



Approved April 13, 2011

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES

March 9, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Don Duffy

Mr. Tom Egan

Ms. Mary Ellen George, Chair

Ms. Barbara Highfill

Ms. Meg Nealon

Ms. Paula Owens

Mr. Dominick Ristaino, Vice Chair

Ms. Karen Rush

Mr. Curtis Watkins

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Roger Dahnert

Ms. Debra Glennon, Second Vice Chair

Mr. Greg Grueneich

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. John Rogers, Administrator

Historic District Commission

Ms. Wanda Birmingham, Secretary to the

Historic District Commission

Mr. Thomas Powers, Assistant City Attorney

In Chairman George's absence Vice Chair Ristaino called the regular March meeting of the Historic District Commission meeting to order at 3:09 pm. He 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.) Mr. Ristaino asked that everyone in attendance please sign in and when addressing the Commission to please state name and address for the record. Mr. Ristaino 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. Mr. Ristaino asked that all cell phones and any other electronic devices be turned off completely or set to silent operation. He also asked that any Commissioner

announce, for the record, their arrival and/or departure when this takes place during the meeting.

Index of Addresses:	501 West Park Avenue	Wilmore
	816 Mt. Vernon Avenue	Dilworth
	1608 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
	1318 Dilworth Road	Dilworth
	1612 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
	516/520 Grandin Road	Wesley Heights

Mr. Rogers told the audience that one address has been pulled from the agenda at the applicant's request: 1715 Euclid Avenue.

Application: 501 West Park Avenue – Addition.

Greater Galilee Baptist Church is nearing the end of a long process to redevelop and renovate and add onto and remove from their campus in the heart of the Wilmore neighborhood. This process has included the Planning Commission, the Planning Department, the neighborhood, and City Council. Bounded by Spruce Street, West Park Avenue, and South Mint Street, a new sanctuary has been designed and a Sunday School/Fellowship Hall addition. Parking has been reconfigured and claimed where houses recently existed. Houses have been relocated to nearby vacant lots. Ingress/egress has been redirected to flow in and out more efficiently. A rezoning was approved for the changes. The HDC APPROVED IN CONCEPT the site plan and building forms in September. New elevations show materials and details: brick, stone coursing, window details taken from existing windows, detailed parapet wall on addition,

projecting entrance on addition. The new west elevation now wraps. The new north elevation shows an oculus window, precast caps. The new south elevation shows nothing taller than the original sanctuary, creating a subordinate addition with multi layering of materials and detail.

Applicant Comments: Church Deacon Dexter Sneed said they are finally ready to move forward. The rezoning was necessary because of the height, location, and footprint. All is resolved.

Architect Don Mahoney with BGW Services said the project has evolved with trying to get many seats and parking into a difficult site. The goal was always to subordinate the new to the old, to deemphasize the new so as to not take away from the old. New plans address texture, materials, fenestration, height, and massing. The new construction envelops approximately one third of the existing sanctuary building but does not overwhelm.

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

Ms. George arrived and recused herself from the remainder of this application due to not being present for the beginning of the presentation.

MOTION: Based on probable compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions, New Construction***, Mr. Duffy made a MOTION that staff may approve revised drawings which show a parapet on the side and improved design of brick over glass to reduce the “weight”. Mr. Watkins seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, HIGHFILL, NEALON, OWENS, RISTAINO,
RUSH, WATKINS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: STAFF MAY APPROVE REVISED DRAWINGS.

Ms. George assumed the seat of Chair.

Application: 816 Mt. Vernon Avenue – Addition.

A screened porch addition which extends beyond the side is proposed for the rear of this house. Lapped wood siding will match that found on a portion of the two story brick house. Columns and pilasters will also match those existing. A brick fireplace has no chimney. The roof will be standing seam copper.

Applicant Comments: Architect Andrew Stout pointed out that an existing fence and side yard planting obscure from the street the view of the area where the addition will be located. It is a simple side facing gable structure.

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

MOTION: Based on the need for further design study regarding the form, materials, simplification, fireplace location, solid/void choices, Ms. Nealon made a MOTION to DEFER the application. Ms. Rush seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, GEORGE, HIGHFILL, NEALON, OWENS, RISTAINO, RUSH, WATKINS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DEFERRED.

Application: 1608 The Plaza – Fence.

A new fence was installed and staff sent an Enforcement Letter to the owner. An application was received in response. The fence is a picket style fence around two sides of the front yard and is several inches higher than ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Fences*** specify and does not enclose all three sides of the yard.

Applicant Comments: Owner Marsha Rexford apologized and explained that she had removed a hedge to make room for the fence except on the left side where the hedge is to remain with no fence.

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

MOTION: Based on exception warranted by the existing hedge to ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Fences*** of the requirement that a fence enclose all sides of the front, Ms. Nealon made a MOTION to APPROVE the location of the fence. The height will be brought in to compliance. Ms. Rush seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, GEORGE, HIGHFILL, NEALON, OWENS, RISTAINO, RUSH, WATKINS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: FENCE HEIGHT WILL BE BROUGHT INTO COMPLIANCE. FENCE MAY BE RUN ACROSS FRONT AND DOWN RIGHT SIDE OF FRONT YARD BUT THE EXISTING HEDGE IS SUFFICIENT TO CLOSE IN THE THIRD SIDE.

Mr. Duffy declared a conflict of interest for the next address as the owner is a client of his firm. He removed himself from the Commission.

Application: 1318 Dilworth Road – Paint brick house, Demolish
Garage, New Garage

The existing garage is located at the end of the drive but near the house leaving the back yard with a good portion of lawn behind the garage. The

proposal is to remove the garage and locate a new one in the right rear of the yard, creating a very usable back yard. The new garage will be brick with shakes cladding the second story - like it is now. The unusual color of the brick on the house and garage cannot be matched today and the request is for permission to paint.

Applicant Comments: Architect Kraig Maggas said the proposed garage was approved in 2006 but the approval expired. Regarding the request to paint the house – water has infiltrated due to recessed mortar joints. The texture of the brick can be matched but not the color. Paint would unify the future rear addition.

Owner Steven Coburn said necessary repairs are going to look bad. He said they have done a lot of work to a previously neglected house and was saving the exterior paint until last.

Owner Shannon Coburn said they want to add a back porch and have been told that the brick can definitely not be matched.

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

MOTION: Based on no exception warranted to ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Painting Brick***, Mr. Egan made a MOTION to DENY the request to paint the brick. Ms. Rush seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: EGAN, GEORGE, HIGHFILL, NEALON, OWENS, RISTAINO, RUSH, WATKINS

NAYS: NONE

MOTION: Based on condition and location, Ms. Rush made a MOTION to APPROVE the demolition of the existing garage and the new construction plans for the garage and proposed location. Ms. Owens seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: EGAN, GEORGE, HIGHFILL, NEALON, OWENS, RISTAINO, RUSH, WATKINS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: PAINT BRICK DENIED. GARAGE DEMOLITION APPROVED. GARAGE NEW CONSTRUCTION IN NEW LOCATION APPROVED.

Application: 1612 Thomas Avenue – Glass in side porch.

MOTION: Based on the need for documentation that further illustrates the intention, Mr. Egan made a MOTION to DEFER the application. Ms. Rush seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, GEORGE, HIGHFILL, NEALON, OWENS, RISTAINO, RUSH, WATKINS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DEFERRED FOR FURTHER DOCUMENTATION.

Application: 516/520 Grandin Road – Window replacement.

Two c. 1926 and c.1930 quads, located side by side in Wesley Heights, are owned by the same person. Extruded vinyl replacement windows are proposed for the entirety of both buildings.

Applicant Comments: Owner Bobby Drakeford said an energy efficiency grant is involved to replace the windows. The frames will remain and the muntin patterns will be the same.

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

MOTION: Based on the need for a better understanding of the intent, Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to DEFER the application. A section drawing showing jamb, sill, and head would explain the questions. Mr. Egan seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, GEORGE, HIGHFILL, NEALON, OWENS, RISTAINO, RUSH, WATKINS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: WINDOW REPLACEMENT APPLICATION DEFERRED FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.

Minutes of the February meeting were unanimously approved with the usual direction to report any changes, corrections, or omissions to Ms. Birmingham.

With business completed the meeting adjourned at 6:10 pm with a meeting length of three hours and one minute.

Wanda Birmingham, Secretary to the Historic District Commission