



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
MINUTES

June 10, 2015

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: NONE

OTHERS PRESENT: Mr. John Howard, 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 June meeting of the Historic District Commission at 1:00 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 2015-007, 2010 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2015-046, 229 E Worthington Avenue	Dilworth

**NEW APPLICATIONS**

HDC 2015-092, 214 N. Graham Street	Fourth Ward
HDC 2015-097, 2006 Dilworth Road E.	Dilworth
HDC 2015-100, 1507 Southwood Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2015-105, 2131 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore
HDC 2015-106, 318 E. Kingston Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2015-107, 1726 S. Mint Street	Wilmore
HDC 2015-109, 1623 S. Mint Street	Wilmore
HDC 2015-111, 2237 Park Road	Dilworth

- 
- **MR. RUMSCH RECUSED HIMSELF DUE TO HAVING COMMUNICATION ON THE DESIGN OF THE PROJECT.**
  - **MR. EGAN RECUSED HIMSELF BECAUSE HE RECEIVED AN ADJACENT PROPERTY NOTIFICATION AND HE ALSO HAD COMMUNICATION WITH THE APPLICANT ABOUT THE PROJECT.**
  - **MR. SULLIVAN RECUSED HIMSELF BECAUSE HE RECEIVED AN ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNER NOTIFICATION.**
- 

**APPLICATION: HDC 2014-007, 2010 THE PLAZA – NEW CONSTRUCTION**

The project was Continued from May for the following items: 1) Traditional building materials, 2) Setback of building 1, 3) Garage orientation on buildings 11-13 and 5, 4) Setback and façade design of building 19, 5) No corner boards on cedar siding.

Existing Conditions

The existing structure at 1926 The Plaza is a 1 story single family home constructed in 1935. Exterior features include two small hipped dormers and a small covered porch on the front. The property at 2010 The Plaza is the Van Landingham Estate, a local historic landmark. The 4 acre property has two accessory buildings with fairly dense landscaping.

Proposal

The proposal is a two part request.

1. Demolition of the structure at 1926 The Plaza.

2. New construction of 19 townhomes, a pool, pool house and other site features.
  - a. Ten units are accessed from The Plaza and face the main house. Six units are accessed from Belvedere Avenue and three units face the main house with access from Thurmond Place.
  - b. Maximum roof peak is approximately 33'-8".
  - c. Proposed material palette is wood, Hardie board siding, synthetic wood (trim), brick, stone and copper (porch roof and gutters).
  - d. Roof details include exposed rafter ends and synthetic wood trim.
  - e. The pool and pool house are accessed from Belvedere Avenue and The Plaza.
  - f. Other site features include landscaping, tree planting, a fence and new driveways and walkways.

*Revised Proposal – May 13, 2015*

1. Site plan includes a landscaping plan with the revised pool location along The Plaza in the front and side yard.
2. Setback (measured from back of curb) along The Plaza is approximately 39', 32' to 33' along Belvedere Avenue and approximately 28' +/- along Thurmond Place.
3. Mechanical units are located internally to the private lots and screened (site plan note).
4. Pool house is a one story structure, traditional materials.
5. Pool deck is decorative concrete or stone. Fencing is decorative aluminum style.
6. Townhouse elevations have been revised, roof pitch changed to 6:12 and height lowered 3'-4'.
7. Window details have been revised.
8. Minor changes to fenestration patterns and roof design.
9. Siding materials are brick, stone and wood. Gable material is 'Hardie-panel'.

*Revised Proposal – June 10, 2015*

1. Primary siding is wood lap with corner boards.
2. The setback along The Plaza increased from approximately 39' to 61'.
3. The corner elevation on Belvedere Avenue has additional fenestration and extended porch (sheet D3).
4. Building 12 on Thurmond Avenue – Sheet C1 shows a one car garage. The other units have two car garages.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

1. The Commission will determine if the 365-Day Stay of Demolition should be applied.
2. The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for new construction.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- Mr. Stewart Gray, Historic Landmarks, spoke in favor
- Mr. Shawn Greeson, Neighborhood Resident, spoke in opposition
- Mr. Cecil Krimminger, Neighborhood Resident, spoke in opposition
- Mr. Damon Rumsch, Neighborhood Resident, spoke in opposition
- Mr. Tom Egan, Neighborhood Resident, spoke in favor

**MOTION:** Based on compliance of *Policy & Design Guidelines New Construction* Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE with revised drawing to staff. The revised drawings will show;

- 1) Windows, doors and trim are to be traditional building materials below 2<sup>nd</sup> floor ceiling,
- 2) Units 11, 12, 13 are approved with no garage and one driveway or one garage door and parking space shall be 2 tire strips with planting between,
- 3) Pool hedge on the Plaza be layered from the sidewalk to the fence,
- 4) Historic trees on Belvedere are retained, 60' oak on lot one is being saved, Holly Hedge on Thurmond is being preserved for buildings 19-14,
- 5) Transoms and sidelights are approved as sash set per project notes on page slide 20 note,
- 6) 2" Charlesluck stone or real stone is approved. Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

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

---

**Application: HDC 2015-080, 229 E. Worthington Avenue – Addition**

The application was Continued from May for the following: 1) Redesign the roof on the rear elevation and garage, 2) Include a Cleveland Avenue side elevation with the both structures, 3) Provide a Sanborn Map to show original floor plan, 4) Traditional windows and materials.

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a 1.5 story Victorian structure at the corner of East Worthington Avenue and Cleveland Avenue. It is listed as a contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places. The proposed use is office (zoned B-1).

Proposal

The proposal is a renovation of the structure including an expansion of the attic, porch addition and reconstruction of a corner tower. A new detached garage is proposed in the rear yard. Other improvements include an outdoor seating area and fence (to be reviewed by staff). Project details include wood siding (lap and shake patterns), wood windows and trim, new eaves and soffits to match existing, new screened porch and a new second floor rear addition.

The proposed garage will have materials complimentary to the principal structure. Total height is +/-23'.

Revised Proposal – June 10, 2015

1. The rear second story roof has been changed to a gable dormer with a small shed roof attached to the side.
2. Plan notes include traditional materials.
3. The Cleveland Avenue elevation is included.
4. The front elevation of the garage roof has been redesigned to a gable flanked by shed dormers.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for additions and accessory buildings (Garages).

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- Chris Hudson Neighborhood Resident spoke in favor.

**MOTION:** Based on compliance of *Policy & Design Guidelines Additions and accessory structure* - Mr. Sullivan made a MOTION to APPROVE as submitted. Mr. Duffy seconded.

VOTE: 11/0

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

NAYS: NONE

**Application: HDC 2015-100– 1507 Southwood Avenue – New Construction**

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a one story ranch style home constructed in 1936. The surrounding context is a variety of one and two story home. Across the street is a commercial structure. The 365 Day Stay of Demolition was approved by the HDC on March 11, 2015.

Proposal

The proposal is a new 1.5 story single family house and detached garage. Features of the house include a full brick façade, front and rear shed dormers, wood trim and wood windows. The front setback will match the existing house. The height from finished floor to the ridge is approximately 27'-11".

**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 meets the guidelines for new construction.

**MOTION:** Based on non-compliance of *Policy & Design Guidelines New Construction* – Ms. Titus made a MOTION to DENY this application because it did not meet the following guidelines on page 34 for New Construction. 1) Scale – The height of the home is substantially taller than most of the homes on the block, 2) Fenestration – the windows on the side elevations are out of scale with the façade, 3) Context – the two story design is out of context with the block of one story houses. Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 10/1

AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, SULLIVAN, TITUS

NAYS: BENDER

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION DENIED.**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2015-105, 2131 Wilmore Drive – Addition**

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a one story cottage ranch style duplex constructed in 1940. The surrounding context is a similar variety of 1 and 1.5 story homes.

Proposal

The proposal is a conversion to a single family house including an addition of columns and roof over the front porch, new windows, removal of a tree in the front yard and removal of chimneys. Other improvements are a new driveway, sidewalk and a new tree planted further from the house in the front yard. Porch columns are brick with wood posts. Trim materials and window are wood.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for additions.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

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

**MOTION:** Based on compliance of *Policy & Design Guidelines Additions* – Mr. Bender made a MOTION to APPROVE with revised drawings to staff. The revised drawings will show, 1) All details to match existing, 2) All materials to be traditional, 3) preserve the two chimneys at the rear of home, 4) Provide staff with column details, 5) Show the location of the AC units at rear. Mr. Haden seconded.

**VOTE:** 7/4                    AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RUMSCH,

NAYS: DUFFY, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, TITUS

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

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2015-106, 318 E. Kingston Avenue– Addition**

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a 2.5 story Four Square house constructed in 1910 and listed as a contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places.

Proposal

The proposal is the removal of the stone archway and columns, and the replacement of wood columns on the front porch. The new wood columns will be 10” round Tuscan style.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for additions.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- Chris Hudson neighborhood resident spoke in opposition.
- Adjacent property owner spoke in favor.

**MOTION:** Based on the need for additional information Ms. Titus made a MOTION to CONTINUE for documentation showing the stone arch is original to the house or was it implemented in the 1940’s. Mr. Sullivan seconded.

**VOTE:** 10/1                    AYES: BENDER, DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO,  
RUMSCH, SULLIVAN, TITUS

NAYS: CORBUS

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2015-107 – 1726 S. Mint Street - Addition**

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a one story cottage style house constructed in 1940 at the corner of South Mint Street and West Boulevard. Adjacent structures include a quadraplex and one story cottage type houses.

Proposal

The proposal is the addition of a shed dormer on the left side, new porch columns and handrails. The dormer will have wood windows and lap siding.

**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 meets the guidelines for additions.

**MOTION:** Based on the need for additional information Mr. Bender made a MOTION to CONTINUE for: 1) remove 5.1 transom window, 2) column and window details, 3) back shed cover removed, 4) push dormer back on first floor one foot. Mr. Haden seconded.

**VOTE:** 11/0                      AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL,  
RISTAINO, RUMSCH, SULLIVAN, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2015-109, 1623 S. Mint Street – Addition**

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a 1.5 story Bungalow style house constructed in 2007. Materials include cementitious siding and trim, and vinyl double hung windows. Adjacent homes are one story Bungalows constructed in the 1930’s.

Proposal

The proposal is a two and three story rear addition and renovation of the existing garage (not visible from the street). Proposed materials, windows and trim will match existing. Other improvements include a metal gate and landscape features in the rear yard. The total height above the existing ridge line is approximately +/-15 feet.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for additions.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

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

**MOTION:** Based on non-compliance of **Policy & Design Guidelines Additions**, Ms. Titus made a MOTION to DENY this application for Size, Scale, Massing, Context and item #3 on page 36 that states all additions to the front or side of existing properties must be of a design that is sensitive to the character and massing of the existing structure, noting Zoutewelle survey slide 150 showing streetscape with existing homes at 25’. Ms. Marshall seconded.

**VOTE:** 11/0                      AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL,  
RISTAINO, RUMSCH, SULLIVAN, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION DENIED.**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2015-111, 2237 Park Road – Addition**

This application was denied in May because of massing of the roof and rear addition. The Historic District Commission will determine if the application has been substantially redesigned before proceeding with the hearing.

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a one story Bungalow constructed in 1926. It is listed as a contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places. The proposed use is office (zoned O-2). Adjacent structures are a mix of one and two story structures.

Proposal

The proposal is a second story addition toward the rear and within the existing building footprint, the removal of two chimneys and a front dormer addition. Project details include wood siding (lap and cedar shake), wood windows and trim, and roof details to match existing.

**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 of *Policy & Design Guidelines Additions* Ms. Titus made a MOTION to APPROVE with the condition that left side rear chimney be extended and kept per code requirements. (Staff can approve the chimney). Mr. Rumsch seconded.

**VOTE:** 11/0                      AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL,  
RISTAINO, RUMSCH, SULLIVAN, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2015-092, 214 N. Graham Street – Addition/Landscaping**

Existing Conditions

The existing site is a surface parking lot at the corner of North Graham Street and West 5<sup>th</sup> Street. The existing concrete block retaining wall is failing and needs to be replaced.

Proposal

The proposal is a new retaining wall constructed of modular concrete block. Retaining walls can be approved administratively if traditional materials are used.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The Commission will determine if an exception is appropriate for this proposal.



**FOR/AGAINST:**

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

**MOTION:** Based on non-compliance of *Policy & Design Guidelines Landscaping and Site Features, page 60*, Mr. Haden made a MOTION to DENY this application for Materials and Landscaping. Certain modern materials for landscape and site features are not allowed without the approval of HDC, 1) Interlocking concrete block, 2) Treated landscaping timbers, 3) Railroad ties, 4) Pre-fabricated lattice. Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 10/1                    AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, SULLIVAN, TITUS

NAYS: BENDER

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR LANDSCAPING AND SITE FEATURES DENIED.**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2015-097, 2006 Dilworth Road E. – New Brick Steps/Splayed Sidewalls**

Existing Conditions

The existing site has a two story Colonial Revival home slightly elevated above the sidewalk and set back approximately 50 feet from the sidewalk. The existing walkway does not connect to the sidewalk.

Proposal

The proposal is a new walkway extending from the sidewalk to the house with new steps and columns.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The Commission will determine if the proposal is complimentary to the context of the streetscape.

**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 1) pier is too tall, 2) light fixture is not clear, 3) Pier cap not specified. Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 11/0                    AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, SULLIVAN, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION NEW BRICK STEPS/SPLAYED SIDEWALLS CONTINUED.**

---

A motion was made to approve the May 2015 minutes with revisions from Ms. Titus.

---

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 pm with a meeting length of 5 hours and 30 minutes.

---

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission.