



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES
September 14, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. James Haden, Chair
Ms. Jana Hartenstine
Mr. P.J. Henningson
Ms. Jessica Hindman
Mr. Rodric Lenhart
Mr. Dominic Ristaino, Second Vice Chair
Mr. Damon Rumsch, Vice Chair
Ms. Deb Ryan
Ms. Claire Stephens
Ms. Tamara Titus

MEMBERS ABSENT: Dr. Lili Corbus
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

Chairman Haden called to order the Regular September 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 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 either 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. A 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 Haden 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. Haden 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:

CONTINUED

HDC 2016-146, 1915 Merriman Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2016-166, 1912 S. Mint Street	Wilmore

NEW APPLICATIONS

HDC 2016-179, 1608 Merriman Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2016-166, 1912 S. Mint Street	Wilmore
HDC 2016-175, 800 Woodruff Place	Wesley Heights
HDC 2016-217, 1609 Park Road	Dilworth
HDC 2016-191, 1948 Park Road	Dilworth
HDC 2016-223, 1822 Cleveland Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2016-224, 1914 Lennox Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2016-199, 1505 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2016-213, 400 Hermitage Court	Hermitage Court
HDC 2016-216, 621 Woodruff Place	Wesley Heights

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-146, 1915 MERRIMAN AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

This application was CONTINUED in August based on the need for additional information and changes to the plans. These revised plans will show:

- Original double steps remaining
- Clarification note: The height is appropriate within this unique block
- The setback of the new porch should be equal to the adjacent property
- Consistency (overhangs, columns, and brackets) within a chosen direction
- Gable end windows clarified
- Window sill and glazing details drawn in or called out
- Corrected details regarding the siding, corner boards, and trim

Existing Conditions

The existing site is a vacant parcel in a block with mostly duplex residential structures. The site is approximately 3 to 4 feet above the sidewalk. The previous structure was a duplex; two sets of steps remain on the site. Setbacks are consistent along the block.

Proposal

The proposal is a new single family one and one half story house with a full width front porch with a full width front porch. The height from grade is approximately 20'-2". The driveway will be extended to the rear of the house.

Revised Proposal – September 14

1. Front gable window and vent have been redesigned
2. Eave bracket dimensions have been updated to 4x6
3. Window trim, porch columns and material dimensions have been updated
4. 24" overhangs
5. 6" siding reveal
6. Brick columns with tapered columns
7. Setback lines are equal to adjacent properties
8. Porch lines up with others on street – one step or slab on grade
9. Carriage track drive will go to rear corner of house (or farther).

Staff Recommendation

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

FOR/AGAINST:

- Linda McGee, neighborhood resident spoke with concerns that the 4x4 brackets are too small and stated that 4X6 would be better.

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

- Pier/column resolution for consistency and accuracy
- Correct relationship of siding to corner boards
- 4x6" brackets
- 6" reveal lapped wood siding
- Drip edge at band detail
- Exposed rafter tails at rear dormer
- Tongue and groove porch floor installed perpendicular to house
- Tongue and groove soffit.

Ms. Hindman seconded.

VOTE: 9/0

AYES: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LENHART, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

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

This application was not heard in August due to lack of sufficient information.

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-2016-179, 1608 MERRIMAN AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

Existing Conditions

The existing site is a vacant parcel located mid-block on Merriman Avenue. The parcel tapers in width from the front to back. Heights of the houses in the block are one, one and one half, and two stories of varying architectural designs. Setbacks are approximately 20 to 27 feet from right of way. Building heights vary.

Proposal

The proposal is a new single family home. Design features include a full width front porch, a front facing gable dormer, rear shed dormer and wood trim materials. Front porch depth is 8 feet. Proposed height is approximately 25 feet.

Staff Recommendation

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

FOR/AGAINST:

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

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

- Site plan which includes grading
- Tree protection plan
- Reduce the overall height or the perception of height
- Carriage track driveway going to the back corner of the house at least
- Consistent pier and column height resolution.

Mr. Rumsch seconded

VOTE: 9/0

AYES: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LENHART, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED

Mr. Henningson declared a conflict of interest and removed himself from the Commission for the next application.

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-166, 1912 SOUTH MINT STREET – NEW CONSTRUCTION

This application was continued in August for further design study and material choices and notes. Revised plans will show:

- Details of materials including dimensions
- Details of the left and right setbacks
- Front dormer pushed back off the thermal wall
- Fenestration more respectful of the massing
- Tree protection plan.

Existing Conditions

The existing site is a vacant parcel located mid-block on South Mint Street. A large tree exists in the front yard. The parcel tapers in width from the front to back. The distance between the sidewalk and existing grade is approximately 8 feet. The topography of the street and adjacent parcels vary. Adjacent houses are one, one and one half, and two stories of varying architectural designs. Setbacks vary.

Proposal

The proposal is a new single family home. Design features include a full width front porch, front facing gabled dormers, rear shed dormer, and wood trim materials. The rear dormer has a standing seam metal roof. Proposed height is +/23'. The tree in the front yard will be removed.

Revised Proposal – September 14

1. The front porch has been redesigned to save the tree
2. A tree protection plan has been provided
3. Adjacent setbacks will be verified

Staff Recommendation:

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

FOR/AGAINST:

- Linda McGee neighborhood resident spoke in favor of this project stating it has beautiful craftsman details and it is good the tree is being saved.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application. The revised drawings will show:

- Massing of the front dormer pulled back from the thermal wall
- Site plan showing the setback of the front porch at 28 or 29 feet
- Details of how the cedar siding meets with the cornerboards - Band and cornerboards are proud of the siding
- Refer to the August window configuration for the front dormer

Ms. Hindman seconded

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, LENHART, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED

MS. RYAN ARRIVED AT 2:45 AND WAS PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-175, 800 WOODRUFF PLACE– NEW CONSTRUCTION

Existing Conditions

The existing site is a vacant corner lot in an area with one story homes and a two story home at the edge of the Wesley Heights Local Historic District at the corner of Woodruff Place and Hurston Place. The topography slopes downward toward Freedom Drive. The site is approximately 3 feet above the sidewalk, the lot size is 82.5' x 150'. Setbacks are consistent along the block. Residential structures at the rear of

the property are not in the historic district. A single family house occupied the site before being demolished without approval in 2014.

Proposal

Proposed is a duplex for this larger corner lot with parking to the rear. Hardie is requested for the main block of the two story structure with shakes proposed for the second floor exterior. Front porches will face both streets.

Staff Recommendation:

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

FOR/AGAINST:

- David May, adjacent property owner, does not support this application stating it is larger than any other Wesley Heights house. Large trees will be lost and it is the wrong scale and context.
- Linda McGee, Wilmore resident, is in opposition of this application. Her concerns are it would set precedent and this project should adhere to the standards for size, scale and massing. The duplex is too big for the Wesley Heights neighborhood.

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

- Context – it is the tallest building on the block
- Far exceeds square footage for existing neighborhood multi-family structures
- Missing information on how the building fronts the street
- Scale is not keeping with the street
- Percent of lot coverage for the structure
- Site plan to include tree locations and removal
- Materials, rhythm, massing, fenestration have not been proven to be appropriate.

Mr. Henningson seconded.

VOTE: 10/0

AYES: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LENHART, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, RYAN, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION DENIED

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-217, 1609 PARK ROAD - ADDITION

Existing Conditions

The c. 1947 house is a brick, one story cottage style design. Site features include a mature canopy tree in the rear left side yard.

Proposal

The project is the addition of a shed dormer on the front right side and an addition to the left side and rear. The dormer materials and trim will match existing. The left side addition includes a brick exterior, new stairs and secondary door facing the front. Other details include a new porch column and handrail, windows and rear deck.

Staff Recommendation:

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for additions. The guideline for setback does not apply.

FOR/AGAINST:

- No one accepted chairman Haden’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** this application as submitted.
Ms. Hartenstine seconded.

VOTE: 8/1 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, LENHART, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: RYAN

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-191, 1948 PARK ROAD - ADDITION

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1925 one and one half story Bungalow. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey. The site is at the triangle of Brookside Avenue, East Tremont Avenue and Park Road at the edge of the Dilworth Local Historic District. Adjacent residential structures are one, one and one half, and two stories. A small addition was recently approved with the direction to disconnect the roofline at the side door and redesign the proposed stair to be straight rather than angled.

Proposal

Now proposed is a stair coming straight out, and no roof over the stoop. This is on the Tremont Avenue side.

Staff Recommendation:

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

FOR/AGAINST:

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

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

- Masonry foundation at the side landing

- T&G floor surface at side landing
- A rail detail like the one on the front.

Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 10/0

AYES: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LENHART, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, RYAN, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-223 – 1822 CLEVELAND AVENUE - ADDITION

Existing

The is a one and one half story Victorian structure at the corner of East Worthington Avenue and Cleveland Avenue. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey. The proposed use is office (zoned B-1). The application for an addition and detached garage was approved June 10, 2015. This is a home with the owner’s law practice in the accessory building.

Proposal

The project is a loggia addition that connects the front of the accessory building to the back of the house. New materials, windows and trim details will match existing (brick piers and wood trim). This is being required by Zoning.

Applicant Comments

Architect Allen Brooks said this is one of the oldest Dilworth houses and the only remaining in the immediate vicinity in a sea of mixed use. Because the owner will have his business in the new outbuilding, a connection is being required so as not to be a ‘two houses on one lot’ situation. The connector is called a loggia which is more substantial with roof with columns and piers, than a breezeway and satisfies Code.

Staff Recommendation:

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

FOR/AGAINST:

- No one accepted Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak FOR or AGAINST this application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – ADDITIONS*, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application, making an exception to allow connectivity because it is required by Zoning. Also noted the office is a secondary structure.

Mr. Ristaino seconded.

VOTE: 10/0

AYES: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LENHART, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, RYAN, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-224, 1914 LENNOX AVENUE – ADDITION

The application was denied May 11, 2016 due to size (creation of a house 150' in length) and massing. Denied projects may be heard by the HDC within 6 months if a project has been substantially redesigned or if there has been a substantial change of circumstances affecting the property. The HDC will first determine if the project has been substantially redesigned or if there is a substantial change in circumstances before opening the hearing for review.

Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to hear this application based on a substantial change. Ms. Stephens seconded. The vote was unanimous.

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a one story Bungalow house with a gable 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. 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 on January 6, 2016 that connected the house to the existing garage. A stop work order was issued in March due to work being performed outside of the COA in additional demolition.

Original 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.

Proposal-May 11, 2016

The revised drawings included the following changes and the project was DENIED:

1. *The size of the connection between the house and garage has been reduced by approximately 50%.*
2. *An open courtyard assumes the remainder of the space between structures.*
3. *The front façade will not be changed.*

Proposal – September 14, 2016

The applicant has re-applied based on substantial redesign of the project:

1. *The connection between the house and garage has been removed.*
2. *The space between structures is an open courtyard.*
3. *An upper story addition is proposed toward the rear that raises the height approximately 5'-10".*

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 and stated it is a good house.

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

- Mr. Ristaino – friendly amendment, lower the rear dormer ridge by one foot to soften it so it is not so tall. Maybe clip the end or maybe hip. Mr. Henningson accepted the amendment.

Mr. Lenhart seconded.

VOTE: 6/2

AYES: HADEN, HENNINGSON, LENHART, RISTAINO, RYAN, STEPHENS,

NAYS: HARTENSTINE, RUMSCH

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-199, 1505 THOMAS AVENUE – ADDITION

Existing Conditions

The house is a c. 1931 one story Bungalow s. The house has a hipped roof with a large hipped dormer on the front elevation. Existing details include boxed eaves and wood windows. Adjacent structures are one story Bungalow houses

Proposal

The project is the addition of a shed dormer on the right side and new windows. The dormer will have materials and details to match the existing house. On the left side elevation three windows are proposed to be replaced with transom windows. The rear addition is not visible from the street but there is an addition planned.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for additions. The guideline for setback does not apply.

FOR/AGAINST:

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

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with the *Policy & Design Guidelines* Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application due to:

- Lack of adequate fenestration – further design study needed
- Rhythm/symmetry disturbed by the proposed roofline projection on one side
- Rear roofline higher than necessary
- Need more information

Mr. Ristaino seconded

VOTE: 10/0

AYES: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LENHART, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, RYAN, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION DENIED

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-216, 621 WOODRUFF PLACE – TREE REPLACEMENT

The application for approval of a landscape plan was denied in August for tree removal without a COA and insufficient replacement/mitigation plans. The motion recommends a future landscape plan that includes three large maturing canopy trees, two that are similar to the previous trees and planted close to the previous location and the third tree to be of a type and location of the owner's choice.

Existing Conditions

The rear yard contained three large maturing trees that were removed without HDC approval. The purpose of removal was to make improvements in the yard.

Proposal

Proposed is an entire rear yard plan to include the past tree removal and the new trees and paving.

Revised Proposal – September 14

1. The landscape plan has been revised to show two trees replanted in close proximity of the original trees and the third located to the right rear corner.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission shall if the proposal meets the guidelines for site features and provide recommendations for tree replacement.

FOR/AGAINST:

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Tree Replacement*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the new location of the trees, The two large maturing trees be oak, size of the trees determined by an arborist with the City.

SUB MOTION: Ms. Ryan made a motion that the 2 oak trees will be 6" in caliper.
Ms. Stephens seconded.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: CORBUS, HADEN, HENNINGSON, LENHART, RISTAINO,
RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR TREE REPLACEMENT APPROVED

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-213, 400 HERMITAGE COURT – ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

The application was denied in February for scale, massing and rhythm of the second story of the garage. The dormer projections are not drawn from the main structure.

The Commission will first determine if the revised proposal has been substantially redesigned before allowing the application to be heard.

Ms. Titus made a motion to NOT hear this application due to no substantial change. Ms. Ryan seconded and the vote was unanimous.

Ms. Titus made a MOTION to APPROVE the July and August minutes with some typos to be corrected. The motion was seconded and the vote was unanimous to approve the July and August minutes.

The Commission briefly entered into closed session and came out at 7:10 pm. A MOTION was made and unanimously approved to adjourn at 7:10 pm with a meeting length of 6 hours and 10 minutes.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission.