



CHARLOTTE

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
May 10, 2017

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. James Haden, Chair
Mr. P. J. Henningson
Ms. Jessica Hindman
Mr. Damon Rumsch, Vice Chair
Ms. Claire Stephens
Ms. Jill Walker
Ms. Mattie Marshall

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ms. Jana Hartenstine
Mr. Dominic Ristaino, 2nd Vice-Chair
Ms. Deb Ryan
Ms. Tamara Titus
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 May meeting of the Historic District Commission at 1:07 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 2016-324, 1816 Wickford Place (lot 4)	Wilmore
HDC 2017-090, 617 W. Park Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2017-114, 1824 S Mint Street	Wilmore
HDC 2017-167, 1700 Heathcliff Street	Wesley Heights
HDC 2017-162, 709 Woodruff Place	Wesley Heights

NEW APPLICATIONS

HDC 2017-305, 1825 Merriman Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2017-151, 520 E. Kingston Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2017-272, 1414 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2017-298, 243 W. Park Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2017-277, 121 Hermitage Road	Hermitage Court
HDC 2017-184, 229 N. Church Street	Fourth Ward
HDC 2017-284, 1330 Pecan Avenue	Plaza Midwood

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-243, 243 W. PARK AVENUE – SUBSTITUTE MATERIAL

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 1926 one story Queen Anne Victorian Cottage. A COA was issued September 2016 for a rear addition, windows, doors, and siding repair/replacement. A Stop Work order was issued March 2017. The siding being installed is for a siding material that cannot be approved administratively.

PROPOSAL

The applicant is applying for the use of Smartside siding, an engineered wood product with a wood grain finish that has already been installed partly.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the siding material is appropriate for the main structure or if another material is more appropriate or if an exception is warranted.

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 – Materials***, and no exception warranted, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application per new guideline 5.2 #5,

Match existing historic materials and #6, Replace wood elements only when they are rotted beyond repair.

Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTE SIDING DENIED**

Ms. Marshall left and was not present for the remainder of the meeting.

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-324-1816 WICKFORD PLACE – NEW CONSTRUCTION – LOT #4

The application was continued for changes or further design study on the following items: (1) *Landscaping* – Provide a tree protection plan addressing both pre-construction treatment and structural recommendations for both front and rear corners of the house. , (2) *Materials* – Confirm where smooth Miratek will be used. , (3) *Fenestration* – Provide historically accurate window details (head, 4” trim, sill extended past the frame). , (4) *Other* – Provide revised roof/eave design (open rafters) and section detail.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a one story single family house constructed in 1938. It is located on the edge of the Wilmore Local Historic 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 size is 150’ x 100’. 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 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 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 establish the setback for all four lots. 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.

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 use for the four new 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 4 is a front gable design with a shed dormers and wraparound porch.
2. The height has been reduced 1 foot on all four houses.
3. Both window design and proportion have been revised.
4. Window details have been revised.

5. Vents have been added to gables.
6. A large mature tree in the front yard will be preserved.

Revised Proposal – May 10

1. *Landscaping* – A tree protection plan has been provided.
2. *Materials* – Material notes have been updated.
3. *Fenestration* – Window trim detail has been updated.
4. *Other* – Roof eave design (open rafters) and section detail have been revised.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

FOR/AGAINST: Stuart Mullen – Neighborhood resident spoke in favor of the application.

MOTION: Based on the need for more information Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application for the fourth lot. Revised drawings will show:

- Accurate drawings of front porch roof.
- Note saying how footings of thermal wall and porch will be done.
- A barrier fence will be installed. Diagram of how the footings are going to be done so it is known what is being approved around the porch, under the porch and around the tree.

Ms. Hindman seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, WALKER

DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED.

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

The project was continued from April for the following: 1 Further design study on the front porch design. Use a precedent from an American Small House design and provide a porch section detail. Consider revising front dormer from a shed to a gable. , 2) Revise the right elevation to address the transition in materials. , 3) Provide a window trim detail for the brick façade. , 4) Provide a section and detail of the front entrance canopy with dimensions. , (5) Update all plan notes and define all trim materials.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing site is a 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 and encroached upon 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. House height is approximately 22'-8". 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 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.

REVISED PROPOSAL –MAY 10

1. The porch element has been redesigned to include a gable over the front porch rather than a canopy.
2. Material transition has been changed on the second floor side and rear elevations.
3. Two gables show in revised plan.
4. Material notes have been updated for transition resolution.
5. Architectural details for windows and front porch have been updated.

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

- Continuous soldier course over front door and across side lights.
- Wood trim between side lights and front doors (no brick).

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

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

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

The application was continued for further design study or more information on the following points. 1) Improve massing along the West Worthington Avenue elevation with added architectural details. , 2) Identify types of trees to be removed, replaced, and update the landscaping plan. Provide landscaping along West Kingston Avenue side of the house, 3) Revise driveway entrance to one car width. , 4) Include the garage and the house on one elevation.

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 commercial structure. Adjacent structures are two stories in height. The required setback is 30 feet from ROW.

PROPOSAL

Proposed is the construction of a single family house and detached garage. Design features include a brick foundation, wood lapped siding, wood shakes in the gables, wood windows, metal porch roof, and wood trim details. Building height is approximately 24’-11”. The garage is one story with materials and details to match the

house. The garage is setback approximately 25' from the rear property line. Two mature trees will be removed and new trees planted.

Revised Proposal – May 10, 2017

1. The left side elevation includes a new window pattern and second floor balcony.
2. Trees to be removed and planted are identified on the site plan.
3. The driveway width along the side street is one car wide.
4. The garage and house are both shown on the elevations.

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**, Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show:

- Divided lights in transom windows.
- Front elevation level 2 windows to be casements or awnings with divided lights, proportional to main windows.
- Brackets added to support balcony on W. Worthington Avenue elevation.

Mr. Henningson seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, 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

This application was continued from April because an opposing party wanted to submit documents in the absence of the applicant.

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

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The site is a triangular vacant lot at the end of a street and at the very edge of the Wilmore Local Historic District. The site is approximately 10 feet above West 4th Street. There are mature trees on the site. There is not an established front setback on the street. The site has an unimproved alley on one side. The adjacent property within the District is a two story quadraplex. The adjacent single family house is not in the District.

PROPOSAL – AUGUST 13, 2014

The proposal is a new two story single family home with a continuous gable roof from front to rear. Primary exterior materials are wood siding, brick, and a standing seam metal roof (front elevation). The height from grade is approximately 30'-8".

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: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – New Construction*, Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application and reinstate the previous approved COA based on the current guidelines. No trees will be removed for construction.

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED**

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

The project was continued for the more information on the following: 1) Historic precedent for porch roof and column design, 2) Additional material details.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 1941 one story American Small House style. Architectural features include a front facing gable and prominent chimney.

PROPOSAL

The project is the construction of a wood canopy over the front entrance. The applicant has submitted additional information on materials, dimensions and an example of a neighboring property that matches what the applicant intends to build.

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 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 will show:

- Face of beam aligns with neck of column on both front and side.
- Overhang on eaves will match existing.
- Rake and eave to match existing.

Ms. Hindman seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-305-1825 MERRIMAN AVENUE – ADDITION

EXISTING CONTEXT

The existing structure is a c. 1945 one story American Small House. Exterior features include a bay window and partial brick exterior. Adjacent houses are one and one and one half stories in height. The house is approximately 6-8 feet above the sidewalk and set back approximately 38' from ROW.

PROPOSAL

The project is a rear addition that does not affect the front or sides of the house and is not highly visible from the street. The finished floor/foundation is consistent with the existing structure. Exterior materials include parged masonry and horizontal lapped wood siding. Windows on the side elevations are similar in proportion to the existing house. Site features include a new retaining wall and terrace. Existing trees will remain. It is a modern, contemporary rear addition with a very light connector to the house.

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 as submitted.

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 5/1 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS

NAYS: WALKER

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED AS SUBMITTED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-151 -520 EAST KINGSTON AVENUE – PORCH COLUMN REPLACEMENT

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing home is c. 1915 one and one half story Bungalow with "an engaged porch on slender columns on brick piers". The house is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is the replacement of the porch columns. New larger, tapered, boxed columns atop brick piers will be more correct. Dimensions taper from approximately 12" at the base to +/- 10". The material is wood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

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.

Ms. Stephens seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR COLUMN REPLACEMENT APPROVED**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-272 – 1414 THE PLAZA – ALTERNATE MATERIAL

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 1944 one and one half story American Small House. Several additions and modifications have been made to the exterior. The original material is brick.

PROPOSAL

The project is being reviewed administratively for a rear addition that is neither taller nor wider than the main house and is not more than 50% of the existing square footage. The owner is requesting approval to use Hardie Artisan siding everywhere there is not brick.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the siding material is appropriate for the main structure.

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

- Additional trim details with dimensions to match the existing wood on the house to include the thickness, the lap exposure and mitered corners.

Mr. Henningson seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTE SIDING APPROVED.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-277, 121 HERMITAGE ROAD – MATERIAL CHANGE ON ACCESSORY STRUCTURE ROOF

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a one story accessory garage/servant’s quarters in the rear yard. The principal building is a c. 1921 two story Colonial Rectilinear house with an architectural shingle roof. The accessory building has a slate roof and that may have matched the house at one time. The house is listed as a Contributing structure in the Myers Park National Register of Historic Places Survey. But the garage is not mentioned even though it is most likely an original outbuilding.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is the replacement of the slate roof on the accessory building with architectural shingles which will match the house. Water problems from failing slate are the driving force.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposed material change would have an adverse effect on the property's integrity.

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

MOTION: Based on exception warranted (to match outbuilding to house) with *Policy & Design Guidelines*, Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the change in material to match the house.

Ms. Walker seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR A CHANGE OF MATERIAL ON THE ROOF OF ACCESSORY STRUCTURE APPROVED.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-184, 229 NORTH CHURCH STREET – WATER REPELLANT COATING

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is the c. 1907 Old Medical College building. It is called Settlers Place condominiums. It is a locally designated Historic Landmark. The building is three stories with an original brick façade. A COA for routine repair and maintenance was issued April 2017.

Proposal

The applicant is requesting the application of a chemical based water repellant to the brick. The product is described as a "Clear, breathable, solvent-based, saline penetrating, water-repellant sealer."

Staff Recommendation

The Commission shall determine if the chemical repellant will cause future harm to the exterior and whether the entire building should be treated.

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

MOTION: Based on warranted exception to *Policy & Design Guidelines*, Ms. Walker made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the material for the exterior of the first floor of the building.

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR A WATER REPELLANT COATING APPROVED.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-284, 1330 PECAN AVENUE - DRIVEWAY

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a single family house on a corner lot with a detached garage and existing carriage track driveway.

Proposal

The proposal is the addition of a second driveway along Hamorton Place in the same design as the existing driveway. The fence would be relocated to accommodate the driveway.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the applicable guidelines for parking areas.

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

MOTION: Based on no exception warranted to ***Policy & Design Guidelines – DRIVEWAY***, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application citing current ***Policy & Design Guidelines***.

Mr. Henningson seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITIONAL DRIVEWAY DENIED.**

A quorum was lost at 5:15 pm for a meeting length of 4 hours and 15 minutes.

Linda Keich, Clerk to Historic District Commission