Mr. Egan called to order the Regular September meeting of the Historic District Commission at 3:05 pm. He began the meeting by introducing the Staff and Commissioners and explaining the procedure. All interested parties planning to give testimony – pro or con – must have completed a blue form and must be sworn in. Mr. Howard or Mrs. Birmingham 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 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, discuss, and consider the information that has been gathered and presented. A Motion for Approval, Deferral, or Denial will be made. 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, 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 Approval or Denial to appeal. This is in accordance with Section 10.213 of the City Zoning Ordinance. 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. Mr. Egan said that those in the audience must be quiet during the hearings. He will ask once that an audience member be quiet and the need for a second request will be removal from the room.

This application was continued from August for further design study regarding (1) Scale – Elevation and roof height on Tremont Avenue, (2) Massing of the roof and (3) Materials.

This site is located at the corner of Euclid Avenue and East Tremont Avenue and is made up of separate parcels. Existing structures include a single family structure and multi family structure. The 365-Day Stay of Demolition was imposed by the HDC and has now expired. The surrounding context is multi-family development and single family homes. The site has some mature trees to the rear and large crepe myrtles within the planting strips along public streets.

The proposal is a twelve unit townhouse development - nine units will face the streets and three will be located to the rear of the site. Parking will be beneath the units. The proposed setback along East Tremont Avenue is consistent with the previously approved multi-family project. The setback along Euclid Avenue is approximate to the existing building, approximately 22’ from thermal wall to back of curb. The buildings are generally two and one half to three stories in height. Exterior materials include cast stone, brick, wood siding and smooth fiber cement. The units have useable balconies and porches.

**Revised Proposal – August 13, 2014**
1. Scale – The height of the corner structure at Euclid Avenue and East Tremont Avenue has been reduced from 38’ to approx. 33’-5” from finished floor. The elevation of the primary structure along Euclid Ave. is approx. 34’-9”.
2. Massing – The dormers along Euclid Avenue are centered above the balconies. The roof height has been lowered slightly.
3. Context – A third material, wood shake, has been introduced on the third floor along E. Tremont Avenue. Entry stoops address the sidewalk.

**Revised Proposal – September 10, 2014**
1. Scale – The height of the corner structure at Euclid Avenue and East Tremont Avenue remains at the previously reduced height.
2. Massing – The roof line along East Tremont has been changed to a series of hipped roofs.
3. Traditional siding materials are used on primary wall planes.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The Commission will determine if the project meets the unresolved design guidelines for Scale, Massing and Materials.

MOTION:  Based on non-compliance with Policy & Design Guidelines – New Construction, Ms. Titus made a Motion to DENY the application for New Construction.  Mr. Sullivan seconded.

VOTE:  2/5  AYES:  SULLIVAN, TITUS  
NAYS:  EGAN, DUFFY, LENHART, RISTAINO, YARBROUGH

MOTION:  Based on the need for additional information Mr. Ristaino made a MOTION to CONTINUE this application.  Revised plans will show 1) All traditional building material notes, 2) Tremont elevation lowered 2’ – 3’.  Mr. Lenhart seconded.

VOTE:  7/0  AYES:  EGAN, DUFFY, LENHART, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS:  NONE

DECISION:  APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED.


The application was continued in August for more information regarding the front porch roof design, dimensions of the house footprint, and other dimensions clarified, and additional setback information.

The existing parcel is vacant. The Commission imposed the 365 Day Stay of Demolition, the time has expired, and the previously existing house has been demolished. The surrounding context is a variety of single family structures and two multi-family structures. Building heights range between 1 and 2 stories. The topography slopes downward gradually from East Boulevard to Latta Park.

The proposal is a 2 story single family dwelling, approximately 29’ in height from finished floor to the ridge. The design features include a front porch with gable and hip roof that reflects the roof design of the primary structure, a ‘porte cohere’ to the side with conditioned space above, exposed rafter tails, eave brackets, 3 over 1 windows, cedar shake and horizontal wood siding, and stone on the foundation and chimney. The proposed setback is consistent with 1709 Park Road to the right.

*Revised Proposal – August 13, 2014*
1.  Setbacks – The proposed setback is approximately 62’7” from right of way (ROW). The adjacent properties are approx. 65’ and 60’ from ROW.
2.  Fenestration – Cross sections and window detail notes have been provided on the plans. Windows to be wooden double hung.
3.  Details – Sections for porch column and beam, brackets and hand rails have been provided.

*Revised Proposal – September 10, 2014*
1.  Setbacks – Site plan shows setback relative to adjacent structures – left and right.
2.  Porch Roof – The front porch roof has been redesigned to match the front gable.
3.  Dimensions – Footprint dimensions have been added.
4.  HVAC – Remains in the same location on the side near the rear because the owners plan on having a basement.
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the project meets the unresolved design guidelines.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood Resident Marcia Rowse spoke in opposition.

MOTION: Based on compliance with Policy & Design Guidelines – New Construction, Ms. Titus, made a MOTION to APPROVE with revised drawings to come back for staff approval which show: 1) front setback 68.5 based on location of adjacent houses, 2) window sub sills beefed up, 3) HVAC relocated to the rear, 4) final landscape plan, 5) traditional building material notes. Mr. Ristaino seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED.

MR. RISTAINO DECLARED A OF A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HIMSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.

APPLICATION: HDC 2014-168 – 425 Rensselaer Avenue – Garage

This project was continued in August for additional building elevations and notes.

The existing home is a small one story cottage style design constructed in 1930. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register survey. It is on a very small lot. The house itself encroaches into the rear yard setback. Adjacent homes are similar in size. A one and one half story garage is under construction but not being built as approved. This has been continued a number times.

Proposal - August 13, 2014
The proposal is a 1.5 story detached garage with a height of approximately 19’-5”. Exterior trim, windows and materials will match the house.

Revised Proposal – September 10, 2014
Additional elevations and plan notes have been provided.

Applicant Comments: Owner Nancy Weekly said she has a change of plan for the rear stair to wrap to the side.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the new detached garage plans meet the applicable guidelines.

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 Ms. Titus made a MOTION to CONTINUE this application for 1) final accurate drawings to include a complete picture of the stairs and landing. Mr. Lenhart seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE
APPLICATION: **HDC 2014-164** – 1319 Thomas Avenue – Accessory Dwelling Unit

The existing house was constructed in 1920. The site is on the edge of the Plaza Midwood Local Historic District and located adjacent to a commercial parking lot on one side. An alley exists for access to multiple properties. A large rear yard garage/accessory building has been in place for many years. In the staff review, some Code issues became obvious regarding setbacks of the proposed rear yard ADU and this application was pulled from a recent HDC agenda to better understand and correct the issues.

A two story ADU (Accessory Dwelling Unit) is to be located near the rear property line with access from the alley. The structure will be detailed as a Victorian cottage with a wrap around porch. The existing accessory building will be renovated to become a higher roofed garage for an RV in the middle with auxiliary spaces to each side. Gable end facing street will have a new panelized garage door.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The Commission will determine if the application meets Policy & Design Guidelines for Garages and Accessory Structures.

FOR/AGAINST: John Klosic, adjacent property spoke in opposition.

**MOTION:** Based on the need for additional information Ms. Titus made a MOTION to CONTINUE for additional information with revised drawings to show: 1) house height, 2) garage height addition - existing vs. proposed, 3) no tree removal, 4) traditional building materials noted, 5) 4’ fence height exception due to a code requirement because this is adjacent to a parking lot, 6) all details to match the house intended and noted. Mr. Duffy seconded.

**VOTE:** 7/0  
AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH  
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE CONTINUED

APPLICATION: **HDC 2014-170** – 1817 Merriman Avenue – Addition

This one story brick house is on the edge of the Wilmore Local Historic District. A metal awning has been removed that covers the front terrace and entry. Steps lead down parallel to the house.

The plan is to add a shed roof supported by columns over the front terrace. A wooden rail that is historically appropriate to the neighborhood and adequately detailed will be added between the columns.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The Commission will determine if the submitted drawings are sufficiently explanatory and detailed to the degree that a decision can be made.

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. Lenhart made a MOTION to CONTINUE this application for further developed drawings. Mr. Ristaino seconded.

**VOTE:** 7/0  
AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH  
NAYS: NONE
APPLICATION: **HDC 2014-190** – 1940 Park Road – Addition

This c. 1940 one and one half story bungalow is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. It is a lot located beside the traffic circle at Park Road/Tremont Avenue/Brookside Avenue. Two additions have been approved in past years.

A new rear addition will be a porch, outdoor fireplace with a chimney, and a deck. A new hipped roof will be supported by columns which match those on the front of the house. Though the addition is neither taller nor wider than the existing house, this rather triangular lot provides full view of anything going on in the rear yard. Materials (including brick, roofing, columns, rail, etc.) and details (including columns, trim, soffit/fascia treatment, overhang, rail, etc.) will match those existing on the house.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The Commission shall determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for Scale, Massing, Fenestration and Rhythm. Commission will determine if the proposed addition is **Policy & Design Guidelines** compliant or if an exception is warranted.

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

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with **Policy & Design Guidelines** – Addition Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE as submitted Ms. Titus seconded.

**VOTE:** 6/1

**AYES:** DUFFY, LENHART, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH

**NAYS:** EGAN

**DECISION:** **APPLICATION FOR REAR ADDITION APPROVED.**

APPLICATION: **HDC 2014-191** – 1511 The Plaza – Addition

This is a large two story bungalow with a porte cochere and full front porch on two lots.

A proposed two story rear addition with a hipped roof will tie back to the house below the existing ridge. New addition will accommodate a master suite above a porch and outdoor dining room. Pool in back yard will be removed with the thought of adding another one in a different location sometime in the future. Materials (including shakes, roofing, brick, windows, etc.) and details (including window configuration, rafter tails, corner boards, soffit/fascia treatment, overhang, material execution, etc.) will match existing.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The Commission shall determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for Scale, Massing, Fenestration and Rhythm. Commission will determine if the proposed addition is **Policy & Design Guidelines** compliant or if an exception is warranted.

**FOR/AGAINST:** No one accepted Mr. Egan’s invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST this application.
MOTION: Based on compliance with Policy & Design Guidelines - ADDITIONS, Ms. Yarbrough made a MOTION to APPROVE as submitted. Mr. Duffy seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2014-192 – 1114 Linganore Place – Addition

This c. 1930 house is listed as a Contributing Structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. It is a two story brick home with underneath parking on a large lot at the corner of Dilworth Road and Linganore Place.

A main level expansion on the rear corner will accommodate a kitchen addition. Over it will be a bedroom expansion. A deteriorated, non-original sun room has been removed and the master suite will expand into this area. A covered porch will fit in between the expanded kitchen and the rebuilt sunroom with an outdoor fireplace/chimney incorporated into a retaining wall. New porch roof will be seamed copper. Paving will be bluestone slate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission shall determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for Scale, Massing, Fenestration and Rhythm.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with Policy & Design Guidelines, Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE as submitted. Mr. Ristaino seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2014-199 – 600 E. Worthington Avenue – Addition

The c. 1915 subject property is a one and one half story bungalow that is listed as a Contributing Structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. The house has a low hip roof with hip roofed dormers and an engaged porch. The site is a corner lot that slopes gently from front to rear. The surrounding residential context is a mix of one, one and one half, and two story houses.

Revised Proposal July 9, 2014
A summary of the approved plans includes:
1. A simplified roof design with fewer changes in height
2. Reduction in chimney height
3. Overall height has been reduced from approximately 24’8” to approximately 20’ measured from the finished floor
4. Fenestration arrangement and style has been modified on the additions
5. Material of the dormers changed to wood shakes
6. Rear elevation is scaled down on the second story

Proposal September 10, 2014
Plans have changed in response to an unfavorable engineering report on the house. Revised plans continue to show a new rear porch with a fireplace past a two story rear addition. Hipped dormers still show but on the left side are now more stand-alone than bridged as before. Rear stairway is now simplified and integrated. Windows have been added to basement walls.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission shall determine if the proposal meets the Policy & Design Guidelines for Scale, Massing, Fenestration and Rhythm. Commission also will determine if the addition is Policy & Design Guidelines compliant or if an exception is warranted.

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

MOTION: Based on Compliance with Policy & Design Guidelines – ADDITIONS, Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE with revised drawings for staff approval. The revised drawings will show 1) elimination of hip on interior elevation, 2) area between the two dormers filled in. Mr. Lenhart seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBOROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH REVISED DRAWINGS FOR STAFF APPROVAL.

APPLICATION: HDC 2014-203 – 2120 Dilworth Road East – Paving

The home is a c. 1927 one story brick home listed as a Contributing Structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey.

The proposal is a new side-by-side driveway and walkway in the front setback. The driveway area in the front yard is proposed to have additional space for parking.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the requested exception for parking in the front setback is warranted.

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. Ristaino MADE a MOTION to CONTINUE this application. Revised application will include: 1) an entire site plan, 2) pictures of the site, 3) change of materials, 4) more details on drawings. Ms. Yarbrough seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBOROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR DRIVEWAY AND WALKWAY CONTINUED FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.

This is a c. 1942 one story brick house overlooking Latta Park.  The front door is recessed from the front thermal wall and to the far right.  The roof is a side to side cross gable.  This house is listed as Non Contributing in the Dilworth National Register Survey (most likely because it was not quite 50 years old when the Survey was done in the mid-1980s).

Additions include a large front facing gable centered over two pair of windows (existing bow window will be removed and replaced with the two pair of windows).  Existing windows to the left on the front will be removed and replaced with another two pair of windows.  A pair of windows will be added in the new front facing gable.  All windows will match each other in a pattern of four vertical over one.  A small shed dormer will be added to the front roof slope and be centered over the left pair of new windows.  A hipped roof front porch will be added across the front and beneath the new gable, Porch roof will be supported by wooden columns atop brick piers.  The pitch of the right side gable will be increased to accommodate the new second floor and continue through the house as a side-to-side gable.  One story hipped roof rear addition will extend into back yard.  All new siding will be shakes.  New windows provide a unified style.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:  The Commission shall determine if the proposal meets the Policy & Design Guidelines for Scale, Massing, Fenestration and Rhythm.  Commission also will determine if the addition is Policy & Design Guidelines compliant or if an exception is warranted.

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

MOTION:  Based on non-compliance with Policy & Design Guidelines Ms. Yarbrough made a MOTION to DENY the application because the addition completely changes the vocabulary of the entire house.  Mr. Sullivan seconded.

VOTE:  7/0  AYES:  DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH  
NAYS:  NONE

DECISION:  APPLICATION FOR ADDITION DENIED.

Since Ms. Glennon is no longer on the Historic District Commission, Ms. Yarbrough made a MOTION to elect Ms. Titus as the second Vice Chair.

VOTE:  6/0  AYES:  DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, YARBROUGH  
NAYS:  NONE

DECISION:  MS. TITUS IS THE NEW SECOND VICE CHAIR.

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 pm with a meeting length of five hours.  
Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission