



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
August 9, 2023 | Room 267

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Kim Parati (Vice Chair)
Chris Barth (2nd Vice Chair)
Noelle Bell
Phil Goodwin
Brett Taylor
Sarah Wheat
Scott Whitlock
Heather Wojick

MEMBERS ABSENT: Nichelle Hawkins (Chair)
Christa Lineberger
Jill Walker
Hermitage Court Vacant Seat
Oaklawn Park Vacant Seat
McCrorey Heights Vacant Seat

OTHERS PRESENT: Kristi Harpst, HDC Program Manager
Jenny Shugart, HDC Staff
Candice Leite, HDC Staff
Marilyn Drath, HDC Staff
Jill Sanchez-Myers, Senior Assistant City Attorney
Nicole Hewett, Assistant City Attorney
Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

With a quorum present, Vice Chair Parati called the August meeting of the Historic District Commission (Commission) meeting to order at 1:08 pm. Vice Chair Parati 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 Standards**. 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 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. Vice Chair Parati asked that everyone please silence any electronic devices. Commissioners are asked to announce, for the record, if one leaves or arrives during the meeting. Vice Chair Parati requested that those in the audience remain quiet during the hearings. An audience member will be asked once to be quiet and the need for a second request will require removal from the room. Vice Chair Parati swore in all Applicants and Staff and continued to swear in people as they arrived for the duration of the meeting. Appeals from the Historic District Commission are to the Zoning Board of Adjustment within 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:

CONSENT

HDCRMI-2023-00380, 2100 Charlotte Dr	Dilworth
HDCRMI-2023-00672, 220 S Summit Av	Wesley Heights
HDCRMI-2023-00682, 1726 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood

NOT HEARD AT THE JULY 12 MEETING

HDCRMI-2023-00255, 1226 Myrtle Av	Dilworth
HDCRMIA-2022-01159, 305 W Kingston Av	Wilmore
HDCRMA-2023-00258, 1541 Wickford Pl	Wilmore

CONTINUED FROM THE APRIL 12 MEETING

HDCRMI-2022-01006, 500 E Park Av	Dilworth
HDCCMIA-2023-00075, 1513-1515 S Mint St	Wilmore

CONTINUED FROM THE JUNE 14 MEETING

HDCRMA-2023-00215, 1919 S Mint St	Wilmore
-----------------------------------	---------

CONTINUED FROM THE JULY 12 MEETING

HDCADMRM-2023-00111, 2101 Dilworth Rd E	Dilworth
HDCCMIA-2023-00115, 1921 Charlotte Dr	Dilworth
HDCRMI-2023-00256, 2310 Charlotte Dr	Dilworth

NEW CASES

HDCRMI-2023-00330, 1525 Merriman Av	Wilmore
HDCRMI-2023-00379, 1818 Lennox Av	Dilworth
HDCRMI-2023-00377, 320 E Park Av	Dilworth
HDCCMIA-2023-00283, 424-428 West Bv	Wilmore
HDCRMI-2022-00774, 227 W Park Av	Wilmore

CONSENT

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, WALKER

RECUSE: TAYLOR

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2023-00380, 2100 CHARLOTTE DR (PID: 12112514) – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing building is a 1.5 story Craftsman bungalow built c. 1930. Architectural features include a front gable roof with deep eaves supported by triangular brackets, a wraparound porch supported by tapered stone columns, and 6/1 windows. Exterior material is unpainted brick with a stone foundation. An original, one-story garage is located in the rear yard. The lot size is measures approximately 60' x 161' x 61' x 150'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5-story residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is the addition of two (2) shed dormers on the roof facing Carling Avenue (right elevation). The new dormers tie in below the ridge. One of the dormers will be constructed around an existing stone chimney. The stone chimney will not be raised. Proposed materials (siding, corner boards, fascia, soffit, etc.) are noted to match existing; however, existing materials are not labeled. New windows are proposed to be either wood or aluminum clad wood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for Additions, pages 6.20-6.24, and the Secretary of the Interiors Standards.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, Staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6, and the Secretary of the Interior Standards, and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with the following Conditions:
 - a. New lap siding should be either wood lap with no visible knots or Hardie Artisan smooth finish lap siding with wood corner boards that sit ¼" proud of the siding.
 - b. Fascia and soffit should be wood to match the original house.
 - c. Provide windows specifications that meet HDC requirements to Staff.
 - d. Provide a window trim detail.
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 Vice Chair Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

1st: BELL 2nd: GOODWIN

Ms. Bell moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the districts and meets the Standards for additions, 6.20 through 6.24, and the Secretary of Interior's Standards. She added the following conditions: new lap siding should be wood with no visible knots or Hardie Artisan smooth finish with wood corner boards that sit ¼" proud of the siding, the fascia and soffit should be wood to match the house, and window details need to be approved by Staff. Mr. Goodwin seconded the motion.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: BELL, GOODWIN, PARATI, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION - APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, WALKER

RETURNED: TAYLOR

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2023-00672, 220 S SUMMIT AV (PID: 07101501) – REAR PORCH ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing two-story building was originally constructed as a duplex c. 1939. Architectural features include a side gable roof, symmetrical six-bay front façade, and 6/6 double-hung wood windows. Exterior is unpainted brick. Originally, matching front porches were separate with brick columns, arched openings, and front-facing gables. A central connector and railings were added to the front porches during the c. 2007-2008 renovations. The accessory structure and existing one-story rear addition were also constructed c. 2007-2008. The lot size measures approximately 50' x 187'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is the addition of new covered porches, which will extend off of the existing one-story rear addition. Proposed materials include unpainted brick to match existing and a standing seam metal roof. Porch floor will be slate. No trees will be impacted by this project. Post-construction, the rear yard will be approximately 47.2 % impermeable. The project would be an Administrative review but for the corner lot location and visibility, which requires Commission review.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for Additions, pages 6.20-6.24, and the Secretary of the Interiors Standards.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, Staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6, and the Secretary of the Interior Standards, and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with the following Conditions:
 - a. Provide brick and mortar sample to Staff for approval.
 - b. All brick is to remain unpainted.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

1st: GOODWIN 2nd: BELL

Mr. Goodwin moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for additions, 6.20 through 6.24, and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He added the following conditions: that brick and mortar samples be provided to Staff, confirmation that all brick will remain unpainted, and submission of permit-ready drawings to Staff for final review. Ms. Bell seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7/0

**AYES: BELL, GOODWIN, PARATI, TAYLOR, WHEAT,
WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR REAR PORCH ADDITION - APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, WALKER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2023-00682, 1726 THE PLAZA (PID: 09506201) – REAR ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing building is a 2-story Colonial Revival built c. 1975. Architectural features include a symmetrical façade with central front gable portico entry, a side gable roof with pent eave returns, and a one-story side porch. The front door has side lights and windows are 6/1 double-hung wood. Exterior is wood lap siding with corner boards, and the brick foundation and exterior chimney are unpainted. The lot size measures approximately 66' x 170'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is a rear addition that ties in 1'-8" below the original ridge. The addition includes both heated square footage and an unheated covered porch with the entire footprint measuring approximately 28' x 25'-10". The addition will be stepped in from both rear corners of the original house. The rear porch is designed to match the details of the original side porch with round wood columns and brick foundation. The rear porch roof is proposed to be metal. Other proposed materials include unpainted brick foundation, wood lap siding with wood corner boards, and wood fascia and soffit to match existing. There is one change to the original house. A window on the right elevation, second level, will be shifted toward the front of the house. No trees will be impacted by this project. Post-construction the rear yard will be approximately 24.3% impermeable. The project would be an Administrative review but for the corner lot location and visibility, which requires Commission review.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for Additions, pages 6.20-6.24, and the Secretary of the Interiors Standards.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, Staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6, and the Secretary of the Interior Standards, and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with the following Conditions:
 - a. Provide material details including, but not limited to, brick sample, siding specifications, and window/door specifications that meet HDC requirements.
 - b. Provide specifications on site plan for trees to be fenced and protected during construction.
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 Vice Chair Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

1st: WHEAT 2nd: WOJICK

Ms. Wheat moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for additions, 6.20 through 6.24, and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. She added the following conditions: that the applicant provide material details including brick samples, siding specifications, and window and door specifications, and that a tree protection plan be provided to Staff. Ms. Wojick seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BELL, GOODWIN, PARATI, TAYLOR, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR REAR ADDITION – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

NOT HEARD AT THE JULY 12 MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, WALKER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2023-00255, 1226 MYRTLE AV (PID: 12305607) – ADDITION, WINDOW CHANGES, & DOOR CHANGES

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing building is a 2-story Colonial Revival constructed c. 1930. Architectural features include a side gable block with a symmetrical façade, central entry, full width front porch supported by Tuscan columns, and one-story side wings. The front door has a fanlight transom and side lights. The double-hung windows are 6/1 and many are paired. Exterior is wood lap siding with corner boards and an unpainted brick foundation. The one-story wing on the right elevation was formerly a screen porch that was infilled around 2004/2005. The lot size is slightly irregular measuring approximately 60’ x 156’ x 36’ x 150’. Adjacent structures are 1.5 and 2-story residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is the reconfiguration and expansion of an existing non-historic rear addition. The new addition will tie in well below the primary ridge. A new hip roof dormer, that ties beneath the original ridge, will be installed on the rear as well. Proposed materials include wood lap siding and corner boards to match existing. The majority of the new roof will be asphalt shingle to match existing with a metal shed roof over the rear patio doors and second level bay window. New windows are proposed Pella double-hung and fixed wood windows with 7/8” Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL) muntins.

The project also includes window changes on the original house. On the left elevation, first level, a non-original window will be removed and replaced with a triple window. A new double-hung window will be installed on the second level. On the right elevation, second level, a double window will be made into a triple ganged window using a salvaged historic window from the rear elevation.

No changes are proposed to the front elevation. No trees are proposed for removal. Site changes include a new brick patio on slab and a new sand-set brick paver walkway and herringbone brick driveway. Post-construction rear yard permeability is approximately 40.38%.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Window mulls should be a nominal 6". On sheet A-5.0 windows "E" and "F" shown with 3" mulls, and window "C" shows a 3 ½" mull.
2. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS 1st: **WOJICK 2nd: **BELL****

Ms. Wojick moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the district and the Standards. She requested that the two proposed triple windows be replaced with twin windows that align with the existing windows that are above or below, citing Standards 6.15, numbers 1 and 2 and 4.14. Ms. Bell seconded the motion.

Mr. Goodwin made a friendly amendment that for the rear elevation, option one and two are equally acceptable. Ms. Wojick and Ms. Bell accepted the amendment.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: **BELL, GOODWIN, PARATI, TAYLOR, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

NAYS: **NONE**

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION, WINDOW CHANGES, & DOOR CHANGES – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, WALKER

ARRIVED: BARTH

APPLICATION:

HDCRMIA-2022-01159, 305 W KINGSTON AV (PID: 11907913) – WINDOW & DOOR REPLACEMENT, DRIVEWAY, & SHUTTERS – AFTER-THE-FACT

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure at 305 W. Kingston Ave was built c. 1928. The primary structure is a 1-story wood lap-sided house bungalow with a side gabled roof. The front porch is a brick foundation and has wood tapered columns on a brick base. The lot size is approximately 50'x 185'. Adjacent structures are mainly a mixture of 1- and 2-story residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is the removal and replacement of several original features and the installation of new features.

1. The original wood (with 12 glass panels) front door will be removed. The original front door is to be replaced with a new wood door with two lower panels and modern glass in the upper section and trim piece will be added.
2. The removal of the original wood 8-over-1 double hung windows and the installation of vinyl 6-over-1 double hung windows with grids between the glass. The proposed replacement windows will be located in the original window openings. Original trim to remain.
3. The removal of louvered shutters and installation of replacement wood pallet-style shutters.
4. A new concrete driveway will be installed up to the foundation of 305 W. Kingston Av and the neighboring property (309 W. Kingston Av). No planting strip will be placed between the driveway and the buildings.
5. New lighting fixtures to be installed on either side of the front door.
6. Existing walkway and new fence can be Staff approved and do not require Commission review.

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. Front door
 - a. Removing an original door is incongruous with the Standard for Front Doors and Entrances (page 4.10 #1).
 - b. The replacement front door and added trim (smaller opening) is incongruous with the Standard for Front Doors and Entrances (page 4.10 #2, #3, and #4).
2. Windows
 - a. Removing original windows is incongruous with the Standard for Windows (pages 4.12 - 4.14 #1, #2, and #3).
 - b. The vinyl 6-over-1 replacement windows (with grids between the glass) are incongruous with the Standard for Windows (pages 4.12 - 4.14 #10, #17, #18, and #19).
3. The pallet-style design of the new shutters is incongruous with the Standard for Shutters (page 4.15 #1 through #11).
4. The proposed concrete driveway with no planting strip between the driveway and the foundations of the buildings is incongruous with the Standard for Sidewalks and Parking (pages 8.2 – 8.3 #1 through #8).
5. New lighting is incongruous with the Standard for Light Fixtures (page 8.12 #4).
6. The walkway and fence may be approved by Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: DENIED

1st: BELL 2nd: WOJICK

Ms. Bell moved to deny the application because it is incongruous with the district and Standards for original doors, citing Standard 4.10, numbers 1 through 4; the original windows citing 4.12 through 4.14, especially 4.14, numbers 10, 17, 18, and 19; the shutters citing 4.15, numbers 1 through 12; the driveway citing 8.2 through 8.3, numbers 1-8; and the light fixture citing 8.12, number 4. Ms. Wojick seconded the motion. Ms. Bell stated that the Commission would be fine with Staff making decisions about replacement windows and may approve wood double-hung windows that match the existing original window. Ms. Bell provided a new condition that the applicant work with Staff to make sure the material choices align with historic standards for the house and neighborhood. She added that the portion of the application for replacement windows is being denied due to a lack of documentation on the originals and that vinyl is a non-conforming material.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, PARATI, TAYLOR, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR WINDOW & DOOR REPLACEMENT, DRIVEWAY, & SHUTTERS – AFTER-THE-FACT – DENIED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, WALKER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA-2023-00258, 1541 WICKFORD PL (PID: 11908701) – CHANGES TO APPROVED COA – AFTER-THE-FACT

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one-story, American Small House with Colonial Revival elements constructed c. 1936. Architectural features include fluted pilasters around the front entry, 6/6 double-hung wood windows, and a central brick chimney. The exterior is painted brick. The front porch is partial width under a shed roof. It was slightly expanded to the left and right at some point and partially enclosed with a screen-system. Lot size is irregular, measuring approximately 82 x 113' x 27' x 125'. Surrounding structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The property owner is proposing to paint the brick on the new addition to match the original brick house. The plans were noted to match existing, but the existing material was not noted on the submitted plans and documents as painted brick when the project was reviewed and approved by the Commission at the June 9, 2021, meeting (COA# HDCRMA-2021-00009).

The proposal is also to consider changes to the COA that was approved by the Commission at the June 9, 2021, meeting (COA# HDCRMA-2021-00009). Changes to the approved COA include:

Original House:

1. Chimney cap – approved to match original chimney but white aluminum added. *Proposed solution by applicant is to clad the top of the chimney in copper since it's a non-functioning chimney.*

New Addition:

2. Eaves (width) – approved to match original clipped eaves but built with various widths between 8" and 12". *Proposed solution by the applicant is to maintain 8"-12" overhangs (for weather protection, continuity of new and old, and to create shadow).*
3. Left side on 1st floor is 2'-0" longer than approved. *Proposed solution by the applicant is to maintain the added length.*
4. Left side at 2nd story bump out is brick and stucco (only stucco on approved drawings). *Proposed solution by the applicant is to maintain the built condition of the wall and roof, but to add stucco veneer over brick above the fascia line.*
5. Windows:
 - a. Left side, 1st floor are 4-over-4 double hung (approved as 6-over-6 double hung)
 - b. Left side, 2nd floor are 8-pane and 6-pane casements (approved as 9-pane casements)
 - c. Right side, 2nd floor of addition are 8-pane casements (approved as 9-pane casements)
 - d. Right side and left side, location on 2nd floor lower than in approved drawings
 - e. Right side and left side, single windows instead of paired windows on 2nd story. *Proposed solution (both left and right sides) is to remove stucco between the windows and add wood trim as well as sills to pair windows; paint to match color of windows.*
 - f. Rear elevation, 2nd story windows lower than in approved drawings. *Proposed solution by applicant is to maintain windows as built, except where noted at item #5.e*
6. Rear elevation: *Proposed solution by applicant is to maintain rear elevation as built.*
 - g. Door on right side rear wall – not built
 - h. French doors – sidelights eliminated
 - i. Rear patio – sunken courtyard and retaining wall – not built
7. Eave between gables of original house and addition on right side of house are uneven. *Proposed solution by applicant is to maintain rear elevation as built.*
8. Gable ends on right side of addition are not aligned with each other. *Proposed solution by applicant is to maintain rear elevation as built.*
9. Foundation heights – different than in approved drawings. *Proposed solution by applicant is to maintain rear elevation as built.*

10. Column trim, screening of gas meter and boxed eaves (gable ends). The applicants have already worked with Staff to fix the eaves, add column trim and screen the gas meter.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Painting of brick is incongruous with the Standards for Masonry (page 5.5 #1 through #4) and Paint (page 5.8 #7).
2. Refer to Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Additions (pages 6.20-6.24 #1 through #6).
3. The Commission will determine if the proposed project meets the Design Standards for Masonry, Paint and Additions.
4. The addition of column trim, screening of gas meter, and fixing the boxed eaves at the gable ends all have been accomplished.
5. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: DENIED

1st: WOJICK 2nd: WHITLOCK

Ms. Wojick moved to deny the application as it is incongruous with the district, Design Standards, and the Secretary of Interior's Standards. In support of her motion, Ms. Wojick cited the following Standards: 6.13 on roof forms, especially numbers 1, 5, and the preamble; window and door sizing in 6.15, numbers 1, 2, and preamble; trim, soffits, and eaves in 6.14, numbers 1, 2, 3, and preamble; porch beams and frieze, including column detail, in Standard 6.17, number 3; the Secretary of Interior's Standards 2.5, and foundations in 6.12, number 1 and the preamble. Mr. Whitlock seconded the motion.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, PARATI, TAYLOR, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR CHANGES TO APPROVED COA – AFTER-THE-FACT – DENIED.

CONTINUED FROM THE APRIL 12 MEETING – DECISION REQUIRED AT AUGUST 9 MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, WALKER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2022-01006, 500 E PARK AV (PID: 12308501) – PORCH CHANGES, WINDOW CHANGES, & PAINTED BRICK.

This application was continued from the April 12, 2023 meeting for the following items:

1. *For the front porch roof extension, work with Staff on column opportunities that might work with the proposed design, per Standard 4.8, number 4.*
2. *Work with Staff to determine the history of the brick painting, per Standard 5.5, number 3.*
3. *In the drawings represent the offset and the roof pitches as they come together with the extension of the existing front porch and the existing side roof line.*
4. *Document the spacing between the window sill and the top of the roof pitch as it attaches to the house.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing 2 ½-story American Foursquare building was constructed c. 1920. The building has a three-bay symmetrical façade with a Pyramidal roof with a small hip roof dormer on the front elevation. Architectural features including a full width hip roof front porch supported by square columns on square brick piers, with a brick balustraded side “deck”; one-story rear ell; one-story side wing; and 18/1 and 12/1 double-hung wood windows. Exterior materials include shingle siding and a painted brick foundation. The lot size is approximately 75’ x 140’. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5 and 2-story residential buildings and 1-story institutional buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is for changes to an existing accessory structure. The garage doors will be removed. Two sets of paired windows will be installed, and new siding toothed in to match existing. The new windows will be double-hung wood with Simulated True Divided Light (STDL) in a 12/1 pattern to match existing. A new exterior entry door will be installed on the elevation facing Lyndhurst Avenue.

The applicant is also requesting the expansion of the front porch roof to connect to a side roof on the right elevation. The front porch roof extension portion of the application is incomplete and cannot be heard by the Commission until additional information is received including, but not limited to, elevation drawings (front and left) showing how the roof will be supported, how it will tie into the existing roof, etc., a beam/column detail, roof plan, photos showing all existing conditions of the front porch; information about all materials including foundation, floor, ceiling, columns, roof trim, etc.

Revised Proposal – April 12, 2023

- Front and right elevation drawings provided for the garage.
- Photos of window trim provided.
- Photos of front porch ceiling, trim, beam, and columns provided.

Revised Proposal – August 9, 2023

- Roof connection drawing provided.
- Brick painting information provided.
- Spacing between window sills and top of roof documentation provided.
- Accessory building changes were approved at the April 12, 2023 meeting, but applicant is requesting a change to the previously approved windows.
 - Approved windows: Pella Reserve Traditional, double-hung, wood, with STDL in a 12/1 pattern.
 - Requested windows: Pella Lifestyle Enduraclad, double-hung. Removable muntins are ordered.
- A decision is required at the August 9, 2023 meeting.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. A decision is required at this meeting.
2. Front Porch:
 - a. Provide a porch section drawing from foundation to roof, showing the column/beam alignment with dimensions and materials noted.
 - b. Provide additional information and details about how the two existing roofs will be connected to the new roof.
 - c. Will the beam wrap around the left side?
 - d. Downspouts should be located to the side (not front) of the new porch column.
3. Windows:
 - a. Sash frame appears too thin, and muntins are removable.
 - b. Proposed windows have not previously been approved by the Commission.
 - c. Refer to Design Standards for Windows, 4.14, #14 and 18, and New Construction: Doors and Windows, 6.15, #4.

4. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

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

Mr. Goodwin moved to approve the portion of the application regarding the new roof extension with the conditions that they maintain the existing roof, column, and beam forms for the new roof including the pitch, overhang, column details, beam details, and exposed rafter details. He cited Standard 4.8 for porches and 3.12 describing the asymmetrical porches typical to the American Foursquare style.

Mr. Barth offered a friendly amendment that the Commission table the discussion of the column painting to see if any additional photographic documentation can be uncovered and to allow the applicant time to study removing the paint and analyze the condition of the existing brick.

Mr. Barth seconded the motion.

VOTE 1: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, PARATI, TAYLOR, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION 1: APPLICATION FOR PORCH CHANGES – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

MOTION 2: DENIED 1st: GOODWIN 2nd: WHITLOCK

Mr. Goodwin moved to deny the request for window changes because it is inconsistent with the historic precedent, Standard 6.15, numbers 1 and 4, and because the applicant did not bring in a physical sample of the proposal of new product. As a second part of this motion, Mr. Goodwin stated that the Commission was denying the request to paint the brick so the applicant can provide further study on the removal of the existing paint or provide photographic evidence that the columns were painted at least 50 years ago. Mr. Whitlock seconded the motion.

VOTE 2: 8/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, PARATI, TAYLOR, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION 2: APPLICATION FOR ACCESORY BUILDING WINDOW CHANGES & PAINTED BRICK- DENIED.

CONTINUED FROM THE APRIL 12 MEETING – AFTER-THE-FACT

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, WALKER

LEFT MEETING: GOODWIN

APPLICATION:

HDCCMIA-2023-00075, 1513-1515 S MINT ST (PID: 11908315, 11908316) – SIGNAGE – AFTER-THE-FACT

This application was continued from the April 12, 2023, meeting for the following items:

- *The applicant re-study the signage for each individual tenant as a holistic approach.*

- *The applicant to place signage near the main point of entry for each tenant.*
- *The applicant to consider the other sign restrictions referenced in Appendix A for Sign Standards and Regulations for Urban Districts, specifically items A.2 #2 and A.1 #13.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structures at 1513 and 1515 S. Mint Street were built in 1927 and 1947, respectively. Both buildings are 1-story brick commercial structures with storefronts along S. Mint Street. The lot size for 1513 S. Mint St is approximately 50' x 147' and the lot size for 1515 S. Mint St. is approximately 50' x 147'. Adjacent structures are 1-story commercial buildings. The Commission previously approved fenestration changes, painted brick, restoration, parking area improvements, and the demolition of a non-historic rear addition on 1513 S. Mint St in September 2019 (COA # HDCCMA-2019-00367); signage, murals, lighting, and awnings were not included. Modifications were made to the original 2019 plans thus the Commission reviewed fenestration changes, restoration, and site work, including lighting and awnings in October 2020 (COA # HDCCMI-2020-00324); a signage and murals were not included. Staff approved a rear addition on 1513 S Mint St (COA # HDCADMC-2022-00191) in April 2022.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is the installation of one (1) wall sign on the front of 1513 S. Mint St. and two (2) wall signs on the right elevation of 1515 S. Mint St. The wall sign on the front of 1513 S. Mint St. projects less than six inches from the wall and is approximately 4.75 square feet in area. The two (2) signs are proposed for the right-side of 1515 S. Mint St. are a combined square footage of approximately 18 square feet. All signage has already been installed as well as a temporary sign at the entrance to the parking on the right side of the building. 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.

Revised Proposal – August 9, 2023

- Updated site drawing showing the locations of the main entrances for each business.
- Images submitted show front, left, and right elevations indicating the possible locations of the three (3) proposed signs.
- The Commission requested that the signage be near the main entrance for each business - two (2) signs will be installed on the front elevation and one (1) sign will be installed on the right elevation.
- There are a total of three (3) signs (one for each tenant) being proposed for the entire building. The combined square footage of all three signs will be 18.4 square feet.
- Two (2) signs are proposed for the front elevation near the main entrances of two of the businesses, Trio and Burrows Welchel & Culp Orthodontics).
 - The Trio sign will be 22" x 31" (4.7 square feet).
 - The Orthodontics sign will be 48" x 23 1/8" (7.7 square feet).
 - The total square footage for the two signs on the front elevation will be 12.4 square feet.
- One (1) projecting sign is proposed for the right elevation near the main entrance of the third business, Horseshoe. The proposed sign will be 24" x 36" (6 square feet) and will project out from the wall 36".
- Alternate locations of signage provided on submitted images.
- All proposed signs are either one or two sided.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The proposed signs are not incongruous with the Standard for Signs because:
 - a. The signs are primarily for identification purposes (Page A.1 #2);
 - b. The signs use metal as the material (Page A.1 #3);
 - c. The projecting sign (Horseshoe) on the right elevation will project more than six inches but is no more than six square feet in area (Page A.2 Within Urban Districts, General Commercial, and Research/Office Zoning Districts, #2);

- d. The two signs on the front elevation will each project less than 6” from the wall and each sign will be less than eight square feet in area (Page A.2 Within Urban Districts, General Commercial, and Research/Office Zoning Districts, #2);
 - e. The signs do not exceed six feet in height or ten square feet in area (Page A.2 Within Urban Districts, General Commercial, and Research/Office Zoning Districts, #3); and
 - f. The signs are either one or two sided (Page A.2 Within Urban Districts, General Commercial, and Research/Office Zoning Districts, #4).
2. The Commission requested a comprehensive signage package for the entire building with the understanding that more signage is needed for this project than is allowable under the current sign Standards. The Commission will determine if the current sign package is approvable (A.1 #6).
 3. All temporary signs should be removed.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

1st: BARTH 2nd: BELL

Mr. Barth moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the Standards in Appendix A.2 for signage within urban and general commercial districts. He noted that the Commission was making a special consideration for the project because it has three separate addresses. He asked that the applicant work with Staff to ensure that the Horseshoe sign is all metal and painted as identified by the applicant. Ms. Bell seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, PARATI, TAYLOR, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR SIGNAGE – AFTER-THE-FACT – APPROVED WITH CONDITONS.

CONTINUED FROM THE JUNE 14 MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, WALKER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA-2023-00215, 1919 S MINT ST (PID: 11907605) – ADDITION & FRONT PORCH CHANGES

This application was continued from the March 8, 2023 meeting for the following items:

- *Site Plan. Provide a revised site plan with the driveway and walkway details, HVAC location, per Standard 8.2.*
- *Windows.*
 - *Retain existing windows per Standard 4.12 – 4.14.*
 - *Provide new window details and specifications (for the addition) to comply with Standard 6.15. The windows on the addition need to be consistent with the historic house, and the ganged windows have a mull gap of at least six inches.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing building is an American Small House with Colonial Revival elements constructed c. 1940. Architectural features include a symmetrical façade with central entry flanked by large 8/8 and 6/6 double-hung windows, a side gable roof, an exterior chimney on the left side flanked by 4/4 windows, a three-quarters width shed-roof front porch supported by wood columns. There is a small addition on the right side. The exterior is unpainted brick. The lot size is approximately 49' x 156'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5-story residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is for the addition of front porch rails, changes to a previous side addition, and a rear addition.

Rear addition proposed materials include unpainted brick foundation and siding with a 7" reveal. Siding, trim, and corner boards will either be wood or Hardie Artisan.

Side addition changes include removal of all windows, vinyl siding, and trim. The new exterior will be wood or Hardie panels and trim and fixed windows. No changes proposed to the existing footprint of the side addition.

New windows are proposed to be wood, double-hung with Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL) to match the existing original windows on the house. The project also includes the removal of vinyl trim wrap and the restoration of the original wood trim throughout. Post-construction rear yard permeability is approximately 32.7%.

Revised Proposal

- Updated site plan provided.
- Elevation drawings updated to show existing window conditions (8/8 and 6/6).
- Window design changed to 8/8 on rear elevation.
- Windows noted to repair, if possible, and if not to replace with wood STDL with brickmould.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. *Front porch rails*
 - a. Should be built at a historic height with a booster rail, see Design Standards for porches 4.8, number 7.
2. *Side porch changes*
 - a. Provide a window trim detail with dimensions.
3. *Rear Addition*
 - a. Right Elevation. How will the fireplace be vented on the exterior?
 - b. Materials include wood or Hardie corner boards. Wood corner boards are typically required.
4. *Windows and Doors*
 - a. Confirm that all original windows are to remain. Any request to remove will need to go back to Commission for review/approval with adequate documentation of existing conditions of windows to be removed and replaced.
 - b. Provide cut sheets and specifications for proposed new windows and doors.
5. *Site Plan*
 - a. Label dimensions of walkway and driveway.
 - b. Will another HVAC unit be needed?
 - c. Show HVAC screening on the site plan and note it's to remain (looks like screening is already in place).

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

1st: BARTH **2nd: BELL**

Mr. Barth moved to approve the application as presented noting that the Commission was not reviewing the driveway at this time. He cited Standards 4.12 through 4.14 for the existing windows that should be retained and repaired, and that the applicant should work with Staff as far as materials, mull gaps, trim, and approved manufacturer citing Standard 6.15 for new windows.

Ms. Wojick offered a friendly amendment to have the front rail dimensions modified with a traditional 30" tall railing system and that a booster rail be installed above that. Mr. Barth accepted the friendly amendment.

Ms. Bell seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, PARATI, TAYLOR, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION & FRONT PORCH CHANGES – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

CONTINUED FROM THE JULY 12 MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, WALKER

LEFT MEETING: PARATI

APPLICATION:

HDCADMRM-2023-00111, 2101 DILWORTH RD E (PID: 12112515) – FRONT WALKWAY & STOOP RESTORATION

This application was continued from the July 12, 2023 meeting for the following items:

- *Per Standards 8.6 and 8.7, redesign the private walkway's connection to the public sidewalk being more understated and take into account the minimal grade change. Provide minimal retaining and steps down to the sidewalk level.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing building is a two-story Colonial Revival constructed in 1929. Architectural features include a simple curved hood supported by brackets over the central front entry side gable roof, left side chimney, symmetrical fenestration, and painted brick. The structure also includes an existing left side two-story enclosed side porch addition. The structure sits on a corner lot that measures approximately 66.67' x 160.39'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5., and 2-story, single-family residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is a new front walkway with two landing pads, and the restoration of the existing painted brick front stoop.

The new 4'-0" wide front walkway connects two landing pads, one at the front steps to the house and one at the street. The landing pad in front of the front stoop measures approximately 7' -4 ½" wide x 6' - 1 ½" deep. The landing pad at the public sidewalk measures approximately 16'-6" wide x 13-3 ½" deep and will be flanked by a brick retaining wall with brick columns topped by lighting fixtures and planters. Proposed materials for the front walkway, landing pads and retaining walls is unpainted tumbled brick in a herringbone pattern.

The existing 10'-1 1/2" x 4'-1 1/2" brick front stoop will be rebuilt to match the existing dimensions with unpainted brick in a herringbone pattern. The front stoop is currently painted brick with a thinly applied brick over the original material on the steps and porch which will be removed. The existing handrails will be reused. Proposed materials are unpainted brick, reuse of the existing metal handrails, concrete planters, and metal lighting fixtures.

Revised Proposal

- The public landing pad/steps/retaining wall has been reduced from an overall size of 16'-6" wide x 13'-3 1/2" deep to 8'-0" wide x 7'-1" deep. The pad area itself has been reduced from 16'-6" wide x 9'-4 1/2" deep to 8'-0" wide x 4'-0" deep.
- Due to the reduction of the public landing pad design, the private walkway has lengthened from 27'-1 1/2" long to 33'-11" long, and the front portion to the retaining wall has been removed.
- All other aspects of the project remain the same.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Do not replace grass in front yards with paving, per Standard 8.4 number 6.
2. Flat lots typically do not have retaining walls, per Standard 8.6-8.7, number 11.
3. Try reuse historic materials, i.e., reuse painted brick by turning it around.
4. Information on proposed *Similar Design in Neighborhood*
 - a. 2137 Dilworth Rd E _ No Approval Record
 - b. 1316 Ewing _ Approved 3/14/2014, old Design Standards
 - c. 2119 Dilworth Rd E _ Approved 3/19/2011, old Design Standards
 - d. 1316 Dilworth Rd _ Approved 8/27/2002
 - e. 2006 Dilworth Rd E _ Approved 7/14/2015, old Design Standards
 - f. 2101 Dilworth Rd W _ Approved 3/8/2023
5. The Commission will determine if the proposed project meets the Standards.
6. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: APPROVED

1st: WOJICK 2nd: WHEAT

Ms. Wojick moved to approve the application as it meets Standards 8.6 and 8.7. Ms. Wheat seconded the motion.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, TAYLOR, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR FRONT WALKWAY & STOOP RESTORATION - APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WALKER

APPLICATION:

HDCMA-2023-00115, 1921 CHARLOTTE DR (PID: 12111901) – ADDITION

This application was continued from the July 12, 2023 meeting for the following items:

1. *Context. Provide a sufficient number of design variables that reference the historic context and also some of the details that help define the neighboring historic buildings.*
2. *The new building should be secondary to the existing structure.*
3. *Spacing, 7.5*

4. *Scale, 7.9*
5. *Massing, 7.7*
6. *Trees, 8.5. Consider larger trees.*
7. *Lighting, 8.12.*
8. *Reference the Staff notes for any other information that was not in the initial motion.*
9. *The Commission did not review other details.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The property is a 2-story office/multi-family building constructed in 1992. Architectural features include a complex roof form, a recessed off-center entry on Charlotte Drive, and two centrally located arched metal vents on the roof. Lot size measures approximately 128.55' x 164.46' x 144.09' x 180'. Adjacent structures are 1-, 1.5-, 2-story single family and 2-story multi-family and office buildings. A replacement retaining wall on the Ideal Way side and rear patio expansion were approved administratively under COA# HDCADMRM-2018-00518; parking, landscaping and site work were approved administratively under COA# HDCADMRM-2020-00416. The HDC approved the replacement of vinyl siding with cementitious board and batten siding, and entry door changes on the front and left elevations in June 2021 under COA# HDCRMI-2021-00149.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is new construction. An existing boutique hotel, the Kasa Edison House, will be expanded with the construction of a new building between the existing structure and Kenilworth Avenue. Proposed height is approximately 26'-0" as measured from grade to ridge. From Charlotte Drive, the height of the existing building is 26'-9 ¼" at the left and approximately 25'-11" on the right. The proposed building footprint is 97'-2" x 30'-0", slightly wider than the existing structure. Proposed materials are brick and cementitious board and batten siding to match the existing structure and metal railings. Window and door and trim materials are not noted. The project includes the removal of three (3) mature canopy trees.

Revised Proposal

- Design changed
- Smaller overall footprint
- Additional tree information provided
- Lighting information provided
- Window details provided

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. New trees should be large, maturing canopy trees similar to the trees being removed.
2. Is it possible to center the windows on the parking lot elevation?
3. Provide specifications on proposed windows.
4. Window trim in fields of brick should be brickmould instead of regular trim.
5. Provide materials, dimensions, and details of shutters.
6. The Commission has previously approved the installation of non-grain fiber cement siding in dimensions to match traditional materials on non-historic additions and on new, infill construction including the existing structure on this lot.
7. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

A number of individuals accepted Second Vice Chair Barth's invitation to comment on the application including Denise Walsh, Matt Knox, Michael Baker, Ellen Citarella, Russel Ruckerstuhl, Shannon Wilcox, and Tiffany George-Kete.

MOTION: CONTINUED

1st: TAYLOR 2nd: WHITLOCK

Mr. Taylor moved to continue the application based on Standards 7.3, 7.5, 7.13, 7.14, 7.16, 8.4, 8.5, 8.6, and 8.12, and that the applicant comes forth with a more complete set of plans and that look at spacing, massing, and the future entrance off Kenilworth. Mr. Barth suggested that the applicant consider Staff’s analysis and the public comments offered tonight in their revision as well as some scale-reducing techniques. Mr. Whitlock seconded the motion.

Ms. Wojick offered a friendly amendment that the applicant provides more information about all the trees on the site.

Mr. Taylor and Mr. Whitlock both accepted Ms. Wojick’s amendment.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, TAYLOR, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION - CONTINUED.

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2023-00256, 2310 CHARLOTTE DRIVE (PID: 12112402) – ADDITION & WINDOW CHANGES

The application deferred due to quorum.

NEW CASES

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WALKER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2023-00330, 1525 MERRIMAN AV (PID: 11909813) – FOUNDATION CHANGES

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing is a one-story American Small House constructed c. 1946. The building has a symmetrical three-bay façade with a side gable main roof with two unpainted, internal brick chimneys. The six-panel Colonial Revival front door appears to be original. Windows are 6/6. The exterior is wood lap siding with corner boards and a painted masonry foundation. The partial width front porch is an early addition that was updated in 2020. The lot size is approximately 50’ x 155’. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5-story single-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is foundation parging with smooth-finish stucco. The existing foundation is painted concrete block.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Confirm the parged foundation will remain unpainted.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

1ST: BELL

2ND: WOJICK

Ms. Bell moved to approve the application per the Secretary of Interior’s Standards 2.5 and Design Standards, Chapter 8, specifically citing Standard 8.7, number 12 and 4.4, numbers 3 and 7. She added that concrete block is not a common feature in the district, nor for this style of architecture, which is why the Commission is allowing the applicant to parge the foundation. Ms. Bell conditioned that the applicant work with Staff to apply the stucco and make sure it is not flush with the outside of the house, but instead applied in such a way that the siding is clearly proud of the foundation and that it should have a smooth finish, be a traditional material, and remain unpainted. Ms. Wojick seconded the motion.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, TAYLOR, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR FOUNDATION CHANGES – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WALKER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2023-00379, 1818 LENNOX AV (PID: 12108309) – FENCE

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1.5-story Craftsman house built c. 1915. Architectural features include a front-gable roof, a bay window, exposed rafters, and 12/1 double-hung windows. The partial width engaged front porch features square columns with shake siding; the right bay of the front porch was formerly infilled. The lot size is approximately 50’ x 190’. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1.5, 2, and 2.5-story residential and commercial buildings. A rear addition was approved under application HDCRMI-2021-00918 on January 12, 2022.

PROPOSAL:

The project is the construction of a replacement fence in the rear yard. With the exception of a small adjustment to bring the fence onto the property at the left rear corner, the location of the fence is not changing. The new fence is proposed to be seven (7) feet in height. The fence design is shadowbox-style with horizontal trim across the top with the panels butt-joined to 6x6 uprights. The uprights will have decorative caps. There will be two, 4’ wide gates matching the style of the fence. The applicant is requesting an exception to the six-foot fence height maximum due to the adjacent commercial uses along the rear and right property lines.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Consider installing a 6’ tall fence along the left property line, which is adjacent to residential structures.
2. Fencing should tie in at the rear corners of the house. If the fencing comes along the side yard, it should step down to 5’ and then 4’.
3. Confirm that the finished fence will be painted or stained after an appropriate curing time.
4. The Commission shall determine if an exception should be granted for an 7’ fence.
5. The Commission approved an 8’ fence at the corner of Ideal Way and Park Road as a buffer between the single-family residence at 2144 Park Road and Ed’s Tavern, on October 17, 2017, under application number HDC 2017-00545.
6. The Commission approved an 8’ fence between 1319 Thomas and 1315 Thomas (the parking lot to Workman’s Friend) on February 13, 2019, under application number HDCRMI-2018-00677.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

1ST: BELL

2ND: WOJICK

Ms. Bell moved to approve the application per the Secretary of Interior's Standards 2.5 and the Design Standards for fences and walls in Standards 8.6 through 8.7. She asked the applicant to work with Staff on where the fence height should drop from 7' to 6'. Ms. Bell explained that the Commission was making an exception to the Standards that normally limit rear yard fences to 6' because the applicant's property faces commercial properties on the right and rear sides, and the Commission has made this exception in the past for properties in similar situations.

Mr. Barth made a friendly amendment that the drop down in fence height should occur between a quarter and half of the run on the left side.

Ms. Wojick seconded the motion.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, TAYLOR, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR FENCE – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

Due to time constraints the following cases will be heard at the September 13th, 2023 meeting:

HDCRMI-2023-00377, 320 E Park Av
HDCCMA-2023-00283, 424-428 West Bv
HDCRMI-2022-00774, 227 W Park Av

Ms. Walker offered one minor change to the June 14, 2023 minutes. Ms. Wojick moved to approve the June 14, 2023 minutes. Ms. Wheat seconded the motion. The June 14, 2023 minutes were approved by a vote of 6/0.

Ms. Wheat moved to approve the May 10, 2023 minutes. Ms. Bell seconded the motion. The May 10, 2023 minutes were approved by a vote of 6/0.

With no further business to discuss, Second Vice Chair Barth adjourned the meeting at 6:50 pm.