



CHARLOTTE

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
February 8, 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 February 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 2016-291, 632 Grandin Road	Wesley Heights
HDC 2016-299, 1422 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2016-315, 1564 S. Mint Street	Wilmore
HDC 2016-320, 248 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore

NEW APPLICATIONS

HDC 2016-321, 1816 Wickford Place (lot 1)	Wilmore
HDC 2016-322, 1816 Wickford Place (lot 2)	Wilmore
HDC 2016-323, 1816 Wickford Place (lot 3)	Wilmore
HDC 2016-324, 1816 Wickford Place (lot 4)	Wilmore
HDC 2017-00012, 247 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2017-00016, 619 E. Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2017-0025, 620 Woodruff Place	Wesley Heights
HDC 2017-00026, 827 Berkeley Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2017-00032, 1619 Lyndhurst Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2016-317, 300 W. Park Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2017-00010, 729 Woodruff Place	Wesley Heights
HDC 2017-00031, 1319 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2017-00004, 416 N Poplar Street	Fourth Ward

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-299, 1422 THE PLAZA

The application was continued for the following information: 1) revised foundation drawing and screen specs.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a single family house constructed in 1941. Adjacent structures are also single family with lots that are 192.5' in depth. 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

The project is a right side screen porch addition at the rear of the house over an existing patio. The addition extends 3' beyond the house on the right side. The topography of the site, location of the addition (approx. 86' from the sidewalk) and landscaping make the addition not highly visible from public right of way.

REVISION – JANUARY 11

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

Revision – February 8

1. The applicant has submitted revised foundation design and screen specs

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

- Foundation skirt added to the front street side of porch with appropriate materials
- Screen tight system with wood exterior

Ms. Ryan seconded.

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

NAYS: RISTAINO

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

-
- **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

The application was continued for the following items: 1) Massing – Remove attached garage and redesign the eave overhangs; 2) Scale – Foundation height should be in scale with adjacent houses; 3) Setback – Note the setback on the site plan; 4) Additional information – HVAC location on site plan, cross section through site including retaining wall.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing site is a vacant corner parcel in an area with one and two story homes. At the front of the lot the site is approximately 50” above the sidewalk but the height gradually decreases (in height) along the side. The lot size is 50’ x 145’. Setbacks vary slightly along the block. Houses on the block range in height from approximately 20’-6” to 23’. The existing retaining wall will remain.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is a new single family house with an attached single car garage. 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 3/1 windows. The applicant is requesting the use of cementitious siding.

Revised Proposal – February 2017

1. The attached garage has been removed
2. The side gables have been modified to resemble a traditional Bungalow design
3. The foundation height has been raised
4. The front setback proposed is +/-43’

5. HVAC is located on the right side toward the rear
6. Cross section through the site is included
7. The applicant has provided a video to further describe the site conditions and retaining wall

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

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

MOTION: Based compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – New Construction*, Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with revised drawings to staff for probable approval.

The revised drawings will show:

- Review bracket detail and increase the number of brackets on side gable
- Remove apron under window sill
- Add trim/drip edge across columns in front porch to create visible beam
- Align neck at the face of the column to beams at the front porch
- Separate and install Hardie shakes individually
- Adjust trim size at top and bottom of the columns
- Grade at rear yard to ensure foundation does not disappear at the rear of the house
- Driveway and fence detail to be reviewed and approved in a future meeting

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 7/1

AYES: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, RYAN
STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: HINDMAN

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

-
- MS. MARSHALL ARRIVED AT 2:24 PM AND WAS PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.
 - MS. RYAN WAS OUT OF THE ROOM FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.
-

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-291, 632 GRANDIN ROAD – PAINTED BRICK

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing home is two story I-House constructed in 1929. The applicant began painting the foundation and chimney and a stop work order was issued. The house is listed as a contributing structure in the Wesley Heights National Register of Historic Places. The project was continued to find alternatives to painting the remainder of the chimney.

PROPOSAL

The applicant submitted an application in March 2016 with photographs to request an exception for painting the brick chimney. The HDC approved the painted foundation upon proof of visual disparities in the masonry work. The HDC denied the application to paint the remainder of the chimney and further advised the homeowner to find alternate solutions.

The brick is textured and multi-colored. Abrasive paint removal is not an appropriate method for removal. The applicant is requesting to paint the remainder of the chimney.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission shall determine if an exception shall be granted to paint the remainder of the chimney or if there is another appropriate remedy. Options include faux finish painting and clay paint faux-finish that removes the paint over time.

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

MOTION: Based compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Painted Brick* - Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application the following condition:

- Chimney painted only in a faux finish that matches the original brick color
- Entire chimney is to be painted

Ms. Marshall seconded.

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

NAYS: HARTENSTINE

DECISION: **APPLICATION APPROVED WITH THE ENTIRE CHIMNEY TO BE PAINTED WITH A FAUX FINISH THAT MATCHES THE ORIGINAL BRICK COLOR.**

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

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a 2.5 story office building constructed in 2007 at the edge of the district. Adjacent structures are residential, industrial and institutional. The building has an upper terrace on the right side.

PROPOSAL

The project is the extension of the roof over the patio to prevent further water damage inside the building while maintaining full access for occupants. All materials and dimensions of the roof trim will match existing. The ridge height does not change and the existing doors will remain. The application was continued from January for additional study on the roof design.

REVISED – FEBRUARY 2017

The applicant has modified the roof design slightly and has provided perspective views of the roof system in more detail. Also included are additional photographs of existing conditions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the *Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions*, and if the revised submission includes all the Commission requested for approval. 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 non- compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions* – Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for:

- Massing, the relationship to the existing roof to what is proposed
The applicant has not accomplished the burden of proof successfully with a roof design that complements the existing structure.

Mr. Henningson seconded.

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

NAYS: RYAN

Mr. Ristaino did not vote.

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-321, 1816 WICKFORD PLACE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

The application was denied in December for further design study and additional information: 1) Size – Provide numeric evidence to show proposed relationship exists within the immediate neighborhood; 2) Scale – The second floor height is too tall; 3) Massing – The designs have conflicting architectural details and proportional elements such as window size. The new procedure does not require proof of substantial redesign.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 1938 one story single family house. It is located on the edge of the District. The HDC placed a 365-day Stay of Demolition on the property January 13, 2016. The parcel is zoned R-43 Multi-Family and is approximately .34 acres in size. The lot dimension is 150' x 100'. Adjacent Zonings are Multi-family, Industrial, Commercial, and Single family. There are mature trees on the site. Trees to be saved, replaced or removed are identified on the plans. The applicant has filed a rezoning application for Urban Residential-1 to construct four single family houses – this is the only lot with a house on it. The required minimum setback is 14', required minimum rear yard is 10' and required minimum lot width is 20'. The Floor Area Ratio (FAR) does not apply to single family structures on individual lots.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is the construction of four single family structures with a focus on house plans for lot 1 and the overall site layout for the four structures. Proposed lot dimensions are 37.5' x 100'. There are two models being proposed and will be identified as Lot/Plan 1, 2, 3 and 4. The setback of the proposed house for Lot 1 is the same as the existing structure which will set the location for Lots 1-4. All homes are 1.5 stories (approx. 25' to 28' in height), and feature front porches 8' in depth, wood siding, wood windows, brick foundations, and wood corner boards. The applicant is requesting cementitious siding for the porch columns and soffits. Plans 1 and 3 feature a front shed dormer and cross gable, house plan 1 is slighter longer than 3. Plans 2 and 4 feature a front gable with shed dormers on either side. Total lot coverage for plans 2-4 is approximately 45%, coverage for lot 1 is approximately 48%.

The underlying zoning will require an 8' planting strip and 6' sidewalk. New landscaping and tree save opportunities are shown on the site plan. Included in the plan is a new private alley at the rear for the four houses. The revised plans also include numeric evidence of comparable lot coverages in the neighborhood, and updated window design and placement.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

FOR/AGAINST:

- Linda McGhee, adjacent property owner spoke in FAVOR of the application stating all the neighbors are thrilled with the wood Dutch lap siding. It honors historic structures.
- The plan distinguishes from the adjacent multi-family which is a nice contrast on 50% of the street.
- Rezoned to R-43 25 years before it was Historic District.
- Applicant has allowed salvage of the doors, windows, hardware, and baseboards.
- The proposed plans encourage front porch living.
- Difference in height of street lessens impact.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information, Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application. The revised drawings will show for the 3 Infill lots.

- Reduction of Scale and Massing
- Demonstration that historic context supports repetition
- Effort to preserve mature trees (Context)

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED ON 3 INFILL LOTS**

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-321, WICKFORD PLACE – NEW CONSTRUCTION FOR THE CORNER LOT ONLY

The application was denied in December for the following items: 1) Size – Provide numeric evidence to show proposed relationship exists within the immediate neighborhood; 2) Scale – The second floor height is too tall; 3) Massing – The designs have conflicting architectural details and proportional elements such as window size. The new procedures do not require proof of substantial redesign.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The parcel is zoned R-43 Multi-Family. Adjacent Zonings are Multi-family, Industrial, Commercial, and Single family. There are mature trees on the site. Trees to be saved, replaced or removed are identified on the plans. The applicant has filed a rezoning application for Urban Residential-1 to construct four single family houses. The required minimum setback is 14', required minimum rear yard is 10' and required minimum lot width is 20'. The Floor Area Ratio (FAR) does not apply to single family structures on individual lots.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is the construction of four single family structures and overall site layout for the four structures. There are two models being proposed. The setback of the proposed house for Lot 1 is the same as the existing structure and will set the location for Lots 2, 3, and 4. All homes are 1.5 stories (approx. 25' to 28' in height), and feature 8' deep front porches, wood siding, wood windows, brick foundations, and wooden trim. The applicant is requesting cementitious siding for the porch columns and soffits. Plans 1 and 3 feature a front shed dormer on the house's cross gable roof. House plan 1 is slightly longer than 3. Plans 2 and 4 feature a front gable with shed dormers on either side. Total lot coverage for plans 2, 3, and 4 is approximately 45%; coverage for lot 1 is approximately 48%.

The underlying zoning will require an 8' planting strip and 6' sidewalk. New landscaping and tree save opportunities are shown on the site plan. A new alley will be created for rear alley access to a parking pad for each house. The revised plans also include numeric evidence of comparable lot coverages in the neighborhood, previous area more clearly shown on the site plan, and updated window design and placement.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

FOR/AGAINST:

- Linda McGhee, adjacent property owner spoke in FAVOR of the application stating all the neighbors are thrilled with the wood Dutch lap siding. It honors historic structures.
- The proposed new houses distinguish from the adjacent multi-family which is a nice contrast on 50% of the street.
- Rezoned to R-43 25 years before it was Historic District.
- Applicant has allowed salvage the doors, windows, hardware, and baseboards.
- The proposed houses will encouraged front porch living.
- Difference in height of street lessens the impact of new construction.

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

- Reduction and resolution of Scale and Massing
- Demonstration that historic context supports repetition or add third type in the group of homes
- Show effort to preserve mature trees
- Address Worthington as a street elevation/frontage
- Provide Zoutewelle elevation survey along Worthington to include multifamily development, and single family homes across Wickford Place

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED ON CORNER LOT**

-
- **MS. MARSHALL WAS OUT OF THE ROOM FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**
 - **MR. RISTAINO DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HIMSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**
-

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-00012-247 W. KINGSTON AVENUE - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 1937 one and one half story American Small House style. The house is approximately 6 feet above the sidewalk. Adjacent houses are between and one and two stories in height. Architectural features include brick exterior, front facing gable, a small partially covered porch, elevated foundation and dormers on the front and side elevation. The existing windows are vinyl.

PROPOSAL

The project is an addition to the upper level, a new front porch, new rear porch, and new windows. The upper level expansion does not expand the footprint. The addition increases the ridge height approximately 4'-9". The front porch features squared columns, expanded deck, handrails and brick piers. The small front dormer will be removed. The side elevations include new windows toward the rear and raising the chimney +/-4'. Siding material is lapped wood. Proposed height is +/-25'-9" from grade. The site will also require grading to improve water drainage. The applicant is also requesting the improvement of the front retaining wall to include brick with metal fencing similar to the adjacent wall/fence.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the *Policy & Design Guidelines* - 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 the need for additional information and further design study Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION to CONTINUE** this application. The revised drawings will show:

- Simplified front
- Lighter massing on the second story
- Pillars removed from the front wall
- Original design respected.

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 7/1 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: RYAN

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED**

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-00016, 619 E. TREMONT AVENUE - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 1920 one story Colonial style house. Design features include a symmetrical façade with covered porch and 6/1 windows. Siding is wood and the chimney and foundation are painted brick. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth Register of Historic Places Survey.

PROPOSAL

The project is an addition to the rear that is neither taller nor wider than the house but is more than 25% larger than the existing square footage. The addition requires removal of the rear hipped roof. New siding is wood lap and cedar shake with a brick foundation. Roof details and trim will match the house. Windows will be reused.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the *Policy & Design Guidelines* - 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*, Ms. Marshall made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as submitted.
Ms. Hindman seconded.

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED AS SUBMITTED**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-00025, 620 WOODRUFF PLACE - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 1942 one story, side gabled duplex. Exterior features include a clay tiled front and side porch, 6/6 wood windows and brick exterior. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Wesley Heights National Register of Historic Places Survey. Adjacent structures are one and two story single and multi-family dwellings.

PROPOSAL

The project is a conversion of the duplex to a single family dwelling with an upper level addition within the existing footprint. The addition is a new cross gable that extends from the existing ridge with an increase of approximately 4'. Final height from finished floor is +/- 21'. New materials include brick to match existing and wood trim with windows to match existing in material and trim. Other design features include an expanded front porch deck with wood columns and a new front shed dormer.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the *Policy & Design Guidelines - 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 the need for additional information and further design study Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application for Massing and Rhythm. The revised drawings will show:

- Shed dormers pulled in by one foot from thermal wall
- Roof pitch reduced on shed dormers
- Gable continued on left elevation
- Existing vs. Proposed on resubmission
- Historically accurate window trim on new second story

Ms. Stephens seconded.

VOTE: 9/1 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RYAN, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: RUMSCH

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED FOR FURTHER DESIGN STUDY**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-00026, 827 BERKELEY AVENUE - ADDITION

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1932 two story, Colonial Revival house. Exterior features include a slate roof, covered side porch and brick exterior. The site has several large mature trees. Adjacent structures are one and one half and two story single family dwellings. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey.

Proposal

The project is a side and rear addition, changes in windows and doors, and removal of a magnolia tree in the rear yard. The addition is visible from the side street. The right side addition includes the removal of an existing one story addition and windows. The new two story addition is within the existing footprint. The exterior is clad in brick with trim to match existing and new windows. The rear porch features a standing seam metal roof, wood columns and brick foundation. New windows and doors will match or complement existing in material and design.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the ***Policy & Design Guidelines - 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 as submitted. The tree removal is approved as an exception due to the location and other existing canopy trees. ***Ms. Marshall seconded.***

VOTE: 9/1 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH
RYAN, STEPHENS,

NAYS: TITUS

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-00032, 1619 LYNTHURST AVENUE - ADDITION

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1905 one story “Triple A” cottage. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey. Exterior siding is wood and stucco. The front porch is currently enclosed. Adjacent structures are one and two stories in height.

Proposal

The project includes re-establishing the open front porch and construction of a rear addition and porch. The rear addition is neither taller nor wider than the original house. The porch design features new wood columns and hand rails. New windows and trim would match existing. Proposed materials include stucco to match existing and ‘Hardie’ style shingles.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the ***Policy & Design Guidelines - 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*, Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. Tree removal is not approved. The revised drawings will show:

- Depth of rear porch – no less than 8 feet recommended
- Beam detail at master bedroom porch
- Differentiation - old to new
- Windows added in master bedroom closet
- All traditional materials labeled.

Mr. Henningson seconded.

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH REVISED DRAWINGS TO STAFF FOR PROBABLE APPROVAL (tree removal not approved)**

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-317, 300 W. PARK AVENUE – ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

Existing Conditions

The site is a corner lot at 300 West Park Avenue and Southwood Avenue. Site dimensions are 50' x 195' with an alley. There are several trees on the right side and within the City's right of way. Plans for a new single family house were approved October 16, 2016. Hardie Artisan siding was approved by the HDC January 11, 2017.

Proposal

The proposal is a one story detached garage with access from the alley. The side setback is 15 feet from right of way, 20 feet from the alley, and 50 feet from the house. Garage height is approximately 17 feet. Proposed siding is Hardie Artisan to match the house. Additional landscaping is proposed on the street side. The secondary entrance is set back 5' from the primary entrance and lower in height.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the *Policy & Design Guidelines* - Garages.

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 – Garages*. Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show:

- Garage doors
- Brackets 5 on left elevation and 6 on right elevation
- Notes corrected to 2x6 trim boards.

Ms. Stephens seconded.

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

NAYS: NONE

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-00010-317, 729 WOODRUFF PLACE– ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

Existing Conditions

The subject property is a c. 1948 American Small House. Due to the year built and the time of the National Register designation, it is listed as non-Contributing in the Wesley Heights National Register of Historic Places, though today it would be considered contributing. The house has a brick façade with a small gabled portico and side gabled roof.

Proposal

Proposed is a one story, detached garage to be located at the rear left corner of the site. The project is being reviewed by the HDC because the applicant is requesting cementitious siding for the garage.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will determine if an alternate siding material may be used.

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 – Accessory Structures***, Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application for substitute siding with Hardie Artisan specified. ***Mr. Henningson seconded.***

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE APPROVED WITH MATERIAL SUBSTITUTION ARTISAN SIDING ONLY.

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-00031, 1319 THOMAS AVENUE– ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

Existing Conditions

The existing house was constructed in 1920. The site is on the edge of the Plaza Midwood Local Historic District and located adjacent to a commercial parking lot on one side. An alley exists for access to multiple properties. The original plan for the garage was approved by the HDC October 8, 2014. A stop work order was issued in September 2016 for work that exceeded the scope of the COA (siding material and side yard setback becoming an issue once the previously existing garage was rebuilt). The applicant is resubmitting plans for a new COA based on existing completed work.

Proposal

The project is the construction of a detached garage/ADU. The garage is near completion and located in the appropriate location at 5’ from the side property line and 30’ from the rear property line. The applicant is requesting an approval for ‘Hardie’ siding. On the accessory dwelling addition the applicant is requesting a metal roof with ‘Hardie’ siding. NOTE: Building will be moved away from side property line to be Code compliant.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will determine if the application is in compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* - Garages and Accessory Buildings.

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 – Accessory Structures*, Ms. Hartenstine made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with replacing existing cementitious wood grain siding with smooth siding with a minimum of ½ inch reveal, of either wood or cementitious siding. The reveal needs to match the existing siding of the house. **Ms. Marshall seconded.**

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE APPROVED.**

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-00004, 416 North POPLAR STREET– TREE REMOVAL

Existing Conditions

The existing site is a single family home located in Fourth Ward. There are two large maturing trees in the front yard and three in the rear.

Proposal

The applicant is requesting the removal of the tree closest to the house in the rear yard. It is leaning and only a part of a previous tree.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will determine if the request meets the *Policy & Design Guidelines* for tree removal or if an exception is warranted.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Tree Removal*, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as submitted with applicant to submit a plan for replanting a canopy tree in the rear yard. **Ms. Marshall seconded.**

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

NAYS: RYAN

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR TREE REMOVAL APPROVED**

A **MOTION** was made to approve the January minutes with revisions by Ms. Titus. Ms. Stephens seconded and the vote to approve was unanimous.

With a meeting length of 5 hours and 54 minutes, the meeting adjourned at 7:00 pm.

Linda Keich, Clerk to Historic District Commission