



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES
January 13, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Don Duffy
Mr. Tom Egan, Chair
Mr. James Haden
Mr. Rodric Lenhart
Mr. Nasif Majeed
Ms. Mattie Marshall
Mr. Dominick Ristaino, Vice-Chair
Mr. Damon Rumsch
Ms. Claire Stephens
Ms. Tamara Titus, Second Vice Chair

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Tim Bender
Dr. Lili Corbus

OTHERS PRESENT: Mr. John Howard, Administrator
Historic District Commission
Ms. Kristi Harpst, Staff
Historic District Commission
Ms. Wanda Birmingham, Staff
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 January meeting of the Historic District Commission at 1:06 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 submit 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 decision 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: **APPLICATIONS CARRIED OVER FROM DECEMBER**

HDC 2015-256, 1829 S. Mint Street	Wilmore
HDC 2015-257, 1816 Wickford Place	Wilmore
HDC 2015-261, 1815 Wickford Place	Wilmore

CONTINUED APPLICATIONS

HDC 2015-141, 220 W. 10 th Street	Fourth Ward
HDC 2015-250, 700 S. Summit Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDC 2015-266, 601 E. Kingston Avenue	Dilworth

NEW APPLICATIONS

HDC 2015-282, 1556 Merriman Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2015-286, 420 S. Summit Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDC 2015-278, 1465 Haywood Court	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2015-243, 524 E. Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2015-280, 1325 Dilworth Road	Dilworth
HDC 2015-281, 804 E. Kingston Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2015-287, 525 East Boulevard	Dilworth
HDC 2015-290, 715 E. Worthington Avenue	Dilworth

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-256, 1829 S. MINT STREET, REAR ADDITION

Existing Conditions

Existing is a c. 1954 one story house at the corner of South Mint Street and West Worthington Avenue in the Wilmore neighborhood. Adjacent residential structures are single family and multi-family.

Proposal

Proposed is a one story addition to the rear and the addition of a new side entry. New ridge will tie below existing ridge. The front elevation will not change. An existing window on the right side will be replaced with a smaller paired window. Design details (including window configuration, doors, roof form, soffit/fascia treatment, overhang, etc.) and materials (including windows, siding, foundation, roofing, etc.) will match existing.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the applicable guidelines for additions.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood resident P. J. Henningson spoke in support of the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions***, Mr. Ristaino made a **MOTION to APPROVE** with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show HVAC on the left side away from the street view with additional screening, and the existing front curb cut and apron removed. Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 **AYES:** DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MAJEED, RUMSCH
RISTAINO, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPROVED WITH REVISED DRAWINGS TO STAFF FOR PROBABLE APPROVAL.

-
- **MR. MAJEED LEFT THE MEETING AT 1:26.**
 - **MR. RISTAINO DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HIMSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**
-

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-257– 1816 WICKFORD PLACE – DEMOLITION

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1938 one story single family house. The parcel is zoned R-43 Multi-Family and is approximately .34 acres. Adjacent properties are multi-family and single family residences. The applicant has submitted an engineering report on the condition of the building that points out the water damage and extensive rot.

Proposal

Proposed is to demolish the house due to its present condition.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will make a determination as to whether or not this house is identified as a Contributing structure to the Wilmore Historic District. With affirmative determination, the Commission can impose 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.

FOR/AGAINST:

- Neighborhood resident P. J. Henningson spoke in support of the proposed demolition

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Demolition*, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to identify the house is a Contributing structure. Mr. Duffy seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS
NAYS: NONE

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Demolition*, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to impose the maximum 365 Day Stay of Demolition. Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: HOUSE IDENTIFIED AS A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE. 365 DAY STAY OF DEMOLITION IMPOSED.

-
- **MS. MARSHALL ARRIVED AT 1:58 AND WAS PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.**
-

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-261 – 1815 WICKFORD PLACE – ADDITION

Existing Conditions

The c. 1950 existing one story structure is located mid-block on a small parcel and adjacent to an alley. Architectural features include a full hip roof and small front stoop. Adjacent residential structures are single family.

Proposal

Proposed is a one story addition to increase the square footage, a new front porch, fenestration changes, increase the roof pitch, replace replacement aluminum windows with wooden ones, extend the driveway, HVAC will be located within the fence, raise the plate height by 12". Materials include wood lap and shake siding, wood columns with brick or stone veneer piers, wood eave brackets and 'Hardie' soffits.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the applicable guidelines for additions.

FOR/AGAINST:

- Neighborhood resident P. J. Henningson spoke in support of the proposed addition.

MOTION: Based on non-compliance of *Policy & Design Guidelines, – Additions*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION to DENY** this application. The proposed addition does not respect the character of the

existing house quoting: "Additions to existing structures on Local Historic Districts have a responsibility to complement the original structure. Additions should reflect the design, scale, and architectural style of the original structure." and "Any project that the Historic District Commission determines would require significant and substantial exterior demolition may, at the discretion of the Commission, be subject to the HDC policy on Demolition." Mr. Haden seconded.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, RISTAINO, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: ADDITION DENIED

- **MR. MAJEED RETURNED BACK TO THE MEETING AT 2:00 PM AND WAS PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.**
-

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-141, 220 W. 10TH STREET – NEW CONSTRUCTION

The application was continued for 1) window details, 2) all materials noted, 3) all dimensions noted, 4) inclusion of a wall section detail, 5) the opportunity for some further design study.

Existing Conditions

The existing site is a narrow vacant lot adjacent to a two story Victorian house and multi-family buildings of various heights. The setback of the Victorian structure is approximately 35' from back of sidewalk. The adjacent multi-family building is approximately 14-18' feet from back of curb.

Proposal

Proposed is a 3 story multi-family building with parking underneath. Materials include brick, wood ship lap siding, metal and stucco. Total height is approximately 40'. The front setback is approximately 23' from the back of curb to the main entrance. New landscaping will be installed around the building.

Applicant Comments

Architect Chris Scorsone pointed out the changes: overall width has been decreased, façade relationship increased verticality, operable windows, increased alcove depths for HVAC, first level inset increased for a greater shadowline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

FOR/AGAINST:

- No one accepted Mr. Egan's invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with **Policy & Design Guidelines – New Construction**, Mr. Majeed made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as submitted and revised. The additional information is sufficient. Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 9/1 **AYES:** DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MAJEED, MARSHALL,
RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS,

NAYS: TITUS

DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED

- **MR. LENHART DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HIMSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**
-

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-250, 700 SOUTH SUMMIT AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

The application was continued for 1) height reduction, 2) HVAC screening, 3) setbacks of proposed and existing drawn correctly.

Existing Conditions

The existing site is a vacant lot. Adjacent structures are multi-family and single family residences. The grade rises 3-4 feet above the sidewalk. There is a mature tree at the rear corner of the site. The Sanborn map from 1953 shows a two story duplex structure on the site.

Proposal

The proposal is a two story single family structure. The front setback is to be 30 feet as noted in the deed. Materials include brick, cedar siding, and wood trim. Windows are wood Simulated True Divided Light (STDL). Other features include eave brackets, exposed rafter tails, wood hand rails and covered rear patio with a metal roof. The applicant is requesting the use of Hardie Artisan lap siding and to locate the mechanical units in the side yard toward the rear and screened per the design guidelines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

FOR/AGAINST:

- No one accepted Mr. Egan’s invitation to speak either for or against.

MOTION: Based on **Policy & Design Guidelines – New Construction**, Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application, with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show 1) HVAC will have permanent screening and or a plant screen, 2) evergreen screening will be ten inches taller than the HVAC units and one hundred percent opacity for the front and side. Mr. Duffy seconded.

VOTE: 8/1 **AYES:** DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, MAJEED, MARSHALL,
RISTAINO, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: RUMSCH

DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED WITH REVISED DRAWINGS TO STAFF FOR PROBABLE APPROVAL

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-266 601 EAST KINGSTON AVENUE –ADDITION

The application was continued for 1) redesign of the rear elevation (massing), 2) additional dimensions, and 3) clearer drawings.

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1920 two story Four Square home. The property is located at the corner of East Kingston Avenue and Winthrop Avenue in the Dilworth neighborhood. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register survey.

Proposal

The proposal is a rear second floor addition that is approximately 7 feet lower than the roof of the main section of the house. Project details of the addition include wood siding, wood brackets, and wood Simulated True Divided Light (STD L) windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the applicable guidelines for 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** the application as submitted. Mr. Rumsch seconded.

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: ADDITION APPROVED AS SUBMITTED

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-282, 1556 MERRIMAN AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

Existing Conditions

The existing site is a vacant lot that narrows from front to back. Adjacent structures are multi-family and single family residences of various height and design. Setbacks along the street vary between 23’-27’ approximately.

Proposal

Proposed is a 1.5 story single family home. The proposed front setback is approximately 26 feet from the right of way and the height from finished floor to ridge is +/- 20’-6”. Siding materials are brick and wood.

Windows are wood Simulated True Divided Light (STDL). Other details include eave brackets, wood trim and a rear dormer.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

FOR/AGAINST:

- P. J. Henningson neighborhood resident spoke in favor of the project.

MOTION: Based on compliance with **Policy & Design Guidelines**, Mr. Ristaino made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application with revised plans to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show, 1) tapered column 8"-12" shaft, 10" capital and 14" base, 2) rear tub window grille pattern – twin casement to reflect look of other windows – STDL 7/8", 3) dormer 6/12" pitch, 4) front porch brick rowlock, 5) porch floor concrete or terracotta, 6) HVAC relocated from side to rear, 7) 7/8 muntin bars on window, 8) left upper window centered on gable, 8) stairwell window centered on gable. Mr. Haden seconded.

VOTE: 10/0

AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED WITH REVISED DRAWINGS TO STAFF FOR PROBABLE APPROVAL.

-
- **MR. DUFFY RECUSED HIMSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION TO BECOME THE APPLICANT**
-

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-286, 420 SOUTH SUMMIT AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

The application was denied December 9, 2015 for 1) Size – the relationship of the project to its site. The house and garage are too large for the site, 3) Massing – The relationship of the building’s various parts to each other. The house is wider than other houses on the block, 4) Context – the overall relationship of the project to its surroundings. The applicant has submitted a new application for review. The Commission will determine if the project has been substantially redesigned to determine if the project will be heard.

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1981 one story house. The foundation is slab on grade construction, siding is vertical T1-11 wood. A previous house on the lot burned down. The property is listed as Non-contributing in the Wesley Heights National Register. Adjacent buildings are one and two story.

Proposal

Proposal is a two story single family Dutch Colonial structure. The proposed front setback is 30 feet from the building as noted in the deed. Materials include cedar shingles and wood trim. Windows are aluminum clad Simulated True Divided Light (STDL). Foundation exterior is stucco. Other features include wood hand rails and columns. The detached garage is accessed from an alley and connected to the house by a brick breezeway. The design and material palette of the garage reflects the principal structure.

Applicant Comments:

A summary of revisions includes:

1. Size – reduced footprint of house by 15%, garage reduced 20%
2. Scale – lower gutter line breaks up massing
3. Massing – reduced width
4. Context – house and garage congruent with neighboring properties
5. Rhythm – 3 bay front breaks down scale
6. Setback – within adjacent deeded setbacks
7. Materials – all natural
8. Landscaping – remove 3 trees worst scenario, can maybe retain 2 with plan revision, will replant large maturing canopy trees, will keep existing steps but remove drive and curb cut, gravel motor court in rear.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

FOR/AGAINST:

- No one accepted Mr. Egan’s invitation to speak for or against this project.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information, Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application. Revised submittal will show further design study regarding 1) massing of the house, 2) garage needs to be secondary to the house and fit in with the neighborhood, 3) fenestration needs to be unified overall. Mr. Majeed seconded.

VOTE: 9/0

AYES: EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MAJEED, MARSHALL,
RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-278, 1465 HAYWOOD COURT – NEW CONSTRUCTION

The application for new construction on this property was denied in October 14, 2015 for the following: 1) Scale – The relationship of the building to those around it. The house is taller than the neighbor to the right and will overshadow the home based on the Zoutewelle survey. 2) Context – The overall relationship of the project to its surroundings. 3) Materials – Proper historic materials or approved substitutes. No exception warranted to non-traditional building materials for maintenance only.

The applicant has submitted a new application for review. The Commission will determine if the project has been substantially redesigned and now meets the guidelines for new construction. The applicant has also added new drawings to reflect changes from the previous application.

Existing Conditions

The existing site is a large vacant parcel at the end of Haywood Court and the edge of the Plaza Midwood Historic District. 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 half story single family homes. Adjacent is a large vacant tract and across the street are the rear yards of single family homes. The grade of the site drops from the front to back and from right to left. The street falls in elevation from Thomas Avenue and the height of the homes gets gradually taller.

Proposal

The proposal is a new single family house and detached garage. Features of the house include a full width front porch, wood and cedar shake siding, wood trim details, brick foundation and STDL windows. Height is approximately 29' from finished floor to ridge.

The summary of revisions includes:

- Style has been changed from a Prairie Style to a Bungalow type design
- Siding material is wood lap and wood shakes
- Width of the house has been reduced from approximately 47'-11" to 35'

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the 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 and further design study, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application. The revised drawings will show 1) redesigned front dormer, 2) dormer pulled back from front thermal wall, 2) both end gables – redesign the fenestration to break pattern down. Mr. Haden seconded

VOTE: 6/4

AYES: DUFFY, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MAJEED

DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-243, 524 EAST TREMONT AVENUE – PAINTED BRICK

Existing Conditions

The existing home is a c. 1920 one story Bungalow. The brick home was recently painted and a Notice of Violation was issued October 2015. Staff met with the property owner and contractor at the site on December 7, 2015.

Proposal

The applicant has submitted an application and materials for review to the request an exception for the brick to remain painted or justification based on **Policy & Design Guidelines**.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Commission shall discuss the new evidence and testimony by the homeowner and will determine if an exception shall be granted based on the work justified.

FOR/AGAINST:

- No one accepted Mr. Egan’s invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Painted Brick*, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** painting (foundation only) and **DENY** painting above the story course and require foundation brick to be differentiated from the main body of the structure *Policy and Design Guidelines*. Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 9/1 **AYES:** EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, HADEN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, TITUS

NAYS: STEPHENS

DECISION: PAINTED BRICK APPROVED FOR FOUNDATION AND DENIED FOR THE MAIN BODY OF THE STRUCTURE

- **MR. MAJEED LEFT THE MEETING AT 6:24 PM AND WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.**
 - **MR. DUFFY DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HIMSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**
-

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-280, 1325 DILWORTH ROAD – NEW CONSTRUCTION

Existing Conditions

The existing site is a vacant parcel on Berkeley Avenue. This is the back yard of 1325 Dilworth Road West. Existing homes on the block are one to two and one half stories and range in height from 22’ to 37’. The property has been surveyed for recordation as a separate parcel.

Proposal

The proposal is a new single family house and a detached garage. Materials include cedar shingles siding, wood trim details, brick foundation, copper porch roof, and wood STDL windows with aluminum cladding. Height is approximately 29’ from finished floor to ridge. The detached garage is one story with brick façade. Four trees will be removed due to construction and will be replaced with new large maturing canopy trees and landscaping. The front setback is approximately 43’ from the right of way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Applicant Comments:

Architects Kraig Magas and Don Duffy along with owner Ken Coe pointed out major issues.
.The proposed footprint is compatible with others on Berkeley
.Ridge height is lower than adjacents.
.Context is within neighborhood pattern
.Fenestration matches others
.Flanking wings break up rhythm
.Setback within established and no closer to street than neighbor.
.Materials – painted brick, cedar shingles, copper standing seam metal on porch
.Landscaping – have tree letter re trees to be removed, replant, concrete drive, stone retaining wall will be cut of drive.

FOR/AGAINST:

- Mr. Chris Hudson neighborhood resident spoke in favor of the application but was concerned about the loss of trees.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Ms. Marshall made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application. Additional information will include 1) brick sample, 2) landscape plan to show 4 maturing canopy trees. Mr. Ristaino seconded.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL,
RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-281, 804 EAST KINGSTON AVENUE – ADDITION

The application was denied December 9, 2015 for the following: Massing - The addition fails to respect the original structure and character of the property, specifically the removal and expansion of sections of side walls toward the rear.

The applicant has submitted a new application for review. The Commission will determine if the project has been substantially redesigned to meet the ‘substantial change’ threshold to be heard. The applicant has also added new drawings to reflect changes from the previous application.

Proposal

The proposal includes a rear porch addition and upper level expansion that raises the existing ridge approximately 2'-5" to the principal structure. Elements of the rear of the house will be removed. The additions will have materials and details to match the existing house. A door on the left side of the front facade will be replaced with a window. New windows are wood Simulated True Divided Light (STDL). A new driveway will be extended to the rear yard, a mature tree on the right side will be removed and a new tree planted in the rear yard. An existing garage will be demolished.

The summary of revisions includes:

- Additional information on previous additions to the rear.
- Clearer drawings showing areas to be removed.

- The massing of wall and roof planes on the side elevations have been redesigned.
- Existing driveway and mature tree will remain.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The HDC will determine if the project meets the Additions guidelines for Size, Scale, Massing, Context, Rhythm, Fenestration and Materials.

FOR/AGAINST:

- Mr. Chris Hudson neighborhood resident spoke in opposition of this project.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Ms. Titus made a **MOTION to CONTINUE** this application. The revised drawings will show 1) further design study on the massing of the second floor - simplify and draw from the original form of the house, (bungalow) Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 8/1

AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, MARSHALL,
RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: LENHART

DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED.

The meeting adjourned at 7:29 pm with a meeting length of 6 hours and twenty-three minutes.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission.