



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
June 12, 2024 | Room 280

MINUTES

- MEMBERS PRESENT: Nichelle Hawkins (Chair)
Kim Parati (Vice Chair)
Shauna Bell
Christa Lineberger
Brett Taylor
Jill Walker
Sarah Wheat
Scott Whitlock
Heather Wojick
- MEMBERS ABSENT: Chris Barth (Second Vice Chair)
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 June meeting of the Historic District Commission (Commission) meeting to order at 12:59 p.m. 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.

Ms. Bell moved to approve the May 8, 2024 Meeting Minutes. Ms. Wojick seconded the motion. The Commission voted 9/0 to approve the minutes.

Ms. Walker moved to nominate Nichelle Hawkins as Chair, Kim Parati as Vice Chair, and Chris Barth as Second Vice Chair for the upcoming term. The motion was seconded by Ms. Wojick. The Commission voted to approve the nominations by a vote of 9/0.

INDEX OF ADDRESSES:

NOT HEARD AT THE MAY 8 MEETING

HDCRMA-2023-01190, 1821 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMI-2023-01092, 825 Romany Rd	Dilworth
HDCCMI-2023-01121, 1218 East Bv	Dilworth
HDCRMI-2023-01094, 404 W Kingston Av	Wilmore
HDCRDEMO-2023-01122, 2031 Wilmore Dr and 2023 & 2027 Wood Dale Tr	Wilmore
HDCRDEMO-2023-01189, 1514-1516 Hamorton Pl	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMA-2023-01124, 2000 Dilworth Rd W	Dilworth

NEW CASES

HDCRMA-2023-01093, 513 Grandin Rd	Wesley Heights
HDCRMA-2022-00897, 1411 & 1413 W 4 th St	Wesley Heights
HDCCMA-2023-00991, 927 East Bv	Dilworth
HDCCMA-2023-01193, 1921 Charlotte Dr	Dilworth
HDCRMIA-2023-01195, 928 Ideal Wy	Dilworth

CONTINUED FROM THE MAY 8 MEETING

HDCRMA-2023-00988, 501 N Poplar St	Fourth Ward
------------------------------------	-------------

NOT HEARD AT THE MAY 8 MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA-2023-01190, 1821 THE PLAZA (PID: 08119605) – ADDITION & ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a two-story Colonial Revival house constructed in 1930. Architectural features include a centered front porch entry with a hipped roof and Doric columns, side gable main roof, a single front door, and 1/1 windows. Lot size is approximately 66' x 170'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential structures.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is a rear addition on the main structure and the construction of a new accessory structure. The proposal also includes the replacement of the existing gravel driveway with a new concrete driveway to match existing which abuts the building foundation and is wider than Staff has the ability to approve. A 12-inch Oak tree and 10-inch Magnolia tree are proposed for removal.

The existing rear addition will be removed, and a new L-shaped addition added. The new addition will bump-out on both the left and right side. The left-side bump-out measures approximately 8'-8" x 13'-8". The right-side bump-out is integrated with the L-shape rear addition, which has a proposed footprint of approximately 19'-8" x 30'-8" x 39'-4" x 21'-4" x 54'-01/8" x 10'-3 11/16". Most of the rear addition is one-story, but the total height, as measured from grade to ridge, is 13'-10 11/16" at the low point and 18'- 3 1/8" at the high point. A small second level rear bump-out that appears to tie in below the primary ridge is also proposed and measures approximately 10'- 4 3/8" x 1'-6" on the left-rear and 19'-2" x 3'-11 1/16" on the right-rear. Proposed materials include an unpainted brick exterior to match existing, and wood shake siding in the gable ends. The windows are proposed to be wood-clad double hung with no muntins to match the primary structure. The double-hung windows facing to the interior of the lot, and the windows on the right-side bump-out, will have transom windows above. All trim is proposed to be wood to match existing. A rear raised patio measuring approximately 30'-8" x 10'-8" will also be constructed. The rear raised patio is proposed to be unpainted brick and concrete.

The new accessory structure's proposed footprint is approximately 29'-0" x 24'-0" and the overall height, as measured from grade to ridge, is approximately 22'-6 7/16". Proposed materials include unpainted brick exterior to match the main structure, and wood shake siding in the gable ends. All trim is proposed to be wood to match the main structure. The windows are proposed to be aluminum-clad double-hung and casement with Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL) in a 6/6 pattern. The garage doors are proposed to be wood.

The post-construction rear yard impermeable area will be approximately 48%.

Staff may approve the remainder of the proposed work including the removal of the existing stone retaining walls along the front yard with no replacement, the replacement of the existing fence with a new wood fence, and the addition of a rear yard lap pool. There are ornamental trees proposed for removal.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The material and details needed for both buildings:
 - a. Provide window and door materials and specifications to HDC Staff for review and probable approval.
 - b. New brick and mortar should be of a color and dimension as existing and remain unpainted, per

Standards, Masonry 5.5 – 5.6 and Paint 5.8.

2. Provide brick sample to HDC Staff for review and probable approval.
3. Site Features
 - a. Provide tree protection plan.
 - b. Provide details and materials of all proposed areas of hardscape, including the swimming pool.
 - c. Provide driveway dimensions. Driveways should be as narrow as possible, per Standard 8.2, number 5.
 - d. A planting strip should be added between the driveway and building foundation, per Standard 8.2, number 8.
4. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Hawkins’ invitation to speak.

MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

1st: WOJICK 2nd: TAYLOR

Ms. Wojick moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the district and it meets the Standards for new construction for residential buildings and additions, Chapter 6, Standards 6.20 through 6.24, and Standard 8.10 for accessory buildings. She also cited the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards 2.5. Ms. Wojick added the following conditions: that the applicant work with staff on the pool, fencing, and driveway; that they replant a substantial tree in the front yard to replace those being removed; and that new brick and mortar should be the color and dimensions of the existing and remain unpainted. She cited Standards 8.5, number 6 for trees; 5.5-5.6 for masonry, and 5.8 for paint. She also asked that brick samples and pool hardscape materials be provided to Staff for final review and approval and that a planting strip be installed to prevent the new driveway from touching the existing house per Standard 8.2, numbers 5 and 8.

Ms. Parati offered a friendly amendment that the word “substantial” be replaced with “mature canopy” in the motion’s references to the replacement tree. Ms. Wojick accepted this amendment.

Mr. Taylor seconded the motion.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION & ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2023-01092, 825 ROMANY RD (PID: 12309513) – FRONT PORCH ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1.5-story Colonial Revival constructed c. 1942. Architectural features include a side gable roof with large triangular vents in the gable ends, a symmetrical façade with a central entry flanked by 8/8 double-hung windows, three gable dormers, and an exterior chimney on the right elevation. A one-story attached garage on has been converted to heated living space. The exterior is painted brick. A metal shed roof supported by metal brackets has been added over the front door. Lot size is approximately 60’ x 140’. Surrounding structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is the addition of new front porch. The existing original stoop and shed roof (a non-original feature) will be removed. The proposed front porch roof will be dark bronze standing seam metal supported by square wood columns. The new front porch roof will tie in 6” below the dormers. Proposed floor is wood tongue and groove and will run perpendicular to the front door. The ceiling will be wood beadboard. Proposed foundation and steps are painted brick to match the existing house. A new 34” tall wood railing will also be installed. New gutters and downspouts are proposed to be installed, running down the outside of the columns. A new front walkway is proposed from the front porch to the existing steps leading to the driveway. No changes proposed to the existing windows or front door.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Provide accurate site plan.
 - a. Provide setback to edge of front porch and to front thermal wall from the front property line.
 - b. The presentation notes the existing front walkway to remain, but it is not shown on the site plan.
 - c. The dimensions of the new walkway are needed.
 - d. The landing area shown on the site plan appears to be too large and incongruous with the neighborhood.
 - e. Commission to determine if a flagstone material is appropriate for the new walkway.
2. Handrail is too tall and obscures the front windows. An accurate historic height with a booster rail should be used.
3. Provide dimensions of wood columns.
4. Clarify note about what “existing door trim relocated” means.
5. All new brick (foundation/steps) should remain unpainted.
6. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Hawkins’ invitation to speak.

MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

1st: WHITLOCK 2nd: WOJICK

Mr. Whitlock moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the Design Standards and the Secretary of Interior’s Standards, 2.5. He cited the following Standards: 4.8 for porch rehabilitation, 6.17 for porches, and 6.20 for additions. Mr. Whitlock added the conditions that the foundation and any new brick will remain unpainted and match the existing historic brick as closely as possible; that the approved sidewalk would be Option 2, the narrower option; that the applicant will work with Staff on handrail design; and that setback information for the front porch and front thermal wall will be provided to Staff to ensure consistency. He clarified that the Commission was approving flagstone for the new sidewalk material because it is in line with the context of the streetscape and is a historic material.

Ms. Wojick seconded the motion.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR FRONT PORCH ADDITION – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH

APPLICATION:

HDCCMI-2023-01121, 1218 EAST BV (PID: 12111315) – FRONT PORCH ENCLOSURE & SITE WORK

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1.5-story Craftsman constructed in 1918. Architectural features include a stone veneer front porch entrance with wide concrete columns on each end, a front gable dormer, a side gable main roof, a left-side brick chimney with stone veneer, and 4/1 windows. The lot size is approximately 60’ x 150’. Adjacent structures are commercial buildings and 1 and 1.5-story historic residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project includes enlarging the existing front dormer, enclosing the existing front porch, adding a rear addition, and site work including new signage.

Front Dormer: The applicant is proposing raising the ridge of the dormer roof 2’-0”. Materials and details to match existing.

Front Porch: The front porch is proposed to be enclosed with aluminum-framed glass as well as fixing the front porch steps. All other aspects of the front porch will remain the same as existing.

Rear Addition: The existing rear dormer addition will be removed. The new rear addition’s proposed dimensions are not provided. Proposed materials are lap siding with a brick foundation. The proposed windows are to 4/1 double hung windows. As part of the rear addition, an ADA lift is proposed. The proposed ADA lift’s measurements and materials are not provided.

Site Work: The application proposes to expand the existing walkway to provide space for temporary seating (front yard patio), relocate the existing mailbox at the front of the property, and upgrading the existing signage. Dimensions and materials of the walkway expansion (front yard patio) are not provided. The overall dimensions of the sign are 3’-5” x 4’-2”. The applicant also proposes adjustments to the parking area. The parking area’s adjustment details are not provided.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Front Dormer
 - a. Hight, scale, massing, fenestration, and rhythm.
2. Front Porch:
 - a. Refer to Standard 4.8, numbers 5 and 6.
 - b. Provide spec sheet for aluminum-framed windows.
 - c. Provide images of front steps with dimensions and material callouts
3. Rear Addition:
 - a. Massing and Additions, Standard 6.20, numbers 2 and 6.
 - b. Drawings are missing dimensions and material callouts.
 - c. Fenestration and rhythm, and trim, Standards 6.15-6.16
 - d. Provide images, material, and dimensions on proposed ADA lift.
 - e. Provide material specifications and details for:
 - f. Windows and doors.
 - g. Siding and trim details.
4. Site Work:
 - a. Provide details and materials of all proposed areas of hardscapes and sitting area.
 - b. Refer to Standards Appendix A for Signs

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Hawkins’ invitation to speak.

MOTION: CONTINUE

1st: PARATI 2nd: WOJICK

Ms. Parati moved to continue the application for a restudy of the following elements: the enclosure of the porch so that a door is not being installed in front of the historic door per Standards 4.8 for porches and 4.10 for front doors and entrances; the front dormer to keep in line with the historic attributes of a 1.5 story bungalow per Standards 7.10 for directional expression, 7.9 for scale, 7.7 for massing and complexity of form, and 7.8 for height and width; the rear addition's massing, scale, and fenestration per Standard 7.17, number 6 for additions to non-residential buildings; and the sign per Standards A.2, numbers 3, 4, and 5. She also cited the Secretary of Interior's Standards, 2.5.

Ms. Wojick seconded the motion.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR FRONT PORCH ENCLOSURE & SITE WORK – CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH

LEFT: LINEBERGER

RECUSED: WHEAT

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2023-01094, 404 W KINGSTON AV (PID: 11908509) – WINDOW REPLACEMENT – ALTERNATIVE MATERIAL

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing property is a 1-story cottage constructed c. 1991. Architectural features include a side gable roof, projecting front gabled bay with a feature window, central entry, small front porch covered by a shed roof, 6/6 windows, vinyl siding, and a brick foundation. The lot size is approximately 50' x 145'. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1, 1.5, and 2-story single family houses.

PROPOSAL:

This project is for the replacement of the existing original vinyl windows. The applicant is proposing Renewal by Anderson Fibrex windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The requested non-traditional material, Renewal by Anderson Fibrex windows, has not yet been approved by HDC. When new non-traditional materials are requested, specification sheets and physical samples are required by the Commission, which have not been provided.
2. Provide window trim detail.
3. Clarify if the half-moon window on the front elevation will remain or will be removed.
4. The Commission will determine if the proposed project meets the Standards.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION: CONTINUE

1st: PARATI 2nd: WOJICK

Ms. Parati moved to continue this application for more information. She required that the applicant create a mockup, either on the actual home with the traditional historic trim, or presented at the meeting, fully trimmed out to assess what the finished window would look like. She cited the Standard 4.14 for windows.

Ms. Wojick seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7/0

**AYES: BELL, HAWKINS, PARATI, TAYLOR
WALKER, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR WINDOW REPLACEMENT – CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER

RETURNED: WHEAT

APPLICATION:

HDCRDEMO-2023-01122, 2031 WILMORE DR; 2023 & 2027 WOOD DALE TR (PID: 11907514) – DEMOLITION – RESIDENTIAL

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The two existing one-story structures were constructed c. 1951. Lot size measures approximately 50' x 150'. Adjacent properties are 1 and 1.5-story residential buildings.

The building that faces Wilmore Drive has a larger footprint that accommodates two units (2031 Wilmore Drive and 2027 Wood Dale Terrace). The building has a front hip roof, and the rear of the building is a gable roof with a triangular vent. The exterior material is asbestos shingle with a painted brick foundation. The building has three stoops; the front stoop faces Wilmore Drive, a side entry stoop faces Wood Dale Terrace, and a rear stoop faces the other building. All stoops have shed roofs supported by simple round metal columns. Most of the windows are 6/6 with picture frame trim; some have fixed wood shutters.

The building at the rear of the lot has a smaller footprint and one unit (2023 Wood Dale Terrace). The front of the building faces the rear of the lot, and the roof is a mirror image of the building that faces Wilmore Drive. Exterior material is board and batten wood siding on the main body. The gable end has lap siding and a rectangular vent. Foundation is painted brick. The building has two stoops; a front stoop faces the rear property line and a side entry stoop faces Wood Dale Terrace. There is a small gable roof bump out on the rear facing the other building. Windows are 6/6 with fixed louvered vinyl shutters. Window trim is traditional but is wrapped in aluminum.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is full demolition of both buildings. The following information is presented for the Commission's review and consideration:

1. Zoutewelle surveys of Wilmore Drive and Wood Dale Terrace
2. Property survey
3. Digital photos of all sides of building
4. Digital photos of significant architectural details
5. Elevation drawings of both buildings

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Are there any mature canopy trees on the property?
 - a. If so, a tree protection plan is needed.
 - b. The location of the trees should be included on a site plan or property survey.
2. Window trim does not appear to be drawn correctly on the rear building (2023 Wood Dale Terrace).
3. The Commission will determine if the application is complete.
4. The Commission will determine whether the building has special significance to the Wilmore Local Historic District. With affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to a 365-Day Stay of Demolition and require a 90-day waiting period to review new construction plans.
5. If the Commission determines that this property does not have any special significance to the district, then demolition may take place without a delay or upon the approval of new construction plans.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Hawkins’ invitation to speak.

MOTION 1: APPLICATION COMPLETE

1st: BELL 2nd: PARATI

Ms. Bell moved to determine the application is complete with all the required documentation provided by the applicant, which includes clear digital photos of all sides of the building; clear digital photos of significant architectural details and site features, including, but not limited to, windows, front doors, brackets, columns, trim, etcetera; a stamped and sealed property survey with setbacks and building dimensions with width and length clearly labeled; and a Zoutewelle survey to document height.

Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

VOTE 1: 8/0

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

NAYS: NONE

MOTION 2: HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

1st: BELL 2nd: PARATI

Ms. Bell moved to determine that the building has special significance and value toward maintaining the character of the Wilmore Local Historic District and because its year of construction was over 50 years ago.

Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

VOTE 2: 8/0

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

NAYS: NONE

MOTION 3: APPROVE DEMOLITION

1st: BELL 2nd: PARATI

Ms. Bell moved to approve the project with a 365-day stay of demolition on the building due to its special significance and value towards maintaining the character of the district. She stated that receipt of accurate measured drawings of the building to be demolished are required for HDC records before plans for new construction will be considered by this Commission.

Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

VOTE: 8/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION – APROVED WITH A 365 DAY STAY.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER

APPLICATION:

HDCRDEMO-2023-01189, 1514-1516 HAMORTON PL (PID: 08117423) – DEMOLITION – RESIDENTIAL

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1-story Craftsman bungalow constructed c. 1924. The building has an engaged full-width front porch with square columns supporting a front gable roof. Two triangular brackets also support the roof. The front gable features cedar shake siding above four rows of lap siding and a central 4-pane window flanked by vents. The roof is bisected by two central brick chimneys. Originally a single-family structure the building has been converted to a duplex. A large window opening on the left side was converted to a door, but the original window trim was left intact. The main entry is slightly off centered. The exterior is wood lap siding with an unpainted brick foundation. The front porch is wood tongue and groove running perpendicular to the front door, and the front porch steps are wood. The railing is not original. Lot size measures approximately 42.5' x 10', with a 10' alley running parallel to the right of the lot. Adjacent properties are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is full demolition of the building. The following information is presented for the Commission's review and consideration:

1. Zoutewelle survey – on order
2. Property survey
3. Digital photos of significant architectural details
4. Elevation drawings

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Digital photos of all four sides of the building are needed.
2. A tree protection plan for the Oak at the front right corner of the property is needed.
3. The Commission will determine if the application is complete.
4. The Commission will determine whether the building has special significance to the Plaza Midwood Local Historic District. With affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to a 365-Day Stay of Demolition and require a 90-day waiting period to review new construction plans.
5. If the Commission determines that this property does not have any special significance to the district, then demolition may take place without a delay or upon the approval of new construction plans.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION: CONTINUE

1st: WHITLOCK 2nd: PARATI

Mr. Whitlock moved to continue the application as the Commission determined it to be incomplete due to the the lack of documentation, including clear digital photos, 300 DPI or better of all sides of the building, and the Zoutewelle height survey.

Ms. Parati seconded.

VOTE: 8/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION – RESIDENTIAL – CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER

RECUSED: TAYLOR

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA-2023-01124, 2000 DILWORTH RD W (PID: 12111822) – NEW CONSTRUCTION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is 2-story Colonia Revival constructed c. 1925. Architectural features include a symmetrical façade with a pedimented central entry supported by tapered fluted columns, side gable slate roof with pent eaves and wide trim band, a one-story flat roof wing, and unpainted brick exterior. The front entrance is flanked by side lights and windows are 6/1 double-hung wood with soldier course headers and stone sills. A small, flat roof one-story addition shelters a rear entry. The lot size is approximately 71.5' x 186.4' x 70.3' x 174.6'. Adjacent buildings are 2 and 2.5-story residential structures. The structure is listed as Contributing to the Dilworth National Register Historic District. On June 14, 2023, the Commission voted to approve demolition of the primary building and accessory building with a 365-day stay under application #HDCRDEMO-2023-00216.

PROPOSAL:

This proposed project is the new construction of a residential building and an accessory structure.

Primary Building:

At the tallest point, height is 33'-2" as measured from grade to ridge. Proposed width is 50'-5 ¼". Setbacks are not provided. Exterior material is primarily proposed to be stucco with cast stone sills and window surrounds. The stucco foundation will be delineated by a water table detail. Dormers and some accent walls proposed to be flush, stacked horizontal Boral siding with butt-joined corners. Roof material is proposed to be traditional slate. Front stoop is proposed to be bluestone pavers. Gothic arched front door is proposed to be wood. Windows proposed to be fixed and casement; material details are not provided.

Accessory Building:

At the tallest point, height is 22'-5 ½" as measured from grade to ridge. Proposed width is not provided. Setbacks are not provided. Exterior material is proposed to be flush, stacked horizontal Boral siding with butt-joined corners, also known as shiplap. The foundation will be stucco to match the primary building; foundation height is not provided. Roof material is proposed to be slate. The single garage door is proposed to be wood carriage-style. Windows proposed to be fixed and casement; material details are not provided.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Front elevation (Dilworth Rd W)
 - a. Massing, width, scale.
2. Right Elevation (Magnolia Av)
 - a. Massing, width, scale, spacing, size.
3. Left Elevation
 - a. Foundation/water table height on central portion.
4. Cornices & Trim
 - a. Bracket size – An 8-foot bracket is too large. The size is incongruous with the style of architecture and

- Dilworth neighborhood.
- b. Provide examples of Timber purlins used in other Tudor-style houses in Dilworth.
- c. Painted timber columns – provide examples of these in other Tudor-style houses in Dilworth.
- 5. Doors & Windows
 - a. Window trim is too narrow in areas of siding for a Tudor-style house.
 - b. Non-traditional Boral trim materials proposed for windows and doors. Wood is typically required for window/door trim.
 - c. Shutter size on left elevation, first level.
 - d. Add mullion trim for all ganged windows on main house and accessory structure.
- 6. Porches
 - a. Bluestone is not an approvable material on front porches/steps, per Standard 6.17, number 3.
- 7. Lighting
 - a. Lighting appears oversized for the building architecture and the Dilworth district.
- 8. Siding – Main Building & Accessory Structure
 - a. Flush, stacked horizontal siding with butt-joined corners, also known as shiplap, is incongruous with Tudor-style architecture.
- 9. Accessory Building
 - a. Paired windows in dormers. Pane size/orientation. Mullion trim needed.
 - b. Bracket size. A 6-foot bracket is too large. The size is incongruous with the style of architecture and Dilworth neighborhood.
- 10. Site plan – Missing required elements
 - a. Front setback dimensions at both front corners.
 - b. Show proposed setback in relation to the other existing houses on the block.
 - c. What is the 14’ wide area shown between the front entrance and pea gravel front walkway?
- 11. Details needed:
 - a. Beam/column section from roof to foundation needed for the timber columns.
 - b. Materials samples for all non-traditional materials requested, including but not limited to Boral shiplap siding, Boral window trim, dressed timber columns, etc.
 - c. Will gutters/downspouts be installed? If so, show locations on plans.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Hawkins’ invitation to speak.

MOTION: CONTINUE

1st: PARATI 2nd: WOJICK

Ms. Parati moved to continue the application so that the applicant could restudy the design, paying close attention to context in the immediate area, making sure that eaves and roof lines line up. She requested that the design’s aesthetic be simplified so the overall structure is more in line with the houses surrounding it. Ms. Parati also asked for a restudy of all elevations to keep within the context of the surrounding structures. She cited the following Standards to support her request that the applicants restudy the proposed design: 6.2 for context, 6.8 for massing and complexity of form, 6.9 for height and width, and 6.3, number 1, for context. She also cited the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, 2.5. Ms. Parati clarified that the main house details and accessory structure were not evaluated at this time.

Ms. Wojick proposed a friendly amendment that the applicant be required to bring a study of the width, depth, and height of the surrounding houses to provide context. Ms. Parati accepted the amendment.

Ms. Wojick seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BELL, HAWKINS, PARATI, WALKER, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION – CONTINUED.

NEW CASES

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER

LEFT: PARATI, WALKER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA-2023-01093, 513 GRANDIN RD (PID: 07102302) – REAR ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing building is a 1-story brick Craftsman constructed c. 1922. Architectural details cross gable roof and a full width front porch with brick base and wood tapered columns. Windows are 4/1, and the front door is a Craftsman 3/3 light pattern. Exterior materials are wood lap siding gable ends and unpainted brick siding with an unpainted brick chimney. The lot size is approximately 53' x 195'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, 2, and 2.5-story residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is a rear addition with a glass connector and covered porch. An existing porch will be removed, the dimensions are not provided. The glass connector measures approximately 8'-3" x 29'-0". The new addition measures approximately 30'-5" x 30'-6". The covered porch measures approximately 14'-0" x 30'-6". The overall proposed height from grade to ridge of each element is not provided, however, the heights range between 2'-0"-4'-0" below the main ridge. Proposed materials include wood German lap siding, unpainted brick foundation, brick and wood columns to match existing, and roof details to match existing. Windows are proposed to be wood casement in a 4/1 patterns; the proposed 4/1 pattern does not match the original window 4/1 pattern's proportions. The glass connector windows are proposed to be fixed with transoms in a 4-light pattern. The rear elevation has fixed windows in the gable end, large sliding glass doors, and oversized casement windows. Door material is not provided. Window and door trim is proposed to be wood.

This project also includes fenestration changes on both the left and right elevations, a new driveway, and a new fence. On the left elevation, the existing glass block window will be replaced with a window to match existing, and the former screen porch will be enclosed with brick and a window to match existing. On the right elevation, two new basement level windows, to match existing, and a corrugated metal window well will be added.

Staff approvable items include the new concrete driveway with planting strip and new wood fence. No trees are proposed to be removed. Post-construction rear yard impermeability will be 41%.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Fenestration and rhythm of all three elevations of addition.
2. Provide existing and proposed dimensions of the driveway.
3. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION 1: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

1st: WOJICK

2nd: WHEAT

Ms. Wojick moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the Design Standards and meets Standard 6.20 for additions. She asked that the applicant work with Staff on the specifics of the driveway, including the final dimensions, materials, and location per Standard 8.2 for sidewalks and parking and on any new fencing per Standard 8.6. She specified that the Commission was approving the fenestration on the addition because it is appropriate for the location and not visible from the pedestrian right of way, per Standard 6.15 for doors and windows. Ms. Wojick also cited the Secretary of Interior's Standards 2.5, number 9 which speaks to the differentiation of additions from the historic structure.

Ms. Wheat seconded the motion.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: BELL, HAWKINS, TAYLOR, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR REAR ADDITION – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

Due to time constraints the following cases will be heard at the July 10, 2024 meeting:

HDCRMA-2022-00897, 1411 & 1413 W 4th St

HDCCMA-2023-00991, 927 East Bv

HDCCMA-2023-01193, 1921 Charlotte Dr

HDCRMIA-2023-01195, 928 Ideal Wy

HDCRMA-2023-00988, 501 N Poplar St

With no further business to discuss, Chair Hawkins adjourned the meeting at 7:08 p.m.