



CHARLOTTE

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
July 12, 2017

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. James Haden, Chair
Mr. P. J. Henningson
Ms. Jessica Hindman, Vice-Chair
Mr. Damon Rumsch
Ms. Claire Stephens
Ms. Tamara Titus, 2nd Vice-Chair
Ms. Jill Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ms. Jana Hartenstine
Ms. Mattie Marshall
Two Vacancies

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

With a quorum present, Mr. Haden called the regular July meeting of the Historic District Commission meeting to order 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 *Historic District Guidelines*. The Commission and Staff may question the Applicant. The Applicant may present sworn witnesses who will be subject to questioning by the Commission and Staff. The Applicant will be given an opportunity to respond to comments by interested parties. After hearing each application, the Commission will review, discuss, and consider the information that has been gathered and presented. During discussion and deliberation, only the Commission and Staff may speak. The Commission may vote to reopen this part of the meeting for questions, comments, or clarification. Once the review is completed, a MOTION will be made to Approve, Deny, or Continue the review of the application at a future meeting. A majority vote of the Commission members present is required for a decision to be reached. All exhibits remain with the Commission. If an Applicant feels there is a conflict of interest of any Commissioner, or there is an association that would be prejudicial, that should be revealed at the beginning of the hearing of a particular case. The Commission is a quasi-judicial body and can accept only sworn testimony. Staff will report any additional comments received and while the Commission will not specifically exclude hearsay evidence, it is only given limited weight. Appeal from the Historic District Commission is to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. One has sixty (60) days from the date of the decision to appeal. This is in accordance with Section 10.213 of the City Zoning Ordinance. Chairman Haden

asked that everyone please turn to silent operation any electronic devices. Commissioners are asked to announce, for the record, if one leaves or arrives during the meeting. Mr. Haden said that those in the audience must be quiet during the hearings. An audience member will be asked once to be quiet and the need for a second request will be removal from the room. Mr. Haden swore in all applicants and Staff, and he continued to swear in people as they arrived for the duration of the meeting.

Index of Addresses:

CONTINUED

| | |
|--|----------------|
| HDC 2016-163, 331 East Boulevard | Dilworth |
| HDC 2017-296, 600 West Boulevard | Wilmore |
| HDC 2017-355, 420 S. Summit | Wesley Heights |
| HDC 2017-328, 1919 Springdale Avenue | Dilworth |
| HDC 2017-337, 324 Grandin Road | Wesley Heights |
| HDC 2017-306, 1714 S. Mint Street | Wilmore |
| HDC 2017-132, 1211 E. Worthington Avenue | Dilworth |

NEW APPLICATIONS

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| HDC 2017-052, 508 E. Tremont Avenue | Dilworth |
| HDC 2017-395, 1924 Wood Dale Terrace | Wilmore |
| HDC 2017-402, 1534 Thomas Avenue | Plaza Midwood |
| HDC 2017-403, 1921 Wilmore Drive | Wilmore |
| HDC 2017-393, 315 East Boulevard | Dilworth |
| HDC 2017-244, 408 Walnut Avenue | Wesley Heights |

NOTE: A MOTION was made at the beginning of most reviews as to whether or not the application met the broad, over reaching **Guidelines** and if the case would proceed to being heard on further issues.

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-163, 331 EAST BOULEVARD – DEMOLITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

This is a c. 1925 two and one half story brick apartment building with a side gabled roof and triangular brackets. It is a quadraplex. There is a two-tiered full façade shed porch with brick piers on the first floor, paired posts and shingled balustrade on the second floor. A central gable has stucco and one half timbering. The building is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey.

Applicant Comments

Developer Rob Pressley, representing the owners, said the plan is to redevelop the property along with the adjacent property where the Magic Maze was torn down.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is for demolition. Plans for any new construction have not been submitted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will make a determination as to whether or not the building is determined to be contributing to the Dilworth Local Historic District. With affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to a 365-Day Stay of Demolition. If the Commission determines that this property is not contributing or no longer contributing, then the Commission can allow demolition to take place without a delay.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood resident Ellen Citarella spoke in opposition of the demolition and asked that the maximum stay of demolition be imposed.

MOTION: Based on the *Policy & Design Guidelines – Demolitions*, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to recognize this building as a contributing structure due to its listing on the national register, its age, its architectural style, and the building materials.

Ms. Walker seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HENINGSON, HINDMAN, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

MOTION: Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the demolition of the building with a maximum stay of 365 days.

Ms. Walker seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HENINGSON, HINDMAN, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-296-600 WEST BOULEVARD – DEMOLITION

This application was continued from June for more information on the City’s code violations on the properties and Police Department issues.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The structures are multi-family constructed in 1959. The development consists of three parcels with multi-family buildings on each. All structures are two stories, clad in brick with central porticos. A large vacant parcel exists behind the buildings at 601 West Boulevard. There are a variety of mature trees on the properties. Adjacent buildings are single family residential and non-residential buildings.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is full demolition of all the buildings. Currently there are 35 units in several buildings. Plans for new construction have not been submitted. The applicant has provided documentation on the code violations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will make a determination as to whether or not the buildings are determined to be contributing to the Wilmore Local Historic District. With affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to 365 – Day Stay of Demolition. If the Commission determines that this property is not contributing or no longer contributing, then demolition may take place without a delay.

FOR/AGAINST: Code Enforcement Supervisor Kim Sauer spoke in support of the demolition, stating there is a total of 16 units that badly need repair. It is difficult to get access to all the units. There is an

Engineering Report that addresses the structure at 600 West Boulevard which is in the worst condition of all the units.

Officer Franklin, from CMPD stated there has been calls for various crimes and gave a report on the many number of incidents.

Ms. Donna Burgess, of CMPD also spoke in favor of the demolition.

MOTION: Based on the *Policy & Design Guidelines – Demolitions*, Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to recognize these buildings as contributing structures .

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 5/2 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS,
NAYS: HENINGSON, WALKER

MOTION: Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the demolition of the buildings with a maximum stay of 365 days. In 90 days additional information may be submitted.

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 5/2 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS
NAYS: HENINGSON, WALKER

DECISION: MAXIMUM 365 DAY STAY OF DEMOLITION IMPOSED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-355 – 420 S. SUMMIT AVENU – NEW CONSTRUCTION

The application was continued from June for the following changes and missing pieces:

- Include boxing detail for Cottage style
- Paired windows in front gable
- Revise knee wall width on front porch stair
- Fireplace should read as a bay or brick chimney
- Revise window sizes in side dormers
- Show HVAC location on plan

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The site is a vacant parcel. Plans for a new two story house were approved February 2015 (COA 2015-286). The current applicant is submitting new plans for a single family house. Adjacent single family structures are one and two stories in height.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is a two story single family house. The proposed front setback is 30 feet from the building as noted in the deed. Total height from finished floor is approximately 27'-10". Materials include wood lap siding and trim and brick foundation. Windows are to be wood simulated true divided light (STD). Other features include wood hand rails and columns.

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 Context– New Construction*, Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as being compliant with setback, spacing, orientation, height, width, scale and directional expression and foundation height.

Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

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

- Elevations and section to show porch beam (neck of column to align with face of beam at front and sides)
- Consider a pent eave returns at boxing
- Consider amending elevation to reflect pulling dormer in from thermal wall.

Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

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

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-328, 1919 SPRINGDALE AVENUE - ADDITION

The application was continued from June for the following:

- Massing of the roof to be more consistent and complimentary with the existing Victorian style
- New window should be proportioned closer to existing
- Revised landscape/site plan with driveway proposed design

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 1900 one story Victorian house. It is listed as a Contributing Structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey. The lot is 200’ deep. The other homes on the block are also Victorian style creating a complex of sister houses facing each other.

PROPOSAL

The project is a two story rear addition, covered patio, and a one story detached accessory building/car port. The new addition rises approximately 4’ above the existing ridge. New siding, trim and window pattern (2/2)

will match the house. The rear twin gables will be enveloped in a mansard roof shape. Dormers will be added to side elevations in the new addition. Materials and details will match existing house, except the newly introduced mansard roof form.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

APPLICANT COMMENTS

Architect Allen Brooks explained and showed examples that the mansard roof form is appropriate and seen in the neighborhood.

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 because it meets the requirements for setback, spacing, orientation, height, width, scale, all of the criteria.

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 5/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

RESTATED MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions*, Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application as submitted.

Mr. Henningson noted that the massing of the gambrel roof is not preferred but an exception is warranted due to the benefit of keeping the roof low and it is barely visible from the street.

Ms. Stephens seconded.

VOTE: 5/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.**

APPLICATION: **HDC 2017-337-324 GRANDIN ROAD – ACCESSORY STRUCTURE**

This application was continued from June for the following, 1) Modify the roof pitch to compliment the house - slightly steeper, 2) Include handrail detail at driveway, 3) Material note for garage door, 4) Window detail that compliments the house windows, 5) Locate stair on elevation

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The site is a corner lot at Grandin Road and West 2nd Street with alley access from the side street. The house is a one story Bungalow approximately 20’-6” in height. The adjacent house height is also 20’-6”. The house is listed as a Contributing Structure in the Wesley Heights National Register of Historic Places Survey.

PROPOSAL

Proposed is a new detached one story garage. The garage height is approximately 17' from grade to ridge and the footprint is approximately 24' x 30'. Siding material is 8" wood lap to match the house. Windows and trim details will match the house. A pedestrian entrance is located on the West 2nd Street side. The garage is accessed from the alley and 4' below grade to reduce the overall height above grade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for new construction of 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. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application.

Ms. Hindman seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

RESTATED MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Accessory Structure*, Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application on details with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show:

- The garage door will be wood veneer and not an applique
- The guardrails match the handrails instead of the fence
- All elevations show door overhangs from the side

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-306 -1714 S. MINT STREET – PAINTED BRICK

The application was continued from June for further design study. Revised submittal will include:

- A new proposal that does not require painting the original brick
- New pictures of all four elevations with plans to paint or screen non-original brick. The applicant has submitted a video that shows more detail of the mismatched and damaged brick exterior for painting.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing home is two story brick quadraplex constructed in 1936. The original exterior is a blonde brick color. Subsequent brick additions do not match the original color or texture. The applicant has attempted, unsuccessfully, to match the blonde brick and clean discolored areas.

PROPOSAL

The applicant is requesting to paint the brick as a way to unify the disparate parts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission shall determine if an exception shall be granted for the painted brick based on the evidence provided.

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 – Painted Brick*, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application because of disparate repairs and weathering.

- Use of paint specifically for masonry structures
- The entire masonry of the building should be painted a single color
- Color used should approximate an original brick color from 1936 and will be approved by staff
- The color may not be changed in the future without approval.

Mr. Rumsch seconded

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR PAINTED BRICK APPROVED**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-132-1211 EAST WORTHINGTON AVENUE

The project was continued from June to determine if the paint can be removed. The applicant has attempted to remove the paint from the brick. However, paint would remain in the mortar and cracks in the bricks.

EXISTING CONTEXT

The existing home is c. 1950 one story brick American Small House/Colonial style house. It is listed as Non-Contributing in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey. The application for painted brick was continued based on the need to determine whether or not the paint can be successfully removed.

PROPOSAL

The brick exterior was painted without a Certificate of Appropriateness by the previous owner. A notice of Violation was issued. The new owners are requesting to keep the house painted as it is. Patches of paint removal show success on just the smooth brick surface. But the many, many places where bricks are broken or cracked do not give up the paint. To remove the paint from the mortar damages the mortar.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission shall determine if an exception shall be granted for the painted brick based on the evidence provided. Other options include faux finish painting, clay paint that removes the paint over time, or other appropriate methods for removal.

FOR/AGAINST: Owner Peter McGrath spoke in favor of keeping the painted brick.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Painted Brick*, Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the painted brick as an exception because removing the paint from the brick would cause damage to the brick and mortar.

Ms. Titus made a friendly amendment: The paint removal test spots should be painted back to the existing color of the structure.

Ms. Walker seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR PAINTED BRICK APPROVED.**

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-052 -508 EAST TREMONT AVENUE - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing home is a c. 1930 one story Colonial style. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey.

PROPOSAL

The project is an addition to front and rear of the house. The front addition includes a new shed dormer on the right side, a new porch roof and columns, and a front gable that extends to the rear. The new ridge height is +/- 3'-4". The rear addition includes shed dormers on side elevations, a covered rear porch and outdoor chimney. Windows and other trim details will match the house. Mature trees 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 compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines - Additions*, Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with revisions for staff to approve. The revised drawings will show:

- On COA reference removal of asbestos cladding and return to an original
- The hood detail over windows is too ornate for this style of home

Ms. Titus seconded.

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

NAYS: NONE

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-395 – 1924 WOOD DALE TERRACE - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 1940 one and one half story American Small House. Exterior material is painted brick with a screened side porch wrapped in metal siding. The centered front porch has a gabled roof with metal columns. The front setback is approximately 39' from porch to ROW. Adjacent setbacks are a range +/- 36' to 44'. The height of tallest original house on the block face is approximately 23' (1908 Wood Dale Terrace).

PROPOSAL

The project is a second floor addition, rear porch, and improvements to the front and side porches. The new ridge/roof height extends above the existing approximately 3'-2". The front additions include a widened porch with 8' depth, new columns, and shed roof. The front addition includes a shed dormer. The side porch includes a new brick foundation to match the house, wood siding and wood windows. The rear addition includes a shed dormer and rear porch with columns, rails and roof to match the front. All new windows are wood. Roof details will match existing.

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 non-compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines , Additions – Mr. Henningson* made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application.

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION DENIED.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-402, 1534 THOMAS AVENUE

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a one story c. 1930 Bungalow style home. Exterior features include a screened front porch with original columns in place, a shallow front dormer and stone primary chimney. The lot is non-conforming with no space for the usual setbacks, the rear yard from house to property line is approximately 16' at the closest point. The alley easement ends at this property. Adjacent structures are a mix of Bungalow style homes.

PROPOSAL

The project is a second floor addition and porch improvements. The addition increases the height of the front dormer and extends to the rear. Both sides of the dormer are 3'-7" from the front and rear thermal walls. The increase in height is approximately 3'-6". New dormer material is cedar shake, eave details will match existing. Porch improvements include new handrails and removal of the screens.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for additions. The setback guideline does not apply.

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

MOTION: Based on exception warranted with *Policy & Design Guidelines*, Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application contextually because it meets guidelines for, scale and directional expression. The height is an exception, because the lot is nonconforming and does not allow the applicant to build to the back or to the side.

Ms. Hindman seconded.

VOTE: 6/1 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, WALKER

NAYS: TITUS

RESTATE MOTION: Based on the need for additional information needed Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application for more details. **The revised drawings will show:**

- More details on the brackets
- Accurate drawings
- Site plan with setback information and the building envelope outline
- Further design study.

Ms. Stephens seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-403, 1921 WILMORE DRIVE - ADDITION

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1948 one story American Small House. Exterior features include a small porch with a side entrance. Porch columns are metal. The front setback is approximately 34' from porch to ROW. Adjacent setbacks range from approximately 30' to 34'. Adjacent structures are a mix of Bungalow and American Small House variations.

Proposal

The project is a front porch addition, the rear addition is being reviewed by staff. The porch deck will be widened to an increased 8' in depth, the width does not change. The side entrance and front windows will remain. New porch columns and hand rails are wood. The proposed porch roof is a gable with cedar shakes and eave details to match 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 context – Ms. Hindman* made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application because it meets guidelines for setback, spacing, orientation, height and width, scale, directional expression and foundation.

Ms. Walker seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

RESTATE MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines, Additions – Details, Size, Massing, Porches, Rhythm* Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show an updated left elevation.

Ms. Stephens seconded.

VOTE: 6/1 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: RUMSCH

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-393, 315 EAST BOULEVARD – ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

Existing Conditions

The existing site is a vacant interior lot located in the center of a block that is bounded by East Boulevard and Cleveland Avenue, East Kingston Avenue, and Euclid Avenue. There are alleyways on three sides of the lot. The site is zoned B-1(PED). Primary access to the site will be provided across the parking lot from East Boulevard. There are several mature trees adjacent to the site and one mature tree on the subject property. Adjacent structures are single family and multi-family with commercial uses along East Boulevard. The HDC approved a principal residential multi-family building on the site April 8, 2015.

Proposal

The proposal is a two story structure with parking on the first level and flex space on the second level. The building layout is similar to the previous approval but with a smaller footprint. It will be owned by three people with each having parking space on the ground level and accessory space above. Mature trees will be preserved. Primary access is from East Boulevard through a shared agreement, secondary access is from the alley easement. The front setback (facing East Boulevard) is 10'-4" from the edge of alley easement, the rear setback is 20' from the edge of alley easement. The left side yard setback is 29'-8" and the right is 5'-8" to building wall. Building height is approximately 28'-2". Materials include cedar shakes on the dormers and 'Hardie Artisan' lap siding.

Staff Recommendation

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

FOR/AGAINST: Ellen Citarella, neighborhood resident spoke in opposition stating that the plan does not show correct alley width.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this Application for lack of complete context. The revisions will show or include:

- The implications and accuracy of property lines
- An accurate survey and/or site plan that shows property lines. If there is a dispute about where the line is, a Plan B with a resolution will be included

- Further design study regarding the directional expression of the structure
- A comprehensive tree plan.

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

RESTATE MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** the application for details. The revisions will show:

- Garage details
- Landscaping details
- Garage door materials
- Window details that eliminate the apron

Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 6/1 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: WALKER

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

- **JILL LEFT THE MEETING AT 6:10 AND WAS ABSENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-244, 408 WALNUT AVENUE – SITE FEATURES/LANDSCAPING

Existing Conditions

The existing home is c. 1936 one story brick Bungalow. The land slopes approximately 8-10 feet from front to back. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Wesley Heights National Register of Historic Places Survey. A Certificate of Appropriateness for a detached garage and site improvements was issued in 2016. A Stop Work Order has been issued due to additional work performed without approval.

Proposal

A Stop Work Order was issued for the following:

1. Retaining walls
2. Fencing
3. Porch column addition
4. Walkways.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission shall determine the corrective action for work performed without approval and if the proposed projects meet the design guidelines for work in the side and rear yards.

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

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this Application. Revised plans will show:

- The specific fence that is proposed to go on top of the retaining wall. Material details of the fence, and clear dimensions all the way around the property
- Lamp post details, including dimensions and light broadcast pattern

Ms. Hindman left at 7:00 pm and was not present for the remainder of the meeting.

Mr. Henningson seconded.

VOTE: 5/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION CONTINUED.**

The meeting ended at 7:20 with a meeting length of 4 hours and 17 minutes.

Linda Keich, Clerk to Historic District Commission