



**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REMOTE ONLINE MEETING
Meeting November 18, 2020, ROOM 280 + WebEx**

MINUTES

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Vacant

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
 Mr. Thomas Powers, Assistant City Attorney
 Ms. Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

With a quorum present, Chairperson Parati called the November 18th remote online Historic District Commission Meeting to order at 1:13 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 remote, online 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:

CONSENT AGENDA

HDCRMI 2020-00534, 1711 Merriman Avenue

Wilmore

NOT HEARD OCTOBER

HDCRMI 2020-00356, 712 E. Tremont Avenue

Dilworth

HDCRMI 2019-00823, 821 Walnut Avenue

Wesley Heights

HDCRMA 2020-00467, 2010 The Plaza

Plaza Midwood

CONTINUED

HDCRMA 2020-00311, 216 S. Summit Avenue

Wesley Heights

NEW CASES

HDCRMA 2020-00471, 1141 Linganore Place

Dilworth

HDCRMI 2020-00210, 1827 Ewing Avenue

Dilworth

HDCRMA 2020-00479, 1901 S. Mint Street

Wilmore

HDCRMA 2020-00501, 628 Woodruff Place

Wesley Heights

HDCRMI 2020-00511, 1620 Dilworth Road E.

Dilworth

HDCRMI 2020-00396, 629 Berkeley Avenue

Dilworth

HDCRMI 2020-00464, 1515 Wilmore Drive

Wilmore

HDCRMI 2020-00533, 1930 Lennox Avenue

Dilworth

CONSENT AGENDA

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00534, 1711 MERRIMAN AVENUE (PID: 11909519) – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one-story house constructed in 1946. The house appears to be a blend of cottage and Bungalow design. Architectural features include a front gable roof, two brick chimneys, 6/6 wood windows and a partial width front porch with a hipped roof supported by brick piers and battered columns. Existing brick piers and chimneys are not painted. The foundation is concrete block. Siding material is asbestos shingle, which is believed to be original to the house, some of which are broken, cracked, or missing. An infilled rear porch has Masonite siding. Lot dimensions are approximately 50' x 170'. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single family houses.

PROPOSAL:

- The proposed project is the addition of two small dormers on the left and right elevations. The dormers end beneath the main ridge and are inset from the walls on the main level. On the left elevation the chimney will remain, and the dormer will be constructed around it. New siding and windows will match materials already approved.
- A rear addition, replacement windows, alternative materials, and other rehabilitation work was approved under COA# HDCADMRM-2019-00359. A new rear yard fence was approved administratively under COA# HDCADMRM-2020-00443.
- While the project is no taller or wider than the existing house and does not increase the square footage, due to the visibility from the front elevation, the project is not able to be reviewed/approved administratively.

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 dormer additions 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

1st: BONAPARTE

2nd: RUMSCH

Ms. Bonaparte moved to approve this project on the consent agenda.

Ms. Lineberger made a friendly amendment; this project meets 7.2 of the guidelines for additions and it is not incongruous with the district.

VOTE: 11/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

NOT HEARD IN OCTOBER

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

RECUSED: HINDMAN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00356, 712 E. TREMONT AVENUE (PID: 12109211) – FRONT WALKWAY

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one-story Bungalow style house constructed in 1925. Design features include a gable roof porch, exposed rafter tails, and eave brackets. Adjacent structures are one to two story houses and multi-family dwellings. The addition project was approved by the HDC on July 11, 2018.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is for a new paver front walkway. The existing brick paver walkway is not original to the house but has been in place since the Dilworth local historic district was established. On May 8, 2019, (HDCRMA-2018-00254), the Commission approved the existing front porch wood steps to be changed to brick due to flooding issues. The existing brick walkway was removed and a new, bluestone paver walkway was installed at the same time, which was not approved by the Commission. The project is an After-the-Fact application for approval for the front walkway.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

1. Additional information about the addresses provided by the applicant that have bluestone on the front porch or front walk:
 - a. 612 E. Tremont – A concrete walkway was approved by the HDC. The installed walkway is non-compliant with the COA and a NOV will be issued.
 - b. 625 E. Tremont – Installed c. 2008/2009, pre-dates current guidelines.
 - c. 630 E. Tremont – Not approved. Rear porch approved under HDCRMI-2019-00264 but no site work has been approved at this location. A NOV will be issued.
 - d. 801 E. Tremont – Installed pre-2008, pre-dates current guidelines.
 - e. 709 E. Worthington – Stone is original or very early addition.
 - f. 801 E. Worthington – Original to the house.
 - g. 804 E. Worthington – COA in 2015 for new accessory building, rear yard patio, and landscaping, which did not include changes to the driveway or front walkway.
 - h. 809 E. Worthington – Installed between July 2011 and August 2012, pre-dates current guidelines.

- i. 815 E. Worthington - Original to the house. Walkway has been brick since pre-2007. The retaining wall was originally concrete, and stone was applied sometime between June 2009 – July 2011, pre-dates current guidelines.
 - j. 819 E. Worthington – Installed between March 2015 and March 2016, pre-dates current guidelines.
 - k. 820 E. Worthington -Installed pre-2007, pre-dates current guidelines.
 - l. 823 E. Worthington – Front porch stone appears to be original. The steps appear to be a later addition but are present in 2009, pre-dates current guidelines.
 - m. 824 E. Worthington – Installed pre-2007, pre-dates current guidelines.
 - n. 825 E. Worthington – Installed pre-2007, pre-dates current guidelines.
 - o. 828 E. Worthington – Installed between July 2011 – August 2012, pre-dates current guidelines.
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: DENIED **1st: BARTH** **2nd: RUMSCH**

Mr. Barth moved to deny this application based upon Guidelines 8.2 number 2 and 7, and 8.4, number 9.

VOTE: 7/3 **AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, LINEBERGER,
MURYN, PARATI, RUMSCH
NAYS: HENNINGSON, WALKER, HADEN

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR FRONT WALKWAY DENIED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

RETURNED: HINDMAN 3:30PM

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2019-00823, 821 WALNUT AVENUE (PID: 07102223) – TREE REMOVAL

This application as continued from the February 12, 2020 meeting for the following item:

A plan from a landscape architect with thoughtful replanting to replenish the tree canopy.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is one-story Bungalow with Tudor elements constructed in 1937, located at the edge of the Wesley Heights Local Historic District. Architectural features include brick porch columns, and stucco with timbering in all three gables. All windows and doors are replacements and not original to the house. According to the National Register nomination, the front door used to have a glazing pattern similar to the 6/1 windows. Siding material is unpainted brick. Lot size is approximately 50’ x 190’. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single-family and multi-family houses. The garage at the rear was also constructed in 1937 and is considered a contributing element to the Wesley Heights National Register Historic District.

PROPOSAL:

A rear addition was approved by the HDC in October 2019 (COA# HDCRMA-2019-00479). One mature pecan tree was approved for removal to construct the addition and the other tree was required to remain with a Tree Protection Plan provided to staff. On December 6th, both the Certified Arborist and the property owner emailed staff separately to provide a Tree Protection Plan (attached). On December 10th, staff requested additional information be added about construction fencing and debris. On December 11th, the property owner contacted staff to advise that the tree that was supposed to remain was just removed by the tree company.

Revised Proposal – October 14, 2020

- *Landscape plan with existing trees and three (3) new proposed trees, which is one additional tree and a different arrangement on the lot from the original approval.*

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The property owner was actively working with staff on a Tree Protection Plan for the pecan tree, as demonstrated in the attached Tree Protection Plan and email correspondence.
2. Recommend that the size of the new trees is 2-3-inch caliper.
3. The Commission will determine if the proposed, including size and general locations of the new trees, is acceptable.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: APPROVED 1st: HADEN 2nd: LINEBERGER

Mr. Haden moved to approve this application based upon the compliance and the deliverance of the specified requirements asked for at the time of continuance.

VOTE: 11/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR TREE REMOVAL APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2020-00467, 2010 THE PLAZA (PID: 09506101, 09506131, 09506102) – NEW CONSTRUCTION MULTI-FAMILY

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The property at 2010 The Plaza is the Van Landingham Estate, a designated local historic landmark. The four-acre property has two accessory buildings with fairly dense landscaping.

PROPOSAL:

The project is the construction of four new buildings that comprise a total of 22 townhomes.

- Ten (10) units are accessed from The Plaza and face the main house.

- Twelve (12) units are accessed from Belvedere Avenue and face Thurmond Place.
- Maximum roof peak is approximately 35'-10".
- Proposed material palette is Nichiha Savannah Smooth siding, Miratec (trim), brick, aluminum clad windows with brick mold trim/fiber cement trim.
- Roof details include wood fascia and brackets
- Other site features include landscaping, tree planting, and new driveways and walkways.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Context: The context is the immediate surroundings of a project. The context of The Plaza and the Plaza Midwood local historic district is different that the context of East Boulevard in Dilworth and West Boulevard in Wilmore.
 - a. Guidelines, page 2.5: "In evaluating a project proposal, the HDC and its staff refer to the adopted design guidelines that are based on the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. They also examine the specific context of the property in question."
 - b. New Construction Guidelines, page 6.1 "Charlotte's historic districts' distinctive character is derived not only from architectural style but also from the nature of the street created by building setback, spacing, mass, and height as well as the landscape quality. This street character and the surrounding properties are considered to be the context for any new building. As such, the block in which the new site is located should be carefully studied when designing a new infill dwelling. This context should include both sides of the subject street."
2. Massing + Spacing: The project consists of three buildings with 5 units and one building with 7 units, which makes for a long mass, not historically seen in historic multifamily in the Plaza Midwood neighborhood. Breaking the townhomes up into smaller buildings of two or three townhomes would help to break down the massing of the project and provide spacing more in-keeping with the residential structures throughout Plaza Midwood. This also applies to width of new buildings, page 6.6.
3. Setback: Should align with the average setback of the historic houses along the Plaza.
4. Orientation to Belvedere: 1800 and 1806 Belvedere are new construction and located outside of the Plaza Midwood Local Historic District boundary.
5. Height: At three stories the townhomes are significantly taller than any other historic structure in the Plaza Midwood neighborhood. The topography of the lot does lessen this impact along the Plaza, but not along Belvedere Avenue. See Height + Width Guidelines, page 6.6.
6. Directional Expression: 1900 Nassau and 1908 Nassau are new construction and located outside of the Plaza Midwood Local Historic District boundary.
7. HVAC location/screening.
8. Additional information about a few properties referenced in the presentation:
 - a. 1424 Thomas Avenue is a one-story, single family structure.
 - b. 1720 Thomas Avenue is a historic brick quadruplex.
 - c. 1511 The Plaza is a two-story is single-family structure.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

Mr. Adam Zwickey, adjacent property owner, spoke in opposition of this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED **1st: HINDMAN** **2nd: MURYN**

Ms. Hindman moved to continue this application based on Guidelines 6.1 through 6.10. The project must remain secondary to the Van Landingham Estate and while the Van Landingham is the building inspiration it must remain the star of the property, per Guidelines 6.5, number 2, 6.7, number 3, 6.10 and 6.8. There is a need for additional information including the elevations in their entirety with the context of both streetscapes and potentially a 3D model showing it (the new construction) in its context. Note the inter-connectiveness of the Guidelines 6.1 through 6.10 as they relate to each other and not one specific guideline. The Commission has not evaluated the project for Guidelines 6.11 through 6.16 or for Chapter 8, including but not limited to, tree plan, the hedgerow, or the hardscaping.

VOTE: 11/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION MULTI-FAMILY CONTINUED.

CONTINUED

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2020-00311, 216 S. SUMMIT AVENUE (PID: 07101502) – NEW CONSTRUCTION

This application as continued from the October 14, 2020 meeting for the following items:

- ***Height.*** Per guideline 6.6, number 2, reduce the height to be no taller than the tallest historic single-family house within 360-degree view.
- ***Trees.*** Provide accurate tree sizing and a planting plan that does not leverage the planting strip. Provide a tree protection plan for the front trees and through a coordination process between the architect and the engineer and the arborist evaluate other construction or foundation techniques to minimize the impact on the root structure.
- ***Fenestration.*** Add a shared jamb for clustered windows. On the main level on the front elevation, the windows should be larger and align to a hierarchy in window size and dimension between first floor and the second floor, and the windows on the right and left elevation towards the front of the house should be larger, and the second-level windows need to better align with the height.
- ***Foundation.*** Per guideline 6.9, number 1, relate the height of the foundation to the height of the foundations on the historic buildings within the context.
- ***Porch.*** Increase the width of the front porch. Ensure that the eave overhangs on the porch match the main house.
- ***Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU).*** Ensure that you follow guideline 8.9 when revising the height of the main house.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The property is a vacant lot that measures approximately 54' x 187.5'. A 10' alley is located at the rear of the lot. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single-family structures. There are three large canopy trees on the lot – a 36" evergreen located at the front corner, a 24" pecan mid-lot, and a 18" pecan in the rear.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is new construction of a single-family structure and detached accessory dwelling unit (ADU).

Single-family structure:

- Proposed height is 28'-0" as measured from grade to ridge.
- Proposed width is 39'-4".
- Front porch is 8' deep, wood t & g flooring perpendicular to the front wall of the house.
- Proposed materials are fiber cement siding (Hardie Artisan smooth or Nichiha Savannah smooth) and brick in a traditional color. Windows will be aluminum clad with Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL).

ADU:

- Proposed footprint: 25'-0" x 35'-4".
- Proposed height: 23'-5".

Trees:

- Both the 36" evergreen and the 18" pecan are proposed for removal.

Revised Proposal – November 18, 2020

- Proposed height reduced to 26'-4".
- Additional information on trees provided, including size and planting plan.
- House setback remains unchanged.
- Fenestration changes on front, left, and right elevations.
- Foundation appears to be reduced in height

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Foundation height appears to short for the house and does not align with foundations along the street.
2. Window heights on second level as compared to neighboring properties.
3. Front porch appears to be more a ¾ width than a full width front porch, which is out of proportion for the style of house proposed and affects the scale and massing. Refer to applicant's inspiration image of 511 Hermitage Court.
4. Tree removal of the 36" evergreen at the front of the lot.
5. ADU massing, scale/height as relates to the main house.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: CONTINUED 1st: BARTH 2nd: HADEN

Mr. Barth moved to continue this application to request that the applicants review with their architect and/or contractor, as well as, arborist to explore alternative means to saving the tree at the front of the property; utilizing both design construction techniques and site work measures. The Commission also requests in this motion that the ADU at the rear of the property be explored in its massing as it relates

to the main dwelling unit, referencing Guideline 8.9, number 3 as their guide. The Commission would also like to see the window head height on the front of the building addressed so that a hinge is not created on the main roof line.

VOTE: 11/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED.

NEW CASES

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2020-00471, 1141 LINGANORE PLACE (PID: 12310406) - ADDITION

Deferred due to an objection to the remote, online meeting platform.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00210, 1827 EWING AVENUE (PID: 12111401) – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The property is a one-story Colonial Revival building constructed in 1928 located at the corner of Ewing Avenue and E. Worthington Avenue. Architectural features include a one-bay gabled hood at entry supported by round columns, a fanlight over the front door, 8/1 cottage-style windows, pent eaves, and a screened-in side porch. Lot size is approximately 66'x 140'. Adjacent structures are 1-, 1.5-, and 2-story single and multi-family structures.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is a gable addition on the rear elevation, and a second level addition to the historic garage structure. No trees are proposed for removal. Post-construction rear yard impermeable area will be 40% (not including the pool and plunge pool).

House Addition + Side Porch Changes:

- The addition ties in below the existing ridge and the massing is shifted to the left to provide a roof over an existing entry stoop on the left elevation.
- The rear wall of the addition is stepped-in from the original rear wall of the first level.
- Roofs are hip to match the rear hip roof on the house.
- New covered patio roof to be supported by brick piers and columns. Columns are the same dimensions as the original front porch columns.
- The screens on the side porch are to be replaced with a panel/shutter system in traditional materials.

- Brick to remain unpainted.

Garage Addition:

- Height of the main house, as measured from grade to ridge, is approximately 22.9' at the front and 24.3' at the rear.
- Existing garage height, as measured from grade to ridge, is approximately 14.6'.
- The proposed height of the garage, as measured from grade to ridge, is 21.7'.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. House Addition
 - a. Clarification needed on which line of Hardie siding will be used – Artisan?
2. Garage Addition:
 - a. As drawn, the addition appears to be an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). If approved, then HDC should make the approval contingent on meeting zoning requirements for Accessory Dwelling Units.
 - b. Garage door design + material. Should be two separate single-bay doors or appear separate.
3. Tree protection plan needed for the 24" hardwood in the rear yard.
4. Landscape and site features may be reviewed at the Administrative level (fencing, pools, walkways, etc.).
5. 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: CONTINUED 1st: BARTH 2nd: HADEN

Mr. Barth moved to continue this application for the following:

Screened porch, for see additional details on the windows and the trimming out of this screened porch, per Guidelines 4.8, number 5 and number 6. Additional graphics as well as notes as far as some windows and certainly other elements that are being replaced on the existing house. Mainly the glass block window that's being replaced; we need to see what that looks like. At the back, the Commission requests that the applicant reanalyze the condition of the porch addition to influence more of a human scale and proportion with respect to the slenderness of the columns and the inadequate base for the structure it's supporting based on Guidelines 6.7, number 1, and 6.8. The garage addition, the Commission requests the applicant reanalyze that aspect of the project as it pertains to 8.9, number 3.

VOTE: 10/1

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

NAYS: RUMSCH

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2020-00479, 1901 S. MINT STREET (PID: 11907601) – ADDITION/ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The property is an American Small House with Colonial Revival elements constructed in 1946. Architectural features include a symmetrical three-bay façade with a central entry portico, central chimney, 8/8 double-hung wood windows, and a decorative cornice. The shutters are appropriately sized for the windows. Materials are painted brick with wood siding in the gable ends. Lot size is approximately 68 x 130 x 42 x 154. Adjacent structures are 1, and 1.5 single-family structures. The lot is located at the edge of the Wilmore local historic district abutting the Wilmore Walk Townhome development which is located outside of the district.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is the removal of a later rear addition and the construction of a larger rear addition to the main house, a deck addition and the construction of a new Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) in the rear yard. The addition ties in below the ridge of the primary ridge. All existing historic windows are to remain. New windows are proposed to be the Windsor Pinnacle Clad series. The main house is approximately 15.9’ as measured from grade to ridge and the lot topography slopes down away from the house. The ADU is approximately 15’ in height as measured from finished floor. Post construction the rear yard will have 38.1% impermeable space.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Front Portico. While many elements of the existing portico do not appear to be original (columns, beam, gable material), the proposed Craftsman-style update is incongruous with the Colonial Revival style of the house.
2. Replacement of the original front door with a new Craftsman-style door.
3. Proportions of windows on the left elevation addition.
4. Clarify the line of Hardie that will be installed – is it Artisan?
5. Corner board trim is usually required to be wood, even when Hardie is installed.
6. Trees proposed for removal?
7. ADU
 - a. Casement window configuration
 - b. Trim dimensions on the clustered windows – the mullion appears to be too narrow.
 - c. Provides a good buffer between the Wilmore Walk Townhomes and the historic homes in the local district.
 - d. Clarification on total height as measured from grade to ridge of ADU versus total height of main house as measured from grade to ridge at the rear elevation.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: CONTINUED 1st: HINDMAN 2nd: HENNINGSON

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

1. Revisit the stylistic expression for consistency with the current structure and the context per Chapter 3 of the Secretary of Interior Standards and 7.2, number 6.

2. Restudy the window size and STDL configuration on the southwest and north elevation and the ADU for proportional consistency within historic windows. Restudy window size and STDL configuration and fenestration rhythm.
3. Revisit the ADU roof configuration. A 4/12 roof should be in a dormer language, and the ridge should be lower than the main structure per 8.9, number 3, and 6.10, numbers 2 and 3.
4. The chimney is to remain.
5. Revisit the downspouts, redirect gutters and downspouts to the side and not the front elevation as per Guidelines 4.6, number 4.
6. Staff to approve previously approved siding material.

Ms. Lineberger made a friendly amendment, add Guidelines 4.10, number 2 and 3, which is replace historic doors that are beyond repair with a new door of the same size, design, material, and types as used originally, sympathetic to the building style.

VOTE: 11/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION/ACCESSORY STRUCTURE CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2020-00501, 628 WOODRUFF PLACE (PID: 07103515) – ADDITION/ACCESSORY BUILDING

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The property is a two-story Colonial Revival building constructed in 1948. Architectural features include a symmetrical façade, exterior end chimney and quarter-round gable windows. The original windows were 8/8 double-hung but have been replaced at some point. A rear sunroom addition and the enclosed front portion were both installed prior to the creation of the Wesley Heights local historic district. Lot size is approximately 55' x 150'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single-family structures.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is for changes to a previously enclosed front entry and the expansion of the existing one-story sunroom/rear addition. The existing sunroom addition measures 31' x 14'-8". The addition will be expanded to two-levels and is proposed to have a footprint of 60'x 25'. The first level will be transformed to an attached, three vehicle garage with living space above. New windows are a mix of casements and double-hung. The enclosed front portico will be reopened. New columns and gable will be constructed. No trees are proposed for removal. Post construction the rear yard will be 33% impermeable.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Expansion of the existing rear addition provides an opportunity to break up the existing blank wall on the left elevation and add some more window openings on the first level.
2. Massing of left and right elevations of the addition should be broken up with varying planes to reduce the impact of the addition.

3. Materials clarification:
- Is the Hardie siding proposed to be the Artisan line?
 - Window trim detail.
 - Window material?

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

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

Mr. Henningson moved to continue this application based on 7.2, numbers 1, 2, 6 and 8. Include accurate site plan that includes the other accessory building on the property.

VOTE: 11/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION/ACCESSORY BUILDING CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

LEFT: RUMSCH, 7:25 pm; HADEN, 7:32 pm

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00511, 1620 DILWORTH ROAD E. (PID: 12311215) – WINDOW AND DOOR CHANGES

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing building is a two-story Colonial Revival constructed in 1935. Architectural features include unpainted brick exterior, high hip roof with side gable projections. The front porch fits into the angle of the side and front gable sections. A second story projection is carried over the drive and supported by posts. Lot size is approximately 60' x 158'. Adjacent structures are one and two-story, single-family residential buildings. The St. Patrick Cathedral campus is located across the street.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is to change four (4) window/door openings on the left elevation.

- Existing bay window to be removed and a new wood casement window to be installed. New wood trim will match existing window trim.
- Basement-level window well to be infilled with brick/mortar to match existing. A new Bilco door will be installed below the current location of the bay window.
- Existing historic door opening (basement access) will be infilled with brick/mortar to match existing.
- Existing double-hung window to be removed and changed to an entry door.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

- Door changes:

- a. Possibility of re-using the original, historic side-entry door in the new door opening?
 - b. The proposed door appears to be a standard size; however, the header height of the original window is taller than the historic door opening. When the window becomes a doorway, will the header height be lowered, or will a custom door being ordered to fit in the existing opening?
 - c. If the header height is lowered, then the header design should match existing.
1. Casement window: Header height + details of casement window should match header height of original window openings on the first level.
 2. Brick:
 - a. Will any of the historic brick that is removed to re-configure the openings be re-used in the areas to be infilled?
 - b. Clarify that no brick will be painted, and the new mortar/brick will match existing.
 3. 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 1: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS 1st: HINDMAN 2nd: LINEBERGER

Ms. Hindman moved to approve this application with the following conditions:

The new casement window has STDL (simulated true divided lights) to coordinate with historic windows for staff to review per Guidelines 4.14 - windows. The door infill must be inset approximately a half an inch per the Secretary of Interior standards. For the new casement window, brick rowlock and brick soldier header to match existing brick details. The new door will be a custom height to fit the existing header. The brick and new mortar must match the existing because the Commission will not entertain painting brick to unify disparate parts.

VOTE: 9/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR WINDOW AND DOOR CHANGES APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00396, 629 BERKELEY AVENUE (PID: 12305708) – WINDOW REPLACEMENT

Applicant deferred to the next meeting.

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00464, 1515 WILMORE DRIVE (PID: 11908222) – CHIMNEY REMOVAL

Applicant deferred to the next meeting.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: RUMSCH, HADEN

RECUSE: HINDMAN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00533, 1930 LENNOX AVENUE (PID: 12108606) - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one-and-one-half story Bungalow brick house with Colonial Revival and Craftsman elements, constructed in 1930. Architectural features include two gabled dormers on the front elevation, 4/1 windows, exposed rafters and brackets, shingle siding in the side and rear gables, and a central entry with Colonial revival hood and sidelights.

PROPOSAL:

The project is a minor redesign of a previous approval from December 2018, under application number 2018-607. After the project was engineered it was found to not meet code, necessitating a redesign to the dormer pitch. The approved dormer pitch was 3/12, the redesigned dormer pitch is 2/12. A new rear covered porch and a change of window size/design in the rear gable are also proposed. All materials and details are traditional to match existing. Windows in the dormer are wood casements in a pattern to match existing and wood shingle siding to match the front dormers and side/rear gables. Commission review of the project is required due to the building’s location on a corner lot.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. If the proposed project was not located on a corner lot, it would be approvable at the staff level.
2. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Additions 7.2 listed above.
3. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

Ms. Jessica Hindman, adjacent property owner, spoke in favor of this application.

MOTION: APPROVED 1st: MURYN 2nd: WALKER

Mr. Muryn moved to approve this application because it meets Guidelines 7.2.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HENNINGSON, LINEBERGER
MURYN, PARATI, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: RUMSCH, HADEN

RETURNED: HINDMAN

Mr. Haden moved to approve the August 12, 2020, September 9, 2020 and October 14, 2020 minutes with amendments. Ms. Hindman seconded, and the vote was unanimous.

Chairperson Parati adjourned the meeting citing the end of the agenda with no further items to discuss at 8:19 p.m.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission