



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
March 13, 2019  
Room 267

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Jim Haden (Chairperson)  
Ms. Jana Hartenstine  
Mr. PJ Henningson  
Ms. Jessica Hindman (1st Vice-Chairperson)  
Ms. Kim Parati  
Mr. John Phares  
Mr. Damon Rumsch  
Ms. Tamara Titus (2<sup>nd</sup> vice-Chairperson)  
Ms. Jill Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Jim Jordan  
Ms. Mattie Marshall

OTHERS PRESENT: Ms. Kristi Harpst, Administrator of the Historic District Commission  
Ms. Candice Leite, Staff of the Historic District  
Ms. Linda Keich, Clerk to Historic District Commission  
Ms. Cindy Kochanek, Staff of the Historic District Commission  
Ms. Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

---

With a quorum present, Chairman Haden called the regular March meeting of the Historic District Commission (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. 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. Chairman 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 removed from the room. Chairman Haden swore in all Applicants and Staff and continued to swear in people as they arrived for the duration of the meeting. Appeal from the Historic District Commission is to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. One has thirty (30) days from the date of the decision to appeal. This is in accordance with Section 10.213 of the City Zoning Ordinance.

Index of Addresses:

HDC 2019-048 224-236 W. Kingston Ave	Wilmore
HDC 2019-113 1700 Heathcliff Ave	Wesley Heights
HDC 2019-045 1716 Merriman Ave	Wilmore
HDC 2019-081 1408 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2019-102 404 W Park Ave	Wilmore
HDC 2019-095 612 E Tremont Ave	Dilworth
HDC 2018-436 1827 Wilmore Dr	Wilmore
HDC 2018-577 1508 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2019-114 2115 Wilmore Dr	Wilmore
HDC 2019-079 729 Woodruff PL	Wesley Heights
HDC 2019-123 719 Romany Rd	Dilworth
HDC 2019-041 508 East Bv	Dilworth

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

ABSENT: HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, JORDAN, MARSHALL

MR. HENNINGSON HAD A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND RECUSED HIMSELF FROM THE MEETING.

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2019-048, 224, 228, 232 and 236 W KINGSTON AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION**

*The application was denied January 16, 2019 for the following: Setback, height and width, scale, foundation, porches and incongruous with the character of the district in its neighborhood context and its gateway location. Per Guideline 6.6, number 3, the evidence to demonstrate the width should be based on the original structures. The HDC has not evaluated the other guidelines.*

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The four properties are one story structures that were re-used for a day care; existing zoning is R-22 Multi-Family. The buildings are connected with heated space. 236 West Kingston Ave. was constructed in 1923 and connected to 232, 228 and 224 were also connected to make one building. They were constructed in 1936 and 1940 respectively. A 365-Day Stay of Demolition was approved by the HDC September 13, 2017. Adjacent structures are commercial and single family (one story) on the block. Across the street are single and multi-family buildings. The historic multi-family building at 241 West Kingston Avenue was constructed in 1949, the height is approximately 32' measured from grade. Its adjacent single-family house (245 West Kingston Avenue) was constructed in 1954, approximate height is 33'. The single-family house at 251 West Kingston Avenue was constructed in 1936 with a pre-Historic District rear addition height of approximately 40'.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is new construction of townhouses. The project is in the rezoning process to a more urban residential district, UR-2. Front setback of the project is approximately 53' from back of curb to the 6' deep front stoop. Front setback to the heated living space is approximately 59' from back of curb. Site features include a 5' side yard and brick pillar/wood fence along the single-family side, and either a 15-foot landscaped buffer or 11.25' buffer with wood fence behind the alley easement in the rear yard. Existing and proposed trees are noted on the site plan.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. The scale/height relationship between the historic single-family houses at 244 and 240 W. Kingston and Building A.
2. Contextual criteria of massing (particularly on Buildings A, and C), stoops/porches (particularly on Buildings D + E), roof form, and rhythm.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

Dennis Mayo, neighborhood resident, spoke in opposition of this application.

**MOTION:**      **1<sup>st</sup>:** Ms. Tamara Titus      **2<sup>nd</sup>:** Mr. Damon Rumsch

MS. TITUS: I move to deny this application, because the project does not meet the following guidelines: Height and width, number 6.6, 1, 2, and 3. At 36 feet tall, all of the buildings are taller from grade than the historic multifamily across the street at 241 West Kingston, and they do not respect the single-family homes at 244 and 240 West Kingston per the applicant's slide number 24. Scale, number 6.7. For width, buildings D and E are 64 feet and 94 feet wide, and the applicant has failed to show a historic building anywhere close to this width within the context area. Then scale, number 6.7. And massing, 6.5 of the guidelines. Specifically, the project fails to meet our guidelines for massing for buildings A, C, D, and E, with the dormers of A and C failing to meet and the entire building of D and E failing to meet. We are denying the application specifically for failure to meet these guidelines with the note that the additional guidelines that are applicable have not been considered and remain open for consideration. MS. TITUS: I'm going to take the (J. Pahares) *friendly amendment* to add roof forms which is number 6.10. And I'm going to say we have not made a determination on setback, because I think there's more to be discussed on that, and there are also six of 11 sitting commissioners right now. So, I want to leave some leeway to hear what those folks think.

**VOTE:** 6/0

**AYES:** HADEN, , PARATI, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER, PHARES

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

**APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION OF TOWN HOMES DENIED**

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

MR. HENNINGSON RETURNS TO MEETING

MS. HARTENSTINE ARRIVES AT 1:54PM

**APPLICATION: HDC 2019-113 1700 HEATHCLIFF AVENUE-TREE REMOVAL**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The site is a triangular vacant lot at the end of a street and at the edge of the Wesley Heights Local Historic District. The site is approximately 10 feet above West 4<sup>th</sup> Street. There are mature trees on the site. There is not an established front setback on the street. The site has an unimproved alley on one side. The adjacent properties within the District are two story quadraplex buildings that are on a lower elevation. The adjacent single-family house is not in the District.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is to obtain retroactive approval for tree removal. The Commission approved plans for new construction at its May 10, 2017 hearing and specifically stated in the motion that “no trees will be removed for construction.” The removed tree was not noted on the presented/approved site plan. The applicant has submitted a new site plan with all mature trees noted, including the removed tree and two large mature canopy trees located at the front of the lot. *Note: The two mature canopy trees at the front of the lot are located within a few feet of the proposed front porch; a site condition that was not addressed during the May 10, 2017 hearing for the New Construction approval, so no tree protection plan was provided for these trees. (This is a similar condition to the 1912 S. Mint Street, New Construction, Case Number; 2016-166).*

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff has the following concerns:

1. A tree protection plan for the two mature canopy trees at the front of the lot should be provided to staff for review/approval within 30 days.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff (such as review/approval of replacement trees).

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

Rachel (Last Name?) neighborhood resident spoke in opposition of this application.

**MOTION:**         1<sup>st</sup>: Ms. Parati                                         2<sup>nd</sup>: Mr. Rumsch

Ms. Parati moved to approve this application with the following conditions, according to Guidelines 8.5, #4 through #6, we request a tree protection plan as defined by a certified arborist to be presented and approved by staff within 30 days. We also request a large shade tree as defined by the City of Charlotte within the 2 ½ to 3 inch caliper to replace the one that was lost. We also request a accurate site plan showing the two existing trees and the plans for the position of the new tree that is being planted.

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

**DECISION:**

TREE REMOVAL APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

N/A

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2019-045 1716 Merriman Ave - ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1-story American Small House with Craftsman elements constructed in 1928. Architectural features include exposed rafters, 6/6 wood windows, an engaged front porch supported by square wood columns, wood vent details, and a brick chimney. Per the Zoutewelle Survey, house height as measured from grade to ridge is 17.1'. The lot size is approximately 50' x 118'.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is an addition with a proposed ridge height of 22'-4". Proposed materials are brick foundation, wood lap siding to match existing and wood windows with Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL) in a 6/1 pattern to match existing. Note: The driveway and patio shown on the site plan are approvable at the staff level. Post-construction the rear-yard impermeable area will be 28%. There are no impacts to mature canopy trees.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. Zoutewelle survey calls out ridge height at 17.1' and applicant's drawing notes the ridge height at 19.6.'
2. Changing the front door to a Craftsman-style door, when the house has Colonial Revival elements.
3. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

N/A

**MOTION:**                                         1<sup>st</sup>: N/A                                         2<sup>nd</sup>: N/A

NO MOTION

CASE NOT HEARD DUE TO LACK OF INFORMATION

**VOTE:** N/A

**AYES:** N/A

**NAYS:** N/A

**DECISION:**

NO DECISION

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

N/A

---

**APPLICATION:** HDC 2019-081\_1408 THE PLAZA - ADDITION

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing property is a 1.5 story Colonial Revival cottage constructed in 1942. Architectural features include a pair of small dormers on the front elevation, a full-width front porch, and a brick chimney on the right elevation. Siding material is brick on the first level and aluminum over wood on the second level. Lot dimensions are 66' x 192'.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is a rear addition that is not taller or wider than the original house, but increases the square footage by more than 50%, changes to the front porch, a new front dormer, and a material change request on the main house gable ends.

- Proposed materials of the rear addition include brick foundation to match existing, Hardie Artisan siding with a 7" reveal and mitred corners, wood trim, and vinyl windows.
- The proposal also includes the addition of a center dormer on the front elevation to match the existing dormers. All aluminum siding and trim will be removed from the dormers and the original wood siding/trim will be repaired.
- The proposal also includes changes to the front porch including new Miratec columns (to replace 8" aluminum fluted columns), new wider brick steps, and brick cheek walls.
- Siding on the gable ends and existing rear dormers is aluminum over wood. Existing siding is proposed to be replaced with new Hardie Artisan lap siding.
- No trees will be impacted by this project. Post-construction, rear yard impermeable coverage will be 43%.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff has the following concerns with the project:

1. An application for vinyl replacement windows with Simulated True Divided Light (STDL) muntins in a 6/1 pattern was submitted to HDC staff in March 2013 (HDC 2013-045). A COA was not issued because the proposed material (vinyl) was not approvable. *(Note: The Policy & Design Guidelines in 2013 gave staff authority to issue COAs for replacement windows).*
2. Window material and apron trim detail on the proposed addition.
3. Removal/replacement of original wood siding on the gable ends of the house.
4. The proposal for the dormer addition and front porch changes is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Additions, 7.2 and New Construction above.
5. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION:** 1<sup>st</sup>: Mr. Henningson 2<sup>nd</sup>: Ms. Parati

Mr. Henningson made a motion to approve this application because it meets our Guidelines 7.2 , #1 through #6 for additions. The addition is not incongruous with the district with the following to be staff approved.

1. Columns are not tapered and consistent with Guidelines 3.14 and 3.15, Colonial Revival.
2. Window sizes to be more consistent with the original structure.
3. Window trim detail to be historic where the sill does not have an apron.
4. Traditional materials on the original structure and nontraditional materials on the addition.
5. Review the front door to confirm that it’s not original.
6. No vinyl windows.

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

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS FOR STAFF APPROVAL

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

MR. HENNINGSON HAD A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND RECUSED HIMSELF FROM THE MEETING.  
MS. HINDMAN ARRIVED AT 3:55PM

---

**APPLICATION:** HDC 2019-102\_404 WEST PARK AVENUE - ADDITION

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing property is a one story Craftsman bungalow constructed c. 1931. Architectural features include clipped gables on the main roof and front porch roof with shingle siding, brackets, triple ganged windows, front door with sidelights, and wood lap siding with corner boards. Lot size is approximately 50’ x 150’.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is a rear addition. The existing ridge measures 19’-3”. The proposed addition will change the overall height to 23’-3 ¼”. The proposal also includes relocating the existing bump-out on the left side to the right side of the house, to provide access to the rear yard (and a future garage). Proposed materials include brick foundation to match existing, wood lap siding on the first level and wood shingle siding on the second level dormers, and double-hung wood windows in a 1/1 pattern to match existing. Rear deck will be wood with a concrete patio on the first level. Post-construction the rear-yard impermeable area will be 35%. No canopy trees will be impacted by this project.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. Massing of the addition roof and second level dormers.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION:** 1<sup>st</sup>: Ms. Hartenstine 2<sup>nd</sup>: Ms. Walker

Ms. Hartenstine made a Motion to Deny this application based on its failure to meet our Guidelines for 7.2 numbers 1, 2, 5 and 6; for its failure to meet 6.10 for roof form and material, specifically item number 2; failure to meet 6.12 for rhythm, specifically related to the dormer for the ratio of solid to voids in number 1(a); for its failure to meet 6.5 for massing and complexity of form specifically related to the entire addition; and for its failure to show the removal of the bay and whether that existing bay was part of the original structure.

**VOTE:** 8/0

**AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION DENIED.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

MS. HINDMAN HAD A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND RECUSED HERSELF FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION

MR. PAHARES LEFT THE MEETING AT 4:52PM

---

**APPLICATION:** HDC 2019-095\_612 E. TREMONT AVENUE - PORCH ADDITION

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing property is a 1.5 story Craftsman bungalow constructed in 1915, according to the National Register nomination. Architectural features include a cross gable roof, brackets, and Dutch-lap siding. The original front porch was converted to heated space prior to Dilworth's designation as a local district.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is the addition of a 6-foot deep front porch. Established setbacks on the street prevent the construction of the porch per Zoning; however, the applicant is requesting approval from the Zoning Administration staff to use the alternative setback provision in the zoning ordinance (included below). Proposed materials include brick foundation, brick piers and tapered wood columns, wood siding in the gable, and wood trim. No trees will be impacted by this project.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

3. The Commission will determine if the proposed front porch meets the Design Guidelines.

4. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION:** 1<sup>st</sup>: Mr. Henningson 2<sup>nd</sup>: Mr. Rumsch

Mr. Henningson made a motion to deny this application for not meeting our Guidelines 6.2 number 1, setback should be within plus or minus ten percent of the original historic setback on the block. Guidelines 6.14, number 4, porches should be a minimum depth of eight feet.

Ms. Titus added an amendment: if this commission were to violate its guidelines and allow a porch that is less than eight feet and that also violates the historic setback on the block, we would be faced with other applications from Dilworth properties that have existing enclosed porches that date back prior to the establishment of the historic district, and this case would set a precedent requiring us to allow those homeowners or business owners to capture new space without reopening the historic porch. If we were to make an exception for houses where the front porch was enclosed prior to the district becoming historic, we would set a precedent for future houses that were trying to recapture or trying to add open space on top of heated space they had already captured that was historically inappropriate. Original front porch is eight feet deep. Mr. Henningson accepted Ms. Titus's friendly amendment.

**VOTE:** 6/1

**AYES:** HARTENSTINE, PARATI, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** HADEN

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR PORCH ADDITION DENIED.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

MS. HINDMAN RETURNED TO THE MEETING

---

**APPLICATION:** HDC 2018-436\_1827 WILMORE DRIVE-FRONT/REAR PORCH ADDITIONS

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing property is a two-story brick Quadruplex with Colonial Revival elements constructed c. 1933. Architectural features include a hip roof, 6/1 wood windows, and a small covered front porch. Siding material is unpainted brick. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1-2 story single family houses. The lot size is approximately 95' x 202'

**PROPOSAL:**

The existing front porch columns are small square posts, which do not appear to be original to the structure. The applicant proposes to replace the current columns with new wood columns more appropriately sized for the structure. The proposal also includes changing the existing split front walkway to a single, centered concrete walkway, which will require the removal of a small tree. A new rear deck addition will be wood and visible from West Boulevard. A paved parking area will also be constructed at the rear of the property to be accessed by an existing curb cut along West Boulevard. A number of small shrubs and brush will need to be removed to build the deck, as well as two canopy trees.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. The proposal for the front porch columns and rear deck addition 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. The HDC will determine if the front walkway and parking changes meet the guidelines for Sidewalks and Parking, 8.2.
3. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff (such as approval of an appropriate deck rail detail for a corner lot deck).

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION:** 1<sup>st</sup>: Ms. Hindman 2<sup>nd</sup>: Mr. Henningson

1. Ms. Hindman made a motion to approve the porch columns.
2. The front walkway denied, restore the original walk per guideline 8.2.1
3. Rear porch is continued for complete drawings
4. Front parking pad is denied per guidelines number 8.2.6
5. Continued for more information on the trees

**VOTE:** 8/0

**AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, PARATI, , RUMSH TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

**APPROVED:** Columns, **DENIED:** Front Parking Pad & Front Walkway, **CONTINUED:** Rear porch & Rear Parking

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

N/A

---



**APPLICATION:** HDC 2018-577\_1508 THE PLAZA – WINDOW CHANGES

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 2-story single family house with a mix of Colonial Revival and Craftsman elements constructed c. 1920s-1930s. The building has 4/1 wood windows, stone chimney, and side porch supported by stone columns. The house is currently wrapped in aluminum siding and trim. Adjacent structures are residential. Lot size measures 66' x 192.5'.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is for changes to window openings on the left and right elevations. On the right elevation, the proposal is to change a paired window to a single window and relocate it closer to the front corner of the house. On the left elevation, the proposal is to remove 3 window openings. The applicant proposes to in-fill the window openings with plywood and aluminum siding to match existing.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

1. The right elevation is symmetrical as-built.
2. On the left elevation, the small, square fixed window does not align with any other windows and is also minimally visible from the street.
3. Staff has recommended to the applicant that the double-hung windows on the left elevation be kept in place and shuttered from the inside.
4. The Commission will determine if the proposed window changes meet the Guidelines.
5. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION:**      **1<sup>st</sup>:** Ms. Parati                      **2<sup>nd</sup>:** Mr. Henningson

Ms. Parati made a motion to deny this application per Guide 4.14, number 1, 5, and 6

**VOTE:** 8/0

**AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, PARATI, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR WINDOW CHANGES DENIED.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

N/A

---

**APPLICATION:** HDC 2019-114\_2115 WILMORE DRIVE – WINDOW REPLACEMENT

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1.5 story brick Cottage constructed in 1936. The building has wood windows and small engaged front porch. Adjacent structures are residential. The subject property is on a curve and has a pie-shaped lot measuring 110' wide at the front and 30' wide in the rear x 156' (approx.) in length.

**PROPOSAL:**

The project is the replacement of window sashes around the house. There are number of non-original windows, including the triple ganged 4/4 windows on the front elevation, a replacement window on the left dormer, and clearly non-historic louvered windows in a rear addition. The applicant has supplied information regarding the condition of the

windows and details of the proposed sash kits which will be full wood with Simulated True Divided Lights (STD), replicate of existing patterns and dimensions. Areas of rotten trim will be repaired/replaced to match existing.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. HDC-2017-00652\_1707 Lennox Avenue, a brick duplex c. 1930, was approved in November 2017 for sash-kit window replacement due to window condition.
2. Recommend requiring the 4-pane fixed window on the front elevation be retained and repaired.
3. The Commission will determine if the proposed replacement window and trim, where required, meet the Guidelines.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION:**      1<sup>st</sup>: Ms Hindman      2<sup>nd</sup>: Mr. Rumsch

Ms. Hindman made a motion to approve the sash replacement kits due to the evidence presented by the applicant with one, a preference for putty profiles at the exterior at five-eighths or seven-eighths inches, and two, staff to review the tracks for low profile utilizing resources on commission if needed. The fixed window adjacent to the front door is to be restored.

**VOTE:** 8/0

**AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, PARATI, , RUMSCH TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

WINDOW SASH REPLACEMENT KITS APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS FOR STAFF REVIEW

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

N/a

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2019-079\_729 WOODRUFF PL – ALTERNATIVE MATERIALS**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The house is a one story American Small House constructed in 1948. It is listed as non-contributing in the Wesley Heights National Register of Historic Places. The front setback is approximately 37 feet. Exterior features include a brick façade, small front gabled porch, and wood windows that appear to be non-original.

**PROPOSAL:**

The front porch and rear addition was approved by the Commission under HDC-2017-00735 and a detached garage was approved with by the Commission under HDC-2017-00010. Both projects were approved with a non-traditional material: Hardie Artisan siding smooth horizontal lap with corner boards.

The property owner is requesting approval for different non-traditional siding material. The property owner will bring information about the proposed siding and a material sample to the meeting.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

N/A

**MOTION:** 1<sup>st</sup>: N/A 2<sup>nd</sup>: N/A

NO MOTION

CASE WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT. MOVED TO APRIL.

**VOTE:** N/A

**AYES:** N/A

**NAYS:** N/A

**DECISION:**

N/A

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

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

---

**APPLICATION:** HDC 2019-123\_ 719 ROMANY ROAD – TREE REMOVAL

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a new single-family house constructed in 2018-2019. The HDC approved the new construction and the removal of one mature canopy tree in the rear yard on November 28, 2017 under COA# 2017-00586 (attached). Adjacent structures are one and two story single family homes, setbacks vary along the block between 40' and 50'. Lot size is approximately 68' x 142'.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is to remove an additional canopy tree in the rear yard, a Hackberry with a codominant stem structure measuring 9"/13". A letter from a ISA TRAQ Certified Arborist is included for the Commission's review.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff (such as the review/approval of a replacement tree)

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

JESSICA HINDMAN PROVIDED SITE INFORMATION FOR CASE

**MOTION:** 1<sup>st</sup>: Ms. Hartenstine 2<sup>nd</sup>: Ms. Parati

Ms. Hartenstine made a motion to approve the removal of this tree based on the arborist's report that the tree is structurally unsound and top heavy and that the applicant replaces the tree with a large shade tree as approved by staff and defined by the City of Charlotte guidelines. Ms. Parati 's friendly amendment referenced guidelines 8.5 numbers 2, 5, and 6. Ms. Hartenstine accepts Ms. Parati's amendment.

**VOTE:** 6/1

**AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, PARATI, PHARES, TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** RUMSCH

**DECISION:**

TREE REMOVAL APPROVED.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

MS. PARATI & MS. HINDMAN LEFT THE MEETING AT 7:10PM

---

**APPLICATION:** HDC 2019-041\_508 EAST BOULEVARD - ADDITION

The application was continued from February for the following items:

1. Additions, page 7.2, item 6. Not meeting compatibility with the existing building related to massing, form, directional expression, and fenestration.
2. The HDC review was limited to the above, and all other factors are still on the table for review.

**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.

*Revised Proposal – March 13*

- 1.Reduced the size, altered directional expression, and re-designed massing to be compatible with the existing building
- 2.Fenestration changed to match the historic windows

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

- 1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets guidelines for Additions, page 7.2.
- 2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION:**      **1<sup>st</sup>:** Ms. Titus      **2<sup>nd</sup>:** Mr. Henningson

Ms. Titus made a motion to approve this project as meeting our guidelines with the requirement that all three proposed tree replacement areas be utilized with three new maturing canopy trees from the city of charlotte’s arborist’s list to be planted there. We are approving Hardie Artisan or wood to match dimensions of existing historic siding.

**FRIENDLY AMENDMENTS [IF ANY]:**

N/A

**VOTE:** 06/0

**AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, , RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

**DECISION:**

**ADDITION APPROVED**