



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

MINUTES

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Phil Goodwin
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
Mr. Thomas Powers, Assistant City Attorney
Ms. Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

With a quorum present Chairperson Parati called the December 8, 2021 hybrid in-person, remote online meeting at 1:12 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 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 AT THE November 10 MEETING

HDCADMRM 2021-00052, 704 Templeton Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMA 2021-00507, 2200 Charlotte Drive	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2021-00598, 2115 Dilworth Road W.	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2021-00533, 2107 Dilworth Road E.	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2021-00385, 712 Mt. Vernon Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2021-00512, 1610 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood

CONSENT AGENDA

HDCRMA 2021-00623, 625 Walnut Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDCRMA 2021-00606, 1911 S. Mint Street	Wilmore
HDCRMI 2021-01026, 1433 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood

CONTINUED FROM NOVEMBER 10 MEETING

HDCRMI 2021-00147, 2221 LedgeWood Lane	Dilworth
HDCRMA 2021-00235, 1913 Cleveland Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMA 2021-00451, 1836 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood

NEW CASES

HDCRMI 2021-00508, 313-315 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
HDCRMI 2021-00608, 1927 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMI 2021-00609, 2128 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood

DESIGN STANDARDS ADOPTION

Ms. Harpst gave a summary of the timeline and the changes that were added to the Design Standards.

Mr. Haden moved to adopt the Design Standards with the seven items on the summary update with the recommendations made by Commissioner Hindman to include Wilmore and Fourth Ward in item number 1 overview to historic commercial, institutional and multifamily uses within those districts. Ms. Hindman seconded, and the vote was unanimous. 8/0.

NOT HEARD AT THE NOVEMBER 10TH a MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN, HENNINGSON

APPLICATION:

HDCADMRM 2021-00052, 704 TEMPLETON AVENUE (PID: 12305618) – PAINTED BRICK

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing property is a two-story brick house with Colonial Revival elements constructed c. 1938. Architectural features include an asymmetrical L-shape plan, gable roofs with pent eaves, a chimney on the front elevation, and a one-story front porch. Exterior material is unpainted brick. All areas of siding and trim, including the gable eaves and window trim are wrapped in vinyl and aluminum. The lot size measures 50’ x 150’. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1, 1.5, and 2 story single family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

Sometime prior to 2007, an opening on the right elevation was enclosed and infilled with new brick/mortar that does not match the rest of the house. The new homeowner is requesting to paint the entire exterior of the house to blend the infilled opening with the rest of the house and other areas where incorrect mortar was used to make repairs.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Refer to Standards for Masonry, 5.5 and Paint, 5.8.
2. As a solution to blend the mismatched brick/mortar of the infilled window, the HDC staff masonry expert recommends:
 - a. Repointing the areas of mismatched mortar with mortar that matches the original – in composition and color.
 - b. Apply a brick stain to blend areas of mismatched brick to match the rest of the house.
 - i. The slide about the silicate glaze staining was provided by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION1: DENIED 1st: LINEBERGER 2nd: BONAPARTE

Ms. Lineberger moved to deny the painting of the brick based on standard 5.5, number 3 and 5.8, number 7

VOTE: 5/3 **AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, HADEN, LINEBERGER, MURYN,
NAYS: HINDMAN, PARATI, WALKER

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR PAINTED BRICK DENIED.

MOTION2: DENIED **1st:** LINEBERGER **2nd:** HADEN
Ms. Lineberger moved to deny the alteration of the header on the side elevation based on 2.5 the Secretary of Interior Standards, number 2 and standard 4.14, number 6.

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

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR ALTERATION OF THE HEADER ON THE SIDE ELEVATION DENIED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:
ABSENT: GOODWIN, HENNINGSON
RECUSED: HINDMAN

APPLICATION:
HDCRMA 2021-00507, 2200 CHARLOTTE DRIVE (PID: 12112410) – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:
The existing structure is a one-story, Craftsman bungalow with Tudor Revival elements constructed c. 1928. Architectural features include a partial width front porch with stucco and wood ‘half-timbering’ front gable roof supported by square brick columns. The left bay of the front porch is screened. Other details include an all-brick exterior (unpainted), 4/1 double-hung wood windows, exterior brick chimney, and unique triangular roof vent details. A previous rear addition was added at the back left rear corner of the building and a former rear stoop was enclosed with shake siding on the rear elevation. Lot size is 50’ x 155’. Surrounding structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single family buildings. The existing partial front porch enclosure and rear addition were approved by the Commission in December 2004 (COA and meeting documents attached).

PROPOSAL:
The proposed project is for a cross-gable addition that raises the ridge approximately 1’-8½”. The building footprint remains unchanged. Existing areas of wood shake siding that enclose a former rear entry, on the right and rear elevations will be changed to brick. The roof of the addition will extend over an open patio and be supported by square brick columns to coordinate with the front porch. A brick half-wall will be built between the existing rear wall of the house and the column supporting the roof over the patio. The screens will be removed from the front porch. No changes proposed to windows/doors on the original house. Proposed materials of the addition include stucco and timbering to coordinate with the front porch roof. New windows are proposed to be Kolbe Ultra Series aluminum clad with 3/1 Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL) and wood trim.

and window header details. New windows will be wood, double-hung Simulated True Divided Light (STD L) in a 6/1 pattern to match existing.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Addition
 - a. Window specifications/details may be provided to Staff for review/probable approval.
2. Right Elevations
 - a. Fenestration and rhythm.
 - b. Beam/column alignment detail needed (Staff approvable)
3. Rear Elevation
 - a. Window and trim dimensions on ganged windows. Mullions appear oversized in some areas and are completely missing in other areas. (Staff approvable)
4. Site Features
 - a. Confirm no trees are being removed to construct the addition.
 - b. Rear yard open space calculations, as measured from back wall of original house. (Staff Approvable).

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: CONTINUED

1st: BARTH **2nd: BONAPARTE**

Mr. Barth moved to continue this application for the following: Standard 6.12, number 1, regarding the windows along the right side elevation, requesting the applicant study the fenestration and rhythm. Section 7.2, number 3, requesting the applicant analyze a definitive line of transition between the existing brick and the addition. Massing, Section 6.5 and 7.2, number 2, provide detailed plans for the commission to review solid and void relationships on the addition.

Ms. Lineberger made a friendly amendment Standard 7.2, number 6 for the differentiation and for the massing make sure the design of the new addition is compatible with the existing building showing the new work be differentiated from the old while being compatible with its massing, form, scale, directional expression, roof forms and materials.

VOTE: 8/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN, HENNINGSTON

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2021-00553, 2107 DILWORTH E. (PID: 12112516) – RETAINING WALL

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing building is a two-story Four Square built in 1929. Architectural features include a hip roof dormer, wraparound front porch supported by round, classical columns, 1/1 windows, and an exterior chimney on the left elevation. Exterior materials include brick on the first level and stucco on the second level. Lot size is approximately 66' x 197'. Adjacent single-family structures are 1, 1.5, and 2 stories in height.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is a new retaining wall along the front property line. The proposed wall will be brick and 2' in height from grade. The retaining wall will terminate in 12" x 12" brick columns at the left and right property line, and at the concrete steps. The applicant is proposing to brick over the original concrete cheek walls. The retaining wall is proposed to be built up to the public sidewalk without a planting strip. True retaining walls that do not impact original historic elements, and that have a planting strip between the new wall and public sidewalk are eligible for Administrative review. Due to project scope full Commission review is required.

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. Confirmation of where is grade being measured from, outside at the sidewalk?
3. Retaining wall should be set back from the sidewalk to allow for a planting strip.
4. Concrete cheek walls should not be bricked over with thin veneer face brick, this is a poor masonry practice.
5. The concrete steps and cheek walls are original historic site features and should not be changed or removed, per Standard 8.4, #1.
6. Instead of changing, bricking over, or removing the original concrete cheek walls, the new retaining wall should wrap back into the property outside of the existing cheek walls in a manner that does not impact them.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

1st: MURYN **2nd: HADEN**

Mr. Muryn moved to approve this application with the condition the brick be outside of the concrete cheek walls, so they are completely exposed.

Ms. Parati made a friendly amendment per standard 8.4, number 1.

Mr. Haden made a friendly amendment make sure the wall returns to this cheek wall and is further back from the sidewalk and towards the back so it is not sticking up and it returns back to grade behind the cheek wall.

Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment per standard 8.6, number 5.

Mr. Haden made a friendly amendment, the wall to be no higher than the top of the cheek wall at the top step.

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

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR RETAINING WALL APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:
ABSENT: GOODWIN

APPLICATION:
HDCRMI 2021-00385, 712 MT. VERNON AVENUE (PID: 12309415) – ACCESSORY BUILDING

EXISTING CONDITIONS:
The existing property is a 2-story Colonial Revival building constructed c. 1925. Architectural features include a symmetrical main façade with a one-story side wing on the left, 6/1 double-hung wood windows, a partial-width porch covered in the center by an arched portico supported by round columns. The front entry is notable with sidelights and a fanlight. A historic, two-vehicle garage is located in the rear. The National Register nomination estimates garage construction c. 1925, the same time as the main house. The lot size is approximately 75' x 175'. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1, 1.5 and 2-story single family houses.

PROPOSAL:
The proposal is the demolition of the historic garage structure and the installation of an accessory building in the rear yard. Footprint measures approximately 25'-0" x 33'-2". Height is approximately 23'-11¾" as measured from grade to ridge. Proposed materials include brick/mortar to match primary structure, Nichiha Savannah smooth fiber cement siding, wood garage doors, wood brackets and trim, and Turncraft 10" wood columns.

STAFF ANALYSIS:
Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The Commission will determine if the original, historic garage structure is dilapidated and may be removed.
2. Fenestration – size/location of windows in left and right gables. The brick headers relationship to the roof trim. Casements may be a solution to meet egress. (Staff approvable)
3. Window specifications/details may be provided to Staff for review/probable approval.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:
No one accepted Ms. Parati's invitation to speak for or against this application.

- wall or front porches.
- Minor changes may be approved by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION1: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS **1st: WALKER** **2nd: HADEN**

Ms. Walker moved to approve this application because it is not incongruous with the neighborhood and meets Secretary of Interior Standards, number 9, and designs standards for porches, 6.14 and additions, 7.2, number 6. Staff to approve any changes to the railing height, to tread on stairs. The column dimensions be six-by-six and clad in wood, the curved treatment of the front door gable and the eave returns be consistent with the historic eave returns on the original house.

Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment; the beams and soffits should be wood.

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

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

CONSENT AGENDA

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN
RECUSED: PARATI

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2021-00623, 625 WALNUT AVENUE (PID: 07102210) – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Known as the Hoover House, the existing structure is a brick Colonial Revival house built c. 1943. Architectural features include a side-gabled roof, exterior end chimney and pedimented door surround, and 6/6 double-hung windows. The gabled side extension on the left elevation is a newer addition. The fixed, shutters also appear to be a later addition. The lot size is approximately 55' x 195.5'. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1, 1.5 and 2-story single family houses.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is a rear addition and changes to fenestration on the left and right elevations. No changes to the front elevation. The addition ties in beneath the original ridge. Roof trim materials and brick foundation are proposed to match existing. Other proposed materials include Hardie lap siding with a 6" reveal and trim. A paired window in the right elevation, located behind the chimney and minimally visible from the street, is proposed to be shortened. On the first level of the left elevation, an existing window will be shifted and made slightly narrower. On the second level of the left elevation an

existing window is proposed to be shortened and a new window installed beside it. There are no impacts to mature canopy trees. Post-construction, the rear yard appears to meet permeability requirements, and this can be confirmed with staff. The rear addition is no taller or wider than the original house, but the expansion of the heated space by more than 50% and the visibility of the window changes on the left elevation require full Commission review.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the 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 project for meeting the Standards and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with permit-ready construction drawings submitted to staff for final review, with the following Conditions:
 - a. The requested regular Hardie siding is not approvable due to dimensional qualities. Siding and trim to be either wood or Nichiha Savannah smooth.
 - b. Add a trim band between the first and second levels of the new addition.
 - c. Provide manufacturer specifications that meet HDC standards for the new windows and doors.
 - d. Clarify shutter details on left elevation.
 - e. Brick and mortar infill on the original house will match existing; a future request to paint will not be accepted.
 - f. Provide rear yard permeability calculations.
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 Mr. Henningson's invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION1: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS 1st: MURYN 2nd: HADEN

Mr. Muryn moved to approve this consent agenda item because it meets 7.2 for new addition and chapter 6 for new construction with the recommendations made by staff.

VOTE: 8/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN

RETURNED: PARATI, 4:25

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2021-00606, 1911 S. MINT STREET (PID: 11907603) – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a brick American Small House built c. 1940. The house has a few minimal Colonial Revival/Tudor elements as visible in the 6/6 window configuration and the front gable roof detailing. The metal awnings and metal porch rails/posts appear to be a later 1960s additions.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is the addition of a shed roof over the existing front stoop. Pre-renovation a metal awning roof was in this location (see photo). Materials are traditional to match existing. The changes on the rear elevation are staff approvable due to scope and location. There are no impacts to mature canopy trees. No change to the rear yard permeability.

Note: there appears to be inconsistencies on some of the ‘existing’ elevation drawings. For example, the “Proposed Left Elevation” matches the as-built conditions shown in the photographs. The affected elevations (front and right) of the proposed drawings appear to be consistent and accurate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the 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 project for meeting the Standards and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with permit-ready construction drawings submitted to staff for final review, with the following Condition:
 - a. The new handrail design be adjusted to a historic height with a booster rail used obtain code height.
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.

MOTION1: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

1st: HINDMAN 2nd: WALKER

Ms. Hindman moved to approve this application because it is not incongruous with the district and meets the standards for additions, page 7.2 and chapter 6. The handrail should be adjusted to a historic height with a booster rail.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2021-01026, 1433 THOMAS AVENUE (PID: 08117223) – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The property is a one-story Craftsman bungalow constructed c 1926. Architectural features include an asymmetrical façade, partial width front porch, exposed rafter tails, exterior brick chimney on the left elevation, a triple ganged window bay with shed roof on the front elevation, wood siding and trim, and 6/1 windows. On the rear elevation are two small, shed roof additions. The brick foundation and chimney are painted. The lot is small and irregular measuring approximately 55’ x 132 x 29’ x 135’. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5 story single-family structures.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is a small, 556 sf, one-story rear addition that ties in below the original ridge. The addition is slightly wider on the left side due to the building being non-conforming with current required zoning setbacks on the right side. One tree will be removed to accommodate the addition. Materials include a painted brick foundation to match existing, wood lap siding/trim/corner boards, etc. to match existing. Post-construction the rear yard impermeable area will be 29%.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the 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 project for meeting the Standards and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item with permit-ready construction drawings submitted to staff for final review, with the following Conditions:
 - a. Replanting of a maturing canopy tree to replace the one being lost.
 - b. Tree protection plan for the large canopy tree to remain.
 - c. Provide manufacturer specifications that meet HDC standards for the new windows on the addition.
 - d. New brick foundation to remain unpainted.
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.

MOTION1: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS 1st: HADEN 2nd: BONAPARTE

Mr. Haden moved to approve this application because it meets our standards for additions and new construction 7.2 and Chapter 6 and the staff recommendations be included in the approval of replanting of a mature canopy tree to replace the one being lost, a tree protection plan for the large canopy tree to remain. Provide manufacturer specifications that meet HDC standards for new windows and the new brick foundation to remain unpainted.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

CASES CONTINUED FROM NOVEMBER 10 MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2021-00147, 2221 LEDGEWOOD LANE (PID: 12112416) – ADDITION

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

- Per Standard 6.5, New Construction, and 6.10, Roof Forms, restudy of the massing, complexity of form, and the roof forms.
- Per Standard 7.2, number 2, limit the size of the addition so that it does not overpower the historic house.
- Per Standard 6.6 Height and Width, restudy of the width to eliminate front yard parking.
- Per Standard 8.2, number 3, Sidewalks and Parking, retain the original historic driveway, and 8.2, number 6, the driveway should not stop at the beginning of the house.
- Per standard 4.15, number 9, Shutters, do not add shutters to buildings that never had them.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one-story, bungalow with both Craftsman and Colonial Revival elements, constructed c. 1926. Architectural details include side gable roof with pent eaves, 6/1 double-hung wood windows, and an engaged front porch under a full façade gabled roof supported by slightly tapered square columns on top of brick piers. The primary exterior material is brick with shake shingle siding in the front gable. The lot is shallow and irregularly shaped measuring approximately 50' x 97' x 29' x 55' x 57'. Adjacent structures include 1 and 1.5 story single-family structures and a 2-story multi-family structure.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is a rear addition that raises the ridge approximately 4'4". An addition to the right elevation is also proposed, which will widen the house approximately 7'-6". A series of sketches showing alternative addition configurations considered are shown on A-7.0. Proposed materials are traditional to match existing, including roof trim and design. New windows shown as Jeld-Wen aluminum clad Simulated True Divided Light (STDL) in a 6/1 pattern to match existing. Post-construction the rear yard will be 79% permeable. The Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) issued a variance for both rear yard and side yard required setbacks due to the unique conditions of this lot at its August 31, 2021 meeting (A-3.0).

Revised Proposal – December 8, 2021

- Rear addition design simplified with ridge height increase reduced to 3'0".
- Side addition design changed to begin slightly farther back.

- Driveway details shown on A-3.0 and A-4.0.
- Shutters removed.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Confirm the new wood siding will be individually applied shakes and not panels of shingles.
2. Confirm the windows to be the ‘Siteline’ line from Jeld-Wen.
3. Minor changes may be reviewed and approved by Staff

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: CONTINUED 1st: BONAPARTE 2nd: HENNINGSON

Ms. Bonaparte moved to continue this application for: standard 6.5 new construction and 6.10 roof forms, restudy the massing, complexity of form and roof forms. Standard 7.2, number 2, limit the size of the addition so it doesn’t overpower the historic house. Standard 6.6, height and width, restudy the width to eliminate front yard parking.

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

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN
LEFT: MURYN, 5:35 PM
RECUSED: PARATI

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2021-00235, 1913 CLEVELAND AVENUE (PID: 12105619) – NEW CONSTRUCTION (MULTI FAMILY)

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

1. **Massing, section 6.5, number 2; Height and Width section 6.6, number 1; Scale section 6.7, number 3.** Restudy the top two floors of the structure in relation to the analysis that was done on page 28 by removing two units off the back in an effort to reduce the rear and the property's massing and scale towards historic lots in the rear and maintaining the 15-foot offset from the rear property line with regard to the lower two levels as well as analyzing a landscape plan that works in this area to provide buffer to the residential properties.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

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

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is for new construction of a multi-family building. The new structure is approximately 44' in height from grade to the top of the decorative parapet (three stories) at the front elevation on Cleveland Avenue and four-stories at the rear of the building, due to site topography. Exterior materials are brick, cast stone, and aluminum clad windows. Setback is 20' from back of curb and 6'-6 1/2" from back of property line. A full-width 9' deep front porch faces Cleveland Avenue. HVAC units will be located on the roof.

Revised Proposal – August 11, 2021

- Rear elevation revised.
- Additional information about the relationship of new building to Euclid and E. Worthington provided.
- Elevation drawings provided.

Revised Proposal – October 13, 2021

- Massing, see pages 1-8.
- Landscaping/Private Sites, see pages 9-11.
- Cornices and Trim, see page 14.
- Porches, see pages 14-15.
- Doors and Windows, see page 13.
- Signage, see page 16.

Revised Proposal – November 10, 2021

- Additional information about corbels/cornice materials.
- Additional details about windows/doors.
- Building step-down at rear.
- Landscaping plan.

Revised Proposal – December 8, 2021

- Rear elevation design change.
- Landscaping plan changed with 15' rear yard noted.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. A decision is required. The Commission will determine if the proposed project meets the Design Standards for New Construction, Chapter 6.
2. Minor changes may be reviewed and approved by Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

Mr. Ken Raynor, adjacent property owner, spoke in opposition of this application.

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

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

1st: HINDMAN 2nd: BONAPARTE

Ms. Hindman moved to approve this application for meeting chapter 6 with permit ready construction documents to be submitted to staff with further details and physical submissions for traditional color, material and size to meet the HDC standards, including, but not limited to the following: brick, cast

stone, metal roof and gutters, railings, windows, doors, louvers, garage gates, garbage, HVAC screening, hard scape, sidewalks, steps, retaining walls, lighting and final signage package.

VOTE: 4/3

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN,

NAYS: LINEBERGER, HADEN, WALKER

DECISION:

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

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN, MURYN

LEFT: HENNINGSON, 7:16 PM

RETURNED: PARATI

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2021-00451, 1836 THE PLAZA (PID: 09506132) – NEW CONSTRUCTION

This application was continued from the November 10, 2021 meeting for the following items:

- Resolve drawing inconsistencies on plans, elevations, and section details including the following:
 - window mulls that reflect accurate spacing
 - siding
 - brick shown at the foundations
 - brackets to engage with barge rafters with birdsmouth detail
 - plumb cut rafter tails
 - sheet A-103 - elevation to match the proposed orientation, match dimensions and notes on all elevations
 - sheet A-400 – correct tapered chimney
 - sheet A-300 – revise note for Andersen Windows to the proposed Weather Shield product
- Seek alternative siding material of at least five-eighths inch or thicker as approved previously by the HDC for compliance with HDC Standards.
- Look to the neighborhood for acceptable precedent for paving surfaces for driveways & sidewalks.
- Review the windows on the north elevation and the middle of the elevation to be at least six to eight inches wider or be top sash windows over the tub and review this window proportion.
- On the Zoutewelle survey show finished floor elevations as it relates to the adjacent properties and structures.
- Provide supporting documentation for bungalows in Plaza Midwood in context for similar width and massing.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing parcel is a vacant lot. The lot was previously part of 1830 The Plaza. Lot size is approximately 66' x 170'. An alley runs behind the property. Adjacent structures are a 2 story multi-family apartment building and 1, 1.5 and 2 story single-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal includes the construction of a new single-family structure and detached accessory building. The proposed new 1.5 story structure has a height of 27'-11 15/16". The building width is 45'-11 1/2". Proposed siding materials are brick veneer, lap siding with trim, and decorative brackets. Shake siding is used as an accent in many of the gable ends. Proposed windows appear to be a mix of double-hung and fixed/awning aluminum clad wood windows. Roofing is asphalt shingle with metal shed accent roofs on the front and rear. The accessory building is proposed for the right rear corner of the property and matches the design & style of the proposed main structure.

Revised Proposal – November 10, 2021

- Ridge height modified.
- More information/documentation provided on alley & existing site conditions/elements.
- Landscape plan provided.
- Rear yard impervious area provided (further breakdown is needed, can work with staff on details).
- Distance between adjacent structures provided.
- Solid paneling removed in lieu of shake siding in gable ends.
- Shed awning over the front porch omitted; still shown on A400.
- Narrow windows removed at rear on North elevation; one paired set remains.
- Apron trim removed.
- Pedestrian door changed on side entry/south elevation.
- Porch ceiling material labeled tongue & groove pine.
- Brick water table removed.
- Straight chimney provided; tapered still shown on A400.

Revised Proposal – December 8, 2021

- Ridge height modified.
- Additional notes/labels on elevations and detail page including plank and shake siding indicated.
- Labels indicate a brick skirt/foundation on all four elevations of the main structure.
- A103 – shows a 4' wide front walkway and 10' wide driveway in concrete.
- Chimney removed on details page.
- House widths and heights from The Plaza shown on A105-A107.
- 1x5 trim shown for windows; the second set of paired windows have been shifted back and are wider on the north elevation.
- Floor plans included on A300-A301; notes indicate Weather Shield signature series windows.
- Plate height indicated for accessory building; overall height not indicated.
- Additional info on the water sampling station provided.
- Post-construction rear yard permeability will be approx. 59%.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Front elevation reversed on neighborhood map, A104.
2. Massing & Height

- Building is both tall and wide; building seems tall for proposed Craftsman style bungalow. Height reduced but still over 27'. Width is proposed at 45'-11 ½".
3. Scale & Foundations
 - Does the foundation, fenestration, etc. line up with adjacent properties?
 4. Windows
 - West elevation – top trim on left side double windows is not visible due to roof overhang.
 - South Elevation – size/proportions on shorter windows.
 - As drawn mullion trim is too narrow between the paired/triple windows throughout; mulls seem to be same size as window trim/casing.
 - 5" casing indicated for window trim; mull trim will need to be increased proportionally; 4" casing is typical.
 5. Materials
 - Additional labels/material details/specs needed throughout plans on main and accessory building including doors, windows (STDLS?), garage door material, shakes, accessory building foundation material, etc.
 - A201-South elevation label indicates hardi-plank siding.
 - Individually applied shingle/shake siding is required.
 - Brick color/sample provided previously, commission to determine if appropriate.
 - 10' wide driveway proposed, commission to determine if appropriate.
 6. Further details are needed for the following:
 - Width & Spacing comparison to adjacent properties; widths and heights supplied for various properties on The Plaza.
 - It is unclear as to whether heated or unheated widths were provided. Building widths shown for building footprints on Mecklenburg County property record cards differ from those provided.
 - Column & beam details appear correct on the elevations however the details page should be reconciled to the elevations.
 - Reconcile landscape plan & site plan regarding HVAC location, rear walkway width, etc. HVAC location needs screening if not completely behind structure. (Staff approvable)
 - Overall accessory building height needed.
 - Rear yard impervious area provided (further breakdown is needed, staff approvable).
 - Porch railing detail needed; should be connected below the caps on the piers, with a booster rail if needed.
 7. 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 1: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS 1st: BARTH 2nd: HADEN

Mr. Barth moved to approve this application with applicant to work with staff on the following: trim thickness and details around windows, corner boards and doors. The brick piers and their relationship to the railing as well as the railing details on the front porch. Applicant to modify the driveway to a three-three-three configuration with carriage strips. Applicant to choose whichever brick in the two options that they presented.

Mr. Barth added a friendly amendment, the applicant to work with staff on the column to beam relationship on the front porch. Beam width should align with the column neck on both sides, interior and exterior.

VOTE: 3/4 **AYES:** WALKER, HADEN, BARTH

NAYS: HINDMAN, BONAPARTE, LINEBERGER, PARATI

DECISION:
MOTION FAILS

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

Ms. Walker moved to continue this application for a restudy of the massing of the front of the structure and that all of what was stated in the original motion remain.

Ms. Lineberger made a friendly amendment applicant to provide accurate drawings that include materials and dimensions that was repeatedly called out in all previous meetings.

Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment the tree species go to staff for compliance with the approved tree list.

VOTE: 6/1 **AYES:** BONAPARTE, HADEN, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WALKER

NAYS: BARTH

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED

Due to time constraints the following cases will be heard on January 12,2022 at 1:00 pm.
HDCRMI 2021-00508, 313-315 W. Kingston Avenue
HDCRMI 2021-00608, 1927 The Plaza
HDCRMI 2021-00609, 2128 The Plaza

Ms. Walker moved to approve the November 10, 2021 minutes as submitted. It was seconded by Mr. Haden and the vote was unanimous.

With no further business to discuss, Ms. Parati recessed the meeting at 7:50 PM.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission