

---

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION HYBRID IN-PERSON/REMOTE ONLINE MEETING**  
**April 13, 2022**  
**Room 280 + WebEx**

**MINUTES**

- MEMBERS PRESENT:** Ms. Kim Parati, (Chairperson)  
Mr. P.J. Henningson (Vice Chairperson)  
Mr. Chris Barth  
Ms. Nichelle Bonaparte  
Mr. Phil Goodwin  
Mr. Jim Haden  
Ms. Jill Walker  
Mr. Scott Whitlock
- MEMBERS ABSENT:** Ms. Jessica Hindman (2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chairperson)  
Ms. Christa Lineberger  
Mr. Chris Muryn
- 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 to order the April 13, 2022. hybrid in-person, remote online meeting at 1:01 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, turn off or silent electronic devices, and do not speak over the person talking or you will be asked to leave the meeting. Lastly, use the "raise your hand" tool, and 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:**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

HDCRMI 2022-00107, 1101 Belgrave Place	Dilworth
HDCRMA 2022, 00070, 2306 Charlotte Drive	Dilworth
HDCRMA 2022-00296, 509 E. Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMA 2022-00236, 2010 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood

**CONTINUED FROM FEBRUARY 9 MEETING**

HDCRMA 2021-00917, 816 Walnut Avenue	Wesley Heights
--------------------------------------	----------------

**CONTINUED FROM MARCH 9 MEETING**

HDCRMI 2021-00508, 313-315 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
---	---------

**NEW CASES**

HDCCMA 2022-00090, 427 East Boulevard	Dilworth
HDCRMA 2022-00150, 729 Mt. Vernon Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMA 2022-00069, 901 Berkeley Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMA 2022-00219, 1001 Mt. Vernon Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMA 2020-00003, 1920 Woodcrest Avenue	Wilmore
HDCRMA 2022-00241, 718 N. Poplar Street	Fourth Ward
HDCADMRM 2019-00577, 1542 Wickford Place	Wilmore
HDCRDEMO 2022-00087, 711 Berkeley Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRDEMO 2022-00168, 1740 Merriman Avenue	Wilmore
HDCRMI 2022-00253, 628 S. Summit Avenue	Wesley Heights

---

**CONSENT AGENDA**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI 2022-00107, 1101 BELGRAVE PLACE (PID: 12310301) – ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a one-story brick Ranch with Spanish revival elements built c. 1949. Architectural features include a large, prominent front chimney, painted brick exterior with stucco in the gable ends, red tile roof with pent eave returns, recessed front entry, paired windows, and small round feature window. The lot size is approximately 99' x 172' x 113' x 193'. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1 and 2-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a rear addition that ties in beneath the original ridge. The addition consists of a new rear gable on the right elevation that bumps out from the existing right rear corner. As an additional transition from the rear right corner of the original house to the new addition, a recessed brick course will be used, extending from grade to the roof. Materials and details will all match existing including the brick exterior, with stucco in gable ends and pent eave returns, wood 1/1 windows, tile roof, vent details, and window/door/roof trim, etc. There are three ornamental trees to be removed to construct the addition (sheet HDC-3). The applicant provided permeability calculations based on the entire lot, and should the Commission approve the project, accurate permeability calculations for the rear yard that meet the HDC standards need to be provided to staff prior to a COA being issued. The project requires full Commission review due to location on a corner lot and request to paint the new brick exterior of the addition, but for these circumstances the project would be an Administrative review.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for 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. Provide accurate rear yard permeability calculations that meet HDC Standards.
  - b. Install actual windows instead of faux openings infilled brick on the right elevation.
  - c. Beam/column detail for rear porch.
  - d. Brick on the new addition to remain unpainted.
  - e. Provide window and door specifications that meet HDC Standards.
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 WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>: BONAPARTE**

**2<sup>nd</sup>: HADEN**

Ms. Bonaparte moved to approve this application, as it is not incongruous with the district and meets the standards for New Construction, Chapter 6, and that permit-ready construction drawings will be submitted to staff for final review with the following conditions: provide accurate rear yard permeability calculations that meet HDC standards, install actual windows instead of faux openings, in-fill brick on the right elevation,

beam/column detail for rear porch, brick on the new addition to remain unpainted, and provide window and door specifications that meet HDC standards.

**VOTE:** 8/0

**AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, PARATI, WALKER, WHITLOCK

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA 2022-00070, 2306 CHARLOTTE DRIVE (PID:12112403) - ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1.5-story Picturesque Revival house built c. 1932. Architectural features include a large gable front block with shed dormers on either side, engaged side porch with arched opening, and slightly projecting gabled entrance with a broken pediment, fluted pilasters, transom window surrounding the front door. Exterior materials include wood shake siding with beveled corners, 6/6 wood double-hung windows and an unpainted brick chimney. The lot size is approximately 50' x 141' x 55' x 117'. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1.5, 2 and 2.5-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a rear addition in place of a former patio area. The addition ties in below the existing ridge and the roof form and design matches the original. Materials will all match existing including the wood shake siding, window/door/roof trim, vents, and brick foundation. On the right elevation a vertical piece of trim will delineate the transition between the original house and new addition. The addition bumps in on the left elevation. No trees will be removed to construct the addition. The project requires full Commission review due to the size of the addition, but for the size the project would be an Administrative review.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for 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. Add a window on the right elevation on the first floor between the rear corner of the original house and the new paired window; aligned with the second level window.
  - b. Provide window and door specifications that meet HDC Standards.
  - c. Provide accurate rear yard permeability calculations that meet HDC Standards.
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 WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>: WALKER**

**2<sup>nd</sup>: BARTH**

Ms. Walker moved to approve this application, as it meets the standards for New Construction and Additions, specifically 6.20 through 6.24, and that the applicant provide the following for staff approval: rear yard permeability calculations measured from the original thermal wall, specs on the windows and doors so that they abide by HDC standards, and then back to staff with permit-ready construction drawings for final review.

**VOTE:**8/0

**AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, PARATI, WALKER, WHITLOCK

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA 2022-00296, 509 EAST TREMONT AVENUE (PID: 12105803) – NEW CONSTRUCTION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure was one-story Craftsman bungalow constructed in 1915. Architectural features include a side gable roof with a front gable porch supported by brick columns, original 8/1 wood windows, wood shake shingle siding brackets. Height is approximately 21.2'. Lot size is approximately 50' x 150'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5 story single-family homes. The building is listed as a contributing to the Dilworth National Register Historic District.

On February 12, 2020, the HDC placed a 365-day stay of demolition on the property (HDCRDEMO-2019-00795).

A new single-family structure and detached single-car garage was approved for construction on September 9, 2020 (HDCRMA-2020-00266). The original house was demolished, and construction of the new building began in 2021.

**PROPOSAL:**

The new single-family structure was approved for the primary ridge height to be 1.5' taller than the historic house and with the front ridge at 23.4' with the secondary ridge and total height as measured from grade at 25.9'. During construction, it was discovered that the house was framed at a height of 26.5'. The plans illustrate the exact heights to the hundredth decimal place. The applicant is requesting to keep the as-built framed height.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Minor changes may be approved by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION: APPROVED**

**1<sup>st</sup>: HADEN**

**2<sup>nd</sup>: HENNINGSON**

Mr. Haden moved to approve this project, as submitted, as it meets the design standards for New Construction, Chapter 6.

**VOTE:** 8/0

**AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, PARATI, WALKER, WHITLOCK

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA-2022-00236, 2010 THE PLAZA (PID: 09506101, 09506102, 09506130, 09506131) - NEW CONSTRUCTION DESIGN CHANGES**

**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.

On May 12, 2021, the Commission approved the construction of four new buildings that comprise a total of 22 townhomes.

- Ten (10) units are accessed from The Plaza and face the main house.
- Twelve (12) units are accessed from Belvedere Avenue and face Thurmond Place.
- Height of units fronting The Plaza and Belvedere are 33'-6" (The height of the Van Landingham Estate is 35'-7" based on the most current Zoutewelle survey).
- Heights of all other units is 35'6"
- Proposed material palette is Nichiha Savannah Smooth siding, Miratec (trim), brick, aluminum clad windows with brick mold trim/fiber cement trim.
- Roof details include wood fascia and brackets
- Other site features include landscaping, tree planting, and new driveways and walkways.
- All HVAC equipment will be placed behind parapet screen wall of roof. See detail 04 on sheet A-3.0.
- All trash & recycle cans will be roll out type. No dumpsters will be used on project.
- 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.

**PROPOSAL:**

The project is for design changes to building number one, which faces The Plaza. No other buildings are submitted for design review at this time. The changes are noted on the plans. There are three primary changes on the building:

1. Center unit roofline/engaged dormer.
2. Fenestration changes on the rear unit due to topography and decrease in height.
3. The rear elevation, which is a new elevation not reviewed under the original approval.

These changes are the template for adjustments to Buildings 2, 3, and 4. The request is for the Commission to approve these changes and, provided any changes to the other buildings are the similar, authorize staff to approve the changes to the other three buildings.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for 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.
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**

**1<sup>st</sup>: BARTH**

**2<sup>nd</sup>: WALKER**

Mr. Barth moved to approve this project, as submitted, as it meets the design standards for New Construction, Chapter 6.

**VOTE:** 8/0

**AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, PARATI, WALKER, WHITLOCK

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED.

---

**CONTINUED FROM FEBRUARLY 9 MEETING**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA 2021-000917, 816 WALNUT AVENUE (PID: 07102126) - NEW CONSTRUCTION, MULTI-FAMILY**

***This application was continued from the February 9, 2022, meeting for the following items:***

- 6.1, Preamble, with regard to scale reducing techniques and the context and character of the district.
- Setback, 6.2, established block face of the thermal wall and porch.
- Spacing, 6.3.

- Massing, 6.5, take cues from contextual quadruplexes.
- 6.12, Doors and windows, shutters, and rhythms.
- Porches, 6.14.
- Chapter 8, Site details, specifically drives, walks, and spacing at foundation with additional details needed, including but not limited to notes, dimensions, window specifications, materials, trees, HVAC and trash, lighting, and retaining walls.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is one-story, multi-family building constructed c. 1950. The front-gabled building has a concrete stoop, 1/1 windows, and a painted brick exterior. Adjacent structures 1, 1.5 and 2-story single-family and multi-family buildings. The lot size is approximately 55' x 150'. The Commission approved demolition with a 365-day stay on July 14, 2021.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is the new construction of a multi-family building. The new structure is approximately 29.3' in height as measured from grade to ridge at its tallest point. Exterior materials are brick with concrete windowsills. The trim, window, door, and column materials are not specified. Setback is 20' from property line to the front porch. A full-width 8' deep front porch faces Walnut Avenue.

*Revised Proposal*

- All four (4) elevations re-designed; height is unchanged.
- Setback changed
- Site details reconfigured
- Tree at front left corner proposed for removal
- Non-traditional materials requested for windows, doors, and all areas of trim.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Right elevation fenestration and rhythm.
2. Differentiation between front and rear elevations.
3. Elevation drawings with dimensions and details.
4. Details needed:
  - a. Beam/column alignment does not look correct. Column dimensions needed.
  - b. Window and door trim/panels proposed as Hardie.
  - c. Fiberglass windows and doors proposed; specifications needed as the Commission has not previously approved this material.
  - d. Front porch pediment materials.
  - e. Roof trim dimensions.
  - f. Brick sample
5. Site Plan
  - a. HVAC and dumpster enclosure details.
  - b. Dimensions/materials of all walkways.
  - c. Driveway material.
  - d. Information about the existing retaining wall.
  - e. Dimensions and details for proposed new retaining wall.
  - f. Will lighting be installed in the rear for the parking area?



**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION: CONTINUED**

**1<sup>st</sup>: BARTH**

**2<sup>nd</sup>: BONAPARTE**

Mr. Barth moved to continue this application for the following reasons: Item one, requesting that the applicant provide more detail in the form of wall sections, at the foundation showing brick extending to the grid line, Standard 6.9, number 2. Item two, requesting more articulation with regard to cornice and trim at the eave lines, Standard 6.11. Item three, requesting that the applicant provide further details with regard to dorm windows, asking that the applicant indicate soldier course brick headers and rowlock brick sills at windows. Additionally in regard to windows, we would like to request that the applicant provide a physical sample for the window specification indicated in the application for approval, Standard 6.12, Doors and Windows. Item four, porches on the proposed, requesting that the applicant look inward to the community and architectural examples similar to this style of architecture, providing adequate column-to-beam-to-eave connections in the porch area, Standard 6.14. Item five massing, requesting the applicant provide adequate differentiation between the front and back of the structure, and requesting that the applicant step back the exterior wall at least six inches along the left and right elevations, Standard 6.5. Item six, requesting the applicant provide symmetrical window rhythm and layout on the right front elevation, Standard 6.12. Item seven site plan, requesting that the applicant show adequate HVAC locations and screening, as well as dumpster locations should be provided, Standard 8.8. And lastly item eight, requesting that the applicant replace the tree being removed as proposed Standard 8.5.

Mr. Haden made a friendly amendment requesting the replacement tree be approved by the City of Charlotte large maturing shade tree list, and that it be a minimum of two-and-a-half-inch caliper as a replacement tree.

**VOTE:** 8/0

**AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, PARATI, WALKER, WHITLOCK

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION – MULTI FAMILY CONTINUED.

---

**CONTINUED FROM MARCH 9<sup>TH</sup> MEETING**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN

RECUSE: HENNINGSON

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI 2021-00508, 313-315 WEST KINGSTON AVENUE (PID: 11907915) – WINDOW/DOOR REPLACEMENT AND FRONT PORCH CHANGES**

***This application was continued from the March 9, 2022, meeting for the following items:***

1. Windows, per Standard 4.14, numbers 14 and 17, match the size of the windows and also match the original pane design.
  - a. The pane layout should match or be consistent with the original.

- b. Provide section details for the windows in an effort to reduce the width of the casing to be put around the windows, especially if going to remove the nailing fin, and note how the window would be properly sealed.
2. Doors, per 4.10 number 2.
  - a. Mimic the original design for all four replacement doors.
  - b. Consider repairing the side and rear doors.
3. Porches, per Standard 4.8, number 2.
  - a. Revise the application to show iron railings for the porches to mimic the original.
  - b. Avoid stripping porches and steps of original materials and architectural features, such as handrails, balusters, columns, and flooring
4. Driveway, per Standard 2.3, number 2, and 2.6, 1-A.
  - a. As a true repair is staff approvable.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a one story ranch style duplex constructed c. 1951. Architectural features include metal windows, low-pitch hip roof with two chimneys and unpainted brick. The front unit is accessed via the central front entry with a flat roof supported by decorative metal columns. The rear unit is accessed via an entry on the left side also covered by a flat roof supported by a decorative meal column. Lot size is 50' x 184'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5 story single-family structures.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is in multiple parts:

1. Doors. Replacement all 4 doors on the structure. The front unit (315 W. Kingston) has a non-original front door and original side entry door. The rear unit (313 W. Kingston) has an original front door and original rear entry door. New front doors are proposed to be fiberglass in a mid-century inspired design. The side and rear entry doors are proposed to be wood similar to the design of the existing doors.
2. Porch Columns. Proposing to wrap the metal porch columns with wood at a finished dimension of 8' x 8'. Railings to be wood.
3. Replacement windows. New windows proposed to be Pella Lifestyle Enduraclad double-hung wood.
4. Driveway. A portion of the existing driveway is asphalt and damaged, which is proposed for replacement.

*Revised Proposal – March 2022*

- Elevations provided
- New doors options and specifications provided
- HVAC units shown on rear elevation
- Proposed railing shown on front and right elevations
- Window specifications provided. The Applicant is requesting approval for both the Pella and Jeld-Wen windows due to potential product manufacturing and delivery delays. Both will have the same configuration in terms of size, style, and grid design.

*Revised Proposal – April 2022*

- Removes door replacement from project scope
- Details about window casings and designs
- Metal columns to remain
- Metal railing details shown

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Windows
  - a. A few of the windows are missing the vertical muntin trim (staff approvable)
2. Railing height dimensions needed.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>: GOODWIN**

**2<sup>nd</sup>: HADEN**

Mr. Goodwin moved to approve this application with the applicant to provide permit-ready drawings to staff for final review with the following conditions: to provide the steel railing details, to show half-inch square balusters and scrolls to mimic the original design, and also to make them code complaint per Standard 4.8, number 2. Also provide updated window details and dimensions, getting very close to mimic the original grill pattern per Standard 4.14, numbers 13, 6 14, and 17.

**VOTE:** 7/0

**AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, PARATI, WALKER, WHITLOCK

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR WINDOW/DOOR & PORCH CHANGES APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

---

**NEW CASES**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN

RETURNED: HENNINGSON

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCCMA 2022-00090, 427 EAST BOULEVARD (PID: 12308310) – NEW CONSTRUCTION, COMMERCIAL**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The site is currently paved with asphalt and used for parking. There is a 10’ alley in the rear. Lot size is approximately 50’ x 140’. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1.5, 2, and 2.5-story multi-family and commercial buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal includes the construction of a new building. Building height is proposed to be 37.9’ as measured from grade to ridge. Setback is shown from back of curb to the front porch at approximately 41’-11” and the front thermal wall at approximately 49’-6”. The building footprint and width dimensions are not shown. Proposed siding materials are Hardie lap siding, Hardie staggered shake siding, accent areas of decorative shingles, wood porch railing, and a painted brick foundation. Proposed column material is not noted. Proposed windows are to be double-hung; materials are not noted. Roofing is asphalt shingle. The building

design is inspired by the historic Victorian architecture along East Blvd.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Windows
  - a. Right, Left and Rear elevations - window size/proportions
  - b. Window trim undersized on windows in gables
  - c. Window mullion trim appears too narrow on paired windows
  - d. Window materials and specifications
  
2. Further details are needed for the following:
  - a. Door design and materials
  - b. Column materials, dimensions, & details
  - c. Porch section showing beam/column detail
  - d. Railing detail/section
  - e. Skirtboard trim dimensions between foundation and siding appears to be undersized
  
3. Site Plan
  - a. HVAC location/screening
  - b. Dimensions & materials for site work including driveways/walkways
  
4. Non-Traditional Materials
  - a. Hardie shingles have not yet been approved
  - b. Hardie siding, has not yet been approved
  - c. Painted brick is proposed for the foundation

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

Ms. Leslie Dutton spoke on this application.

**MOTION: CONTINUED**

**1<sup>st</sup>: WHITLOCK**

**2<sup>nd</sup>: WALKER**

Mr. Whitlock moved to continue this application for the following points. Setback - we would ask that it be in keeping with surrounding properties and needs to be studied, per Standard 6.2, number 1. Foundations – additional information is needed about the height and how it relates to the adjacent properties per Standard 6.9 # 1, and 2. Cornices and Trim - exterior trim components should be larger, restudied in keeping with the adjacent properties, per Standard 6.11. Doors and windows - provide wider mullions, at least six inches on the ganged windows, and to consider the proportion of windows on side elevations, per Standard 6.12. Porches - some more consideration is needed for the porch as it relates to the left-hand side where the bay protrudes, it appears un-occupiable, per Standard 6.14 and 6.10 # 1, 2, 3, and 4. Materials - consider wood siding and materials in lieu of cementitious, per Standard 6.10. Lastly, we did not review landscaping (Standards 8.1-11) and rhythm (Standard 6.12) at this point.

Mr. Barth made a friendly amendment requesting to see more accurate drawings depicting -- or omitting, rather, trim applied to the gutters, to see finish material and soffits, and for the applicant to restudy the change in material in the upper gables to be more defined to individual architectural elements or being divided by band board material, applicant to reference historical examples from the district.

**VOTE:** 8/0

**AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, PARATI, WALKER, WHITLOCK

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION – COMMERCIAL CONTINUED.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA 2022-00150, 729 MT. VERNON AVENUE (PID: 12305105) - NEW CONSTRUCTION**

**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 February 13, 2019, HDC meeting (HDCRDEMO-2019-00009). An application for new construction at this site was Denied in March 2021 for the project's scale, height (32'-1"), width (53'+ open porte cochere), rhythm, massing, and foundation, a spacing and setback (32'-7") exhibit, design feature review, landscape and tree protection plan, material data or specifications, and review of the guidelines referencing spacing, rhythm, massing as it responds to the context of the street. An application for new construction at this site was Denied in October 2021 for the proposed project's spacing, rhythm, massing and form, setback (44'-6"), design conformity, fenestration, height (28'-4") and width (56'-7"), roof form, and the Secretary of Interior's Standards numbers 9 and 10.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal includes the construction of a primary structure and accessory building.

1. The proposed primary structure has a height of 34.4" at its tallest point as measured from grade to ridge, according to the Zoutewelle Survey (SP2.1/SP3.0).
2. The total house width is approximately 65'-6 ¾.
3. Setback to front thermal wall, at the closest point, is 40'-6".
4. Setback to front porch edge is 39'-4" and 39'-10" to the roof.
5. Proposed siding materials are gray brick, fiber cement faux-grain wood lap siding, nickel gap siding. Proposed windows are aluminum-clad with either a 5/8" traditional or putty profile with cast stone sills. Roofing is asphalt shingle and standing seam metal.
6. The proposed accessory building with a height of 23'-9". Materials are proposed to be the same as the main structure.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Spacing/Context and the rhythm of the street
  - a. The house is located very close to both side yard setbacks, appears especially close to 723 Mt. Vernon.
2. Massing, height, width, roofs
  - a. Houses on the street that have similar heights are vertical in form and narrower in width.
  - b. Need clarity on height. The Zoutewelle survey shows the tallest point as being 34.4' (SP2.1/SP3.0) but the elevation drawings (A2.00) show the total height at 33.5'.
  - c. Houses on the street that have similar widths are linear in form and shorter in height, or the main massing of the house is square with one-story wing(s) adding to the overall width.

3. Front Elevation
  - a. Large expanse of roof.
  - b. Metal roof on the front elevation.
  - c. Beam/column alignment on front porch.
4. Left Elevation:
  - a. Fenestration and rhythm.
5. Accessory Structure:
  - a. Need clarity on height. The indicated grade line appears to be placed higher than foundation/grade shown on drawing (see East and Rear elevations).
  - b. Rear elevation lack of fenestration.
  - c. Beam/column alignment.
  - d. Garage door appears to be a double-door; need materials specifications.
6. Materials + Details:
  - a. Fiber cement siding with faux wood grain proposed; no manufacturer name or specifications provided. Faux wood grain has not been approved by the Commission.
  - b. Window details, design, dimensions for individual and ganged windows for both fields of siding and masonry.
7. Site Plan
  - a. HVAC screening needed
  - b. Details about the hot tub, swimming pool, retaining wall, and other site features are needed.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

Ms. Kevin Davis spoke against this application.

Ms. Susie Jernigan spoke against this application.

Ms. Michelle Amoroso spoke against this application.

Mr. David Cohen spoke against this application.

Ms. Paula Kranz spoke in favor of this application.

**MOTION: CONTINUED**

**1<sup>st</sup>: HENNINGSON**

**2<sup>nd</sup>: GOODWIN**

Mr. Henningson made a motion to continue this application with the following points: Front Porch - provide more historic column/beam detail on the porch, per standard 6.17, number 2. Materials - no faux grain cementitious wood siding. The applicant should use wood unless they can find a cementitious product that matches the dimensions we require, i.e., matches the actual dimensions of wood that's common on a Tudor house, per standard 6.18, number 2. Metal Roof - the metal roof on the porch is considered appropriate because it does have a low-sloped porch roof, and a low-sloped roof is not incongruous with the Tudor architecture, it's also pre-finished, per standard 23 4.5, number 5 and number 8. Siding – requesting the applicant come back to us with mockups and samples of the brick. Sample should include ones of their choice as well as a traditional brick that is lighter in color. Also requesting a vertical siding sample and restudy. Applicant to bring back a different option or provide precedence of the vertical siding on the front elevation. Impervious area – requesting a restudy or confirm the calculations of the impervious area in the rear yard. Accessory Structure – requesting a little more information on the actual height, the material specifications for the garage doors, more information on the beam and column alignment, as well as reviewing and adding fenestration to ensure that there's no big, long, blank walls.

Mr. Barth made a friendly amendment requesting the applicant to bring samples of the metal roof showing the proposed color and a connection detail selection.

**VOTE:** 6/2

**AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON,  
WHITLOCK

**NAYS:** WALKER, PARATI

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN

LEFT: PARATI, 5:53

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA 2022-00069, 901 BERKELEY AVENUE (PID: 12309205) – ADDITION/ACCESSORY BUILDING**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 2-story Colonial Revival building built c. 1929. Architectural features include a symmetrical façade with a central single-bay flat roof portico supported by round columns and pilasters, paired 6/1 double-hung wood windows, front door with transom and sidelights and rear ell. The broken terracotta tile front porch wraps around the right side of the house and terminates in a one-story covered side porch that matches the front portico in design and details. The house is unpainted brick, with a large exterior brick chimney. There is a hipped roof, brick, two-bay historic garage located in the rear. The lot size is approximately 75' x 150' x 108' x 172'. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1.5, 2, and 2.5-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a rear addition of heated living space, screen porch, and a new accessory building. The existing historic accessory building will be demolished. The new rear addition steps in from the original right rear corner of the house and the roof ties in below the original ridge. On the left elevation the new screen porch element bumps out beyond the existing left corner of the house. Some materials are proposed as traditional to match existing, including brick exterior and wood roof trim. A standing seam metal roof proposed for one-story screen porch element of addition; slate roof to match existing is proposed on the rest of the addition.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Photos documenting the condition of the existing accessory building proposed for demolition.
2. Accessory building
  - a. Massing
  - b. Window mullion trim needed on paired windows
  - c. Provide a window trim detail with dimensions

- d. Bracket and roof hood materials and details
- e. Door(s) design, materials, and specifications, including garage doors

3. Addition

- a. Provide manufacturer specifications that meet HDC standards for the new windows
- b. Window materials and specifications
- c. Material underneath inset windows on rear and left elevations
- d. Column materials, dimensions, & details
- e. Section showing beam/column detail

4. Site Plan

- a. Tree species, size, location on site plan. Note trees to stay and trees to be removed.
- b. HVAC location/screening
- c. Dimensions & materials for site work including driveways/walkways
- d. Provide rear yard permeability calculations

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

Ms. Gay Jordan spoke on this application.

Mr. G. Miller Jordan spoke on this application.

Mr. Roger Dahnert spoke on this application.

**MOTION: CONTINUED**

**1<sup>st</sup>: GOODWIN**

**2<sup>nd</sup>: HADEN**

Mr Goodwin moved to continue this application for the following reasons, to complete/produce all of the items in the required submission checklist, which includes all of the items mentioned in the staff analysis, with regard to the accessory building, the addition, and the site plan. Include photographs documenting the condition of the existing accessory building. Add the Zoutewelle streetscape for assess to all of the heights and it relates to all of the other buildings in the area. Create a more logical presentation of the slides by having existing side-by-side proposed, and have the slides presented in a more logical pattern so it can be followed simply. Also provide the gate details, materials, and design. Provide a tree protection plan. Lastly, restudy the fenestration on the accessory structure and restudy any large expanses of metal roofing.

Mr. Barth made a friendly amendment requesting a restudy of the fenestration on the west elevation of the addition and a restudy of the new windows as the proposed seem to be rather undersized in relation to the window style and proportion of the existing house.

**VOTE:** 7/0

**AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, WHITLOCK, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR ADDITION AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURE CONTINUED.

---

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA 2022-00219, 1001 MT. VERNON AVENUE (PID: 12314141) - ACCESSORY BUILDING  
NOT HEARD - APPLICANT DEFERRED.**



---

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA 2020-00003, 1920 WOODCREST AVENUE (PID: 11907617) – PAINTED BRICK/FRONT PORCH CHANGES**

NOT HEARD - APPLICANT DEFERRED.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI

LEFT: HENNINGSON, 6:55pm

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA 2022-00241, 718 N. POPLAR STREET (PID: 07804C99) – PAINTED BRICK**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 3-story condo building constructed in 1983. Siding material is unpainted brick and Masonite. The lot size is approximately 73' x 204'. Adjacent structures townhomes, condos, and commercial buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The property owner is requesting to paint the entire exterior of the building. The application is an After-the-Fact review, with the Commission reviewing the project on its merits as if the painting has not yet occurred.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Refer to Standards for Masonry, 5.5 and Paint, 5.8.
2. The Commission will determine if the proposed project meets the Standards.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak for or against this application.

**MOTION: DENIED**

**1<sup>st</sup>: BARTH**      **2<sup>nd</sup>: BONAPARTE**

Mr. Barth moved to deny this application per Standards 5.5, number 5, and 5.8, number 7

**VOTE:** 6/0

**AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, WHITLOCK, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR PAINTED BRICK DENIED.

---

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCADMRM 2019-00577, 1542 WICKFORD PLACE (PID: 11908408) – FENCE**

NOT HEARD - APPLICANT DEFERRED.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRDEMO 2022-00087, 711 BERKELEY AVENUE (PID: 12309406) – DEMOLITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is one-story, Ranch constructed c. 1950. Architectural features include a side gable red tile roof, front gable projection with picture window, recessed front entry with original front door and sidelights, a front bay projection with casement windows, and a large interior chimney. The exterior is unpainted brick. There is a one-story, two vehicle, brick detached garage. The lot size is approximately 80' x 164' x 34' x 37 x 174'. Adjacent structures 1, 2 and 2.5-story single-family and multi-family buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is full demolition of the main building. The following information is presented for the Commission’s review and consideration:

- Digital photos of all sides of building
- Digital photos of significant architectural details
- Property survey
- Elevations
- Zoutewelle survey

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

1. The Commission will determine if the application is complete.
2. The Commission will determine whether or not the building has special significance to the Dilworth Local Historic District. With affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to a 365-Day Stay of Demolition.
3. If the Commission determines that this property is does not have any special significance to the district, then demolition may take place without a delay or upon the approval of new construction plans.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION 1: COMPLETE APPLICATION**

**1<sup>st</sup>: BARTH**

**2<sup>nd</sup>: WALKER**

Mr. Barth moved to determine the application is complete with all the required documentation.

**VOTE: 7/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, WHITLOCK, WALKER**

**NAYS: NONE**

**MOTION 2: SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE**

**1<sup>st</sup>: BARTH**

**2<sup>nd</sup>: WALKER**

Mr. Barth moved to determine that this building has special significance and value toward maintaining the character of the Dilworth Local Historic District because of its year of construction.

**VOTE: 7/0**

**AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, WHITLOCK,  
WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**MOTION 3: APPROVED WITH 365 DAY STAY**                      **1<sup>st</sup>: BARTH**                      **2<sup>nd</sup>: WALKER**

Mr. Barth moved to approve the project with a 365-day stay of demolition on the building due to its special significance and value toward maintaining the character of the district.

**VOTE: 7/0**

**AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON WHITLOCK,  
WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION APPROVED WITH A 365 DAY STAY OF DEMOLITION.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRDEMO 2022-00168, 1740 MERRIMAN AVENUE (PID:11909408) – DEMOLITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is one-story, American Small House constructed c. 1948. Architectural features include a symmetrical façade with a projecting front gable supported by replacement metal columns, exterior brick chimney and 1/1 replacement windows. The entire house is wrapped in vinyl and aluminum. The lot size is approximately 50' x 141'. Adjacent structures one-story American Small Houses.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is full demolition of the building. The following information is presented for the Commission's review and consideration:

- Zoutewelle survey
- Property survey
- Photo of front elevation
- Photos of interior damage

The following items are not included:

- Digital photos of all sides of building
- Digital photos of significant architectural details
- Elevation drawings

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

1. The Commission will determine if the application is complete.

2. The Commission will determine whether or not the building has special significance to the Wilmore Local Historic District. With affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to a 365-Day Stay of Demolition.
3. If the Commission determines that this property does not have any special significance to the district, then demolition may take place without a delay or upon the approval of new construction plans.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION: INCOMPLETE/CONTINUED**

**1<sup>st</sup>: HADEN**

**2<sup>nd</sup>: BONAPARTE**

Mr. Haden moved to determine the application is incomplete and further documentation/complete package is required.

**VOTE:** 7/0

**AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON  
WHITLOCK, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION INCOMPLETE/CONTINUED.

---

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI 2022-00253, 628 S. SUMMIT AVENUE (PID: 07102327) – TREE REMOVAL/REPLANTING**  
NOT HEARD - APPLICANT DEFERRED.

---

With no further business to discuss, Mr. Haden adjourned the meeting at 7:42 PM.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission