



CHARLOTTE

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES

February 19, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Tim Bender
Dr. Lili Corbus
Mr. Don Duffy
Mr. Tom Egan, Chair
Ms. Debra Glennon, 2nd Vice Chair
Ms. Karen Labovitz
Ms. Mattie Marshall
Mr. Dominick Ristaino, Vice Chair
Ms. Lisa Yarbrough

MEMBERS ABSENT: Three Vacancies

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
Ms. Carol Adkins, Court Reporter

Index of Addresses:	1716 Wickford Place	Wilmore
	1917 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore
	401 East Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
	800 East Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
	2309 Dilworth Road West	Dilworth
	1711 Dilworth Road East	Dilworth
	315/317 E. Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
	1923 Dilworth Road East	Dilworth
	816 Brookside Avenue	Dilworth
	1918 Ewing Avenue	Dilworth
	2009 Charlotte Drive	Dilworth
	600 East Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
	1701 Park Road	Dilworth

Mr. Egan called to order the Regular February meeting of the Historic District Commission at 3:07 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.

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

The property is a one story duplex, c.1936. The home has twin front facing gables over the front porch supported by thin metal supports. The proposal is to convert the duplex to a single family home. Changes to the façade include removal of the existing duplex front doors and replace with a single main entrance, removal of existing front windows and replace with a pair of windows to each side of the new centered door, and the addition of a sloped shed roof that will join the existing twin gables. The metal supports will be replaced with tapered columns on a brick pier. Siding will be replaced where needed to match the existing wood lapped siding.

Based on the need for additional information and clarification, this application was deferred in December 2013 for revisions which clearly show: (1) window heights, (2) windows centered beneath gables, (3) details to match existing, (4) site plan, (5) cheek walls, (6) shed connector details, (7) finished drawings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: HDC Staff believes the project meets all of the Guidelines for Additions and that the additional information has been included.

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

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED

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

This application was not heard at the December meeting because it was nearly identical to the previous application and the conversation would have been the same. Mr. Murphy removed this application from the December agenda.

The property is a one story duplex, c. 1933. The home has a twin gable roof covering the porch supported by square wooden posts. The porches are not joined.

The proposal is to convert the duplex to a single family home. Changes to the façade include removal of the two front doors, addition of a single centered entrance, replacement of existing windows with two sets of paired windows and the addition of a sled roof that joins the twin gables. The wood posts will be replaced by a traditional porch with a brick base. Tapered wooden porch columns will be added. Siding will be replaced where needed to match the existing wood lapped siding. The foundation will be painted and new brick steps will replace the existing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff believes the project meets the applicable Guidelines for Additions

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* - Doors/Windows/ Addition, Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE with the following revised plans which staff may approve: (1) resolve/correct bracket detail, (2) porch design and size remains including columns, (3) roof between existing dormers, 4) brick foundation, 5) tongue and groove wood floor porch, 6) window and door reflect correct proportion, Mr. Bender seconded

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED WITH REVISED PLANS TO STAFF.

APPLICATION: 401 East Worthington Avenue – New Construction

An application for a two story house was deferred at the October 2013.

Revised plans now show a new one and one half story single family home with a wraparound porch on this vacant lot at the corner of East Worthington Avenue and Euclid Avenue. A rear detached one and one half two car garage but has been reduced in size. A side door has been added to the left and right elevations of the house and wood siding shows on both side elevations. The porch columns are traditional brick pier with tapered columns. The left elevation has a primary gable. Two secondary gables face toward the rear. The rear elevation has details and massing that resemble the front. The right elevation has a single gable and both side elevations have an organized window pattern. Siding and trim materials are wood. The overall height is approximately 29'8.75" measured from the ground. The revised proposal includes new window and door design, improvements to left and right sides, wood siding on both levels, streetscape exhibits, and additional dimensions. The 1.5 story detached garage is a simpler cross gable design with a total height of approximately 24'. Materials and details will match house.

Applicant Comments: Architect Allen Brooks said a new owner has different needs than the past application. The overall height has been reduced by two feet. The proposed garage has been reduced by 20% of the previous footprint. Though the original house was recently demolished, it was developed in the Victorian period (c. 1905). The proposed house will keep the Victorian wrap porch of the past house and acknowledge the adjacent house with a front facing gable. Shed dormers have been set back from the front. Trees will be protected.

Owner Richard Saltrick responded to audience concerns about the location of the proposed garage in what some identified as an alley way by saying he would be glad to relocate the garage farther off the rear property line. A rear alley did not show on any maps he has seen but his intent is to live in his new house a long time and he wants to do all he can to be in good graces with any regulations and the neighborhood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff believes the project meets the applicable Guidelines for New Construction. The plans show the house meeting the minimum required setback. However, the Commission may require the home to meet the established setback along the block face. The Alternative Setback Provision also allows this reduction when a neighborhood pre-dates modern zoning codes.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood Resident Brenda Reuter spoke in opposition.
Neighborhood Resident Courtenay Buchan spoke in opposition.
Neighborhood Resident Mike Holland spoke in opposition.
Neighborhood Resident Tamara Titus spoke in opposition.
Neighborhood Resident Jack Fenlon spoke in opposition.
Neighborhood Resident Kirk Otey spoke in opposition.
Neighborhood Resident Chris Hudson spoke in opposition.

Neighborhood Resident Marcia Rouse spoke in opposition.
Neighborhood Resident Jessica Hindman spoke in favor.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* - New Construction, Mr. Ristaino made a MOTION to APPROVE THE NEW HOUSE with the following revisions which staff may approve (1) 3 risers to front porch, (2) 9' first floor ceiling height, (3) 9' second floor ceiling height, (4) hinge spring of sheds below ridge, (5) rear dormers pushed in a minimum of 12", (6) one and one half story garage with details and materials to match house, (7) garage shifted to be sited within property line setbacks Ms. Labovitz seconded.

VOTE: 8/1 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, GLENNON, LABOVITZ,
MARSHALL, RISTAINO, YARBROUGH

NAYS: EGAN

DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED WITH REVISIONS TO STAFF

MS. GLENNON DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED
HERSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.

APPLICATION: 800 East Worthington Avenue – Second Story Addition

This application was deferred at the December 2013 meeting for some additional documentation and further design study regarding massing and fenestration.

This c. 1925 house is a one story bungalow designed by either architect Peeps or Van Hoey. 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. There is unusual tapered trim and distinctive light patterns still existing.

The proposal is a second story addition and an addition to the rear. The proposed upper level springs from behind the existing thermal wall and features a new cross gable roof plan. The proposed roof pitch, siding, windows and details match the existing. 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 the date on who was the original architect is conflicting and this house may have been the architect's own home. There is a real sense that the old house is in there and the plan is to adhere to the bungalow logic. All perimeter roofs remain. The addition is tucked in and pushed to the rear.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The following Guideline should be considered for this proposal: Massing, Size, Scale, Fenestration, Rhythm, Materials, and Context appear to be met. The Setback guideline is not applicable for the front.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood resident Tamara Titus spoke in opposition.
Neighborhood resident Matt Majors spoke in favor.
Neighborhood resident Kirk Otey spoke in opposition.

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* - Additions, Ms. Yarbrough made a motion to deny this application for Size, and Massing. She commented that the corner lot side elevation character is lost. Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 6/2 AYES: CORBUS, EGAN, LABOVITZ, MARSHALL, RISTAINO,
YARBROUGH

NAYS: BENDER, DUFFY

DECISION: APPLICATION DENIED.

NOTE: Attorney Thomas Powers reminded the applicant that she has (1) the right to appeal the decision, (2) the right to redesign the project and re apply, and (3) the right to wait six months and bring the same proposal back to the Commission.

Ms. Labovitz left at 6:20 pm and was not present for the remainder of the meeting.

APPLICATION: 2309 Dilworth Road West – Front Porch Addition/Rear Addition

This application was deferred at the December 2013 meeting for the need of revised drawings which clearly and accurately show: (1) stone removed, (2) lapped wood siding, (3) closed boxing on the pergola, (4) rear windows centered, (5) smaller window on rear, (6) railings, (7) front door.

The existing home is a one story brick cottage style home with a front facing gable, a balanced window pattern and a center entrance. The home was constructed in 1947 and is identified as a Non Contributing structure in the National Register Survey. The setbacks are consistent along the block face with adjacent homes that are one and one half stories.

The proposed project for Commission review is a front porch addition and replacement of a window on the front with French doors to provide access onto the new porch. A gable would be pulled forward over the center of the porch. Porch piers are brick supporting square wood

columns. A pergola with closed boxing will be added over the extended porch area. The gable end is clad with cedar shake and the sides with lapped wood siding.

The revised February proposal includes brick base columns, wood siding, and the rear windows centered.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff believes the proposed design meets *Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions*.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Dr. Corbus made a MOTION to DEFER this application with revised plans to clearly and accurately show: (1) all finalized details, (2) 12”columns, (3) 16”masonry piers, (4) gable over front door with brackets to support cantilever, (5) tongue and groove (or masonry if so chosen) decking material, (6) front porch section, (7) ceiling material, (8) details of rear addition. Ms. Yarbrough seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON,
MARSHALL, RISTAINO, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DEFERRED.

APPLICATION: 1711 Dilworth Road East – Side Conservatory Addition.

This application was deferred in December with the direction to study further the details of the conservatory and how it might more match the house.

The subject property was built in 1946 but was substantially renovated in recent years. This block is not within the Dilworth National Register boundaries. The Cottage style home has Craftsman elements, such as decorative eave brackets, supporting wide overhangs. The garage was approved in December. Remaining to be approved is the conservatory addition. The use of the addition will be similar to a greenhouse and requires clear windows on all sides for sunlight. The revised design includes trim detail similar to the existing home.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff believes the project meets the applicable guidelines for additions

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines - Additions*, Mr. Duffy made a motion to APPROVE AS SUBMITTED. Mr. Ristaino seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON,
MARSHALL, RISTAINO, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: CONSERVATORY ADDITION APPROVED.

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

This application was deferred at the December 2013 meeting for additional information.

The proposed project is a 12 unit, three story multi-family building with below grade parking and a center courtyard. The project will require a rezoning. Exterior materials include brick, wood and fiber cement siding. The porch roofs are standing seam metal. Windows are composite wood. Units facing East Tremont Avenue connect to the street with entrances and porches at 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 new mixed use building. The overall height, as shown, is lower than the adjacent mixed-use building and taller than the structure on the right side. Multi-family buildings across the street are comparable in height to the proposed structure but are constructed on a higher elevation. The rezoning requires the construction of a new sidewalk and planting strip with street trees. The revised proposal includes the right and rear elevations which were missing in December.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff believes the project meets the applicable guidelines for new construction. However, the Commission may want to discuss further the issue of Fenestration.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* - New Construction, Mr. Bender made a motion to APPROVE AS SUBMITTED. Mr. Duffy seconded

VOTE: 6/2 AYES: BENDER, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON,
 MARSHALL, RISTAINO

NAYS: CORBUS, YARBROUGH

DECISION: REDEVELOPMENT PLANS APPROVED

APPLICATION: 1923 Dilworth Road East – Fence.

The property is located at the corner of Dilworth Road East and Ideal Way. A fence was approved by the Commission and a fence is currently under construction.

This proposal is for an amendment from the approved plan regarding the location of the fence along the Ideal Way side. The approved plans did not specify a dimension from the fence to the back of the sidewalk. However, based on an estimated measurement the distance appears to be approximately 12 inches from back of sidewalk to the fence panel. During construction there were slight changes which moved the location of the fence. The applicant has resubmitted drawings to show the revised fence location which is about four inches from the back of the sidewalk.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff believes the revised plan meets the applicable guideline that requires a landscaping strip between the fence and sidewalk.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood Resident Marcia Rouse spoke in opposition.
Neighborhood Resident Paula DeLoma spoke in opposition.
Neighborhood Resident Chris Hudson spoke in opposition.
Neighborhood Resident John Phares spoke in opposition.
Neighborhood Resident Kirk Otey spoke in opposition.
Neighborhood Resident Dianne Crutchfield spoke in opposition.
Neighborhood Resident Michael Baker spoke in opposition.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to DEFER this application and bring it forward as a new application with plans to clearly and accurately show (1) context, (2) actual photographs, (3) dimensions, (4) details. Ms. Corbus seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON,
MARSHALL, RISTAINO, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DEFERRED.

Ms. Glennon removed herself from the Commission for the next application because she received an Adjacent Property Owner letter.

APPLICATION: 816 Brookside Avenue – Second Story Addition

The subject property is c.1920 one and one half story Bungalow listed as a Contributing structure in the National Register Survey. The home has a side gabled roof with a lower gabled front porch with brackets and columns.

The proposed project is a two story addition at the rear of the existing structure. New siding and windows will match the existing house. The addition will be approximately 4 feet taller than the existing structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission should consider the following guidelines for the proposed addition: Massing, Fenestration, and Rhythm

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood Resident Chris Hudson spoke in opposition.
Neighborhood Resident Marcia Rouse spoke in opposition.
Neighborhood Resident John Phares spoke in opposition.

MOTION: Mr. Ristaino made a MOTION to DENY the application.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to DEFER this application. Revised plans will include (1) pictures, (2) a streetscape exhibit, (3) significant massing restudy, (4) fenestration simplified and organized, (5). Ms. Marshall seconded

VOTE: 5/2 AYES: BENDER, DUFFY, MARSHALL, NORVELL, RISTAINO,
 NAYS: CORBUS, EGAN

DECISION: APPLICATION DEFERRED.

APPLICATION: 1918 Ewing Avenue – Fenestration Changes/Addition.

The subject property is a c. 1920 one and one half story brick Bungalow listed as a Contributing structure in National Register Survey. The home has a front gable with a shed porch on brick columns with arched bays which extends over for the porte cochere.

The proposed projects include changes to windows and doors – some moved, some blocked in, some added. Two shed dormers will be added toward the rear of the house. Because of all the past bricking in and removing windows and doors, the proposal is to paint the brick house. The size and texture of the brick can be matched but not the color. A window in the front gable will be changed out to be more in keeping with the house and also to satisfy egress per Code.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission should consider the guidelines in the review of this proposal: Fenestration/Rhythm

Staff believes the proposal meets the remaining applicable guidelines. Setbacks and landscaping are not applicable

The Commission will determine if painting the brick exterior is appropriate to unify the structure based on the conditions of the structure, or determine if there are other solutions. Based on the current conditions staff believes painting is an appropriate solution to cure the exterior defects.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood Resident John Phares spoke in opposition.
Neighborhood Resident Chris Hudson spoke in opposition.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines*, Mr. Bender made a MOTION to APPROVE this application with the following revisions for staff to review and possibly approve: (1) rather than the proposed shed dormers a side to side cross gable will be added with pitch to match smaller gable on drive side, (2) reduce proposed size of front replacement window to 80% and still meet Code, (3) bring cross gable in a minimum of 8" from edge of roof, 4) remove proposed transom on the right elevation, (5) painting brick is justified. Mr. Duffy seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON,
MARSHALL, RISTAINO, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED WITH REVISED PLANS FOR STAFF TO REVIEW AND APPROVE.

MS. Marshall left at 11:30 PM and was not present for the remainder of the meeting.

APPLICATION: 2009 Charlotte Drive - Addition

The subject property is a single family home built in 1942. The rear of the home faces Kenilworth Avenue. The block is not within the Dilworth National Register boundaries. Charlotte Drive is the front street but the back property line is against Kenilworth Avenue which is an unusual circumstance of having a larger street behind. The houses and garages and backyards are completely visible from the street behind.

The proposal is for a rear addition that will be visible from Kenilworth Avenue, the addition of a window and new wood siding in the front gable, new columns supporting the front porch roof, new windows on the side elevations, and the bricking in of a side door.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff believes the proposal meets the guidelines for additions.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* - Additions. Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE part of the application with revisions to come to staff for review and possible approval: Rear addition with columns to match the front. Decking will be added so that new columns are resting on decking rather than ground. Front columns will remain as they are. Half round window in front gable may be changed out to become a rectangular window or vent. Siding in front gable may be changed to match lapped wood siding of new rear addition.

VOTE: 7/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON, RISTAINO,
YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED WITH REVISED PLANS FOR STAFF TO REVIEW AND APPROVE.

APPLICATION: 600 East Worthington Avenue – Second Story Addition

The c. 1915 subject property is a one and one half story Bungalow that is listed in the National Register Survey as a Contributing structure. The house has a low hipped roof with hipped dormers and an engaged porch.

The proposal is a second story addition that springs from behind the front wall plane back toward the middle of the house and extends into the rear yard to include a new first floor. The addition is capped with a series of hip roofs matching the existing pitch. The materials will be wood siding with details and fenestration to match or complement the existing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff believes the project meets the applicable guidelines for additions. The guideline for setbacks is not applicable.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood Resident John Phares spoke in opposition
Neighborhood Resident Tamara Titus spoke in opposition

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* - Additions. Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to DENY this application regarding inappropriate SCALE, MASSING, FENESTRATION AND RHYTHM. Ms. Yarbrough seconded

VOTE: 7/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON, RISTAINO, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DENIED

APPLICATION: 1701 Park Road – New Construction

This c. 1920 house is identified as Contributing in the National Register of Historic Places Inventory. It appears as if it has for many years but the understanding is that it is completely gutted out to the exterior walls. Demolition is being requested. This property qualifies for Preservation Tax Credits because it is located within a National Register Neighborhood. It is a 1.5 story Colonial Revival design with balanced fenestration along the façade and a covered entrance. The exterior is wood shingle siding. The home is set back slightly from the adjacent homes on either side.

The proposal was denied in November 2013 based on non-compliance with the Guidelines regarding Size, Scale and Massing. Before deliberating on the current project the Commission must determine if the applicant has made substantial changes to the previous plan for it to be heard before a six month waiting period. Based on the current submittal the following revisions have been made:

1. The roof form has been redesigned as a series of hips
2. The setback is more consistent with the houses to either side
3. Context images are included to show the house in comparison to those on the block
4. The overall design concept of the home has not changed
5. Materials and their execution have changed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff believes the revised roof design has improved the massing and scale of the home resulting in a substantial change.

MOTION: Based recent past denial and substantial change required to rehear before six months, Mr. Egan stated there was not enough change to the application for the commission to rehear.

VOTE: 7/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON, RISTAINO, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: Commission agreed unanimously that substantial change was not evidenced.

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 am with a meeting length of nine hours and 3 minutes.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission