



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REMOTE ONLINE MEETING
Meeting January 13, 2021, ROOM 280 + WebEx

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ms. Kim Parati (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: Mr. P.J. Henningson (Vice Chairperson)
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 January 13th remote online Historic District Commission Meeting to order at 2:42 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 DECEMBER

HDCRMA 2020-00633, 1913 Cleveland Avenue Dilworth

CONTINUED FROM NOVEMBER

HDCRMA 2020-00467, 2010 The Plaza Plaza Midwood

CONTINUED CASES

HDCRMA 2020-00311, 216 S. Summit Avenue Wesley Heights
 HDCRMA 2020-00479, 1901 S. Mints Street Wilmore
 HDCRMA 2020-00501, 628 Woodruff Place Wesley Heights

CONSENT AGENDA

HDCRMI 2020-00709, 2128 Park Road Dilworth
 HDCRMA 2020-00708 1628 Wilmore Drive Wilmore
 HDCCMA 2019-00827, 1316 Thomas Avenue Plaza Midwood

NEW CASES

HDCRMI 2020-00740, 400 S. Summit Avenue Wesley Heights
 HDCRMA 2020-00634, 729 Mt. Vernon Avenue Dilworth
 HDCRMA 2020-00471, 1141 Linganore Place Dilworth
 HDCRMI 2020-00703, 1716 Winthrop Avenue Dilworth
 HDCRMI 2020-00707, 933 Berkeley Avenue Dilworth
 HDCRMI 2020-00701, 1511 Chestnut Avenue Plaza Midwood
 HDCRMI 2020-00635, 1332 Lafayette Avenue Dilworth

NOT HEARD IN PREVIOUS MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: HENNINGSON

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2020-00633, 1913 CLEVELAND AVENUE (PID: 12105619) – NEW CONSTRUCTION
(MULTI-FAMILY)

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

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 new construction of a multi-family building. The new structure is approximately four stories along Cleveland Avenue and five-stories at the rear of the building, due to site topography. Exterior materials are brick and aluminum clad windows. A partial-width front stoop faces Cleveland Avenue.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Height, Massing, Scale, Setback, Spacing, and Roof Forms.
2. Front porch depth.
3. Landscape plan.
4. The building maximizes the entire lot and will be directly adjacent to the existing multi-family structures on Euclid Avenue. An exhibit that illustrates the proposed building behind the existing properties on both Euclid and E. Worthington Avenue would help to illustrate the potential impacts to the district and existing structures.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

Mr. Rick Cohan, neighborhood resident, spoke against this application.
Ms. Lucy Raynor, neighborhood resident, spoke against this application.
Mr. John Fletcher, neighborhood resident, spoke against this application.
Ms. Karen Fletcher, neighborhood resident, spoke against this application.
Ms. Ellen Citarella, neighborhood resident, spoke against this application.
Mr. Benson Okeryl, neighborhood resident, spoke against this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED 1st: HADEN 2nd: BONAPARTE

Mr. Haden moved to continue this application, because it does not meet our guidelines for new construction 6.1, massing, roof form, height, width. We incorporate all the at-large discussion, regarding our concerns and desires to see what happens with this building [see CLT Planning, Design & Development YouTube Recording: Historic District Commission January 27, 2021 - Special Called

Meeting – Timestamp 59:32 for information on the discussion]. We have not reviewed other elements and guidelines. We solely reviewed those guidelines under 6.1 related to overall massing and overall design. We are not reviewing details.

VOTE: 9/1

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

NAYS: RUMSCH

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION (MULTI-FAMILY) CONTINUED.

CONTINUED FROM NOVEMBER MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: HENNINGSON

APPLICATION:

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

This application as continued from the November 18, 2020 meeting for the following items:

- ***New Construction, 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. 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 in its context. It is the inter-connectiveness of the guidelines 6.1 through 6.10 as they relate to each other and not one specific guideline. Specific guidelines referenced include: 6.5, number 2; 6.7, number 3; and 6.10.
 - The Commission has not yet 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.

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.

Revised Proposal – January 13, 2021

- Site plan with existing conditions and tree save shown
- Site plan with partial landscape planting plan shown
- Revised elevations
- Streetscape with elevations
- 3-D views

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Context: The context is the immediate surroundings of a project
 - 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. At three stories the townhomes mass and scale is larger 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.
3. HVAC location/screening.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: CONTINUED 1st: MURYN 2nd: RUMSCH

Mr. Muryn moved to continue this application, for guideline 6.1 and 2.5 for context as the building that fronts The Plaza relates to its context. Note on the plan the HVAC locations that was discussed to be in the roof or hidden by the roof parapets. Look into further development of the building along Thurmond as it pertains to the stepping of the façade and other embellishments around the front door of the individual units.

Ms. Hindman added a friendly amendment, separate the dormers so they are true dormers and provide a continuous cornice line at the second story and to eliminate any material transition at the exterior corners of the dormers.

Mr. Barth added a friendly amendment, to include some additional details on the architectural elements and trimming.

Ms. Hindman added a friendly amendment, we have not evaluated the project for guidelines 6.11 through 6.16 or Chapter 8.

VOTE: 10/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION (MULTI-FAMILY) CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: HENNINGSON

LEFT: HADEN, MURYN 5:42PM

APPLICATION:

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

This application as continued from the November 18, 2020 meeting for the following items:

- **Trees.** Review with the 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 technique and site work measures.
- **Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU).** Per guideline 8.9, number 3, Explore the building’s massing as it relates to the main dwelling unit.
- **Fenestration.** Address the window head height on the front of the building so that the hinge is not created on the main roof line.

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 37” 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 37" 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

Revised Proposal – January 13, 2021

- Re-evaluated front porch design to save 37" deodar cedar
- Window design changed
- ADU design updates and 3-D renderings provided

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 for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS 1st: RUMSCH 2nd: LINEBERGER

Mr. Rumsch moved to approve this application with the following conditions for staff approval, front elevation, the center window to get smaller which will allow the fascia board between the two dormers to be in line with the fascia board on either side of the two dormers, the rear elevation to go back to the previous elevation and the rear garage doors to conform to our guidelines.

Ms. Hindman added a friendly amendment; the intention is for the side-to-side front gables to have a single roof plane.

VOTE: 5/3

AYES: BARTH, GOODWIN, LINEBERGER, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: BONAPARTE, HINDMAN, PARATI

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION (SINGLE FAMILY) APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

CONSENT AGENDA

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: HENNINGSON, HADEN, MURYN

RECUSE: RUMSCH

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00709, 2128 PARK ROAD (PID: 12110213) – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1.5 story Bungalow constructed c. 1920. The building is a side-gabled brick structure with an oversized gabled front porch supported by massive brick columns. A second story addition has been added. Lot size is 55’ x 135’. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single and multi-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is changing a non-historic covered deck/screen porch addition on the left elevation into an enclosed heated space. Materials are traditional to match existing with wood shake siding, wood columns in the same dimensions as existing, and double-hung Simulated True Divided Light (STDL) wood windows in a 6/1 pattern.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets guidelines for Additions, page 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 for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED

1st: BARTH

2nd: HINDMAN

Mr. Barth moved to approve this application as drawn.

VOTE: 7/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: HENNINGSON, HADEN, MURYN

RETURNED: RUMSCH, 7:00 PM

APPLICATION:

HDCCMA 2019-00827, 1316 THOMAS AVENUE (PID: 08117305) – NEW CONSTRUCTION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The proposed project site is currently a vacant lot being used for parking. It is located at the edge of the Plaza Midwood local historic district. Lot size is approximately 50’ x 150.

PROPOSAL:

The project was Approved with Conditions at the October 14, 2020 HDC Meeting.

After the HDC approval, the architect proceeded with the construction documents and determined that the overall height was not quite enough after exploring all possible alternate solutions with their consultants. An additional 5.25” of height is needed based on the final evaluation of all the integrated components. This includes the interior floor trusses and the mechanical ductwork.

Many alternatives were studied and considered including cutting the studs down, changing the roof pitch, lowering all the doors and windows, but these alternatives impacted the exterior appearance, which would have resulted with new submission.

The Structural Engineer and the Mechanical Engineer determined the minimal floor system needed, thus altering the height by only 5.25” at the main hip ridge. The revised front elevation that demonstrates the needed additional 5.25” does not impact appearance of the previously approved project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets guidelines for Additions, page 7.2 and New Construction, Chapter 6.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the projects 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 for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED

1st: HINDMAN 2nd: GOODWIN

Ms. Hindman moved to approve this application as drawn.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, PARATI, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED.

Due to time constraints, the following cases will be heard on January 27, 2021:

- HDCRMA 2020-00479, 1901 S. Mint Street
- HDCRMA 2020-00501, 628 Woodruff Place
- HDCRMA 2020-00708, 1628 Wilmore Drive
- HDCRMA 2020-00634, 729 Mt. Vernon Avenue
- HDCRMA 2020-00471, 1141 Liganore Place
- HDCRMI 2020-00703, 1716 Winthrop Avenue
- HDCRMI 2020-00701, 1511 Chestnut Avenue

HDCRMI 2020-00707, 933 Berkeley Avenue
HDCRMI 2020-00635, 1332 Lafayette Avenue

Ms. Lineberger moved to approve the December 9, 2020, minutes with modification. Ms. Walker seconded and the vote was unanimous.

Chairperson Parati adjourned the meeting citing the end of the agenda with no further items to discuss at 7:11 p.m.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission