



APPROVED FEBRUARY 9, 2022

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REMOTE ONLINE MEETING
September 8, 2021
ROOM 280 + WebEx**

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ms. Kim Parati (Chairperson)
Mr. P.J. Henningson (Vice Chairperson)
Ms. Jessica Hindman (2nd Vice Chairperson)
Ms. Nichelle Bonaparte
Mr. Phil Goodwin
Mr. Jim Haden
Mr. Chris Muryn
Ms. Jill Walker

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Ms. Kristi Harpst, Administrator Historic District Commission
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 called the September 8, 2021 remote online meeting at 12:58 p.m. 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 Standards. 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 Vice-Chairperson Henningson will further open the floor to anyone who has joined the meeting by telephone. Speakers will begin by stating their name and address. Vice-Chairperson Henningson 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 AT THE AUGUST 11 MEETING

HDCRMI 2021-00362, 1921 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMI 2021-00255, 801 E. Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2021-00355, 821 Woodruff Place	Wesley Heights
HDCRMI 2021-00305, 400 E. Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2021-00363, 329 W. Park Avenue	Wilmore

CONSENT AGENDA

HDCRMI 2021-00639, 1401 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMI 2021-00626, 2001 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMI 2019-00827, 1316 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood

CONTINUED FROM JULY 14TH MEETING

HDCRMA 2021-00150, 320 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
---	---------

CONTINUED FROM AUGUST 11TH MEETING

HDCRMA 2021-00389, 1533 Wickford Place	Wilmore
HDCRMA 2021-00252, 325-331 East Boulevard	Dilworth

NEW CASES

HDCRMI 2021-00234, 611 W. Park Avenue	Wilmore
HDCRMA 2021-00493, 716 Woodruff Place	Wesley Heights
HDCRMA 2021-00451, 1836 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMA 2021-00494, 729 Mt. Vernon Avenue	Dilworth

NOT HEARD ON AUGUST 11TH MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER, HINDMAN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2021-00362, 1921 THOMAS AVENUE (PID: 08119338) – ADDITION/PORCH CHANGES

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure was originally a one-story Bungalow style house constructed in 1928. A second-story addition and front porch addition was constructed c. 2006. Lot size measures approximately 50’ x 150’ with an alley to the rear. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5 story single-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is in two parts:

1. Changes to the pier/column design of the front porch. The existing front porch is an addition and not original to the house. The porch has oversized piers/columns which does not allow for the use of the porch. The proposal is to reduce the size of the piers and change the columns to be paired/triple and square. The center column is eliminated to further open the porch. A replacement knee-wall is also proposed. All proposed materials are traditional wood and brick.

2. A new covered entry and access stairs at the rear left corner of the house. The addition measures approximately 8’-1” x 4’-6”. Proposed materials are traditional wood and brick. Roof proposed to be metal.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The proposed project appears to meet all standards for Additions, Page 7.2 and New Construction, Chapter 6.
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 WITH CONDITIONS 1st: HENNINGSON 2nd: WALKER

Mr. Henningson moved to approve the changes to the front porch and the covered entry, it meets our standards for additions 7.2 and request the material for the porch be concrete and the brick to remain unpainted. Staff to approve the base and cap detail on the porch columns.

Mr. Goodwin made a friendly amendment to give the applicant the option of terra cotta or some other material other than concrete.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, MURYN,
PARATI, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION/PORCH CHANGES APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER, HINDMAN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2021-00255, 801 E. TREMONT AVENUE (PID: 12108701) – ADDITION/WINDOW CHANGES

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1.5-story Bungalow style house constructed in 1928. Architectural features include a side-gable roof with eave returns, one-story side wing (now enclosed), front façade engaged gable with paired windows, and a shed roof supported by decorative brackets over the front entry. Many of the windows on the house are paired 6/1. The property is a corner lot with a slightly irregular size, measuring approximately 60' x 120' x 109' x 148'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single and multi-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The project is an addition and window changes. The addition is a covered, open patio with an exterior chimney located at the rear, right side of the house. The project also includes window changes on the rear and right elevation. A pair of non-historic doors, in a non-historic opening will be replaced on the left elevation. On the rear a set of 6 windows will be replaced with a pair of sliding glass doors. On the right elevation, two windows will be installed on an existing blank wall. Proposed materials are wood siding and trim to match existing, a stucco chimney, and new windows/doors will be double-hung Kolbe or Jeld-Wen Sitaline aluminum clad in a 6/1 pattern to match existing. Post-construction rear yard impermeable coverage will be 34%.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The proposed project appears to meet all standards for Additions, Page 7.2 and New Construction, Chapter 6.
2. Is it possible to add a vertical trim piece on the right elevation to indicate location of original rear of the house? Or, if not possible to add in the location of the original rear corner, potentially keep the corner board/vertical trim at the location of the 2005 addition to show the evolution of the various additions.
3. 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: BONAPARTE

2nd: HADEN

Ms. Bonaparte moved to approve this application with the condition that a line of demarcation is added or shown on the right elevation between the old and new addition and be sent to staff for final review. This is based on Additions, Standards 7.2, numbers 3 and 6.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON,
MURYN, PARATI, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:APPLICATION FOR ADDITION/WINDOW CHANGES APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER, HINDMAN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2021-00355, 821 WOODRUFF PLACE (PID: 07102165) – ADDITION/PORCH CHANGES

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is new infill construction built in 2002. The building is a one-story, front gable house with Craftsman elements. Architectural features include a three-bay, full-width front porch with wood columns on brick piers. Exterior materials are wood lap siding with wood shakes in the gables. Lot size is 40' x 149'. Surrounding structures are 1 and 1.5-story single-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The project is for changes to the front porch. The left bay of the front porch will be enclosed with casement windows, trim and wood lap siding on the front and right elevations. On the left elevation, which is interior to the porch, the applicant provided the option of windows or a pair of French doors. All porch elements, railing, piers/columns will remain.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The Commission will determine if the proposed project meets the design standards for Porches, Page 4.8 and Additions, Page 7.2.
2. Windows appear undersized for the space.
3. Siding above the windows.
4. Large expanse of siding on the left elevation interior to the porch, particularly on the French door option.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: CONTINUED 1st: HADEN 2nd: HENNINGSON

Mr. Haden moved to continue this application with the conditions that the windows, and the French doors be restudied. The details for the relationships to the siding and transoms and the amount of siding in relationship to the amount of open space or openings for windows and doors be restudied per standards 4.8 and 7.2.

VOTE: 4/3

AYES: BONAPARTE, HADEN, HENNINGSON, WALKER

NAYS: GOODWIN, MURYN, PARATI

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION/PORCH CHANGES CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER, HINDMAN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2021-00305, 400 E. WORTHINGTON AVENUE (PID: 12105718) – ACCESSORY BUILDING

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing property is a 1.5 story Craftsman bungalow constructed c. 1920. Architectural features include a front bracketed gable with a lower off-center gabled porch, 8/1 wood windows, wood shake siding, painted brick foundation with a garage beneath an infilled rear porch. The property is a corner lot with a 10' alley in the rear. The lot size is approximately 40' x 140'. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1 and 1.5-story single family houses.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is the installation of an accessory building in the rear yard. Footprint measures approximately 25'-7" x 18'-7". Height is 19'-3 1/2". Proposed materials include wood garage door, wood entry door, wood brackets and trim. Siding proposed to be Hardie smooth or comparable and windows proposed to be wood or composite. Post-construction rear yard open space will be 54%.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Massing of two-story walls.
2. Roof and dormers. Front dormer pitch at 2/12.
3. Rear elevation is a two-story wall with a 2/12 roof pitch.
4. Foundation appears undersized in proportion to the structure.
5. Entry door is too close to the edge of the building. Door trim overlaps with corner board trim.
6. Materials specs and samples needed; composite siding and windows have not yet been approved by the Commission.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

Ms. Nancy Northcott, adjacent property owner, spoke in favor of this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED 1st: HENNINGSON 2nd: GOODWIN

Mr. Henningson moved to continue this application based on Standard 8.9, number 3, the design must have a compatible style to the main house, per Standard 6.5, restudy the massing so the garage does not appear to be a large one-story building. It must read like a one or a one-and-a-half story structure that is secondary to the main house. The first and second story walls and dormer should not be coplanar. Per Standard 6.10, number 3, update the diagram with accurate roof pitch. Restudy the roof pitch and the pitch of the dormer and the dormer must connect below the ridge line. Per Standard 6.12 for fenestration, restudy the door location on the left elevation. Restudy the fenestration of the windows or lack thereof on the right side and provide window and sill details. Per Standard 6.15, specify wood siding and that the garage door is wood. Update the Zoutewelle survey to show the garage and include pictures of the surrounding homes in the immediate context.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON,
MURYN, PARATI, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER
ARRIVED: HINDMAN 3:12, PM
RECUSED: HENNINGSON

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2021-00363, 329 W. PARK AVENUE, (PID: 11908618) - WINDOW REPLACEMENT

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one-story Bungalow style house constructed in 1926 with a partial front porch with a gable roof. Other features include a side-gable roof with brackets, a brick chimney and painted brick foundation. A rear addition was added in 2008 prior to the creation of the Wilmore Local Historic District. An addition was approved by the Commission on February 12, 2020 (COA# HDCRMA-2019-00812).

PROPOSAL:

The project is the total replacement of window sashes. Original trim to remain.

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 standards.
2. Provide spec sheets and information on the proposed new windows.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: CONTINUED 1st: WALKER 2nd: HADEN

Ms. Walker moved to continue this application so the homeowner can provide specifications on these 15 remaining windows that have been purchased and the applicant to provide evidence that the windows are not able to be repaired by reaching out to staff for a recommended company that can provide that information.

VOTE: 7/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR WINDOW REPLACEMENT CONTINUED

CONSENT AGENDA

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER

RETURNED: HENNINGSON, 3:43 PM

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2021-00639, 1401 THE PLAZA (PID: 08117109) – ACCESSORY BUILDING

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing property is a one-story Craftsman bungalow constructed c. 1933. Architectural features include a main front gable with a lower gable of over the partial-width wrap around front porch supported by paired square wood columns on brick piers. A portion of the porch has been enclosed. Other architectural features include a brick foundation, 6/1 wood windows, and wood lap siding. The property is a corner lot measuring approximately 50' x 148' with a 10' alley in the rear. Surrounding structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single-family and institutional buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is the installation of a one-story garage in the rear yard. The new building is sited as far back to the right corner of the property as possible while still meeting zoning setbacks. The garage will be accessed from the alleyway with the garage doors facing the alley. Proposed height is approximately 16'-1", substantially shorter than the main house. The building footprint measures approximately 24'-0" x 26'-6". Proposed materials are traditional to match existing on the main house, including wood garage doors, windows, brackets and rafter tails. The rear yard impervious area will be 30% post construction.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets Standards for Accessory Buildings, Page 8.9, and New Construction, Chapter 6.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting all Standards and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with window specifications and 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]:

Mr. Warren Steinmuller, adjacent property owner, spoke in opposition of this application.

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

Mr. Henningson moved to approve this application because it meets our Standards for accessory buildings, Standard 8.9 in new construction, and Standard 6. The following change on the Hamorton Place elevation, the location of the door moved away from the back corner of the building and remove the gate on the site plans.

Ms. Hindman went on the record re: Mr. Haskell's point about the double garage door and the extra space on the sides of the garage of the dimension is well taken given the constraints on this lot and the concerns about the neighbor is a very insightful point.

VOTE: 8/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER

RECUSED: MURYN 4:00 PM

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2021-00626, 2001 THE PLAZA (PID: 08119707) – FENESTRATION CHANGE/RESTORATION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 2-story Foursquare with Craftsman elements constructed c. 1925. Architectural features include a hip roof with a small hip dormer, a one-story side porch that has been converted into a sunroom, and a full-width front porch with a hip roof that extends past the right elevation over an engaged carport. The porch and carport roof are supported by square brick columns. The house retains most of the original double-hung wood windows in a 4/1 pattern. The front door and sidelights are also original with a light pattern that matches the windows. Lot size measures approximately 66'x 170'. Surrounding structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single-family and institutional buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is changing a door opening to a window on the right elevation, second level. It is unclear if the door opening is original but given the location it is highly unlikely. At one point this house was divided into apartments and it is believed that this door was installed for egress purposes. An original, historic window on the rear elevation is proposed to be relocated to the door opening. Brick from the rear of the house will be toothed-in under the window. All materials and dimensions of any new material will match existing. Since the project cannot be proven to be a true restoration, and is highly visible, the project requires Commission review and approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets Standards for Windows, Page 4.14.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting all Standards and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item.
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: HADEN

2nd: WALKER

Mr. Haden moved to approve this application because it meets the standards for windows 14.14.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN,

PARATI, WALKER
NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR FENESTRATION CHANGE/RESTORATION APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER

RETURNED: MURYN, 4:15 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'. The project was Approved with Conditions at the October 14, 2020 HDC Meeting. A revised front elevation was approved at the January 13, 2021 HDC meeting due to structural and mechanical engineering requirements.

PROPOSAL:

The project was approved with a 15% maximum for penetrations (windows/doors) from floor to roof on the right elevation as required by the Fire Code for commercial structures. However, the Code Reviewer has determined that the requirement for this particular lot is 10% maximum for penetrations. The right elevation has been adjusted to meet the 10% Fire Code requirement.

- The most significant change is to the bay. Originally designed with a triple window, the design has now changed to a slightly shorter single window flanked by permanently affixed shutters. The square window in the gable has been changed to a vent.
- At the rear, on the second level a double window has been changed to a single window. The window is now centered above the open porch on the first level.
- The four windows forward of the bay were slightly reduced in size.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets standards 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 Standards 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]:

Ms. Natasha Maximovitch, adjacent property owner, spoke in opposition of this application.

MOTION: APPROVED

1st: HENNINGSON

2nd: HADEN

Mr. Henningson moved to approve this application because it is not incongruous with the district and meets our standards for additions 7.2 and for new construction standard number 6.

VOTE: 7/1

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

NAYS: MURYN

CONTINUED FROM JULY 14TH

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER

RECUSED: HENNINGSON

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2021-00150, 320 W. KINGSTON AVENUE (PID: 11908603) – ADDITION/ACCESSORY BUILDING

This application was continued from the July 14, 2021 meeting for the following items:

1. **Height.** Restudy of the height relative to the historic structures within 360 degrees based on Standard 6.6. Include the Zoutewelle on both sides of the street with the proposed project within the street scape.
2. **Massing.** Restudy of the massing for its weight and its two-story presentation based on Standard 6.5.
3. **Rhythm.** Restudy of the rhythm and the co-planar walls based on Standard 6.12.
4. **Fenestration.** Restudy of the fenestration, the six-over-six windows, and their overall proportion relative to the historic windows based on Standard 6.12.
5. **Porch.** Eliminate the center column on the front porch based on Standard 6.14. A study of the Tudor and English Cottage presentation of columns on porches, the details for the base and cap on column, referencing precedent and examples, and the alignment with the beam and projection of the pier caps all based on Standards 3.18, and 3.20.
6. **Roof.** Per Standard 6.15, restudy of the ridge vent detail.
7. **Site Plan.** Per Chapter 8, provide information about the HVAC location and screening, tree protection plan, driveway details, dimensions, and spacing at the house and retaining wall details and dimensions. Provide impervious calculations for the rear yard
8. **Accessory Building.** Not reviewing the accessory building at this time, as it is dependent on any continuations.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one-story, American Small House with Tudor/English Cottage Revival elements constructed c. 1936. Architectural features include a front gable covering a partial width front porch, stucco and wood ‘half-timbering’ in the front facing gable, 6/6 double-hung windows, and an engaged left side brick chimney. The exterior is unpainted brick. Existing ridge height is 24.9’ from grade. Lot size is 50’ x 195’. Surrounding structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is for an addition, front porch column changes, a retaining wall and a replacement accessory building. The addition includes an increase in the overall building height of approximately 3’-2” with a deck on the 2nd level rear. The addition will be clad in lap siding with shingle-style siding in the

gables. The rear deck will be supported by wood columns on brick piers. An existing concrete block garage will be demolished. The new accessory building will be a 2-car garage with a footprint of approximately 22.8' x 26.8' and a height of approximately 20'-3". The existing partial carriage track driveway will be replaced with a new driveway.

Revised Proposal – September 8, 2021

1. **Height.** *Reduced to an increase of 1'-2".*
2. **Massing.** *Addition design changed.*
3. **Fenestration.** *Window locations changed.*
4. **Porch.** *Center column eliminated.*
5. **Site Plan.** *HVAC location and screening provided.*

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Addition
 - a. Add a small offset on one or both sides of the new addition roof to differentiate from the original ridge.
 - b. Materials and architectural details specifications for the addition (siding, windows, trim, columns, deck, etc.)
 - c. Proposed building needs to be shown on Streetscape survey.
2. Right + Left Elevations
 - a. Dormer window trim.
 - b. Corner board trim needed on second level rear wall.
 - c. Porch columns
 - i. Craftsman in design instead of Tudor/Cottage.
 - ii. Column/beam alignment.
3. Rear Elevation
 - a. Porch column appears undersized.
4. Accessory Building
 - a. Height and footprint dimensions needed.
 - b. Shallow, co-planer dormers create an unusual massing of the side walls.
 - c. Trim dimensions on all doors.
 - d. Garage door – style and material details.
5. Site Features
 - a. Rear yard open space calculations
 - b. Retaining wall dimensions needed.
 - c. New driveway width.
 - d. Ensure new driveway is not run up to the foundation of the house, a minimum 12" planting strip is needed between the house and driveway.
 - e. Tree protection plan. How far away is the tree in the middle of the yard to the proposed retaining wall, driveway, rear addition and accessory building.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: CONTINUED

1st: GOODWIN 2nd: HADEN

Mr. Goodwin moved to continue this application for the following: A roof plan that resolves the two roof pitches from front to rear, resolve the funneling effect at the intersection of the two gables on the right and the left elevations. Show the correct elevation of 725.9 wherever elevations are mentioned in the submittal. Add the impervious area calculation and a tree protection plan. Show precedent for the front columns and if the Craftsman style is acceptable for this home. Move the door at the balcony on the rear elevation. Document materials for the roof. Show window trim and corner boards on primary structure and accessory structure. No coplanar walls on the garage. The walls of the dormer need to move back. The upper windows need to be moved away from the rakes or either resized. The door needs to read as a two-bay not a one-bay door, and applicant to provide specifications for the garage door. Applicant to show where the garage is positioned on the site plan regarding its distance from the house. Applicant to show the second-floor delineation with respect to the first floor. Per Standards 6.10 for roof forms and materials, standards 6.11 for the trim, standard 6.12 for the doors and windows, and standard 8.9, number 6 for the garage door.

VOTE: 7/0

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

NAYS: NONE

CONTINUED FROM AUGUST 11TH

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER

LEFT: MURYN, 5:45 PM

RECUSED: HENNINGSON

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2021-00389, 1533 WICKFORD PLACE (PID: 11908716) – NEW CONSTRUCTION

This application was continued from the August 11, 2021 meeting for the following items:

1. Materials, Standard 6.15

Study the siding material for conformity to historic standards.

2. Roof Form and Materials, Standard 6.10

The rear dormer is coplanar and needs to be moved back

3. Doors and Windows, Standard 6.12

- Restudy the windows on the rear dormer.
- At the right elevation to add a window on the right side.
- The gable windows should be made smaller in proportion. Provide the window selections.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one story, brick American Small House constructed in 1941. Architectural features include a symmetrical three-bay façade with central entry portico with a broken terracotta tile porch floor and a central chimney. Exterior material is brick with the gable ends wrapped in vinyl. All doors and windows appear to be replacements. The lot is a unique pie-shape measuring approximately 134' x 128' x 114'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5 story single-family buildings. On October 14, 2020, the HDC placed a 365-day stay of demolition on the property (HDCRDEMO-2020-00378).

PROPOSAL:

Proposal

- The proposal is new construction of a single-family structure. Due to lot constraints, the new single-family structure will be sited in approximately the same location as the current house.
- Proposed height: 20'-8" as measured from grade to ridge.
- Proposed materials are ACRE siding and fiber cement for window, corner board and roof trim, and porch columns. Window material proposed to be wood or aluminum clad double-hung with Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL)

Revised Proposal – September 8, 2021

- Nichiha Savannah smooth finish proposed.
- Jeld-wen Sitrine wood windows proposed.
- Rear dormer design updated.
- Gable window sizes adjusted.
- Window added on right elevation.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Gable windows (front, left, right elevations):
 - a. Instead of getting smaller proportionally, became narrower and muntin pattern changed.
 - b. Design + proportions should match 6/1 windows on rest of house.
 - c. Casement needs to have a sash-trim piece.
2. Rear elevation:
 - a. First Level: Paired casement window missing a mullion.
 - b. Second Level: Check mullion and trim dimensions on gang of 4 windows, does not appear consistent throughout.
3. Left Elevation:
 - a. Screen direct vent fireplace with vegetation.
4. Materials:
 - a. Front door design and material specifications needed.
5. Walkway and driveway.
 - a. Dimensions and materials needed.
 - b. Secondary walkway from driveway to main walk needs to be narrower than main walk.
6. Minor changes may be approved by staff, including all the comments listed above in #1-5.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

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

Mr. Haden moved to approve this application because the applicant met all the conditions per the standards in the continuance.

Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment with the condition that the gable casements mimic a six over one with enlarged mutton at sash or all windows be six over six at the designer's discretion and staff to review all window and the front door details.

VOTE: 6/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER, MURYN

RETURNED: HENNINGSON, 6:16 PM

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2021-00252, 325-331 EAST BOULEVARD (PID: 12307506 & 12307507) – NEW CONSTRUCTION MULTI-FAMILY

This application was continued from the August 11, 2021 meeting for the following items:

1. Per Standards for Setback, 6.2 and Chapter 8:

- Provide a dimension from the back of the sidewalk to the thermal wall along Euclid Avenue.
- The tree replanting is okay as shown with the following comments: Replacement tree should occur within lot lines and not in the public right of way. It is okay to remove the Hackberry trees. It is okay to replace the Pecan tree. Any discussion of street trees is not in the HDC's jurisdiction.

2. Per Chapter 6, project wide:

- Restudy of the three-story presentation and rhythm.
- A strengthening of the contextual foundation levels within the architectural details.
- A strengthening of the cornice and roof levels within this building.
- Restudy of the East Boulevard spacing, especially with regard to the spacing adjacent to 319-321 East Boulevard.
- A single sidelight configuration is not approved.
- The Commission is not reviewing the roof form or the court-yard elevations at this time.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

325 East Boulevard was demolished in 2015. The former building was a “2 ½ Craftsman, frame. Broad side gabled block with exposed rafter ends, wood shingled on second and half stories, weather boarded below. Engaged porch on square posts on piers. Front gable projection with flanking shed dormers. Gabled entry. ca. 1915.” The building was listed as a contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places.

331 East Boulevard was demolished in 2020. 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 proposal is new construction of a multi-family building located on two parcels at the corner of East Boulevard and Euclid Avenue. The new structure is approximately 34'-7 2/16" in height at the front elevation facing East Boulevard. The building steps up in height approximately 1/3 of the way back from the front façade to a height of approximately 41'- 0½". Proposed materials are partially called out on the

details page, which notes wood siding with a 4" reveal and wood columns, trim, and porch rails. Windows proposed to be double-hung aluminum clad.

Revised Proposal – August 11, 2021

- Block site plan with setback dimensions provided.
- Elevations on streetscape survey.
- Tree replanting plan shown.
- East Boulevard elevation revised with fourth floor eliminated, front porch design changes.
- Euclid elevation design revised.

Revised Proposal – September 8, 2021

- *Note: The labels on slides 9-15 should read "Presented on 8.11.2021" instead of 7.30.2021. The meeting on 7/30 was cancelled and the information was presented at the regularly scheduled August meeting*
- Setbacks revised.
- Tree planting locations revised.
- Restudy of three-story presentation, contextual foundation levels, architectural details, cornice and roof levels provided.
- Spacing revised.
- Roof pitch increased to 6/12.
- Single sidelight removed from left and right elevation entryways.
- Courtyard elevations provided.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The Commission will determine if the proposed project meets the design standards for New Construction, Chapter 6.
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: BONAPARTE 2nd: HADEN

Ms. Bonaparte moved to approve this application because it is not incongruous with the district and that it meets the standards, chapter 6 for new construction.

**VOTE: 7/0 AYES: BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN,
PARATI, WALKER**

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION MULTI-FAMILY APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER, MURYN

APPLICATION:

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing one-story Bungalow constructed c. 1931. The building has a three-bay façade with a front gable main roof. Architectural features include a partial-width front porch with a front gable, supported by replacement metal columns on parged and painted brick piers. The house has been wrapped in vinyl and aluminum. All of the doors and windows are replacements. The lot size is small measuring approximately 74' x 66' x 74' x 55'. Adjacent historic structures 1 and 1.5 single family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is an addition to the right side. Due to the parcel shape and location of the historic structure on the parcel, a rear addition is not possible. The owner is seeking a variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) for side addition. The metal carport is proposed for removal. It is unclear if the vinyl/aluminum wrap will remain or be removed.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Front Elevation:
 - a. Mullion trim needed between new paired window opening.
2. Front Porch:
 - a. Porch rail proportions. A historically accurate height with booster rail is recommended, per Porches, page 4.8 (#7).
 - b. The 17" square column size is too large.
 - c. Beam/column relationship drawn incorrectly. Section detail needed.
 - d. Center brick column should not be removed.
3. Right Elevation:
 - a. Lack of fenestration.
4. Windows:
 - a. Apron trim should be removed.
 - b. Window detail needed for ganged windows. Mullion trim needs added to all ganged windows.
5. Foundation:
 - a. How will the parging be removed from the brick piers and stairs?
 - b. Is the foundation of the addition to be brick or parged?
 - c. If parged, will it be concrete or smooth coat stucco?
6. Roof:
 - a. Boxing/eaves should not be pork chop in design.
7. Materials:
 - a. Detail and dimension information needed for all materials (Miratec trim, windows, siding, soffit, vents, etc.).
 - b. Is vinyl/aluminum wrap to remain on original house? If not, corner boards needed.
8. Site Plan:
 - a. Fence/HVAC Screening detail drawing needed. As shown does not meet design standards.
 - b. Tree protection plan for Oak.

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 based on the following: Applicant to provide an accurate representation of existing conditions and provide clarity on fenestration changes at the front porch. Applicant to provide thorough notes on existing and proposed materials and conditions. Applicant to consult with staff on approvable materials, porch rails and beam column relationship. The existing center pier at the front porch is to remain. The right elevation needs fenestration, the clustered windows need shared jambs. No aprons at exterior windows and no pork chop eaves. Applicant to provide clarification on parging at the foundation on existing and proposed. Documentation of non-historic windows and information on siding under the vinyl. Applicant to provide information on fence, HVAC screening, existing trees and a tree protection plan. Reference Chapter 6 & 7

VOTE: 7/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW ADDITION CONTINUED.

Ms. Walker moved to approve the May 12, 2021 minutes. Mr. Haden seconded, and the vote was unanimous 7/0.

Mr. Haden moved to approve the June 9, 2021 minutes. Ms. Walker seconded, and the vote was unanimous 7/0.

Mr. Haden moved to approve the June 30, 2021 minutes with minor edits. Ms. Walker seconded, and the vote was unanimous 7/0.

Ms. Bonaparte moved to approve the July 14, 2021 minutes. Mr. Haden seconded, and the vote was unanimous 7/0.

Ms. Hindman moved to approve the August 11, 2021 minutes with minor edits. Ms. Bonaparte seconded, and the vote was unanimous.

Due to time constraints the following cases will be heard on October 13, 2021 at 1:00 pm.

HDCRMA 2021-00493, 716 Woodruff Place

HDCRMA 2021-00451, 1836 The Plaza

HDCRMA 2021-00494, 729 Mt. Vernon Avenue

With no further business to discuss, Ms. Parati recessed the meeting at 7:21 PM.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission