.
- Exterior and interior photos of Wilmore School windows provided.
- Elevation design changes of townhomes along W. Kingston.
- Elevation design changes of mixed-used building along S. Mint Street/West Boulevard.
- Setback on W. Kingston Avenue is approximately 51'-0" as measured from back of curb to front thermal wall for the units closest to the residential single-family. The September proposal setback was 40'-8".
- Setback on W. Kingston Avenue for majority of units is +/- 40'-0". The September proposal setback was 31'-2 ½".
- Setback on West Boulevard is now 62'-5" and 66'-10". The September proposal setback was 40'-6" and 46'-0".

### *Revised Proposal – December 13, 2023*

- Wilmore School Building
  - No updates provided.
- Townhomes
  - Design changed including roof forms, elevations, width, spacing, and orientation.
  - Setback
    - For the unit closest to the residential single-family, setback ranges from 50'-0" to 58'-0" as measured from back of curb to front thermal wall. The November proposal setback was 51'-0" and the September proposal setback was 40'-8".
    - Setbacks for the two, four-unit buildings in the middle is not provided. The September proposal setback was 31'-2 ½".
    - Setback to W. Kingston for the unit closest to S. Mint is 40'-5".
    - Setback is not provided for S. Mint.
  - Width
    - The width of the two, four-unit buildings in the middle is 62'-0".
    - Width not provided for the other buildings.
  - Height

- For the unit closest to the residential single-family, height is 33'-2". Height for the remainder of the units is 37'-0", which is changed from the November proposal height of 45'-0".
  - Mixed-Use Building
    - Setbacks
      - S. Mint - range from 53'-5" to 29'-1 ½" to 38'-3" and 25'-1" at the Retail building at the corner of S. Mint and W. Blvd, which is unchanged from the November proposal.
      - West Blvd – unchanged from November proposal.
    - Width/Length – not provided.
    - Height of majority of the building is 34'-5" as measured from the top of the parking deck entry to the top of the 3rd story, and 44'-8" to the top of the building. The overall building height is 4" shorter than the November proposal.
    - Retail building height is 38'-0", which is unchanged from the November proposal.
  - Comparison exhibits of site plan revisions and townhome elevations provided.

*Revised Proposal – February 14, 2024*

- Revised site plan with setback changes for townhomes. See page labeled "Site Plan Detail – Townhouses."
- Revised townhome elevations provided in both color and black and white.
- Townhome porches expanded to 8' in depth.
- Site plan showing spacing and rhythm detail provided for mixed use building. See page labeled "Site Plan Detail – Gateway."
- Revised mixed use building elevations provided in both color and black and white.
- Interior elevations provided in both color and black and white.
- Revised site sections provided.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Townhomes
  - a. Provide setbacks between of townhomes along S. Mint Street on the permit-ready plans.
2. Multi-Use Building
  - a. Provide heights from grade to ridge for all portions of the building on the permit-ready plans.
3. Materials and Details
  - a. Dimensions and details about the fiber cement lap siding needed.
  - b. Brick and mortar sample needed.
  - c. Window specification that meet HDC standards are needed. Vinyl windows are not approvable.
  - d. Detail drawings needed for windows, doors, railings, eaves, transition between brick and siding, window/door trim, storefronts, signage, parapet design for brick and siding exteriors, retail landscape patio, lighting, etc.
4. Minor changes may be reviewed by HDC Staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION 1: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>:     BARTH                    2<sup>nd</sup>:     PARATI**

Mr. Barth moved to approve the following aspects of this project, as these aspects are not incongruous with the Standards: Site Plan and Both Buildings (Townhomes and Gateway (mixed-use) Building) as it relates to context, 6.1-6.4; setback, 6.5; spacing, 6.6; orientation, 6.7; massing 6.8; height and width, 6.9, as it corresponds with the two examples provided within a 360 degree view; scale, 6.10; and directional expression, 6.11; as well as the preamble, 7.1; context, 7.2-7.3; setback, 7.4; spacing, 7.5; orientation, 7.6; massing and complexity of form, 7.7; height and width, 7.8; scale, 7.9; and directional expression, 7.10. The approval was contingent on the restoration and rehabilitation of the historic school (building) property.



Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

**VOTE 1: 8/1**

**AYES: BARTH, HAWKINS, PARATI, TAYLOR, WALKER, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

**NAYS: LINEBERGER**

**DECISION 1: APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN AND BUILDINGS – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

**MOTION 2: DENY**

**1<sup>st</sup>: BARTH      2<sup>nd</sup>: PARATI**

Mr. Barth moved to deny the following aspects of both Buildings (Townhomes and Gateway (mixed-use) Building) as it relates to foundations, 6.12; roof form and materials, 6.13; cornices and trim, 6.14; doors and windows and rhythm, 6.15-6.16; porches, 6.17; materials, 6.18; as well as foundations, 7.11; roof form and materials, 7.12; cornices and trim, 7.13; doors and windows and rhythm, 7.14; storefronts, 7.15; and materials, 7.16.

Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

**VOTE 2: 9/0**

**AYES: BARTH, HAWKINS, PARATI, TAYLOR, WALKER, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION 2: APPLICATION FOR MATERIALS AND DETAILS - DENIED.**

---

**CONTINUED FROM THE JANUARY 10 MEETING**

---

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

ABSENT: BELL

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCMI-2023-00667, 129 N POPLAR ST (PID: 07801608) – SIGNAGE**

*This application was continued from the December 13, 2023 meeting for the following items:*

1. *Provide more information on the new material which the HDC has not yet approved*
  - a. *Need to know how it is applied, how it is removed, and how it is maintained.*
  - b. *Need to know if the ghost sign that is there now is historic.*
2. *Restudy the size of the signs per HDC Standards, A.2, particularly paying attention to the section Within Urban Districts, General Commercial, and Research/Office Zoning Districts; Nonconforming Signs; Historic Signs. Those are all included -- are all standards that should be referenced.*
3. *Masonry, 5.5-5.6.*
4. *Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5.*
5. *If we can find something within our historic districts that might help make a case for this, then that would be wonderful, too.*

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing building is a 2.5-story brick Victorian constructed c. 1900. Architectural details include a steeply pitched gable-on-hip slate roof, deep eaves, arched 2/2 double-hung wood windows with cast stone sills, and a three-story hip roof tower with engaged gable dormers. The lot size is approximately 55' x 110'. Adjacent structures are institutional, multi-family, and commercial.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is replacement signage on the left elevation for a sign that fell off during a windstorm and a new, additional sign on the rear of the building. The sign on left elevation will measure approximately 60” x 60”. The sign on the rear will measure approximately 72” x 28”. The existing sign in the front yard is not proposed to change. The sign material is a non-PVC film that will be applied directly to the brick exterior. The number of signs requested, and proposed sign material, requires Commission review.

*Revised Proposal:*

- Left elevation sign dimensions changed to 2’-10” x 2’-10”, for a total of 8 sq ft.
- Rear elevation sign dimensions changed to 4’ x 1’-6”, for a total of 6 sq ft.
- Street views of building provided.
- Documentation on removal provided.
- Video links for application/removal provided.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Approval of the total square footage as proposed will require justification based on specific circumstances of this particular lot and building.
2. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins’ invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>: LINEBERGER**

**2<sup>nd</sup>: PARATI**

Ms. Lineberger moved to approve the application because it met the Design Standards for Signs, A.1 and A.2, number 2. She added that the Commission was making an exception to the number, size, and locations of the approved signs due to the special circumstances of the building and its location. Ms. Lineberger also stated that the type of sign and the way its affixed would be approved by Staff.

Ms. Parati offered a friendly amendment that the motion specify that the approval is due to the unique location of the building and each side is being treated as a different street frontage because of the one-way streets next to the building.

Ms. Lineberger accepted the amendment, and Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 9/0**

**AYES: BARTH, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, TAYLOR, WALKER, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR SIGNAGE – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

Due to time constraints the following cases will be heard at the March 13<sup>rd</sup>, 2024 meeting:

- HDCRMA-2023-00737, 2025 Charlotte Dr
- HDCRMI-2023-00739, 1532 Dilworth Rd
- HDCRMIA-2023-00835, 2000 Patton Av
- HDCRMIA-2023-00834, 251 W Kingston Av
- HDCRMA-2023-01160, 201 Grandin Rd
- HDCCMI-2023-00860, 311 East Blvd

With no further business to discuss, Chair Hawkins adjourned the meeting at 7:49 pm.