



APPROVED APRIL 14, 2021

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REMOTE ONLINE MEETING
March 10, 2021 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
Mr. Damon Rumsch
Ms. Jill Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT: Vacant
Ms. Christa Lineberger
Mr. Chris Muryn

OTHERS PRESENT: Ms. Kristi Harpst, Administrator of the Historic District
Ms. Candice Leite, Staff to the Historic District Commission
Ms. Cindy Kochanek, Staff to the Historic District Commission
Ms. Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission
Ms. Jill Sanchez-Myers, Senior Assistant City Attorney
Ms. Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

AT 12:57 P.M., MR. HADEN MOVED TO APPROVE THE OAKLAWN PARK GUIDELINE SUPPLEMENT AS SUBMITTED. MS. BONAPARTE SECONDED. THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS, 9-0.

COMMISSIONER HINDMAN NOTED FOR THE RECORD THAT SHE HAS MINOR EDITS FOR THE OAKLAWN PARK GUIDELINES AND WILL WORK WITH STAFF TO RESOLVE THEM.

With a quorum present, Chairperson Parati called the March 10, 2021 remote online Historic District Commission Meeting to order at 1:20 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 FEBRUARY

HDCRMI 2020-00743, 2000 Charlotte Drive	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2020-00719, 536 E. Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2020-00722, 251 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore

AFTER THE FACT APPLICATIONS

HDCRMI 2020-00702, 429 W. Park Avenue	Wilmore
HDCRMI 2020-00720, 1912 Park Road	Dilworth

CONTINUED FROM FEBRUARY

HDCRMA 2020-00467, 2010 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMI 2020-00210, 1827 Ewing Avenue	Dilworth

CONTINUED FROM DECEMBER 9TH

HDCRMA 2020-00579, 600 S. Summit Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDCRMA 2020-00501, 628 Woodruff Place	Wesley Heights

CONTINUED FROM JANUARY 27TH

HDCRMA 2020-00708, 1628 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore
HDCRMA 2020-00634, 729 Mt. Vernon Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2020-00635, 1332 Lafayette Avenue	Dilworth
<u>NEW CASES</u>	
HDCRMI 2020-00787, 554 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
HDCRMI 2020-00721, 2205 Charlotte Drive	Dilworth

NOT HEARD IN FEBRUARY

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: LINEBERGER, MURYN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00743, 2000 CHARLOTTE DRIVE (PID: 12111107) - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one-story American Small House with Colonial Revival elements constructed c. 1941. The building is a side-gabled brick structure with 6/6 double-hung windows. The front porch roof is a later addition. The addition of a roof and brick chimney over an existing concrete patio was approved by the Commission in September 2018 (HDCRMI-2018-00430). The house height is approximately 20'-2". The lot size is 55' x 140'. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single family houses.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is a rear addition. The addition ridge is offset from the primary ridge on the right side. The addition ridge is approximately 2'-10 $\frac{3}{4}$ " taller than the primary ridge. On the right elevation (Ideal Way side) a shed dormer will be added. On the left elevation the new addition will connect to an existing one-story side addition. Materials are noted to match existing with wood columns in the same dimensions as existing, and double-hung Simulated True Divided Light (STDL) windows in a 6/6 pattern.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The existing window in the existing one-story bump-out as shown on A-4.0 does not appear to have the correct trim dimensions as-built. Window trim on the addition is drawn correctly but noted to match existing. Clarification needed.
2. Materials are noted to match existing; however, the existing siding and trim in fields of siding are not specified on the plans.
 - a. Clarification on materials that will be used on the addition is needed.
 - b. Confirm new brick/mortar will match existing.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: CONTINUED 1st: RUMSCH 2nd: HADEN

Mr. Rumsch moved to continue this application for a redesign for a simplification of the forms of the addition on the left elevation and on the rear, citing 7.1 introduction, additions complement the original structure, 7.2, number 6, the design is compatible with existing buildings, and 7.3. Show the new AC unit in the front yard, showing how it will be hidden by the existing screening. Get a brick sample to show that it matches the existing brick.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: LINEBERGER, MURYN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00719, 536 E. TREMONT AVENUE (PID: 12109360) – ACCESSORY BUILDING

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a new construction single-family house built in 2016. Lot size measures approximately 30' x 199' x 79' x 137'. Surrounding structures are 1, 1.5, and 2 story single family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is the construction of a detached accessory structure in the rear yard. Due to lot topography the accessory structure will be accessed from Dilworth Mews Court. The footprint is approximately 32' x 22' and the total height is not indicated. The height from the concrete slab to the bottom of the roof truss is 8'-8 ½". Materials include 8' x 8' wood posts and trusses and the roof material will be architectural asphalt shingles.

The proposed project received a setback variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) on September 29, 2020, see attached letter.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Design compatibility with the Dilworth local historic district and the primary structure.
2. 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: CONTINUED **1st:** WALKER **2nd:** HENNINGSON

Ms. Walker moved to continue this application with the request that the applicant return to the commission showing this particular structure in context to its surroundings both visually and

un-adjoined and that the applicant provide detailed drawings that show the rear elevations and materials of the finished product. And perhaps an amendment to revisit the three-car nature of this structure.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: LINEBERGER, MURYN

RECUSED: HENNINGSON

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00722, 251 W. KINGSTON AVENUE (PID: 11907911) – ALTERNATIVE MATERIALS

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a two-story bungalow constructed in 1946 with a major addition (2007) that pre-dates the designation of Wilmore as a local historic district. New wood siding was installed on the front and rear of the house during the 2007 addition. Lot dimensions are approximately 50' x 170'. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single and multi-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is to replace damaged siding originally installed in 2007-2009 as part of a major addition to the building. The fiber cement lap siding will only be installed on the non-historic addition. No original materials will be changed. The replacement of the non-original, damaged wood shingle siding in the front gable has already been administratively approved (HDCADMRM-2020-00770).

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The Commission has previously approved the installation of non-grain fiber cement siding on non-historic additions and on new, infill construction.
2. The Commission will determine if the proposed replacement siding and trim, where required, meet the Guidelines.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

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

Ms. Hindman moved to continue this application for more accurate drawings of exactly what is proposed, including, but not limited to, the shakes at the gable ends, the thickness and exposure of the existing historic siding, the thickness and exposure of the proposed fiber cement siding, and window trim and corner board details that demonstrate that they are thicker than the deepest point of the lap in the siding. Also, show precedent for the use of a fiber cement product coplanar with the wood product.

VOTE: 8/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ALTERNATIVE MATERIALS CONTINUED.

AFTER THE FACT APPLICATIONS

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: LINEBERGER, MURYN

RETURNED: HENNINGSON, 2:37 PM

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00702, 429 W. PARK AVENUE (PID: 11908520) – LANDSCAPE & SITE FEATURES

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1.5 story Craftsman constructed c. 1931, located at the corner of W. Park Avenue and S. Mint Street. Architectural features include a full-width front porch that wraps around the left elevation, decorative shingles in the gables ends, brackets, and 8/1 windows. Lot size is approximately 85' x 217'. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single-family houses. The rehabilitation of the house including window repair, front porch repair, and partial enclosure of the rear porch were approved at the Administrative level (COA# HDCADMRM-2018-00513). The English garden, new walkway, garden path, and firepit were approved at the staff level due to location and materials (COA# HDCADMRM-2020-00637). This is an after-the-fact application and a Stop Work Order (SWO) was issued.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is the addition of landscape and yard features in the side yard adjacent to S. Mint Street including:

1. Bocce court (10' x 60');
2. Floating deck (24" off ground, footprint 10' x 20') with a raised bench at one corner.
3. Round, brick sand-set patio

Proposed materials are traditional and include sand-set brick, wood, and crushed stone.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The location of the bocce court and deck in the side yard prevents these projects from being Administratively reviewed/approved.
2. The proposed projects do not alter historic features and are reversible, which meets Secretary of the Interior's Standard #10.
3. All traditional materials are proposed which meet the guidelines requirement for materials.
4. Screening of the bocce court and deck, particularly from the front elevation along West Park Avenue.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

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

Mr. Haden moved to approve as submitted.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR LANDSCAPE & SITE FEATURES APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: LINEBERGER, MURYN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00720, 1912 PARK ROAD, (PID: 12108711) – FRONT WALKWAY & LANDSCAPE WALL

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1.5 story Craftsman bungalow constructed in 1925. Design features include a front gable engaged front porch with tall brick piers and very short square wood posts, brackets, small side gabled dormers, and unique shingle siding arrangement. Adjacent structures are one to two story houses and multi-family dwellings. Lot size is approximately 57’ x 195’. Protective covenants are on the house which are overseen by Preservation North Carolina (PNC).

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is a new front walkway and a new retaining wall along the front property line along the sidewalk. The front walkway is an After-the-Fact application for approval. The landscape wall has not been constructed. Proposed materials are bluestone and slate.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

- Flat lots typically do not have retaining walls.
- Additional information about the addresses provided by the applicant that have a stone material for the front walk:
 - 1100 E. Worthington – installed between June 2009 and July 2011, prior to current guidelines.
 - 1928 Dilworth Rd W – installed pre-2009, prior to current guidelines.
 - 1024 Ideal Way – installed pre-2009, prior to current guidelines.
 - 1922 Ewing – brick walkway in 2011, sometime between 2011 and 2014 the walkway was changed, prior to current guidelines.
 - 1932 Dilworth Rd W - installed pre-2007, prior to current guidelines.
 - 820 E. Worthington – installed pre-2007, pre-dates current guidelines.
 - 2125 Dilworth Rd E – brick walkway in 2014, changed to stone in 2015,

- pre-dates current guidelines.
- 828 E. Worthington – installed between July 2011 – August 2012, pre-
- dates current guidelines.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

Bob Henderson, neighborhood resident, spoke in favor of this application.
 Don Duffy, neighborhood resident, spoke in favor of this application.
 Dominick Ristaino, neighborhood resident, spoke in favor of this application.

MOTION: APPROVED 1st: GOODWIN 2nd: HADEN

Mr. Goodwin moved to approve this application; based on 8.2, number 2, follow historic design precedents of the surrounding environment, 8.4, number 9, use materials consistent with historic structure and property. Also approve the retaining wall as applied for using the materials in the application to mimic the retaining wall across the street.

Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment, Federal guidelines, number 9 and 10 which support the approval of this project.

VOTE: 6/3

AYES: BARTH, GOODWIN, HADEN, HINDMAN,
 RUMSCH, WALKER,

NAYS: BONAPARTE, HENNINGSON, PARATI

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR FRONT WALKWAY & LANDSCAPE WALL APPROVED.

CONTINUED FROM FEBRUARY 10 MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: LINEBERGER, MURYN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2020-00467, 2010 The Plaza (PID: 09506101A/B, 09506131, 09506102) – NEW CONSTRUCTION (MULTI-FAMILY)

This application as continued from the February 10, 2021 meeting for the following items:

- *Floor plan showing front porches, patios, walks, and the street connection, including the issue with the hedges along Thurmond.*
- *Streetscape survey that shows the of the front features of the surrounding buildings which would include the height, the scale, the context, the foundation, cornices, porches, rhythm, as compared to the proposed new buildings. Site features, as described in Chapter 8 should also be included.*
- *A protection plan for any trees/landscaping that need to be protected during the construction process.*
- *Dimensions included on the drawings, particularly roof heights*

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.

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

Revised Proposal – January 13, 2021

1. Site plan with existing conditions and tree save shown
2. Site plan with partial landscape planting plan shown
3. Revised elevations
4. Streetscape with elevations
5. 3-D views

Revised Proposal – February 10, 2021

1. Height of units fronting The Plaza and Belvedere are 33'-6"
2. Heights of all other units is 35'6"
3. HVAC locations noted
4. Architectural details provided (window trim, brackets, etc.)
5. New 3-D views

Revised Proposal – March 10, 2021

1. Floorplans with dimensions provided.
2. Window detail updated
3. Additional Streetscape surveys are ordered, will be made available as part of an Agenda Supplement prior to the meeting.
4. The height of the Van Landingham Estate is 35'-7" based on the most current Zoutewelle survey.
5. The maximum height of the residences is 35'-6". This occurs at a lower grade elevation than the Estate.
6. The height of the units on The Plaza and Belvedere are 33'-6".
7. Maximum length of the townhomes is 155' for the 7-unit building.
8. Length of historic commercial properties in the Plaza Midwood district;
 - a. Holy Trinity Lutheran church (adjacent to our property) is 180'.
 - b. The Riviera Apartments at 1812 the plaza is 200'.
 - c. Proposed (not approved) length of future commercial building at Van Landingham is 180'
9. All HVAC equipment will be placed behind parapet screen wall of roof. See detail 04 on sheet A-3.0.
10. All trash & recycle cans will be roll out type. No dumpsters will be used on project.

11. Mailboxes to be determined by post office. Mail will either be delivered to individual units or to a central mailbox as required by the USPS.
12. For reference, the Van Landingham estate has an elevation height of 792.7' per the Zoutewelle Survey of The Plaza block 1900-2100.
13. The existing hedge along Thurmond place is required to remain per the rezoning documents. Discussed the possibility of removing portions of the hedge with the landscape architect & Civil engineer, Kevin McCorkle. If portions of the hedge are removed to create openings/access, this would cause damage to the root system and would compromise the hedge.
14. Tree save areas are shown on sheet C0.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The Commission will determine if the proposed project meets the Design Guidelines for New Construction.
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: CONTINUED 1st: HINDMAN 2nd: RUMSCH

Ms. Hindman moved to continue this application for the elevation facing the VanLandingham, for a brick sample, for other specifications should they not be on the pre-approved HDC list, including, but not limited to, garage doors, front doors, and windows, knowing that staff can approve those if they're on the pre-approved list. With the qualifier that this commission will need to review site features, such as the landscaping plans, the front yard fence along The Plaza, the patio retaining wall, the material height in relationship to grade, and any secret garden entrances along Thurmond. If the applicant is not able to resolve that information in the 180-day review period, we will pull that out for a separate application.

Mr. Haden made a friendly amendment we need to have a little more clearly defined tree protection plan as part of the next submittal.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION (MULTI-FAMILY) CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: LINEBERGER, MURYN

APPLICATION:

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

This application as continued from the February 10, 2020 meeting for the following items:

1. Screen Porch. Remove the note on the porch enclosure for shutters and label as windows.

2. Rear Addition. Guidelines 6.9, number 1; 6.7, number 1; and 6.8.
3. Study the porch addition toward the rear of the house for elements such as scale, the columns, and human proportion in relation to the height of the porch.
4. Additional study on the relevance of pedestrian door at grade.
5. Accessory Structure. Restudy of the garage door on the accessory structure to read as two separate doors, per Guideline 8.9, number 6.
6. Trees. Provide a tree protection plan per Guideline 8.5, number 4.

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 to be replaced with a panel/shutter system in traditional materials.
- Brick to remain unpainted.

Garage Addition:

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

Revised Proposal – February 10, 2021

1. Provided porch paneling detail and revised rear elevation for side porch changes.
2. Rear addition. Added 4' brick wall to create more defined patio space
3. Revised addition to the accessory structure.

Revised Proposal – March 10, 2021

1. Side porch: Note updated to windows, not shutters.
2. Rear addition: Porch roof lowered, and second level addition massing and roof form changed.

3. Accessory structure: Door details added. Material changed from Hardie Artisan lap siding to Hardie shingle siding.
4. Site Plan: notes tree to be protected during construction in consultation with arborist.

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. Accessory Structure: Material noted as Hardie shingle siding. The Commission has not yet approved Hardie shingle panels due to dimensional and visual properties.
3. Tree protection plan 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 for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS 1st: RUMSCH 2nd: HADEN

Mr. Rumsch moved to approve this application with the following conditions, the back door changing to a door that matches in style with the existing basement door, a wood cedar shake on the garage and hardie artisan for the siding material. Lastly, provide a brick sample to match the existing brick for staff to review.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

CONTINUED FROM DECEMBER 9 MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: LINEBERGER, MURYN

RECUSED: PARATI

APPLICATION:

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

This application as continued from the February 10, 2021 meeting for the following items:

1. Site plan updated to show location of trees.
2. Tree protection plan.

3. Additions, 7.2: Front elevation – revised plans that show missing elements, columns and chimney, and re-evaluation of the location of the front dormer.
4. Right and Left Elevations – update to show matching columns.
5. Re-study massing of rear addition in reference to existing structure.
6. Rear elevation needs to show the offset/setback from the existing to the new.
7. Provide a window detail for proposed new windows to be installed on the addition. Wood or aluminum clad allowed. Vinyl is not approvable.

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 ¼" 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 ½" 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.

Revised Proposal – March 10, 2021

1. Tree locations shown on site plan.
2. Revised front elevation: dormer proportions/location changed, missing details added (chimney, columns).
3. Revised left, right, and rear elevations.
4. Rear addition massing and off-set revised.
5. Window and door trim details and materials provided.

Staff Analysis

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Rear Addition + Porch Addition
 - Rear addition should tie in 6" below existing ridge.
 - 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?
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: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS 1st: HINDMAN 2nd: WALKER

Ms. Hindman moved to approve this application with the following conditions, that the tree protection plan be forwarded to staff and that the window STDL configuration be forwarded to staff for review

and that the egress windows at the side gables be as small as reasonably possible, casement to appear as double-hung, to meet code and proportionately coordinated with the historic house.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN,
HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, RUMSCH, WALKER,

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: LINEBERGER, MURYN

RETURNED: PARATI, 5:55 PM

APPLICATION:

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

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

- 1. Additions, guideline 7.2, numbers 1, 2, 6, and 8.*
- 2. Site plan. Please provide an accurate site plan that includes the other accessory building on the property.*

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.

Revised Proposal – March 10, 2021

- 1. Revised site plan.*
- 2. Revised addition design, including changes to the existing one-story bump-out.*
- 3. New Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) proposed.*

Staff Analysis

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Front Elevation: Front entry addition design is incongruous with the original house, particularly the brick pier and column combination. Colonial Revival houses do have a pier/column language. The board and batten siding in the front pediment is not stylistically appropriate for Colonial Revival buildings.
2. Front + Right Elevations: The addition of a second story to the existing one-story wing. Lack of delineation between first and second levels. Window locations and proportions.
3. Left Elevation: Board and batten siding on the shed dormer.
4. Rear Elevation: Dormers are co-planer with the first level walls. Use of lap siding on one dormer and board and batten siding on the other dormer. Lack of fenestration on the two-story bump-out.
5. Accessory Structure: Location, size and massing. Does not appear to be secondary to the main house.
 - a. Does not meet required setbacks for Accessory Dwelling Units.
 - b. What is the square footage? Accessory dwelling units are limited to 800 sf in size per Zoning.
6. Window trim on the addition is picture frame.
7. Materials clarification:
 - a. Board and batten siding is incongruous with the Colonial Revival style of the original house.
 - b. Is the Hardie siding is the Artisan line?
 - c. Window trim detail needed.
 - d. Information about proposed material for new windows on the addition.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: CONTINUED 1st: HENNINGSON 2nd: HADEN

Mr. Henningson moved to continue this application with the following changes: add a tree to the site plan. Porch, per guideline 6.14, number 2, restudy the porch to align with the Colonial Revival style and provide dimensions of the front porch along with a diagram that shows the setbacks for the front porch and the setbacks of the porches and thermal wall of the houses of the neighbors. Massing, per guideline 7.2, number 2, 6, and 8, that discusses limiting the size of the addition on the right elevation. Make the addition one story to better align with the style of the Colonial Revival, and to align with our guidelines for additions on Colonial Revival houses. With the rear addition, a restudy of the massing and ensure that the rear yard is 50 percent permeable as taken from the line on the rear wall of the historic house. Fenestration, per guideline 6.12, number 1, relate window and door openings to the historic house, being mindful of the ratio of solid to void and the rhythm of the windows and door openings for the side and rear addition. Materials, per guideline 6.15, number 1, board and batten is incongruous for additions on Colonial Revival houses. Select a material that's more in keeping with the Colonial Revival style. Garage, per guideline 8.9, number 6, garage doors need to appear separated, and guideline 8.9, number 3, the accessory building must be secondary in width and height to the main house.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION/ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT CONTINUED.

CONTINUED FROM JANUARY 27TH MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: LINEBERGER, MURYN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2020-00708, 1628 WILMORE DRIVE (PID: 11909601) – ADDITION /ACCESSORY BUILDING

This application as continued from the January 27, 2021 meeting for the following items:

1. *Guideline 7.2, numbers 2 and 6. Address differentiation between the new and existing construction.*
2. *Guideline 8.5. Provide a site plan and tree location as well as a tree protection plan.*
3. *Guideline 6.1, number 5. Address the window and door materials to be used.*
4. *Guideline 8.9, number 6. Address the garage door configuration on the detached garage.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one-story, front-gabled Bungalow constructed c. 1931. Architectural details include a full-width front porch supported by brick piers and tapered columns, 6/6 double-hung wood windows, wood brackets, and Dutch-lap wood siding. The parged brick foundation and chimney are painted. The front door and a few windows on the left elevation are replacements. A non-original rear addition was constructed prior to the creation of the Wilmore Local Historic District. Lot size is 63' x 150'. Surrounding structures are 1 and 1.5 story single family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is an addition to the primary structure and the construction of a new one-story accessory structure on a corner lot. An existing rear addition will be removed, and a new rear addition will be constructed. All materials are proposed to match existing including siding, trim, windows and foundation. New foundation is proposed to be parged and painted to match existing. Post-construction rear yard impermeable coverage will be 35%.

Per the applicant, the garage placement was determined by the fall of the land. The grade drops from the rear property line to the back of the house. If the garage doors were to face the rear property line, a retaining wall at the boundary and a larger concrete pad would be required for turning radius, which would cause functional problems. Spruce Street has no homes that front it. All homes on this block front either Wilmore Drive or Merriman Avenue. The garage doors facing the Spruce Street will not interfere with the front of any other homes.

Revised Proposal – March 10, 2021

1. Tree proposed for removal shown on existing site plan.
2. Tree proposed to be planted shown on proposed site plan.
3. New French doors specified as wood.

4. New windows specified as wood, double-hung in a 6/6 pattern to match existing.
5. Garage door details added.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets guidelines for Additions, page 7.2 and Accessory Buildings, page 8.9.

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITION 1st: BONAPARTE 2nd: HADEN

Ms. Bonaparte moved to approve this application as submitted.

Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment, the barge rafter dimension to match the existing.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION/ACCESSORY BUILDING APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

Due to time constraints, Ms. Parati recessed the meeting at 7:15 PM. The four cases remaining on the agenda will be heard on Friday, March 26th at 10 AM.

HDCRMA 2020-00634, 729 Mt. Vernon Avenue
HDCRMI 2020-00635, 1332 Lafayette Avenue
HDCRMI 2020-00787, 554 W. Kingston Avenue
HDCRMI 2020-00721, 2205 Charlotte Drive

Mr. Haden moved to approve the June 10th business meeting, January 27th meeting and February 10th meeting minutes with minor edits. Ms. Hindman seconded, and the vote was unanimous – 9-0.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REMOTE ONLINE MEETING
Reconvened from March 10, 2021 on March 26, 2021
ROOM 280 + WebEx

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ms. Kim Parati (Chairperson)
Mr. PJ Henningson (Vice Chairperson)
Ms. Jessica Hindman (2nd Vice Chairperson)
Mr. Chris Barth

Mr. Phil Goodwin
Mr. Jim Haden
Ms. Christa Lineberger
Mr. Chris Muryn
Mr. Damon Rumsch
Ms. Jill Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT: 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

Ms. Jill Sanchez-Myers, Senior Assistant City Attorney
Ms. Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

With a quorum present, Chairperson Parati reconvened the March 10, 2021 remote online meeting at 10:11 a.m. on March 26, 2021. 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:

CONTINUED FROM JANUARY 27TH

HDCRMA 2020-00634, 729 Mt. Vernon Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2020-00635, 1332 Lafayette Avenue	Dilworth

NEW CASES

HDCRMI 2020-00787, 554 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
HDCRMI 2020-00721, 2205 Charlotte Drive	Dilworth

NEW CASES

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BONAPARTE

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00787, 554 W. KINGSTON AVENUE (PID: 11907120) – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one-story American Small house constructed in 1951. It is a simple brick structure a triple window on the front elevation, wood gable vents, and a small front porch. Lot size is an irregular shape measuring approximately 71'x130'x15'x130'. Surrounding historic structures are one-story brick American Small houses, an institutional building, and new townhomes. In February

2019, the Commission approved a changing a double-hung window on the right elevation to a transom wood window and a small rear addition measuring 12'-6" x 14'-9" was staff approved (COA# HDCRMI-2018-00457).

PROPOSAL:

The proposal a new addition to the front of the structure. Due to lot configuration and setback requirements a larger rear addition is not feasible. Proposed new setback will meet the 20' required zoning setback. The heated portion of the addition is approximately 351 square feet. An 8' deep front porch is also proposed. Materials are traditional to match existing (brick, wood windows, etc.).

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The Commission will determine if the proposed project meets the Design Guidelines for Additions, page 7.2.
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: DENIED 1st: RUMSCH 2nd: WALKER

Mr. Rumsch moved to deny this application because It does not respect the rhythm of the setbacks along the street as in new construction setbacks, 6.16, the first note.

VOTE: 10/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION DENIED.

CONTINUED FROM JANUARY 27TH

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BONAPARTE

RECUSED: HINDMAN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2020-00634, 729 Mt. Vernon Avenue (PID: 12305105) – NEW CONSTRUCTION

This application as continued from the January 27, 2021 meeting for the following items:

- *Conduct initial further study of the project's scale, height, width, rhythm, massing, and foundation as it corresponds to the adjacent historic homes and properties on its block within a 360-degree radius, per Guidelines 6.2 and 6.3.*
- *Provide an exhibit that shows spacing and setbacks, so the house is visible in context.*

- *Review several design features as it relates to the project overall as a composition in relating back to certain design elements and features seen in the historic district which include siding material, window type and configuration, roof form, roof material, cantilever precedent, etc. per Secretary of the Interior's Standards, page 2.5 and Guidelines 6.5, 6.9, 6.10, 6.11, 6.12 and 6.15.*
- *Provide a site plan indicating existing trees on site, and if the trees are to be removed and retained. Provide a tree protection plan or a reason for removal and evidence to support that per Guidelines 8.5.*
- *Provide material data or specifications on windows, precast concrete elements, the pool in the back, the retaining walls, the paver systems, etc.*
- *The overall guidelines referencing spacing, rhythm, massing as it responds to the context of the street will need to be reviewed, and this will need to be analyzed before the finer details of the project are approved.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing site is a vacant lot. The former structure was a Colonial Revival 1.5-story single family house constructed in 1951. Demolition of the house was Approved with a 365-Day Stay at the January 16, 2019 HDC meeting.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal includes the construction of a primary structure and accessory building. The proposed primary structure is two-stories with a height of 32'-1" to the tallest point. The house width is approximately 53' with an open Porte cochere roof that extends further on the right side. Proposed siding materials fiber cement shiplap siding and wood shake siding with a stone foundation and chimney. Proposed windows are aluminum-clad and curtain wall windows. Roofing is asphalt shingle and standing seam metal.

The proposed accessory building is 22'-3 ½" at the rear and the front elevation is shorter due to lot topography. Materials are proposed to be the same as the main structure. Windows are on the front and rear elevations; no windows proposed on the side elevations.

Revised Proposal – March 10, 2021

- No changes made to the design of the project.
- Setback exhibit provided. As proposed, the setback of the new house is 32'7".
- Front yard tree located on site plan. No information provided about the tree size or protection plans.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The proposed house has a setback of 32'-7" to the front thermal wall which is incongruous with the historic context of Mount Vernon Avenue. Setbacks on exhibit are measured inconsistently. Some measured to front porch others to front thermal wall. Typically, for proposed new construction, the Commission considers both setbacks – thermal wall and porch – as part of its review.
2. Materials – shiplap siding is incongruous with the existing historic context and the Dilworth neighborhood.

3. Details about the hot tub, swimming pool, retaining wall, and other site features are not available and not for review at this time.
4. The Commission will determine if the proposed project meets the Design Guidelines for New Construction and Accessory Buildings.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

Kevin Davis, neighborhood resident, spoke against this application.
Sarah Curme, neighborhood resident, spoke against this application.
Susan Jernigan, neighborhood resident, spoke against this application.
Christi Flowers, neighborhood resident, spoke against this application.
Peter Fulton, neighborhood resident, spoke against this application.
Michele Amoroso, neighborhood resident, spoke against this application.

MOTION: DENIED 1st: RUMSCH 2nd: WALKER

Mr. Rumsch moved to deny this application because of the notes from last month's continuance, specifically, dealing with setback and massing simplification.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION DENIED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BONAPARTE, HINDMAN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00635, 1332 LAFAYETTE AVENUE (PID: 12309410) – ADDITION

This application as continued from the January 27, 2021 meeting for the following items:

- *Analyze options for the support structure for the second story addition over the porte cochere and how it can be related to the massing*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1.5-story Bungalow constructed c. 1925. A major addition has been added to the rear under old guidelines. The original portion of the house features clipped gable roof and a full-façade front porch supported by round columns. The original carport has been converted to an enclosed porch. The property also retains its original rolled curb at the sidewalk. Lot size is irregular and measures approximately 75' x 117' x 93' x 190'. Surrounding structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single family buildings. A rear addition no taller or wider than the existing house and less than a 50% square footage increase was approved Administratively. The approval also includes the removal of non-original features including skylights on the front elevation, a concrete wall at the end of the driveway, and the restoration of an original trellis feature on the front porch, COA# HDCADMRM-2019-00821.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project includes removing the carport enclosure and restoring the original carport to its original condition. The driveway extended to restore the carport’s original function. The original carport had a trellis roof; however, the existing second level addition is remaining. The decorative ends of the trellis are being proposed for installation on both the front and the left elevations as a nod to the original design. The columns will also be rebuilt to match original historic conditions.

Revised Proposal – March 10, 2021

- Port cochere column dimensions increased proportionally.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets guidelines for building materials, page 5.2 and the Secretary of the Interiors Standards, page 2.5.
2. 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 1st: BARTH 2nd: RUMSCH

Mr. Barth moved to approve this application as designed for the usage of a 10 inch columns on the porte cochere.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

NEW CASE

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BONAPARTE, HINDMAN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2020-00721, 2205 CHARLOTTE DRIVE (PID: 12112621) – RETAINING WALL

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Known as the Ross House, the existing building is a 1.5 story Picturesque/Tudor Revival Cottage built in 1938. Architectural features include steep side gables and a broader front gable with an engaged front porch. Adjacent single-family structures are 1, 1.5, and 2 stories in height. Lot size is approximately 50’ x 148’.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is a new retaining wall along the public sidewalk. This is an After-the-Fact application. True retaining walls are eligible for Administrative review. Retaining walls are permitted without backfill and with a planting strip left between the sidewalk and the wall.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The retaining wall material meets the guidelines and takes design inspiration from the main house.
2. The Commission will determine if the proposed retaining wall meets the guidelines.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

1st: WALKER **2nd: HADEN**

Ms. Walker moved to approve this application with the condition, the applicant makes sure the limestone cap square straightedge faces the street and that the width of the cap is as pictured in the presentation.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR RETAINING WALL APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

Chairperson Parati adjourned the meeting citing the end of the agenda with no further items to discuss at 12:11 p.m.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission