



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES
June 8, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dr. Lili Corbus
Mr. Tom Egan, Chair
Mr. James Haden
Mr. Rodric Lenhart
Mr. Nasif Majeed
Ms. Mattie Marshall
Mr. Dominic Ristaino, Vice Chair
Ms. Claire Stephens
Ms. Tamara Titus, Second Vice Chair

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Tim Bender
Mr. Don Duffy
Mr. Damon Rumsch

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 June meeting of the Historic District Commission at 1:04 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. Chairman 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. An audience member will be asked once to be quiet and the need for a second request will be removal from the room.

Mr. Howard reported that a new date has been set for the upcoming Historic District Commission Retreat. It is to be on July 8 in Room 280 here in the CMGC.

A draft of the Policy & Design Guidelines is expected soon with an adoption possibly in the fall.

Index of Addresses: **NEW APPLICATIONS**

HDC 2016-063	2000 Park Road	Dilworth
HDC 2016-070,	1748 Merriman Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2016-107,	703 Walnut Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDC 2016-113	512-514 Walnut Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDC 2016-117	2219 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2016-114	1422 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2016-103	420 W. 5 th Street	Fourth Ward
HDC 2016-130,	701 N. Graham Street	Fourth Ward
HDC 2016-037,	2200 Park Road	Dilworth
HDC 2016-093,	529 E. Kingston Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2016-094,	816 Mt. Vernon Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2016-096,	701 Mt. Vernon Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2016-116,	1948 Park Road	Dilworth

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-2016-063, 2000 PARK ROAD – ADDITION/TREE REMOVAL

This application was continued from May for need of the following information:

- Details on the front porch and how it will tie into the house and column details
- Clear, accurate drawings
- Additional photos of existing
- A tree removal letter from a Certified Arborist to show evidence on why the trees were removed and evidence of any damage to the house (structural report if Arborist’s letter is not sufficient)
- A landscape plan showing replacement trees.

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. Existing height is approximately 21'. Adjacent structures are one and one and one half story single family homes.

Proposal – Addition (April)

The proposed project is a single story addition that extends to the rear. 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 and detail. Additional details include triple corner columns to support the existing front porch and new side porch roof. New siding shall be added as shown with siding lap dimension to 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 exiting 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 drawings include the following changes:

1. Removal of the rear addition
2. Removal of the fence from the project
3. Removal of the side porch and deck
4. Removal of the garage and basement windows

Updated Proposal-June 8, 2016

1. The applicant is requesting a new porch design and materials. The column base material has been changed to wood.
2. Two cherry trees are shown on the site plan in place of a cedar and elm that were removed without approval.
3. A Stop Work order was issued today due to the foundation work being done that was not covered in past review.
4. Stone is being requested as an accent addition to the front.

Applicant Comments – Owners explained that the tree removal was a terrible misunderstanding. It was thought that the removal was covered in a past approval.

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 Mr. Chris Hudson spoke in opposition, stating there is a concern that applicant did not following HDC process and no COA was issued, therefore no permit should have been granted.

- Neighborhood Resident John Phares spoken in opposition concerned that the entire foundation has been removed, 2 major trees are gone. The foundation could have been repaired. The porch is the most important historic feature of this house; it is original and should remain.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Tree Removal*, Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application with conditions: A landscape plan that is to be submitted should show:

1. No removal of the front yard Elm tree
2. Two large maturing trees from the city’s list are to be planted where they can thrive

Based on no exception warranted to *Policy & Design Guidelines - Additions*

3. The existing column configuration and materials will remain unchanged (repaired as necessary). The columns to remain will help preserve historic character.
4. Friendly amendment from Chairman Egan, the approval of 3 trees to be removed, The Cherry tree, Cedar tree and the Sweet Gum tree as noted.

Mr. Haden seconded

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: TREE REMOVAL APPROVED (AS NOTED ABOVE) WITH MITIGATION. APPLICATION FOR COLUMNS DENIED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-070, 1748 MERRIMAN – ADDITION

Existing Context

The existing structure is a c. 1940 one story Cottage style home. It has wood siding and trim, and 6 over 1 window light pattern. Adjacent homes are primarily one story Cottage style. A second floor addition was approved August 12, 2015 (2015-113).

Proposal

The proposal is a revision of the approved second floor addition within the existing building footprint. Project details include two new front dormers, second floor addition to the rear, a covered front porch on the right side, wood lap siding, windows and trim details to match existing, and roof trim and materials to match existing. Total new height is approximately 25’ measured from grade at the front of the house. The changes to the approved plan are driven by the need to add upstairs bedrooms and Code required egress.

Applicant Comments – The architect explained that this revision simplifies the overall plan. A dormer will be added to the front and a small shed also. The porch will be moved over to the right. The rear will be evened out and the overall shape is similar to the past approval.

Staff Recommendation:

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

FOR/AGAINST:

- Neighborhood Resident PJ Henningson, spoke in favor of the application.
- Neighborhood Resident Chris Hudson spoke in opposition of this application, stating that the front elevation comparison was missing; it is not consistent with the street.

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions*, Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION to DENY** this application due to the proposed changes do not respect the original character of the original house, and the existing house would no longer be distinguishable. The proposed is not sensitive to the character and massing of the existing house. **Ms. Marshall seconded.**

VOTE: 8/1 **AYES:** CORBUS, HADEN, LENHART, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: EGAN

DECISION: APPLICATION DENIED

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-107, 703 WALNUT AVENUE – NON-TRADITIONAL SIDING

Existing Conditions

The existing structure was originally a duplex constructed in 1933. It was converted to a single family house. It is identified as a Contributing structure in the Wesley Heights National Register of Historic Places Survey. A Certificate of Appropriateness was issued by staff July 14, 2015 for an addition with lapped wood siding. A Notice of Violation was issued January 2016 due to substitute siding being in place.

Proposal – Non-traditional siding

The new addition on the rear house has cementitious siding. The applicant is requesting an exception to allow the siding to remain.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will determine if an exception for non-traditional siding material is approved.

FOR/AGAINST:

- Chris Hudson, Dilworth resident spoke in opposition of this application, stating the applicant disregarded the guidelines for material.

MOTION: Based on no exception warranted to *Policy & Design Guidelines – Building Materials*, Ms. Marshall made a **MOTION to DENY** the application of substitute siding. **Ms. Titus seconded.**

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** CORBUS, EGAN, HADEN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR HARDIE, NON-TRADITIONAL BUILDING MATERIAL, DENIED.

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-113, 512-514 WALNUT AVENUE – ADDITION

This application was denied in May for:

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

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. Existing height is +/- 17'-6". Adjacent structures are a mix of one and two story homes.

Proposal

The proposal is a second floor addition within the existing footprint and changes to window and door openings. The new height is +/-23'. Additions include new porch columns and expanded deck, new siding in the existing porch gable and a new gable dormer. On the left elevation a new entrance replaces an existing window. On the right elevation a small stoop and overhang are added with a new entry door. Additions to the rear include two new doors and a deck.

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 Chairman Egan's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with the *Rules and Procedures* Ms. Titus made a **MOTION to DECLINE** hearing this application because the revised plans did not represent a substantial change from that recently DENIED. Positive changes were made to the Massing, Fenestration, and Materials. Significant changes need to be made to the Scale for this to represent a new application. **Mr. Haden seconded.**

VOTE: 7/1

AYES: CORBUS, EGAN, HADEN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: MAJEED

DECISION: COMMISSION DECLINED TO HEAR THIS APPLICATION AS SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE WAS NOT REPRESENTED.

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-117, 2219 THE PLAZA - ADDITION

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a C. 1930 one and one half story Bungalow on the edge of the Plaza Midwood Historic District. Adjacent structures are one and one and one half story homes. The house is +/-14'-9" tall measured from the finished floor. Exterior material is painted brick.

Proposal

The proposal is an upper level addition that extends the height approximately 8'-9". New siding material is stucco, and board and batten. Roof trim details will match existing. The rear porch will be removed. The building footprint does not change.

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:

- Dilworth Resident Jessica Hindman, spoke in opposition of this application, stating that historic precedent for this roof form is not set, the pieces on the front are big, and the massing needs to step in.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information and further design study, Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION to CONTINUE** this application. Revised drawings will show:

1. Second story addition reduced by bringing the walls in
2. Rear gable redesigned
3. Stucco and board and batten will be the siding in gables

Chairman Egan made a friendly amendment that the board and batten can be seen anywhere on the approved plans.

Dr. Corbus made a friendly amendment that only traditional building materials will be used. Both amendments were accepted by Ms. Stephens.

Mr. Lenhart seconded.

VOTE: 6/2 **AYES:** EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MAJEED, MARSHALL, STEPHENS

NAYS: CORBUS, TITUS

DECISION: APPLICATION CONTINUED

-
- **MS. MARSHALL WAS OUT OF THE ROOM FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**
-

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-114, 1422 The Plaza – ADDITION/GARAGE

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1941 single family house. Adjacent structures are also single family with lots that are 192.5' in depth. There are two accessory buildings in the rear yard that will be removed. A COA for a second floor addition was issued March 14, 2014 (2013-048).

Proposal-April

The project is a detached garage and a new roof and wall system over the existing patio in the rear yard. The garage height is approximately 25'-10". Proposed siding material on the garage is cementitious shakes and lapped wood.

Staff Recommendation

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

FOR/AGAINST:

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

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines***, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for the following issues:

1. Size - the proposed garage is wider than the house.
2. Scale - the proposed garage is taller than the rear elevation of the main house.
3. Context, it appears to be the largest garage in Plaza Midwood, and it does not read as a secondary structure.
4. Deny the screen porch addition because it fails to meet our guidelines for massing and rhythm. By punching out 3 feet on the side it becomes a featured element on the right side elevation.

Mr. Majeed seconded.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: CORBUS, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MAJEED, RISTAINO, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR GARAGE AND ADDITION DENIED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-103, 420 W. 5TH STREET - ADDITION

Existing Conditions

Charlotte Fire Station Number 4 is a flat-roofed, three-bay, two-story brick building on West Fifth Street in Fourth Ward. It is adjacent to high rise and mid-rise multi-family buildings. The proposed addition has been approved by the Mecklenburg County Historic Landmarks Commission where a COA was issued May 20, 2016. A previous and somewhat similar proposal for an addition and renovation was approved in concept July 2013 by the HDC.

Proposal –Addition

Proposed is an adaptive re-use – from fire station to restaurant - project with an addition to the rear and right side. A rooftop terrace will also be added. The façade materials will be brick and metal. The exterior stairs will be enclosed with metal panels.

Staff Recommendation

The Historic Districts staff believes the project meets the guidelines for size, scale, massing, fenestration, rhythm, materials and context.

FOR/AGAINST:

- Mr. Stuart Gray of the Historic Landmarks Commission spoke in favor of this application, stating this application that is presented is the exact same presentation approved by the Historic Landmarks Commission.

MOTION: Based on a need for additional information and further design study Mr. Majeed made **MOTION to CONTINUE** this application. Revised drawings will show: More fenestration details. Ms. Titus made a friendly amendment that the Commission needs to see more details for the proposed three large bi-fold doors where fire truck doors new exist, as well as the side walk-through door, and review the choices of new materials. Mr. Majeed accepted the amendment and **Ms. Stephens seconded.**

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

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-130, 701 N. GRAHAM STREET – FIRE RECONSTRUCTION

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a one story commercial building at the corner of North Graham Street and West 10th Street constructed in 1987. It is a Circle K. An electrical fire inside the building has left remaining a brick shell. Adjacent structures are industrial, commercial, and multi-story residential.

Proposal

The proposal includes cementitious siding (Hardie Artisan) and new signage. The brick walls will be kept and Hardie is proposed everywhere else. The footprint remains. Landscaping will be kept and added to. The dumpster enclosure will be repaired. A hatched walkway will be from the door to the corner and through the corner landscaping. The goal is to try to use non-combustible materials as much as possible. The canopies over the gas pumps will be renovated.

Staff Recommendation:

The HDC will determine if an exception for non-traditional siding material is warranted.

FOR/AGAINST:

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

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information, Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION to CONTINUE** this application. The revised drawings will show:
1. Additional information on the siding size
2. Additional information on the brick that is being used under the canopy
Chairman Egan made a friendly amendment, to include a head and jam detail on how the artisan siding will fit with the windows and a detailed column drawing at the canopy. Ms. Stephens accepted the amendment and **Mr. Haden seconded.**

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

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR RECONSTRUCTION CONTINUED

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-037, 2200 PARK ROAD – ADDITION

Existing Conditions

The two story brick commercial building was constructed in 1928 and listed as a Contributing Structure in the Dilworth National Register. The site is located at the corner of Ideal Way and Park Road. The deck expansion and other façade changes including garage doors on the front facade were approved by the HDC May 13, 2015.

Proposal-February

The proposal is the addition of a deck enclosure, windows, doors and stairs to the rear of the building. Site features include new trees, dumpster enclosure, and parking lot paving. Siding and trim materials are wood, the new windows and doors are metal frame.

Staff Recommendation:

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

FOR/AGAINST:

- Adjacent property owner Ms. Paula Pridgen gave a handout and a PowerPoint presentation in opposition of this addition and improvements.
- Ms. Ellen Citarella, Dilworth resident spoke in opposition echoing Ms. Paula Pridgen’s presentation.

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions*, Ms. Marshall made a **MOTION to DENY** this application. Ms. Titus expanded the MOTION to specify that the proposed does not meet criteria for compatible size, massing, scale, fenestration, landscaping, and no local examples of garage bays exist. Ms. Marshall accepted the addition. **Ms. Corbus seconded.**

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION DENIED.

-
- **MR. RISTAINO LEFT THE MEETING AT 6:30 AND WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-093, 529 E. KINGSTON AVENUE – ADDITION

Existing Conditions

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 of Historic Places Survey. Adjacent residential structures are one, one and one half, and two story single family homes.

Proposal

The proposal is the addition of a deck enclosure to the rear of the building. Siding and trim materials are wood to match existing. The roof is supported by new square columns. The new casement windows on the right side will match the existing windows at the front. The footprint will not change. A new gable will face the rear and have a row of clerestory windows for additional light into the new screened porch.

Staff Recommendation:

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

FOR/AGAINST:

- Mr. Chris Hudson Dilworth resident spoke in opposition of this addition, stating the house is well constructed now and does not need more addition.
- Ms. Phyllis Fulton spoke in favor of this application, stating that she loves what they are doing, and it is in keeping with the neighborhood.

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** – massing, scale, size, materials, fenestration, footprint unchanged, Mr. Majeed made a MOTION to APPROVE the rear addition. Mr. Lenhart seconded.

VOTE: 2/6

AYES: LENHART, MAJEED

NAYS: CORBUS, EGAN, HADEN, MARSHALL, STEPHENS, TITUS

DECISION: MOTION FAILED.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Dr. Corbus made a **MOTION to CONTINUE** this application. Further design study will show:

1. A substantial redesign of the clerestory and the massing of the addition
2. The roof brought down.

Ms. Stephens seconded

VOTE: 6/2

AYES: CORBUS, EGAN, HADEN, MARSHALL, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: LENHART, MAJEED

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-094, 816 MT. VERNON AVENUE – ADDITION

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1930 two story Colonial Revival house. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey. Adjacent residential structures are one, one and one half, and two story single family homes.

Proposal

Proposed is the enclosure of a side porch, the removal of a side chimney, and new windows and doors on the rear and right side. New double hung windows will match existing design. Column type/material is noted as Turncraft or equal. Appropriate trim will be added where it does not exist.

Staff Recommendation:

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

FOR/AGAINST:

- Mr. Chris Hudson, Dilworth resident asked if there a drawing for the height of the adjacent properties.

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

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** CORBUS, EGAN, LENHART, HADEN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-096, 701 MT. VERNON AVENUE – WINDOW CHANGES

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1935 one and one half story Colonial style house. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey. Adjacent structures are one, one and one half, and two story single family homes.

Proposal

The proposal is window replacement on the left side elevation with new wood casement and double hung windows. Existing paired windows will be replaced with a gang of three double hung windows – the sill will be dropped. A garden window will be replaced with wood casements. Window material and trim will match existing.

Staff Recommendation:

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

FOR/AGAINST:

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Window Changes*, Ms. Marshall made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with revised drawings to staff for probable approval.

The revised drawing should show:

1. The new configuration details should remain at sill height that currently exists
2. The garden window removal/replacement is approved as drawn.

Chairman Egan friendly amendment, if the window configuration (2 to 3) was to change then staff will approve it. *Ms. Stephen seconded.*

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** CORBUS, EGAN, LENHART, HADEN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR WINDOW CHANGES APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. REVISED DRAWINGS TO STAFF FOR PROBABLE APPROVAL.

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-116, 1948 PARK ROAD – ADDITION

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1925 one story Bungalow. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey. The site is at the traffic circle at the intersection of Brookside Avenue, East Tremont Avenue, and Park Road. Adjacent residential structures are one, one and one half, and two stories. The lot is a triangular lot and where an addition could be placed was set by the Zoning Administrator.

Proposal

The project is a one story addition to the right side and rear. New materials, windows, and trim will match existing. A small secondary porch will be added on the Tremont Avenue side.

Staff Recommendation:

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

FOR/AGAINST:

- Mr. Chris Hudson, spoke in opposition of this application stating it is hard to distinguish what is old and what is new. And asked if the design adequately maintains the bungalow style.

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions***, Ms. Stephen made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application with revised drawings to staff for probable approval.

The revised drawings will show:

1. Disconnect the roofline at the side back door.
2. The stairway door will be a window.
3. HVAC will be in the back on the side and adequately screened.
4. The side deck will be removed.

Mr. Haden seconded.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: CORBUS, EGAN, LENHART, HADEN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

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

Mr. Lenhart left at 7:15 pm and was not present for the remainder of the meeting.

At 7:15 pm Ms. Stephens made a MOTION to go into closed session to consult with Attorney Thomas Powers regarding an upcoming appeal to the ZBA. Ms. Marshall seconded.

