



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES
October 12, 2016

- MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. James Haden, Chair
Ms. Jana Hartenstine
Mr. P.J. Henningson
Ms. Jessica Hindman
Ms. Mattie Marshall
Mr. Dominick Ristaino, Second Vice Chair
Mr. Damon Rumsch, Vice Chair
Ms. Deb Ryan
Ms. Claire Stephens
Ms. Tamara Titus
- MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Rodric Lenhart
One Vacancy
- 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

Following a discussion among Commission, Staff, and Assistant City Attorney, a MOTION was made by Ms. Hindman and seconded by Ms. Marshall to adopt a change in the denial process: a denial can come back before the Historic District Commission in 2 months. The timeframe within which to make an appeal is 30 days from date of decision. This will go into effect starting in November. The vote was unanimous to adopt the new denial and appeal process.

Chairman Haden called to order the Regular October meeting of the Historic District Commission at 1:05 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 2016-166, 1912 S. Mint Street	Wilmore
HDC 2016-179, 1608 Merriman Avenue	Wilmore

NEW APPLICATIONS

HDC 2016-250, 2215 Dilworth Road W	Dilworth
HDC 2016-241, 300 W. Park Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2016-254, 700 Templeton Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2016-242, 317 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2016-248, 428 N. Poplar Street	Fourth Ward
HDC 2016-251, 1001 Mt. Vernon Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2016-253, 505 East Boulevard	Dilworth
HDC 2016-256, 1419 Lexington Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2016-257, 201 W. Park Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2016-234, 1913 Cleveland Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2016-235, 300 E. Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2016-236, 304 E. Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2016-237, 308 E. Worthington Avenue	Dilworth

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

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

This application was continued in September for further design study. Revised plans will show:

- New front dormer pulled back from the thermal wall

- Clarified and accurate setbacks
- Details of how the cedar siding meets the corner boards – Band and corner boards should show proud of the siding
- Refer back to August window configuration for the front dormer

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 topography of the street and adjacent parcels vary. Adjacent houses are one, one and one half, and two stories of varying architectural designs. Setbacks along the block vary between 25’ and 35’.

Proposal

Proposed is a new single family home. Design features include a 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 24’ .7”.

Revised Proposal – October 12

1. Front setback proposed is approximately 35’ to the front porch. Adjacent are 29’ and 34’-6”.
2. Front dormer has been set back and reduced in mass.
3. Siding is ¾ x 8 cedar, 1”x6” trim cedar boards, 1/4” corner board reveal, 4’ x 8’ plywood board on board and batten siding, 1” x 2” battens.

Applicant Comments: Contractor Justin Nifong summarized the changes – The front dormer has been reduced in size. Site plan shows proposed front porch lines up with existing porches along the street. There will be a ¼” reveal at corner to trim. The windows have been changed back to the August presentation.

Staff Recommendation:

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** for New Construction.

FOR/AGAINST:

- Linda McGee, neighborhood resident, spoke in favor of this project stating the windows need to be appropriate for the period.

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** Ms. Ryan made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with revised drawings to be submitted for staff review. The revised drawings will show:

- Correct beam/column alignment
- Correct dimensions on site plan
- All windows 3/1 except the front bay window
- Skirt band across porch to be modified to allow for drainage.

Ms. Stephens seconded.

VOTE: 9/0

AYES: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, RYAN, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

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

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

This application was continued in September for:

- The need of a site plan which includes grading
- Tree protection plan
- Reduce overall height or the perception of height
- Carriage track driveway going to the back corner of the house
- Consistent pier and column height resolution

Proposal – September

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.

Proposal – October

1. The site plan includes grading information
2. Front dormer has been moved
3. Revised height is 24'-6"
4. Driveway design has been modified
5. Porch columns/pier consistent on all elevations

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 the windows need to be appropriate for the period.

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

- All four elevations will match the site plan
- Foundation all brick or stucco - show
- Existing vs. proposed dotted grade line to show the grade changes
- Wall sections and plans reflect the consistent foundation condition
- Tree protection plan for the existing tree
- Dimensions on overhang
- Correct material notes
- Site sections - existing vs. new grade including the effect on the tree in both directions
- Contour reference heights on the topos
- Railing details for the back porch

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 10/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-250, 2215 Dilworth Road West - ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

This application was denied in July due to no exception warranted to allow an accessory building in the side yard and impact on driveway location.

Existing Conditions

The principal structure is a c. 1929 single family Colonial Revival home. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey. The parcel is an irregular shape with very little rear yard and nearly impossible to get a car back there. The lot angles sharply on the left side. The applicant is requesting an exception to the accessory building guideline due to the configuration of the lot. Adjacent property owner garages converge near the proposed location for this garage.

Proposal – July

The proposal for a new detached garage in the left side yard was denied in July.

Revised Proposal – October

1. The garage location has been moved back to the furthest possible location. It is as far to the rear left side of the house as possible. On the previous plan the garage was located more toward the front of the house
2. The driveway has been extended approximately 15 feet beyond the front façade
3. Proposed continues to be a one car garage
4. Materials remain the same
5. A carriage style door is proposed
6. The size of the proposed garage has been reduced (enabling it to be pushed back).

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will determine if an exception is warranted for locating the accessory building in the side yard due to the lot shape and house location. The Commission will also determine if the garage 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 exception warranted to *Policy & Design Guidelines – ACCESSORY STRUCTURE*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** as submitted with exception to accessory structure guidelines based on size and shape restraint of lot. Staff can approve modifications as long as the designated dimension between the front of the garage and front of the house remains the same or moves further to the back yard.

Ms. Hartenstine seconded.

VOTE: 7/3

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

NAYS: MARSHALL, RYAN, TITUS

DECISION: ACCESSORY STRUCTURE APPROVED

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-241, 300 W. PARK AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

The application was denied in August for scale (“This house will be taller than any historic house on the block.”) and context (“No other historic home on this block is two stories.”). The Commission will first determine if the revised proposal has been substantially redesigned or if there is a substantial change in circumstances before allowing the application to be heard.

Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** that the new application represents a substantial change and will be heard. Ms. Ryan seconded. The vote was unanimous.

Existing Conditions

The existing site is a vacant corner parcel in an area with one and two story homes. The site is approximately 3 feet above the sidewalk. The lot is 50’ wide by 200’ deep. Setbacks are consistent along the block. An alley exists behind the property. Houses on the block range in height from approximately 20’-5” to 30’-5”.

Proposal - August

The proposal is a new single family house and a detached garage. Design features include cedar siding in the gables and a brick foundation. The front porch is full width and 8’ in depth. The applicant is requesting the use of cementitious siding. The detached garage is one story and will be accessed from the alley. Garage materials will match the house.

Proposal – October 12, 2016

The revised design includes the following changes:

1. Height has been reduced
2. The house is 1 ½ stories
3. Front porch depth is 8’
4. Siding is ¾ x 8” cedar, 1” x 6” trim cedar boards, ¼” corner board reveal. Cedar shake siding in gables.

Staff Recommendation

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

FOR/AGAINST:

Linda McGee, Wilmore Resident, spoke in favor of this application and said she is pleased with the changes that were made.

Neighborhood Resident Liz Sheik spoke in support of the application.

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

- Brackets at the corners will begin at the bottom of the rakes
- Enlarge brackets
- Increase finished floor elevation as measured from the sidewalk where it meets the front steps to three feet
- Window specs to meet historic details and be wood

- Keep beams as drawn

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 9/0

AYES: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO,
RUMSCH, RYAN, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-254, 700 TEMPLETON AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1936 one story brick house. This is at the corner of Templeton and Euclid Avenues. Adjacent properties are one and two story single family houses. A multi-family development is located behind the house. A 365-Day Stay of Demolition was placed on the property July 13, 2016.

Proposal

The project is a new single family house and a detached garage. The proposed building setback matches existing thermal walls. The proposed height is approximately 28'. Materials are wood and brick. The detached garage is 21' in height with materials and architectural details to match the house.

Applicant Comments: Architect Allen Brooks pointed out that they are trying to replace the house with a more articulated example as exists on the street. The plan is to pay homage to what exists there now but create an integrated, holistic design for a house with a second floor and garage. It will become the 2nd shortest house on the street and one half of the houses are larger in square footage and one half of them are smaller. The proposed garage creates a nice presentation to Euclid Avenue. A large tree will be protected.

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 either for or against this application.

MOTION: Based on Non-Compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – NEW CONSTRUCTION***, Ms. Ryan made a **MOTION to DENY** this application for:

- Size – fortress like on the street and is significantly larger than the other houses
- Scale – it is larger than the buildings on Templeton Avenue as they relate to single family
- Fenestration – relationship between doors and windows are out of line on the front façade
- Massing – the roofline is overcomplicated

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 10/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION DENIED

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-242, 317 W. KINGSTON AVENUE - ADDITION

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1929 one story Bungalow. The front gable transitions to a hip roof on the rear elevation. The existing material is cementitious lap siding.

Proposal

The project is a second floor addition with shed dormers on the left and right sides that tie below the ridge but are visible from the street. Proposed siding is cementitious lap to match existing with wood boxing. New windows are wood double hung with wood trim.

Staff Recommendation:

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for Scale, Massing, Fenestration, Rhythm, Materials and Context.

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 – Additions*, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with an exception warranted to Guidelines for non-traditional materials because the home has cementitious siding.

Ms. Hindman seconded.

VOTE: 8/1

AYES: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: RYAN

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-248 – 428 N POPLAR STREET - ADDITION

Existing

The existing structure is a c. 1900 two story Victorian house at the corner of North Poplar Street and West 8th Street. It was once a duplex but has been converted to single family for many years.

Proposal

The project is a proposed second floor addition on the left rear, the footprint does not change. The addition will fill in an existing elbow. Wood siding and trim will match existing. The slate roof will be reused on the addition. The new second floor will not exceed the original ridge line.

Staff Recommendation:

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for Scale, Massing, Fenestration, Rhythm, Materials and Context.

FOR/AGAINST:

- Adjacent Property Owner spoke in opposition to the addition.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – ADDITIONS*, Ms. Marshall made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application as submitted as it meets Guidelines. **Ms. Titus seconded.**

VOTE: 8/1

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

NAYS: RYAN

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-251, 1001 MT. VERNON AVENUE – ADDITION

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1925 two story home. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey. The home is on a corner lot at Mt. Vernon and Lexington Avenues. The project was approved May 21, 2014. The COA expired and the applicant is resubmitting the unchanged plans for approval.

Proposal

The proposal is a two story rear addition that will be partially visible from the street and below the ridge line. The material is brick with trim and windows to match existing.

Applicant Comments: Architect Don Duffy said it is the same as two years ago. They are filling in an offset on the rear and adding a standing seam copper roof. The original hipped roof will be preserved.

Staff Recommendation

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

FOR/AGAINST:

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

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

VOTE: 10/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-257 – 201 W. PARK AVENUE - ADDITION

Existing Conditions

The structure is a c. 1955 one story ranch style building. It is located at the corner of South Tryon St. and West Park Avenue at the edge of Wilmore. The building is being modified to accommodate a day care use.

Proposal

The project is the installation of a wheelchair ramp at the front and rear entrances on this nearly triangular lot. The ramp material is wood.

Applicant Comments: Owner Ed Bowers said the change of use requires Code issues to be compliant. With six parking spaces in the back, accessibility must be provided for that entrance also.

Staff Recommendation

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

FOR/AGAINST:

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

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

- Elevations – West Park Avenue, Tryon Street, and rear with accurate grade information
- Material notes listed including handrails and decking
- Site plan with landscaping plan showing screening of parking
- Fencing details
- Photos of all sides of building
- Context photographs
- Consider other options per our guidelines – sloped walk, lifts, etc.

Ms. Ryan seconded

VOTE: 10/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-253, 505 EAST BOULEVARD – ADDITION

Existing Conditions

The existing office building was constructed in 1988. The front elevation features include a covered entrance with upper balustrade.

Proposal

The proposal is a redesign of the front portico and balustrade within the existing footprint. Details include Tuscan style columns (10” at the base), new fascia and trim boards. Proposed materials are synthetic and/or wood.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for Massing, Rhythm, Materials and Context.

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 – Additions*, Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application making an exception to Guidelines for non-traditional materials on a non-contributing structure and its date of construction. Color selection should comply with manufacturer’s specifications for material performance.

Ms. Titus seconded

VOTE: 10/0

AYES: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, 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.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-256, 1419 LEXINGTON AVENUE – ADDITION

Existing Conditions

The structure is a c. 1941 one and one half story Colonial Revival style house. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. Features include a side porch, 8/8 windows, and covered entrance.

Proposal

The project for HDC review is the enclosure of the side porch, new windows, and the addition of a new front porch. The side porch enclosure includes lapped wood siding and trim, and wood windows. The new front porch features include brick piers, wooden posts, and a gable roof. The existing porch deck will remain.

Applicant Comments: Architect Ray Sheedy said the goal is to keep the Georgian Revival style intact. The side porch was once open and has been filled in at some time.

Staff Recommendation

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

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 – Additions*, Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings should show:

- 8/8 window pattern
- Shape of the portico remaining
- Copy the front columns to the side porch (Tuscan)

Ms. Marshall seconded

VOTE: 9/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, RYAN, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-234, 1913 CLEVELAND AVENUE – DEMOLITION

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a one story concrete block building constructed in 1993.

Proposal

The proposal is full demolition of the subject property for redevelopment.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will make a determination as to whether or not this structure is determined to be contributing to the Dilworth Historic District. With affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to 365-Day Stay of Demolition. Or, if the Commission determines that this property is not contributing, then demolition may take place without a delay.

FOR/AGAINST:

- Chris Hudson, neighborhood resident, spoke in opposition of the demolition

Ms. Titus made a motion and it was seconded by Mr. Ristaino that this is a non-contributing structure. The vote was unanimous.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Demolitions*, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the demolition with no delay.

Mr. Ristaino seconded

VOTE: 8/2 **AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, RYAN, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: HARTENSTINE, MARSHALL

DECISION: PROPERTY DETERMINED TO BE NON CONTRIBUTING AND APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION APPROVED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-235, 300 EAST WORTHINGTON AVENUE – DEMOLITION

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1930 one and one half story Bungalow. It is listed as Non-Contributing in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey.

Proposal

The proposal is full demolition of the subject property for redevelopment.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will make a determination as to whether or not this structure is determined to be contributing to the Dilworth Historic District. With affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to 365-Day Stay of Demolition. Or, if the Commission determines that this property is no longer contributing then demolition may take place without a delay.

FOR/AGAINST:

- Chris Hudson, neighborhood resident, spoke in opposition of the demolition

Ms. Titus made a motion and it was seconded by Mr. Ristaino that this is a contributing structure. The vote was unanimous.

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

Mr. Ristaino seconded

VOTE: 10/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: 365 DAY STAY OF DEMOLITION IMPOSED

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-236, 304 EAST WORTHINGTON AVENUE – DEMOLITION

Existing Conditions

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

Proposal

The proposal is full demolition of the subject property for redevelopment.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will make a determination as to whether or not this structure is determined to be contributing to the Dilworth Local Historic District. With affirmative determination, the Commission can impose up to a 365-Day Stay of Demolition. Or, if the Commission determines that this property is no longer contributing then demolition may take place without a delay.

FOR/AGAINST:

- Chris Hudson, neighborhood resident, spoke in opposition of the demolition.

Ms. Titus made a motion and it was seconded by Mr. Ristaino that this is a contributing structure. The vote was unanimous.

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

Mr. Ristaino seconded

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, RYAN, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: 365 DAY STAY OF DEMOLITION IMPOSED

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-237, 308 EAST WORTHINGTON AVENUE – DEMOLITION

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1930 (or most likely earlier) one and one half story Bungalow. It is listed as Contributing in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey.

Proposal

The proposal is full demolition of the subject property for redevelopment.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will make a determination as to whether or not this structure is determined to be contributing to the Dilworth Historic District. With affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to 365-Day Stay of Demolition. Or, if the Commission determines that this property is no longer contributing then demolition may take place without a delay.

FOR/AGAINST:

- Chris Hudson, neighborhood resident, spoke in opposition of the demolition
Ristaino that this is a contributing structure. The vote was unanimous.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Demolitions*, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to impose a maximum 365 day stay of demolition.

Mr. Ristainoh seconded

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, RYAN, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: 365 DAY STAY OF DEMOLITION

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

A MOTION was made and unanimously approved to adjourn at 6:20 pm with a meeting length of 5 hours and 15 minutes.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission.