




---

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REMOTE ONLINE MEETING**  
**September 9, 2020, ROOM 280 + WebEx**

**MINUTES**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Ms. Kim Parati (Chairperson)  
 Mr. PJ Henningson (Vice Chairperson)  
 Ms. Jessica Hindman (2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chairperson)  
 Mr. Chris Barth  
 Ms. Nichelle Bonaparte  
 Mr. Jim Haden  
 Ms. Christa Lineberger  
 Mr. Chris Muryn  
 Mr. Damon Rumsch  
 Ms. Jill Walker

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Mr. Jim Jordan

**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, Chairperson Parati called the September 9<sup>th</sup> Remote Online Historic District Commission Meeting to order at 1:07 pm. Chairperson Parati began the meeting by introducing the Staff, the Commissioners, and explaining the meeting's procedure. Participants in today's evidentiary hearings were required to submit a copy of any presentation, document, exhibit or other material that they wished to submit at the evidentiary hearing prior to today's meeting. All such materials, as well as a copy of City staff's presentations and documents, were posted online prior to today's meeting. No case is proceeding today in which anyone contacted the City to object to the hybrid meeting platform. The review of each application consists of the Presentation of the application and Deliberation: The application is presented by the HDC staff. The Commission will first determine if there is enough information to proceed with the hearing. The applicant will present their testimony for the application. Other parties wishing to speak, for or against, will be given reasonable time to present factual sworn testimony based on the HDC Design Guidelines. The HDC may question the applicant and HDC staff members. HDC staff and the applicant will be given an opportunity for rebuttal and final comments. The HDC shall close the hearing for discussion and deliberation. During discussion and deliberation only the

Commission and staff may speak. An HDC member may request the hearing to be opened for further questioning. The HDC will craft a motion for Approval, Continuation, or Denial. The majority vote of the Commission present is required for a decision to be reached. A final vote by the HDC will end the hearing. Chairperson Parati asked that the following guidelines be followed during the meeting; mute your audio when you're not speaking. Use only one source of audio (computer or phone), do not put your phone on hold, make sure you are in a quiet area, please turn off or silent electronic devices and do not speak over the person talking or you will be asked to leave the meeting, use the "raise your hand" tool. Please do not speak unless recognized by the Chair or Staff. Because the Commission is a quasi-judicial body, any speaker FOR or AGAINST an application must be sworn in. Due to the hybrid nature of today's proceedings, any individual wishing to speak for or against an application was asked to sign-up and provide any additional evidence in advance of the meeting. During the hearing Chairperson Parati will further open the floor to anyone who has joined the meeting by telephone. When it is your turn to speak, please begin by stating your name and address. Chairperson Parati swore in all Applicants and Staff and continued to swear in people as they arrived for the duration of the meeting.

**INDEX OF ADDRESSES:**

**MOTION REVIEW**

HDCRMA 2020-00166, 404 W. Park Avenue Wilmore

**CONSENT AGENDA**

HDCRMI 2020-00263, 500 E. Kingston Avenue Dilworth  
 HDCCMI 2020-00507, 2010 The Plaza Plaza Midwood

**CONTINUED JULY**

HDCRMA 2019-00762, 1028 Isleworth Avenue Dilworth

**CONTINUED AUGUST**

HDCRMA 2019-00748, 201 Grandin Road Wesley Heights  
 HDCRMI 2020-00099, 1547 Merriman Avenue Wilmore

**NEW CASES**

HDCRMA 2020-00266, 509 E. Tremont Avenue Dilworth  
 HDCRDEMO 2020-00262, 1418 Lexington Avenue Dilworth  
 HDCRMI 2020-00264, 333 W. 9<sup>th</sup> Street Fourth Ward  
 HDCCMI 2020-00324, 1513-1521 S. Mint Street Wilmore  
 HDCRMI 2020-00312, 604 S. Summit Avenue Wesley Heights  
 HDCRMI 2020-00277, 1106 E. Worthington Avenue Dilworth  
 HDCRMI 2020-00316, 1730 Thomas Avenue Plaza Midwood  
 HDCRMA 2020-00311, 216 S. Summit Avenue Wesley Heights

---

**MOTION REVIEW**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

**ABSENT:** JORDAN

MR. HENNINGSON RECUSED HIMSELF FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.  
MS. WALKER RECUSED HERSELF FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA 2020-00166, 404 W. PARK AVENUE – ADDITION**

*This project was originally approved with conditions at the July 29<sup>th</sup>, 2020 Special Called Meeting. Please see below for the original motion and review motion.*

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing property one story Craftsman bungalow constructed c. 1931. Architectural features include a clip gables on the main roof and front porch roof with shingle siding, brackets, triple ganged windows, front door with sidelights, wood lap siding with corner boards. Lot size is approximately 50' x 150'. Adjacent structures are one- and two-story single-family houses.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is a rear addition. The existing ridge measures 19'-3" and will not be raised. The addition will tie in behind the original ridge and will be approximately 3'-6" taller than the original house. A window on the right elevation will be removed to create a side-entry door. 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, or aluminum clad, windows in a 1/1 pattern to match existing. Flush-mount skylights are proposed for the rear elevation. An at-grade, concrete-set brick patio is also proposed. Post-construction the rear-yard impermeable area will be 42.2%. No trees will be impacted by this project.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

1. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Ms. Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**

**1st: MURYN 2nd: BONAPARTE**

Mr. Muryn moved to approve this application with the conditions, citing 7.2 of our Guidelines: have the right -side elevation with the new addition moving back one foot from the existing elevation.

**VOTE:** 9/0

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.  
REVIEW OF MOTION – SEPTEMBER 9<sup>TH</sup>, 2020

**MOTION REVIEW: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**

**1st: MURYN 2nd: BONAPARTE**

Mr. Muryn moved to approve this project for meeting the guidelines for additions 7.2 with a note that the original vertical corner boards on the rear corners of the structure

are to remain to mark the transition of the original house and the new addition on both the left and right-side elevations. On the right elevation, the difference between the original house and the new addition should also be visible in plan. In order to see this move in plan and more clearly in perspective, please offset new construction 12 inches inside that of the original wall.

**VOTE:** 8/0

**AYES:** BONAPARTE, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI, RUMSCH,  
HADEN, BARTH

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

---

**CONSENT AGENDA**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

**ABSENT:** JORDAN

MS. WALKER RETURNED TO THE MEETING FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.

MR. HENNINGSON RETURNED TO THE MEETING FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI 2020-00263, 500 E. KINGSTON AVENUE– ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing building is a 2.5 story Italianate Revival constructed in 1910. Architectural features include a high hip roof with shed dormer, dentil and bracket cornice and frieze board, a one-story front porch with Doric columns, heavy railing and applied frieze with triglyphs and medallions. Lot size is approximately 50 x 150. Adjacent structures are 1.5 and 2-story single family buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is to change and slightly expand 1988/2002 rear open porch addition. The design of the proposed porch incorporates architectural details (columns, beam, trim, etc.) of the house. The project does not include any changes to existing window/door openings. The existing French doors will be updated but the openings will not change. There are no other changes proposed to existing window/door openings. An existing shed will be removed, and the fence will be reconstructed to match existing. Post-construction the rear yard will be 37.16% impermeable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Additions, 7.2
2. All landscaping and site features (walkways, fences, shed removal, 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 rear porch 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.
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 Ms. Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION: APPROVED**                    **1<sup>st</sup>: HADEN**    **2<sup>nd</sup>: BARTH**

Mr. Haden moved to approve this application for meeting 7.2 of our Guidelines for additions.

**VOTE:** 10/0

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

**ABSENT:** JORDAN

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCCMI 2020-00507, 2010 THE PLAZA– LANDSCAPE AND SITE IMPROVEMENTS**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The property at 2010 The Plaza is the Van Landingham Estate is a designated local historic landmark. The four-acre property has two accessory buildings with dense landscaping. In 2019, the Commission approved an access ramp and staff approved minor changes to windows and doors on a previous addition to the house, and a new at-grade patio area.

**PROPOSAL**

The project is the construction of a new parking area at the rear of the house. The parking area will be pea gravel to match the existing parking areas in front of the house and is completely reversible. No trees are proposed for removal. According to the applicant, the parking area is a temporary solution to accommodate the tenant at the VanLandingham Estate. When plans for the additional commercial buildings are brought to the Commission, the applicant intends to come back to the Commission with a parking master plan for the entire site, which may include a re-design of this parking area.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Sidewalks and Parking, 8.2.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the parking area 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 Ms. Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION: APPROVED**

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

Ms. Bonaparte moved to approve this application for being in accordance with Guidelines 8.3 nonresidential projects.

**VOTE:** 10/0

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR LANDSCAPE AND SITE IMPROVEMENTS APPROVED.

---

CONTINUED FROM JULY

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

**ABSENT:** JORDAN

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA 2019-00762, 1028 ISLEWORTH AVENUE– ADDITION**

**This application as continued from the July 8, 2020 meeting for the following item:**

- **Trees.** Provide a tree protection plan for the mature trees in the rear yard and provide documentation on the status of the trees proposed for removal.
- **Rear Yard.** Provide documentation on the HVAC with screening; provide information on the percentage of the historic rear yard and permeability post construction.
- **Portico.** Per guideline 4.8, the portico columns should remain round. Review the height of the portico and railing which are too tall and out of proportion to the front door.
- **Side porch.** Per guidelines 6.5; 6.10; 4.8, numbers 5 and 6; and 2.5- Federal guidelines, review and address issues with fenestration, rhythm, materials, the enclosure of the side porch, the massing, and preserve the reading of the historic side porch.
- **Addition.** Per guideline 7.2, numbers 2, 3, 5, and 6; guideline 6.10, numbers 3 and 4; guideline 6.5; guideline 4.7, ensure that there's formality in the fenestration and the rhythm of the addition, provide a sample of brick, align the window head height, address the massing and assure compatibility, and review the trim.
- **Fenestration.** Re-study the fenestration once the massing is addressed because once the massing is addressed, that will fundamentally change the approach to the fenestration.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a two-story, Colonial Revival House constructed c. 1930. The house has a few minimal Colonial Revival elements visible in the side gable eave returns, gable end chimney, and the

symmetrical façade. There is a one-story rear ell, and a one-bay, one-story side porch projection, which has been enclosed with windows to create a sunroom. Exterior material is unpainted brick. A two-car frame garage is located behind the house. Lot size is 55' x 200'. Surrounding structures are one- and two-story single-family buildings.

### **PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project has multiple elements, including:

1. Front portico design change.
2. A second-level addition to the existing one-story side porch projection.
3. Rear addition. Details and materials to match existing.
4. Request to paint the entire exterior of the house.
5. Demolition of the existing garage.
6. Construction of a new two-bay brick garage – may be eligible for Administrative review due to location.
7. Replacement shutters on the front elevation –eligible for Administrative review.

#### *Revised Proposal – July 8, 2020*

- *Front Elevation: portico re-designed*
- *Right Elevation: Window placement on original house is shown to remain. Fireplace on addition changed to interior only with vent shown*
- *Left Elevation: Roof redesign on the side porch addition*
- *Rear Elevation: Roof height lowered*
- *Information provided about footprint dimensions of surrounding structures*
- *Additional information provided about converting the side porch to heated square footage*
- *Request to paint brick and replace original wood windows has been rescinded*

#### *Revised Proposal – September 9, 2020*

- *Trees shown on site plan and tree protection plan provided*
- *HVAC units shown on site plan and first floor plan*
- *Rear yard permeability calculations provided*
- *Front portico columns are round*
- *Side porch design changed*
- *Rear addition massing changed*
- *Fenestration changed*

### **STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Material details needed: siding specifications including manufacturer and dimensions, window material/manufacturer, etc.
2. Minor changes may be approved by staff.

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

Ms. Alicia Stack, adjacent property owner, spoke in opposition of this project.

**MOTION: CONTINUED**

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

Ms. Hindman moved to continue this application for the following:

- Trees – Trees that will remain need an adequate protection plan, including a site plan map. The trees to be removed need formal documentation from a certified arborist's analysis.
- Rear yard – Screening at the HVAC units. Historic rear yard calculations to staff to include the future garage.
- Portico – No comment
- Side porch – the second story massing is not approvable as drawn. It does not meet Guidelines 6.5; 6.10; 4.8, numbers 5 and 6 and 2.5. More detail is required for the expression of the columns and beams at the historic side porch.
- Addition – More detail is required for the brick compatibility for head jam, sill and corner board details with material specification.
- Fenestration – The I and H windows are to match the historic size and light proportion of the small historic window on the front of the second story elevation. The rear elevation doors, STDL must match the proportion of the historic windowpane.
- Shutters – The shutters at the front elevation at the cluster windows are to be reviewed by staff.
- Specific material specifications, including, but not limited to the siding, windows and brick. Provide an exhibit that shows the proposed brick against the brick of the house and include dimensions.

**VOTE:** 10/0

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.

---

**CONTINUED FROM AUGUST**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

**ABSENT:** JORDAN

**APPLICATION:**

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

*This application as continued from the August 12, 2020 meeting for the following items:*

- *Windows:*
  - *Do not replace original windows per guidelines 4.14, numbers 1, 2, and 3.*
  - *Add a stone casing around the casement windows that flank the stained glass.*
  - *For the windows above the stained-glass windows, restudy the windows to move from a paired window to a single.*
  - *Provide a window protection plan for the stained-glass windows.*
  - *Provide more detail on the space between the stained-glass windows and the side lights.*
  - *Restudy the of the light pattern of the side lights that flank the stained-glass windows and a restudy.*
- *Roof:*
  - *Restudy the balcony location and retain a portion of the original roof and railing.*



- *Include a three-dimensional model that shows the pedestrian viewpoint from the street level.*
- *On the rear elevation, do not add the brick pilaster detail.*
- *On the new construction, restudy the balcony structure, specifically that the wood angle braces are out of character.*
- *On the site plan, add the HVAC location, locations of the trash and the screening detail and any fencing, etc.*
- *New drawings need to accurately reflect the building and what's being proposed.*

**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*

*Revised Proposal – August 12, 2020*

- *Historic windows retained on both right and left elevations*
- *Main entry moved to ground level on right elevation*
- *Roof changes on left elevation*

*Revised Proposal – September 9, 2020*

- *Original windows to remain*
- *Stone casing added around casement windows that flank the stained glass and light pattern changed*
- *Size of windows changed above stained-glass windows*

- *Balcony design changed and three-dimension model from pedestrian viewpoint provided*
- *Balcony structure on new building changed from wood to metal*
- *HVAC, trash cans located on site plan*

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Label size (footprint) of the addition building on plans.
2. Label dimensions of porch supports on addition.
3. Window protection plan for stained glass windows needed.
4. Minor changes may be approved by staff (porch support dimensions, window protection plan, etc.)

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Ms. Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS                      1<sup>st</sup>: HENNINGSON   2<sup>nd</sup>: HADEN**

Mr. Henningson moved to approve this application with conditions. Provide staff with details on the window protection plan, details on screening for the trash with height and material, change the light pattern on the windows above the stained-glass windows make them six-light pattern with vertical expression over horizontal. Update the drawings to show the cross remains on the front elevation.

**VOTE:** 10/0

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION/FENESTRATION CHANGES APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

**NEW CASE**

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

**ABSENT:** JORDAN

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA 2020-00266, 509 E. TREMONT AVENUE– NEW CONSTRUCTION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is one-story Craftsman bungalow constructed in 1915. Architectural features include a side gable roof with a front gable porch supported by brick columns, original 8/1 wood windows, wood shake shingle siding brackets. Height is approximately 21.2'. Lot size is approximately 50' x 150'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5 story single-family homes. The building is listed as a contributing to the Dilworth National Register Historic District. On February 12, 2020, the HDC placed a 365-day stay of demolition on the property (HDCRDEMO-2019-00795).

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is new construction of a single-family structure and detached single-car garage. The new single-family structure will be sited in approximately the same location as the current house. Proposed height: the primary ridge is proposed at 1.5' taller than the historic house and the secondary ridge has a total height as measured from grade to ridge of 25.9'. Proposed materials for both the house and garage include individual cedar shakes with a 7" exposure, wood trim, wood tongue and groove front porch floor and aluminum clad windows with Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL). One 17" Black Walnut Tree will be removed, and replanting is proposed.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Minor changes may be approved by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Ms. Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION: APPROVED**

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

Mr. Henningson moved to approve this application as drawn as it meets the guidelines for new construction.

**VOTE:** 10/0

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED.

---

**CONTINUED FROM AUGUST**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

**ABSENT:** JORDAN

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI 2020-00099, 1547 MERRIMAN AVENUE– REPLACEMENT WINDOWS**

*This application as continued from the August 12, 2020 meeting for the following item:  
Provide additional information documenting the existing conditions of all windows, which should be undertaken by a reputable company/contractor to evaluate all windows on a case-by-case basis to determine which ones can be repaired versus replaced.*

**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 6/6 windows.

*Revised Proposal – August 12, 2020*

- *Additional photo documentation of windows provided.*

*Revised Proposal – September 9, 2020*

- *The Stringer Company will attend the meeting to discuss the condition of the windows.*

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about 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 Ms. Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**                      **1<sup>st</sup>: HENNINGSON 2<sup>nd</sup>: HADEN**

Mr. Henningson moved to approve this application for the reason, the applicant reached out to numerous professionals for their opinion on the state of the windows and that they are beyond repair. A request for staff, to help the applicant on the correct windows to use as replacements.

Mr. Barth made a friendly amendment applicant to match size, light pattern and STDL grilles for the replacement windows.

**VOTE:** 10/0

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR WINDOW REPLACEMENT APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

---

**NEW CASE**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

**ABSENT:** JORDAN

**APPLICATION:**

## **HDCRDEMO 2020-00262, 1418 LEXINGTON AVENUE– DEMOLITION**

### **EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

Known as the Morgan B. Gilreath house, the existing structure 1.5 story, brick American Small House with Colonial Revival elements constructed in 1942. Architectural features include a front bay window and a lower side wing which contains the entry. Exterior material is brick (painted) and wood lap siding in the gable ends. The building still retains its original front door and original 6/6 windows. Lot size is measures approximately 75' x 145' x 58' x 164'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5 story single-family homes. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Dilworth National Register Historic District.

### **PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is full demolition of the building. The applicant is requesting approval for immediate demolition and a waiver of the 365-day delay. The following information is presented for the Commission's review and consideration:

- Digital photos of all sides of building
- Digital photos of significant architectural details
- Property survey
- Zoutewelle survey

### **STAFF ANALYSIS:**

1. The Commission will determine if the application is complete.
2. The Commission will determine whether the building has special significance to the Dilworth Local Historic District. With affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to a 365-Day Stay of Demolition.
3. If the Commission determines that this property does not have any special significance to the district, then demolition may take place without a delay or upon the approval of new construction plans.

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

No one accepted Ms. Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

### **MOTION 1: APPLICATION COMPLETE**

Ms. Parati confirmed the application is complete. The Commission collectively approved.

### **MOTION 2: APPROVED**

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

Mr. Haden moved to determine the building has special significance and value toward maintaining the character of Dilworth local Historic District because of the year of construction and architectural style.

**VOTE:** 10/0

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

**NAYS:** NONE

### **MOTION 3: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**

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

Mr. Haden moved to approve the demolition with a 365 day stay due to its special significance and value toward maintaining the character of the district. The receipt of accurate measured drawings of the

building to be demolished are required for HDC records before plans for new construction will be considered by this commission.

**VOTE:** 10/0

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION APPROVED WITH 365 DAY STAY.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

**ABSENT:** JORDAN

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI 2020-00264, 333 W. 9<sup>th</sup> STREET– ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing building 2-story Victorian constructed c. 1910. The building has very few distinctive architectural features besides the front door and trim, and what it once had has either been replaced (ex. the original 2/2 windows) or covered up (ex. the original wood siding and trim band between the siding and the gables). Adjacent structures are 1.5 and 2-story single-family and commercial buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal includes two porch additions and material changes. On the front elevation a second level porch is proposed. An existing window opening will also be changed to a door to access the porch. On the rear elevation, an inset area will be filled in with a two-story porch. The project also includes removal of the aluminum siding and trim and replacement with new beveled wood siding and trim, except for the gables on all four elevations in which fish scale wood shingles are proposed.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Front Elevation Porch Changes
  1. This is a simple vernacular Victorian. A second level front porch as proposed is incongruous with both the architecture of the original house and of Victorian architecture in general. In addition, there does not appear to be any other examples of this type of second level front porch in the Fourth Ward historic district.
  2. Applicable Secretary of the Interiors Standards: #1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9 and 10.
2. Rear Elevation Porch Changes
  3. No concerns. This portion of the project appears to be not incongruous with the house or the Fourth Ward district.
3. Siding/Trim Changes

- This is a simple vernacular Victorian. Incorporation of high-style element such as the fish-scale siding in the gables is incongruous with the architecture of the original house and the other similar Victorian structures within the Fourth Ward District (ex: 529 N. Poplar Street).
- Removal of the metal siding is encouraged; however, the original wood siding should be retained and repaired, rather than replaced.
- Applicable Secretary of the Interiors Standards: #1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9 and 10.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION 1: DENIED**                      **1<sup>st</sup>: HADEN**   **2<sup>nd</sup>: RUMSCH**

Mr. Haden moved to deny the second story front porch, removal of historic siding, and the use of fish scale siding without evidence of it being there previously.

**VOTE:** 10/0

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR FRONT ADDITION DENIED.

**MOTION 2: APPROVED**                      **1<sup>st</sup>: HADEN**   **2<sup>nd</sup>: RUMSCH**

Mr. Haden moved to approve the rear two story porch addition as designed.

**VOTE:** 10/0

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR REAR ADDITION APPROVED.

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

**ABSENT:** JORDAN

MR. BARTH LEFT THE MEETING AT 5:11PM AND WAS ABSENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.

MS. WALKER LEFT THE MEETING AT 5:11PM AND WAS ABSENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCCMI 2020-00324, 1513, 1515, 1521 S. MINT STREET – COMMERCIAL BUILDING REHABILITATION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing properties are connected brick Industrial/Commercial buildings. 1513 was constructed c. 1927 and 1515 was constructed c. 1946.

1513 is a three-bay building. Material is brick running bond (painted) with a parapet roof with decorative soldier course brick at the roofline and above the storefront openings. Most of the original storefront openings have been infilled over the years with a combination of glass block and wood paneling. The transom windows over the left and center bays appear to retain the original metal windows framed in wood trim. The three signage spaces appear to be later additions. The rear third of the building appears to be a later addition. The lot size is approximately 50' x 150'.

1515 is four-bay building with smaller storefront windows, recessed front entry, and a garage bay. Material is brick common bond, painted. A soldier course of inset brick runs the length of the building above the windows and doors giving the storefront a modified tripartite design. The top third of the building has inset header bricks that form a rectangle across all four bays, likely originally intended as an area for signage. The lot size is approximately 50' x 150'.

1521 is a vacant gravel lot used for parking. Adjacent structures are commercial buildings, parking lots and single family residential to the rear along Westwood Avenue and Wickford Place.

***On September 11, 2019, the Commission approved fenestration changes, existing windows storefronts and doors, painted brick, restoration of historic transom windows, parking area improvements, and the demolition of a non-historic rear addition at 1513 S. Mint. The approval did not include signage, murals, awnings, or lighting.***

**PROPOSAL:**

1513 S. Mint Street

- Rear Addition. A clerestory addition of 3'-2" will be added to the rear portion of the building to allow for natural light and proper roof drainage at the addition. The height is no higher than the top of the adjacent building's barrel roof.
- Lighting.
- No changes to front elevation.

1515 S. Mint Street

- East Elevation – storefront window and door changes.
- No change to front elevation.
- South Elevation – new door and canopy removed.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Minor changes may be approved by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Ms. Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION: APPROVED/CONTINUED**

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

Mr. Henningson moved to approve the lighting because it is not incongruous with the district. We move to continue the application for accurate drawings and more detail on the clerestory, fenestration changes, awnings and murals. Including dimensions for everything and materials. Show side by side of what your changing, what is there today and what you propose.



Mr. Haden made a friendly amendment to have a comparison of what is original/existing, to what was originally approved, and what the applicant is asking for now in the way of fenestration changes, opening changes, and the clerestory.

**VOTE:** 8/0

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR LIGHTING APPROVED AND ADDITION CONTINUED.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

**ABSENT:** JORDAN, WALKER, BARTH  
MS. PARATI RECUSED HERSELF FROM THE NEXT APPLICATION.

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI 2020-00312, 604 SUMMIT AVENUE– ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a one-story American Small House with colonial revival details constructed in 1937. Architectural features include a symmetrical three-bay façade with thin, paired columns supporting an arched portico, clipped gable ends, and 6/1 windows. Adjacent structures are a mix of one- and two-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

Currently, the front porch patio is only partial width located under the center portico and on the right of the portico. The project would expand the existing front porch patio to the left to span all three-bays of the house. The project also includes the addition of hip roofs supported by thin paired columns over both the left and right patio areas to create a full-width front porch. All materials and details are to be traditional in design and dimension to match existing.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The proposal is similar to a previously approved front porch additions at 318 Grandin Rd (November 2019), 429 West Blvd (May 2019), and 1910 Ewing Drive (2016).
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Ms. Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION: APPROVED 1st: HINDMAN 2nd: LINEBERGER**

Ms. Hindman moved to approve this application as drawn as it meets guideline 6.14 for Porches.

**VOTE:** 7/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, HADEN, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER,  
HENNINGSON, PARATI

NAYS: NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED..

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

**ABSENT:** JORDAN, WALKER, BARTH

MS. PARATI RETURNED TO THE MEETING AT 6:11PM.

MS. LINEBERGER LEFT THE MEETING AT 6:11PM AND WAS ABSENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI 2020-00277, 1106 E. WORTHINGTON AVENUE-- ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1.5 story Tudor Revival brick cottage constructed c. 1930. Architectural features include an asymmetrical façade with a large chimney and pair of façade gables one of which contains an arched entry with keystones and the other a diamond pane window, steep-side gables with stucco accents, 6/1 double-hung wood windows, and a one-story rear ell. Lot size is approximately 60' x 155'. Adjacent structures are a mix of one- and two-story residential buildings. A rear screen porch addition, window restoration, retaining wall and front walk repairs were approved at the staff level under COA# HDCADMRM-2020-00278.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is for a dormer addition, changing wood vents to windows in the gables on the left and right elevations, and window replacement. The proposed dormer is slightly taller than the side gable on right elevation but ties in beneath the main ridge of the house.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Dormer:
  - a. Recommend ganged windows with mullion trim, instead of single windows to better fit the design of the house. Nearly all the windows on the house are paired with mullion trim.
  - b. Roof pitch
2. Vent Changes: Recommend diamond pane windows (either fixed or casement) to match the small similarly sized windows on the front elevation.

3. Replacement Windows: The issue appears to be with deteriorated trim elements (brick mould, etc.) rather than deteriorated window sashes.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Ms. Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION 1: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

**1st: HINDMAN 2nd: RUMSCH**

Ms. Hindman moved to approve this application with conditions per Guidelines 4.5, number 3, the dormer should be a shed dormer and the three windows ought to be clustered as a trio. Staff to review the dormer roof pitch.

**VOTE:** 7/0

**AYES:** BONAPARTE, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MURYN,  
PARATI, RUMSCH

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

**MOTION 2: CONTINUED**

**1st: HENNINGSON 2nd: HADEN**

Mr. Henningson moved we would like to continue the application for the replacement of windows based on guidelines 4.14, number 1, 2, 3. We are asking the applicant to bring back reputable contractor or business, organization to prove that the windows are beyond repair and support with photographic evidence that the windows are in fact beyond repair.

**VOTE:** 7/0

**AYES:** BONAPARTE, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MURYN,  
PARATI, RUMSCH

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR WINDOW REPLACEMENT CONTINUED.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

**ABSENT:** JORDAN, WALKER, BARTH, LINEBERGER

MR. RUMSCH LEFT THE MEETING AT 6:44PM AND WAS ABSENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI 2020-00316, 1730 THOMAS AVENUE-- ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a one-story, Craftsman bungalow constructed c. 1930. The building was originally a duplex and has transitioned into a single-family residence. Architectural features include stucco and timber trim in the gables, 4/1 wood windows, and an unpainted brick exterior. An accessory building measuring approximately 18' x 18' and height of approximately 13'-9" is located at the rear of

the lot. Lot size is approximately 50' x 150'. Surrounding structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single family and multi-family buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is the rehabilitation of and additions to a historic accessory building. Post-construction the rear yard will be 62% permeable. The additions are in two parts:

1. The existing garage is 18' deep and will be expanded to a depth of 22' to allow it to function as a one-car garage. The addition will extend the existing face of the garage, reproducing the original façade. No changes to height are proposed.
2. Addition toward the primary structure. The addition will be glass with steel frame windows and cedar lap siding. The height of the addition is proposed at 10'-3", which is lower than the garage's primary ridge.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The project meets the Secretary of the Interiors Standards, the HDC Guidelines for Accessory Buildings and Additions, and is not incongruous with the site or neighborhood.
2. Minor changes may be approved by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

Mr. Rumsch, adjacent property owner, spoke in favor of this application.

**MOTION: APPROVED**

**1st: HINDMAN 2nd: HADEN**

Ms. Hindman moved to approve this application as submitted for compliance with 8.9 Accessory Buildings and the Secretary of Interior Standards

**VOTE:** 6/0

AYES: BONAPARTE, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MURYN, PARATI,

NAYS: NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ACCESSOTY STRUCTURE APPROVED.

---

**APPLICATION: HDCRMA 2020-00311, 216 S. SUMMIT AVE – NEW CONSTRUCTION**  
**Application deferred to next meeting due to time constraints.**

---

Ms. Parati adjourned the meeting at 7:00 PM  
Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission