



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES

October 14, 2015

- MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Tim Bender
Dr. Lili Corbus
Mr. Don Duffy
Mr. James Haden
Mr. Rodric Lenhart
Mr. Nasif Majeed
Ms. Mattie Marshall
Mr. Dominick Ristaino, Vice-Chair
Ms. Claire Stephens
Ms. Tamara Titus, Second Vice Chair
- MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Tom Egan, Chair person
Mr. Damon Rumsch
- OTHERS PRESENT: Mr. John Howard, Administrator
Historic District Commission
Ms. Wanda Birmingham, Staff
Historic District Commission
Ms. Kristina Harpst, Staff
Historic District Commission
Ms. Linda Keich, Clerk to the
Historic District Commission
Mr. Thomas Powers, Assistant City Attorney
Court Reporters

In Chairman Egan’s absence, Vice Chairman Ristaino called to order the Regular October meeting of the Historic District Commission at 1:02 pm. He began the meeting by introducing the Staff and Commissioners and explaining the meeting procedure. All interested parties planning to give testimony – FOR or AGAINST – must complete 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. 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. 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. 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.

- Mr. Howard reminded all that the HDC Retreat will be held on November 3. We will meet in the Mahlon Adams center in Freedom Park at 9:00 am and stay until 1:00. The consultant team will introduce themselves and meet the Commission.
- Mr. Howard introduced the new HDC member who holds the Planning Commission seat. He is Nasif Majeed, former City Council member and now a Planning Commission member.

Index of Addresses:

CONTINUED APPLICATIONS

HDC 2015-145, 1708 Thomas Avenue Plaza Midwood

NEW APPLICATIONS

HDC 2015-208, 1508/1510 S. Mint Street	Wilmore
HDC 2015-211, 1465 Haywood Court	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2015-209, 715 E. Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2015-214, 1224 East Boulevard	Dilworth

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-145 – 1708 THOMAS AVENUE – ADDITION

This application was continued from September for additional information and further design study.

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1930 one story Bungalow. Architectural features include a low gable roof with front shed dormer and full width porch. Adjacent structures are one, one and one half, and two story dwellings.

Proposal

The proposal is a second story addition. The front dormer would be removed and replaced with a larger shed dormer.

Revised Proposal – September 9, 2015

Revisions to the previous plans include the following:

1. The front dormer addition has been changed to match the rear shed dormer.

Revised Proposal – October 14, 2015

1. The overall height has been reduced.
2. The second story window on the right side has been changed to a casement window.
3. Siding materials are wood with trim details to match existing

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for Size, Scale, Massing, Fenestration, Rhythm, Materials and Context.

FOR/AGAINST:

- No one accepted Mr. Ristaino’s invitation to speak either for or against the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines - Additions*, Mr. Majeed made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the addition. Friendly amendment made by Ms. Titus and accepted by Mr. Majeed - revised drawings will show the hinge point of the rear shed dormer dropped 6” from the ridge. Mr. Duffy seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 **AYES:** BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, HADEN, LENHART, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: ADDITION APPROVED WITH REVISION.

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-208, 1508/1510 SOUTH MINT STREET– RENOVATION/ADDITION

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a one story commercial building at the corner of South Mint Street and West Summit Avenue. The original building was constructed in 1926, and later additions were constructed in 1931. Several façade changes have occurred over the years including the addition and removal of doors and windows. The corner building features a mitered corner entrance, framed by columns and clay tiles on the roof edge. Existing masonry is painted or has a stucco coat.

Proposal

The proposal is a façade renovation which includes new windows, doors, and signage. Existing stucco will be removed to expose the original masonry. Existing doors and windows will be replaced in some areas to unify the entire building. A small canopy is proposed along the street sides. New exterior material on one section will be wood and existing masonry will be repainted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The HDC will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for Fenestration, Rhythm, Materials and Context.

FOR/AGAINST:

- Neighborhood Resident Nathan Gray spoke generally in favor of the application but with some concerns.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information and further design study, Mr. Bender made **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application. Revised drawings will show, 1) Example for garage door, 2) Revisit the choice of metal on the Summit elevation, 3) Explore keeping the corner roof element/entrance detail, 4) Middle building on Mint Street to drop below the building on the right, keeping the individual building look. Ms. Stephens seconded.

VOTE: 10/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: RENOVATION/ADDITION CONTINUED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-211 – 1465 HAYWOOD COURT – NEW CONSTRUCTION

A proposal for new construction on this property was denied on August 12, 2015. The basis for denial was inappropriate Size, Scale and Massing. The applicant has submitted a new application for review. The Commission will determine if the project has been substantially redesigned in order to be heard and now meets the guidelines for new construction.

MOTION: Mr. Ristaino made a MOTION to hear the application based on substantially changed plans. Ms. Stephens seconded.

7/3

AYES: BENDER, DUFFY, LENHART, MAJEED, RISTAINO, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: HADEN, MARSHALL, CORBUS

Existing Conditions

The existing site is the same large vacant parcel at the end of Haywood Court and is the edge of the Plaza Midwood Historic District. An original house was in serious disrepair and demolished several years ago. The front of the lot is angled and the width is approximately 87'-6". The four adjacent structures on the street are one and one and one half story homes. Adjacent to this lot is a large vacant tract of land which is outside the boundaries of the Plaza Midwood Local Historic District. On the other side of Haywood Court, leading down to the end of the street, are the back yards of houses facing another street and are outside the Plaza Midwood Local Historic District boundaries. The grade drops from the front to back and from right to left.

Proposal

The proposal is a new two story single family house and detached garage. Features of the house include a front porch, wood and cedar shake siding, wood trim details, brick foundation, and clad STDL windows.

Summary of revisions include the following:

- Elevation drawings that show the change in grade.
- Front setback has been reduced.
- Increase in rear yard area.
- Height has been reduced.
- Width has been reduced.
- Front porch width has been reduced.
- The right side elevation includes an additional window toward the front and full double hung windows on the second story.
- Reduction of the garage to one story.

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

FOR/AGAINST:

Adjacent property owner Kelly Scherer spoke in favor of the application but had concerns regarding HVAC placement.

MOTION: Based on non-compliance to **Policy & Design Guidelines – New Construction** - Ms. Titus made a **MOTION to DENY** this application for 1) Scale, Context, Materials, 2) Slide 29 – the house is 3”-6” taller than the neighbor to the right and will overshadow all 3 homes on the Zoutwelle survey, 3) No exception warranted to non-traditional building materials –maintenance only. Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 7/3

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

NAYS: BENDER, MAJEED, STEPHENS

DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE FAMILY HOUSE DENIED.

MS. TAMARA TITUS RECUSED HERSELF FROM THE NEXT APPLICATION BECAUSE SHE RECEIVED AN ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNER NOTIFICATION.

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-209, 715 EAST WORTHINGTON AVENUE – SECOND FLOOR ADDITION

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1925 one story Bungalow. Exterior features include traditional design details such as cedar shake siding, exposed rafter tails, a centered front gable over the porch and eave brackets. Adjacent houses on the block are a variety of 1, 1.5 and 2 story homes.

Proposal

The proposal is the addition of a cross gable dormer toward the rear of the house and rear first floor addition. The height of the new gable is approximately 2 feet taller than the existing ridge. A new rear facing gable will tie below new ridge. Window trim, exterior materials, soffit design and other architectural details will compliment or match existing.

Applicant Comments: Architect Allen Brooks explained that the upstairs rooms are not useful. The goal is to bring back details and function that has been lost in past renovations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The HDC will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for Size, Scale, Massing, Fenestration, Rhythm, Materials and Context.

FOR/AGAINST:

- Adjacent Property Owner Tamara Titus spoke in favor with some concern over the side gable execution.

MOTION: Based on compliance with **Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions**, Mr. Duffy made a **MOTION to APPROVE** with revised drawings 1) to document the 50/50 rear yard calculation. 2) HVAC units screened in the side yard, or 3) HVAC located in rear. Mr. Majeed seconded.

VOTE: 9/0

AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, HADEN, LENHART, MAJEED, MARSHALL,
RISTAINO, STEPHENS

NAYS: NONE

DR. CORBUS LEFT AT 4:45 PM AND WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-214, 1244 EAST BOULEVARD – FRONT DORMER ADDITION/FRONT FAÇADE CHANGES

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1926 two story building. The current use is office and has been for a number of years. The existing façade is painted brick. Several fenestration changes and additions have been made over the years prior to the establishment of the Dilworth Local Historic District.

Proposal

The proposal is a group of changes to the façade and some site work. Front façade changes include the addition of shutters, removal of an existing window opening, addition of a hipped dormer on the front below the ridge, extension of a brick wall on the right side with a new arched entrance through the wall. Changes to the right side include a new door and deck expansion. Changes to the left elevation are the addition of a new sign and windows. Site work includes the removal of a mature tree in the rear yard, brick sidewalk, and bluestone porch decking. The applicant is requesting cementitious siding on the new front gable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The HDC will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for Fenestration, Rhythm, Materials and Context.

FOR/AGAINST:

- No one accepted Mr. Ristaino's invitation to speak either for or against.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions*, Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show 1) Signage within *Policy & Design Guidelines*, 2) Deck rails to match existing, 3) Add a large maturing canopy tree, 3) shutters for the 2nd floor should be sized appropriately with hinges and shutter dogs, 4) maintain second story windows with an exception of one that will be removed on the side elevation, 5) dormer siding material will be traditional wood, 6) wood or wood clad dormer window will have muntins and traditional casing. Mr. Bender seconded.

VOTE: 7/2

AYES: BENDER, DUFFY, HADEN, MAJEED, RISTAINO
STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: LENHART, MARSHALL

DECISION: DORMER ADDITION/FAÇADE CHANGES APPROVED WITH REVISED PLANS FOR STAFF APPROVAL.

Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the August and September minutes with amendments. The vote was unanimous.

Ms. Marshall made a MOTION to APPROVE the Lyndhurst letter written by Ms. Titus. The vote was unanimous.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 pm with a meeting length of 4 hours and 45 minutes.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission.