



APPROVED MARCH 13

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
February 13, 2019

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ms. Jana Hartenstine
Ms. Jessica Hindman, Vice-Chair
Mr. PJ Henningson
Mr. Jim Jordan
Ms. Mattie Marshall
Ms. Kim Parati
Mr. Damon Rumsch
Ms. Tamara Titus, 2nd Vice-Chair
Ms. Jill Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. John Phares
Mr. James Haden, Chair

OTHERS PRESENT: Ms. Kristi Harpst, Administrator of the Historic District Commission
Ms. Candice Leite, Staff of the Historic District Commission
Ms. Linda Keich, Clerk to Historic District Commission
Ms. Andrea Leslie-Fite, Assistant City Attorney
Ms. Candy Thomas, Adkins Court Reporter

With a quorum present, Ms. Jessica Hindman called the regular February meeting of the Historic District Commission to order at 1:10 pm. She 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 for 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 decision of the Historic District Commission is made 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. Vice-chairman Hindman asked that everyone please turn all electronic devices on silent. Commissioners are asked to announce,

for the record, if one leaves or arrives during the meeting. Ms. Hindman said that those in the audience must be quiet during the hearings. An audience member will be asked once to be quiet and if there is a need for a second request they will be removed from the room. Ms. Hindman swore in all Applicants and Staff, and she continued to swear in people as they arrived for the duration of the meeting.

Index of Addresses:

NOT HEARD IN JANUARY

HDC 2018-457	554 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2018-485	1721 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore
HDC 2018-677	1315/1319 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2018-492	1944 Woodcrest Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2019-009	729 Mt. Vernon Avenue	Dilworth

CONTINUED

HDC 2019-005	1545 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2019-003	601 Berkley Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2019-004	1768 Merriman Avenue	Wilmore

NEW APPLICATIONS

HDC 2018-702	415 Walnut Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDC 2019-019	1318 Dilworth Road	Dilworth
HDC 2019-040	1418 Hamorton Place	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2019-017	609 Grandin Road	Wesley Heights
HDC 2019-037	1914 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2019-038	2001 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2019-036	417 Grandin Road	Wesley Heights
HDC 2019-022	2114 Dilworth Road E	Dilworth
HDC 2019-039	612 S. Summit Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDC 2019-041	508 E. Tremont Avenue	Dilworth

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-457, 554 W KINGSTON AVENUE – WINDOW CHANGES

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a one-story American Small house constructed in 1951. It is a simple brick structure with a triple window on the front elevation, wood gable vents, and a small front porch.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is to change to a window opening on the right side. The existing window is a double-hung wood window. The applicant is requesting to change the opening to a transom wood window.

The project is before the Commission for review due to the window on the right elevation being substantially visible from the street and not viable for Administrative approval per page 2.6, 1.C. Replacement Windows & Doors.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The Commission will determine if the proposed window change is not incongruous with the district and meets the guidelines.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines*, **Mr. Henningson** made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application. The change is not incongruous with the district.

- Ms. Parati made a Friendly amendment stating that matching brick is to be approved by staff.
- Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment stating that the specification of the window is to be approved by staff.

Mr. Henningson accepted both friendly amendments and the change is not incongruous with the district. Staff to approve the brick and mortar to match and the window details.

Ms. Walker seconded.

VOTE: 7/2 **AYES:** HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, RUMSCH, WALKER
NAYS: HARTENSTINE, TITUS

DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED WITH STAFF TO REVIEW THE WINDOW DETAILS AND THE BRICK AND MORTAR DETAILS

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-485, 1721 WILMORE DRIVE – WINDOW CHANGES

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a one-story Colonial Revival-style bungalow house constructed in 1936. Notable features include wood siding with mitered corners, a front portico, and an engaged front porch.

PROPOSAL

The project is to replace windows. The original wood double-hung Simulated True Divided Light (STDL) windows were replaced with new vinyl windows with grids between the glass (GBG). A Notice of Violation (NOV) was issued in August 2018 for installation of new windows without a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The Commission will determine if the proposed replacement windows meet the guidelines.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Ms. Hindman’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** the project for:

The removal of the original windows does not meet our guidelines under Section 4.14 for removal of historic windows.

- #1 – Retain and preserve windows that contribute to the overall historic character of a building.
- #2 – Repair original windows by patching, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing.
- #3 – Replace only those features of the window that are beyond repair.

Specifically, the chosen replacement windows that have already been installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness does not meet our guidelines under 4.14:

- #10 – Replace entire windows only when they are missing or beyond repair.
- #18 – Give depth and profile to windows by using true divided lights, or three-part simulated divided lights with integral spacer bars and both interior and exterior fixed muntins.
- #19 – Replace a wood window with a wood window when possible.

Ms. Hartenstine seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR REPLACEMENT WINDOWS DENIED.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-677, 1315/1319 THOMAS AVENUE – FENCE ABOVE 6’

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing house at 1319 Thomas Avenue was constructed in 1920. The site is at the edge of the Plaza Midwood Local Historic District and located adjacent to a commercial parking lot, 1315 Thomas Avenue. An alley exists at the rear of both properties for access to multiple properties. A dilapidated stockade-style wood fence approximately six-feet in height currently separates the two properties. The project is an active case with Code Enforcement requiring the dilapidated fence to come into compliance.

PROPOSAL

The project is the construction of a replacement fence along the property line between 1315 and 1319 Thomas Avenue. The location of the fence is not changing. The proposed fence will be eight-feet in height along the entire property line until it reaches the front porch of 1319 Thomas Avenue, at which point the fence will step-down to five-feet in height. The fence design will be horizontal pickets butt-joined to 6x6 uprights. The fence will be the same on both sides with a sound barrier placed in the middle. Additional landscaping such as knock-out rose bushes will be planted in front of the five-foot sections of fence. A flowering vine will be planted along the eight-foot portions of the fence. The applicant is requesting an exception to the six-foot fence height maximum due to the adjacent commercial use.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The Commission approved an 8’ fence at the corner of Ideal Way and Park Road as a buffer between the single-family residence at 2144 Park Road and Ed’s Tavern, on October 17, 2017 (HDC 2017-545).
2. The Commission shall determine if an exception should be granted for an 8’ fence.

FOR/AGAINST: Mr. John Klosek, adjacent property owner, spoke in opposition of this application.

MOTION: Based on an exception to the *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines, 8.6 #4* **Mr. Henningson** made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the fence adjacent to commercial use and added the fence will not obstruct the alleyway.

- Ms. Parati offered a friendly amendment to specify allowing the use of an eight-foot fence; adjacent to commercial use.

Ms. Walker seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED BASED ON AN EXCEPTION TO GUIDELINES 8.6 #4 FENCES.

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-492, 1944 WOODCREST AVENUE – ALTERNATIVE MATERIALS

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a one-story American Small House constructed in 1933. The original siding material is unknown. Until recently, the house was covered in vinyl siding. The new non-traditional siding was installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA). Notice of Violations (NOV) has been issued by Code Enforcement.

PROPOSAL

The applicant is requesting approval for new siding. The property owner will bring a material sample of the installed siding to the meeting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The Commission will determine the appropriate course of action for non-traditional material use.

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

MOTION: Based on the non-compliance of the *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines*, **Ms. Titus** made a **MOTION** to **DENY** the cementitious product that was used to cover the original wood siding because, it does not meet our guidelines due to its thickness at three-eighths or less, and its improper installation relative to trim boards. It also fails to meet our requirements for cementitious siding due to the wood texture.

Guidelines 5.2:

1. Retain wood as one of the dominant framing, cladding and decorative materials.
2. Retain wood features that define the overall character of the building.
3. Repair rotted or missing sections rather than replacing the entire element.
6. Replace wood elements only when they are rotted beyond repair. Do not use cementitious, vinyl, aluminum or fiberglass siding to replace original irreparable wood siding.
9. Do not use synthetic siding, such as vinyl or aluminum to cover existing wood.

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

- **Ms. Hartenstine** offered a friendly amendment, there is no wood texture on the face of it.

VOTE: 9/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUE SIDING DENIED BASED ON GUIDELINES 5.2, #1, #2, #3, #6 AND #9.

APPLICATION: HDC 2019-009, 729 MT. VERNON AVENUE - DEMOLITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a 1.5-story single family house constructed in 1951. Adjacent structures are a mix of one, one and a half and two-story single-family houses. The subject property is a Colonial Revival-style house, with a brick exterior, double-hung wood windows, and a front bay window. All wood trim and siding accents appear to be wrapped in non-traditional material.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is a full demolition of the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The Commission will determine whether or not the building has special significance to the Dilworth Local Historic District. With an affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to a 365 Day Stay of Demolition.
2. 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.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines Ms. Marshall* made a **MOTION** to determine that the building has special significance and value toward maintaining the character of the Dilworth Local Historic District because of the year of construction, 1951, and architectural style.
Mr. Henningson seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, JORDAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER
NAYS: NONE

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines – DEMOLITIONS Ms. Marshall* made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the demolition with a 365 Day Stay of Demolition on the building, due to its special significance and value towards maintaining the character of the district.
Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, JORDAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: DEMOLITION APPROVED WITH A 365 DAY STAY

APPLICATION: HDC 2019-005, 1545 THOMAS AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

The application was continued from January for the following items:

1. A front elevation that accurately shows the slope of the land with the front steps.
2. Landscaping/tree re-planting plan shown on the site plan.
3. A site plan that includes the subject property and the setbacks of the three houses to the left.
4. Survey including at least five houses to the left of the subject property on Thomas Avenue.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The site is a vacant lot located at the edge of the Plaza Midwood local historic district. The lot is zoned for multi-family, R-22 MF.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is the construction of a new duplex structure. Per covenants on the property the front setback is required to be a minimum of 20'. Height, as measured from grade to ridge, is +/- 32'-8". Materials include brick siding and columns, Hardie Artisan lap siding, Hardie boxing and soffit, and wood windows. Post construction the rear yard will have 51% permeable open space. The removal of a tree along the right property line is requested.

Revised Proposal – February 13

1. Front elevation with topography changes shown
2. A site plan that includes landscaping/tree re-planting plans and setback of the 3 houses to the left of the subject property
3. Zoutewelle Survey of 1541-1529 Thomas Avenue

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The proposal for the new construction is not incongruous with the District and meets all guidelines for New Construction, Chapter 6.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines, New Construction*, **Ms. Parati** made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application with the condition, that the window details will be approved by staff.

Ms. Walker seconded.

- Ms. Titus offered a friendly amendment that the final window selection will be approved by staff.

VOTE: 9/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED. THE FINAL WINDOW DETAILS WILL BE APPROVED BY STAFF**

APPLICATION: HDC 2019-003, 601 BERKELEY AVENUE – ADDITION

The application was continued from January for the following items:

1. Tree save plan for canopy trees on the property (rear yard Oak, front yard trees).
2. Address the coplanar dormers and/or appearance of a two-story house.
3. Indicate height of the tallest historic building on the block.
4. Re-arrangement of three cluster windows on first and second story.
5. Provide window trim details for the wood shingle walls.
6. Alternate design detail for the pork chop eave returns.
7. Provide a study of the windows on the right side of the house.
8. Revised deck rail design.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing property is a corner lot with a one-story single-family house constructed in 1951. Lot dimensions are 65' wide in front, 55' wide in the rear and 148' in length. There are three large mature trees on the property. The house is a one-story brick ranch style home with a hipped roof. A 365-day delay of demolition was approved by the HDC on May 9, 2018.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is a hybrid New Construction/Addition project due to the zoning setback constraints on this lot and the active demolition approval for the property. The existing ridge height is 16'-3" and the proposed ridge height is 31'-1". Materials include brick to match existing, wood shake siding, wood trim and wood windows with Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL). The garage shown on the proposed site plan is not for approval at this time.

Note: The requested Zoning setback variance was approved by the ZBA on January 29, 2019.

Revised Proposal – February 13

1. Tree protection plan for the 54" oak in the rear yard.
2. Dormer design revised.
3. Proposed ridge height is 24'.
4. Provided ridge heights of comparable historic heights of houses in the surrounding area.
5. Modified window arrangement on front and right elevations
6. Provided window trim details.
7. Changed eave return design.

STAFF CONCERNS

1. Rear porch rail design is not compliant.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines, Additions*, **Ms. Titus** made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with the following conditions to be approved by staff:

- The rear elevation second story window should be more in keeping with the size, of both the double-hung windows below.
- A casement is allowed for egress.
- Staff should review the final window size selection.
- The window trim on the second story dormers should be four inches wide, staff to review trim with applicant.

Ms. Parati seconded.

VOTE: 8/1 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, JORDAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER
NAYS: HINDMAN

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED. THE FINAL WINDOW DETAILS WILL BE APPROVED BY STAFF**

-
- **MR. RUMSCH WAS OUT OF THE ROOM FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION**
-

APPLICATION: **HDC 2019-004, 1768 MERRIMAN AVENUE – ADDITION AND ACCESSORY BUILDING**

The application was continued from January for the following items:

1. Accurate site plan with the location of the garage, the location of the fence, gate, and landscaping.
2. Showing precedent for privacy fence in the side yard.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a one-story American Small house with Tudor/Colonial Revival elements constructed in 1940. Previous alterations to the building occurred prior to Wilmore’s designation as a local district; these alterations include replacement windows, an enclosed side porch, and a rear dormer addition.

PROPOSAL

Changes to an existing dormer addition and a new accessory structure. The dormer height will increase by 9 ½ inches. Materials include wood lap siding, double-hung wood windows with Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL), and wood trim. The new one-story garage accessory structure has a footprint of 20’-6” x 24’-0”, and its design is inspired by the main house. Materials include wood lap siding, wood corner boards, wood windows, and doors.

Revised Proposal – February 13

1. Updated site plan with the location of garage, fence, gate and landscaping.
2. Provided examples throughout Wilmore of garages + fences on corner lots.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The garage is not incongruous with the district and meets guidelines for Accessory Buildings, page 8.9.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines, Additions/Accessory Structure*, **Mr. Henningson** made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with the following conditions for staff approval:

- The garage should have consistent siding material all around.
- Accurate drawings.
- Garage door material, wood or wood clad.
- Trim details.
- Fence high side of lot, six-foot privacy fence shall extend to the rear corner of the house, detail, low side of lot, fence setback a minimum of 18 inches per **Guideline 8.6, #8** -Rear fencing may be a maximum of six feet in height, as measured from the outside at grade. On corner lots on residential streets, privacy fences in rear yards must be screened with appropriate landscaping materials on the public side of the fence.

Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, TITUS, WALKER,

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **ADDITION AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURE APPROVED**

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-702, 415 WALNUT AVENUE - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a one-story Bungalow style house constructed in 1926 with a front porch that continues on the left side. Other features include a hipped roof, wood siding, a hipped front dormer, brick chimney, side gables, and paired windows on the front. A one-story rear addition was added c. 2007/2008.

PROPOSAL

The project is a one-story addition to the left elevation and the rear. The rear addition is not visible from the street, will tie in below the existing ridge, and will measure approximately 16' x 17'-4". The addition to the left elevation will be located behind an existing wrap-around front porch and is no taller than the existing house. The addition is +/- 8' in width and will extend 3' past the front porch. No changes to the front of the house, including the front porch and original front dormer. New materials are wood siding and trim to match existing. New roof and window trim details will match the house. No impacts to mature canopy trees.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The project is similar to the recently approved side addition at 805 E. Tremont Avenue (HDC 2018-00437).
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Ms. Hindman'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 drawn.

- Ms. Titus offered a friendly Amendment, screen the HVAC.

Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2019-019, 1318 DILWORTH ROAD – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a 2 ½ story Colonial Revival house constructed in 1926. Architectural features include a side-gabled roof, three gabled dormers with round-arched bays, twin columned side porches mirror the flat-roofed columned one-bay front porch. Siding material is unpainted brick. Adjacent structures are 2 and 2 ½ story single family houses. The lot size is approximately 100' x 200'. In the rear yard is a garage that will remain.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is a rear addition that is no taller or wider than the existing house. The addition is greater than 50% of the square footage of the original house. The addition will fill in a rear ell. Materials include brick siding, wood windows, wood columns and brackets, and a slate roof to match existing. New roof and window trim details will match the house. Post-construction, the rear yard will be 75% permeable. 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 Ms. Hindman’s invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines* – **Mr. Henningson** made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application, meets Guideline 7.2 for additions, with staff to approve the column material and details.

Ms. Parati seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED**

APPLICATION: HDC 2019-019, 1418 HAMORTON PLACE - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a 1-story Craftsman bungalow house constructed in 1930. Other features include front clipped gable roof, partial-width front porch with a matching clipped gable roof supported by square wood columns atop brick piers, 4/1 windows, exposed rafter and bracket details. House height as measured from grade to ridge is 18’-9”. The lot size is approximately 46’ x 148’.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is an addition that raises the main ridge approximately 7’-6”. The addition adds a cross gable roof that will eliminate the exposed rafters on the left and right elevations. A second story will be added to an existing one-story element on the rear elevation. A two-story covered terrace/deck will be added to the rear. Materials are 5” wood German siding to match existing and wood or aluminum clad windows to match existing. All details (corner boards, brackets, window trim, etc.) will be wood to match existing. A 32” Oaktree is located near the left corner of the addition. No changes to existing window openings on the first floor.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. Height, massing, scale, directional expression, roof form, context.
2. Tree protection plan needed for the 32” Oak.
3. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

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

MOTION: Based on non- compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines, Additions* –**Ms. Titus** made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for its failure to meet guidelines for additions.

- 7.2, #1 - Attempt to locate the addition on the rear elevation so that it is minimally visible from the street.

This is highly visible because the ridge would go up seven feet, six inches.

- 7.2, #2 – Limit the size of the addition so that it does not visually overpower the existing building. The proposed visually overpowers the building and changes the directional expression from horizontal to vertical.
- 7.2, #5 – Maintain the existing roof pitch. Roof lines for new additions should be secondary to those of the existing structure.

This does not maintain the existing roof pitch and raises the main ridge.

- 7.2, #6 – Make sure that the design of a new addition is compatible with the existing building.

This is not compatible with the original massing, scale, directional expression, or roof form. Specifically, the proposed sloped element is not in keeping with the original pitch of the roof. All other aspects of our guidelines have not been addressed. We are denying the application for these items.

Ms. Parati seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **ADDITION DENIED**

- **MS. PARATI RECUSED HERSELF FROM THE NEXT APPLICATION.**
-

APPLICATION: HDC 2019-017, 609 GRANDIN ROAD - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a one-story Colonial Revival-style house constructed in 1936.

PROPOSAL

The project is to replace windows. The original wood double-hung Simulated True Divided Light (STDL) windows were replaced with new vinyl windows with grids between the glass (GBG) between October 28, 2017 and April 2018 without a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA). The project received a permit for interior work only on October 17, 2018. A Stop Work Order was issued October 27, 2017, for the addition of a dormer without a COA. The windows were replaced when an active Stop Work Order was on the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The Commission will determine if the proposed replacement windows meet the guidelines.
2. Minor Revisions may be reviewed by staff.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Ms. Hindman’s invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the applicatio

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with *Historic District Design Guidelines – Additions*, **Mr. Henningson** made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for its failure to meet the following guidelines:

- **4.14, #1** Retain and preserve windows that contribute to the overall historic character of a building.
- **#2** – Repair original windows by patching, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing.
- **#3** – Replace only those features of the window that are beyond repair.
- **#16** – Do not reduce the glass surface area.
- **#18** – Give depth and profile to windows by using true divided lights, or three-part simulated divided light with the integral spacer.
- **#19** - Replacement windows should not be vinyl

Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, MARSHALL, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION DENIED

- **MR. JORDAN STEPPED OUT OF THE ROOM AT 5:00 PM**
-

APPLICATION: HDC 2019-040, 1914 THOMAS AVENUE - ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The main building is a 1-story Craftsman bungalow house constructed in 1923. Architectural features include unpainted brick foundation, wood shake shingle siding, a full width engaged front porch with brick piers and paired wood columns, and a small hipped dormer. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single family homes. The lot size is 50' x 150'.

PROPOSAL

The project is the demolition of an existing one-story accessory building and the construction of two new accessory buildings in the rear yard. Due to the visibility of the accessory structures from the street, the project requires a full Commission review. The accessory buildings will be nearly identical on the exterior. The footprint of each building measures approximately 13'-4" x 27'-4". Both buildings are 14'-5" in height as measured from grade to ridge and have hipped roofs that coordinate with the primary structure. Siding material wood lap siding with a 3" reveal, brick foundation, and steel windows and doors. Post-construction, the rear yard will be 78% permeable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Accessory Buildings, 8.9 above.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines, Accessory Structure* –**Ms. Titus** made **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as drawn.
Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **ACCESSORY STRUCTURE APPROVED**

APPLICATION: HDC 2019-038, 2001 THOMAS AVENUE - ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The main building is a 1-story Colonial Revival style bungalow house constructed in 1932. Existing materials include asbestos siding over wood, a painted brick foundation, vinyl windows, and tile over the original concrete porch. Original architectural features include decorative cornice returns, original wood siding in the front pediment, wood front door, wood vents, and brick chimney. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5 story single family homes. The lot size is 50' x 150'.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is for the demolition of an existing 12'x 16' shed building from the mid-1990s and the construction of a new one-story accessory building. The new accessory building is 16'-11" in height as measured from grade to ridge, which is significantly shorter than the primary structure. The footprint measures approximately 13' x 24'. Siding material is Hardie Artisan lap siding with a 7" reveal and mitered corners, wood windows, and wood carriage-style doors. The 'driveway' material is crushed slate chosen for both visual and permeability reasons. The addition of a pergola over an existing wood deck is also proposed. The pergola material is painted wood and will be approximately 9'-6" in height tying in well below the existing ridge of the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Accessory Buildings, 8.9 above.
2. Hardie siding should be the smooth finish.
3. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines, Accessory Structure –Ms. Walker* made **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as drawn with the request to use the smooth Hardie Artisan.

Mr. Rumch seconded.

Ms. Parati offered a friendly amendment to specify Hardie Artisan Smooth siding.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, PARATI, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **ACCESSORY STRUCTURE APPROVED**

-
- **MS. MARSHALL LEFT THE MEETING AT 5:10 PM**
-

APPLICATION: HDC 2019-036, 417 GRANDIN ROAD – PAINTED MASONRY

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing home is 1.5 story Bungalow constructed c. 1928 and known as the Covington House, according to the National Register listing. Basic one-story frame house with side-gabled roof broken by two gabled dormers and a centered portico. Portico shields center bay and has front-facing gable. 6/6 sash windows.

PROPOSAL

The brick chimney stack was painted/lime washed without a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA). A notice of Violation was issued. The property owner is requesting to keep the lime wash due to the mismatched brick and mortar.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The Commission shall determine if an exception shall be granted for the painted brick based on the evidence provided.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with the *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines, Painted Masonry* – **Ms. Walker** made **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application for retroactive treatment on this chimney because it meets our guidelines 5.8 Paint.
Ms. Parati seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, PARATI, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **PAINTED MASONRY OF CHIMNEY APPROVED**

APPLICATION: HDC 2019-022, 2114 DILWORTH ROAD E – PAINTED MASONRY

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a 1.5 story Craftsman bungalow house constructed c. 1925. Architectural features include a partial-width front porch supported by triple square columns atop wood piers, batten siding in the front gable, and 6/1 wood windows. The lot size is approximately 66' x 162'. The HDC approved the painting of the house "to unify disparate parts of the building exterior" on January 14, 2015. Existing front entry doors appear to be original or perhaps early replacements due to hardware and glass.

PROPOSAL

The proposal includes the request to paint a new brick fireplace/chimney on the rear of the structure. All other portions of the addition are approvable at the staff level

The proposal is to change the front entry doors. The applicant is requesting to enlarge the height of both sets of front doors, install a transom above each and replace both front doors with new doors in a similar design.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. Guidelines for Masonry, 5.5 item 3, and Paint 5.8, item 7, require unpainted brick to remain unpainted; however, the reference is to historic masonry. The guidelines are silent on whether or not new brick can be painted, only referencing brick as a traditional material appropriate for new construction in Materials, 6.15, item 1.

Therefore, the Commission will decide if the new addition of an outdoor fireplace/chimney element may be painted to coordinate with the painted brick house as previously approved by the Commission in 2015 under the old guidelines.

2. The rear entry door/transom is not original to the house. A previously open rear porch was infilled at a later date.
3. The front doors appear to be original, including the heights.
4. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with the *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines, Painted Masonry* – **Mr. Henningson** made **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the painting of the new unpainted masonry chimney.
Ms. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, PARATI, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: PAINTING OF THE NEW UNPAINTED MASONRY APPROVED

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with the *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines, Front Doors and Entrances* –Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION** to **DENY** the application to replace the front door and enlarge the original door opening. Per guidelines 4.10

GUIDELINES 4.10

#4 – Do not reduce or enlarge entrances or door openings.

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, PARATI, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: ENLARGE ORIGINAL DOOR OPENING DENIED

-
- **MS. JILL WALKER LEFT THE MEETING AT 6:15 PM AND WAS ABSENT THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING**
 - **MR. JORDAN CAME BACK TO THE MEETING AND WAS PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2019-039, 612 SOUTH SUMMIT – DEMOLITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Known as the Gantt House, the main building is a 1-story Colonial Revival style bungalow house constructed c. 1926 according to the National Register listing. A portico and porch combination shields two of the three facade bays of this small frame dwelling. One story high, it has a hipped roof crossed by clipped gables on the sides. The slightly off-center front entry has sidelights which coordinate with the 4/1 sash windows on the facade. The house is currently wrapped in vinyl siding. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2 story single family homes. The lot size is 50' x 197.5'

PROPOSAL

The proposal is full demolition of the primary structure. The two-story accessory structure (c. 1932) is to remain.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The Commission will determine if the building has special significance to the Wesley Heights Local Historic District.
2. The Commission will determine if the structure is unsalvageable. With an affirmative determination, the Commission can waive the 90-day waiting period for new construction plans.
3. If the Commission determines that this property does not have any special significance to the district or is unsalvageable (even if it has special significance to the Wesley Heights district), then the Commission may determine if demolition may take place without a delay or upon the approval of new construction plans.

FOR/AGAINST: Ms. Shannon Hughes, an adjacent property owner, spoke in opposition of this application.
Mr. John Caratelle, an adjacent property owner, spoke in opposition of this application.
Ms. Carolyn Kellogg, an adjacent property owner, spoke in opposition of this application.
Ms. Kim Parati, an adjacent property owner, spoke in opposition of this application.

MOTION: Ms. Titus made a motion to recognize, that the house has special significance and value toward maintaining the character of Wesley Heights Local Historic District because of the year of construction (1932). And the architectural style.
Mr. Jordan seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, RUMSCH, TITUS
NAYS: NONE

MOTION: Ms. Titus made a motion to approve the demolition with a 365 day stay on the building due to its special significance and value toward maintaining the character of the district.
Ms. Hartenstine seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, RUMSCH, TITUS
NAYS: NONE

-
- **MS. JESSICA HINDMAN LEFT THE MEETING AT 6:30 PM AND WAS ABSENT THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING**
-

APPLICATION: HDC 2019-041, 508 EAST BOULEVARD - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a 2.5 story Colonial Revival structure constructed c.1900. Architectural features include a large front gable pediment with Palladian-inspired three-part window, a wraparound porch (partially enclosed) with Doric columns, a decorative front entrance with a transom and sidelights, corner trim detailed as square columns, wood lap siding, and 6/1 windows. The house shares a lot with 500 East Boulevard, with the lot measuring approximately 150' x 140'.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is an addition no taller or wider than the existing structure but will increase the square footage greater than 50%. The new addition will connect at an existing one-story element at the rear. The addition is shorter than the main ridge by 1'-6". Materials are Hardie Artisan siding with an exposure to match existing, wood shingle siding in the rear gable to match existing, and a combination of fixed and casement aluminum clad windows. All roof and trim details will be wood to match existing. The proposal includes the removal of one canopy tree.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. As a structure with many classical elements, staff would recommend a bracket design more in keeping with the architecture of the house, rather than using the more Craftsman-style bracket as shown.
2. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets guidelines for Additions, page 7.2.
3. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

MOTION: **Ms. Hartenstine** made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE**, this application because it did not meet Guideline 7.2, #6 specifically for compatibility with the existing building related to massing, form, directional expression, and fenestration.
Ms. Parati seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 AYES: HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, JORDAN, PARATI, TITUS, RUMSCH
 NAYS: NONE

Adjourned 7:10 PM with a meeting time of six hours and ten minutes.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District.