



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES

March 11, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Tim Bender
Mr. Don Duffy
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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Dr. Lili Corbus
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. Thomas Powers, Assistant City Attorney
Court Reporters

Chairman Egan called to order the Regular March meeting of the Historic District Commission at 1:05 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.

Ms. Titus made a MOTION to APPROVE the February 11, 2015 with two revisions: Change MOTION to Continue and note the Wesley Heights multi-family project has specific window approval.

Index of Addresses:

CONTINUED APPLICATIONS

HDC 2014-252, 1309 Lexington Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2015-268, 1712 Euclid Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2015-026, 1926 Woodcrest Avenue	Wilmore

NEW APPLICATIONS

HDC 2015-030, 316 W. Park Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2015-034, 601 N. Pine Street	Fourth Ward
HDC 2015-039, 1211 East Boulevard	Dilworth
HDC 2015-043, 1507 Southwood Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2015-047, 1134 Liganore Place	Dilworth

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2014-252, 1309 LEXINGTON AVENUE – ADDITION

This application was continued from January for more information on the column material. This revised application does not include changes to the front dormers.

The existing c. 1953 structure is a one story home. It is listed as a Non-Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. The home has stone trim around the entrance, a front facing gable, and twin dormers.

The proposal for Commission review is an addition of a porch roof supported by columns. The 10” columns are made of ‘Durastone’, a non-traditional material.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission shall determine if the proposal meets the applicable guidelines for additions, and if the proposed non-traditional building material is appropriate.

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

Applicant Comments: Contractor John Harmon explained that the columns, once painted, will look and feel like wood and will be more durable.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions*, Mr. Ristaino made a MOTION to APPROVE with revised drawings and notes to staff. 1’X6’ lapped siding in the new pediment. Massing, Size, Fenestration, Rhythm are all OK. Setback is not applicable. A friendly amendment was accepted that explained the exception was being made for a substitute material due to the Non-Contributing status of the house. Mr. Lenhart seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: BENDER, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO,
SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW ADDITION APPROVED WITH REVISED DRAWINGS TO STAFF.

APPLICATION: HDC 2014-268, 1712 Euclid Avenue – New Construction

Based on the need for additional information this application was Continued from February. Further design study is needed for Massing, Fenestration and Rhythm.

The existing site is a vacant interior lot located in the block bounded by East Boulevard, Cleveland Avenue, East Kingston Avenue and Euclid Avenue with alleyways on three sides. The site is zoned B-1 (PED). Primary access to the site will be provided through an easement across 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.

The proposal is the construction of a two story quadruplex. 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.

Revised Proposal – February 14, 2015

1. Building height revised to be similar to adjacent buildings on East Boulevard.

2. Roof pitch lowered from 12/12 to 10/12.

Revised Proposal – March 11, 2015

1. Roof massing has been modified.
2. Fenestration on southeast elevation has been redesigned.
3. An additional 5' has been added to the rear yard (facing single family) and building size reduced 5'.

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

FOR/AGAINST: Adjacent Property Owner Ellen Citarella spoke in opposition to the project.
Adjacent Property Owner Trish Boyd spoke in opposition to the project.
Adjacent Property Owner Steve Citarella spoke in opposition to the project.
Adjacent Property Owner Kemper Boyd spoke in opposition to the project.
Neighborhood Resident Marcia Rouse spoke in opposition to the project.
Neighborhood Resident John Phares spoke in opposition to the project.
Adjacent Property Owner Diane St. John had questions.

Applicant Comments: Developer Jason McArthur stated he was asked to make a number of changes: Height is lowered by 5', added shed roofs, added gables and reduced the footprint.

MOTION: Based the need for additional information Ms. Titus made a MOTION to CONTINUE for further design study re: 1) Landscaping in parking area, 2) Balcony deck and column design, 4) Roof design. Mr. Duffy seconded.

VOTE: 8/2 AYES: BENDER, DUFFY, HADEN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, TITUS, SULLIVAN, YARBROUGH

NAYS: EGAN, LENHART

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONINUED FOR FURTHER DESIGN STUDY AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.

Mr. Sullivan was out of the room for the next application.

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-026, 1926 Woodcrest Avenue – Addition

This application was continued from February for more information.

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 and new front entrance that faces the street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the applciable *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. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE with revised drawings to staff. The revised drawings will show 1) Evenly spaced roof brackets, 2) Barge rafter design more prominent, 3) Shutters removed or drawn appropriately, and 4) Window sill dimensioned accurately. Size, Scale, Massing, Materials, Landscape, Fenestration meet the guidelines. Mr. Haden seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: BENDER, DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, TITUS,
 YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

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

Mr. Sullivan was out of the room for the next application.

Mr. Ristaino declared a conflict of interest as an owner of an adjacent property and removed himself from the Commission for the next application.

Application: HDC 2015-018, 316 W. Park Avenue – Addition

The existing structure is a c. 1931 one story bungalow with traditional details and full side gable roof. Existing height is approximately 20'-6". Adjacent homes are one and two story bungalows.

The existing roof plane will be continued to accommodate a rear two story addition with a ridge height of approximately 24'-1". Siding on the new addition will be wood lap. Windows will be wood STDL, vinyl clad with wood trim. The applicant is also requesting the removal of a rear, secondary chimney that is not visible from the street. The front elevations will be preserved with the additional roof expanse being the only change.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for additions. The guideline for setback does not apply.

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 for further design study of: 1) Roofline, 2) Massing, 3) Fenestration, 4) Rhythm, and 5) Context. Size, Scale and Materials meet the guidelines. Ms. Yarbrough seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: BENDER, DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, TITUS,
 YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-039, 1211 East Boulevard – Demolition.

The existing structure is a c. 1925, 2.5 story brick 'Picturesque Revival' style home. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. The dwelling is on the edge of both the Dilworth National Register Neighborhood and the Local Historic District. It is adjacent to the Kenilworth Commons shopping center and two contributing residential structures.

The proposal is the demolition of the subject property for a parking lot. Harris Teeter intends to use the lot for employee parking.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the maximum '365-Day Stay of Demolition' should be applied. Or, if the Commission determines that this property is no longer contributing, then demolition may take place without a delay.

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

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

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

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 the landscape and screening plans no sooner than 90 days.

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

NAYS: NONE

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-043, 1507 Southwood Avenue – Demolition

The existing structure is a c. 1936 one story ranch style home located at the edge of the Wilmore Local Historic District. The surrounding context is a variety of one and two story homes and commercial structures.

The proposal is the demolition of the subject property. The applicant is requesting immediate approval for demolition based on the deteriorated condition of the house.

RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the house is a contributing structure to the Wilmore Local Historic District and may apply up to a 365 Day Stay of Demolition. Or, if the Commission determines that this property is no longer contributing, demolition may take place without a delay or with a lesser delay.

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

MOTION: Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to recognize the subject property as a Contributing structure to the Wilmore Local Historic District. Ms. Marshall seconded.

Applicant Comments: Architect Angie Lauer said the structural report discovered that the brick is not fastened to the walls and there are no footings. She asked that demolition be allowed to proceed and that the 90 day no hear rule be waived. With the work that would be required it would amount to a virtual teardown.

MOTION: Based on context, building materials, siting, age, Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to recognize the house as Contributing.

VOTE: 9/1 AYES: BENDER, DUFFY, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO,
SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: EGAN

MOTION: Based on *Policy & Design Guidelines - Demolition*. Mr. Bender made a MOTION to impose the maximum 365 Day Stay of Demolition and the Commission will hear the application for New Construction any time – waiving the 90 day no hear rule.

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: 365 DAY STAY OF DEMOLITION IMPOSED. NEW CONSTRUCTION PLANS WILL BE REVIEWED AT THE APPLICANT’S CHOICE.

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-034 – 601 N. Pine Street– Solar Panels Addition

The existing structure is a c. 1900 one and one half story Victorian style home. It is located on the corner of North Pine Street and West 9th Street in Fourth Ward.

The proposal is the addition of 10-13 solar panels on three south facing roof planes. The application states a crape myrtle would be removed if “Array Deck 1” panels are approved. The panels are designed to be mounted flat on the roof. This roof plane faces 9th Street.

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 solar panel design and location meets the guidelines for additions. The guideline for setback does not apply.

MOTION: Based the need for additional information on the West 9th Street panels and tree removal Mr. Bender made a MOTION to CONTINUE for further design study and clarification. Otherwise, the solar panel location on the other roof planes is not substantially visible and can be approved by staff. Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 10/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR SOLAR PANELS CONTINUED FOR FURTHER DESIGN STUDY AND CLARIFICATION.

Mr. Ristaino declared a conflict of interest and removed himself from the Commission for the next application.

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-047, 1134 LINGANORE PLACE - ADDITION

The existing structure is a c. 1930, 2.5 story Colonial Revival home identified as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. The home was recently severely damaged by two trees falling on the house. The plan is to rebuild and make renovations.

The following is a summary of exterior improvements:

1. Reconstruction of front porch
2. Addition of brick row lock between the first and second floor and along the foundation
3. Addition of detailed cornices
4. New wood eave brackets
5. Brick siding to replace wood siding on right side extension
6. New windows in third floor side gables
7. Rear fenestration changes and third floor dormer addition

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for additions. The guideline for setback does not apply.

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/Renovation*, Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE with revised drawings and notes to staff. The revised drawings will show 1) Fenestration/rhythm changes, 2) Boxing to match existing, 3) Soldier course will be added above every header, 4) Whitewash brick, 5) Siding to match or brick, 6) Shutter sizes appropriate or remove, 7) Raise chimney with existing details. Mr. Haden seconded.

VOTE: 8/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW ADDITION APPROVED WITH REVISED DRAWINGS TO STAFF.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm with a meeting length of 4 hours and 55 minutes.
