



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
November 9, 2022 | Room 267

MINUTES

- MEMBERS PRESENT: Kim Parati (Chairperson)
Chris Barth (2nd Vice-Chairperson)
Noelle Bell
Phil Goodwin
Nichelle Hawkins (Vice Chairperson)
Christa Lineberger
Jill Walker
Heather Wojick
- MEMBERS ABSENT: Jessica Hindman
Scott Whitlock
- OTHERS PRESENT: Kristi Harpst, HDC Program Manager
Cindy Kochanek, HDC Staff
Jenny Shugart, HDC Staff
Candice Leite, HDC Staff
Jill Sanchez-Myers, Senior Assistant City Attorney
Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

With a quorum present, Chair Parati called the regular November meeting of the Historic District Commission (Commission) meeting to order at 1:00 pm. She began the meeting by introducing the Staff and Commissioners and explaining the meeting procedure. All interested parties planning to give testimony – FOR or AGAINST – must submit a form to speak and must be sworn in. Staff will present a description of each proposed project to the Commission. The Commissioners and the Applicants will then discuss the project. Audience members signed up to speak either FOR or AGAINST will be called to the podium for each agenda item. Presentations by the Applicants and audience members must be concise and focused on the **Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines**. The Commission and Staff may question the Applicant. The Applicant may present sworn witnesses who will be subject to questioning by the Commission and Staff. The Applicant will be given an opportunity to respond to comments by interested parties. After hearing each application, the Commission will review, discuss, and consider the information that has been gathered and presented. During discussion and deliberation, only the Commission and Staff may speak. The Commission may vote to reopen this part of the meeting for questions, comments, or clarification. Once the review is completed, a MOTION will be made to Approve, Deny, or Continue the review of the application at a future meeting. A majority vote of the Commission members present is required for a decision to be reached. All exhibits remain with the Commission. If an Applicant feels there is a conflict of interest of any Commissioner, or there is an association that would be prejudicial, that should be revealed at the beginning of the hearing of a particular case. The Commission is a quasi-judicial body and can accept only sworn testimony. Staff will report any additional comments received and while the Commission will not specifically exclude hearsay evidence, it is only given limited weight. Chair Parati asked that everyone please turn to silent operation any electronic devices. Commissioners are asked to announce, for the record, if one leaves or arrives during the meeting. Chair Parati

said that those in the audience must be quiet during the hearings. An audience member will be asked once to be quiet and the need for a second request will be removal from the room. Chair Parati swore in all Applicants and Staff and continued to swear in people as they arrived for the duration of the meeting. Appeal from the Historic District Commission is to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. One has thirty (30) days from the date of the decision to appeal. This is in accordance with Section 10.213 of the City Zoning Ordinance.

INDEX OF ADDRESSES:

NOT HEARD AT THE OCTOBER 12 MEETING

HDCCMA-2022-00596, 300 E Worthington Av	Dilworth
HDCCMA-2022-00577, 801 East Bv	Dilworth
HDCRMI-2021-01057, 600 E Worthington Av	Dilworth

CONSENT

HDCCMI-2022-00914, 215 E Worthington Av	Dilworth
HDCRMI-2022-00966, 1730 Thomas Av	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMIA-2022-00956, 216 S Summit Av	Wesley Heights

CONTINUED FROM JULY 13 MEETING

HDCRMA-2022-00378, 465 W Worthington Av/1901 S Mint St Wilmore

CONTINUED FROM SEPTEMBER 14 MEETING

HDCRMI-2022-00376, 330 West Bv	Wilmore
--------------------------------	---------

CONTINUED FROM OCTOBER 12 MEETING

HDCRMA-2022-00218, 1921 Park Rd	Dilworth
HDCRMA-2022-00546, 2301 Charlotte Dr	Dilworth
HDCRMA-2021-01060, 306 N. Graham St, 420 W 6th St	Fourth Ward

NEW CASES

HDCRMI-2022-00682, 719 Templeton Av	Dilworth
HDCCMI-2022-00706, 301 East Bv	Dilworth
HDCRMI-2022-00637, 1113 Myrtle Av	Dilworth
HDCCMIA-2022-00705, 325 W Summit Av, 1501 S Mint St	Wilmore

NOT HEARD AT THE OCTOBER 12 MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: HINDMAN, WHITLOCK

APPLICATION:

HDCCMA-2022-00596, 300 East Worthington Avenue (12105618) - New Construction/Relocation

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The site is at the edge of the Dilworth Local Historic District and is a vacant lot. The site slopes from front to rear approximately 8-10 feet. The lot size is approximately 45' x 140'. Adjacent structures are a mix of 1 and 2 story residential buildings, mixed-use and institutional buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project in three parts: 1.) the relocation of the Leeper Store building from South Boulevard to the project site with the construction of a new foundation for the building, 2.) additions and fenestration changes to the Leeper Store, and 3.) the construction of a new accessory building.

The Leeper Store building is a locally designated Historic Landmark and the relocation and proposed alternations to the building will also require review by the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Historic Landmark Commission. Proposed changes to fenestration include the removal of the original storefront and replacement with a new storefront, the addition of storefront windows and an awning to the right elevation, enlarging all first level windows on the right elevation to be the same size as the second level windows, the addition of an open stair along the right elevation, the addition of an enclosed access stair on the left elevation. There also appear to be changes to the rear elevation but the extent of these changes is unclear.

The new accessory building measures approximately 28'-3" in height as measured from grade to ridge. The footprint measures approximately 28' x 38', not including the exterior stair. The design of the windows and doors and the use of brick on the main level is inspired by the Leeper building.

The project was not heard at the October 12, 2022, meeting due to time constraints. The following sheets have been updated:

- HDC-1 has an added context map,
- HDC-3 has updated renderings, and
- HDC-5 has site adjustments, so the accessory building is completely clear of the alleyway.

Note: This project is specifically being considered due to the relocation of the Leeper Store building to preserve a designated Historic Landmark. The moving of the building, the construction of a foundation for the moved building at the new site, and the new construction of an accessory structure are all being considered together to support the relocation of the Leeper Store building. If the project is approved and the Leeper Store is not moved to this site, then no portion of the project may proceed and a new application for new construction will be required.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Leeper Store Building

- a. Existing elevations of the structure are needed.
- b. Changes to the original storefront design and loss of original materials, see Secretary of the Interiors Standards.
- c. Clearly label the original windows and openings that are to remain and the window openings to be enlarged.
- d. Details needed about the new awning and how it will attach to the building.
- e. Horizontal and vertical siding materials and dimensions.
- f. Are signage dimensions the same on the front and right elevations?
- g. New brick and mortar should be of a color and dimension similar to the existing and remain unpainted according to the Design Standards, Masonry 5.5 – 5.6 and Paint 5.8.

2. New Accessory Building

- a. Dormers are coplanar to the first level walls.
- b. Dormers tie into the main ridge.
- c. Eave trim detail needed.

- d. Architectural details needed, such as the ‘architectural beams’ on the front and rear elevations.
- e. Mullion dimensions are too narrow on ganged windows in dormers.
- f. Siding material and dimension specifications needed.
- g. Pergola detail needed.
- h. New brick and mortar should be of a color and dimension similar to the existing and remain unpainted according to the Design Standards, Masonry 5.5 – 5.6 and Paint 5.8.

3. Details page, HDC-9

- a. Mullion dimensions shown on window detail “3” are too narrow.
- b. What is in the inset dimension on the brick infill on the faux window detail “5”?
- c. Windows appear to have apron trim on detail “10”.
- d. Manufacturer specifications for proposed new windows and doors, including garage doors.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

Scott Rea, a neighborhood resident, spoke on this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED

1st: BARTH

2nd: HAWKINS

Mr. Barth moved to continue this application for the following items: Requesting that the applicant restudy the historic building to be placed on this site, with regard to spacing and rhythm and setback. Applicant to revisit the historic structure's spacing between it and the southeastern neighbor to the property, allowing for more room; as well as further classification on the spacing providing dimensions down Worthington between each historic structure. In addition, we are stating that we would be more comfortable if the historic structure was closer to Cleveland Avenue. Applicant to provide more setback on the front of the property. Applicant to provide accurate drawings with regard to the structure as it currently stands, providing further detail and plans and elevations; particularly noting door and window locations, architectural details, and materiality. Applicant to provide details for the move to occur and contingency plans should any damage, further damage, occur to the structure and its architectural elements, referencing Chapter 7 in the design guidelines.

We are holding off on commenting on other items until this study is performed but would like to reference staff notes in the memo for the additional items and more detailed information. We would also like to reference Secretary of the Interior's Standards 2.5, items 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, and 10 for rehabilitation and request that the applicant maintain historic openings on the existing structure.

Ms. Lineberger made a friendly amendment; applicant to provide additional details for the addition to the historic structure/stairs.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WALKER, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION/RELOCATION CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: HINDMAN, WHITLOCK

APPLICATION:

HDCCMA-2022-00577, 801 East Boulevard (12311903) - Signage and Brick Painting

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a commercial office building constructed c. 1976, located on the corner of East Boulevard and Lennox Avenue. The front elevation facing East Boulevard is 1-story and transitions into a 1.5-story building in the rear. Exterior material is unpainted brick. Roof forms are irregular and asymmetric. Lot size is 200' x 200'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, 2 and 2.5-story single-family, multi-family and commercial structures. Previous work was approved in October 2021 under COA #HDCCMI-2021-00764.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is in three parts:

- 1.) Changes to previously approved signage, to include:
 - a. The addition of lighting to illuminate the signage on the front of the building, and
 - b. On the East elevation, an area previously designated for address numbers has been redesigned for a wall sign.
- 2.) Request for a new monument sign, and
- 3.) Painting the previously unpainted brick exterior of the entire building.

The signage requests exceed what can be staff approved and requires Commission review.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The amount of signage proposed for the site. Typically, buildings along East Boulevard have either a monument sign or a building sign, not both.
2. Refer to Standards for Masonry, 5.5 and Paint, 5.8.
3. The Commission will determine if the proposed project meets the Standards.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION 1: APPROVED

1st: GOODWIN

2nd: WALKER

Mr. Goodwin moved to approve the signage request with the following conditions: Keep the signage along the front of East Boulevard Street as previously approved in the COA per standard A.1, number 13. Also, to approve illumination of the signs along East Boulevard per A.1, number 10., and to also change the north elevation signage as proposed.

Ms. Parati made a friendly amendment; applicant to work with staff on the way that they plan to illuminate the sign.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WALKER, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR SIGNAGE CHANGES APPROVED.

MOTION 2: DENIED

1st: WALKER

2nd: HAWKINS

Ms. Walker moved to deny the request to paint the unpainted brick based on guidelines for paint, 5.8, number 7, and masonry, 5.5, number 3. As well to deny the application's request for a monument sign per our guideline A.1, number 13 and A.2, number 5, in most circumstances only one sign per property.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WALKER, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR PAINTED BRICK AND MONUMENT SIGN DENIED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: HINDMAN, WHITLOCK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2021-01057, 600 East Worthington Avenue (12108518) - Tree Removal/Replanting

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing property is a 1.5-story Bungalow constructed c. 1915. Architectural features include a low hip roof with hip roof dormers, a full width engaged front porch with simple square columns. Siding is wood lap with a shingle dado, and painted brick foundation. Windows are original double-hung in a 12/1 and 15/1 pattern. The two-story portion is a later addition. The lot size is approximately 50' x 140'. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1, 1.5 and 2-story single family houses.

PROPOSAL:

This project is for a tree removal of a mature Pecan tree because it is dropping pecans. The DBH size of the tree is not provided. A report from a Certified Arborist is attached. A review of the tree removal request has also been requested from the City of Charlotte Urban Forestry staff and will be included with the agenda supplement.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The DBH of the tree to be removed is not provided.
2. If approved for removal, then a new large maturing canopy tree(s) 2-3" caliper, should be planted as a replacement to regrow the canopy.
3. Minor changes may be approved by staff, including tree replanting plan.
4. The Commission will determine if the proposed tree removal meets the Standards.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: DENIED

1st: GOODWIN

2nd: BARTH

Mr. Goodwin moved to deny the tree removal request based on 8.5, number 2.

VOTE: 7/1

AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WALKER, WOJICK

NAYS: HAWKINS

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR TREE REMOVAL DENIED.

CONSENT AGENDA

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: HINDMAN, WHITLOCK

APPLICATION:

HDCCMI-2022-00914, 215 East Worthington Avenue (12105402) - Roof Addition

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one-story brick commercial structure built c. 1956. The building is a mix of concrete block with a brick façade, and all masonry is painted. The lot size is approximately 56' x 115'. The building is at the edge of the Dilworth local historic district, located just off of South Boulevard. An existing historic pole sign is to be re-used per an earlier decision by the Commission. Adjacent structures are one-and two-story commercial buildings and single-family houses.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is the installation of a new roof addition of a wood panel system to screen two, new, taller HVAC units. On the front elevation, the screening will be setback approximately 10'-8" from the front edge of the roof. The screening will be setback approximately 4' from the side edges of the roof. The top of the screen will extend approximately 5'-0" above the roof parapet walls. The new screening will be horizontal wood slats with 1" spacing between the slats. The screening will be painted after an appropriate curing time.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Rehabilitation of Building Elements: Roofs, page 4.5.
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.
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 Chair Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED

1st: WOJICK 2nd: BARTH

Ms. Wojick moved to approve the request for roof screening of the additional HVAC as the screening is not incongruent with Standards 4.5, Roofs and 2.5, Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

VOTE: 8/0

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI,
WALKER, WOJICK**

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ROOF ADDITION APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: HINDMAN, WHITLOCK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2022-00966, 1730 Thomas Avenue (08118608) - Addition

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one-story, Craftsman bungalow constructed c. 1930. The building was originally a duplex and has transitioned into a single-family residence. Architectural features include stucco and timber trim in the gables, 4/1 wood windows, and an unpainted brick exterior. An accessory building measuring approximately 18' x 18' and height of approximately 13'-9" is located at the rear of the lot. Lot size is approximately 50' x 150'. Surrounding structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single family and multi-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is the rehabilitation of and additions to a historic accessory building. Post-construction the rear yard will be 62% permeable. The additions are in two parts:

1. The existing garage is 18' deep and will be expanded to a depth of 22' to allow it to function as a one-car garage. The addition will extend the existing face of the garage, reproducing the original façade. No changes to height are proposed.
2. Addition toward the primary structure. The addition will be glass with steel frame windows and cedar lap siding. The height of the addition is proposed at 10'-3", which is lower than the garage's primary ridge.

The project was previously approved by the Commission on September 9, 2020, under case number HDCRMI-2020-00316. A COA was issued but expired before permits were pulled. The applicant is requesting Commission re-affirmation of the previous approval with no changes to the project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for Additions and New Construction, Chapter 6, and Accessory Buildings, 8.10. The project is unchanged from the plans previously presented to and approved by the Commission on September 9, 2020.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the Standards for Additions and New Construction, Chapter 6, Accessory Buildings, 8.10, and the Secretary of the Interior 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 Chair Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED

1st: BELL

2nd: BARTH

Ms. Bell moved to approve the addition as it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for Additions and New Construction in Chapter 6, and Accessory Buildings in Chapter 8, 8.10; and given the project is unchanged from the plans previously presented to the commission in 2020.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WALKER, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ROOF ADDITION APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: HINDMAN, WHITLOCK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMIA-2022-00956, 216 South Summit Avenue (07101502) - Tree Removal/Replanting

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Formerly a vacant lot, the existing buildings are a new single-family primary building and accessory structure completed in 2022. The lot measures approximately 54' x 187.5'. A 10' alley is located at the rear of the lot. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single-family structures.

The project was approved by the HDC in January 2021 under COA# HDCRMA-2020-00311, which included the requirement to plant two new trees, and also required design construction techniques, site work measures, and a tree protection plan to protect and minimize impacts to the root structures of the 37" deodar cedar located at the front corner of the lot and the 24" pecan located mid-lot.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is tree removal of both the 37" Deodar Cedar and the 24" Pecan tree.

- The Pecan tree has already been removed.
- The Deodar Cedar has been partially removed. A Stop Work Order (SWO) was issued to halt the total removal.

The project is considered an After-the-Fact review, with the Commission reviewing the project on its merits according to the Design Standards as if work has not yet occurred.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for Trees, 8.5, numbers 2 and 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 the following conditions:
 - a. The trees shown on the 'Proposed Replanting Options Site Plan' are the same as those required to be planted as part of the original project approval. In addition to those trees, the property owner should plant two (2) new, large, hardwood maturing canopy trees as replacements for the removed Pecan and damaged/partially removed Deodar Cedar. For a total of 4 new trees to be planted on the lot.
 - b. One of the new trees should be a Deodar Cedar.
 - c. All new trees should be a minimum of 3" caliper and planted no later than the Spring 2023 planting season.
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 Chair Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION 1: DENIED

1st: LINEBERGER

2nd: WALKER

Ms. Lineberger made a motion to deny the removal of the Pecan tree. Since the Pecan tree has already been removed, we are required it be replaced with two large maturing hardwood canopy trees, one of which is of the applicant's choosing. The replacement trees should be approximately 2"-3" caliper in size.

Ms. Bell made a friendly amendment; applicant to have a contingency plan if the replacement trees do not live for whatever reason, they need to be replaced.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WALKER, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR PECAN TREE REMOVAL DENIED.

MOTION 2: APPROVED

1st: LINEBERGER

2nd: BELL

Ms. Lineberger made a motion to approve the removal of the Deodar Cedar and require it be replaced with two large maturing hardwood canopy trees.

Mr. Barth made a friendly amendment; applicant to replant a Deodar Cedar as one of the two trees.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, HAKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WALKER, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR DEODAR CEDAR TREE REMOVAL APPROVED.

CONTINUED FROM JULY 13 MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: HINDMAN, WHITLOCK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2022-00378, 465 West Worthington/1901 South Mint Street (11907601) - Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU)

This application was continued from the July 13, 2022, meeting for the following items:

- 1. Revisit the height of the ADU as it relates to the primary structure, per Standard 8.10, numbers 3 and 7.*
- 2. Provide a further study of the impact of both the alley and the driveway pavements, vis-a-vis curb cutouts, per Standard 8.2.*
- 3. Provide a clearer understanding of project meets the Tree Protection Plan (TPP) guidelines, per Standard 8.5.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The property is an American Small House with Colonial Revival elements constructed in 1946. Architectural features include a symmetrical three-bay façade with a central entry portico, central chimney, 8/8 double-hung wood windows, and a decorative cornice. The shutters are appropriately sized for the windows. Materials are painted brick with wood siding in the gable ends. Lot size is approximately 68 x 130 x 42 x 154. Adjacent structures are 1, and 1.5 story single-family structures. The lot is located at the edge of the Wilmore local historic district abutting the Wilmore Walk Townhome development which is located outside of the district. A rear addition to the primary structure and the construction of a new Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) accessed from the alley was previously approved by the Commission on January 27, 2021, under application number #HDCRMA-2020-00479.

PROPOSAL:

During construction it was discovered that the foundation of the ADU was constructed much higher than shown on the approved plans. The applicant is proposing design changes to the approved ADU due to grade issues. The shed roof slope will be reduced from a 3/12 to 2/12 pitch and material changed from asphalt to standing seam metal. The overall height and relationship to the primary house has also changed. The ADU was approved at a height of 14'-0" from finished floor; 19' total height from grade to ridge, which is approximately 1'-6" shorter than the primary structure when topography is considered. The ADU height is now proposed to be 21'-10" from grade to ridge and equal to the height of the primary structure. The original presentation and approved plans are attached.

Revised Proposal – November 9, 2022

- *Design changed to one-story*
- *Front elevation height at W. Worthington is approximately 17'-11 ½"*
- *Rear elevation height at property line with neighboring parcel is approximately 12'-11 ½", due to site topography*
- *New walkway requested*
- *Skylights proposed on rear elevation*

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Accurately labeled plans with legible dimensions and notes are needed. Labels are cut off. Clarity on East elevation (both right and left elevation labeled as East).
2. Rear elevation: skylights should be flush mount.
3. Side elevations: fenestration.
4. What are the footprint measurements of the proposed structure?
5. ADU setbacks are measured to the furthest projection (eaves), not the foundation as shown on the site plan.
6. Does the ADU adhere to the Zoning square footage limitations?
7. How will the parking area shown be accessed?
8. Window/door specifications needed.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

Justin Bell, a neighborhood resident, spoke on this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED

1st: WOJICK **2nd: HAWKINS**

Ms. Wojick made a motion to continue this project with the following requirements: Requesting permeability calculations for the property. Requesting notes to reflect flush-mount skylights. Requesting window fenestration to be addressed on the left elevation of the ADU. Requesting the footprint measurements of the proposed structure, but also requesting the width of the existing main house. Requesting the ADU setbacks to be documented on the site plan from the eaves, not the foundation. Request the square footage be documented on the plans so we know that it adheres to the ADU zoning requirements. Confirmation of use for a parking pad or not for the ADU structure. Request window and door specifications. The continuation of this project is based on the uniqueness of lot and its location within the neighborhood. Per Standards 8.10, number 3, and number 7.

Mr. Goodwin made a friendly amendment; applicant to provide tree protection documentation on the big tree in the back.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WALKER, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU) CONTINUED.

CONTINUED FROM SEPTEMBER 14 MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: HINDMAN, WHITLOCK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2022-00376, 330 West Boulevard (11907925) - Front Porch Changes

This application was continued from the September 14, 2022, meeting for the following items:

1. *Per Standard 4.8, Porches, and Secretary of the Interior Standards 2.5:*
 - *Provide a front elevation that retains the original gable.*
 - *Provide a section of the foundation through the roof which includes the column and railing details and materials.*
2. *Per Standards 5.6 and 5.6 for Masonry:*
 - *Provide a brick sample and drawing details for the reconstruction of the preexisting brick foundation, steps, and porch floor replacement detail. Restudy of the massing for its weight and its two-story presentation based on Standard 6.5.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing 1-story Bungalow constructed c. 1931. The building has a three-bay symmetrical façade with a hip roof and side gables. Architectural features including a three-quarter width gable roof front porch supported by replacement metal columns, a painted brick foundation and unpainted brick chimney. The 1/1 windows appear to be replacements and the house is wrapped in vinyl/aluminum including the decorative brackets. The lot size is approximately 50' x 200'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5-story single-family buildings and two-story multi-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is for changes to the front porch. The existing concrete floor will be removed and replaced. The brick foundation will also be replaced. The front steps will be removed and replaced. The project is already underway and considered an After-the-Fact review, with the Commission reviewing the project on its merits as if work has not yet occurred.

Revised Proposal – November 9, 2022

- Updated front and right elevations provided

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Will the brick rowlock be reinstalled?
2. What will the porch columns look like?
 - a. Dimensions, materials, details are needed.
3. A section drawing, from roof to foundation, that shows the beam/column/foundation alignment is needed.
4. Will the front walkway be changed?
5. Will a railing be installed?
 - a. If so, a railing detail with dimensions is needed.
6. Steel front doors are incongruous with the district and do not meet the Design Standards for Front Doors and Entrances.
7. Minor changes may be approved by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: CONTINUED

1st: LINEBERGER

2nd: WALKER

Ms. Lineberger made a motion to continue this application for the same points that were noted in the previous continuation at the September 14 meeting.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WALKER, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR FRONT PORCH CHANGES CONTINUED.

CONTINUED FROM OCTOBER 12 MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: HINDMAN, WHITLOCK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA-2022-00218, 1921 Park Road (12108821) - Addition/Accessory Building Demolition & New Construction

This application was continued from the October 12, 2022, meeting for the following items:

- *Height between the main house and the ADU. Provide dimensions of the tallest ridge line to grade on the main house, dimensions from all the ridge lines and grade on the ADU to ensure the ADU is secondary to the main house. If a change in height is needed, there could potentially be impacts to the complexity of form, roof forms, design of the ADU, so the Commission did not comment on the complexity of form, etc.*
- *Per Secretary of the Interior Standards, 9 and 10, and 6.20, numbers 1 and 3. The transitional board between the diamond and traditional shingles to be at least an inch and a half. Approving the use of diamond shingles in this specific application because it is not visible from the street, terminates at an interior corner that is separated from the rectilinear wall, is a historic material, and is not incongruous with*

the curved wall on the rear elevation that is not visible.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1.5-story Bungalow building built c. 1920. Architectural features include a front gable roof with a six-light fixed window flanked by vents, engaged front porch supported by tapered wood columns and brick piers, small side gable bump outs on both the left and right elevations, a wood shingle exterior, and painted brick foundation. There is a hipped roof, brick, one-bay historic garage located in the rear. The lot size is approximately 50' x 223'. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1 and 1.5-story residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is a rear addition of heated living space, removal of an existing one vehicle garage and construction of a new accessory building, and site work, including retaining walls. The existing historic accessory building will be demolished. The new rear addition steps out from the original right corner of the house and steps out on the left elevation slightly in front of the original left rear corner. The new roof of the addition ties in beneath the original ridge. Changes to windows are proposed on the left elevation. The garage portion of the new accessory structure will be accessed from the rear alley. Height is noted at 20'-7 5/8" for the new accessory structure. Lot topography slopes slightly upward toward the rear of the lot. The height of the primary structure is approximately 24'-0 5/8" from grade to ridge at the front elevation, and approximately 21'-9 1/2" from grade to ridge of the new rear addition. Materials are not noted for any portion of the existing structure or for the proposed new construction. Trees proposed for removal are shown on A-2.1. Post- construction rear yard impermeable area will be 40%.

Revised Proposal – August 10, 2022

- Addition, rear elevation window configuration and roof design changes
- Accessory structure design changed, including roof forms
- Topography exhibit provided
- Permeability specs provided
- Trees to remain, new tree placement shown on A-2.1
- Pool equipment, HVAC units and trash cans shown on A-2.0

Revised Proposal – October 12, 2022

- Fenestration changes on right elevation shown on A-3.3
- Height comparison between primary structure and new accessory structure shown on A-3.5 – A-3.9
- Accessory structure design changed, see A-8.1 and A-8.2
- Accessory structure width minimized, see A-8.2
- Hardware added to garage doors, see A-8.2
- Pool equipment shown inside fence on A-2.0
- Fencing detail shown on A-5.0
- HVAC wood screen detail shown on A-2.0
- Shingle pattern detail provided
- Shingle pattern plan provided for both addition and accessory structure

Revised Proposal – November 9, 2022

- Site section provided showing heights of front and rear of house and front and rear of accessory building
- Finished floor height information provided for house and accessory building
- Square footage information about accessory buildings located along the alleyway abutting project site provided
- Transitional board between shingles changed to 1.5" and 2" between shingles and doors
- Photos of houses with shingles provided
- The original window/vent detail proportions and trim corrected on front elevation and accessory structure, except the garage door elevation

- N.C. Cooperative Extension tree protection information provided

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Details for both Addition and Accessory Building
 - a. Provide dimensions, materials, and details on window trim, cornices, roof eave, and siding.
 - b. Materials and details needed, including windows and door specifications.
 - c. Bracket detail needed.
2. Accessory building
 - a. Two-story massing on the front portion of the building.
 - b. Foundation appears undersized compared to the size, scale, and massing of the structure.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

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

Mr. Barth made a motion to approve this application, as it is not incongruous with the district and follows the Design Standards. Applicant to work with staff for final architectural plans, permit-ready drawings, and on architectural details.

Ms. Hawkins made a friendly amendment; application approved per Standard 8.10 for Accessory Structures, and Standard 6 for Additions.

VOTE: 7/1

AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, WALKER, WOJICK

NAYS: PARATI

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION & ACCESSORY BUILDING DEMOLITION/ NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: HINDMAN, WHITLOCK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA-2022-00546, 2301 Charlotte Drive (12112613) - Addition/Window + Siding Replacement

This application was continued from the October 12, 2022, meeting for the following items:

1. *Per Secretary of the Interior Standards, 2.5 number 6, for the cedar shake replacement and German siding replacement provide:*
 - *A video of the condition or a physical sample of the shake*
 - *An evaluation of the German siding to determine its condition*
2. *The window replacement was not reviewed at the October 12 meeting because the applicant deferred this portion of the project to the November meeting.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 2-story Picturesque Revival building built c. 1925. Architectural features include a steep side gable roof with shed dormer pierced by lower central steeply gabled entry projection, 8/8 and 6/6 windows, wood shingle siding, central interior brick chimney, and brick foundation. A one-story hip roof side porch runs the length of the

left elevation. The lot size is approximately 51' x 159' x 86' x 157'. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1.5 and 2-story residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project in four parts: 1.) siding replacement, 2.) original window replacement, and 3.) rear addition with fenestration changes on the rear elevation, and 4.) side addition of an attached garage.

1. New siding proposed to be shingles to match existing.
2. New windows proposed to be sash-only replacements with all trim remaining. New windows will be wood, double-hung in a 6/6 pattern to match existing. Exact manufacturer and specifications, including putty profile size, not provided.
3. Rear addition of a second level deck and stair. The existing access stairs will be removed. Traditional materials proposed. New window and door openings will be added.
4. Side addition of attached single-vehicle garage. Due to lot topography the garage is completely below grade and not visible from the street. The existing driveway is accessed from Ordermore Avenue, which is the edge of the Dilworth district.

Revised Proposal – October 12, 2022

- Window information is being collected and not available at this time
- Additional information about cedar shake siding provided
- Updated photographs of rear, right and front elevation provided
- Right elevation drawing not provided

Revised Proposal – November 9, 2022

- Window information is being collected and not available at this time
- Documentation of attempts to repair shingles provided
- Documentation of water damage behind shingles provided
- Documentation of original and replacement German lap siding provided
- Expert certifications and references of Serpaco Painting Contractor provided

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Replacement Siding
 - a. Siding specifications, including dimensions, needed for new siding to be installed for both shakes and German lap.
 - b. New siding should be wood, individually applied shakes, not panels of shakes.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: APPROVED

1st: HAWKINS 2nd: WOJICK

Ms. Hawkins made a motion to approve the portion of this application regarding the replacement of the cedar shake and German lap siding located on dormers as well as the front and rear elevation per design standards 5.2, wood, numbers 3 and 7. Also, we have not evaluated the window replacement.

Ms. Wojick made a friendly amendment; approval is based on physical evidence that the applicants came and presented that showed the deterioration of the existing siding.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WALKER, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION/WINDOW & SIDING REPLACEMENT APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: HINDMAN, WHITLOCK

LEFT: LINEBERGER, GOODWIN, 6:58PM

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA-2021-01060, 306 N. Graham St, 420 W. 6th Street (07806401 & 07806402) - New Construction MF

This application was continued from the October 12, 2022, meeting for the following items:

- 1. Restudy the Context, per Standard 7.2.*
- 2. Provide a Zoutewelle survey that crosses the street, showing adjacent properties along all of the streets, per Standards 7.3, 7.8 and 7.9.*
- 3. Per Standard 7.4, Setback, provide an interpretation from the Planning Department on how the relative setbacks apply to the site. Specifically, can the new structure be located closer to the curb.*
- 4. For spacing, use scale-reducing techniques along the length of the new construction, per Standard 7.5.*
- 5. Per Standard 7.7, massing, break up the massing along the streetscape.*
- 6. The Commission did not review the remaining Design Standard criteria.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

There are two parcels with three structures that are all connected and form a u-shape. The lot size of 306 N. Graham Street is approximately 309' x 197'. The lot size of 420 W. 6th Street is approximately 68' x 194'. Adjacent structures are commercial and multi-family buildings.

306 N. Graham Street (PID# 07806401): Constructed c. 1928, the two-story structure is a classic historic commercial building with a storefront on the first level, windows on the upper façade, and decorative cornice. The storefront windows are replacements but the highly decorative brick and cast stone detailing remain intact.

A one-story brick building with a decorative stepped parapet connects the two-story commercial building with the one-story building located at 420 W. 6th Street.

420 W 6th Street (PID# 07806402): One structure, constructed c. 1950. The building is a one-story, brick building with an American bond brick pattern in the front section, the middle section of the building has a running bond brick pattern, and the rear section of the building is concrete block. The front elevation fronts N. Graham Street and architectural features include a brick wing wall and large storefront windows that wrap around the right elevation.

The Commission approved Demolition of the structures with a 365-day stay on March 9, 2022.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is new construction of a mixed-use multi-family and commercial building. The front portion of the historic commercial building at 306 N. Graham St will be retained and incorporated into the new building. Along N. Graham Street the new structure setbacks will be 23'-7 ¾" to the thermal wall and 21'-5 ¾" to the stairs which is behind the front thermal wall of 306 N. Graham (13'-10 ½"). The new structure measures approximately 79'-8" from grade to parapet along W. 7th Street and 88' along W. 6th street. Exterior material are brick and corrugated metal panels on the first two-three levels and EIFS and fiber cement siding on the upper levels. Renderings, sections, partial elevations, and elevation details are provided. Proposed windows are vinyl/fiberglass with a brick rowlock and 8" precast concrete headers. There are 7 trees noted for removal.

Revised Proposal – November 9, 2022

1. Written description provided
2. Zoutewelle survey for N. Graham Street is on order and will not be available until late November/early December.
3. Setbacks unchanged. Additional information from Zoning Administration has been provided about alternative setback provisions.
4. All elevations altered to include building step-backs. A step-back exhibit is also provided.
5. Spacing: exhibit provided
6. Graham Street elevation updated
 - Third story to the left of the historic building is no longer brick but a patio with a meal awning
 - Insets altered
 - Additional architectural details included to break-up long expanses
7. Window design changes

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Side-by-side elevations showing changes from October to November meeting would be helpful to clearly illustrate changes.
2. Windows:
 - a. Picture frame window trim.
 - b. Horizontal windowpanes shown on A40.
 - c. Material on upper levels.
3. Fiber cement siding proposed. No details specified.

Application Checklist Summary:

1. Written description – provided
2. Materials description – materials are labeled on A32—A35, A37, A38, A39, A40, A42, and A43. Materials specifications and product information is partially provided for windows/storefronts, brick, and mortar on A43.
3. Photos of Existing Conditions – provided
4. Context Photos - provided
5. Property survey –provided
6. Site Plans, Existing + Proposed:
 - a. Existing Site Plan – survey provided with 7 trees noted for removal
 - b. Proposed site plan – provided i. No grading plan provided
 - ii. No fences/walls indicated
 - iii. Existing trees shown on property survey
 - iv. Dumpsters/mechanical units/backflow preventer locations?
7. Elevation Drawings
 - a. Existing elevations – street view elevations provided in the Zoutewelle survey
 - b. Proposed – Not provided, renderings only
 - c. Floor levels indicated on A33 – A35, 6th St, 7th St, and Rear Elevations
 - d. A32 – N. Graham Street elevation, height labels not provided
 - e. A36 – partial N. Graham Street elevation and wall section

f. A37 – partial elevation and partial section showing typical details of stoop on Graham St

8. Architectural details

- a. Railing detail drawing – not provided
- b. Window and door details shown on A38, A39, A40, A42, and A43
- c. 306 N. Graham storefront, additional restoration details needed
- d. Lighting details – not provided
- e. Signage details – not provided
- f. Storefront elevation(s) detail – not provided
- g. Wall section/Storefront section – not provided

9. Streetscape a. The concept elevations shown on the Zoutewelle Streetscapes

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: CONTINUED

1st: BELL

2nd: BARTH

Ms. Bell made a motion to continue this application, providing additional context. I think the commission agreed that the work that was done was really good, a step in the right direction, but recognizing the conversations we had about residential, also the back rendering, to provide additional either step-back or context to the building (i.e., scale, massing, setback, rhythm and spacing) so just continuing all of that, per Standard 7.2. Also, moving forward make sure all iterations of the designs are included so the commission may look at how the design and the context is evolving. New iteration to include the survey. Lastly, we are not including design detail, material selection, etcetera, in this motion. Applicant to continue to work with staff and review staff’s analysis via the staff memo.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, PARATI, WALKER, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION MF CONTINUED.

Due to time constraints the following cases will be heard at the December 14, 2022 meeting.

- HDCRMI-2022-00682, 719 Templeton Av
- HDCCMI-2022-00706, 301 East Bv
- HDCRMI-2022-00637, 1113 Myrtle Av
- HDCCMIA-2022-00705, 325 W Summit Av, 1501 S Mint St

With no further business to discuss, Chair Parati recessed the meeting at 7:59PM.

Candice R Leite, Planner - Historic District Commission