



CHARLOTTE

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

November 9, 2016

MINUTES

- MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. James Haden, Chair
Ms. Jana Hartenstine
Mr. P. J. Henningson
Ms. Jessica Hindman
Mr. Rodric Lenhart
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:** None
One Vacancy
- OTHERS PRESENT:** Mr. John Howard, Administrator of the Historic District Commission
Ms. Kristi Harpst, Staff
Historic District Commission
Ms. Wanda Birmingham, Staff
Historic District Commission
Ms. Linda Keich, Staff
Historic District Commission
Mr. Thomas Powers, Assistant City Attorney
Adkins Court Reporters

Chairman Haden called to order the Regular November 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

201 West Park Avenue	Wilmore
1608 Merriman Avenue	Wilmore

New Applications

433 West Boulevard	Wilmore
800 Woodruff Place	Wesley Heights
317 South Summit Avenue	Wesley Heights
300 West Park Avenue	Wilmore
312 West Trade Street	Fourth Ward

APPLICATION: 201 West Park Avenue – Additions

This address is located on a triangular lot at the very edge of the Wilmore Local Historic District. The one story building is being renovated to become a child care facility. A ramp is being added to be compliant with Code. A site plan and more details about the ramp were required from the Continuation of last month. Revised plans show a 12'x5' ramp going off the end of the front porch. The handrail is Code compliant. The location of the ramp allows for direct access to Accessible Parking space(s). A second ramp on the rear (showing on previous plans) has been deleted. A large tree remains. The drive is 22' wide to allow in and out which Code requires. Median parking has been deleted from plans. The rear door size will be increased from 32" to 36".

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines*, Mr. Henningson made a MOTION to approve the changes proposed to the building - addition of ramp with rail, rear door enlargement, and the site plan with the parking and landscaping. Ms. Stephens seconded. NOTE: Any new brick work will be with reused brick and be toothed in.

VOTE: 9/1 AYES: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: RYAN

DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED.

Mr. Ristaino arrived and was present for the remainder of the meeting.

APPLICATION: 1608 Merriman Avenue – New Construction

This application was recently continued due the need for a more detailed site plan, a wall section, a tree protection plan, and the rail detail. The front elevation must be shown accurately including the topo relative to the foundation/crawl space. The foundation will be shown in brick. All notes will be correct.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Mr. Henningson made a MOTION to CONTINUE the application. Additional information will include: an accurate site plan showing grade on all four sides, an accurate indication of the impact the changing grade makes at the property lines, accurate notes (delete Hardie notes), a section front to rear and left to right, add brackets where they appear to be missing, an exhibit showing the correct beam/column relationship. Ms. Hartenstine seconded.

VOTE: 9/2 AYES: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: HINDMAN, RYAN

DECISION: Application continued.

Application: 433 West Boulevard – New Construction

This address is located on West Boulevard midblock between South Mint Street and Wickford Place in the Wilmore neighborhood. The proposed project is a one and one half story house. Setback lines up with setbacks along the street. The carriage track drive extends to the rear corner of the house.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood Resident Linda McGee spoke in favor of the application but had two concerns: the pattern of the siding, and the dimensions of the brackets.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – New Construction*, Ms. Stephens made a MOTION to APPROVE the proposed New Construction with staff to review revised plans which will show: brackets modified to be in proper scale, window sills added, HVAC location and screening, tree removal clarification, carriage track drive details. The mid gable column should show no pier. Mr. Henningson seconded.

VOTE: 10/1 AYES: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, RYAN, STEPHENS

NAYS: TITUS

DECISION: New Construction Approved with revised plans to be reviewed by staff.

Application: 800 Woodruff Place – New Construction

This address is located at the corner of Woodruff Place and Hurston Court in the Wesley Heights neighborhood. A single family house was recently demolished (by a previous owner) and the lot is zoned for multifamily. New Construction plans have recently been denied. Proposed is a triplex with two of the units facing Woodruff Place and one unit facing Hurston Court. Existing steps at City sidewalk will remain.

Applicant Comments: Architect Angie Lauer pointed out that the previous home was inappropriately demolished by a former owner. This proposal retains

two large oak trees. The previous plans were for a multi-unit single building. This tri plex plan reads as different houses, creating a scheme that blends in with the historic pattern of the street. Homage is paid to the lost home through recreated details. Height will not exceed adjacent corner house and the proposed footprint is not significantly larger than the lost house.

Architect Allen Brooks explained that the units vary from each other and perform as two houses creating a single family feel.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood Resident David May spoke in opposition to the tri plex plans.

Neighborhood Resident Donetta Collier spoke in opposition to the tri plex plans.

NOTE: Mr. Lehart said the redesign is excellent. He pointed out that the house is gone and never coming back. This is the lot that multi family could appropriately happen.

MOTION: Based on plans failing to meet *Policy & Design Guidelines – New Construction* on the points of Size, Scale, Height, Setback, Context, Ms. Titus made a MOTION to DENY the application as presented.

VOTE: 8/3 AYES: HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, RYAN, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: HADEN, HINDMAN, LENHART

Mr. Lehart was not present for the next application.

Application: 317 South Summit Avenue – Tree Removal

The proposal is to remove three trees due to the plan for a new garage. Seven trees will remain in the back yard and one in the front yard. A two car detached garage will be accessed by carriage track driveway from the curbcut to the fence and solid concrete thereon.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information, Ms. Stephens made a MOTION to CONTINUE the application. Revised plans will include a tree protection plan, drive details. Mr. Rumsch seconded.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines*, Mr. Henningson made a MOTION to APPROVE the tree removal due to the three trees not contributing to the tree canopy (pecan, black cherry, hackberry). Staff will review a tree protection plan for remaining trees, including the large one located in the adjacent yard. NOTE: Staff is reviewing the garage. Ms. Stephens seconded.

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

NAYS: NONE

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

Application: 300 West Park Avenue – Garage

This vacant lot is located at the corner of West Park Avenue and Southwood Avenue. A one story three car detached garage is proposed with rear alley access. Existing trees are in the Right of Way. Gable end to street will be landscaped. A new one and one half story house has recently been approved.

Applicant Comments: Owner Robert St. Louis explained that materials and details will match the approved house. He said that his research using the Sanborn Maps shows that there were many large secondary structures including one that still exists across the street that is 40' in length. A tree protection plan is in place. Since the garage is facing the alley, it will not show from the street that it is a three bay.

MOTION: Based on the need for further design study to break down the mass (step down roof, bi fold garage doors), Mr. Rumsch made a MOTION to CONTINUE the application. Ms. Stephens seconded.

VOTE: 8/1 AYES: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: RYAN

Application: 312 West Trade Street – Awning

This is a mid-rise building at the very edge of the Fourth Ward Local Historic District. It is a designated Historic Landmark and owned by First Presbyterian Church. It is known as the Builders Building has been empty for several years. A scaffolding has been in place to protect pedestrians from chunks of falling façade. Proposed is a cantilevered awning to catch anything that falls so that the scaffolding can be removed. The Historic Landmarks Commission has seen the plans and approved them.

Applicant Comments: Beth Matthews explained that the church has been asked to remove the scaffolding by the City. A church committee is working on figuring out what they want to do with the entire block. The lentils on the building are corroding and falling off. Proposed is a temporary fix to address the life safety issues.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on the life safety issues at hand, Ms. Titus made a MOTION to APPROVE the addition of the awning as proposed. The color will be closer to bronze and reviewed by staff. The proposed is to do the least harm to the building and be reversible. Water runoff will be studied to make sure that it is not dumped to the sidewalk. Ms. Hartenstine seconded.

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

NAYS: NONE

Mr. Henningson made a MOTION to approve the October minutes with corrections. Ms. Stephens seconded and the vote was unanimous.

With a meeting length of 4 hours and 31 minutes, the meeting adjourned at 5:37 pm.

Wanda Birmingham, Staff
Historic District Commission

