



Approved April 14, 2010

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
MINUTES

March 10, 2010

- MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Jonathan Crotty, Chair  
Ms. Mary Ellen George, Vice Chair  
Ms. Debra Glennon  
Ms. Lucia Griffith  
Ms. Barbara Highfill  
Mr. John Phares  
Mr. Dominick Ristaino  
Ms. Karen Rush
- MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Greg Grueneich  
Mr. Damon Rumsch  
One Vacancy
- OTHERS PRESENT: Mr. John Rogers, Administrator  
Historic District Commission  
Ms. Wanda Birmingham, Secretary to the  
Historic District Commission  
Mr. Mujeeb Shah-Khan, Assistant City Attorney

With a quorum present and in Mr. Crotty's absence Vice Chairman George called the regular March meeting of the Historic District Commission to order at 3:10 pm. She began the meeting with a welcome to all in attendance and by swearing in those present (and continued to do so throughout the meeting as others arrived). Due to the quasi-judicial nature of the Commission, staff and others who may speak are sworn in at every meeting. (Commissioners are sworn in by the City Clerk for the length of the appointment at the beginning of each term.) Ms. George asked that everyone in attendance please sign and when addressing the Commission to please state name and address for the record. Ms.

George explained the meeting process. The review of each application consists of two parts. The first is the presentation portion. Staff presents the application then Commissioners and those speaking on behalf of the application will discuss the project. Next, members of the audience will be asked if anyone present wishes to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application. Again, there will be an opportunity for comments and questions from the Commission and the applicant. The second part is the discussion and deliberation portion of the meeting. At this point, discussion of the application is limited to the Commission members and staff only. Unless the Commission votes to re-open the meeting to ask additional questions or for clarification of some issue, the applicant and audience members do not participate in this portion of the discussion. Once discussion is complete, a MOTION will be made to APPROVE, DENY, or DEFER and a vote will be taken. A simple majority vote of those Commissioners present is required for a decision. Ms. George asked that all cell phones and any other electronic devices be either turned off completely, or set to silent operation. She also asked that any Commissioner announce, for the record, their arrival and/or departure when this takes place during the meeting.

Mr. Rogers reported that Mr. Rumsch was absent due to being on vacation where he grew up in St. Thomas. He shared a beautiful picture of a boat anchored near a beach.

Mr. Rogers reported that Mr. Grueneich was absent due to the birth of his first child, daughter Gracelyn. He shared a picture of the brand new baby with her parents.

Index of Addresses:	607 Mt. Vernon Avenue	Dilworth
	928 East Park Avenue	Dilworth
	1142 Berkeley Avenue	Dilworth
	618 North Graham Street	Fourth Ward
	601 East Kingston Avenue	Dilworth

Application: 607 Mt. Vernon Avenue – Paint Brick.

A request to paint this brick house was deferred in December. A fairly new rear addition that fills in a rear corner of the house does not match the rest of the

house. In December the owners were asked to explore with experts in the field options other than painting brick.

---

Ms. Griffith arrived at 3:25 pm and was present for the remainder of the meeting.

---

Applicant Comments: Owner Bernie Gesing said the HDC instructed him to look into staining the brick of the addition try to make it match the house. Mr. Gesing said this would fade and not be a permanent fix and will not address the striated texture of the original brick vs. the addition. The mortar is different all around.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Ms. George's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Painting Brick***, by seeing brick samples and staining evidence, Ms. Highfill made a MOTION to APPROVE the findings of an onsite Design Review Committee (Mr. Ristaino, Mr. Phares, and Ms. Rush). Ms. Griffith seconded.

VOTE: 7/0            AYES: GEORGE, GLENNON, GRIFFITH, HIGHFILL, PHARES, RISTAINO, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MAY GIVE FINAL APPROVAL.

---

Application:            928 East Park Avenue – New Construction.

New construction plans have been deferred by HDC for revisions over the last several months. This property was once the side yard of a large lot with a Dilworth Road West address. An addition was removed from the side of the house and the lot subdivided into three lots. This is the corner lot and the house will face East Park Avenue and be tucked back as far into the lot as possible with the drive coming off Dilworth Road West.

Applicant Comments: Architect John Zucker pointed out the recent revisions at the direction of the HDC: extended overhangs, increased the mass of the primary entry, and lowered the house. The house steps down to 1 ½ story to transition to the existing houses on East Park Avenue.

Owner Jamie Rentch said the materials are drawn from the new houses across the street from the corner lot and the adjacent houses.

---

Mr. Crotty arrived at 3:55 pm and was present for the remainder of the meeting.

---

FOR/AGAINST: Neighbor Martha Sheets had concerns about the side and rear elevations. She suggested shifting the entire footprint one foot toward Dilworth Road West which would allow a one foot ground-to-peak offset to break the mass of the side elevation.

Another neighbor expressed concern regarding the scale and the fact that from her house she will soon see a huge structure rather than the trees she now sees.

Adjacent neighbor Mrs. Bounds was concerned about the “niche” in the side of the building facing her house.

MOTION: Ms. Griffith complimented the changes and made a MOTION to DEFER the application for additional information and further design study: (1) proportioned streetscapes for both East Park Avenue and Dilworth Road West which include the proposed house and 4-5 houses in each direction, (2) explore material use and the thought of matching that on the adjacent houses, (3) break the mass of the wall facing the adjacent house on East Park Avenue, (4) explore changes to further diminish the scale, (5) relocate window on side elevation, (6) detailed site plan which includes sidewalk, steps, remaining trees, removed trees indicated, (7) landscape plan. Mr. Phares seconded.

VOTE: 8/0            AYES: CROTTY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRIFFITH, HIGHFILL, PHARES, RISTAINO, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION DEFERRED FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND FURTHER DESIGN STUDY.

---

Application: 1142 Berkeley Avenue – Roof Replacement.

This two story brick house was built around 1939 with a full slate roof. A granddaughter has recently inherited the house and did not know of HDC. Proposed is to re roof both the house and garage with a standing seam metal roof. The garage has already been re roofed. The slate is to be removed from the house and the standing seam materials have been purchased.

Applicant Comments: The owner's contractor said that he has had two roofers who specialize in slate look at the roof. They say the color could not be matched, caps are missing, fungus is growing, and the slates are cracked. The roof is failing and it is cost prohibitive to replace slate. Artificial slate was considered but it did not offer enough character. Internal guttering is directing water into the attic.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Crotty's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on the need for further material study and exploration of repair, Ms. Rush made a MOTION to DEFER the application to change out the material on both the house and the garage. Mr. Phares seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: CROTTY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRIFFITH, HIGHFILL, PHARES, RISTAINO, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: CHANGE IN ROOF MATERIAL (FROM SLATE TO STANDING SEAM METAL) DEFERRED FOR FURTHER MATERIAL STUDY AND REPAIR STUDY.

---

Application: 618 North Graham Street – Parking Lot Bollards and Cables.

This address is an empty lot beside a condominium project on Graham Street. Bollards and cables were installed to prevent the condo owners from parking on the property.

Applicant Comments: Owner Ms. Rosalind Lackey said the condominium association paved her property and began parking there. She was upset when she got an ‘adverse possession’ letter from then and felt she had to protect her property by marking her boundaries. She intends to one day build there.

FOR/AGAINST: Adjacent Property Owner, David Rumany, said the condominium project feels the bollards and cables are not appropriate and are unattractive. He said these issues can absolutely be worked out.

MOTION: Based on no exception warranted to ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Landscaping Features***, Ms. Rush made a MOTION to DENY the bollards and cables. Staff will work with the owner for something that is approvable – landscaping, fence, etc. Ms. Griffith seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: CROTTY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRIFFITH, HIGHFILL, PHARES, RISTAINO, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: BOLLARDS AND CABLES DENIED.

---

Application: 601 East Kingston Avenue – Screen in Front Porch.

This was approved six years ago and the approval expired before the work was pursued. The right ell of the porch is to be screened in behind existing columns. This portion is not original. The screen door will be perpendicular to the street behind a column.

Applicant Comments: Owner Louis Lesesne shared a letter from the Adjacent Property Owner who does not object to the proposal.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Crotty's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions***, Ms. Lucia made a MOTION to APPROVE the partial screening in of the front porch as presented. Ms. Rush seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: CROTTY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRIFFITH, HIGHFILL, PHARES, RISTAINO, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: SCREENING IN PORCH APPROVED.

---

Mr. Rogers reported on the status of the Wilmore Local Historic District Rezoning application. The application was filed by the neighborhood in 2001. Since then the boundaries have been revised to focus on the residential core. The process is that the Historic District Commission votes on whether or not to endorse and recommend the designation. If the vote is yes, then that recommendation is forwarded to Raleigh where they have 30 days to respond. The Public Hearing is April 19 with the political decision to come in May. If approved, a Wilmore seat will be added to the Historic District Commission. MOTION: Mr. Phares made a MOTION to Endorse and recommend the Wilmore report as consistent with City Ordinances. Final boundaries will be established. Ms. Griffith seconded. The vote was unanimous.

Ms. Griffith reported on a meeting with a Planning Commission member and HDC staff and HDC Legal. It was determined that communication and networking will be a subject for discussion at a spring retreat.

A MOTION was made and seconded and the vote was unanimous to approve the February Minutes as distributed with the direction to call Mrs. Birmingham with any changes.

The meeting adjourned at 6:03 with a meeting length of 2 hours and 53 minutes.

---

Wanda Birmingham, Secretary to the Historic District Commission