



---

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
June 14, 2023 | Room 267

MINUTES

- MEMBERS PRESENT: Kim Parati, Chair  
Nichelle Hawkins (Vice Chair)  
Chris Barth (2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chair)  
Noelle Bell  
Phil Goodwin  
Christa Lineberger  
Brett Taylor  
Jill Walker  
Sarah Wheat  
Scott Whitlock  
Heather Wojick
- MEMBERS ABSENT: 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, Chair Parati called the June meeting of the Historic District Commission (Commission) meeting to order at 1:06 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 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:**

**CONSENT**

HDCRMI-2023-00317, 1224 Belgrave Pl	Dilworth
HDCCMIA-2023-00329, 715 East Bv	Dilworth
HDCRMI-2023-00378, 900 E Worthington Av	Dilworth
HDCRMI-2023-00406, 331 E Tremont Av	Dilworth

**CONSENT - REAFFIRMATION**

HDCRMI-2023-00477, 301 E Kingston Av	Dilworth
--------------------------------------	----------

**DECISION REQUIRED AT JUNE 14 MEETING**

HDCRMI-2022-00587, 1547 Merriman Av	Wilmore
HDCRMA-2022-00775, 501 N Poplar St	Fourth Ward

**NOT HEARD AT THE MAY 10 MEETING**

HDCRMA-2023-00076, 1701 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMA-2023-00215, 1919 S Mint St	Wilmore
HDCRMI-2023-00249, 915 Magnolia Av	Dilworth
HDCCMIA-2023-00237, 420 W 5 <sup>th</sup> St	Fourth Ward

**CONTINUED FROM THE MAY 10 MEETING**

HDCRMA-2023-00074, 1500 Dilworth Rd	Dilworth
HDCRDEMO-2023-00079, 1209 Myrtle Av	Dilworth

**NEW CASES**

HDCRDEMO-2023-00216, 2000 Dilworth Rd W	Dilworth
HDCADMRM-2023-00111, 2101 Dilworth Rd E	Dilworth
HDCCMIA-2023-00115, 1921 Charlotte Dr	Dilworth

**CONSENT**

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

ABSENT: NONE

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2023-00317, 1224 BELGRAVE PL (PID: 12310412) – WINDOW CHANGES**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing building is 2-story Colonial Revival constructed c. 1951. Architectural features include a symmetrical façade with central entry flanked by large 12/12 windows, a hip roof, an exterior chimney on the left side. The front portico with metal roof supported by square columns appears to be a later addition. The exterior is unpainted brick. The lot size is approximately 75’ x 174’. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is for the addition of a window opening on the left elevation, second level, located in front of the brick chimney. The new window will be wood, double hung, 6/6, with wood trim and a brick sill to match existing. The unique stack bond brick pattern on either side of the window will also be matched. The dimensions and pattern of the proposed new window opening matches existing windows on the right elevation of the house.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for New Construction of Residential Buildings, Doors and Windows, 6.15-6.16; Materials, 6.18; 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, Chapter 6, for Doors and Windows and Materials, and the Secretary of the Interior Standards, and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with the following Conditions:
  - a. Provide cut sheets and specifications for proposed new windows that meet HDC Standards.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION:**

**APPROVE**

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

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

Ms. Wheat moves to approve the application as presented as it is not incongruous with the Standards for the new construction of residential buildings for doors and windows in Standards 6.15 and 6.16, materials in Section 6.18, and the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

**VOTE: 11/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR WINDOW CHANGES - APPROVED.**

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCCMIA-2023-00329, 715 EAST BV (PID: 12311814) – SIGNAGE – AFTER THE FACT**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a multi-tenant commercial office building constructed c. 1972, located on the in the center block between Lennox Ave and Springdale Ave with approximately 120' of street frontage. The front elevation facing East Boulevard is 1-story. Exterior material is stucco over brick. Roof form is flat with a parapet around the edge and a faux gable facing East Boulevard. Lot size is 193' x 120'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story office and single-family structures.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is the replacement of panels on the existing monument sign located on the left side of the front yard (Sign 1) and the removal of the second monument sign located on the right side of the front yard (Sign 2).

Sign 1 was originally approved by the HDC in September 1996 (COA #96.153.D.97) as a 54" x 66" unlit monument sign, which is approximately 25.2 square feet in area. The replacement of the panels will allow for the names of both tenants to be on one sign instead of currently on two separate signs. There will be no structural changes to this sign and the location will remain the same. As an existing non-conforming sign, the project requires full Commission approval.

Sign 2 was installed without HDC approval between March 2020 and September 2022. This sign will be removed.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. Staff is recommending approval due to the special circumstances of the project in that the Commission originally approved the sign and because the base of the sign is not changing, only the panels are being updated to reflect new tenant information.
2. The project is not incongruous with the Standards in that it meets the requirement for only one sign per street frontage for multi-tenant business properties thereby consolidating signage for multiple tenants, Appendix A number 13; Urban Districts, General Commercial, and Research/Office Zoning Districts number 5; and Multi-Tenant Business Properties withing All Zoning Districts number 2.
3. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, Staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the Standards for Signage, Appendix A, and the Secretary of the Interior Standards, and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item.
4. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION: APPROVED**

**1<sup>st</sup>: WALKER**      **2<sup>nd</sup>: WOJICK**

Ms. Walker moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the Standards and the context of the neighborhood. She added that it was a repeat of an existing non-conformity approved in 1996. She approved it based on Standards Appendix A, number 13 referencing sign consolidation and size. Ms. Parati reiterated that this type of project, while currently not approvable per the most up to date Standards, is being grandfathered in and should not be used as a precedent in future cases.

**VOTE: 11/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

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

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

RECUSED: LINEBERGER, TAYLOR

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2023-00378, 900 E WORTHINGTON AV (PID: 12108818) – REAR PORCH, FENCE, & LANDSCAPE**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1-story Bungalow built c. 1925. The building is a side gable block with engaged partial width porch supported by brick piers and tapered columns with a projecting front gable section. The exterior material is wood lap siding with mitered corners with board and batten in the gable ends and a painted brick foundation. Deep eaves are supported by brackets. The windows appear to be sash-kit replacements. A rear addition including the second level and rear porch were approved under COA# HDC.2010.59. The lot size measures approximately 80’ x 140’. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is an expansion of the existing rear covered porch, a new arbor, and a small extension of the rear fence to create an enclosure for roll-out trash receptacles. Materials and details will match the front porch. The new shed roof over the porch will be metal. New walkways in pea gravel and bluestone will be added. The existing rear fence will be extended approximately six feet toward the front of the house. A wood arbor with metal cap will be installed along the right property line, inside the fence. Height of the arbor is not provided. The rear yard permeability calculations appear to be taken from the existing rear wall instead of from the rear of the original house. The addition portion of the project requires full Commission review due to visibility of the corner lot location.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6, 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. Submit revised rear yard coverage calculations to Staff.
  - b. Provide height of the proposed arbor.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION:      APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS              1<sup>st</sup>:      BELL              2<sup>nd</sup>:      GOODWIN**

Ms. Bell moved to approve the application for the rear porch, fence, and landscape project as it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for new construction of residential buildings in Chapter 6 and the Secretary of Interior Standards 10.4.1 for rules of procedure. Ms. Bell clarified the conditions of the approval include that the applicant provide revised rear yard calculations and the height of the arbor to Staff.

**VOTE: 9/0**

**AYES:    BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, HAWKINS, PARATI, WALKER, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

**NAYS:    NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR REAR PORCH, FENCE, & LANDSCAPE – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

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

ABSENT: NONE

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2023-00406, 331 E TREMONT AV (PID: 12105672) – PORCH CHANGES**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing building is a townhome constructed in 2016. Exterior materials are a mix of unpainted brick, stone block, and shake siding. Architectural features include a front porch, a second level balcony covered with a flat metal roof and a third level dormer. The lot size is approximately 25' x 50'. Adjacent structures are single-family and multi-family buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is for the addition of a mechanized screen system to the front porch. The bronze, metal header box will be mounted to the ceiling of the porch inside the columns. Specifications of the proposed screen system and assembly are provided. If the screen box were able to be completely hidden, the project could have been reviewed and approved at the Administrative level. The Commission has not previously reviewed this type of request, so full Commission review is required.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for New Construction of Residential Buildings Materials, 6.15, Porches, 6.17, Additions, 6.20, 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 of 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. A piece of wood trim should be installed to conceal the metal front of the shade header box.
  - b. The product is being approved based on reversibility and the design, location, and context being not incongruous with design of the 2016 townhome structure.
  - c. Separate applications are required for 327 and 335 E Tremont for Staff approval.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION: APPROVED**

**1<sup>st</sup>: WHITLOCK 2<sup>nd</sup>: HAWKINS**

Mr. Whitlock moved to approve this project because it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for new construction for residential buildings, specifically materials in 6.15, porches in 6.17, additions in 6.20, and the Secretary of Interior Standards. Ms. Parati offered a friendly amendment that the applicant must include a piece of wood trim to conceal the metal front of the shade header box. She also noted that this was being approved by the Commission due to its reversibility and location.

**VOTE: 11/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR PORCH CHANGES - APPROVED.**

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2023-00447, 301 E KINGSTON AV (PID: 12307601) – POOL & LANDSCAPE - REAFFIRMATION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 2.5-story Queen Anne house built c. 1900. Architectural features include an asymmetrical façade, hip roof with gabled projections and gable dormers, wrap-around front porch supported by Tuscan columns, 1/1 double-hung windows, wood lap siding and a brick foundation. The hip roof side extension and Porte cochère on the right elevation is a newer addition. The lot size is approximately 89.5' x 100'. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1.5, 2, and 2.5-story residential and commercial buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The project was first heard in February and March 2022 under application number HDCRMI-2022-01077. The proposed project is a new swimming pool, outdoor kitchen, and fencing. The house is oriented to Kingston Avenue, and it appears that 1621 Cleveland was carved from this parcel, leaving this lot with zero rear yard. Proposed materials for the outdoor kitchen and fencing are brick to match existing on the main house. The fence pickets and gate(s) will be metal.

At the February 9, 2022 meeting, the Commission voted to Continue the review of the project “per Chapter 8.2, number 6, no front yard parking and all driveways must extend to the rear of the building. Please bring back another design that helps to achieve this standard.”

At the March 9, 2022 meeting the Commission voted to Approve with Conditions, that the existing driveway will be maintained. The Decision letter is attached. **Final permit-ready plans were not received within the required timeframe and no COA was issued. The applicant is requesting re-affirmation of the previous approval with the following minor changes:**

- The permeable pavers in the rear yard will be changed to artificial turf
- Driveway gate located closer to the front corner of the house.
- Driveway material changed to artificial turf behind the driveway gate.
- The pool equipment will be placed at the front right of the house, in front of the driveway gate, and will be screened with a 4' tall wood panels.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for Sidewalks and Parking, page 8.2, Landscaping and Lawns, page 8.4, and Fences and Walls, page 8.6, 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 Private Sites, Chapter 8, and the Secretary of the Interior Standards, and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with the following Conditions:
  - a. Existing driveway is to be maintained as is.
  - b. Staff to work with applicant on all fencing changes to ensure compliance with Design Standards.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application to a full hearing.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS 1<sup>st</sup>: BARTH 2<sup>nd</sup>: BELL**

Mr. Barth moved to approve the application as presented as it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for sidewalks and parking in Standard 8.2, landscaping in 8.4, fences and walls in 8.6, and the Secretary of the Interior Standards. Ms. Parati made a friendly amendment that the applicant keep the driveway as is and work with Staff on the fencing changes to make sure they are compliant with the Standards.

**VOTE: 11/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR POOL & LANDSCAPE - REAFFIRMATION – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

**DECISION REQUIRED AT THE JUNE 14 MEETING**

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2022-00587, 1547 MERRIMAN AV (PID: 11909710) – RETAINING WALL & PORCH CHANGES – AFTER THE FACT**

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

- 1. The steps and the cheek walls and walkway are to be restudied, per Standards 8.6, number 3, and 8.2.*
- 2. Provide a visual representation of how the cheek walls, steps, and walkway will be integrated.*
- 3. The cheek walls should be angled, not stepped.*
- 4. The retaining wall was approved.*

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing 1-story American Small House constructed c. 1940. The building has a three-bay façade with a side gable main roof and the right bay is a projecting gable featuring a paired window. Architectural features include a partial width front porch supported by square wood columns, 6/6 windows, interior brick chimney and unpainted brick exterior. The lot size is approximately 50' x 117'. Adjacent structures are one-story single-family buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

- The proposed project is for changes to a previously approved project.
- An application was submitted and HDC Staff provided the option of going to the Commission to request the proposed stone or to work with Staff on a redesign that could be approved at the Administrative level.
- The applicant selected to work with Staff on the project redesign with the project being started prior to the issuance of the administrative COA # HDCADMRM-2021-01088 in March 2022.
- The project involved the replacement of an existing damaged front concrete walkway, concrete porch steps, sidewalk steps, and a replacement front retaining wall. The approval was for in-kind replacement of the walkway and porch & sidewalk steps, and a new brick retaining wall set back 18" from the back of the sidewalk. The cheek walls for the sidewalk steps were to be faced with a brick layer with a single wood handrail installed for the sidewalk steps.
- Due to an inability of the applicant to cancel the materials that were already on order, the project was completed out of compliance with the COA in terms of materials.
- 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.

The stone walls shown in the attached presentation at 1543 Merriman Av, 325 West Blvd, 248 W Kingston Av, 1923 S Mint St, 1523 Merriman Av were installed prior to the establishment of the Wilmore Local Historic District. 1613 S Mint St (labeled as 1600 in the presentation) is an original retaining wall. 1732 Wilmore Dr appears to have been installed in early 2011. The retaining wall shown at 1931 Wilmore Dr was not approved and is an active violation case.





11. *The stone path. That's not typically seen in the Fourth Ward neighborhood, that should be revised to brick or examples in the neighborhood to provide context. Per Standards 8.2, number 2.*

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is two-story, duplex constructed c. 1978. Architectural features a flat roof, wide vertical T1-11 siding with a wide trim band separating the first and second levels, vertically oriented windows, a cantilevered front patio with solid vertical sidewalls, and a brick foundation. A covered stair provides access to the second level at the rear. A solid wall in the same material as the house partially encloses the rear yard and provides screening for parking. The lot size is approximately 56' x 100'. Adjacent structures 2 and 3-story residential structures. On September 14, 2022, the Commission approved the immediate demolition of the building because the applicant intends to recycle, repurpose, and deconstruct as much of the house as possible versus demolishing it.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is the new construction of a multi-family structure. Height is 38'-2" to ridge from finished grade. Setback is 14'-11 1/2" to the front porch from back of curb. The front porch is 8" deep. The proposed materials are:

1. Roof – synthetic shake with cementitious fascia and freeze.
2. Siding – “wood look” cementitious lap siding with 8" reveal. Synthetic shingle siding in the bump-out on the left elevation.
3. Corner boards and trim– smooth cementitious.
4. Front doors – wood with stained glass windows, with cementitious trim.
5. Windows – 2/2 double-hung and fixed, sage colored electro-chromatic glass, cementitious trim.
6. Brackets – cementitious.
7. Porch column and railings – wood.
8. Foundation and front porch steps – thin brick veneer (HDC-018).

Site features are shown on HDC-011 but most dimensions are not provided. At corner entrance, a stone front patio and double front walk in stone connects the entrance to N. Poplar and W. 8<sup>th</sup> Street. A stone water feature is proposed along W. 8<sup>th</sup> Street. A wide stone walkway and front patio is proposed for the entrance to the rear unit facing W. 8<sup>th</sup> Street. A brick retaining wall, masonry driveway and 6' tall fence/driveway gate is proposed in the rear yard.

*Revised Proposal – March 8, 2023*

- Setbacks provided on HDC-005
- Tallest point increased from 778.8' to 780.8'
- Cornice roof pitch changed from 4/12 to 9/12
- Third level roof design changed
- Left elevation design, fenestration, and materials changed
- Rear elevation third level design changed, and man-door eliminated from first level
- Right elevation third level design changed

*Revised Proposal – May 10, 2023*

- Roof form redesigned. See HDC-012 through HDC-021
- Comparable buildings and context shown on HDC-003.
- Height, width, depth comparisons shown on HDC-004.
- Front porch design changed to wrap around the left elevation on the first level.

*Revised Proposal – June 14, 2023*

- Roof form, two (2) options presented.
  - Option 1, see Sheets HDC-012, -014, -016, -018, -020, -024, -026, -028, -030 and -032.
  - Option 2, see Sheets HDC-015, -017, -019, -021, -023 -025, -027, -029, and -31.
  - *Note: There are two different sheets labeled HDC-022, which show different dormer roof forms.*
- Doors proposed as mahogany wood, see Sheet HDC-037.

- The project summary states standard door lites with 2/3 glass will be used and stained glass is no longer proposed for the doors. The elevations and door detail shows a decorative glass design, see Sheet HDC-037.
- Windows proposed as Jeld-Wen Sitrine aluminum clad, see Sheet HDC-036.
- Window glass options are provided, see Sheet MAT-002 and Cover Sheet HDC-000.
- Roof material options are provided.
  - Option 1, see Sheet HDC-012.
  - Option 2, see Sheet HDC-013.
  - Solar roof information on Cover Sheet HDC-000, Sheet MAT-001 and Tesla specifications at the end of the presentation.
- Porch flooring shown as wood tongue and groove, see Sheet HDC-011
- Rear elevation window styles. Options provided on rear elevations. Option 1 shown on Sheets HDC-026, -028, and -036. Option 2 shown as staying the same on Sheets HDC-025 and -027, with examples provided of smaller double-hung windows, see Sheet CTX-006.
- Stone paths revised to be brick, see Sheet HDC-011  
Materials options provided on Cover Sheet HDC-000

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. A decision is required at the June 14, 2023 meeting.
2. Fenestration
  - a. Glass is required to be the most translucent possible. Sage colored or electro-chromatic is not approvable per the Design Standards, 6.15, number 5.
  - b. Left elevation: Rhythm, ganged window proportions and mullion trim dimensions, and window to wall proportions in middle bay projection.
    - i. See proportions of wall to window on a projection at 326 W. 8<sup>th</sup> Street, a historic building (HDC-007)
    - ii. See proportions of wall to window on a projection at 601 N Poplar Street, a historic building (CTX-007)
    - iii. See proportions of wall to window on a projection at 503 and 505 N. Pine Street, infill new construction (HDC-005).
  - c. Rear elevation: Option 1 windows shown on Sheets HDC-026, -028, and -036, appear to meet the Standards.
  - d. Right elevation: Paired windows in the front room of the house are too small; overall window proportions and rhythm.
3. Materials
  - a. Summary shown on Cover Sheet, HDC-000 is pixelated and difficult to read.
  - b. Samples needed for all alternative materials requested.
  - c. Siding and Trim
    - i. Brand and thickness needed for proposed siding materials. Exposure is noted at 6", but siding thickness is not provided.
    - ii. Wood trim for windows, doors, corner boards, etc. is typically required for cementitious siding.
  - d. Roof materials requested have not yet been reviewed by the Commission.
4. Site features
  - a. Retaining wall details and dimensions needed. Clarity if the walls flanking both sides of the driveway are true retaining walls or decorative.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION:      APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS      1<sup>st</sup>:      GOODWIN      2<sup>nd</sup>:      WOJICK**

Mr. Goodwin moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for new construction in Chapter 6. He conditioned the approval that the applicant use option one for roof forms with the raised turret design, for windows and doors they shall use wood doors, option two or three with the windows being

aluminum clad with clear glazing. He asked that they work with staff on the doors to be 2/3 lite with leaded glass. For roof materials, they are to use option two or three with the Tesla solar tiles in less visible locations as shown on the plans with either black asphalt shingles in visible areas or DaVinci black synthetic in other areas. For the columns, beams, and railings, they are to use wood. Wood will be used for the pilasters, trim, and windows. The trim boards will stand proud by ¼". Siding will be Hardie Artisan. Mr. Goodwin said that with regard to porch flooring, they are to use wood tongue and groove, laid perpendicularly and work with staff on specifics. For the hardscaping, they are to use red brick for the walkways as outlined in option one. They should work with Staff to extend the planting area in the rear. The carriage tracks and accented parking will be concrete as opposed to gray brick. The driveway by the side gate shall be 9'. For retaining walls and cheek walls, the rowlock should be one course above the steps, and on the retaining walls it should be no more than one course higher than the adjacent grade. The applicants should work with Staff to ensure that fencing is compliant. For the windows on the rear and side, they will go with option two for double hung. Mr. Goodwin added that any ganged windows need a 6" mullion. Ms. Parati confirmed that the Tesla solar roofing placed on the shed roof sections and dormers can be over asphalt shingles or simulated slate. Mr. Goodwin accepted that confirmation. Ms. Hawkins added a friendly amendment to cite Standards 6.5, number 5 for roofing and solar panels, 6.17, numbers 2, 3, and 5 for the porch flooring, and 8.2, number 8 for paving, planting strips, and gravel strips. Ms. Wojick added that driveway width and use of poured concrete strips could be found in Standard 8.2, numbers 4 and 5. She also added the friendly amendment to reference Standard 6.14 for wood trim, 6.15, number 5 for windows, and 6.15, number 3 for doors. Ms. Wojick also offered an amendment confirming that the existing CMU block will stay and the existing brick veneer will be replaced with a new brick veneer.

**VOTE: 11/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION - MULTIFAMILY - APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

**NOT HEARD AT THE MAY 10 MEETING**

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA-2023-00076, 1701 THE PLAZA (PID: 08118602) – ADDITION & FRONT PORCH CHANGES**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing building is a 1-story Cottage with Tudor Revival and Craftsman elements constructed c. 1936. Architectural features include a main cross gable roof with very shallow eaves, rear hip roof that has deeper eaves and exposed rafter tails, a small front gable projection with a large prominent front chimney, arched front entry, and 4/1 double-hung wood windows. Exterior is wood lap siding and an unpainted brick foundation. The partial width front porch is uncovered and has a broken tile floor. The lot size is approximately 66' x 170' with a 10' alley in the rear. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a rear addition that raises the ridge 3'-6" but steps in at both ends so the original ridgeline remains visible.



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 %.

**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. Rear Elevation. Triple window proportions and mullion trim dimensions.
4. Windows and Doors
  - a. Update drawings to show existing window conditions (8/8 and 6/6).
  - b. Confirm that all original windows are to remain.
  - c. Provide cut sheets and specifications for proposed new windows and doors.
5. Site Plan
  - a. Are any trees impacted or proposed for removal as part of the addition project?
  - b. What is the location of the HVAC?

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION: CONTINUED 1<sup>st</sup>: LINEBERGER 2<sup>nd</sup>: WOJICK**

Ms. Lineberger made a motion to continue the deliberation of this application until a later meeting. She requested that the applicants submit a revised site plan, driveway and walkway details and HVAC location per Standard 8.2. They should retain the existing windows per Standards 4.12 and 4.14 and include window details and specifications per Standard 6.15. Mr. Barth made a friendly amendment that the revised plans should indicate that the windows and doors on the proposed addition be consistent with the historic house and that the ganged windows have a mull gap of at least 6”.

**VOTE: 11/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION & FRONT PORCH CHANGES - CONTINUED.**

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

RECUSED: TAYLOR

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2023-00249, 915 MAGNOLIA AV (PID: 12108804) – PORCH STAIR REPLACEMENT**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing Bungalow was constructed c. 1930 as a one-story structure. The second story addition was constructed c. 2006-2007. Architectural features including a partial width front porch with brick piers and paired wood columns, 4/1 windows, deep eaves and wood brackets, and a painted brick foundation. The lot size is approximately 60' x 147' with a 10' alley to the side and rear. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is for changes to the front porch steps. The existing wood front steps are proposed to be changed to brick due to water issues. No other changes proposed.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Brick steps are common on bungalows throughout Dilworth. The Commission has previously approved a similar project at 712 E. Tremont Avenue, HDCRMI-2018-00254 due to flooding issues and more recently at 1819 Lennox Ave, HDCRMIA-2022-00817.
2. Additional information about applicant provided brick step examples:
  - a. 900 E Worthington – brick steps installed between June 2009 and July 2011
  - b. 808 E Worthington – brick steps pre-date 2007
  - c. 804 E Worthington – brick steps pre-date 2007
  - d. 715 E Worthington – brick steps pre-date 2007
  - e. 701 E Worthington – brick steps installed between July 2011 and May 2014
  - f. 700 E Worthington – brick steps pre-date 2007
  - g. 413 E Worthington – brick steps installed c. 2016
  - h. Photo labeled as 616 E Tremont is 616 E Worthington – brick steps installed between June 2009 and July 2011
  - i. 906 Magnolia – brick steps installed between May 2014 and March 2015
  - j. 914 Magnolia – brick steps installed between May 2014 and March 2015
3. Confirm the new steps will remain unpainted.
4. 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:      APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS      1<sup>st</sup>:      WALKER      2<sup>nd</sup>:      BELL**

Ms. Walker moved to approve the application citing that the Secretary of Interior Standards state that when some applications are evaluated, some circumstances warrant exceptions. She felt that the property owner had proved his case in this regard. She stated that the application was not incongruous with the district and may replace the existing wood steps with brick because the wood continues to deteriorate from the flow of water from the roof above. Ms. Wojick made a friendly amendment to have the applicant work with Staff to match the new brick to the brick found on the interior of the crawlspace.

**VOTE: 10/0**

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

**NAYS:    NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR PORCH STAIR REPLACEMENT – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

RETURNED: TAYLOR





Application number HDCRMA-2023-00074, 1500 Dilworth Rd (PID: 12309709) for Window Changes was not heard as the applicants were not present at the meeting. This application will be deferred to a future agenda.

---

**CONTINUED FROM THE MAY 10 MEETING**

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

RECUSED: LINEBERGER

LEFT MEETING: HAWKINS

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRDEMO-2023-00079, 1209 MYRTLE AV (PID: 12305132) – DEMOLITION – RESIDENTIAL**

*This application was continued from the May 10, 2023, meeting for the following items:*

1. *Per Standard 9.2, number 2. Provide additional information, including an engineer report, on the structure to validate or confirm that a 365-day delay would be applicable.*

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is two-story Colonial Revival constructed c. 1929. Architectural features a side gable roof with pent eaves and wide trim band, a central chimney, 9/9 and 6/6 double-hung wood windows, and unpainted brick exterior. The front entrance is on the left side with a gabled hood and decorative surround of square pilasters. The side and rear porches have been enclosed with vertical wood siding. The original, one-story detached garage is in the rear yard. The lot size is approximately 92.5' x 161.5' x 23.6' x 180'. Adjacent buildings are 1.5, 2, and 3-story residential structures.

**PROPOSAL:**

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

1. Zoutewelle survey
2. Property survey
3. Digital photos of all sides of building
4. Digital photos of significant architectural details
5. Elevation drawings

*Revised Proposal*

- No new information submitted.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The Commission will determine if the application is complete.
  - a. Are there any mature canopy trees on the property? If so, a tree protection plan will be needed.
2. The Commission will determine whether the building has special significance to the Dilworth Local Historic District. With affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to a 365-Day Stay of Demolition and require a 90-day waiting period to review new construction plans.
3. If the Commission determines that this property does not have any special significance to the district, then demolition may take place without a delay or upon the approval of new construction plans.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION 1: APPLICATION COMPLETE**

**1<sup>ST</sup>: WHEAT**

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

Ms. Wheat moved to determine the application is complete with all the required documentation provided by the applicant, which includes clear digital photos of all sides of the building; clear digital photos of significant architectural details and site features, including, but not limited to, windows, front doors, brackets, columns, trim, etcetera; a stamped and sealed property survey with setbacks and building dimensions with width and length clearly labeled; and a Zoutewelle survey to document height.

**VOTE 1: 9/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

**MOTION 2: SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE**

**1<sup>ST</sup>: WHEAT**

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

Ms. Wheat moved to determine that the building has special significance and value toward maintaining the character of the Dilworth Local Historic District, because it is listed as a contributing property in the National Register of Historic Places, its year of construction was over 50 years ago, and its architectural style.

**VOTE 2: 9/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

**MOTION 3: APPROVED DECONSTRUCTION**

**1<sup>ST</sup>: WHEAT**

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

Ms. Wheat moved to approve the project with a 365-day stay of demolition on the building due to its special significance and value towards maintaining the character of the district. Receipt of accurate measured drawings of the building to be demolished are required for HDC records before plans for new construction will be considered by this Commission.

**VOTE 3: 9/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

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

**NEW CASES**

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

ABSENT: HAWKINS

RECUSED: TAYLOR

RETURNED: LINEBERGER

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRDEMO-2023-00216, 2000 DILWORTH RD W (PID: 12111822) – DEMOLITION – RESIDENTIAL**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is two-story Colonia Revival constructed c. 1925. Architectural features include a symmetrical façade with a pedimented central entry supported by tapered fluted columns, side gable slate roof with pent eaves and wide trim band, a one-story flat roof wing, and unpainted brick exterior. The front entrance is flanked by side lights and

windows are 6/1 double-hung wood with soldier course headers and stone sills. A small, flat roof one-story addition shelters a rear entry. The lot size is approximately 71.5' x 186.4' x 70.3' x 174.6'. Adjacent buildings are 2 and 2.5-story residential structures. The structure is listed as Contributing to the Dilworth National Register Historic District.

**PROPOSAL:**

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

1. Zoutewelle survey
2. Property survey, which includes locations of trees located on the property.
3. Digital photos of all sides of building
4. Digital photos of significant architectural details
5. Elevation drawings

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The Commission will determine if the application is complete.
2. The Commission will determine whether the building has special significance to the Dilworth Local Historic District. With affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to a 365-Day Stay of Demolition and require a 90-day waiting period to review new construction plans.
3. If the Commission determines that this property does not have any special significance to the district, then demolition may take place without a delay or upon the approval of new construction plans.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION 1: APPLICATION COMPLETE**

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

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

Mr. Goodwin moved to determine the application is complete with all the required documentation provided by the applicant, which includes clear digital photos of all sides of the building; clear digital photos of significant architectural details and site features, including, but not limited to, windows, front doors, brackets, columns, trim, etcetera; a stamped and sealed property survey with setbacks and building dimensions with width and length clearly labeled; and a Zoutewelle survey to document height.

**VOTE 1: 9/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WALKER, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**MOTION 2: SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE**

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

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

Mr. Goodwin moved to determine that the building has special significance and value toward maintaining the character of the Dilworth Local Historic District, because it is listed as a contributing property in the National Register of Historic Places, its year of construction was over 50 years ago, and its architectural style.

**VOTE 2: 9/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WALKER, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**MOTION 3: APPROVED DECONSTRUCTION**

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

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

Mr. Goodwin moved to approve the project with a 365-day stay of demolition on the building due to its special significance and value towards maintaining the character of the district. Receipt of accurate measured drawings of the

building to be demolished are required for HDC records before plans for new construction will be considered by this Commission.

**VOTE 3: 9/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WALKER, WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

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

---

Due to time constraints the following cases will be heard at the July 12<sup>th</sup>, 2023 meeting:

HDCADMRM-2023-00111, 2101 Dilworth Rd E

HDCCMA-2023-00115, 1921 Charlotte Dr

The Commission discussed the election of the new officers beginning with the July 12, 2023 meeting. Ms. Walker moved to nominate Vice Chair Hawkins to the Chair position, Chair Parati to the first Vice Chair position, and Mr. Barth to the second Vice Chair position. Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion. The Commissioners voted 11/0 to approve the motion.

Ms. Lineberger moved to approve the February 8, 2023 Minutes. Mr. Whitlock seconded it, and the vote was unanimous, 10/0. They deferred making a decision on approving the May 10, 2023 Minutes until a later date. Vice Chair Hawkins was the absent vote.

With no further business to discuss, Chair Parati adjourned the meeting at 7:31 pm.