



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REMOTE ONLINE MEETING
Meeting December 9, 2020, ROOM 280 + WebEx

MINUTES

- MEMBERS PRESENT:** Ms. Kim Parati (Chairperson)
 Mr. PJ Henningson (Vice Chairperson)
 Ms. Jessica Hindman (2nd Vice Chairperson)
 Mr. Phil Goodwin
 Mr. Jim Haden
 Ms. Christa Lineberger
 Mr. Chris Muryn
 Mr. Damon Rumsch
 Ms. Jill Walker
- MEMBERS ABSENT:** Mr. Chris Barth
 Ms. Nichelle Bonaparte
 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, Senior Assistant City Attorney
 Ms. Jill Sanchez-Myers, Senior Assistant City Attorney
 Ms. Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

With a quorum present, Chairperson Parati called the December 9th remote online Historic District Commission Meeting to order at 1:00 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. Speakers will begin by stating their 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:

NOT HEARD IN NOVEMBER

HDCRMI 2020-00396, 629 Berkeley Avenue Dilworth
HDCRMI 2020-00464, 1515 Wilmore Drive Wilmore

CONTINUED FROM OCTOBER

HDCRMI 2020-00388, 405 Heathcliff Street Wesley Heights

CONSENT AGENDA

HDCRMI 2020-00584, 1100 East Boulevard Dilworth
HDCRMI 2020-00621, 2007 Dilworth Road E. Dilworth

NEW CASES

HDCRMA 2020-00490, 424 S. Summit Avenue Wesley Heights
HDCRMA 2020-00579, 600 S. Summit Avenue Wesley Heights
HDCRMI 2020-00632, 330 Settlers Lane Fourth Ward
HDCRMI 2020-00441, 1724 The Plaza Plaza Midwood
HDCRMI 2020-00527, 218 W. Park Avenue Wilmore
HDCRMI 2020-00228, 1724 Wickford Place Wilmore
HDCRMI 2020-00578, 1901 The Plaza Plaza Midwood
HDCRMI 2020-00512, 709 E. Tremont Avenue Dilworth
HDCRMI 2020-00603, 331 East Boulevard Dilworth
HDCRMI 2020-00604, 813 Romany Road Dilworth
HDCRMI 2020-00626, 1913 Cleveland Avenue Dilworth
HDCRMA 2020-00633, 1913 Cleveland Avenue Dilworth

NOT HEARD IN NOVEMBER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00396, 629 BERKELEY AVENUE (PID 12305708) – WINDOW REPLACEMENT
Application withdrawn by Applicant

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BONAPARTE

RECUSED: PARATI, LINEBERGER

APPLICATION:

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

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing building is a 1.5 story front gable Bungalow constructed in 1946. Architectural features include a partial width front porch that wraps around the left elevation supported by brick piers and wood columns, brackets, and a substantial chimney on the right elevation. There is a smaller flue chimney on the left elevation and another toward the rear of the right elevation. The siding and trim on the main body of the house is wrapped in vinyl.

PROPOSAL:

Habitat for Humanity of the Charlotte Region is completing a Critical Home Repair project at 1515 Wilmore Dr to improve the health and safety of the home. The only portion of the project that requires full Commission review is the request to removal all three (3) chimneys to below the level of roof deck.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The chimney at the front right appears to be a primary, contributing element to the character of the historic building.
2. The chimney on the left elevation appears to be a secondary flue as does the chimney to the rear of the right elevation. Due to the secondary, less prominent design and locations of these chimneys, they are eligible for staff review.
3. The other proposed projects in the included scope of work are all reviewable at the staff level or are considered routine maintenance and do not require review/approval.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: APPROVED 1st: HINDMAN 2nd: HADEN

Ms. Hindman moved to approve the removal of the leaning, damaged [unsupported band] chimney on the right-side rear.

VOTE: 5/2

AYES: GOODWIN, HADEN, HINDMAN, MURYN, WALKER

NAYS: RUMSCH, HENNINGSON

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR REAR RIGHT CHIMNEY REMOVAL APPROVED.

MOTION: DENIED 1st: HINDMAN 2nd: HADEN

Ms. Hindman moved to deny the removal of the front chimney and the left rear chimney and repair the two chimneys.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MURYN,
RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR REMOVAL OF THE FRONT CHIMNEY AND THE LEFT REAR CHIMNEY DENIED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BONAPARTE

RETURNED: LINEBERGER 1:31PM, PARATI 1:31PM

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00388, 405 HEATHCLIFF STREET (PID: 07103301) – ADDITION/ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

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

- *Page 3.22: Front porch*
 - *Front door and porch addition to be restudied to be in keeping with the American Small House style.*
 - *Front porch floor should be tongue and groove flooring versus decking.*
- *Section 7.2: Rear addition should also be in keeping with the American Small House style, including:*
 - *Windows to be mulled together. Deny any use of Eze-Breeze product on this application with windows to be approved by staff.*
 - *Rear addition should read as an enclosed porch with column and beam details on the corners.*
 - *Enclosed soffit versus an open soffit.*
 - *Left elevation addition wall should be offset from the existing house wall by 6 to 12 inches.*
- *Pages 6.9 and 4.4: Masonry foundation should be underneath the rear addition versus open air.*
- *Fence: The main fence line on the left elevation in the front yard to stay the same, in the same location.*
- *Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) in the rear of the yard: Offset the shed dormer on the rear elevation on the ADU at least 12 inches from the wall below it on the main floor.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one-story, American Small House constructed c. 1958. According to the Wesley Heights National Register Nomination, the house was moved to this lot in 1994. The house is wrapped in vinyl siding and had vinyl 1/1 replacement windows. It is unclear if the front stoop is original. Based on the design, size and scale of the porch supports, these appear to be later additions. There are very few original distinguishable architectural features on this house, which may or may not be present under the vinyl siding. Lot size is 63' x 150'. Surrounding structures are 1 and 1.5 story single family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project has multiple elements, including:

1. Front portico design change.
2. Rear addition of heated space that ties below the original ridge.
3. Remove the vinyl siding and replace any original siding with new Hardie siding. Replacement window and door trim is also proposed.
4. Construction of a new garage with living space above at the rear of the lot. Footprint is approximately 23'-0" x 32'-0' and height is 22'-6" as measured from grade to ridge but sits below the house due to lot topography.

Revised Proposal

1. Front porch: Wood piers changed to brick. Flooring changed to tongue and groove.
2. Rear addition: window and trim changes.
3. Foundation changed to brick piers with wood screening.
4. ADU: Rear dormer stepped-in on sides.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Front Elevation:
 - a. Replacement front door – dentil molding is incongruous for the architecture of this house.

- b. Porch flooring is tongue and groove – confirm will be installed perpendicular to the front door.
 - c. Design of front porch is incongruous with the architecture of the house, including the brackets, exposed rafter tails, and the front porch posts. Full length square wood columns would be more appropriate to the house.
2. Windows
 - a. Mullion trim needed between ganged windows.
 3. Accessory Building
 - a. Dormer is co-planer to the first level on the left and right elevations.
 4. 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 WITH CONDITIONS 1st: HINDMAN 2nd: HADEN

Ms. Hindman moved to approve this application with the following conditions: the rear addition columns are not necessary and can be removed at the discretion of the applicant. The foundation as shown is approved per federal guideline number 9 and the accessory dwelling unit dormer needs to be offset at least 12 inches from the wall below on all three sides, to be reviewed by staff.

VOTE: 9/0 **AYES:** GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI, RUMSCH, WALKER,
NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURE APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

CONSENT AGENDA

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BONAPARTE

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00584, 1100 EAST BOULEVARD (PID: 12111407) - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a two-story Picturesque Revival – Mediterranean style brick building constructed in 1928. Architectural features include traditional massing with low hip tiled roof and broad full facade tiled roof porch, supported by classical columns, which extends across one-story side wing. Lot dimensions are approximately 75’ x 200’. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story residential structures currently used for residential, institutional, and commercial purposes.

PROPOSAL:

- The proposal is the installation of an ADA-compliant access ramp along the right (Ewing) elevation.
- The ramp proposed will be constructed with a wood structure and either wood or synthetic deck (horizontal surface only). The wood will be painted, and the guard rail will be a black powder coated aluminum (see the drawings) with black powder coated steel handrail.

- Landscaping will be installed between the end of the ramp and the parking area to help screen the two air conditioning condensing units and to approve the appearance of the Ewing elevation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Additions 7.2, Access Ramps 8.9, and the Secretary of the Interiors Standards.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the ramp addition and landscaping 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: WALKER 2nd: HENNINGSON

Ms. Walker moved to approve this access ramp because it meets guidelines 8.10 numbers 1, 2, and 3.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ACCESS RAMP APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BONAPARTE

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00621, 2007 DILWORTH ROAD E. (PID: 12111108) - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Known as the Hutchinson House, the one-story Colonial Revival house was constructed in 1925. Architectural features include a shed roof one-bay portico supported by paired columns, a one-story hip roof side wing, wood shutters, fan light over the front door, and 6/1 double-hung wood windows. Except for the foundation, the house is painted brick. Existing ridge height is 21'-9". The lot size is approximately 60' x 144'.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is a rear addition and deck addition. A much larger project included raising the main ridge, adding a front dormer and changing the historic front portico was approved in January 15, 2020 HDC meeting under case number HDCRMI 2019-00617. Given the significant reduction in the project scope, with no changes to the front elevation, the project is a recommended consent agenda item. The rear addition is slightly taller than the original ridge line, which is why the project cannot be reviewed at the Administrative level. New windows will be either double-hung or casement with Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL) in a 6/1 pattern to match existing. Proposed materials of the additions are wood lap siding and trim to match existing. No changes to the rear yard impermeable area. There are no impacts to mature canopy trees.

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 Ms. Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED **1st: RUMSCH** **2nd: HENNINGSON**

Mr. Rumsch moved to approve this application as submitted.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

NEW CASES

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BONAPARTE

RECUSED: LINEBERGER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2020-00490, 424 S. SUMMIT AVENUE (PID: 07102408) - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing building is a one-story Craftsman bungalow constructed c. 1928. Architectural features include a front gabled dormer, hip-roof, recessed entry with a partially enclosed front porch (altered), 3/1 double-hung wood windows, and an interior chimney. Existing ridge height is approximately 20'-0". The lot size is approximately 65' x 187.5'. Adjacent structures are one- and two-story single family and multi-family structures.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is for a rear addition added to an existing rear bump-out. The footprint of the addition measures approximately 24'-0" x 32'-8". The addition is approximately three feet above the ridge of the main house. Proposed materials will match existing including wood trim, sill, eave, fascia, gutter and bracket details. New windows to be double-hung wood to match original windows on the house. The siding will be a split Hardie material that was used on previous improvements. There are two large trees to the rear of the home to be addressed relative to their health and potential threat. Post-construction the rear yard will be 48% impermeable.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The addition is attached to an existing rear bump-out and leaves the original, historic house unchanged. The addition is reversible.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

1st: MURYN 2nd: HINDMAN

Mr. Muryn moved to approve this application because it meets guidelines 7.2 and the Secretary of Interior Standards number 9; with the option to use Smooth Hardie Artisan or wood siding per guidelines 6.15 number 2.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON,
HINDMAN, MURYN, PARATI, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BONAPARTE

RETURNED: LINEBERGER 2:59 PM

LEFT: HINDMAN 3:00 PM

RECUSED: PARATI, WALKER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2020-00579, 600 S. SUMMIT AVENUE (PID: 07102334) - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Known as the Carter House, the 1.5-story Craftsman bungalow was constructed in 1925. Architectural features include a front gabled ell anchored by a front exterior brick chimney, side-gabled roof with deep eaves supported by triangular knee braces. Siding material is asbestos with an unpainted brick foundation, and windows are 6/1 double-hung wood. The house height is approximately 24'-1" as measured from grade to ridge. The lot size is approximately 55' x 197.5'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is the addition of a dormer on the front elevation and a rear addition of heated square footage and a covered porch. The rear addition ties in below the main ridge and steps in 4 1/4" on both the right and left elevations. The footprint of the rear addition is approximately 11'-7 1/2" deep x 30' wide. The covered porch addition is approximately 16'-0" deep x 29'-8 1/2" wide. All materials and details are proposed to match existing except for the siding. The house is currently covered with asbestos shingle siding. The new addition will have wood lap siding. The rear addition measures approximately 21'-3" from grade to ridge.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Front Dormer:
 - a. Location. Dormer does not appear to be quite centered above the paired windows on the first level and also appears to tie in at the main ridge, not 6" beneath.
 - b. Divided light proportions of windows in dormer and missing mullion trim detail.
2. Rear Addition + Porch Addition
 - a. The site topography appears to slope upward from the front of the site toward the back of the site. Will the rear ridge line be visible above the main ridge due to site topography?
3. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

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

Mr. Muryn moved to continue this application based on 7.2 of the guidelines, looking for an update to the site plan and a tree protection plan. A revision of the front elevation for missing elements, example, the columns and chimney. Restudy the location of the dormer on the front elevation. On the right and left elevation, an update to those drawings showing the matching columns as stated by the applicant. The massing of the addition in reference to the existing structure; and on the rear elevation, showing the setback from the existing to new. A detail of the chosen windows, preferably a wood window to represent the time period.

Mr. Henningson made a friendly amendment restudy the massing on the rear elevation.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON,
LINEBERGER, MURYN, RUMSCH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BONAPARTE, HINDMAN

RETURNED: PARATI 3:48 PM

LEFT: WALKER 3:30PM

RECUSE: MURYN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00632, 330 SETTLERS LANE (PID: 07803706) - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a brick townhome constructed in 1988. The building is an end unit in a row of three townhomes and both end units are mirror images of each other. Siding material is unpainted brick. Adjacent structures are two and three-story brick townhomes.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is to change the hip roof above the triple window on the front elevation to a flat roof with a terrace. The building is experiencing water infiltration issues. A window on the front elevation will be changed to a door to access the new rooftop terrace. Materials are metal railing and Duratek flooring to match other townhome units along Settlers Lane.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The Commission has approved the use of alternative deck materials on horizontal surfaces in certain instances previously. Typically, on non-original rear decks on interior lots.
2. The location of the terrace, on a second level, may allow for the use of alternative materials on the horizontal surfaces due to the minimal visibility of the terrace floor from the street.
3. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

Mr. Christopher Haering spoke in favor of the project.

Mr. Christopher Muryn spoke in favor of the project.

MOTION: CONTINUED 1st: RUMSCH 2nd: HADEN

Mr. Rumsch moved to continue for more detail on how the addition will be built and the exact materials that are going to be used to either flash it or service it. We're good with the concept of a roof being replaced instead of a hip roof on the corner of the building, but we need for a detailed section through the roof showing how the flashing is done with the wall below. A correct relationship between the top of the deck and the interior floor elevation, and some documentation of the system that is going down.

VOTE: 5/1

AYES: GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON,
LINEBERGER, RUMSCH

NAYS: PARATI

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BONAPARTE, HIMDMAN, WALKER

LEFT: RUMSCH 4:52 PM

RETURNED: MURYN 4:52PM

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00441, 1724 THE PLAZA (PID: 09506202) – ACCESSORY BUILDING

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a two-story Dutch Colonial Revival house constructed c. 1930. Architectural features include a gambrel roof with a shallow shed dormer on the front elevation, 4/1 double-hung wood windows, a central portico supported by classical columns and a side porch with a flat roof also supported by classical columns. The porch floor wraps around the house connecting the front portico and the side porch. Siding is wood lap and the brick chimney and foundation are painted. The lot size is approximately 66' x 170'.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is the demolition of the existing dilapidated garage/carport accessory structure and the construction of a new accessory building. The new one-story accessory building will be located slightly further back on the lot and the design is inspired by the original structure and the main house. Siding material is proposed to be 8" Hardie lap siding with all details (columns, vents, trim) proposed to be wood. There are no impacts to mature canopy trees. Due to the visibility of the proposal, full Commission review is required.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Accessory Buildings, 8.9.
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 WITH CONDITIONS

1st: HENNINGSON 2nd: HADEN

Mr. Henningson moved to approve this application because it meets guidelines 8.9 for accessory buildings. The material should be smooth Hardie Artisan.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON,
LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY BUILDING APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00527, 218 WEST PARK AVENUE (PID: 11908823) – REPLACEMENT WINDOWS

Application withdrawn by applicant.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BONAPARTE, HINDMAN, RUMSCH

RETURNED: WALKER 5:01 PM

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00228, 1724 WICKFORD PLACE (PID: 11907807) – REPLACEMENT WINDOWS

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a two-story accessory building located at the rear of the lot and is connected to the primary structure (400 West Blvd) by a breezeway. The accessory structure was constructed c. 1946. The first level is painted concrete block and the second level is asbestos shingle siding. The windows on the first level are in-filled and on the second level are 2/2 wood. The lot size is approximately 50' x 117'.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is to replacement windows due to loss from a fire. The original windows on the second level along the Wickford place elevation were burned and unsalvageable. The proposed new windows will be double-hung, vinyl 1/1 sash-kits.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. 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 1: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

1st: HENNINGSON

2nd: HADEN

Mr. Henningson moved to approve the replacement of the windows that were destroyed by the fire per guidelines 4.14 number 9 with wood windows matching the original number and arrangement of panes per guidelines 4.14, number 17 and 19.

VOTE: 6/1

AYES: GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON,
LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI

NAYS: WALKER

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR WINDOW REPLACEMENT APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00578, 1901 THE PLAZA (PID: 08119702) – WINDOW REPLACEMENT
Application withdrawn by applicant.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BONAPARTE, HINDMAN, MURYN,
RECUSED: MURYN, WALKER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00512, 709 E. TREMONT AVENUE (PID: 12108603) – TREE REMOVAL

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure 1.5-story bungalow constructed in 1920. Architectural features include both Craftsman and Colonial Revival elements. The partial-width partially engaged front porch is supported by Doric columns and the house has 6/1 double-hung wood windows. The brackets and exposed rafter tails are hallmarks of the Craftsman style. Siding material is wood lap with a painted brick foundation and painted brick interior chimney. Lot size is approximately 50’ x 150’. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single-family and multi-family houses.

PROPOSAL:

Removal of a mature Water Oak tree (38” dbh) located along the right property line. The arborist’s report indicates the overall health of the tree is fine based on a limited visual inspection, which does not allow staff to approve removal at the Administrative level.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. TRAQ inspection by a qualified arborist is suggested to help identify if there are issues with the tree’s health.
2. Accurate site plan showing proposed replanting is needed.
3. Recommend that the size of the new large maturing canopy tree(s) is 2-3” caliper.
4. Minor changes may be approved by staff, including tree replanting plan.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: CONTINUED 1st: HENNINGSON 2nd: RUMSCH

Mr. Henningson moved to continue this application and have the applicant provide a tree risk assessment report by a TRAQ certified arborist.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, LINEBERGER
PARATI, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR TREE REMOVAL CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BONAPARTE, RUMSCH
RETURNED: HINDMAN 5:33 PM, WALKER 5:33, MURYN 5:33

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00603, 331 EAST BOULEVARD (PID: 12307507) – TREE REMOVAL

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The former building was a “2.5 story apartment building with a side gable roof and triangular brackets. Two-tier full façade shed porch with brick piers on first floor, paired posts and shingled balustrade on second. Central gable with stucco and timbering, ca 1925.” The building was listed as a contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is after-the-fact tree removal. A large, mature canopy tree (walnut) was removed during demolition of the primary structure in August 2020.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Site plan showing the location of the new tree to be planted. Recommend that the size of the new tree(s) is 2-3” caliper.
2. Minor changes may be approved by staff, including tree replanting plan.

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: HADEN

Mr. Muryn moved to approve the tree removal with the condition that three mature trees selected from the City of Charlotte approved tree canopy list be planted within the next two growing seasons of nine months and have a provision that this would not be effective -- or this would not go into effect with the sale of the lot to a new owner. Mr. Haden made a friendly amendment, The City’s approved list for large maturing shade trees per planting season and change growing season to planting season.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER
MURYN, PARATI, WALKER
NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR TREE REMOVAL APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BONAPARTE, RUMSCH

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00604, 813 ROMANY ROAD (PID: 12309510) -TREE REMOVAL

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is known as the Nebel house, a two-story Colonial Revival house with a suspended second-story porch, constructed in 1943. Architectural features include a suspended second-story porch, gable end eave returns, large gable end chimney on the right elevation, half-round/quarter-round decorative vents, and 10/15 windows on the front elevation with 6/9 and 6/6 windows on the side elevations. Siding material is unpainted brick. The front portico is a modern addition.

PROPOSAL:

The removal of a 46” Willow Oak.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Accurate site plan showing proposed replanting is needed. Recommend that the size of the new large, maturing canopy tree(s) is 2-3" caliper.
2. Minor changes may be approved by staff, including tree replanting plan.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS 1st: HADEN 2nd: HINDMAN

Mr. Haden moved to approve this application for tree removal based on their compliance with our guidelines for risk assessment study preformed and a recommendation to remove by the arborist. A requirement for replanting of two mature shade trees from the City of Charlotte's approved large maturing canopy tree with the recommendation that they are not Willow Oaks.

VOTE: 8/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR TREE REMOVAL APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BONAPARTE, RUMSCH

APPLICATION:

HCCDEMO 2020-00626, 1913 CLEVELAND AVENUE (PID: 12105619) - DEMOLITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one story, concrete block three-bay building. The existing structure is a one story, concrete block three-bay building. The c. 1960 building mentioned in the Dilworth National Register Nomination burnt down in the early 1990s. The current structure was built in 1993. The building has a shallow gable roof with a front parapet.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is full demolition of the building. 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:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

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

