



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES

January 14, 2015

- MEMBERS PRESENT: Dr. Lili Corbus
 Mr. Tom Egan, Chair
 Mr. James Haden
 Mr. Rodric Lenhart
 Ms. Mattie Marshall
 Mr. Dominick Ristaino, Vice Chair
 Mr. Michael Sullivan
 Ms. Tamara Titus, Second Vice Chair
 Ms. Lisa Yarbrough
 Mr. Tim Bender
- MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Don Duffy
 One Vacancy
- OTHERS PRESENT: Mr. John Howard, Administrator
 Historic District Commission
 Ms. Wanda Birmingham, Assistant Administrator
 Historic District Commission
 Ms. Kristina Harpst, Preservation Planner
 Historic District Commission
 Ms. Linda Keich, Clerk to the
 Historic District Commission
 Mr. Jason Cay, Assistant City Attorney
 Mr. Thomas Powers, Assistant City Attorney
 Court Reporters

Chairman Mr. Egan called to order the Regular January 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. Staff 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.

Index of Addresses:

CONTINUED APPLICATIONS

HDC 2014-234 1613 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore
HDC 2014-262 2114 Dilworth Road East	Dilworth
HDC 2014-268 1712 Euclid Avenue	Dilworth

NEW APPLICATIONS

HDC 2014-252 1309 Lexington Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2015-001 1915 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2015-004 2231 Charlotte Drive	Dilworth
HDC 2015-005 800 East Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2015-009 708 Mt. Vernon Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2015-012 2132 Charlotte Drive	Dilworth
HDC 2015-018 830 Park Avenue	Dilworth

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

This application was recently Continued for further design study regarding: 1) The front dormer, 2) Dormer must be pulled back from front thermal wall, 3) Enhanced fenestration plans, 4) Siding, 5) Material details – size and proportion, 6) Rail details – historically appropriate.

Existing Conditions

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 the back of sidewalk. A similar setback condition exists across the street.

Proposal

The proposal is for a new one and one half story single family home, a detached garage to be located 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. T&G porch deck and ceiling

9. Garage materials to match home

Revised Proposal – December 10, 2014

The following is a summary of the plan revisions:

1. Adjacent setbacks added
2. The first floor height at porch beam is noted as 10'
3. Porch depth is 6'-6" from thermal wall to inside of columns, 8'-6" to outside of column
4. Porch ceiling material is T&G
5. Photos of adjacent structures included
6. Window and wall sections added
7. Window sizes have been changed and noted on side elevations
8. Gable vents added.

Revised Proposal – January 14, 2015

The following is a summary of the plan revisions:

1. Front dormer has been changed to a shed dormer
2. New shed dormer steps back from front thermal wall
3. Window notes have been updated to reflect appropriate details (exhibit A not F)
4. Side gable material is lapped wood
5. Hand rail detail added
6. Details included – corner boards, band board, eave detail.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission shall determine if the revised plans address the unresolved issues and meet the *Policy & Design Guidelines*.

FOR/AGAINST: President of the Wilmore Neighborhood Association Justin Lane spoke in favor of this application. He made the point that the neighborhood association was not concerned with the height as there are many varying heights adjacent to each other in the original neighborhood. (Mr. Egan asked that minutes of the neighborhood meeting be provided.)

Neighborhood resident, Denise Moseman spoke in favor of this application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – New Construction*, Mr. Ristaino made a MOTION to APPROVE as submitted. Plans verify that: 1) Size is compatible, 2) Scale is compatible, 3) Massing is compatible, 4) Fenestration is compatible, 5) Rhythm is compatible, 6) Setback is good, 7) Materials are good, 8) Context is compatible, 9) Landscaping is good. NOTE: One page of submitted drawings shows a window that is not trimmed out correctly (F) while another drawing (A) on the same page shows the correct proportions. Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: BENDER, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, TITUS, RISTAINO, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2014-262 – 2114 Dilworth Road East – Painting of Unpainted Brick.

This application was recently continued for the opportunity to get a brick expert to go out and give an opinion on whether or not the brick can be repaired and/or the home unified in some other way than painting the entire house.

The existing structure is a c. 1925 one and one half story brick home. It is listed as a Contributing Structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey.

Proposal

The proposal is to paint the brick exterior. The applicant has submitted photographs of the existing cracks, leaching, unmatched patchwork, and visible infill.

Revised Proposal –January 14, 2015

The proposal is to paint the brick exterior due to badly matched brick and mortar on additions, black staining that streaks down the brick, white leaching, holes, cracks. The applicant has submitted additional photographs of the existing conditions and recommendation letters from contractors.

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

RECOMMENDATION: The Commission shall determine if the existing conditions warrant the request for painting the brick exterior and/or if the evidence warrants an exception.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Painting Brick*, Ms. Titus made a MOTION to APPROVE as submitted with evidence warranting an exception due to poorly matched additions on all four elevations. Ms. Yarbrough seconded.

VOTE: 7/3 AYES: BENDER, EGAN, HADEN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: CORBUS, LENHART, SULLIVAN

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR PAINTING BRICK APPROVED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2014-268 – 1712 Euclid Avenue – New Construction of Quadraplex.

Based on the need for additional information this application was recently continued. Revised plans will show: 1) Size calculation re permeable vs. impermeable, 2) Massing – verify building height with note on plan, 3) Fenestration – include window details, 4) Wall sections, 5) Shutters need to be correct or removed from plans, 6) Remove large louvered vents or scale them down, 7) Design choice – bottom board could be a masonry material, 8) Landscape plan which shows three trees being removed and two being planted back.

The existing site is an interior lot located in the center of a block between East Boulevard, Cleveland Avenue, East Kingston Avenue, and Euclid Avenue with alleyways on three sides. It has been vacant for long years if not always. The site is zoned B-1(PED). Primary access to the site will be provided through a driveway from East Boulevard. There are several mature trees around the site. Adjacent structures are single family and multi-family with commercial uses along East Boulevard.

Proposal

The proposal is the construction of a two story quadraplex on the vacant parcel. A house plan is to look like a carriage house that historically could have been located there. Plan details include the following:

1. Parking will be provided along the alleyways
2. Trees to remain are reflected on the site plan
3. Mechanical systems are located at the rear
4. Maximum height is approximately 33’-4.75”

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-001 – 1915 Thomas Avenue – Addition.

This house is a c. 1925 bungalow located mid block on Thomas Avenue.

Proposal

The proposal is for a small extension to the right side elevation. The extension width is approximately 4'-2" and will be visible from Thomas Avenue. Siding, foundation and window design will match existing.

RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the applicable ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions.***

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. Ristaino made a MOTION to APPROVE as submitted. Justification: 1) Size – compatible, 2) Scale – compatible, 3) Fenestration- matches, 4) Massing – compatible, 5) Rhythm – compatible, 6) Setback – compatible, 7) Materials – match, 8) Details – match, 9) Window details – match, 10) Context- compatible. Ms. Yarbrough seconded

VOTE: 9/0

AYES: CORBUS, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL
TITUS, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

DR. CORBUS LEFT AT 6:10 PM AND WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-004 2231 Charlotte Drive – Porch Addition

The existing structure is a c. 1920 two story duplex. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. The exterior features include a screened front porch on the right side and a one story entrance on the left side.

Proposal

The proposal for Commission review is the addition of a full width porch that will also engage the left side entrance. The porch will retain the depth of the existing porch. The porch roof will feature gables on the ends connected by a hip, brick columns and wood hand rails. New siding and foundation will match existing.

RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the project meets the applicable ***Policy & Design Guidelines - ADDITIONS*** .

The existing structure is a c. 1947 one and one half story Colonial Revival cottage. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey.

Proposal

The proposal for Commission review is the addition of a front porch, unenclosure of the side porch, window removal/infill, and conversion of the side addition to a screened porch. The new porch dimension is to be 38' x 10' with a standing seam metal roof supported by columns. New brick steps will have cheek walls, and the porch will have appropriate wooden hand rails. A window to be eliminated on the side will be bricked in, using a herringbone pattern as a contrast to the existing brick work. Gabled and hipped dormers will be removed from rear elevation and replaced with a shed dormer with a standing seam metal roof. A new first floor gable will tie back to hit the house in middle of the new shed dormer. 1/1 windows will become 6/1. Carriage drive will have brick infill between the tire tracks. Three trees in poor health (per letter from Certified Arborist) and one with a significant lean will be removed. New trees will be planted.

Applicant Comments: Architect John Phares said in addition they plan to remove vinyl on the garage and replace wood siding. New carriage style garage doors will be installed. Ques were taken from other houses in the neighborhood regarding the Colonial Revival columns. The grander 18" columns tie into the streetscape language and appropriately work with the more than eight foot porch depth . Smaller size seemed inadequate.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the proposal meet the applicable guidelines for additions.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines - Additions* Mr. Ristaino made a MOTION to APPROVE as submitted except the columns: 1) Size compatible, 2) Scale - compatible, 3) Fenestration – good change, 4) Rhythm - good, 5) Setbacks - good, 6) Materials match, 7) Landscaping - replant a tree regarding the rear removal with a large maturing canopy tree. Ms. Titus seconded. If plans are revised to show columns that are 10" or 12" staff can approve them.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL,
RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITIONS - APPROVED EXCEPT THE COLUNMS.

Ms. Marshall was out of the room for the next application.

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-012 – 2132 Charlotte Drive – Demolition.

The existing structure a c. 1950 one story duplex. It is listed as a Non-C ontributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. An application for demolition was filed November 2012. A 365-Day Stay of Demolition was placed on the structure. The COA was never requested nor issued.

Proposal

The proposal is to demolish the structure to be replaced with a single family home.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if a 365-Day Stay of Demolition should be placed on the structure or if it should be waived.

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 – Demolition*, Ms. Titus made a MOTION that the house is a contributing structure. . Ms. Yarbrough seconded.

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

 NAYS: HADEN, SULLIVAN

MOTION: Based on *Policy & Design Guidelines – Demolition*, Ms. Titus made a MOTION to impose the maximum 365 Day Stay of Demolition and the Commission will hear the application for New Construction no sooner than 90 days.

DECISION: 365 DAY STAY OF DEMOLITION IMPOSED WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE PLANS FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION WILL BE REVIEWED AFTER 90 DAYS.

Application: HDC 2015-018 – 830 Park Avenue – Addition and Paint Brick.

The existing structure is a c. 1941 one and one half story Bungalow. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register survey. Exterior features include two small gabled dormers and bow window on the left side.

Proposal

The proposal for Commission review is the addition of a shed dormer to the front, enlargement of the rear dormer, a one story rear addition with flanking side porches, windows and door replacement, painting exterior brick and construction of a car port.

The front dormer plan retains the existing dormers and adds a third to the center with a shed roof and additional windows.

A copper roof will be added to the left side bow window. Two windows on the left side toward the rear will be shortened with brick infill.

The rear first floor addition will be clad in brick. The new dormer and extended dormer will tie in below the ridge with wood siding. The garage doors will be carriage style with a new attached car port with wood columns.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the applicable *Policy & Design Guidelines* for **Additions** and if the proposal for painting brick warrants an exception under special circumstances.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Ms. Titus made a MOTION to CONTINUE this application for 1) Detailed drawings to scale - including trim, windows, 2) Photo evidence of similar garages with attached carport, 3) More info re painted brick, 4) Size – good, 5) Scale- good, 6) Massing –

good, 7) Fenestration – good, 8) Landscape – Good, 9) Rhythm – good, 10) Materials – good. Mr. Sullivan seconded.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL,
RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION and PAINTING BRICK CONTINUED.

Ms. Titus had two corrections to the December Minutes: (1) Mr. Ristaino’s name was listed as voting on a case where he was recused, and (2) correct reason for Denial to context and placement (all other criteria met) for 1511 The Plaza. With corrections to be made as indicated, Ms. Titus made a MOTION to APPROVE the minutes. The motion was seconded and the vote was unanimous.

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 pm with a meeting length of five hours and fifty-five minutes.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission
