



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
February 8, 2023 | Room 267

MINUTES

- MEMBERS PRESENT: Kim Parati (Chair)
Nichelle Hawkins (Vice Chair)
Chris Barth (2nd Vice-Chair)
Noelle Bell
Christa Lineberger
Sarah Wheat
Scott Whitlock
- MEMBERS ABSENT: Phil Goodwin
Jill Walker
Heather Wojick
Vacant (3)
- 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
Thomas Powers, Senior Assistant City Attorney
Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

With a quorum present, Chair Parati called the regular February meeting of the Historic District Commission (Commission) meeting to order at 1:09 pm. 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 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 silence any electronic devices. Commissioners are asked to announce, for the record, if one leaves or arrives during the meeting. 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. 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:

NOT HEARD AT THE JANUARY 18 MEETING

HDCMA-2022-00954, 1913 Cleveland Av	Dilworth
HDCRMA-2022-00865, 258 W Park Av	Wilmore
HDCRMIA-2022-00820, 1529 Thomas Av	Plaza Midwood

CONTINUED FROM DECEMBER 14 MEETING

HDCRMI-2022-00682, 719 Templeton Av	Dilworth
HDCMI-2022-00706, 301 East Bv	Dilworth

CONTINUED FROM JANUARY 11 MEETING

HDCRMA-2021-01060, 306 N Graham St/420 West 6th St	Fourth Ward
HDCRMI-2022-00725, 818-826 E Kingston Av	Dilworth

NEW CASES

HDCRMA-2022-00957, 1953 Wilmore Dr	Wilmore
HDCRMIA-2022-00983, 720 E Park Av	Dilworth
HDCRMI-2022-01006, 500 E Park Av	Dilworth
HDCRMIA-2022-01039, 1515 Hamorton Pl	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMA-2022-01041, 1900 Dilworth Rd W	Dilworth
HDCRMIA-2022-01070, 2101 Dilworth Rd W	Dilworth
HDCRMA-2022-01118, 429 W Park Av	Wilmore

NOT HEARD AT THE JANUARY 18 MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, GOODWIN, WALKER, WOJICK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA-2022-00865, 258 WEST PARK AVENUE (PID: 11908813) – ACCESSORY BUILDING DEMO/NEW CONSTRUCTION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one-story, bungalow constructed c. 1931. Architectural features include a main hip roof with a projecting side gable to the right elevation and a front gable supported by brick piers and square columns over a partial width front porch. Other features include paired, double-hung 6/1 wood windows, wood lap siding with corner boards, and a parged brick foundation. The site retains the original concrete front steps and sidewalls connecting the front walk to the public sidewalk. An original accessory building is located at the rear of the lot. Lot size is approximately 50' x 195'. Surrounding structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is the demolition of the existing, dilapidated accessory structure and the construction of new accessory structure with a similar configuration and footprint. Proposed materials are traditional to match existing on the primary structure, including wood lap siding, double-hung 6/1 wood windows, and wood trim. A 24” hackberry growing into the foundation of the existing building is proposed for removal. Post-construction rear yard permeability calculations are not provided.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Setback on side and rear should be 5’ to the furthest projection (eaves) of the new building.
2. Rear yard open space calculations needed. 50% of rear yard, as measured from the back of the original house, needs to remain permeable.
3. Provide a Zoutewelle Streetscape elevation that is legible.
4. Provide a property section from the front to rear property line as viewed from Southwood. The section drawing should include the height of the main house and height of the new accessory building at the elevation facing the house and the elevation facing 1543 Southwood. Height should be measured from grade to ridge.
5. Specifications needed (location, size, species) for the new tree to be planted as a replacement for the Hackberry.
6. Window trim detail with dimensions needed for both single and ganged windows.
7. Window and door specifications submitted to Staff that meet HDC Design Standards.
 - a. Garage doors need to be wood since they are street-facing.
 - b. Craftsman entry doors should not have dentil molding trim.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS 1st: WHITLOCK 2nd: WHEAT

Mr. Whitlock made a motion to approve this application because it’s not incongruous with the HDC Design Standards for accessory buildings, 8.10. and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5. Approval is with the condition that staff reviews the items related to setbacks, window trim on the exterior and confirmation of the new trees to be included to replace the missing tree per Standards 8.5, #2. The size of the new building is being approved based on the size of the historic structure that it is replacing.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WHEAT, WHITLOCK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY BUILDING DEMO/NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, GOODWIN, WALKER, WOJICK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMIA-2022-00820, 1529 THOMAS AVENUE (PID: 08118410) – DRIVEWAY AND PARKING, AFTER-THE-FACT

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one-story Craftsman bungalow constructed c. 1932. The house is a side gable roof with a projecting front gable over the engaged front porch. The front porch roof is supported by a brick pier and square wood column and has a tongue-and-groove front porch floor. There is a small, shed roof side addition on the left elevation

behind the exterior painted masonry chimney. The building appears to have been originally constructed as a single-family house but has since transitioned into a duplex. The original front porch is partially enclosed on the right side, with a second front entry added. Exterior materials are wood German lap siding, a painted brick foundation, and 6/1 double-hung wood windows. The lot size is approximately 50' x 173'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5-story residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is a new asphalt driveway covered with Latex-ite to replace a gravel drive. The new driveway will be installed in the same location as existing, extending into the rear yard. No changes will be made to the existing concrete apron. There are 4 options presented with various configurations and combinations of products (asphalt, concrete, Latex-ite). The project is considered an After-the-Fact review, with the Commission reviewing the project on its merits as if work has not yet occurred.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Refer to Standards for Sidewalks and Parking, page 8.2, #7.
2. The examples provided on A-1.0 of asphalt parking are either violations, institutional properties, or pre-date the designation of the Plaza Midwood district.
3. Latex-ite has not been reviewed previously by the Commission. A physical product sample is needed for any request to use non-traditional materials.
4. 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: DENIED

1st: BELL

2nd: HAWKINS

Ms. Bell made a motion to deny this application because it does not comply with HDC Design Standards 8, #7.

Ms. Parati made a friendly amendment to add a reference to the Secretary of the Interiors' Standards, 2.5.

Ms. Hawkins made a friendly amendment to add references to Standards 8.2, # 3 and 8.2, # 7.

VOTE: 5/1

AYES: BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, WHEAT, WHITLOCK

NAYS: PARATI

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR DRIVEWAY AND PARKING, AFTER-THE-FACT DENIED.

CONTINUED FROM DECEMBER 14 MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, GOODWIN, WALKER, WOJICK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2022-00682, 719 TEMPLETON AVENUE (PID: 12305505) - ADDITION

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

- 1. Restudy the roof form and pitch per guideline 6.3, number 1, and 4.5, number two, and 6.20, number 3.*
- 2. Restudy the fenestration per 6.15.*
- 3. Provide addition details on the front door per standard 4.10.*
- 4. The cementitious siding and trim to be used should follow a historically accepted alternative, per 6.18.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing building was formerly a 1-story brick ranch that has been altered with a front porch, front dormer, a two-story addition on the rear, and other details to look like a Bungalow in 2006. The brick is unpainted. The windows are 6/1 and appear to be replacements. The lot size is approximately 50' x 198'. Adjacent structures are 1.5 and 2-story single-family and multi-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is widening the existing front dormer and extending the walls of the existing two-story addition forward to infill the area between the side gable roofs. Existing windows in the gable ends will be enlarged for egress. Proposed materials are fiber cement siding and wood casement windows.

Revised Proposal – February 8, 2023

- Roof form and pitch changed
- Fenestration in gable ends changed
- Front door material details provided
- Siding material proposed to be traditional wood German lap to match existing

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Expansion of an existing non-conforming addition.
2. Vertical transition trim should remain between new gable/siding and corner of original second-level addition on both right and left elevations.
3. Window trim on dormer and gable end windows shown with picture frame molding (mitered corners). The trim also appears to be too narrow.
4. Proportions of new gable end windows are taller and narrower than windows on the first level.
5. Blank wall in new gables addition on left and right elevations. A vent detail would help to break up the wall.
6. 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: HAWKINS

Ms. Lineberger made a motion to continue this application for a restudy of the roof form per HDC Design Standard 6.20, # 5, a restudy of the fenestration per Standard 6.15 and the vertical transition per Standard 6.20, # 6 to provide a vertical transition detail differentiating the original from the new construction.

Ms. Parati made a friendly amendment to add a reference to the entire section of the HDC Design Standards 6.20 and to the Secretary of the Interiors' Standards, 2.5 for context.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WHEAT, WHITLOCK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.

CONTINUED FROM JANUARY 11 MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, GOODWIN, WALKER, WOJICK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2022-00725, 818-826 E KINGSTON AVENUE (PID: 12311C99) - ROOF REPLACEMENT, ALTERNATE MATERIALS

This application was continued from the January 11, 2023 meeting for the following items:

- *Provide another material that more accurately replicates the current roof material, per Standard 4.5, numbers 4, 5, and 8.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a historic multi-family building constructed c. 1928. According to the National Register nomination, the building appears to be earlier apartments with parapeted sections alternating with forward-projecting tiled hipped roof projections with replacement bays. The apartments have transitioned to condominiums with four individually owned units. The exterior is unpainted brick with tile parapet roof. Windows are 6/1 with brick soldier course headers, brick sills and 6/6 ganged windows. The lot size is L-shaped, measuring approximately 50 x 177 x 100' x 52' x 45 x 83. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is to replace portions of the existing roof with alternative materials. New coping, in a bronze color, is proposed for installation over the masonry coping of the primary roof parapet. The existing steel tile roof is proposed to be replaced with new steel alloy tiles.

No other changes are proposed. There are no impacts to mature canopy trees. The existing TPO membrane roof and new gutters/downspouts were approved at the staff level under COA# HDCADMRM-2022-00726.

Revised Proposal – February 8, 2023

- “Techo Tile” metal tile material proposed.
- Original roof finials to be retained and reused on new roof.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. The Commission will determine if the proposed roof tiles meet the Design Standards.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: CONTINUED

1st: WHITLOCK 2nd: BELL

Mr. Whitlock made a motion to continue this application because the proposed product does not meet the HDC Design Standard 4.5, # 4, 5 and 8. Requesting further information including a dimension comparison in a physical sample or a

dimension drawing comparing the proposed material to the existing material, and a sample of the hip detail, preferably in a physical sample that shows how that compares in size and shape to what's existing. Additional information on what efforts have been made and where conclusions have been drawn so that the commission can understand the limitations of the potential roof replacement options. Recommending that the applicant reach out to specialists. There are societies for different types of roofers and roofing materials that may help with the suggestion to contact Murr & Laney, as they do a lot of historical work and are experts in this field. Their conclusion would be helpful to make a decision.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WHEAT, WHITLOCK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ROOF REPLACEMENT, ALTERNATE MATERIALS CONTINUED.

NOT HEARD AT THE JANUARY 18 MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN, WALKER, WOJICK

APPLICATION:

HDCMA-2022-00954, 1913 CLEVELAND AVENUE (PID: 12105619) – NEW CONSTRUCTION-COMMERCIAL

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one story, concrete block three-bay building. The c. 1960 building mentioned in the Dilworth National Register Nomination burned down in the early 1990s. The current structure was built in 1993. The building has a shallow gable roof with a front parapet. A new multi-family building was Approved with Conditions by the Commission in December 2021 under application number HDCRMA-2021-00235. The approval letter is attached.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is for the new construction of a commercial building. The new structure is approximately 45'-4" in height as measured from grade to the top of the decorative parapet (three stories) at the front elevation on Cleveland Avenue and 51'-4" in height at the rear of the building, due to site topography. The building footprint measures approximately 89'-0" in depth x 33'-4" in width. The upper-level bays on the right and rear elevations bump out for an additional 5'-0". Exterior materials are brick, fiber cement or wood panels, aluminum storefront systems, and hanger-style windows on the front elevation. Setback is 16' from back of curb. HVAC units will be located on the roof. Parking will be located at the rear of the building and not visible from the street.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. All properties within the Dilworth Local Historic District have a "level of significance", and the terms contributing/non-contributing are not used to describe Local District properties or in decision-making processes of how a project does/does not meet the adopted Design Standards.
2. Left and Rear Elevations: Provide dimension for height of water table trim.
3. Provide a window sample and manufacturer specifications for storefronts and hanger-style windows.
4. What material is proposed for the double-hung windows? Provide specifications.
5. Provide a window trim detail with dimensions, including header and sill, for both windows set in brick and

windows set in areas of fiber cement/wood.

6. Provide detailed site plan that shows all site elements with materials and dimensions noted (walkways, front patio, parking screening details, trees/landscaping species, etc.)
7. Provide the overall square footage measurements for each signage area.
8. Minor changes may be reviewed and approved by Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

Ms. Kiera Jones, representative for an adjacent property owner, asked questions and sought clarification on items regarding the application.

Mr. Doug Utter, adjacent property owner, asked questions and sought clarification on items regarding the application.

Mr. Rick Cohan, adjacent property owner, spoke in opposition to the application.

Ms. Jodi Rosenthal, adjacent property owner, asked questions and sought clarification on items regarding the application.

MOTION: CONTINUED

1st: BARTH 2nd: LINEBERGER

Mr. Barth made a motion to continue this application for the following reasons: that the applicant further study the hanger-style windows by either showing historic precedence on historic buildings within our districts, or proposing an alternate, more traditionally appropriate option in lieu of hanger-style windows, per the HDC Design Standards 7.14, #2, 7.2 for context and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, page 2.5. Applicant to include at minimum a six-inch mull between ganged double-hung window units to replicate traditional window construction per 7.14, # 1 and #2 and perform a restudy of the right and rear elevation for ways to include additional fenestration or human-scale elements to minimize large expanses of brick or blank wall, per 7.14. Provide further section details through window head, sill, and jamb and provide brick corbelling that is self-supporting, per 7.13, 7.16 and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, page 2.5. Restudy nonpermeable surfaces and request that paving not be placed directly up to the building foundation with a minimum spacing of at least 18 inches for plant strip or mulch beds, per 7.2 and 7.3. Applicant to provide historic examples within our districts of the protruding box bays per the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, page 2.5, 7.2 preamble for context, and 7.3, #1. The commission is waiting to review signage, front yard paving, dumpster locations, screening, and all items related to tenant usage until a subsequent review.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WHEAT, WHITLOCK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION-COMMERCIAL CONTINUED.

CONTINUED FROM DECEMBER 14 MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN, WALKER, WOJICK

LEFT MEETING: HAWKINS

APPLICATION:

HDCMI-2022-00706, 301 EAST BOULEVARD (PID: 12307501) – WINDOW/DOOR REPLACEMENT & AWNING ADDITION

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

1. *Per Standard 4.18, number 1, for Storefronts, to return with the original form of the building.*
2. *Per Standard, 4.14 numbers 1, 3, 10, and 11, for Windows to include the original window pattern detail & original materials and restudy what is original and [document] condition of the windows.*
3. *Per Standard 4.17 for commercial awnings, preamble.*
4. *Per Standard 5.17, restudy the metal elements.*
5. *Signage to comply with 8.2, number 5.*
6. *Per page 2.5, Secretary of the Interior's Standards.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing building is a mid-century modern Commercial structure built c. 1957. The brick exterior is painted but the stone accent panels on the front elevation are not. The front steps are stone and are flanked by built-in stone planters. Other architectural features include original metal front door with semi-circular door handles, original wood windows on front elevation, original (or early) stucco panels above the windows and front entrance, metal windows on the side and rear elevations and an original (or early) metal railing roof feature with curved ends. Lot size is approximately 50' x 140'. There is a 10' alley in the rear. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1, 1.5, 2, and 2.5-story commercial buildings, some are former residential buildings converted to commercial uses.

PROPOSAL:

The project is multi-part:

1. Awning and material changes:
 - a. Remove existing awnings on the front and left elevations.
 - b. Install Nichiha FC panels on the front elevation wrapping the corner of the left elevation. The new horizontal panels will replace the existing faux stucco finish panels.
 - c. Install a new flat metal canopy above the windows and under the new horizontal siding on the front elevation. This will also wrap around the corner of the left elevation.
2. All elevations
 - a. Addition of a pre-cast cap over the brick header course.
 - b. Replacement of curved edge silver metal railing with a new black metal railing on top of the roof.
3. Rear elevation
 - a. Addition of a flat metal canopy over the rear door.
4. Signage
 - a. New address signage to be installed on the face of the brick
 - b. Proposing addition of new signage installed on the face of the brick (proposed dimensions not provided)
 - c. The existing yard sign is to remain but will be modified for new tenant information.
5. Window Replacement
 - a. The replacement of all windows on the building is proposed. Window openings to remain the same.
 - b. New windows proposed to be metal storefront type.
6. Railing
 - a. New simple black metal pipe rail will be installed to meet code requirements (staff approvable).

Revised Proposal – February 8, 2023

- Front elevation design changed, see A.7, A.9, A.11, and A.12; material to be Hardie Panel.
- Storefront windows details provided on A.4.
- Metal canopy details provided, see A.15 and A.16.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Will the original front doors be retained? The existing front elevation does not accurately depict the existing front doors. The front door handles are a character defining features and if the doors need to be replaced the new front doors should match existing.
2. Signage details needed.
 - a. Not enough information provided about dimensions (height, width, square footage).
 - b. Painted brick is proposed for sign which does not meet standards for Masonry, 5.5 or Paint, 5.8.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: CONTINUED

1st: BELL

2nd: WHITLOCK

Ms. Bell made a motion to continue this application requesting the original form of the building [be retained] per HDC Design Standards 4.18, # 1. The applicant is to provide additional detail on the windows including the condition of the windows, with a [statement by a] professional historian on the windows reiterating or confirming the claim that the windows are not repairable per Standard 4.14, # 1, #3, #10. Regarding the awning, if the storefront has changed, the awnings can too. Applicant to provide the other information referenced [above] at the next meeting, then the commission can address the awning.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WHEAT, WHITLOCK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR WINDOW/DOOR REPLACEMENT & AWNING ADDITION CONTINUED.

CONTINUED FROM JANUARY 11 MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN, WALKER, WOJICK

RECUSED: LINEBERGER

RETURNED: HAWKINS

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA-2021-01060, 306 N GRAHAM ST, 420 W 6TH STREET (PID: 07806401 & 07806402) – NEW CONSTRUCTION (COMMERCIAL/MULTI-FAMILY)

This application was continued from the January 11, 2023 meeting for the following items:

1. *Per Setback, 7.4, provide drawings to accurately reflect exactly what the setbacks are.*
2. *Per Massing, 7.7, provide more articulation at the rear elevation to minimize the impact on adjacent residential structures. And that specifically applies to the massing on the one side that is planar from ground level to the top of the building.*

3. *Provide additional details per all of the comments in the staff analysis.*
4. *For the windows, provide the trim details.*
5. *All windows proposed for replacement on 306 North Graham Street -- that's the original structure – provide restoration details.*
6. *Provide details on the fiber cement siding. Specifically, the siding needs to emulate the thickness of standard wood siding. This can be a cementitious substitute provided it available.*
7. *Provide materials and product information for the windows, the storefronts, and brick and mortar.*
8. *On the proposed site plan, provide grading plan; indicate fences and walls; and locations of dumpster and mechanical units.*
9. *Provide architectural details, railing detail drawing, lighting details, signage details, storefront elevation details, wall section, storefront section.*
10. *Provide side-by-side comparisons of each iteration on individual slides so they can be reviewed accurately.*
11. *Update the drawings to reflect the supplement agenda items with the open corner site lines on Graham & 6th and Graham & 7th on the corner of the buildings.*
12. *Per Materials, 7.14, specifically the windows, use aluminum-clad windows on all of the first five levels and that anything above should translate consistency with the rest of the structure.*
13. *Per Materials, 7.14, Aluminum clad windows are being accepted up to floor five unless they are on vertically unifying building elements, anything above should translate consistently with the rest of the structure. Identify window types on the elevations.*

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 materials 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

- Written description provided
- Zoutewelle survey for N. Graham Street is on order and will not be available until late November/early December.
- Setbacks unchanged. Additional information from Zoning Administration has been provided about alternative setback provisions.
- All elevations altered to include building step-backs. A step-back exhibit is also provided.
- Spacing: exhibit provided
- 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
- Window design changes

Revised Proposal – December 14, 2022

- Drawings from the November 9 presentation are included as a reference
- Building colors, including brick color, appear to have been changed
- Breaks in the building added between the storefronts on Graham
- Metal awnings above storefronts along 6th and Graham have been lowered
- Rear elevation design changes
- Additional Zoutewelle survey provided on A19

Revised Proposal – February 8, 2023

- Setbacks shown on A25
- Rear elevation massing changed. See sheets labeled “Aerial 7th Street”.
- Railing detail drawing shown on A43.
- Updated plans and 3-D renderings provided with open corner site lines on Graham -- 6th and Graham and 7th on the corner of the buildings.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Side-by-side elevations showing consecutive changes from October to February meeting would be helpful to clearly illustrate changes.
2. Windows:
 - a. Picture frame window trim shown on A43 and A48.
 - b. Windows labeled as having a vinyl SDL bar, A48.
 - c. Horizontal windowpanes shown on A45, Elevation Details
 - d. All windows proposed for replacement on 306 N. Graham Street, see A46: Restoration Details.
3. Material on upper levels.
4. Fiber cement siding proposed. No details specified.
5. Dumpsters/backflow preventer locations?
6. Provide grading plan.
7. Label fences/walls on site plan.
8. Provide materials details and specifications for all building elements.
9. There is a note on A45 about parge/paint but not clear what this references.

Application Checklist Summary:

1. Written description – provided in November presentation
2. Materials description – materials are labeled on A36, A37, A38, A39, A40 (Rear Elevation), A42, A43, A44, and A45. Materials specifications and product information is partially provided for windows/storefronts, brick, and mortar on A46, A47 and A48.

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. Tree inventory and arborist report provided as part of January 11 meeting in the Agenda Supplement.
 - iv. Dumpsters/backflow preventer locations?
 - v. HVAC condensers located on roof, A23.
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 A36, A37, A38, A39 and A40.
 - d. A41 – partial N. Graham Street elevation and wall section at amenity bridge.
 - e. A42 – partial elevation and partial section showing typical details of stoop of residential units on Graham St.
8. Architectural details
 - a. Railing detail drawing shown on A43.
 - b. Window and doors elevation detail shown on A43, A44, A45, A46, and A47
 - c. 306 N. Graham storefront, additional restoration details needed for the new aluminum storefront
 - 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: BARTH 2nd: BELL

Mr. Barth made a motion to continue this application for the further information and changes. Regarding the windows remove the picture frame window trim detail, per HDC Design Standards 7.14 and 6.16 for detailing. In reference to the replacement windows on the existing historic building, please provide additional detailing on how the restoration is to occur per Standard 4.14, restoration of windows. For the windows, specifically as it relates to slide 49, the applicant should pursue only vertical proportions of window lights throughout the project. The commission is not reviewing lighting or signage at this time. It is not for consideration, as stated by the applicant. Requesting that the applicant provide side-by-side comparisons on each iteration of the project for review next time.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, PARATI, WHEAT, WHITLOCK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION (COMMERCIAL/MULTI-FAMILY) CONTINUED.

Ms. Lineberger moved to approve the January 11, 2023 minutes with the correction to add Commissioner Wheat to the list of members present. The motion was seconded by Mr. Whitlock and the vote was 7/0 to approve.

Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the January 18, 2023 minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Barth and the vote was 7/0 to approve.

Due to time constraints the following cases will be heard at the March 8, 2023 meeting.

- HDCRMA-2022-00957, 1953 Wilmore Dr
- HDCRMIA-2022-00983, 720 E Park Av
- HDCRMI-2022-01006, 500 E Park Av
- HDCRMIA-2022-01039, 1515 Hamorton Pl
- HDCRMA-2022-01041, 1900 Dilworth Rd W
- HDCRMIA-2022-01070, 2101 Dilworth Rd W
- HDCRMA-2022-01118, 429 W Park Av

With no further business to discuss, Chair Parati adjourned the meeting at 6:44 PM.

Cindy Kochanek, Project Coordinator - Historic District Commission