



CHARLOTTE

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES

December 11, 2013

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Tim Bender
 Dr. Lili Corbus
 Mr. Roger Dahnert
 Mr. Don Duffy
 Mr. Tom Egan, Chair
 Ms. I-Mei Ervin
 Ms. Debra Glennon, 2nd Vice Chair
 Ms. Karen Labovitz
 Ms. Mattie Marshall
 Mr. Dominick Ristaino, Vice Chair

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Brad Norvell
 Ms. Lisa Yarbrough

OTHERS PRESENT: Mr. John Howard, Administrator
 Historic District Commission
 Ms. Wanda Birmingham, Assistant Administrator
 Historic District Commission
 Ms. Linda Keich, Clerk to the
 Historic District Commission
 Mr. Thomas Powers, Assistant City Attorney

Mr. Egan called to order the Regular December meeting of the Historic District Commission at 3:08 pm. He began the meeting by introducing the Staff and Commissioners and explaining the procedure. All interested parties who planned to give testimony – pro or con – must have completed a blue form and must be sworn in. An HDC Staff member will present a description of the proposed project. HDC Staff will then make a Staff recommendation based on compliance with the *Policy & Design Guidelines*. The Commission may question the Applicant and Staff may question the Applicant. The Applicant may present sworn witnesses who will be subject to questioning by the Commission and Staff. Other interested parties wishing to speak – pro or con – will be given reasonable time to present sworn testimony. The Applicant will be given an opportunity to respond to comments by interested parties. After hearing each application, the Commission will review and discuss the information and evidence gathered and consider and adopt a Motion for Approval, Deferral, or Denial. All exhibits remain with the Commission. If an Applicant feels there is a conflict of interest of any Commissioner or an

association that would be prejudicial, it will 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. While the Commission will not specifically exclude hearsay evidence, it is only given limited weight. Appeal from the Historic District Commission is to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. One has sixty (60) days from the date of the issuance or Denial within which to appeal. This is in accordance with Section 10.213 of the City Code. Mr. Egan asked that everyone please turn to silent operation any electronic devices. Commissioners are asked to announce, for the record, if one leaves or arrives during the meeting.

Index of Addresses:	1700 Heathcliff Street	Wesley Heights
	1716 Wickford Place	Wilmore
	1917 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore
	315/317 E. Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
	618 North Graham Street	Fourth Ward
	800 East Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
	1936 Park Road	Dilworth
	425 East Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
	723 East Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
	621 East Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
	2309 Dilworth Road West	Dilworth
	2019 Dilworth Road East	Dilworth
	1711 Dilworth Road East	Dilworth
	323 Rensselaer Avenue	Dilworth

Application: 1700 Heathcliff Street – Demolition

The two story concrete block structure was constructed in 1940 according to tax records. A Sanborn map lists the address as 1700 Westbrook Drive. The structure appears to straddle two parcels and an alley. The structure is not listed in the Wesley Heights National Register, which also specifies the period of significance from 1922 to 1930. The structure is vacant and in poor condition. The location of the structure on the site is inconsistent with other dwellings on the block, thus disrupting the rhythm of the streetscape. The structure itself may have once been an accessory. It seems like it was a garage with living space above. But what it was accessory to is no longer evident or is gone.

The City’s Code Enforcement department is responding to complaints from adjacent property owners about the condition of the property. They are proposing to demolish the structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff believes Code Enforcement’s request is appropriate, given the structure’s condition and design. However, the Commission should consider whether the structure has the architectural integrity to warrant relocation consistent with surrounding structures and rehabilitation.

Neighborhood and Business Services: Ben Krise confirmed the poor condition of the building. It is rotten out and caving in. This has been an ongoing issue for more than a year. The owner has the right to repair but has done nothing and actually the structure could not meet current code.

MOTION: Based on its location, its probable secondary use, materials, condition, and date of construction, Ms. Glennon made a MOTION to identify this as a Non-Contributing structure to the Wesley Heights Local Historic District. Mr. Duffy seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, ERVIN, GLENNON,
LABOVITZ, MARSHALL, RISTAINO

NAYS: NONE

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Demolition*, Ms. Glennon made a MOTION that because this Non Contributing structure is in such a deteriorated, dilapidated condition that demolition is approved. Ms. Labovitz seconded the motion.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, ERVIN, GLENNON,
LABOVITZ, MARSHALL, RISTAINO

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: IDENTIFIED AS A NON-CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE.
DEMOLITION APPROVED

APPLICATION: 1716 Wickford Place – Window/Door Replacement, Addition

This c. 1936 structure is a one story duplex. The home has a twin front facing gables with a porch across the front supported by wrought iron. The proposal is to remove the two front doors and add a centered door. The twin gables will be joined by a shed room in the middle, above the new front door. A pair of windows, centered off the gables, will be to the left and right of the new door. The wrought iron will be removed and replaced with tapered wooden columns above four-across-the-front brick piers. New 4/1 windows will match existing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: HDC Staff believes the project meets all of the Guidelines for Additions. The Commission should specifically consider the changes in Fenestration and Rhythm.

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

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Mr. Bender made a MOTION to DEFER. Revised plans in the form of finished drawings will show 1) window heights, 2) windows centered off existing front gables, 3) detail and configuration to match existing, 4) site plan, 5) masonry cheek walls at front steps, 6) brick veneer, 7) clarify how new shed roof actually works. Ms. Ervin seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON,
LABOVITZ, MARSHALL, NORVELL, and RISTAINO

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DEFERRED

Mr. Dahnert arrived at 3:15 pm and was present for the remainder of the meeting.

APPLICATION: 1917 Wilmore Drive – Window/Door Replacement, Addition

This application was not heard because it was nearly identical to the previous application.

Mr. Egan asked the applicant if he would like to withdraw his application and he could come back with complete drawings in February along with his previous application.

Mr. Murphy removed himself from the docket.

Ms. Glennon shared that she has seen the next presentation at the Dilworth Community Development Association meeting. In answer to questions from Attorney Powers, she answered that she is not predisposed, is not biased, and has no conflict. Mr. Powers stated that there is no Conflict of Interest.

APPLICATION: 315/317 East Tremont Avenue – Demolition/ New Construction

The subject parcels were previously part of a larger redevelopment plan (HDC 2013-035) that was denied in August. However the clock has been ticking for nearly a year on Demolition of the structures involved. On the block facing East Tremont, adjacent structures include a four story mixed use building, a vacant lot, a single story structure (c.1905) and a 2.5 story multi-family building (c. 1905). Across the street is primarily multi-family. Development to the rear (facing East Worthington) is primarily residential. Existing building setback range along the subject block face is approximately 16 to 35 feet. The subject parcels have two structures:

- 315 East Tremont Avenue, c. 1950, has been identified as a Non Contributing structure.

- 317 East Tremont Avenue, c. 1925, has been identified as a Contributing structure.

The proposed project requires the demolition of these two structures. The imposed 365 Day of Demolition is soon to run out.

The proposed project is a 12 unit, three story multi-family building with below grade parking and a center common courtyard with a water feature. This project requires rezoning. Exterior materials include brick, stained or painted wood and fiber cement siding on the upper level. The porch roof is standing seam metal. Windows are composite wood frame. Units facing East Tremont Avenue have entrances and porches on the pedestrian level. The proposed setback to the thermal wall is consistent with the existing older structures and the setback to the porch is consistent with the mixed use building. The overall height, as shown, is lower than the adjacent mixed-use building to the left and taller than the homes to the right. Multi-family buildings across the street are comparable in height to the proposed structure but are constructed on a higher elevation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Howard stated the Commission should consider the following Guidelines for new construction: (1) Massing and Fenestration on side elevations, (2) Rhythm, (3) Materials, (4) Landscaping – tree replacement/protections plan. NOTE: Street trees will be installed per the Zoning Ordinance.

Staff believes the project meets Guidelines for Size, Scale, Context, and Setback.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood Resident Tamara Titus expressed concerns.

Neighborhood Resident Jessica Hindman spoke in support of the proposed project.

Neighborhood Resident Jeff Gerlach spoke in favor of the proposed project.

MOTION: Based on the need for more information on Fenestration and Rhythm Mr. Ristaino made a MOTION to DEFER this application. Seconded by Ms. Marshall

VOTE: 9/1 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, DAHNERT, EGAN, GLENNON, MARSHALL, NORVELL, RISTAINO

NAYS: LABOVITZ

DECISION: APPLICATION DEFERRED

APPLICATION: 618 North Graham Street – New Construction

The proposal is the final phase of three for a development that was built in the early 1980s. The existing 2.5 story multi-family buildings are contemporary wood sided units with open

parking under the buildings and balconies on the second level. Along Graham Street rear patios are enclosed by a brick wall. There are a few mature trees in the open spaces. A wood fence borders the side and rear of the lot. The subject vacant lot is adjacent to a blank wall of the new 4 story multi-family building that faces Graham Street. The setback along the street is generally consistent with the units set slightly back.

The proposal is a four story multi-family building with closed parking on the first level and residential units above. Balconies are located on the second and fourth level. Primary exterior materials include brick and cementitious siding. Secondary materials include metal balcony railings and cementitious soffits and trim. The canopy over the garage is standing seam metal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Given the unique character as a completion phase of a long ago completed project and the location the Commission should consider the following Guidelines: (1) Scale, (2) Massing, (3) Fenestration – particularly along Graham Street, (4) Rhythm, (5) Materials, (6) Context.

Staff believes the project meets Guidelines for Size, Setback and Landscaping.

Applicant Comments: Applicant Anderson Pearson said it is a challenge to finish out a 1980 townhome development clad in lapped wood and T111. The new owner does not want to copy what now exists but wants to do something compatible. The terraces can meet the private open space required by Code. Brick siding will be wrapped to the ends. An existing front brick wall will remain.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood Resident David Roujmaniele was concerned that the new owner never met with the HOA. He spoke in opposition to the project as it is proposed.

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* - New Construction Mr. Ristaino made a motion to DENY this application based on inappropriate Massing, Size, Fenestration, and Rhythm. Mr. Duffy seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, DAHNERT, EGAN, GLENNON, LABOVITZ, MARSHALL, NORVELL, RISTAINO,

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DENIED

APPLICATION: 800 East Worthington Avenue – Second Story Addition

The house, c. 1925, is a one story bungalow designed by prominent architect W.H. Peeps. It features a low hipped roof and two chimneys. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. The site slopes downward from front to rear.

The proposal project is a second story addition and addition to the rear. From the front the upper level addition starts behind the thermal wall and features a cross gable roof plan. The proposed roof pitch matches the existing pitch. Materials and details will match existing – including the unusual tapered elements found on the front. The side elevations feature two gabled dormers on each side. The rear addition introduces a covered porch and chimney. The proposed ridge height measured from the finished floor is approximately 22’.

Applicant Comments: Architect Jessica Hindman said that they have looked at a hipped roof but it does not work contextually. They are trying to stay as far back as possible from the front and side streets. The intent is to pull together the first story to a new second story taking the opportunity for the entirety to look ‘of a piece’. The height is going from 18 to 24 feet.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The following Guidelines should be considered for this proposal: (1) Size, (2) Scale, (3) Massing.

The Guidelines for Fenestration, Rhythm, Materials and Context are met. The Setback Guideline is not applicable.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood resident Tamara Titus spoke of concern.

Neighborhood resident John Phares spoke in opposition to the proposed project.

Neighborhood resident Courtenay Buchan spoke in support of the proposed project.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to DEFER the application. The Lennox Avenue elevation and the front elevation need to be revisited for revision regarding Scale, Massing, and Fenestration. Mr. Ristaino seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, DAHNERT, EGAN, GLENNON, LABOVITZ, MARSHALL, NORVELL, RISTAINO,

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DEFERRED

Ms. Glennon recused herself from the Commission for the next application because this is her home.

Mr. Ristaino recused himself from the Commission for the next application because he may be the builder on this project.

APPLICATION: 1936 Park Road – Porch Addition

The existing structure was constructed in 1905 and is identified as a Contributing structure in the National Register Survey. The home is described as a two story Victorian with a shed porch on square posts and scalloped frieze boards. It also has polygonal bay windows on the front. The door on the left bay is believed to be an alteration from a window.

The proposed project is a front porch addition, new shingles on the second story, installation of an original front door, front fascia extensions on the second floor, and replacement of the right side of the bay window (now a door and this is where the original door is going to be moved from) to add a window. The porch design is full width and wraps around the left side.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The following Guidelines should be considered for this proposal: (1) Size, (2) Scale, (3) Fenestration.

The Guidelines for Massing, Rhythm, Materials and Context appear to be met. The 4' wide side porch area meets the side yard requirement and serves primarily as a covered walkway from the side entrance.

Owner Comments: Ms. Glennon said a 28/1 original window was at some time removed from the front and reinstalled on the side. It will be relocated to its rightful location. The entire intent with the changes being proposed is to correct things done long ago.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* - Additions, Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE this application as submitted. Mr. Dahnert seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, DAHNERT, EGAN, LABOVITZ, MARSHALL, NORVELL,

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED.

Mr. Dahnert left at 7:48 and was not present for the remainder of the meeting.

APPLICATION: 425 East Worthington Avenue – New Construction of a Garage

The principal structure is a c. 1920 one and one half story Bungalow. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. The site has rear yard access via alleyway. The adjacent rear property is non-residential.

The proposal is for a two car garage with a dormer addition in a future phase. The exterior material is wood shingles with cornerboard treatment. The garage doors will face the alley. The proposed height of the garage is approximately 22'-4" from ground to ridge. The plan does not identify any mature tree removal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The following Guidelines should be considered for this proposal: (1) Size, (2) Scale, (3) Fenestration, (4) Rhythm

Staff believes the project meets Guidelines for Massing, Setback, Materials, Context, and Landscaping.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* - Accessory Structures, Mr. Ristaino made a MOTION to APPROVE this application with all details and materials to match the house. Ms. Labovitz seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON,
LABOVITZ, MARSHALL, NORVELL, RISTAINO

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED

Ms. Glennon said she received an Adjacent Property Owner notification for the next case but is neither pre-disposed nor prejudiced and remained on the Commission.

APPLICATION: 723 East Worthington Avenue – Rear Porch Enclosure, Addition,
Garage New Construction

The subject property is a one and one half story Bungalow with wood shingle siding, cross gabled roof, and decorative joists. The c. 1925 house is listed as a Contributing structure to the Dilworth National Register Survey.

The proposed projects are a conversion of the rear screened porch to conditioned space to include a mud room, and construction of a new carriage house. The rear porch enclosure is not visible from the street, but the proposed mudroom will be partially visible. Materials and details will match house.

The proposed carriage house/garage incorporates details from the principal structure such as exterior materials, post-pier design, window design and cross gable roof. The proposed structure is secondary in scale to the principal dwelling. It will be one half garage, one half carport, with a studio space above.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Porch Enclosure: Commission should consider the ability to reverse the porch enclosure. Addition and Carriage House: meets all applicable Guidelines,

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood Resident Tamara Titus spoke in full support of this application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* - Accessory Structures, and Additions, Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE this application as submitted. Mr. Ristaino seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON,
LABOVITZ, MARSHALL, NORVELL, RISTAINO,

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED

APPLICATION: 621 East Tremont Avenue – Second Story Addition

A previous application for this property was denied in July and August of 2013. The application is being accepted based on the initial denial in July and being in the period of time that a substantial change must show in revised plans.

The subject property is a one story Bungalow c. 1920. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. The house features clipped gables (Jerkenhead), engaged chimney, exposed porch rafters, brackets, and 4/1 windows. The rear elevation features two gables on the left and right side.

The proposal is a second story addition, a rear addition, and porch redesign. The front porch redesign includes conditioned living space above. The new foundation would be clad in stone. The upper level will have clipped gables with 3/1 windows and cedar shake siding. A shed dormer is introduced to the left of the gable. The chimney is proposed to be removed and the existing roof raised. Side elevations reintroduce clipped cross gables with 3 and 2/1 windows on the upper story and replacement of one window on the lower story on each side. The right elevation adds a chimney with 3/1 windows on either side. The intent is to remove the existing pair of rear gables, windows, and door. The new addition introduces a single two story sweeping rear gable, new windows, and doors.

Applicant Comments: Architect Chris Scorsone pointed out that all Tudor detailing has been removed. A trim board was added between the floors. The pitch of the front gable was reduced. The size has been reduced by 400 square feet. Original windows have been kept on the sides.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The following Guidelines should be considered for this proposal: (1) Size, (2) Scale, (3) Massing, (4) Fenestration, (5) Rhythm, (6) Setback – regarding the conditioned space above front porch, (7) Context.

The Guideline for Materials appears to be met.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood Resident Tamara Titus spoke in opposition of this application

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* - Additions, Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE this application with the following revisions for staff approval (1) front end gable – tie back in a clip, (2) add side lites,(3) windows on side to match, (4) change pitch of clips relative to what happens on the front clip, 5) full columns a choice, (6) stone will be lowered between columns. Mr. Ristaino seconded.

VOTE: 8/1 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON,
LABOVITZ, NORVELL, RISTAINO,

NAYS: MARSHALL

DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED

APPLICATION: 2309 Dilworth Road West – Second Story Addition

The existing home is a one story cottage style home with full brick façade, centralized entrance and balanced window pattern. The home was constructed in 1947 and is identified as a Non Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register. The setbacks are consistent along the block of one and one half story homes.

The application was denied November 2013. Before deliberating on the current project the Commission must determine if the applicant has made substantial changes from the previous plan. New changes include a full width front porch with French door access, the rear addition ties below existing ridge, the front gable will be extended forward.

Based on the changes in response to Commission concerns from November, staff believes this project has met the Substantial Change criteria.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff believes the porch design is appropriate and meets the Guidelines. However, there are missing details that the Commission may require before granting full approval.

Applicant Comments: Contractor Aaron Elrod said the intent is to remove the vinyl in the front gable and replace with shakes. Front columns will be atop real stone piers.

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

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Dr. Corbus made a MOTION to DEFER this application. Revised plans will show (1) stone removed, (2) lapped wood siding, (3) pergola with closed boxing for front terrace, (4) center up rear windows, (5) appropriate smaller window in rear, (6) appropriate railings, (7) front door, (8) accurate detailed drawings. Ms. Marshall Seconded

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON,
LABOVITZ, MARSHALL, NORVELL, RISTAINO

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DEFERRED

APPLICATION: 2019 Dilworth Road East – One Story Rear/Side Addition

The corner lot house is a one and one half story c. 1925 Bungalow. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. The home features a nearly full façade shed dormer and one story side wing engaged porch supported by paired columns. A one car attached garage is located on the right side along Carling Drive.

The proposed project is a one story addition to the rear and side of the existing home. A portion of the left addition will be visible from the front, the right and rear addition will be visible from the street, but will not exceed the existing height. The existing engaged one car garage would be expanded to a two car garage. A new rear gabled roof matches the existing, and the porch adds paired columns similar to the front. The left side addition extends approximately 3 feet from the existing structure with two gables and balanced fenestration. The rear addition features a covered porch with a gable and additional living space to the right with a larger gable roof. A new chimney is proposed near the center of the home. Exterior materials will match existing, Standing seam metal roof material is introduced over the new rear porch.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The following Guidelines should be considered for this proposal: (1) Size, (2) Scale, (3) Massing, (4) Fenestration, (5) Rhythm, (6) Context as it relates to a two car engaged garage.

The Guideline for Materials appears to have been met. Setback is not applicable.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* - Additions. Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE as submitted but suggested the applicant think about hipping the metal roof on the new rear porch. Consistent boxing will be reflected. Mr. Ristaino seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON,
LABOVITZ, MARSHALL, NORVELL, RISTAINO,

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED

Mr. Bender left at 9:30 pm and was not present for the remainder of the meeting.

APPLICATION: 1711 Dilworth Road East – Garage/Side Addition Conservatory

The subject property was built in 1946 but has been substantially renovated. It is within the National Register boundaries. The Cottage style home has Craftsman elements such as decorative eave brackets supporting wide overhangs. The existing detached garage does not appear to be an original structure.

The proposed project is to demolish the existing garage and build a new detached garage. A glass/wood conservatory will be added to side of house. The proposed new one car garage is a one and one half story structure with cross gable roof and small shed dormer with conditioned space above. The exterior materials and details will match existing house. The one story side addition is partially visible from the front. The primary exterior material for the conservatory addition is glass with STDL windows – roof and walls.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Demolition: It appears the existing garage is neither a contributing structure nor an original structure to the local district and demolition for subsequent improvement is suitable. **Garage (New Construction):** The following Guidelines should be considered for this proposal: (1) Fenestration, (2) Rhythm.

The Guidelines for Size, Scale, Massing, Materials, and Context appear to have been met. Setback and Landscaping are not applicable. **Addition:** The following Guidelines should be considered for this proposal: (1) Fenestration.

The Guidelines for Size, Scale, Massing, Rhythm, Materials, and Context appear to have been met. Setback is not applicable.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* - Additions. Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE the demolition of the garage. Ms. Ervin seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON, LABOVITZ,
MARSHALL, NORVELL, RISTAINO,

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: DEMOLITION APPROVED

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* - Accessory Structures, Dr. Corbus made a MOTION to APPROVE the garage as submitted. Mr. Ristaino seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON,
LABOVITZ, MARSHALL, NORVELL, RISTAINO,

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: GARAGE APPROVED

MOTION: Based on the need for more information Dr. Corbus made a MOTION to DEFER the Conservatory addition with revised details to speak more to the house vocabulary i.e. glazing and boxing. Mr. Ristaino Seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON, LABOVITZ,
MARSHALL, NORVELL, RISTAINO,

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: CONSERVATORY ADDITION DEFERRED.

APPLICATION: 323 Rensselaer Avenue – One Story Rear/Side Addition

The subject property is a c. 1905 single story dwelling with a gable roof and full width front porch supported by two columns. The site has a significant slope from front to back and is adjacent to an office development and a renovated single family home. The existing siding appears to be wood shingles. Existing homes along the street are one and one half story bungalow type designs. Mature trees do not exist on the property. Due to the poor condition of the home the engineering report recommends reconstruction of the foundation.

Proposal – Justification of Substantial Change

The application was denied November 2013. Before deliberating on the current project the Commission must determine if the applicant has made substantial changes from the previous plan. Based on the current submittal the following revisions have been made in response to Massing, Fenestration, and Rhythm:

1. Overall height has been reduced
2. Front gable roof pitch lowered
3. Additional detail to top gable with cedar shakes
4. Revised window pattern in front gable and throughout
5. Removed middle columns on porch and redesigned end columns and posts
6. Added railing to front porch
7. Shifted right shed dormer to front
8. Added windows to either side of chimney
9. Moved side gable to rear with revised window pattern
10. Reduced height of left shed dormers and widened
11. Evened window pattern on lower level
12. Revised window pattern on rear elevation
13. Added top gable detail

Based on the changes in response to Commission concerns from September, staff believes this project has met the Substantial Change criteria.

The proposal is a renovation of the entire home including foundation repair and expansion. Additional interior space will be captured by adding three new shed dormers and a new small gable addition to the first floor at the rear. The existing exterior chimney will be repaired and the secondary chimney removed. The front porch will be redesigned yet retain elements of its existing design. Exterior materials would be cedar shakes to match existing, brick (new and reclaimed), and wood siding (board and batten).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The previous application was denied due to issues with Massing, Fenestration and Rhythm. Staff believes these issues have been addressed in the revised plan.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* - Additions. Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE with revised plans for staff approval to show (1) shed dormers pull in from lower level, (2) left shed centered over windows below, (3) right shed not centered but can move shed over to side of gable, (4) can eliminate window on each side of chimney, (5) a window may be added in space gained if shed is slid over. Mr. Ristaino seconded

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON, LABOVITZ,
MARSHALL, NORVELL, RISTAINO

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED WITH REVISED PLANS TO BE SUBMITTED FOR STAFF APPROVAL.

OTHER BUSINESS

- Minutes November were approved unanimously with the usual direction to report any changes or corrections to Ms. Keich.
-

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 pm with a meeting length of eight hours and twenty eight minutes.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission