



APPROVED MAY 13, 2020

---

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

March 11, 2020

Room 267

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Jim Haden (Chairperson)  
Ms. Kim Parati (Vice Chairperson)  
Ms. Jessica Hindman (2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chairperson)  
Ms. Nichelle Bonaparte  
Mr. PJ Henningson  
Mr. Jim Jordan  
Ms. Christa Lineberger  
Mr. Chris Muryn  
Mr. John Phares  
Mr. Damon Rumsch  
Ms. Jill Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Chris Barth

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ms. Kristi Harpst, Administrator of the Historic District  
Ms. Candice Leite, Staff to the Historic District Commission  
Ms. Cindy Kochanek, Staff to the Historic District Commission  
Ms. Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission  
Ms. Andrea Leslie-Fite, Senior Assistant City Attorney  
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 1:14 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 removal 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:

**Consent Agenda**

HDCRMI 2020-00053, 1808 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore
HDCRMI 2020-00098, 1209 Ideal Way	Dilworth

**Consent Agenda move to regular Agenda**

HDCADMRM 2019-00738, 1223 Belgrave Place	Dilworth
--	----------

**Continued Cases**

HDCRMA 2019-00748, 201 Grandin Road	Wesley Heights
HDCRMI 2019-00585, 1640 Dilworth Road E.	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2019-00726, 2015 Dilworth Road E.	Dilworth

**New Cases**

HDCRMI 2020-00096, 901 Mt. Vernon Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2020-00107, 601 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
HDCRMI 2020-00046, 1520 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMI 2020-00099, 1547 Merriman Avenue	Wilmore

---

**CONSENT AGENDA**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

BARTH

**APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2020-00053, 1808 WILMORE DRIVE – WINDOW CHANGES**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a one-story Craftsman bungalow constructed in 1936. Architectural features include a front gable roof with brackets. The front porch appears to have originally been a partial width porch that has been extended to a wrap-around porch. Porch columns and rails are decorative metal. An attached carport is supported by simple round metal columns, which also appears to be a later addition. The windows are 1/1 replacements. The lot size measures approximately 50' x 193'. Adjacent historic structures are one-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is for changes to windows and doors on a non-original addition on the left elevation. The changes are visible from the street. All new windows to be double-hung wood in a 1/1 pattern to match existing. The entire house is wrapped in vinyl and aluminum and the owners do not plan to remove these materials.

1. Left Elevation:
  - a. Remove skinny window facing the street on the bump-out.
  - b. Remove the center two windows of the four-ganged windows. Wall areas to be repaired with vinyl material to match existing.
2. Front Elevation: replace existing side entry door on front porch with a new double-hung wood window. Repair wall with vinyl to match existing.
3. Right Elevation:
  - a. Relocate existing window and add a new window opening of the same size. Repair wall with vinyl to match existing.
  - b. Remove driveway step/entry to porch and infill with new brick to match existing.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Windows, 4.12-4.14.
2. All landscaping and site features (walkways, fences, walls, etc.) and new porch rails may be reviewed and approved at the Administrative level.
3. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the window changes and front porch change for meeting all Guidelines and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with permit-ready construction drawings submitted to staff for final review.
4. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION: APPROVE**

**1<sup>st</sup>: RUMSCH 2<sup>nd</sup>: PHARES**

Mr. Rumsch moved to approve this consent agenda application.

**VOTE:** 11/0

**AYES:** BONAPARTE, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR WINDOW CHANGES APPROVED.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

BARTH

**APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2020-00098, 1209 IDEAL WAY – REAR ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

Known as the E.J. Rhune house, the existing structure is a two-story Dutch Colonial constructed in 1927. Architectural features a brick first floor, gambrel roof with shed dormers with wood lap siding, a one-story side wing, front portico and paired double hung 6/1 windows. The lot measures approximately 50' x 139'. The Dilworth National Register Nomination specifically mentions the garage.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a rear addition that is no taller or wider than the original house. Otherwise staff approvable, this addition is increasing the square footage of the house of slightly more than 50%, which requires the project to be submitted to the Commission review/approval. (Existing House: 1,899 sf. Proposed Addition: 966 sf.) All materials proposed are traditional to match existing. The addition is designed to have minimal impacts to the rear dormer and to be completely reversible

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Additions, 7.2.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the Addition for meeting all Guidelines and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with permit-ready construction drawings submitted to staff for final review.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION: APPROVE**

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

Ms. Walker moved to approve this consent agenda application based on guideline 7.2 number 1,2, and 3.

**VOTE:** 11/0

**AYES:** BONAPARTE, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR REAR ADDITION APPROVED.

---

**MOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA TO THE REGULAR AGENDA**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

BARTH

**APPLICATION: HDCADMRM 2019-00738, 1223 BELGRAVE PLACE – ACCESSORY BUILDING**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a one-story brick ranch constructed in 1951. The lot measures approximately 100' x 200'. This section of Dilworth is more suburban in character with longer blocks, larger and non-uniform lots, and deeper setbacks. Adjacent structures along the block various types of one- and two-story single-family homes. A rear addition and window replacement were approved in 2013 and the front dormers and front portico were approved in 2015.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is an Accessory Building (the driveway, pool, tree removal is all being reviewed at the staff level). Design was inspired by the Accessory Structure at 1201 Belgrave Place (HDCRMI-2018-00573) approved by the Commission in December 2018.

- Primary structure height varies from 17.7' to 20.3' (Average height is 19').

- Per Zoning Administration Staff: the tallest point may be used when measuring the height of a primary structure to meet the requirement that accessory buildings cannot exceed the height of the primary structure.
- Accessory Building Height: 20'-1 ½", as measured from grade to ridge (including the 2' excavation).
- Accessory Building Footprint: 24' x 30'
- Materials: Traditional to match the primary structure.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Accessory Buildings, 7.2.
2. All landscaping and site features (walkways, fences, driveways, swimming pool, etc.) may be reviewed and approved at the Administrative level.
3. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the Accessory Building for meeting all Guidelines and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with permit-ready construction drawings, and window/door details submitted to staff for final review.
4. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION: CONTINUE**

**1<sup>st</sup>: HENNINGSON 2<sup>nd</sup>: JORDAN**

Mr. Henningson moved to continue this application based on guideline 8.9, number 3; with the 2.5-inch difference in height to the main house, the accessory building is not secondary. The style and character are not compatible with the main house; focusing on the dormers and massing.

**VOTE:** 11/0

**AYES:** BONAPARTE, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY BUILDING CONTINUED.

**CONTINUED CASES**

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

BARTH

**APPLICATION: HDCRMA 2019-00748, 201 GRANDIN ROAD – ADDITION/FENESTRATION CHANGES**

*This application was continued from the January 15, 2020 meeting for the following items:*

*Re-study the window changes preservation and retention of the windows in the position currently in now per the following Guidelines:*

- 4.14, number 1. Retain and preserve windows
- 4.14, number 2. Repair existing, original windows
- 4.14, number 3. Replace window features only when beyond repair
- 4.14, number 5. Retain glass screen/shutter the backside of window
- 4.14, number 6. Avoid adding or changing window openings.
- Secretary of the Interior's Standards, page 2.5, number 1. "...or be placed in new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building."

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a Romanesque Revival church designed by renowned Charlotte architect Louis Asbury and constructed in 1928. The “T” shaped building contains both sanctuary and offices. The Church section has a gable facing Grandin Road. Notable architectural features include the triple entry with marbled windows, brick with crenellations, pilasters and corbelling details, cast stone trim, and arched, marbled windows. The property also includes a 1.5 story brick rectory constructed c. 1940. The rectory is an American Small House with Tudor and Colonial Revival details. Adjacent structures 1, 1.5 and 2-story single family residential buildings and 2-3-story multi-family townhomes. The lot size is approximately 108’ x 187.5’. The parcel is zoned MUDD(CD).

### **PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is the conversion of a former church into condominiums. No changes are proposed to the front elevation. The only proposed change to the rear elevation is to add windows on the basement level in dimensions and configuration to match existing; proposed material is aluminum clad. On the right (courtyard) elevation the windows on the basement level will be changed to aluminum clad patio doors. A single-entry door will be removed and bricked in to match existing. The stained-glass windows will be removed, and the openings enlarged. The left (W. 4<sup>th</sup> St) elevation also includes the removal of all stained-glass windows and enlarging the openings. Portions of the windows are proposed to be re-used in the entry doors. Brick steps and partition walls will provide access and separation between the units. An addition will be constructed on the courtyard side of the building behind the existing parsonage. Proposed materials are brick to match existing and aluminum clad Simulated True Divided Light (STD L) windows and doors.

*Revised Proposal – March 11, 2020*

- *Window design changed on right elevation*
- *Windows noted to be re-used and relocated on the left elevation*

### **STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. Primary concern: loss of all original, character-defining stained-glass windows on both the left and right elevations. A design solution to keep at least one elevation largely intact would be more suitable.
2. Left Elevation:
  - a. The design does not match the notes. Notes state “existing stained-glass windows to remain but raised 36””; however, the drawing shows a different design.
3. Right Elevation:
  - a. Is the sill being moved and changed from cast stone to brick?
  - b. Window design of the original building on both the left and right sanctuary elevations are symmetrical and have decorative arched headers. The window design change from an arched to square headers, is incongruous with the original symmetry of the building design.
  - c. Single entry door is shown as removed in the elevations. If removed, will the cast concrete detail be replicated?
  - d. Will there be knee-walls or some other type of partition between the patios?
4. Addition:
  - a. Label size (footprint and height dimensions) on plans.
  - b. Dimensions of porch supports?
  - c. Label tree species and size on the site plan for both trees proposed for removal and new trees to be planted.

### **SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

### **MOTION: CONTINUE**

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

Mr. Henningson moved to continue this application based on guidelines 4.14, number 1, retain and preserve the original windows; 4.14, number 2, repair existing original windows; 4.14, number 3, replace windows only when beyond repair; 4.14 number 5, retain the glass screen or shutters behind the windows; 4.14, number 6, avoid adding or changing the

fenestration and openings; and per the Secretary of Interior Standards 2.5, number 1, make minimal changes to the defining characteristics of the building.

The rear elevation of the addition is not incongruous with the neighborhood, with the exception of, the sidelights on the rear elevation. We request you revisit the fenestration per guideline 6.12. Add additional details, AC unit placement, trash, etc. to the site plan.

Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment, the rear elevation is only the sidelights of the doors, not all of the fenestration.

Mr. Henningson accepted the friendly amendment.

**VOTE:** 11/0            **AYES:** BONAPARTE, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION AND FENESTRATION CHANGES CONTINUED.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

BARTH

**APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2019-00585, 1640 DILWORTH ROAD EAST – ACCESSORY BUILDING**

*This application was continued from the January 15, 2020 meeting for the following items:*

- *Site plan that includes the location of the neighbor's property on Isleworth to ensure that the garage is not forward of the neighbor's house per guideline 8.2.*
- *Consider moving the garage further back into the rear yard to avoid side yard parking per guideline 8.2*

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 2.5 story brick Colonial Revival, with Tudor Revival elements, constructed in 1930. Architectural features include an asymmetrical sloped gable entry, one-story side porch (now enclosed), and 6/6 double-hung windows with a keystone header detail. The lot size is an irregular pie shape measuring 171 x 177 x 71 x 88. The former garage structure was approved for removal the Administrative level in 2015.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a new one-story accessory building with a footprint of 24' x 24' and an overall height of 21.2'. A breezeway roof will connect the garage to a former rear addition on the primary structure. The lot currently has two curb cuts and driveway entrances, one off Dilworth Road East and one off Isleworth Avenue. Per zoning, the front yard faces Dilworth Road East. Proposed materials are brick to match the house, wood garage doors, wood or composite trim to match existing, and double-hung windows with Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL) in a 6/6 pattern to match existing. The project also includes the removal of concrete in the side yard adjacent to Dilworth Road East, rebuilding the berm and replanting grass. There are no impacts to mature canopy trees; ornamental trees may have to be removed to construct the garage.

*Revised Proposal – March 11, 2020*

1. *Site plan shows location of 1025 Isleworth Avenue.*
2. *Garage location moved back on the lot behind the thermal wall of both 1640 Dilworth Road East and 1025 Isleworth Avenue*

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The unique shape of the lot provides challenges for locating the garage to meet all HDC requirements. If the garage is pushed to the corner, it will be partially located in the side yard.
2. Replanting ornamental trees to screen the breezeway, and as a separation between the garage and the single-family residential house at 1025 Isleworth.
3. 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: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>: RUMSCH 2<sup>nd</sup>: BONAPARTE**

Mr. Rumsch moved to approve this application, as submitted, with the condition that staff will review and approve the following items as per guidelines 8.9 – Accessory Buildings. The planting on the two sides of the rear yard, the rear fenestrations, lowering the roof connection at the breezeway and architectural detail to match the existing house

**VOTE:** 8/3

**AYES:** BONAPARTE, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN, PHARES, RUMSCH

**NAYS:** JORDAN, PARATI, WALKER

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

BARTH

MR. RUMSCH RECUSED HIMSELF FROM THE NEXT APPLICATION.

**APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2019-00726, 2015 DILWORTH ROAD EAST - ADDITION**

*This application was continued from the January 15, 2020 meeting for the following items:*

*Front and Side Porch*

- *Restudy requested on front porches on Dutch Colonials*
- *6.2, provide more information on setbacks of neighbor's houses and front porches*
- *6.15, use historic materials for siding, front porch, and steps*
- *5.2, number 6, use round columns that match existing*
- *Provide more information on fenestration details on the side porch*
- *Provide information for what is under the vinyl and aluminum siding*

Site Work

- All walkway changes to be reviewed by staff.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a two-story Dutch Colonial Revival house constructed in 1926. Architectural features include a symmetrical, three-bay front façade, 8/8 and 6/6 double-hung wood windows with functional shutters, and a small engaged arched portico above the front door. The first story and chimney are unpainted brick and, with the exception of the original round wood columns, all wood features on the house (siding, trim, etc.) are wrapped in vinyl and aluminum. The original one-story side porch located on the left elevation has been screened since prior to Dilworth's designation a local historic district.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is the addition of a full-width front porch and the enclosure of an existing side porch on the left elevation.

Front porch: floor proposed to be bluestone with brick rowlock; 10" square Miratec columns. Size to be 36'-11" wide and 8' deep. A new 5' wide walkway connecting the new front porch to the existing driveway is also proposed.



Side porch: No change to footprint and brick foundation to remain. New flooring, replacement roof to match existing. New 10" square Miratec columns to replace the original round wood columns. Windows are wood with exterior muntins. Hardie tongue and groove siding proposed.

*Revised Proposal – March 11, 2020*

- Examples of front porches on Dutch Colonial-style houses
- Provides information on setbacks of neighbor's houses
- Historic materials proposed for siding, windows, side porch
- Round columns to match existing
- Fenestration details on side porch added

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

Front Porch:

1. Bluestone front porch material. Installation of bluestone on a front porch and front steps was recently denied for 1915 Ewing by the HDC on May 8, 2019.
  - a. Traditional material would be broken terracotta or concrete with a brick row-lock.
2. Existing siding is wrapped with vinyl/aluminum. New siding on ends of porch roof is proposed to be vinyl/aluminum to match existing.
3. 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: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>: HINDMAN 2<sup>nd</sup>: JORDAN**

Ms. Hindman moved to approve this application as drawn, with staff to review and approve the floor of the finished porch. Applicant will confirm that the siding material will match the existing historic siding material.

**VOTE:** 10/0

**AYES:** BONAPARTE, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI, PHARES, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

---

**NEW CASES**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

BARTH

MR. RUMSCH RETURNED TO THE MEETING AT 3:12 PM.

**APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2020-00096, 901 MT. VERNON AVENUE – ADDITION/ACCESSORY STRUCTURE**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a two-story brick Colonial Revival constructed in 1938. Architectural features include side gable roof with pent eaves, 6/6 double-hung windows, arched recessed front entry with decorative fanlight and sidelights. The windows on the side elevations and the first-level of the front elevation all have an arched brick header detail. Lot size is approximately 75' x 175'. Adjacent structures are 1.5, 2 and 2.5 story single family buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is in two parts:

1. Main House: Addition of a decorative hood over the front door. The structure will be installed to follow the brick arch. Materials are western red cedar and copper. The structure is completely reversible.
2. Accessory Building:  
Footprint: 23'-10" x 25'-1'  
Height: 20'-8"  
Materials: wood lap siding, wood corner boards, wood windows and trim, brick foundation, standing seam metal roof.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Is the new accessory building an addition to the existing garage or a completely new structure?
2. Garage door material?
3. Rear yard open space calculations.
4. 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: APPROVE**

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

Ms. Hindman moved to approve this application as submitted.

**VOTE:** 7/4

**AYES:** BONAPARTE, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN, PHARES,

**NAYS:** JORDAN, PARATI, RUMSCH, WALKER

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURE APPROVED.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

BARTH

**APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2020-00107, 601 WEST KINGSTON, 601 WEST BOULEVARD, 541 WEST WORTHINGTON AVENUE – ALTERNATE MATERIALS**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The new construction of multi-family buildings was approved by the HDC March 14, 2018 on the north site. The south site construction was approved on August 8, 2018. Approved materials include brick and decorative areas (trim bands, cornice) of GFRC.

**PROPOSAL:**

The applicant is proposing to use a thin-coat of EIFS applied over brick instead of the GRFC.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

The Commission will determine if the proposed material is not incongruous with the district.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION: CONTINUE**

**1<sup>st</sup>: RUMSCH 2<sup>nd</sup>: HENNINGSON**

Mr. Rumsch moved to continue this application so the applicant can provide a mockup detail on the existing brick building, above the first-floor window and porch entry area; to show the details that were specified and to show the water proofing detail.

**VOTE:** 11/0

**AYES:** BONAPARTE, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN,  
PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ALTERNATE MATERIAL CONTINUED.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

BARTH

MR. HENNINGSON RECUSED HIMSELF FROM THE NEXT APPLICATION.

**APPLICATION:** HDCRMI 2020-00046, 1520 THOMAS AVENUE – TREE REMOVAL (AFTER-THE-FACT)

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The property is a one-story Craftsman bungalow constructed c. 1935. Architectural features include a partial width front porch with a gable roof supported by brick piers and square wood columns, 4/1 cottage-style windows, and the original front door and sidelights in the same design as the windows, and brackets. The entire house is wrapped in vinyl and aluminum. Lot size is approximately 75' x 87'. There are three large, mature canopy trees on the property (not including the street tree). Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5 story single family buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal to remove a mature tree in the front yard. The tree was leaning slightly and measured approximately +/- 10" diameter. A new maple tree planted in the front yard is proposed as a replacement.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. The Commission shall determine if the tree should be removed and a new tree(s) planted.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

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

Ms. Walker moved to approve the removal of the ten-inch caliper tree due to the tree's leaning and unhealthy shape and replace that tree with an Oak of the homeowner's choice of a two-inch caliper, and in lieu of planting the required additional trees, the homeowner will use the funds to shore up the trees on his property.

**VOTE:** 10/0

**AYES:** BONAPARTE, HADEN, HINDMAN, JORDAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN,  
PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR TREE REMOVAL APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

BARTH

MR. HENNINGSON RETURNED TO THE MEETING AT 4:19 PM.

**APPLICATION:** HDCRMI 2020-00099, 1547 MERRIMAN AVENUE – WINDOW REPLACEMENT

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1-story, brick American Small House with Colonial Revival elements constructed in 1940. Architectural features include 6/6 wood windows, a partial-width engaged front porch supported by square wood columns, wood vent details, and a brick chimney. The lot size is approximately 50' x 117'.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is to replace the original 6/6 double-hung wood windows. The proposed new windows will be double-hung, aluminum clad windows, 6/6 windows.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. Is this a sash-kit only replacement? Will the existing wood trim on the windows be repaired or replaced?
2. 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: CONTINUE**

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

Ms. Parati moved to continue this application for more information.

**VOTE:** 11/0

**AYES:** BONAPARTE, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN,  
PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR WINDOW REPLACEMENT CONTINUED.

---

MR. PHARES MOVED TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 11, 2019, HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES. MS. PARATI SECONDED AND THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.

MR. HADEN ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 4:40 PM.

LINDA KEICH  
CLERK TO THE BOARD