



CHARLOTTE

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES

November 12, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Tim Bender
Dr. Lili Corbus
Mr. Don Duffy
Tom Egan, Chair
Mr. Rodric Lenhart
Ms. Mattie Marshall
Mr. Dominick Ristaino, Vice Chair
Mr. Michael Sullivan
Ms. Tamara Titus, Second Vice Chair
Ms. Lisa Yarbrough

MEMBERS ABSENT: 2 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
Court Reporters

Chairman Mr. Egan called to order the Regular November meeting of the Historic District Commission at 3:03 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, Continuation, 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. Ristaino 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. Ristaino 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.

Index of Addresses: **CONTINUED APPLICATIONS**
HDC 2014-070 1700 Heathcliff Street Wesley Heights
HDC 2014-210 525 East Boulevard Dilworth
HDC 2014-216 2037 The Plaza Plaza Midwood

NEW APPLICATIONS
HDC 2014-226 704 East Park Avenue Dilworth
HDC 2014-229 1940 Park Road Dilworth
HDC 2014-233 1125 Belgrave Place Dilworth
HDC 2014-234 1613 Wilmore Avenue Wilmore
HDC 2014-240 617 Walnut Avenue Wesley Heights

DR. CORBUS WAS OUT OF THE ROOM FOR THE FIRST APPLICATION.

APPLICATION: HDC 2014-210 – 525 East Boulevard – New Construction.

This application was continued from October for further design study on 1) Size, 2) Scale, and 3) Materials.

The existing site is a vacant parcel at the corner of East Boulevard and Winthrop Avenue. Previously existing was a two-story stucco multi-family building c. 1911 with a hipped roof and one story porches. The structure was destroyed by fire several years ago. The block currently consists of two story buildings facing East Boulevard and one and one half story homes facing Winthrop Avenue. Across the street is a mix of uses including churches, office, and retail of varying heights and setbacks. The setback along the block face of East Boulevard and Winthrop Avenue is relatively consistent.

Proposal-June 11, 2014

A three and one half story townhouse development of two separate buildings joined by a center courtyard with ground level garages was proposed. The exterior materials proposed stucco, brick, and wood. Porches and balcony's face East Boulevard. The ultimate height is approximately 39'-9" from grade. The East Boulevard and Winthrop Avenue facades feature a balanced fenestration pattern, a series of hipped roofs and other design elements, and even salvaged materials, from the original building. **The application was denied based on Size, Scale, Massing, and Context.**

Revised Proposal-July 9, 2014

The revised application is resubmitted based on substantial redesign from the denied application. A summary of the changes include:

1. Setback increase of 3' along East Boulevard.
2. Removal of front porches along East Boulevard.
3. Winthrop Avenue setback increased 4'.
4. Building height reduced 3'-2.5" matching the height of 501 East Boulevard.
5. Height of end units along Winthrop Avenue has been reduced.
6. Material changes include additional wood shake siding and brick to compliment adjacent structures.
7. Massing of building has been changed through variation between townhouse units and roof design. HDC determined that the Substantial Change test was not met and the proposal was not reviewed further.

The proposal is a renovation project that includes removal of deteriorated Masonite, new wood siding, new window details, roof trim details, privacy fence, driveway, and patio. The application was continued.

Proposal – November 12, 2014

Summary of plan revisions:

1. Fenestration – Windows have been changed from 6/1 to 1/1. Appropriate trim dimensions include 6.5” header, 1-3/8” panel mold and 3-1/2” brick mold.
2. Roof details – Cedar shake replaced with wood lap.
3. Eave brackets removed.
4. Foundation will be a contrasting color from primary structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the proposed improvements meet the applicable design guidelines.

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 with revised plans to be submitted for staff review which show, 1) No sub sill apron, 2) No stained cedar rafter tails, 3) No vehicular gate, 4) Sub sill no less than 1-5/8”. Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BENDER, DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART,
SULLIVAN, TITUS, RISTAINO, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR RENOVATION APPROVED.

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

MS MARSHALL ARRIVED AND WAS PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.

DR. CORBUS RETURNED TO THE MEETING FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.

APPLICATION: HDC 2014-226 – 704 East Park Avenue – Addition

The application was denied in September because the proposed addition changed the vocabulary of the house.

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-1980’s).

Proposal – September 10, 2014

Additions include a large front facing gable centered over two pair of windows (existing bay window will be removed and replaced with the two pair of windows). Existing windows to the left of the front will be removed and replaced with another two pair of windows. A pair of windows will be added in new front facing gable. All windows will match each other in a pattern of 4 vertical over one. A small shed

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission shall determine if the proposal addresses the unresolved issues and meets the guidelines.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Fences*, Mr. Ristaino made a MOTION to APPROVE the fence to be relocated no less than 18” from sidewalk or 12” from PL – whichever is greater and the fenced will be painted. Mr. Duffy seconded. Based on the need for additional information a MOTION was made to CONTINUE the Porte Cochere for 1) resolution of any potential setback issue, 2) rhythm issue, 3) massing issue, 4) further design study to subordinate the porte cochere to the main house.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR FENCE APPROVED.
APPLICATION FOR PORTE COCHERE CONTINUED**

**MS. YARBROUGH LEFT AT 6:55 PM AND WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER
OF THE MEETING.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2014-234 – 1613 Wilmore Avenue – New Construction.

The existing property is vacant. Surrounding single family homes are primarily one and one and one half stories. The setback along the subject block is a range of approximately 17’ to 20’ from the front porch to back of sidewalk. A similar setback condition exists across the street.

Proposal

The proposal is for a one and one half story single family home, a detached garage in the rear yard, and removal of a tree in the rear yard. Plan details include:

1. 6’ front porch.
2. 21’-11” setback measured from the porch.
3. Overall height of 27’ from FF. Foundation height approximately 2’-4”.
4. Wood lap and cedar shake siding.
5. Wood windows and trim.
6. Wood roof trim details and brackets.
7. Tapered columns with brick piers.
8. Tongue and groove porch decking and ceiling.
9. Garage materials to match home.

RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the project meets the guidelines for new construction.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Mr. Ristaino made a MOTION to continue this application for further design study and clarification re: 1) Scale to adjacent homes, 2) height reduction, 3) context, 4) massing of porch, 5) fenestration, 6) sections, 7) material detail labels, 8) include side corner boards, 9) setbacks, 10) landscaping, 11) gable vents. Ms. Titus seconded

VOTE: 9/0

AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, MARSHALL,
RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, TITUS,

NAYS: NONE

APPLICATION: HDC 2014-244 – 809 Mt. Vernon Avenue – New Construction.

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a one story brick ranch style home listed as a Non-Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. The Commission waived the 365-Day Stay of Demolition in March 2014. Plans for a new 1.5 story single family home were approved May 21, 2014.

Proposal – Revisions to approved plans

Revisions include:

1. A smaller front dormer.
2. Change from a gable to shed porch roof.
3. Removal of the rear dormer.
4. Redesigned rear porch staircase.
5. Chimney shifted further into the roof.
6. Addition of skylights on the rear.
7. A new detached garage with details to match the home.

RECOMMENDATION: The Commission shall determine if the changes meet the applicable guidelines for new construction.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – New Construction*, Dr. Corbus made a MOTION to APPROVE with revised drawings for staff to review which show: 1) Size, Scale, Massing, Setback is within the Policy and Design Guidelines, 2) Fenestration – Garage window change, 3) materials – section for front porch, 4) Context and Landscaping approved as before, 5) HVAC units put on left side rear location.

VOTE: 9/0

AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, MARSHALL,
RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, TITUS,

NAYS: NONE

APPLICATION: HDC 2014-070 – 1700 Heathcliff Street – New Construction.

This application was continued from October for additional design study regarding fenestration and materials. Revised plans now include: 1) Tongue and groove for the front porch, and an 2) Accurate site plan which includes the percentage of lot coverage, driveway, sidewalks, landscaping, and the discussed guard rail and stairway.

The site is a triangular vacant lot at the end of a street. The adjacent properties are one and one half and two story single family homes and an adjacent two story quadraplex. There are mature trees on the site. There is not an established front setback on the street. The site has an unimproved alley on one side.

The revised plan details for the two-story home address comments from August. The new plan includes wood siding and trim, brick foundation, redesigned porch roof and window details. The height from grade is approximately 30'-8".

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the proposal meets guidelines for new construction.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – New Construction*, Mr. Bender made a MOTION to APPROVE as revised. Mr. Duffy seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, MARSHALL,
RISTAINO,SULLIVAN, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED.

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 pm with a meeting length of seven hours fifteen minutes.
Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission