



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

October 11, 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. Tamara Titus, 2nd Vice Chair
 Ms. Jill Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ms. Claire Stephens

OTHERS PRESENT: Mr. John Howard, Administrator
 Historic District Commission
 Ms. Kristina Harpst, Staff
 Historic District Commission
 Ms. Wanda Birmingham, Staff
 Historic District Commission
 Ms. Linda Keich, Clerk
 Historic District Commission
 Mr. Thomas Powers, Senior Assistant City Attorney
 Ms. Andrea Leslie-Fite, Assistant City Attorney
 Adkins Court Reporters

With a quorum present, Mr. Haden called the regular October meeting of the Charlotte Historic District Commission to order at 1:04 pm. He began the hearings portion of 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 the subject agenda item. Presentations by the applicants and members must be concise and focused on the ***Charlotte 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 the 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 if 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 weighty. 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 file an 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:	1534 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
	723 East Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
	1416 Pecan Avenue	Plaza Midwood
	505 East Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
	901 East Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
	605 Berkeley Avenue	Dilworth
	416 North Poplar Street	Fourth Ward
	2144 Park Road	Dilworth

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-402 1534 THOMAS AVENUE - ADDITION

This application was last continued in September for lack of accurate drawings and documentation of what is there verses what is proposed.

Existing Conditions

This is a c. 1930 one story bungalow. Features include a screened front porch with original columns in place, a shallow front shed dormer, and a stone primary chimney. The lot is not conforming in shape. Adjacent structures are a mix of bungalow style homes.

PROPOSED

The project is for a second floor addition and porch improvements. The proposed addition increases the height of the front dormer, raises the cross gable ridge, and adds a rear facing dormer that ties back to the roof below new ridge height. New dormer siding is cedar shake. Details will match existing. Porch improvements include new handrails and removal of the screening.

Applicant Comments

Owner Casey Stanley explained that the house is in poor condition. The goal is to bring it up to the standards of today with a minimal second story addition. Because of the shape of the lot, there is no opportunity to extend the house to the rear. The increased height is at rock bottom of what can happen with 7 ½ to 5 ½ foot high ceilings already.

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

MOTION: Based on the need for additional design study regarding the massing and the directional expression of the proposed front dormer, Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** the application.

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 7/2 AYES: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: HENNINGSON, TITUS

DECISION: APPLICATION CONTINUED.

Ms. Titus declared a conflict of interest and removed herself from the Commission for the next application.

Ms. Marshall arrived at 1:30 and was present for the remainder of the meeting.

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-507 723 EAST WORTHINGTON AVENUE – WINDOW REPLACEMENT

This application was recently continued for more information on exactly how the final product will appear.

Existing Conditions

This c. 1925 one and one half story house is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey.

Proposal

Complete window replacement is being requested. The contention is that the windows are beyond repair and leave the house cold in the winter time. The window representative had a sample window of Fibrex material but there were things that were going to be different in the actual installation.

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

MOTION: Based on the need for complete information about what is there and what is proposed, Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** the application (same request as last time). A mock up or technical drawings would be necessary.

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 8/1 **AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: HARTENSTINE

DECISION: APPLICATION CONTINUED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-481 1416 PECAN AVENUE – ADDITION

This application was recently continued for further design study and more information.

The existing house is a c. 1908 one story bungalow. Exterior features include craftsman details such as eave brackets, and a full front porch with tapered columns. The lot is not an exact rectangle which restricts what an addition could be.

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

Proposal

Architect Angie Lauer said they have taken the comments from the last meeting and simplified the plan. The left side has been simplified to more match the proposed right side. A storage building to the left has been left off – it is now just a fence. The mass of the addition has been pushed to the rear, leaving the front as it exists now. A "bad" fifties addition is being removed from the back.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines*, Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the revised plans.

Ms. Parati seconded.

VOTE: 8/2 **AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: HARTENSTINE, TITUS

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-507 505 EAST TREMONT AVENUE – ADDITION, PAINT BRICK

This is a c. 1950 one story brick duplex. It is listed as Non Contributing in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey. The application was recently continued for further design study regarding the choice of materials and more information.

Proposal

This duplex is being renovated. A front stoop will be removed and replaced with a front porch that is the full width of the front unit. The front door to the second (back) unit will continue to be a stoop – though renovated. A brick foundation wall is proposed for the front porch. Painting the brick has been removed as a request. 8” lapped wood siding is proposed for the front facing gable. The brick piers have been slimmed down. The new proposed setback is compatible with other setbacks in the block.

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

MOTION: Based on the need for more information on the American Small House, Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** the application for further design study regarding

- Columns
- Brick foundations walls on sides - inset
- Brick color to match or compliment
- Roof overhang
- Cross section – include roof/column/overhang.

Mr. Phares seconded.

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION CONTINUED.

Mr. Phares declared a conflict of interest and removed himself 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 2017-417 901 EAST WORTHINGTON – NEW CONSTRUCTION

This site is a vacant lot at the corner of Park Road and East Worthington Avenue. There is rear alley access. Adjacent single family structures are one and two story homes. A single family house was approved by the Commission in June of 2013. The original house was demolished in 2011. A previous owner removed trees without approval. The application was recently continued for further design study on details and execution.

Proposed

The garage has been moved on the site plan from the corner of the lot closest to the side street to the other rear corner. Two full sized windows have been added on right side elevation to take the place of smaller windows. Shed dormers have been lowered and all detail suggestions have been included.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines –New Construction*, Ms. Hartenstine made a MOTION to APPROVE the application for new construction with eave dimension called out as 24” on the plans, and window dimensions showing accurately.

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL PARATI, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED WITH NOTES ADDED TO PLANS.

Ms. Titus declared a conflict of interest and removed herself from the Commission for the next application.

APPLICATION: HDC 2017 -573 605 BERKELEY AVENUE - ADDITION

This is a one and one half story home across from the ball fields of Dilworth School. This block of Berkeley is not within the Dilworth National Register boundaries. The house is brick with two dormers.

Proposed

The plan is to extend the existing cross ridge two feet, four inches. The existing dormers will then be slid up the roof and a third dormer added. A gabled front stoop will be added. A front terrace, from the new front stoop over to an existing side porch will be added. There is not enough brick to reclaim so anywhere new siding is required, lapped wood will be used. A rear addition will tie onto new roof below the ridge. Wood double hung windows will be used.

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. Walker made a **MOTION to APPROVE the additions** with notes added to plans that verify overhangs.

Ms. Hindman seconded.

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: ADDITION APPROVED WITH NOTES ADDED TO PLANS.

Mr. Haden declared a conflict of interest and removed himself from the Commission for the next application. Ms. Hindman assumed the Chair.

APPLICATION: HDC 2017- 564 416 NORTH POPLAR STREET – TREE REMOVAL

There is a large maturing canopy tree planted in a small space in the front yard. The tree was planted in the 1970s and has grown too large for the space. It is growing into the front steps of the house, the neighbors’ driveway, and the City sidewalk. There is some Duke Power equipment in grates in the City sidewalk. The owners are in the process of developing a master landscape plan.

Proposed

This tree is to be removed and something more appropriate in size will be replanted.

FOR/AGAINST: Adjacent Property Owners Fred and Jeannie Taylor spoke in favor of the tree removal. They verified that their driveway has had to be replaced twice and needs it a third time due to the roots of this particular tree.

MOTION: Due to the need to have a comment from Duke Power, and missing a structural damage report, Ms. Walker made a **MOTION to DENY the removal.**

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 **AYES:** HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: TREE REMOVAL DENIED.

4:10 PM. Mr. Rumsch left and was not present for the remainder of the meeting.

Mr. Phares declared a conflict of interest and removed himself from the Commission for the next application.

APPLICATION: HDC 2017- 545 2144 PARK ROAD – FENCE

This address is at the corner of Park Road and Ideal Way. It is across the side street from Ed’s Tavern. This house is a Historic Landmark.

Proposal

A wooden fence in a height of eight feet is being requested for the Ideal Way side of the back yard to block the intrusion of noise and activity @ Ed’s tavern. The fence will be set back from the edge of the street and behind existing landscaping.

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

MOTION: Based on exception warranted to *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines – Fencing*, Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the fence at eight feet in height. It will be concealed in the existing landscaping.

Ms. Hartenstine seconded.

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: FENCE HEIGHT IN REAR YARD MAY GO TO EIGHT FEET.

The Historic District Commission ended at 5:07 pm with a meeting length of four hours and three minutes.

Respectfully Submitted,
Wanda Birmingham
Staff
Historic District Commission