



CHARLOTTE
 HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
 January 11, 2017

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. James Haden, Chair
 Ms. Jana Hartenstine
 Mr. P. J. Henningson
 Ms. Jessica Hindman
 Ms. Mattie Marshall
 Mr. Dominic Ristaino, 2nd 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 of the Historic District Commission
 Ms. Kristi Harpst, Staff of the Historic District Commission
 Ms. Wanda Birmingham, Staff of the Historic District Commission
 Ms. Linda Keich, Staff of the Historic District Commission
 Mr. Thomas Powers, Assistant City Attorney for the City of Charlotte
 Adkins Court Reporters

Chairman Haden called to order the Regular January 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 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 2016-284, 1741 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore
HDC 2016-299, 1422 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood

NEW APPLICATIONS

HDC 2016-320, 248 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2016-3151564 S. Mints Street	Wilmore
HDC 2016-307, 1533 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore
HDC 2016-318,1212 Lexington Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2016-325, 300 W. Park Avenue	Wilmore

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-284, 1741 WILMORE DRIVE – FENESTRATION CHANGES

The application was continued from December for revised plans which show: 1) elevations without the old windows drawn in, 2 the height of the two right-most windows on the left elevation maintained, 3) all details including windows – header and sill, corner boards and handrail, and 4 the proposed window pattern matched on the two right most casement windows on the right elevation.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 1934 one story Bungalow. Existing siding is vinyl over wood siding and some exposed brick.

PROPOSAL

The project is a rear addition, fenestration changes and siding repair/replacement. On the front elevation a new primary entry door replaces two existing, new windows are 3 over 1 wood STDL, new dormer windows, and new wood handrail. New windows are proposed on the left, rear and right elevations. The vinyl siding will be removed and the underlying wood siding will be repaired and replaced where necessary.

REVISIONS – JANUARY 11, 2017

1. Revised elevations with new window and door placement only
2. New window heights on right elevation match existing
3. Trim and handrail detail updated
4. Casement windows on the right elevation are matched

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

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

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

- Window trim, porch rail, and corner board details to replicate historic precedent.

Ms. Hartenstine seconded.

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

NAYS: NONE

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-299, 1422 THE PLAZA

The application was continued for the following information: 1) accurate drawings with details of the foundation and trim, 2) engineer's report on foundation, and 3) arborist's recommendation for tree protection.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 1941 story and one half single family house existing on the high side of The Plaza. Adjacent structures are also single family on deep lots. The setback of the house is approximately 48 feet from right of way. The site is approximately 4-5 feet above the sidewalk. A COA for a second floor addition was issued March 14, 2014 (2013-048).

PROPOSAL

Proposed is a screened porch addition on the right rear of the house. The addition extends 3' beyond the side thermal wall. It will not be substantially visible.

REVISION – JANUARY 11

1. The plans include a section of the porch footing and deck and the footings are indicated on the elevations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for additions. The guideline for setback does not apply because there is no change to the front.

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 Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application. The revised plans will show:

- foundation skirt detail
- wood trim for the screening detail

Ms. Hindman seconded.

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

NAYS: RYAN

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.**

- MS. MATTIE MARSHALL ARRIVED AT 1:45 PM.
 - MR. RISTAINO DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HIMSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.
-

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-320, 248 W. KINGSTON AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing site is a vacant corner parcel in an area with one and two story homes. The site is approximately 2-3 feet above the sidewalk, the lot size is 50' x 145'. Setbacks vary slightly along the block. There is an existing stone retaining wall with engaged stone piers which will remain.

PROPOSAL

Proposed is a new single family house with an attached single car garage. The garage will be entered from the side street. The height from the finished floor is approximately 21'-11". Front setback is consistent with the adjacent property. Design features include a full width front porch, exposed rafter tails with open eaves, and 3 over 1 windows. The piers of the retaining wall will be cut down. The applicant is requesting the use of cementitious siding.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

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, Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application. Revised drawings will show:

- alignment with bungalow architecture
- gable/dormer pulled back from the thermal wall
- foundation
- plan for retaining wall including front and side elevation that show grade change
- setbacks – side and front
- material notes for windows and siding
- site plan with AC placement/screening
- elevation from Southwood
- further design study to remove attached garage
- setback detail on side and front yards (include setback detail/lengths for neighbors
- all details (including dimensions) and material notes.

Ms. Hindman seconded.

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

NAYS: RYAN

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-315, 1564 S. MINT STREET – ADDITION.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 2007 two and one half story office building owned by Greater Galilee Baptist Church. It is at the very edge of the Wilmore Local Historic District. Adjacent structures are residential, industrial, and institutional. The building has a rooftop patio on the right side.

PROPOSAL

The project is the extension of the roof over the patio. All materials and dimensions of the roof trim will match existing. The ridge height does not change and the existing doors will remain.

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 Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based on insufficient information Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application for further design study regarding the roof. Look to staff for assistance on other options for design.

Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 9/1 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: RYAN

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ROOF ADDITION CONTINUED.**

-
- MS. RYAN LEFT AT 3:05 AND WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.
-

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-307, 1533 WILMORE DRIVE - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 1931 one story Bungalow. The original foundation is brick, siding materials are wood lap and cedar shake.

PROPOSAL

The project is a one story addition to the rear that ties below the existing ridgeline. Rear yard open space exceeds 50%. Siding materials will match existing wood lap and cedar shake. The addition will be visually defined with vertical band boards. Windows and roof trim details will match existing.

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 Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

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

- Back porch brick foundation with tongue and groove decking
- Bracket detail
- Rear gable ends to be wood
- Trim detail dimension to be historically accurate

Ms. Stephens seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-318 1212 LEXINGTON AVENUE - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 1928 two story Colonial Revival house. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey.

PROPOSAL

Proposed is a offset one story addition to the rear, with extensions to the left and right side, and changes to existing window and door openings on the right side. New foundation materials, roof and window trim details will match existing. The applicant is requesting the use of 'fiber cement' siding on the addition.

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 Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

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

- Miratek trim changed to wood
- Columns to be round to match front of the house
- Gable end return to match existing
- Wood siding

Ms. Titus seconded.

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

NAYS: NONE

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

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-325 300 W. PARK AVENUE – SIDING CHANGE

EXISTING CONDITIONS

A Certificate of Appropriateness application was approved by the HDC October 12, 2016 for a new single family house. Design features included wood lap and cedar shake siding.

PROPOSAL

The applicant is applying for cementitious (Hardie 'Artisan') 7-1/4" lap siding with a 6" reveal and 1" x 6" corner boards. Window and door trim, fascia and frieze boards are also cementitious. Cedar shake siding remains the choice for the gables.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if an exception is warranted for the use of non-traditional materials.

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 – Non-traditional Materials***, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show:

- trim detail
- siding trim resolution
- corner boards
- soffit
- skirt board
- head jamb

Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

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

With a meeting length of 2 hours and 45 minutes, the meeting adjourned at 3:45 pm.

Linda Keich, Clerk to Historic District