



# CHARLOTTE

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

April 12, 2017

## MINUTES

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. James Haden, Chair  
 Ms. Jana Hartenstine  
 Mr. P. J. Henningson  
 Ms. Mattie Marshall  
 Mr. Dominic Ristaino, 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice-Chair  
 Mr. Damon Rumsch, Vice Chair  
 Ms. Deb Ryan  
 Ms. Claire Stephens  
 Ms. Tamara Titus  
 Ms. Jill Walker

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Ms. Jessica Hindman  
 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 April meeting of the Historic District Commission at 1:03 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 to speak 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 proceeding, 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 2016-321, 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 2017-090, 617 W. Park Avenue	Wilmore

**NEW APPLICATIONS**

HDC 2017-114, 1824 S. Mint Street	Wilmore
HDC 2017-166, 416 W. Park Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2017-167, 1700 Heathcliff Street	Wesley Heights
HDC 2017-162, 709 Woodruff Place	Wesley Heights
HDC 2017-172, 324 Grandin Road	Wesley Heights
HDC 2017-174, 1824 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2017-132, 1211 E. Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2017-171, 719 Romany Road	Dilworth

---

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY MS. RYAN AND SECONDED BY MR. RUMSCH TO ADOPT THE NEW GUIDELINES AS OF APRIL 13. THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS TO APPROVE THE NEW GUIDELINES.**

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

---

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

The application was continued in March for the following items: 1) *Massing* – Explore more design variations for the interior houses, 2) *Landscaping* – Provide a tree protection plan addressing both pre-construction treatment and treatment during construction for all four lots. Structural recommendations will be included where needed, 3) *Materials* – Confirm where smooth Miratek will be used, 4) *Fenestration* – Provide historically accurate window details (head, 4” trim, sill extended past the frame), 5) *Other* – Provide revised roof eave design (open rafters) and section detail.

***EXISTING CONDITIONS***

There is one existing structure, a one story c. 1938 single family house. These parcels are 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. Adjacent uses 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 create four lots and construct four single family houses.

### **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 all four proposed 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 2, 3, and 4. All homes are one and one half stories, and feature 8' in depth front porches, wood siding, wood windows, brick foundations, and wood corner boards. The applicant is requesting cementitious siding for the porch columns and soffits.

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 along the rear of the four houses. The revised plans also include numeric evidence of comparable lot coverages in the neighborhood, pervious area more clearly shown on the site plan, and updated window design and placement.

#### *Revised Proposal – March 8*

1. Lot #1 is a side gable design with a front facing shed dormer
2. The height has been reduced by one foot on each of the proposed houses
3. Window design and proportion has been revised to Commission recommendation
4. Window details have been revised
5. Vents have been added to rear gables

#### *Revised Proposal – April 12*

1. *Massing* – Explore more design variations for the interior houses.
2. *Landscaping* – Provide a tree protection plan addressing both pre-construction treatment and protection during construction with structural recommendations where needed.
3. *Materials* – Confirm where smooth Miratek will be used.
4. *Fenestration* – Provide historically accurate window details (head, 4" trim, sill extended past the frame).
5. *Open rafters* and section detail.
6. *Detail* – Full column detail rather than pier/column for house on Lot #2.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

**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 – New Construction** Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will include below for the lots - numbers one, two, and three.

- Miratek installed on columns, corners, fascia
- Windows– Take brick casing off, 4" wide non tapered trim with 7/8 inch putty glaze
- Roof overhang extended to 24 inches at right angle to siding
- ¾ individual V-groove bead board soffit
- 2X8" barge rafters with bed mold installed base
- Tree protection plan
- Corner boards are to be equal to 5 ½ inches

**Ms. Stephens seconded.**

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

TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED ON 3 INFILL LOTS WITH REVISED DRAWINGS TO STAFF FOR PROBABLE APPROVAL.

---

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-00321-1816 Wickford Place – New Construction – Lot #4.

This is the corner lot. A required tree protection plan is missing.

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

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

**MOTION:** Based on the need for more information Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application for the fourth lot. The revised drawings will include below for this lot the same points from the other three lots.

- Miratek installed on columns, corners, fascia
- Windows– Take brick casing off, 4” wide non tapered trim with 7/8 inch putty glaze
- Roof overhang extended to 24 inches at right angle to siding
- ¾ individual V-groove bead board soffit
- 2X8” barge rafters with bed mold installed base
- Tree protection plan
- Corner boards are to be equal to 5 ½ inches

**Ms. Stephens seconded.**

**VOTE:** 9/1 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

**DECISION:** NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED FOR THIS ONE LOT.

---

- **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

The project was continued from March for the following: 1) Massing – Further design study of the left side dormer and rear roof (suggested a hip roof) and, 2) Provide final design for front retaining wall.

**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 elevations. The existing windows are vinyl.

**PROPOSAL**

Proposed 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 wood lap. Proposed height is +/-25'-9" from grade. The site will also require grading to improve water drainage. The applicant is also requesting changes the front retaining wall to include brick with metal fencing similar to the adjacent wall/fence.

*Revised Proposal – March 8*

1. The porch columns have been simplified by removing the brick piers and removing the boxing.
2. The side gables have been shortened and faced with brick. A window has been added.
3. The brick stair wall has been replaced with a wood hand rail.
4. The side shed dormer has an additional window.
5. The roof slope on the shed style addition has been increased to a 12:3 pitch.

*Revised Proposal – April 12*

1. The left side dormer has been revised.
2. The rear roof forms have been revised to a hip style on the first and second level.
3. The retaining wall designs have been revised.

**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*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the addition. Based on the need for additional information, the retaining wall is **CONTINUED**. Revised drawings will show:

- Accurate elevation grades - inside and outside
- Bring the wall down as low as possible
- Details on fence and gate materials.

**Ms. Stephens seconded.**

**VOTE:** 8/1      **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, RUMSCH, RYAN, STEPHENS, WALKER

**NAYS:** TITUS

**DECISION:**      **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.**  
**APPLICATION FOR RETAINING WALL CONTINUED.**

**APPLICATION: HDC 2017-090 - 617 W. PARK AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION**

The project was continued from March for the following: 1) *Massing* – Further design study of the left side elevation and move dormer at least 12" from the first floor wall, 2) *Materials* – Replace stone veneer foundation with brick, 3) *Fenestration* – Revise window arrangement on front dormer and remove side light on rear door, 4) *Other* - Provide a detail of front entrance overhang and new driveway location.

**Existing Conditions**

The existing site is a small vacant lot with parcel dimensions of approximately 74' x 55'. The applicant has received a variance for the front setback and rear yard because of the parcel size and configuration. The adjacent parcel is similar in size and configuration. An alley easement exists between the properties and is unimproved but encroached on by the adjacent owner. Adjacent structures are one to two stories in height.

**Proposal**

The proposal is the construction of a single family house. Design features include brick and shake siding, 6/6 pattern full size windows and wood trim. The front setback will be approximately 12' from ROW and align with the adjacent property. The HVAC unit is located in the rear yard. The driveway on the left side will continue as far as possible to the rear. If the alley access issue can be resolved, the owner will utilize the alley for access.

**Revised Proposal – April 12**

1. The left side elevation has been revised.
2. Stone veneer has been replaced with brick.
3. Front dormer window pattern has been revised.
4. Overhang detail has been provided.
5. New driveway location is shown on site plan.

**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 on the need for additional information, *Mr. Rumsch* made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application . The revised drawings will show:

- Redesign front awning or furnish evidence of same from neighborhood
- Restudy of right elevation at corner
- Material resolution on right elevation
- Notes to reflect actual elevation changes
- Details of both brick and wood window trim
- Define all trim dimensions and materials.

**Ms. Titus seconded.**

**VOTE:** 9/1      **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS  
TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** RYAN

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

---

**MS. RYAN LEFT THE MEETING AT 3:00 PM AND WAS ABSENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2017-114, 1824 S. Mint Street – NEW CONSTRUCTION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The existing site is a vacant corner lot with parcel dimensions of approximately 36.6' x 160'. The previous structure was a two story, wood sided, neighborhood store. Adjacent structures are two stories and more in height.

**PROPOSAL**

Proposed is the construction of a single family house and garage. Design features include a brick foundation, wood lap siding, wood shakes in the gables, wood windows, metal porch roof and wood trim details. The garage is one story located to the rear of the lot with side street entry. Materials will match the house. Two mature trees will be removed and new trees planted.

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

- Single lane relocated driveway
- Massing improved on the Worthington Avenue facade (soften, add interest, etc.)
- Show all four elevations - including the garage and the house together
- Landscape plan with clarification and identification regarding the trees being removed and

replaced

- HVAC placement and screening.

**Mr. Rumsch seconded.**

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

**NAYS:** NONE

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

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2017-166, 416 W. PARK AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The existing site is a partially vacant lot with an accessory building in the rear yard. Adjacent structures are one and two story single family houses.

**PROPOSAL**

Proposed is the construction of a single family house. Design features include a brick foundation, Hardie Artisan lapped siding and shakes in the gables, wood windows, and wood trim details.

**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 on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – New Construction*, Mr. Ristaino made a **MOTION to APPROVE** with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show:

- Chimney to be brick veneer or flue moved to a ‘not visible’ location
- Nominal vs. actual trim, siding, boxing details with end result being shadowline reveal of ¼ inch to ½ inch on all abutting materials
- Consistent double hung window pattern
- Shakes to be individual wood shakes (not panels)

**Mr. Rumsch seconded.**

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

**NAYS:** NONE

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

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2017-167-1700 HEATHCLIFF STREET – NEW CONSTRUCTION**

A single family house was approved by the HDC in 2014 (2014-070). The project did not begin and the COA has expired. The applicant is requesting approval of the previous plans on this oddly shaped lot.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

**FOR/AGAINST:** Adjacent Property Owner, Rachel Ortez spoke in opposition to the application.

**MOTION:** Ms. Marshall made a **MOTION to CONTINUE this** application until next month because an opposing party wants to submit documents in the absence of the applicant.

**Mr. Rumsch seconded.**

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2017-162 -709 WOODRUFF PLACE - ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The existing structure is a c. 1941 one story American Small House.

**PROPOSAL**

The project is the construction of a wood canopy over the front entrance. It will be a front facing gable to enhance the entry.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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



for setback and fenestration do 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 Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application for a historic precedent design and more detailed drawings to reflect materials to be used. A good example is 705 Woodruff Place front gabled porch roof.  
**Ms. Titus seconded.**

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

**NAYS:** NONE

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

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2017-172 – 324 GRANDIN ROAD – ACCESSORY STRUCTURE**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The site is a corner lot at Grandin Road and West 2<sup>nd</sup> Street with alley access along the side street. The house is a one story Bungalow.

**PROPOSAL**

The proposal is a new detached garage. The garage height is approximately 19’ and the footprint is approximately 28’ x 28’. Siding material is 8” wood lap to match the house. Windows and trim and details will match the house.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

**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 – Accessory Structure** – Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for: failure to meet garage guidelines regarding scale and context. The garage will read like a house on the side street. It is not the proper scale for the property because the proposed garage height is almost equal to the house. The design is not drawing from the main structure.  
**Mr. Rumsch seconded.**

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

**NAYS:** NONE

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

---

- **MR. RUMSCH DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HIMSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**
  - **MS. HARTENSTINE DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HERSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**
-

**APPLICATION: HDC 2017-174 1824 THOMAS AVENUE – DRIVEWAY/RETAINING WALL**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The site is a single family property approximately 2-4 feet above grade. Originally, the front yard did not have a retaining wall. The property owner began site work without a COA and a Stop Work Order was issued.

**PROPOSAL**

The applicant is requesting the installation of an interlocking block retaining wall approximately 30-36” in height.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

The Commission shall determine if an exception is warranted for the interlocking block material to be installed.

APPLICANT COMMENTS: Owner Etre Vee Howard said the installation of the wall was her solution to prevent more soil erosion while protecting a nearby large tree.

**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 – Landscape and Site Features*, and no exception warranted, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for interlocking concrete block.

*Ms. Marshall seconded.*

**VOTE:** 7/0      **AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**      **APPLICATION FOR RETAINING WALL DENIED**

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

**APPLICATION: HDC 2017-132 1211 East WORTHINGTON AVENUE – PAINTED BRICK**

**Existing Conditions**

The existing home is a c. 1950 one story brick American Small House. It is listed as Non-Contributing in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey.

**Proposal**

The brick exterior was painted without a Certificate of Approval. A notice of Violation was issued. The applicant is requesting approval of the painted brick.

**Staff Recommendation**

The Commission shall determine if approval shall be granted or if an exception is warranted for the painted brick based on the evidence provided. Options include faux finish painting, and product that removes the paint over time.

**APPLICANT COMMENTS:** Owner’s agent Marc Huberman said there is evidence of poor mortar work, previous additions that do not match, deteriorated mortar, chipped brick, and different sizes of bricks.

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

**MOTION:** Based on no exception warranted to the *Policy & Design Guidelines*, Ms. Hartenstine made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application which fails to meet the burden of proof to unify disparate parts.  
**Mr. Rumsch seconded.**

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION:** Mr. Rumsch made a **SUBSTITUTE MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application for more information, giving the applicant a better opportunity demonstrate the burden of proof in support of the painted brick.

**Ms. Hartenstine seconded.**

**VOTE:** 8/0      **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS  
TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**      **APPLICATION FOR PAINTED BRICK CONTINUED**

- 
- **MS. STEPHENS LEFT THE MEETING AT 5:25 AND WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.**
- 

**APPLICATION: HDC 2017-171 719 ROMANY ROAD - DEMOLITION**

***Existing Conditions***

The existing structure is a c. 1971 contemporary house. Features include wood siding, a center front window and door, and mature trees in the front and rear. Romany Road was one of the last developed streets in the Dilworth Local Historic District.

***Proposal***

Proposed is demolition of the subject property. Plans for new construction are being developed but have not been submitted for review.

***Staff Recommendation***

The Commission will make a determination as to whether or not this house is determined to be contributing to the Dilworth Local 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 or with a delay of less than the usual 365 days.

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

**MOTION:** A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Walker and seconded by Mr. Rumsch that the house is a Non-Contributing structure.

**VOTE:** 8/0      **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Demolition*, Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application because it is not a Contributing structure. Mr. Henningson also asked the applicant not to demo the property until new plans are approved.  
**Mr. Titus seconded.**

**VOTE:** 8/0      **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**      **APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION APPROVED BUT WILL NOT BE DEMOLISHED UNTIL NEW PLANS ARE APPROVED.**

---

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

Linda Keich, Clerk to Historic District Commission