



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES

February 11, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dr. Lili Corbus
Mr. Don Duffy
Mr. Tom Egan, Chair
Mr. James Haden
Mr. Dominick Ristaino, Vice Chair
Ms. Tamara Titus, Second Vice Chair

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Tim Bender
Mr. Rodric Lenhardt
Ms. Mattie Marshall
Mr. Michael Sullivan
Ms. Lisa Yarbrough
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. Daniel Peterson, Assistant City Attorney
Court Reporters

Chairman Egan called to order the Regular February 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 to the Commission. The Commission will first determine if there is sufficient information to proceed with the hearing. If continuing, Commissioners and the applicants will then discuss the project. Audience members signed up to speak FOR or AGAINST will be called to the podium. Presentations by the applicants and audience members must be concise and focused on 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. 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. During discussion and deliberation only the Commission and staff may speak. The Commission may vote to reopen this part of the meeting for questions, comments, or clarification to the application and audience members. Once the review is completed, a MOTION will be made to Approve, Deny, or Continue the review of the application at a future meeting. The majority vote of the Commission members present is required for a decision to be reached. 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, that should 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 2014-268 1712 Euclid Avenue Dilworth

HDC 2015-018 830 Park Avenue Dilworth

NEW APPLICATIONS

HDC 2015-028 708 Mt. Vernon Avenue Dilworth

HDC 2014-273 245 W. Kingston Avenue Wilmore

HDC 2015-011 512 E. Tremont Avenue Dilworth

HDC 2015-026 1926 Woodcrest Avenue Wilmore

HDC 2015-027 Wesley Heights Townhomes Wesley Heights

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

Based on the need for additional information – Current accurate site plan with proposed and existing landscaping, and overall study regarding scale and context – this application was recently continued.

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 many years if not always. The site is zoned B-1(PED). Primary access to the site will be provided through a parking lot 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. The plan is to create a carriage house looking building 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"

5. Exterior materials are cedar shake and wood lap siding
6. Windows are wood.

Revised Proposal – January 14, 2015

1. Building and open space area calculation provided
2. Building height recalculated
3. Wall section and fenestration details provided
4. Shutters removed
5. Tree replacement/protection plan revised.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission shall determine if the revised proposal meets the ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** for new construction.

FOR/AGAINST: Adjacent Property Owner Kemper Boyd spoke in opposition.
Adjacent Property Owner Trish Boyd spoke in opposition
Neighborhood Resident Marcia Rouse spoke in opposition.
Neighborhood Resident Steve Cigarillo spoke in opposition.
Neighborhood Resident John Phares spoke in opposition.

MOTION: Based the need for additional information Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to CONTINUE for further design study re: 1) Massing, 2) Fenestration - south elevation more articulated, 3) South elevation needs more articulation. Rhythm, setback, material, context, and landscaping are OK. Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 4/2 AYES: DUFFY, HADEN, RISTAINO, TITUS

NAYS: CORBUS, EGAN

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED.

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

Based on the need for additional information this application was recently continued for 1) Detailed drawings to scale - including trim, windows, 2) Photo evidence of similar garages with attached carport, and more info re painted 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 carport.

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 carport with wood columns.

Revised Proposal – February 11, 2015

The drawings have been revised with additional details and new photographs of the existing structure and adjacent structures.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the applicable guidelines for additions and if the proposal for painting brick warrants an exception under special circumstances. The Guideline for 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*, Dr. Corbus made a MOTION to APPROVE as submitted with the caveat that the approval to paint the brick is not part of the approval and the front dormer ends must match existing. Mr. Duffy seconded

VOTE: 6/0 AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, RISTAINO, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-028 – 708 Mt. Vernon Avenue – Porch Column Addition.

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. An addition was recently approved with staff given the ability to approve 10” or 12” porch columns. The applicant is seeking approval for 14” columns.

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*, Ms. Titus made a MOTION to APPROVE as submitted. Mr. Haden seconded

VOTE: 6/0 AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, RISTAINO, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR 14” PORCH COLUMNS ADDITION APPROVED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-026 1926 Woodcrest Avenue – Addition

The existing structure is a c. 1951 one story home. Exterior features include a side porch and a covered front entrance with a front door that does not face the street.

The proposal is the addition of a front facing gable with cedar shakes, enclosure of the side porch, new wood siding, new windows and trim, new front door that faces the street.

STAFF 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 the need for additional information regarding plans with materials and dimensions clearly noted, Mr. Egan made a MOTION to CONTINUE this application. Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, RISTAINO, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.

Mr. Ristaino announced that he received an Adjacent Property Owner notification for rental property that he owns. He stated that he is unbiased and can review the evidence. No one objected to Mr. Ristaino remaining on the Commission.

APPLICATION: HDC 2014-273 245 W. Kingston Avenue – Fence

The existing front yard is located approximately five or six feet above sidewalk level. A brick retaining wall is the front edge of this property.

The proposal is the installation of a six foot tall aluminum fence around the front yard to prevent dogs and children from falling over. The fence would be atop to the retaining wall. Existing steps will remain.

RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if an exception to the *Policy & Design Guidelines – Fences is warranted*.

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

MOTION: Based the need for additional information, Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to CONTINUE the application. Revised plans will show: 1) Accurate topo, 2) Accurate exhibit, 3) Section through stairs, 4) Any evidence of similar conditions nearby. Mr. Haden seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, TITUS, RISTAINO

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR FENCE CONTINUED

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-011 – 512 East Tremont Avenue – Demolition.

The c. 1930 existing structure is listed as Contributing in the Dilworth National Register Survey. It is a one story duplex with a projecting entry, carport, and side porch. This house exists in an area with past water problems. A duplex old convergence underground repair caused the City to have to tear off part of the house in the past. The established setback of older homes along the block face is approximately 20 to 23 feet from back of curb.

The proposal is a demolition of the structure and construction of a new single family home. Features of the new home include a full width front porch, front facing dormer, exposed rafter ends, traditional materials, wood windows and overall height of approximate 34’.

FOR/AGAINST: Realtor Shannon Lynch Realtor spoke in favor of the demolition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will make a determination as to whether or not this house is determined to be contributing to the Dilworth Local Historic. With affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to 365 Day Stay of Demolition. Or if the Commission determines that this property is no longer contributing, then demolition may take place without a delay.

MOTION: Based on the National Register information, materials, and siting of house, Ms. Titus made a MOTION that the subject property is a Contributing structure to the Dilworth Local Historic District. Mr. Ristaino seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, RISTAINO, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

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.

VOTE: 6/0 AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, RISTAINO, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: 365 DAY STAY OF DEMOLITION IMPOSED. NEW CONSTRUCTION PLANS WILL NOT BE HEARD ANY SOONER THAN 90 DAYS.

Applicant for the next application and past Chair of the Historic District Commission asked that the Commission have a moment of silence to remember former Commissioner Brad Stafford who recently passed.

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-027 – Wesley Heights Townhomes – New Construction.

The site is mostly vacant with the exception of a two story brick quadraplex at 131 Grandin Road. The site is relatively flat but with a higher elevation on South Summit Avenue. Mature trees exist along the edges of the site. Adjacent land uses include commercial along West Trade Street, multi-family and single family development, and a prominent church building at 201 Grandin Road.

Applicant Comments: Architect Mark Fishero pointed out that this plan preserves the existing quad. All new perimeter buildings front the street. Front doors face each other on interior buildings. Each unit has its own front door.

The proposal is for the construction of 44 townhomes. Design features include:

Consistent setbacks with adjacent structures.

Centralized open spaces

Brick façade and walls on the lower levels

Non-traditional siding and trim

Exposed rafter ends and wood brackets

Overall height approximately 39'-10".

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the *Policy & Design Guidelines* for New Construction.

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. Duffy made a MOTION to CONTINUE this application for further design study regarding: 1) Scale – buildings 9 and 11, 2) Massing - building 9 and 11 rooflines, 3) Fenestration - end elevation on buildings 9 and 11, 4) Rhythm - buildings 9 and 11, 5) Materials - traditional, 6) Context -buildings 9, 10 and 11 regarding the corners. NOTE: Size, landscaping, and setbacks are fine. Mr. Haden seconded

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, RISTAINO, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION CONTINUED FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND FURTHER DESIGN STUDY.

A MOTION was made, seconded, and the vote was unanimous to approve the January Minutes.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm with a meeting length of four hours and 55 minutes.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission
