



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
May 11, 2016

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Tim Bender  
Dr. Lili Corbus  
Mr. Tom Egan, Chair

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 the workshop portion of the meeting, Ms. Marshall, Chair of the Nominating Committee, said they met and are nominating Mr. Jim Haden for Chair, Mr. Damon Rumsch as Vice Chair, and Mr. Dominick Ristaino as Second Vice Chair. Ms. Marshall made a motion to vote in the new Chair, Vice Chair and Second Vice Chair, seconded by Ms. Stephens the vote was unanimous 9/0. The new officers will take their seats beginning in July.

Vice Chairman Ristaino called to order the Regular May meeting of the Historic District Commission at 1:01 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 for each agenda item. 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 and 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 Chairman 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. An audience member will be asked once to be quiet and the need for a second request will be removal from the room.

Index of Addresses:     **NEW APPLICATIONS**

HDC 2016-045, 525 Spruce Street	Wilmore
HDC 2016-062, 1823 Lexington Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2016-063, 2000 Park Road	Dilworth
HDC 2016-065, 1529 Merriman Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2016-057, 1914 Lennox Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2016-064, 512 East Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2016-066, 1922 Lennox Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2016-090, 500 E. Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2016-072, 1936 Park Road	Dilworth
HDC 2016-074, 328 E. Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2016-088, 943 Romany Road	Dilworth
HDC 2016-067, 1609 Belvedere Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2016-085, Grandin Heights Townhomes	Wesley Heights
HDC 2016-086, 604 Summit Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDC 2016-092, 512-514 Walnut Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDC 2016-070, 1748 Merriman Avenue	Wilmore

Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** April 13, 2016 minutes with minor corrections from Ms. Titus:

Mr. Haden seconded. The vote was unanimous.

---

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

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-2016-062, 823 LEXINGTON AVENUE - ADDITION**

This application was continued from April for the further design study regarding massing, height, fenestration, scale. Revised plans will show:

- Diminished side elevations
- Roof lowered on sides
- A plan that respects and is sensitive to the original character of the house.

**Existing Conditions**

The existing structure is a c. 1929 one and one half story Bungalow. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey.

**Proposal**

Proposed is a second floor addition that includes new gabled roof from front to rear, enlarged side gables, and dormers on the side and rear elevations. New building height is the same as the house to the left and lower than the one to the right. New siding material is lapped wood, trim and details and windows will match existing.

**Updated Proposal – May 11, 2016**

The revised drawings include the following changes:

1. The height of the cross gable has been lowered below the ridge of the new primary gable
2. The window pattern on the first and second floor on the right elevation has been organized
3. The paired window on the left elevation gable becomes a single unit.

**Staff Recommendation**

The HDC will determine if the revisions meet the guidelines for scale, massing, rhythm and fenestration.

**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***, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as submitted. Mr. Haden seconded.

**VOTE: 8/0**

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-045, 525 SPRUCE STREET – ADDITION**

This application was continued from April for the following issues:

- Further design study regarding the massing of the left side elevation addition
- Keep upper windows intact
- Accurate drawings showing front porch details
- Wrought iron an acceptable choice for porch details
- The porch being expanded to full width could be fine.

**Existing Context**

The existing home is a c. 1933 Dutch Colonial style. Features include a small centered front porch and a non-original side addition. The brick foundation and chimney are painted.

**Proposal- April**

The project is an expansion of the side addition, new hand rails, rear deck, and front porch expansion. The roof of the new addition will have a Dutch Colonial shape but in a smaller version than the main block of the house. New windows will match existing style and light pattern but second floor existing windows will be modified to accommodate the expansion of the roof for the side addition. New brick foundation will match existing.

**Updated Proposal-May 11, 2016**

The revised drawings include the following changes:

1. Simplified roof design on the left elevation
2. Retention of existing windows on left side, second floor
3. Elimination of the front porch expansion.

**Staff Recommendation:**

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

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- PJ Henningson, neighborhood resident spoke in favor of the application.

**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. Existing gable end maintained
2. Hip new rear roof back to house
3. Add or enlarge windows.

Ms. Stephens seconded.

**VOTE: 9/0**

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

**NAYS:** NONE

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

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-063, 2000 PARK ROAD – ADDITION/SITE FEATURES**

This application was continued from April for the following:

1. Porch/Side deck redesign
2. Traditional materials and no introduction of stone

3. Garage door details and information
4. Fence details and information
5. 1/1 windows in basement.

### **Existing Conditions**

The existing structure is a c. 1925 single family home. The home is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey. Adjacent structures are one and one half story single family homes.

### **Proposal –Addition (April)**

The proposed project is a single story addition that extends to the rear on an existing one story home. The front façade and existing maximum ridge line/height of +/- 22' have been maintained. Openings and fenestration on the side elevations are to remain or repurposed. Existing windows shall remain or be relocated as shown. Existing windows found to be in poor condition shall be replaced with windows that match existing windows in size & detail. Additional details include triple corner column to support the existing front porch and new side porch roof. New lapped wood siding will match existing. Stone veneered foundation and steps are proposed. All repaired and replaced wood trim on windows and doors will match existing. Below the single story extension out the back is slightly narrower than the existing main volume of the house to preserve the existing prominent roofline. A side entry segmented garage door shall be located at the rear of the house.

### **Proposal – Site Features (April)**

Proposed site features include a new privacy fence, driveway, walkways, landscaping, patio and new trees to replace those removed.

### **Updated Proposal-May 11, 2016**

The revised plans include the removal of the following:

1. Side porch
  2. Deck
  3. Garage
  4. Front porch
- The request for the addition of stone, and replacement of porch columns, tree removal/replacement and window replacement remains on the table.

### **Staff Recommendation**

The Commission will determine if the proposed projects meet the applicable design guidelines for fenestration, rhythm, materials and context.

### **FOR/AGAINST:**

- Neighborhood resident John Phares spoke in opposition to the application.
- Neighborhood resident Jack Kehoe spoke in opposition to the application.

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Fenestration changes***, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION to APPROVE**

1. The fenestration on the left, right and rear elevations as submitted.
2. No stone will be added.
3. The front porch will be CONTINUED, to show details on how it will tie into the house. Show details of new columns. Ms. Stephens made a friendly amendment to present clearer drawings and to submit more photos of existing. Ms. Titus accepted Ms. Stephens' friendly amendment.  
Ms. Stephens seconded.

**VOTE: 9/0**                    **AYES:** DUFFY, HADEN, LENHART, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO,  
RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS  
**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR FENESTRATION CHANGES APPROVED.  
APPLICATION FOR FRONT PORCH CONTINUED.**

**TREE REMOVAL:**

**MOTION:** Based on the need for additional information Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application for:

1. A tree removal letter from a Certified Arborist to show evidence on why the trees were removed and evidence on any damage to the house. (structural report if Arborist's letter is not sufficient)
2. Landscape plan showing where replacement trees will be replanted  
Mr. Haden seconded

**VOTE: 9/0**                    **AYES:** DUFFY, HADEN, LENHART, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO,  
RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS  
**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR TREE REMOVAL CONTINUED FOR MORE INFORMATION**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-065, 1529 MERRIMAN AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION OF GARAGE**

This application was continued from April for:

1. Further design study of the garage (consider redesign)
2. Correct details on drawings
3. Accurate site plan
4. Garage context information.

**Existing Conditions**

The existing site is a vacant parcel at the corner of Merriman Avenue and Larch Street. The site is approximately 3 to 5 feet above the sidewalk along Merriman Avenue. There are mature trees along the side and rear of the site. Adjacent structures are a mix of single family homes from various construction periods. An unused alley easement exists on Larch Street behind the subject property. The setback of the abutting property on Larch Street is 30 feet from right of way/back of sidewalk (required zoning setback is 20 feet).

**Proposal-April**

The proposal is a new detached garage. Design features will include architectural elements from the house including centered dormers, traditional siding materials, eave brackets, and wood windows. The height from grade is approximately 21'-2". Three mature trees will be removed and replaced with new trees.

**Updated Proposal-May 11, 2016**

The revised drawings include the following changes:

- Site plan with dimensions of garage footprint and setback of 20 feet.

**Staff Recommendation**

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for garages.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- Neighborhood resident P.J. Henningson spoke in favor of the application.
- Neighborhood resident Linda McGee spoke in favor of the application.
- Dilworth resident Chris Hudson spoke in opposition of the application.

**MOTION:** Based on non-compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for: Size, Massing in relation to both the streetscape and that the garage is not a secondary structure to the house it serves.  
Mr. Haden seconded.

**VOTE: 8/1**                      **AYES:** DUFFY, HADEN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO,  
RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS  
**NAYS:** LENHART

**DECISION: CONSTRUCTION OF NEW GARAGE DENIED**

- 
- **MS. TITUS DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION AND REMOVED HERSELF FROM THE COMMISSION.**
- 

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-057, 1914 LENNOX AVENUE - ADDITION**

This application was continued from April for further design study regarding:

1. An addition that possibly does not attach to the garage
2. Size, Scale, Massing, and Context
3. Fenestration of left and right elevation
4. Overall length regarding the surrounding structures.

**Existing Conditions**

The existing structure is a one story Bungalow house with a gabled front porch roof and cross gable roof over the main structure. The c. 1925 house is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey which was done in 1987. A detached garage is located toward the middle of the rear yard. An application for a second story addition was denied by the HDC August 2015. A COA was issued by HDC staff for a one story addition that connects the house to the garage on January 6, 2016. A stop work order was issued in March due to work being performed outside of the COA.

**Proposal**

The project is an addition that connects the garage to the principal structure. Plans indicate sections of the house to be demolished and restored or replaced. New materials, windows and trim details will match existing. Rear yard open space is calculated as approximately 67.6%.

**Updated Proposal-May 11, 2016**

The revised drawings include the following changes:

1. The size of the connection between the house and garage has been reduced by approximately 50%
2. An open courtyard is created between structures the house and garage in addition to the connector
3. The front façade will not be changed.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The HDC will determine if the project meets the guidelines for size, scale, massing, fenestration, rhythm, materials and context.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- Trip Wheeler adjacent property owner spoke in favor of this application.
- Doug Ehmann adjacent property owner spoke in favor of this application.
- Tamara Titus neighborhood resident spoke in opposition of this application.
- John Phares neighborhood resident spoke in opposition of this application.
- Chris Hudson neighborhood resident spoke in opposition of this application.

**MOTION:** Based on non-compliance with the *Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions*, Mr. Haden made a **MOTION to DENY** this application due to inappropriate: Size, Scale, Massing  
Ms. Marshall seconded.

**VOTE: 4/4**                    **AYES:** DUFFY, HADEN, MARSHALL, RUMSCH,  
                                     **NAYS:** LENHART, MAJEED, STEPHENS, RISTAINO

**DECISION: MOTION FAILS.**

**MOTION:** Based on the need for additional information Mr. Lenhart made a **MOTION to CONTINUE** this application for further design study. The revised drawings will show:

1. The garage secondary to the house
  2. Lower height.
- Mr. Majeed seconded.

**VOTE: 3/5**                    **AYES:** LENHART, MAJEED, STEPHENS  
  
                                     **NAYS:** DUFFY, HADEN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH

**DECISION: MOTION FAILS.**

**MOTION:** Based on non-compliance with the *Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION to DENY** this application for:

1. Inappropriate size of additions vs. the relationship of the house to the addition
  2. The house should not set precedent on being 150' in length
  3. The garage should not set precedent on being taller than the house
- Mr. Haden seconded.

**VOTE: 7/1**                    **AYES:** DUFFY, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS  
                                     **NAYS:** MAJEED

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION DENIED.**

- 
- **MR. LENHART LEFT THE MEETING AT 4:10 PM AND WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.**
-



**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-2016-064, 512 EAST TREMONT AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION**

This application was CONTINUED from April for further design study regarding:

1. Scale, massing, and simplification of the overall design of the house
2. Fenestration, related to scale and massing - windows should be proportionate to the massing of the wall planes

**Existing Conditions**

The c. 1930 existing structure is listed as Contributing in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey. It is a one story duplex structure with a projecting entry, and carport and side porch for one unit. The City demolished a part of the building several years ago due to an old water convergence underneath. The legal building envelope is restricted by this water condition. The established setback of older homes along the block face is approximately 20 to 23 feet from back of curb. An application for demolition was reviewed February 11, 2015, the HDC placed the maximum 365-Day Stay of Demolition on the property. The 365-Day Stay of Demolition expired February 12, 2016.

**Proposal-April**

The proposal is the construction of a new two story Dutch Colonial, single family house with a detached garage. The front setback is approximately 14'-5" from right of way. Exterior materials are brick, wood shake siding, and wooden STDL windows. The detached garage will retain architectural details from the house.

**Updated Proposal-May 11, 2016**

The revised drawings include the following changes:

1. Horizontal lapped wood siding on the first floor
2. Removal of the gable and hip roofs on the left and right side
3. New simplified window style and rhythm on side elevations
4. Addition of Dutch Colonial style secondary roof design on left side

**Staff Recommendation**

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

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- Neighborhood Resident John Phares spoke in opposition of this application.

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines*, Mr. Duffy made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show: the fenestration on the left and right elevations simplified and organized. Mr. Rumsch seconded.

**VOTE: 8/0      AYES: DUFFY, HADEN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS**  
**NAYS: NONE**

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

- 
- **MS. TITUS DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION AND REMOVED HERSELF FROM THE COMMISSION.**
-

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-066, 1922 LENNOX AVENUE - ADDITION**

This application was continued from April for further design study:

1. Size, Scale and Massing to be reduced so that an addition will reflect a more modest 1 ½ story addition
2. Fenestration and rhythm simplified.

**Existing Conditions**

The existing structure is c. 1925 one story Colonial style duplex. The home is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. Adjacent structures are one, one and one half, and two story single family homes. A large mature tree is located in the rear yard near the house. It will not be disturbed if the addition to expand upward is approved.

**Proposal –Addition**

The proposed project is a second floor addition with an expansion on the rear and a new detached accessory building. Windows and doors on the rear and side elevations will be replaced. The front porch will also be replaced. The addition includes new front and rear dormers and a new cross gable roof. New materials, roof details and trim will match existing. The one story accessory building retains architectural details of the house.

**Updated Proposal-May 11, 2016**

The revised drawings include the following changes:

1. Redesign of the front gable/shed dormer to a pair of shed dormers
2. Continuous eaves along the front façade
3. Continuous shed dormer on the rear elevation
4. Alignment of new ridge peak with existing on the right side elevation.

**Staff Recommendation**

The Commission will determine if the proposed improvements meet the applicable design guidelines for size, scale, massing, fenestration and rhythm.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- Jarod Brown adjacent property owner spoke in favor of the application.
- Trip Wheeler adjacent property owner spoke in favor of the application.

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as drawn.

Mr. Duffy seconded.

**VOTE: 7/0**

**AYES:** DUFFY, HADEN, MARSHALL, MAJEED, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-090, 500 EAST WORTHINGTON AVENUE – ADDITION/DETACHED GARAGE**

**Existing Conditions**

The existing structure is c. 1920 one and one half story Bungalow style house. The home is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. Adjacent structures are one and one and one half story single family homes. The property is located at the corner of East Worthington and Lyndhurst Avenues.

**Proposal**

The proposed project is the addition of a screened porch, pergola addition to the deck, stair, and detached one car garage in the rear yard, tree removal to thin out and make room for the proposed. Traditional materials will be used on the house and garage. The garage is one story with design details reflective of the principal structure.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The Commission will determine if the proposed improvements meet the design guidelines for additions and garage design.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- No one accepted Vice Chairman Ristaino’s invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST this application.

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions*, Mr. Haden made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as submitted.  
Mr. Rumsch seconded.

**VOTE: 8/0**                      **AYES:** DUFFY, HADEN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH,  
STEPHENS, TITUS  
**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-074, 328 EAST WORTHINGTON AVENUE – DETACHED GARAGE**

**Existing Conditions**

The site is a corner lot at East Worthington Avenue and Euclid Avenue. The slope of the land falls from the front to the rear. There are mature trees on the lot. The existing one and one half story house was constructed in 1994. A two story garage was recently denied.

**Proposal-February**

Proposal was a detached one and one half story garage in the rear yard. The windows are aluminum clad wood. Trim material is wood.

**Updated Proposal-May 11, 2016**

The revised design includes the following changes: Change in height to a one story garage. Materials and details will match house.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for garages.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- No one accepted Vice Chairman Ristaino’s invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST this application.

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Garages*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show:

1. Roof pitch 7/12
  2. 1/1 windows and single light door
  3. Exposed brick foundation
  4. Light fixtures for staff approval
  5. Details and materials to match the existing house
  6. No lights in garage doors
  7. 2 or 3 large maturing trees from the City list of recommended trees.
- Ms. Stephens seconded.

**VOTE: 8/0**

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR GARAGE WITH REVISED DRAWINGS TO STAFF FOR PROBABLE APPROVAL**

---

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

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-072, 1936 PARK ROAD – ADDITION/FENESTRATION CHANGES**

**Existing Conditions**

The c. 1905 existing structure is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey. It was converted to a multi-family use many years ago and remains so today. The home is described as a two story Victorian with a shed porch on square posts and scalloped frieze boards. It also has polygonal bay windows on the front. A porch addition was approved in December 2013 (2013-186) but the approval has expired.

**Proposal**

The proposed project is the repair of the side entrance by replacing a gable roof with a flat roof/balcony on the left side toward the rear. The hand rail on the new side roof deck will match existing hand rails. Other features include new entry doors, repair or replacement of stairs and siding on the first floor. On the second floor a new shed roof replaces a gable dormer with new windows and doors to the rear. A French door is proposed to replace a window on the rear elevation. On the right elevation a second story window is replaced with two smaller windows where a picture window is being removed.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The Commission will determine if the proposed improvements meet the design guidelines for massing, fenestration, rhythm, materials and context.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- No one accepted second Vice Chairman Titus's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST this application.

**MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions*, Mr. Rumsch made a MOTION to APPROVE this application as drawn.**

1. The brick foundation can be painted
  2. Rear door can be staff approved
- Mr. Haden seconded

**VOTE: 7/0**

**AYES:** DUFFY, HADEN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RUMSCH,  
STEPHENS, TITUS

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED**

---

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

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-088, 943 ROMANY ROAD – DETACHED GARAGE**

**Existing Conditions**

The site is a corner lot at Romany Road and Lexington Avenue. There is a one story garage in the rear yard. The existing one story house was constructed in 1951.

**Proposal**

The proposal is a detached one story garage to replace the existing garage. Garage height is approximately 15 feet. Materials include a brick façade, metal roof and stucco to reflect the material palette of the house. Other design features include French doors and circular vent that also reflect elements of the house.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for garages.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- No one accepted Vice Chairman Ristaino’s invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST this application.

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Garages*, Mr. Duffy made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application as submitted.

Ms. Marshall seconded.

**VOTE: 7/0**

**AYES:** DUFFY, HADEN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, STEPHENS, TITUS

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR GARAGE APPROVED**

---

- **MS. MARSHALL WAS NOT PRESENT DURING THE VOTE FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**
- 

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-085, GRANDIN HEIGHTS TOWNHOMES – REVISION FOR NON-TRADITIONAL MATERIAL**

**Existing Conditions**

The site is a vacant parcel to be developed with a three story multi-family project that was approved by the HDC on April 8, 2015 (2015-027) with brick and wood siding materials.

**Proposal**

This applicant is requesting approval for non-combustible materials on the third floor soffits to meet the North Carolina Building Code for Commercial Structures. A similar application for non-traditional material on a commercial building was approved February 10, 2016 (2015-287).

**Staff Recommendation:**

The HDC will determine if the use of non-traditional material should be approved.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- No one accepted Vice Chairman Ristaino’s invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST this application.

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Non-Traditional Building materials***, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application with an exception warranted to our policies due to NC building code requirement for roofs overhanging a 2 hour firewall. Mr. Rumsch seconded.

**VOTE: 7/0**                      **AYES:** DUFFY, HADEN, MAJEED, RUMSCH, RISTAINO, STEPHENS, TITUS  
**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR HARDIE APPROVED IN SPECIFIC LOCATION.**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-086, 604 S. SUMMIT AVENUE – ADDITION**

**Existing Conditions:** The existing structure is a c. 1937 one story Cottage style house. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Wesley Heights National Register of Historic Places Survey. Adjacent structures are a mix of one and two story homes

**Proposal**

The proposal is a rear addition that is not visible from public right of way. The project requires the removal a small storage area and porch on the rear. Siding, windows and trim details with match the existing house in materials and size. Two mature trees will be removed to accommodate the addition.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The Commission will determine if the proposed improvements meet the Design Guidelines for Size, Scale, Massing, Fenestration, Rhythm, Materials and Context.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- No one accepted Vice Chairman Ristaino’s invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST this application.

**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. Back porch covered fully or partially with details to match the front
2. Add window on right elevation
3. Add left elevation window on blank wall
4. Add two new large maturing canopy trees

Ms. Marshall seconded.

**VOTE: 8/0**                      **AYES:** DUFFY, HADEN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH,

STEPHENS, TITUS  
NAYS: NONE

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

---

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

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-067, 1609 BELVEDERE AVENUE – PAINTED BRICK**

**Existing Conditions**

The existing home is c. 1932 one story Bungalow with a brick foundation and chimney. The applicant painted the foundation and chimney in an attempt to unify disparate parts.

**Proposal**

The applicant has submitted an application and photographs to request an exception for painting the brick. Reasons for painting are mismatched mortar and different types of brick.

**Staff Recommendation:**

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

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- No one accepted Vice Chairman Ristaino's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST this application.

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Painted Brick*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the painted brick foundation based on the discrepancy of materials and finishes with staff to approve a darker foundation color and to deny the painted brick chimney. Mr. Duffy seconded.

**VOTE: 7/0**                      **AYES:** DUFFY, HADEN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO,  
STEPHENS, TITUS  
**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR PAINTED BRICK ON THE FOUNDATION APPROVED AND THE PAINTED BRICK CHIMNEY WAS DENIED**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2016-092, 512-514 WALNUT AVENUE – ADDITION/FENESTRATION CHANGES**

**Existing Conditions**

The existing structure is a c. 1928 one story brick duplex. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Wesley Heights National Register of Historic Places Survey. Architectural features include a front porch on the right side and an arched entry to a side unit on the left side. Adjacent structures are a mix of one and two story homes.

**Proposal**

Proposed is a second floor addition within the existing footprint and changes to window and door openings. Front additions include new porch columns and expanded porch footprint, relocated front door, new siding in the existing porch gable, and an added front dormer. On the left elevation a new entrance replaces an existing window. On the right elevation a deck from the rear wraps to a new side entrance.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The Commission will determine if the proposed improvements meet the Design Guidelines for Size, Scale, Massing, Fenestration, Rhythm, Materials, and Context.

**FOR/AGAINST:**

- No one accepted Vice Chairman Ristaino's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST this application.

**MOTION:** Based on non-compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions***, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application based on inappropriate:

1. Scale, Massing, Fenestration, and Materials and material application
2. Fenestration in the front gable is oversized for the space
3. Massing - 7 feet higher distorts roofline
4. Materials - Hardie no exception warranted
5. Removal of the three original brick columns

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

**VOTE: 8/0**

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION/FENESTRATION CHANGES AND NON-TRADITION MATERIALS  
DENIED**

---

The meeting adjourned at 7:26 pm with a meeting length of 6 hours and twenty five minutes.

---

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission.