



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
October 10, 2018

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. James Haden, Chair
Ms. Jessica Hindman, Vice-Chair
Ms. Jana Hartenstine
Mr. PJ Henningson
Ms. Mattie Marshall
Mr. John Phares
Mr. Damon Rumsch
Ms. Tamara Titus

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ms. Kim Parati
Ms. Jill Walker
Mr. James Jordan

OTHERS PRESENT: Ms. Kristi Harpst, Program Manager of the Historic District Commission
Ms. Candice R Leite, Staff of the Historic District Commission
Ms. Andrea Leslie-Fite, Senior Assistant City Attorney
Ms. Candy Thomas, Adkins Court Reporter

With a quorum present, Mr. Haden called the regular October meeting of the Historic District Commission meeting to order at 1:05 pm. He 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 Guidelines**. 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 a 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. Appeal from the Historic District Commission is to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. One has sixty (60) days from the date of the decision to appeal. This is in accordance with Section 10.213 of the City Zoning Ordinance. Chairman Haden asked that everyone please turn to silent operation any electronic devices. Commissioners are asked to announce, for the record, if one leaves or arrives during the meeting. Mr. Haden said that those in the audience must be quiet during the hearings. An audience member will be asked once to be quiet and the need for a second request will be removal from the room. Mr. Haden swore in all Applicants and Staff, and he continued to swear in people as they arrived for the duration of the meeting.

Index of Addresses:

CONTINUED

HDC 2018-411	515 Walnut Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDC 2018-464	922 East Boulevard	Dilworth
HDC 2018-446	620 E. Tremont Avenue	Dilworth

NEW APPLICATIONS

HDC 2018-523	517 Walnut Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDC 2018-514	2003 Dilworth Road E	Dilworth
HDC 2018-437	805 E. Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2018-445	1908 Dilworth Road E	Dilworth
HDC 2018-511	1804 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2018-525	1543 Southwood Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2018-496	1015 East Boulevard	Dilworth
HDC 2018-526	1608 Mimosa Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2018-505	524-526 S Summit Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDC 2018-550	1709 Dilworth Road W	Dilworth

MS. TITUS HAD A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THIS APPLICATION.

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-411 515 WALNUT AVENUE - ADDITION

The application was continued for the following items: (1) Additions, 7.2, item 5 roof lines of new addition are not secondary to those of the existing structure.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The site is a corner lot on Walnut Avenue that abuts a greenway and approximately 10 feet above Litaker Avenue. The existing structure was originally constructed in 1929 and modified with HDC approval. The lot size is 55' x 192.5'. Existing features include brick exterior, bungalow style porch, a gabled dormer and shed roof dormer on the front, and a shed dormer on the rear. The applicant has included examples of houses in the neighborhood of similar size.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is a rear addition that is no taller or wider than the house but is located on a corner lot and the proposed square footage is greater than 50% of the existing house. A one-story sunroom/screen porch "breezeway" connects the main house to the new 1.5 story addition. The footprint of the main addition is 26'x36'. The addition includes a garage on the first level under living space. Architectural features include a brick façade, wood porch columns. The proposal includes wood lap siding on the addition's dormers to match existing dormers on the main house. The applicant has provided examples of attached garages in the district. There are no impacts to mature trees.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for additions, 7.2 above.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines*, **Ms. Hartenstine** made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as submitted.
Ms. Marshall Seconded.

VOTE: 5/2 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL
NAYS: PHARES, RUMSCH

DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED AS SUBMITTED

MS. TITUS HAD A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THIS APPLICATION.

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-464– 922 EAST BOULEVARD – ADDITION\PORCH ENCLOSURE

The application was continued from September for the following items:

1. More information detailing the exterior of the front elevation
2. Leave the existing exterior walls intact.
3. Provide information relating to Commercial building code requirements for entrances and landings and how code requirements impact the project design.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a 1.5 story Colonial Revival cottage constructed in 1920. Architectural features include side roof with two gabled dormers and a recessed corner porch. Siding material is wood with corner boards. The building is currently occupied by a commercial use. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1-2 story former residential houses that are now used for commercial purposes and commercial-type buildings. The lot size is approximately 67' x 190'.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is enclosing the recessed corner porch on the front elevation. The existing porch stairs, piers/columns, and handrail are to remain. The new enclosure is reversible. Materials include wood lap siding and wood corner boards to match existing. New windows will be wood or aluminum clad to match existing. New roof and trim details will match existing. There are no impacts to mature trees.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Rehabilitation of Building Elements – Porches, 4.8 and for Additions, 7.2 above.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **DENY** a portion of the project:

Mr. Rumsch: I move to deny a portion of this application for any changes to the existing exterior walls or columns or stairs or ceiling as presented.

Mr. Phares: Guidelines 4.8, #6, Any porch enclosure that is permitted shall be designed to be reversible, and removal of original features should be minimal.

Ms. Hindman: It’s also the Secretary of Interiors Standards, #2, #5, and #9

Ms. Hindman seconded

Mr. Rumsch made a motion to continue this application for: accurate drawings, specifically for how the new enclosure meets the existing columns, how raising the floor by 2. ½ “effects outside elevations including but not limited to the transparency of the enclosure itself.

Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PHARES, RUMSCH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.

MR. RUMSCH LEFT THE MEETING AT 3 PM AND WAS EXCUSSED FOR THIS ONE CASE

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-446, 620 EAST TREMONT AVENUE – ADDITION

The application was continued from September for the following items:

1. Massing - Restudy of the rear elevation for simplicity
2. Roof Form- Restudy of the dormers, including the simplification of the right-side dormer and restudy of the left-side dormer that straddles the hip extension

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a 1 story Bungalow house constructed in 1915. Architectural features include a hip roof, full width engaged front porch, and centered dormer. Siding material is wood and brick foundation is painted. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single family houses and multifamily quadraplexes. The house height is approximately 21'-5". The lot size is 50' x 150' and lot topography slopes down away from the street. In the rear yard is a pool that will remain.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is a rear addition that is slightly taller and wider than the existing house. The hip addition ridge height on the left side is located behind a chimney and is approximately 2' above the existing ridge. The hip roof pitch matches existing. On the right side is a gable addition that ties into the left side hipped roof. Materials include wood siding, wood or aluminum clad windows, wood columns and brackets, and brick to match existing. New roof and window trim details will match the house. Post-construction the rear yard will be 50% permeable. There are no impacts to mature trees.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

STAFF HAS THE FOLLOWING CONCERNS:

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for additions, 7.2 above.
2. The addition is located toward the rear of the house and does not overpower the original house.
3. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: **Ms. Hartenstine** made a MOTION to CONTINUE this application for a restudy of the rear and side elevation, including roof form and massing to comply with guidelines 6.10, #4 where proportionally the new roof should not overwhelm the structure or be out of scale for the style of the house. Guideline 7.2, #6 to make sure the design of the new addition is compatible with the existing building. The new work should be differentiated from the old while being compatible with its massing, form, scale, directional expression, roof forms and materials, foundation, fenestration, and materials.

Also in our previous request to simplify the massing is in relationship to the existing building and to be sensitive to the scale of the existing building.

Ms. Hartenstine, the applicant to bring back 3Ds with the rear elevation showing, in addition to the rest of the views they've shown.

Ms. Hindman: The dormer straddling the hip is incongruence with the bungalow language.

Mr. Phares seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PHARES,
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-523, 517 WALNUT AVENUE – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing house is a one-story Craftsman bungalow single family house with a brick exterior and wood siding in the gables. The house was constructed in 1926. The lot dimensions are 55' x 192.5' with a slight grade increase from front to rear. Surrounding single family houses are 1-2 stories in height.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is an addition on the left rear side and a new detached garage. The addition would raise the ridge approximately 3'-8" and extend into the rear yard 22' with new side gables. The garage footprint is approximately 27' x 28' and the height is approximately 20'11". New materials include wood siding, wood garage doors, cementitious trim where noted, and wood windows. Original windows to remain are identified on the plan. The front porch and other features on the front façade will remain.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The sides of the addition will be visible from the street and the house is not taller than an original house in the surrounding context.
2. The HDC will determine if the addition meets guidelines in 6.10 and 7.2.
3. The accessory building is not incongruous with the District and meets guidelines on page 8.9 above.
4. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines*

Ms. Titus made a **MOTION to APPROVE** with the following condition. The plans will show both sets of double-ganged windows on the right elevation be retained per guideline 4.14, #5. If a window is no longer needed due to interior renovations, retain the glass screen or shutter the backside so that it appears from the outside to be in use.

Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment bring the face of the shed dormer in 12 to 18 inches per guideline 4.5, #3

Ms. Hartenstine friendly amendment, provide the window details to staff for approval

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PHARES, RUMSCH, TITUS,
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-514, 2003 DILWORTH ROAD EAST – FENCE AND WALL

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing site is a corner lot at Dilworth Road East and Ideal Way. The site slopes from front to back approximately 12 feet. The project is a brick fence along the side yard. A stop work order was issued due to the height of the brick columns which exceed 6 feet. The proposed brick fence is similar to others in the Dilworth neighborhood. Fence columns will be cut down to be 6-feet in height. The bottom portion of the fence is solid and ranging from 32-52 inches in height due to topography. The upper portion of the fence is brick lattice design stepped in from the base and approximately 20-40 inches in height. The total height of the fence will not exceed 6-feet. The project also includes the installation of an automatic metal driveway gate. A small planting strip is located between the fence and public sidewalk.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Fencing, 8.6, items 5, 6, 8, and 9.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information **Ms. Hartenstine** made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application for the applicant to bring back elevations of the fence along the sidewalk.
Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 6/2 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, PHARES, RUMSCH
NAYS: MARSHALL, TITUS

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR FENCE CONTINUED

MS. HINDMAN HAD A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HERSELF FROM THE NEXT APPLICATION

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-437, 805 EAST TREMONT AVENUE – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a 1 story Bungalow house constructed in 1925. Architectural features include a side gable roof and partial width engaged front porch that warps around the left side of the house. Siding material is wood and the foundation is brick. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single family houses and multifamily quadraplexes. The house height is approximately 20'-0". The lot size is 56' x 174'.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is an addition to the left side behind an existing wrap-around porch that is no taller than the existing house. The addition will tie in below the existing ridge. The addition measures approximately 12'-0" x 34'-8". Materials include wood siding and corner boards, wood or aluminum clad windows, wood brackets and vent, and brick to match existing. New roof and window trim details will match the house. A 32" Water Oak is located on the left property line and a tree protection plan is included.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for additions, 7.2 above.
2. The addition is located behind an existing wrap-around porch, toward the rear of the house and does not overpower the original house.
3. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with the *Charlotte Historic Design Guidelines*, **Ms. Titus** made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as submitted
Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, PHARES, RUMSCH, TITUS
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-445, 1908 DILWORTH ROAD EAST – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a 1.5 story Bungalow house with Colonial Revival elements constructed in 1924. Architectural features include a side gable roof and a full façade shed front porch. Siding material is brick with wood shake shingles in the gables. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single family houses. The house height is approximately 22'-3". The lot size is 60' x 180'

PROPOSAL

The proposal is an addition and changes to a non-original front dormer that was added in the early 1990s. The addition would raise the ridge +/- 2'-9 1/2" by extending the side gables and adding new front and rear dormers. Materials include wood shake siding to match existing and wood or aluminum clad windows. New roof and window trim details will match the house. There are no impacts to mature trees.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for additions, 7.2 above.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** this application.

MOTION: Based on the need for more information **Mr. Henningson** made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application. By losing the gable end on the left and right elevations, they’re not the right size, and violates Guideline 7.2.3. “Attempt to attach new additions or alterations to existing buildings in such a manner that if additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the building would be unimpaired.” Re-study of the fenestration on the second floor on the left and right elevations and second floor gable ends.

Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 4/3 **AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, PHARES,

NAYS: HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, RUMSCH

DECISION: ADDITION CONTINUED

**MR. RUMSCH HAD A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HIMSELF FROM THE NEXT APPLICATION.
MS. HARTENSTINE HAD A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HERSELF FROM THE NEXT APPLICATION.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-511, 1804 THOMAS AVENUE - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a 1 story Craftsman bungalow house constructed in 1924. Architectural features include a side gable roof and partial width engaged front porch that warps around the left side of the house. Siding material is brick with wood shake shingle in the front porch gables. Adjacent structures are 1-1.5 story single family houses and duplexes. The lot size is 56’ x 150’.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is a rear addition that is no taller than the house and does not increase the square footage of the house more than 50%. The new rear addition includes a small bump-out to the right side, which is slightly wider than the main house and, therefore, requires full Commission review. An existing patio, deck, and rear entry addition will be removed. The new rear addition will tie in below the existing ridge. The addition measures approximately 19’-0” x 37’-0”. Materials include brick to match the existing house, wood or aluminum clad windows, and wood brackets and vent to match existing. New roof and window trim details will match the house. An 18” Pecan is located near the right property line and a tree protection plan is included. Post construction the rear yard will have 21.5% impervious coverage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for additions, 7.2 above.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with **Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines**, **Ms. Hindman** made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as drawn.

Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PHARES, TITUS
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-525 – 1543 SOUTHWOOD AVENUE – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a 1 story American Small House with Colonial Revival details constructed in 1940. Architectural features include a side gable roof, 6/6 windows, and a small front entry covered stoop. Siding material is brick. Adjacent structures are 1-1.5 story single family houses. The lot size is 50' x 150'.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is a new front porch, new windows, and a new rear addition that is no taller or wider than the house but does increase the square footage of the house more than 50%. An existing deck will be removed. The new rear addition will tie in below the existing ridge. Materials include Hardie Artisan lap siding, wood shake shingles or fiber-cement shake shingles individually applied, and wood or aluminum clad windows. New roof and window trim details will match the house. Post construction the rear yard will have 34.9% impervious coverage. There are no impacts to mature trees.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff has the following concerns with the application:

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for additions, 7.2 above.
2. Lack of window openings on the right elevation of the addition.
3. The Commission will determine if the original windows are beyond repair and can be replaced with new wood windows to match existing.
4. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based on the need for more information **Ms. Titus** made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** the window replacement to show clear evidence that all the windows are beyond repair.

Ms. Titus made a motion to approve the rest of the application with staff to approve fenestration changes to the addition on the right elevation and material changes from cedar shake to a more appropriate material.

Mr. Phares seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PHARES, RUMSCH,
TITUS,
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **WINDOW REPLACEMENT CONTINUED.**
APPROVE ADDITION WITH CONDITIONS

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-496 – 1015 EAST BOULEVARD – ADDITION/WINDOW REPLACEMENT

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is the C. Columbus Harmon House, a 2 story Craftsman frame building constructed in 1922. Architectural features include stuccoed and timbered gables, brackets and an engaged porch with gable projection on tapered stuccoed columns. Siding material is wood lap siding. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story commercial buildings. The lot size is 75' x 200'.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is a new front porch, ADA ramp, new windows, and a new rear addition. An existing, non-historic rear addition will be removed. The new rear addition will tie in below the existing ridge. Materials include brick columns, metal window system for the front porch area, and wood or clad replacement windows. New roof and window trim details will match the house. There is a mature tree near the front left corner of the existing porch.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff has the following concerns with the application:

1. Changes to the design and material of the original tapered porch columns.
2. Removal of the original triple windows on the front elevation and the left elevation.
3. The Commission will determine if the original windows are beyond repair and can be replaced with new wood windows to match existing.
4. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information **Ms. Hartenstein** made **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application to save the trees in the front yard and provide a tree protection plan; keep tapered columns; meet the guidelines for the front entrance and canopy based on Guideline 4., #6 relook at an accessible entrance based on our Guideline 8.10, #1 retain existing original windows on all elevations, any window replacement will need to be presented to the commission to illustrate that the existing windows are beyond repair.
Mr. Henningson friendly amendment -Approve the steel in-fill fenestration at the porch.
Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, PHARES, RUMSCH, TITUS
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION CONTINUED**

APPLICATION HDC 2018-526 – 1608 MIMOSA AVENUE – DETACHED ACCESSORY BUILDING

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a one story Craftsman bungalow constructed in 1938. The front porch restoration and a small rear addition were approved in 2016. Adjacent structures are 1 to 1.5 stories in height. Lot dimensions are 50’ x 165’.

PROPOSAL

The project is a new detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU)/Garage in the rear yard. Building height is +/- 20’- 8¾” from grade. The building footprint is approximately 24’ x 36’; only slightly larger than the existing garage which will be demolished. Materials include fiber cement lap siding, and wood shake shingles in dimensions to match the primary structure. Individual garage doors will be wood, carriage-style. Windows to be wood or aluminum clad. Post-construction, the rear yard impermeable area will be approximately 23%.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The gable roof element over the garage doors, use of lap and shake siding, wood doors, wood or clad windows in a 6/1 pattern, and other decorative elements such as corner boards and brackets, are compatible with the character of the primary building.
2. The Commission will determine if the ADU is secondary to the main structure.
3. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with **Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines**, **Ms. Titus** made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application because the ADU fails to meet Guideline 8.9, #3. The ADU does not read as a secondary structure, because from the left elevation view which is C number 1 of this presentation. It is clear that the proposed building is taller from grade than the rear elevation of the main house and the front elevation of the main house. The entire ADU is taller than the historic house, and the ADU carries equal mass to the house, because the house has a front and rear porch which carry less mass.
Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, PHARES, RUMSCH,
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DENIED

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-505, 524-526 SOUTH SUMMIT AVENUE – WINDOW REPLACEMENT

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a two story Colonial Revival brick duplex constructed in 1932. Architectural features include a side gable roof, central interior chimney, and a full width front porch supported by square brick columns. Adjacent structures are 1 to 2 stories in height in a variety of architectural styles. Lot dimensions are 55' x 197.5'. A Stop Work Order (SWO) was issued on 8/31/2018 for beginning work without a COA.

PROPOSAL

The project is a two-part request: 1.) Approval to replace the 3 windows on the front elevation already removed with new wood windows to match existing, and 2.) Total replacement of the remainder of the original wood windows on all 4 sides of the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The Commission will determine if the 3 removed/replaced windows are beyond repair and can be replaced with new wood windows to match existing.
2. The Commission will determine if the rest of the windows on the building are beyond repair and can be replaced with new wood windows to match existing.
3. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to replace the vinyl windows with new wooden windows, made to the specifications of what was taken out, using as much of the old material sashes, as possible based on the guideline 4.14 for window.
Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, PHARES, RUMSCH, TITUS
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DENIED

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **DENY** the replacement of the existing windows and repair what is there based on guideline 4.14 for windows
Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, PHARES, RUMSCH, TITUS
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DENIED

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-550, 1709 DILWORTH ROAD WEST – FRONT ELEVATION CHANGES

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a two story Colonial Revival brick multi-family building constructed in 1990. Adjacent structures are 1 to 2 story single family, multi-family and commercial structures. Lot dimensions are 100' x 200'.

PROPOSAL

The project is the re-design of two small dormers on the front elevation. Materials include brick, wood or aluminum clad windows, and a metal shed roof. All roof and window trim details will match existing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Roof Form and Materials, 6.10 and Cornices and Trim, 6.11 above.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the solution to this application as submitted with staff to monitor the progress and to approve changes in the field as needed.
Mr. Phares seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, PHARES, RUMSCH, TITUS
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION APPROVED**

Minutes for September were not voted on

ADJOURNED: 6hrs 17mins