



CHARLOTTE

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
September 13, 2017

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. James Haden, Chair
Ms. Jana Hartenstine
Mr. P. J. Henningson
Ms. Jessica Hindman, Vice-Chair
Ms. Mattie Marshall
Ms. Kim Parati
Mr. John Phares
Mr. Damon Rumsch
Ms. Claire Stephens
Ms. Tamara Titus, 2nd Vice-Chair
Ms. Jill Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

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, Clerk to the Historic District Commission
Mr. Thomas Powers, Assistant City Attorney for the City of Charlotte
Ms. Jennifer Baehr, Historic District Commission Intern
Adkins Court Reporters

With a quorum present, Mr. Haden called the regular September 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 if necessary. 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 2016-402	1534 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2017-407	2116 Charlotte Drive	Dilworth
HDC 2017-439	301 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore

NEW APPLICATIONS

HDC 2017-515	224, 228, 232, 236 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2017-417	901 E. Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2017-473	800 Woodruff Place	Wesley Heights
HDC 2017-451	1924 Wood Dale Terrace	Wilmore
HDC 2017-464	604 E. Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2017-481	1416 Pecan Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2017-507	505 E. Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2017-517	500 Hermitage Court	Hermitage Court
HDC 2017-521	1600 S. Mint Street	Wilmore
HDC 2017-519	1513 Belvedere Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2017-474	308 E Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2017-523	1319 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2017-514	1917 Lennox Avenue	Dilworth

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-402 1534 THOMAS AVENUE – ADDITION

The application was continued from July for further design study to address the following:

- Detailed drawings with dimensions and architectural features,
- Accurate existing elevations with shed dormer shown on side elevations,
- Revised dormer roof pitch and/or side wall fenestration to complement the house,
- Provide a site survey to show the addition will conform to the zoning rear setback requirement

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a one story Bungalow style home constructed in 1930. Exterior features include a screened front porch with original columns in place, a shallow front dormer, and a stone primary chimney. The lot is non-conforming. The lot depth is 64’ and 83’ on the sides, 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 and 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 *Charlotte Historic District 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 the need for additional information Ms. Hindman made **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application. Revised drawings will show

- Accurate drawings and documentation of what the existing conditions are
- Accurate drawings of the existing windows
- Clear indication of what exists vs. proposed.

Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 11/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: ADDITION CONTINUED

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-407 2116 CHARLOTTE DRIVE – DETACHED GARAGE

The application was continued from August for further design study to create a garage that better references the front of the house.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The main building is a c. 1930 one and one half story Colonial style brick house. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey. A rear addition was approved in 1992.

PROPOSAL

The project is the demolition of the existing one story garage and construction of a one and one half story detached garage in the rear left corner of the property. The garage height is approximately 22 feet. Windows will match those on the house; exterior siding requested is cementitious lap.

REVISED PLANS – SEPTEMBER 13, 2017

- The front shed dormer on the garage has been revised.
- An updated site section has been included.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines* for **Accessory Buildings**.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines – Garage*, Ms. Hartenstine made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment that was accepted: windows are three separate units that are clustered with trim in between. The revised drawings will show:

- Wooden garage door
- Windows ganged together with trim in between.

Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 10/1 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, WALKER

NAYS: TITUS

DECISION: DETACHED GARAGE APPROVED WITH REVISED DRAWINGS TO STAFF FOR PROBABLE APPROVAL

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-439, 301 W. KINGSTON AVENUE – PORCH ADDITION

The application was continued from August for the following: Details on the front porch including dimensions and materials.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing brick structure is a two story house constructed in 1948. There are additions that were made to the house over time. The HDC will review the front porch (including posts, tapered columns, brick base, roof, trim, rails, wing walls) that was completed without approval. This is an enforcement issue.

PROPOSAL

The applicant is requesting approval for the front porch addition. The front porch is a traditional Bungalow style with brick piers and tapered wood columns.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will determine if the porch addition meets the *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines*.

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

MOTION: Based on the need for further design study on the front porch, Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application. Revised plans will show an architectural language chosen and applied consistently (ex: craftsman, farmhouse, or American foursquare).

NOTE: A choice option is to justify with evidence or change the design.

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 10/1 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PHARES, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: PARATI

DECISION: FRONT PORCH ADDITION CONTINUED

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-515 224, 228, 232, 236 W. KINGSTON AVENUE - DEMOLITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The four properties are one story structures that had been used for a day care in the past but have been vacant in recent years. The buildings are connected with one commercial kitchen for all four. 236 West Kingston Avenue was constructed in 1923 and has been modified and connected to 232 which is also a one story structure. 228 and 224 are connected to make one building. They were constructed in 1936 and 1940 respectively. Parts or all of the brick features are painted. Existing zoning is R-22 Multi-Family. Adjacent structures are commercial and residential.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is demolition of the buildings. Plans for new construction have not been submitted but are being developed.

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. Or if the Commission determines that this property is no longer contributing, then demolition may take place without the maximum delay.

FOR/AGAINST: Adjacent Property Owner Aquanetta Miller spoke in favor of the demolition. She stated concerns of drug activity and said it is not safe to walk down the street. She would like to see a redevelopment of these properties which would enhance the neighborhood.

Neighborhood Resident Jason Lane said that demolition would allow changes that eliminate attraction to hang out.

MOTION: Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to recognize 224, 228, 232 and 236 W. Kingston Avenue as contributing structures to the Wilmore Local Historic District based on the age of construction and the architectural style of the buildings.

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 11/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

MOTION: Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the demolition of 224, 228, 232 and 236 W. Kingston Avenue, imposing the maximum 365 Day Stay of Demolition.

VOTE: 11/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **DEMOLITION APPROVED WITH A 365 DAY STAY OF DEMOLITION IMPOSED.**

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

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-417 901 East WORTHINGTON AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The site is a vacant parcel at the corner of Park Road and East Worthington Avenue. This lot has rear alley access. Adjacent single family structures are one and two stories. A single family house was approved by the Historic District Commission in June 2013. The original house was demolished in 2011. Previous owner removed trees.

PROPOSAL

The project is a one and one half story single family house. The proposed front setback is approximately 33 feet from the right of way to the front porch. Access to the detached garage is from the alley off Park Road. Total height is approximately 29'-3". Materials include wood lap siding and trim, wood shake siding in the dormers, and brick foundation and porch piers. Windows are wood Simulated True Divided Light (STDL). The detached garage materials match the house, the height is approximately 20'-7". New trees will be planted to replace those removed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

FOR/AGAINST: Adjacent property owner, Tamara Titus, stated the house should not be taller than the tallest historic house on the block. She stated she would like to see a bracket detail and a window trim detail.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application for further design study. The revised drawings will show:

- Zoutewelle survey to justify the height
- Precedents for the porch eave
- Window trim
- Bracket details
- Corner board details
- Study the garage location to maximize usable back yard
- Reduce shakes on 2nd floor
- Pull back front dormer from the front thermal wall
- Details of the roof pitch
- Eaves to be increased from 24 and 30 inches
- Rakes can be less than the 30 inches
- Tighten relationship between the eaves and the window head at all eave conditions
- Complete roof eave line
- Minimize window to rake distance.
- Details of the porch railing and caps
- Windows on the front room full in height

Ms. Hindman seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, RUMSCH STEPHENS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-473 800 WOODRUFF PLACE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing site is a vacant corner parcel in an area with one story homes and a two story home on the end of Woodruff Place. The landscape slopes downward toward Freedom Drive. The site is approximately 3 feet above the sidewalk and the lot size is 82.5' x 150'. Setbacks vary between 34 and 41 feet on the block face. Residential structures at the rear of the property are not in the historic district, and adjacent structures within the district are one and two story single family. The previous structure on this site was a single family house. There are mature trees of various conditions on the edges of the property.

PROPOSAL

The project is a two story single family house. The proposed front setback is approximately 34 feet from the right of way to the front thermal wall. Two trees would be removed and one existing would remain with a new tree to be planted in the front yard. The proposed house height is approximately 24'-7". Primary façade material is brick. Windows are wood Simulated True Divided Light (STDL). The detached garage materials and design reflect elements of the house, the height is approximately 21'-4". Other details include wood roof trim, copper gutters or similar, wrought iron hand rail, and wood porch columns.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the *Charlotte Historic Guidelines* for **New Construction**.

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

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines – New Construction*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for its failure to meet guidelines under New Construction:

Page 6.5, Massing and Form

- Item 1 - Relate massing to those of existing adjacent historic houses.
- Item 2 - Use forms for new construction that relate to the forms of the majority of surrounding buildings.

Mr. Haden made a friendly amendment of another failure to meet Guidelines, which was accepted

Page 6.10, Roof Form and Materials

- Item 1 – Use roof forms, such as gable or hipped or combinations of forms in the design of new residential buildings that relate to existing surrounding examples.
- Item – 3 reflect the pitch and gable orientation of surrounding historic buildings in the design of a new dwelling.
- Item – 4 proportionally, the new roof should not overwhelm the structure or be out of scale for the style of the house.

Ms. Titus seconded

VOTE: 11/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES STEPHENS, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION DENIED

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-451 1924 WOOD DALE TERRACE - ADDITION

EXISTING CONTEXT

The existing structure is a one story American Small House constructed in 1940. Exterior material is painted brick with a screened side porch wrapped in metal siding. The centered front porch has a gabled roof with wrought iron 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 additional square footage is within two new dormers and a rear addition that extends the existing ridge. The new roof height is approximately 2'-9" taller than existing. The front additions include a widened porch with 8' depth, new columns and new gabled roof. The side porch includes a new brick foundation to match the house, wood siding and wood windows. The rear addition includes a 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 *Charlotte Historic District 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 *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines – Additions*, Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show:

- Shed dormers to drop six inches below the primary ridge
- Front dormer window taller to fill the space and mimic the six divided lights in the top sash of the main windows
- Allow casements at the second level bedrooms
- Consider adding more windows at the rear of the shed
- HVAC units are shown on the site plan.

Ms. Stephens seconded.

VOTE: 11/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES
STEPHENS, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER
NAYS: NONE

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

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-464 604 East WORTHINGTON AVENUE - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 1929 two story Bungalow listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places (originally one and one half story). The second story addition was approved by the HDC in 1999. Adjacent structures are one to two story houses.

PROPOSAL

The project is a rear addition that ties in beneath the ridge line but extends 3-4 feet on the right side. The front gable window would be converted to a set of three windows. New materials and trim will match the house. Porch columns, rails and deck are wood. The new outdoor chimney is brick.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

FOR/AGAINST: Adjacent Property Owner, Tamara Titus, commented the rear yard calculation is incorrect because the calculation was done from the rear of a previous addition, not from the original back wall. However they can use the alley in their calculation if they need to.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines - Additions*, Ms. Hartenstine made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application with revisions for staff to approve which will show:

Mr. Henningson made a friendly amendment which was accepted

- Carriage track driveway to extend to the privacy fence.

Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment which was accepted

- Reduce the size of the window assembly over the front porch

Ms. Hindman seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, STEPHENS, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-481 1416 PECAN AVENUE - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a one story Bungalow constructed in c. 1908. Exterior features include Craftsman details such as eave brackets, full front porch, and tapered columns. The lot is not an exact rectangle which restricts what an addition could be.

PROPOSAL

Proposed is an addition that raises the ridge line of the cross gable roof. The rear addition will tie onto new ridge below the extended height of 3'-4". The addition starts at the middle of the house. New materials and roof trim will match the house. Front concrete steps will be replaced with wood steps.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines* for Additions. The criteria 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 more information, Ms. Hartenstine made a **MOTION to CONTINUE** this application for further design study. The revised drawings will show:

- Left elevation simplified to respect the massing of the existing building.

Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 11/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, STEPHENS, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.**

- **MATTIE MARSHALL LEFT AT 5:45 AND WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-507 505 East TREMONT AVENUE – ADDITION/PAINTED BRICK

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a one story brick duplex constructed in 1950. It is listed as Non-Contributing in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey.

Proposal

The project is a front porch addition to the front and side entrances. The front porch dimensions are 8’ x 27’ and the side is approximately 8’ x 8’. The brick steps would be replaced with wood steps. New columns are wood with brick piers and wood handrails. The project also replaces the wood siding in the gables with shake siding.

The applicant is also requesting to paint the brick exterior. Exhibits to show defects in the brick are included in the presentation.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines* for Additions and if painting the brick is justified.

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

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION to CONTINUE** this application for further design study. The revised drawings will show:

- Other solutions explored for the painting of the brick
- Drawings to scale
- Setbacks on the entire block
- A re-study of the Massing of the front porch pillars
- Lattice alternative for the front porch

Ms. Hartenstine seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION AND PAINTED BRICK CONTINUED.**

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-517 500 HERMITAGE COURT - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 1916 one and one half story Bungalow. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Myers Park National Register of Historic Places Survey.

PROPOSAL

The project is the addition of shed dormers on the left and right side with metal roofs. The dormers tie onto the main roof below the ridge line. Materials and roof trim match existing. On the rear the porch is redesigned to include new foundation walls, steps, porch column, and a metal roof. The windows on the right and left side will be replaced with windows to match the original house. Palladian window will be removed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines* for Additions and fenestration changes.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines- Additions*
Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as submitted.
Ms. Hindman seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, PARATI, PHARES, TITUS, WALKER
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-521 1600 SOUTH MINT STREET – REHABILITATION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

This address is at the corner of South Mint Street and Spruce Street. The c. 1920 commercial building is to be renovated in a way that takes it back to a former condition.

PROPOSAL

Previously painted exterior will be repainted, changing to a dark monochromatic color scheme but keeping the mural. Wood panels will be added beneath the larger windows. Clear glass will replace tinted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines*.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines*- Rehabilitation Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as submitted.
Ms. Hartenstine seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR RENOVATION/REHABILITATION APPROVED.**

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-519 1513 BELVEDERE AVENUE – REPLACEMENT WINDOWS/MATERIAL (VINYL)

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a one and one half story American Small House constructed in 1947. Exterior siding is wood lap and existing windows are wood frame with wood trim.

Proposal

Proposed is to replace all windows. The window type requested is double hung vinyl/PVC. The applicant is also requesting the replacement/capping of the soffit, fascia and eaves with vinyl to match the windows.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will determine if the proposed replacement windows and trim meet the *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines*.

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

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with the *Historic District Guidelines, Replacement Windows*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application.

Page 4.14, Replacement Windows

- Item 19 – Replace a wood window with a wood window when possible. Wood-resin composite, aluminum clad wood, or fiberglass windows that meet these guidelines may be considered on a case-by-case basis. Requests for vinyl windows must be reviewed by the full Historic District Commission.

We are denying the vinyl Fascia, Soffit eaves

Page 5.2, Materials, Wood

- Item 5 – Match existing historic materials and details
- Item 6 – Replace wood elements only when they are rotted beyond repair. Do not use cementitious, vinyl, aluminum or fiberglass siding to replace original irreparable wood.

Ms. Walker seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, PHARES, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR VINYL REPLACEMENT WINDOWS, SOFFIT, AND FASCIA DENIED.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-474 308 East WORTHINGTON AVENUE – METAL ROOF

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 1910 one and one half story Victorian Cottage. The house was moved to this location from 1823 Cleveland Avenue in 1988. The house is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey

Proposal

The applicant is requesting approval for a standing seam metal roof over the porch.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will determine if the proposed roof material meets the ***Charlotte Historic District Guidelines*** and is appropriate for this house style.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with the ***Charlotte Historic District Guidelines***, Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the metal roof over the porch in a finish that would be historically appropriate to the date of construction of this house.

Ms. Titus seconded

VOTE: 10/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR METAL ROOF OVER PORCH APPROVED.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-523 1319 THOMAS AVENUE – METAL ROOF

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing house is a c. 1915 one story Folk Victorian Cottage. Design features include a hipped roof with a front gable and side gable and hipped wraparound porch supported by tapered wood columns.

Proposal

The applicant is requesting approval for a standing seam metal roof on the primary structure.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will determine if the proposed roof material meets the *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines* and is appropriate for this house style.

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

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with the *Historic District Guidelines*, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **DENY** the metal roof on the main structure.

Page 4.5 – Roofs

- Item 4, Repair of roof materials and elements should be made in-kind with materials that duplicate the original materials.
- Item 5, Replace historic roof coverings when necessary, using new material that matches the original roof covering closely in composition, size, shape, color and texture. If the slate on a roof has deteriorated severely, replace it with matching new slate.

Ms. Stephens seconded

VOTE: 10/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR METAL ROOF OVER MAIN STRUCTURE DENIED.**

-
- **MS. HINDMAN REMOVED HERSELF FROM THE COMMISSION TO BECOME THE APPLICANT FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**
 - **MR. PHARES DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HIMSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**
-

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-514 1917 LENNOX AVENUE – TREE REMOVAL

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The property is the site of a single family house with a large, mature tree in the rear yard that is leaning toward the house. A second large mature tree is also in the rear yard.

Proposal

The project is the request to remove the large, mature tree in the rear yard that is leaning toward the house.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission shall determine if the tree should be removed and new tree(s) planted, if possible.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with the *Historic District Guidelines, Tree Removal* - Ms. Walker made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the request for tree removal.

Mr. Henningson seconded

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR TREE REMOVAL APPROVED.**

The meeting ended at 7:04 with a meeting length of 6 hours and 4 minutes.

Linda Keich, Clerk to Historic District Commission