



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
March 9, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dr. Lili Corbus  
Mr. Don Duffy  
Mr. James Haden  
Mr. Nasif Majeed  
Mr. Dominic Ristaino, Vice Chair  
Mr. Damon Rumsch  
Ms. Claire Stephens  
Ms. Tamara Titus, Second Vice Chair

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Tim Bender  
Mr. Tom Egan, Chair  
Mr. Rodric Lenhart  
Ms. Mattie Marshall

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

In Chairman Egan’s absence, Vice Chair Dominic Ristaino called to order the Regular March 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 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. Vice Chair 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.

---

Index of Addresses:     **CONTINUED APPLICATIONS**

HDC 2015-281, 804 E. Kingston Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2015-290, 715 E. Worthington Avenue	Dilworth

**NEW APPLICATIONS**

HDC 2016-032, 2112 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore
HDC 2016-034, 408 Walnut Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDC 2016-038, 404 Walnut Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDC 2016-020, 632 Grandin Road	Wesley Heights

---

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

This application was continued from February for further design study on the side elevations to create an addition that respects the rhythm of the existing home’s architectural style.

***Existing Context***

The existing structure is a c. 1920 one and one half story Bungalow. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey.

**Details of Proposed Request**

The proposal includes a rear porch addition and the addition of two dormers on the left and right elevations. The height will increase approximately 2’-9”. The addition 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).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The HDC will determine if the project meets the **Policy & Design Guidelines** for Additions regarding Size, Scale, Massing, Context, Rhythm, Fenestration, and Materials.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

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

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with **Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions**, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show 1) New ridge height - 2’9 1/8” increase, 2) no painted brick, and 3) rear yard 50%/50% permeability calculation. Ms. Stephens seconded.

**VOTE: 8/0**

**AYES:** CORBUS, DUFFY, HADEN, MAJEED, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

**NAYS:** NONE

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

- 
- **MS. TITUS DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AS AN ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNER AND REMOVED HERSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**
- 

**APPLICATION: HDC 2015-290, 715 E. WORTHINGTON AVENUE, ADDITION**

This application was continued from February for further design study to include: 1) Rear elevation should be 6”-8” extension or recess from the thermal wall, 2) Side elevations – new rear facing sides of dormer to recess back 6”-8” on both sides so gable element sits proud.

**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 one, one and one half, and two 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 ridge will be raised and the height of the new gable will be approximately 2 feet taller than the existing ridge. Window trim, exterior materials, soffit design, and other architectural details will complement or match existing.

***Revised Plan Summary***

1. Removal of new chimney on right side
2. Extension of dormers on the left and right elevations

**Staff Recommendation**

The HDC will determine if the revisions meet the **Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions regarding** Size, Scale, Massing, Fenestration, Rhythm, Materials, and Context.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

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

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the addition with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show the dormer moved back or forward 6"-8". Mr. Duffy seconded.

**VOTE: 7/0**                      **AYES:** CORBUS, DUFFY, HADEN, MAJEED, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS

**NAYS:** NONE

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

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-032, 2112 WILMORE DRIVE – SECOND STORY ADDITION**

**Existing Context**

The existing structure is a c. 1940 one story ranch house. Existing windows are an eight over eight pattern. The siding material is asbestos. Adjacent houses on the block are a variety of one and one and one half story structures.

**Proposal**

Proposed is a second floor addition which includes the replacement of windows and removal of the asbestos siding. The addition includes a new porch roof and front shed dormer. New windows are wood with an eight over eight light pattern for the full sized windows. Roof trim and boxing will match existing. The second floor addition will extend from the existing roof line toward the rear. The building footprint will not change and no site features will be impacted.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The HDC will determine if the revisions meet the *Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions* for Size, Scale, Massing, Fenestration, Rhythm, Materials and Context.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- Neighborhood resident P.J. Henningson spoke in support of the proposed addition but had some concerns.

**MOTION:** Based on non-compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions* and no exception warranted, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for failure to meet the guidelines regarding 1) Massing: adds a full second story to an existing one story, 2) Failure to respect the integrity of the original structure. Topography exhibit relative to the front elevation must be provided. Material notes showing consistency with existing need to be added. Mr. Rumsch seconded.

**VOTE: 6/2**                      **AYES:** CORBUS, DUFFY, HADEN, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, TITUS

**NAYS:** MAJEED, STEPHENS

**DECISION: SECOND STORY ADDITION DENIED**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-034, 408 WALNUT AVENUE – PARGING**

**Existing Context**

The existing home is an one story brick Bungalow constructed in 1936. The land slopes approximately 8-10 feet from front to back.

**Proposal**

The proposal is to parge the foundation due to water damage on the interior.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The Commission shall determine if parging will have a detrimental effect on the style of the house.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

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

**MOTION:** Based on non-compliance with the ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Parging***, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION to DENY** this application, detrimental on the existing brick structure and it does not address the proofing of flooding. Ms. Stephens seconded.

**VOTE: 8/0**

**AYES:** CORBUS, DUFFY, HADEN, MAJEED, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: PARGING DENIED**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-038, 404 WALNUT AVENUE-REAR ADDITION**

**Details of Proposed Request**

***Existing Context***

The existing structure is a one story Bungalow constructed in 1923. The property is a corner lot that slopes from the front to back approximately 8-10 feet.

***Proposal***

The proposal is an addition to the rear of the house. New windows, brick and wood siding will match existing. Roof details will also match the existing design.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The HDC will determine if the revisions meet the ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** for Size, Scale, Massing, Fenestration, Rhythm, Materials, and Context.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- Neighborhood resident John Caratelli spoke in support of the proposed addition.

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show 1) right elevation wall will have a window, 2 )brick for the basement screen wall, no wood, 3) basement columns in brick, 4) all windows to match the existing. Mr. Haden seconded.

**VOTE: 8/0**                      **AYES:** CORBUS, DUFFY, HADEN, MAJEED, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

**NAYS:** NONE

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

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-020, 632 GRANDIN ROAD– PAINTED BRICK**

**Details of Proposed Request**

*Existing Context*

The existing home is a two story I-House constructed in 1929. The applicant began painting the foundation and chimney.

*Proposal*

The applicant has submitted an application and photographs to request an exception for painting the brick foundation and chimney. The steps and brick rowlock on the porch will not be painted.

**Staff Recommendation**

The Commission will discuss the new evidence and testimony by the homeowner and will determine if an exception shall be granted based on poorly matched additions or repair work, and the painting is designed to unify the disparate parts of the building.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

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

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Painted Brick*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application where the brick building has poorly matched additions or repair work, and where the painting is designed to unify the disparate parts of the building. The paint on the foundation will remain, no painting on the front steps, and knee walls, and brick rowlock. Based on no exception warranted to *Policy & Design Guidelines – Painted Brick*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION to DENY** the painted brick of the chimney. Ms. Titus seconded.

**VOTE: 7/1**                      **AYES:** CORBUS, HADEN, MAJEED, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

**NAYS:** DUFFY

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR PAINTED BRICK APPROVE FOUNDATION AND DENY THE CHIMNEY.**

---

Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** January 10, 2016 minutes with corrections to pg. 5, 804 East Kingston Avenue; Ms. Marshall included height in her motion. Page 9 and 10 525 East Boulevard, in Mr. Rumsch's motion, if they choose Hardie, close the wide spacing.

Ms Titus also made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the December minutes with corrections and requested the other commissioners to also proof the minutes. Mr. Rumsch seconded. The vote was unanimous.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 pm with a meeting length of 3 hours and forty-three minutes.

---

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission.