



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

November 8, 2017

MINUTES

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ms. Mattie Marshall

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
Ms. Jill Kachmarik, Code Enforcement Inspector
Adkins Court Reporters

A MOTION was made to APPROVE the amendments that have been made to the Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines. The vote was unanimous to APPROVE the UPDATES.

A MOTION was made to APPROVE the amendments that have been made to the Policy and Procedures. The vote was unanimous to APPROVE the UPDATES.

With a quorum present, Mr. Haden called the regular November meeting of the Charlotte Historic District Commission to order at 1:12 pm. He began the hearings portion of the meeting by introducing the Staff and Commissioners and others 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 to 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 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 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 for the duration of the meeting to swear in people as they arrived.

Index of Addresses:

CONTINUED

HDC 2017-404, 723 East Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2017-507, 505 East Tremont Avenue	Dilworth

NEW APPLICATIONS

HDC 2017-567, West Worthington/West Boulevard	Wilmore
HDC 2017-614, 617 West Park Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2017-626, 1123 Berkeley Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2017-650, 2227 Sarah Marks Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2017-594, 1823 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2017-636, 1630 Dilworth Road West	Dilworth
HDC 2017-653, 1508 Dilworth Road	Dilworth
HDC 2017-617, 424 Walnut Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDC 2017-655, 1009 East Boulevard	Dilworth

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-404 723 EAST WORTHINGTON AVENUE – WINDOW REPLACEMENT

The application was recently continued for 1) Drawings or a physical mockup with head jamb details with historic trim and a sample of the putty profile sash, 2) Details of the existing construction for comparison.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 1925 one and one half story house. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey. The house is further described as having a cross gable roof with exposed rafters and decorative joists.

PROPOSED

The project is replacement windows around the house. The window type is Renewal by Andersen. The window material is described as “Fibrex, which is made of reclaimed wood fiber and PVC polymer that is fused together.” This new window material has not been reviewed by the HDC. The window patterns would be consistent with the original windows. There are 16 windows to be replaced in their original openings. The HDC will determine if the window materials and trim meet the guidelines.

APPLICANT COMMENTS

Owner Ed Vinson said that it has been difficult to get the information the Commission is requesting from the vendor.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

This application was submitted June 1, 2017. November 8, 2017 is the 6th month. Per HDC procedures a decision must be rendered this month to APPROVE or DENY the application. Staff recommends denial of the application.

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

MOTION: Based on the request for additional information that was not submitted, Mr. Phares made a **MOTION** to **DENY** the application.
Ms. Hindman seconded.

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION DENIED.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-507 505 E. TREMONT AVENUE – PORCH ADDITION

The application was continued from October for the following: 1) Re-study the column detail and porch configuration, 2) Select a brick color that matches/complements the original brick, 3) Provide a revised column detail cross section that includes the roof edge.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

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

PROPOSAL

The project is a front porch addition to the front door and the second, stepped back and to the side, front door. The front porch dimensions are 8' x 27' and the second is stoop which is approximately 8' x 8'. The brick steps would be replaced with wood steps. New columns are wood, 10" square, with wood handrails. Siding material in the gable is wood lap and brick underpinning. The applicant has submitted revised drawings of the porch design

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 the Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines, Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION to APPROVE** the application with revised plans to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show:

- Rail should be two by two nominal pickets
- Brick curtain wall be offset at least four inches
- 4" eave/rake
- Staff to assist the homeowner in resolving the relationship between the beam and the neck of the column alignment

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 10/0

AYES: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-567 600, 601, 604, 610 W. WORTHINGTON AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The structures are a group of c. 1959 multi-family buildings which are zoned R-22 Multi Family. All structures are two stories apartment buildings, clad in brick with center entries. A large vacant parcel exists behind the building at 601 West Boulevard. Adjacent buildings are single family residential and non-residential buildings. The HDC placed a 365-Day Stay of Demolition on the property July 12, 2017.

PROPOSAL

The project is the construction of townhomes on the subject parcels. Setbacks are consistent with the existing buildings. Materials are brick, stone and wood trim. Trees to be removed and saved are noted on the site plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

FOR/AGAINST: Adjacent Property Owner Amber Brockmeyer spoke in opposition of this application.

Adjacent Property Owner Brittany Valle spoke in opposition of this application.

Adjacent Property Owner Alex Valle spoke in opposition of this application.

Adjacent Property Owner James Vance spoke in opposition of this application.

Adjacent Property Owner Stuart Mullen spoke in favor of this application.

MOTION: Based on no exception warranted to *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **DENY** the application based on:

- Lack of consideration of the site, the scale, the mass, and height of the buildings. Its neglect to take into account the context of this being built, along with all the comments made around the table.

MS. TITUS: For me, this is a clear denial. I spent some time walking the site yesterday. It does not meet our guidelines for size, scale, massing, context, or landscaping, specifically trees. I prepared lengthy comments moving from general to specific with a long list¹⁶ of finding of fact of why this does not meet our guidelines.

I think for massing, the most important thing to note is the Zoutewelle survey for the West Boulevard elevation. It's the complexity of that massing versus the simplicity of the massing of the buildings that surround it that causes it to fail that guideline.

And most importantly - height. The proposed new construction is all four stories, it exceeds 40 feet. We have a very clear guideline that says that the height of a proposed building should be no taller than the tallest adjacent historic building of the same type, single family to single family and multifamily to multifamily. The applicant has failed to show us an existing historic

multifamily building in the Wilmore Historic District that is greater than 36 feet in height. Therefore, they have failed the HDC test and will be introducing a new height with new construction that does not meet guidelines.

MS. STEPHENS The only thing I'll say is to what I just heard Ms. Titus say which is what I felt when I looked at yesterday. It is too tall. But I looked at other things that I like about it. I like the design and Ideas of breaking it up, and the flatness on top was interesting, basically it is just too tall.

MR. RUMSCH: I agree with everything that has been said. It is too large and it doesn't respect the topography of the site. However, I would like to say that the front elevation is one of the issues with new construction. It is not different and unique. This elevation reminds me of the industrial textile supply company on Mint Street. It has the industrial look to it that I like. It is too large but, I love the large windows. It would be nice if they were metal. I don't know if you could afford that or something that would simulate that kind of look. I think it should have a little bit more in and out. I really was getting in the beginning of the presentation fond of that elevation. I would hate to see the flat roofs, the balconies, those large windows; those pieces are so different from what we usually see.

MR. PHARES: I would like to refer the applicant to the new guidelines and the 17 criteria that all new construction projects will be evaluated for compatibility. When they come back I would like for them to show us how they addressed each one.

Setback, I would like to see how the setbacks of the new construction compare and relate to the setbacks of the other structures in this area. I realize this is multifamily, where a lot of the other existing structures are predominantly single family.

Spacing, the side distance from adjacent buildings as it relates to other buildings.

Massing, the relationship of the building's various parts to each other . The massing is very large, very blocky, very unlike the massing that is found in the existing context.

Scale, the height and width of this appears far larger than anything else in this vicinity.

Directional expression, I like the base of the building, but is that appropriate? Roof forms and materials, it's flat, whereas the other roof forms in the vicinity are gabled and hips, more residential feeling. Doors and windows, can't really get into that. Porches, I don't see any outdoor spaces.

Landscaping, we are here to protect the character of the neighborhood. I'm concerned about the removal of a tremendous number of trees and changing

the creek, if we are here to protect the general character of the historic districts, it doesn't seem like there's been any effort whatsoever to save what could be saved. What we are doing to the existing landscaping is a huge issue. 22 inch caliper trees and we're losing 40 24, 36, 48 inch trees. How can we say that were protecting this district if we are rubber stamping something like that? I want to see some effort on the applicant's part to say we have saved as many as possible here and let the Commission determine if that is enough. Those are my comments.

MR. HENNINGSON: Height, way to big. I definitely appreciate all the inspiration taken from the church and taken from the school in your overall design. However, as Ms. Titus said, not seeing the character of multifamily homes, how we do it in Wilmore reflected in here. So I have a general problem with that. Obviously with the height being too big, any significant changes to bring the height down could and very well may have a huge impact on the massing and just the overall form of this project.

I'm reiterating those trees. I want the audience to know we have denied application for garages because one tree is in the way. Please understand we do take trees seriously and how many trees are being proposed to be removed Tamara? Ms. Titus: I counted 92 trees on the south site and they are retaining five. There is a huge problem with the amount of trees being removed, especially in the creek area that is going to require a Rezoning. Just looking at all of those trees there and how serious we take our trees here in the historic districts, I venture to wonder how you could even develop that.

Tacking on an 18 foot retaining wall, I don't enjoy that either. I think safety for the neighbors who have pets, kids, animals.

MS. TITUS: Just a reminder, 35 feet is cap on multifamily historic in Wilmore unless they have other evidence to the contrary.

MS. HINDMAN: The setback actually is a major issue. If I am looking at the two site plans and see the way the site is laid out, I feel like on the one hand it just appears to try to maximize the density with a similar unit which I don't really think is appropriate as we grade this into the neighborhood. I think that it's a great opportunity on West Boulevard to create a street room and something that is maybe a little bit more dense, but as we get into the neighborhood, that's got to change. The units are laid out orthogonal to the side property line and not to West Boulevard, and my expectation, in an urban environment, are that those units would be orthogonal to the streets that they face for the setback.

Spacing, I think this really goes back to the way the units are laid out on the two sites. It really changes the nature of the neighborhood with the way they are laid out. I think there are plenty of really creative inventive ways these things have been laid out in Wilmore that use the opportunities for parking and fire

truck turn arounds and landscaping, storm water retention underneath parking lots, that kind of thing.

We have seen that in projects that have come before this commission before and those are opportunities to space this site differently.

The directional expression as it is being presented to us is not characteristic of Wilmore. If we drive through Wilmore itself, it has a different directional expression.

Landscaping, there are too many 36 inch caliper trees that are lost in this proposal. I understand the limitations of the west side of the site if there is a City improvement project going in there, but on the high side of the site, there are so many 36 inch caliper trees. This particular commission and staff can provide more guidance on this. We are not going to accept River Birch and Sweet Gums as replacement for Willow Oak trees. These communities have a pedestrian quality that we've lost. There are things about the elevations in the architecture that I get excited about but I really think that we need to speak to the pedestrian quality of these communities, particularly in Wilmore and the life on the street in the communities.

There are owl habitats that are protected in Charlotte and I do not know if there is one of them on this site or not.

MS. PARATI: I also did a site visit, and I have nothing to add. I think you've heard the same thing over and over again. In fact, the fact that one of your neighbors could pull up basic information and come in better prepared I think speaks volumes. We've spent a lot of time on this, and there are many people on the docket waiting to be heard, and I think you just start by going to the guidelines.

MS. HARTENSTINE: I agree with everything everyone said, definitely on the height, but before I even, I think that's kind of a waste of time to talk about it, other than you being aware of it. I agree with what Jessica said about the orientation to West Boulevard, to the road and to the character of the neighborhood. I mean, sidewalks, you know, those kinds of things, those connectivity's, are important.

This retaining wall, I mean, you have this natural buffer on the right-hand side of the site. I don't think it's being utilized in a way you need to have an 18 – foot retaining wall. Let's say we get down the road. I don't know if that is going to meet anything in the historic guidelines of a character that anyone on this project is ever going to even consider.

When you come back, bring topo information, because we can read site plans, and that helps, if there is a case to make. I think we would really like to have a small scale plan of all these trees, you have them all surveyed. I think we would

like them easier to read, highlighted so we know what size the significant trees are.

MS. WALKER: I don't have anything further to add. We have absolutely spent enough time on this. I would like to point out to staff, at some point I wonder if this might be worth considering for our guidelines in a historic district, I would hate to see that in the future you could pay money instead of replacing the trees. That was a shock to me.

MS. HARTENSTINE: That is not ours it is the City's Tree Ordinance.

MS. WALKER: We can't get stricter than that?

MR RUMSCH: We do.

MR. PHARES: The Historic District Overlay trumps Zoning.

MR. POWERS: The Historic District overlay trumps in a planning sense. The Tree Ordinance is a separate ordinance that is actually a development guideline under Chapter 21. You can actually enforce the rule of trees, because that is a policy of the City, but the actual guidelines of the tree ordinance, no. If they are removing trees per the tree ordinance and any aspects of that is part of the Tree Ordinance Guidelines, you would have the authority under the tree ordinance. The Tree Advisory Commission will have the ability to look at that and review those issues, but you would not have the authority.

MS. TITUS: Thomas isn't that under the condition of a proposed rezoning which has not taken place yet? This is R-5. This is not UR anything right now.

MR. POWERS: That is correct. If a rezoning were to take place then that would be subject to the rezoning process which would then impose the tree ordinance. The removal of trees would still be under your purview, because the trees are already on the property, then, yes, staff has the ability to work with an existing tree on the property that is being removed and could be replaced. If they are doing a complete rezoning, then it will trigger Chapter 21 for the actual Rezoning, and that would then remove this process from you.

MS. TITUS: Right now we hold it, because the rezoning has not occurred.

MR. PHARES: I have one more question that may be important. I always been under the impression that a project is not supposed to come to us until it has been through all these hoops and hurdles, rezoning?

MS. HINDMAN: You mean other jurisdictional issues?

MR. PHARES: Yes, Is that not still part of our guidelines?

MR. HOWARD: Procedurally it is hard to know everything.

MR. PHARES: It is nice to have that on a large project like this, it's nice to have a preliminary meeting where we could say this is what we are going to be looking for and they can go back and react to that. I'm not saying I disagree with that. I am saying when it comes back and we start making decisions about what we are going to approve this or not, is it not supposed to be through the rezoning. There has always been a gray area about that.

MR. HOWARD: We were talking about that yesterday. We try to let zoning get ahead of us to get their entitlements and all that stuff worked out. Sometimes they run in tandem and we don't like it when we are out ahead of them.

When we are out ahead of them, we try to make sure that it is at least close to being parallel or that they get their zoning down the road a little further. We will talk with Plan Development to get this stuff straightened out because there are a lot of things hanging out here with environmental issues and impacts to water. There is a lot going on here.

Mr. Phares seconded.

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION DENIED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-614, 617 W. PARK AVENUE - NEW CONSTRUCTION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing site is a vacant lot with an unusual shallow depth. The previous applicant received a variance for the front setback and rear yard because of the parcel size and configuration. An alley easement exists between two properties and is unimproved and encroached upon by the adjacent owner. Adjacent structures are 1 to 2 stories in height. The HDC approved plans for a one and one half story house in May 2017.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is the construction of a single family house. The proposal is to make some changes to the previous approval. Design features include brick foundation, wood lap and shake siding, and wood trim details. House height is approximately 23'-6". A front porch is proposed. Front porch depth of 3'-10" due to the unusual lot size and the front setback. A side addition is for outside storage.

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 FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on the need for further design study on the front porch, Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** the application regarding the front porch. The Commission is not addressing any other issues in this MOTION.

Ms. Hartenstine seconded.

VOTE: 8/2 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, PHARES, RUMSCH, STEPHENS ,
TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: HENNINGSON, PARATI

DECISION: APPLICATION CONTINUED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-626 1123 BERKELEY AVENUE - NEW CONSTRUCTION/GARAGE

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The site is a vacant parcel. It was created from the back yard of a house facing Dilworth Road. Plans for a new two story house were approved in February, 2016 (COA# 2015-280). The new applicant is submitting plans for a single family house. Existing homes on the block are one to two and one half stories and range in height from 22' to 37'. The property has been surveyed for recordation as a separate parcel.

PROPOSED

The project is a two story single family house and a detached garage. Building materials are brick and wood lap siding with wood trim, cedar shake roof and copper gutters and downspouts. The applicant is requesting 10" cementitious board as the fascia. Total height from finished floor is approximately 31'-7". The two car garage is one story with materials to match the house.

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 FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines –New Construction*, Ms. Hartenstine made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** as submitted.

Ms. Hindman seconded.

VOTE: 8/2 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, PHARES, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS,
WALKER

NAYS: HENNINGSON, PARATI

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION WITH TWO CAR GARAGE APPROVED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2017 -650, 2227 SARAH MARKS AVENUE – DETACHED GARAGE ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

This address is at the corner of Sarah Marks Avenue and Ledgewood Lane. The principal structure is a two story house and the garage is one story in the rear yard and accessed from the side street. The garage is non-conforming because it does not meet the required rear yard setback. Improvements can be made to non-conforming structures so long as the non-conformity is not increased.

PROPOSED

The project is a second floor addition to the garage. It would provide a work room or guest room without tearing down the garage. The addition would make the structure 18’ in height which is lower than adjacent single family houses. Existing siding would be replaced with wood lap siding and new siding is cedar shake. The existing garage door would be replaced. All other trim details will match the house. The yard will be reworked by removing some paving and adding other – the 50% rear yard permeable requirement will be met. An angled door on the back of the house will be squared off.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the 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 – Additions*, Mr. Phares made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** garage addition as submitted.

Ms. Stephens seconded.

VOTE: 2/8 **AYES:** PHARES, STEPHENS

NAYS: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, PARATI, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

DECISION: MOTION FAILS.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines – Additions*, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the changes to the rear of the house and the removal of the rear yard paving. And move to **CONTINUE** the accessory building addition for further design study on the massing in hopes of minimizing and simplifying the second story mass.

Ms. Stephens seconded.

VOTE: 9/1 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, PARATI, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: PHARES

DECISION: **CHANGES TO THE REAR CORNER OF THE HOUSE AND REMOVAL OF THE REAR YARD PAVING APPROVED. ACCESSORY BUILDING ADDITION CONTINUED.**

MS. HARTENSTINE 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- 594, 1823 THOMAS AVENUE - GARAGE

EXISTING CONDITIONS

This address is at the corner of Thomas Avenue and Haywood Court. The street slopes downward from Thomas Avenue to Haywood Court. The existing house is a c. 1922 one story Bungalow. Features include exposed rafters, eave brackets, cedar shake siding, and a low front shed dormer. An alley easement exists from Haywood Court. A previous application for a two story garage was denied June 2017.

PROPOSED

The project is a detached garage pushed to the right, rear corner of rear yard. Access to the garage is through the alley easement. Garage height is approximately 20'-6". The building is set back from the adjacent house. Design features include wood lap and cedar shake siding, exposed rafters and eave brackets. Garage doors are carriage style. Because of the topography the numerical building height is slightly more than the house, but the relative height of the garage is lower than the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for accessory building

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 a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** the application regarding height, width, and scale with the request that the dormers be brought in off the thermal wall and tie below the ridge. The second floor gable window will be reduced.

Mr. Henningson seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, PARATI, PHARES, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: GARAGE CONTINUED.

- 5:47 PM Ms. Hartenstine left and was not present for the remainder of the meeting.
-

APPLICATION: HDC 2017- 636, 1630 DILWORTH ROAD W – ACCESSORY BUILDING

EXISTING CONDITIONS

This address is at the corner of Dilworth Road West and East Park Avenue. The existing structure is a c. 2010 two and one half story house. There is an existing one story garage at the rear corner.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is to demolish the existing garage and build a new two story accessory building and car port. Materials are cedar shake siding and brick. Trim materials are wood. Building height is approximately 22'-6" and lower than the principal building.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information and further design study, Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION to CONTINUE THE** application. Revised plans will show:

- Location of the garage/structure to prevent side yard parking
- Roof massing to draw context from the main house
- Accurate drawings
- Walkway that connects the driveway to the side door on Dilworth Road West to the sidewalk removed.

Ms. Hindman seconded.

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

NAYS: TITUS

DECISION: ACCESSORY STRUCTURE CONTINUED.

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2017- 653, 1508 DILWORTH ROAD WEST – GARAGE

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing house is a large c. 1927 two and one half story Colonial Revival/Georgian style home with a brick side porch and crenellated roof line. The house is listed as a Contributing Structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey. The site has a pool, pond, and other landscape features in the left and rear yards. The lot size is approximately .875 acres. An application for the detached garage and tree removal was reviewed and denied in August. The applicant submitted additional design options that would save the two trees. The options were not optimal for the property owner or there were building separation or setback conflicts.

PROPOSAL

The revised project is a detached garage in the rear yard, removal of two trees to accommodate the garage and a proposal to plant four new trees on site and two trees on a neighboring property. The detached one and one half story garage is approximately 24' in height. Exterior materials are wood lap siding and trim, cedar shake roof and wood garage doors. Windows and trim will match the house.

FOR/AGAINST: Civil McGowan adjacent property owner spoke in opposition of this application.
Mary Fletcher King adjacent property owner spoke in opposition of this application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with Charlotte Historic *District Historic District Design Guidelines* Ms. Parati made a **MOTION to DENY** the application based on no exception warranted to the guideline which states that existing trees that define the district's character will be retained. NOTE: Denial of the garage is based only on the tree removal.
Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: NEW GARAGE DENIED AS PROPOSED.

MR. RUMSCH LEFT AT 7:00 PM AND WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.

APPLICATION: HDC 2017- 617, 424 WALNUT AVENUE – ADDITION/FENESTRATION CHANGES

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The house is a c. 1924 one story Bungalow. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Wesley Heights National Register of Historic Places Survey. The masonry elements of the house have been painted. The property slopes downward from front to back.

PROPOSAL

The project is an addition to the rear that includes raising the ridgeline of the existing right side bump out and window changes. The side addition raises the ridge approximately 2 feet. The half window on the front right side is increased to a full size window to match existing front windows. Other windows to be replaced on the left and right side are shown on the elevations. The front door will be replaced with a Craftsman style door. Materials and roof details will match existing. New brick will be painted to match existing.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines*, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the application as submitted with a request that the original four-over-one windows being repaired and reused if possible.
Mr. Henningson seconded.

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

DECISION: ADDITION APPROVED AS SUBMITTED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2017- 655, 1009 EAST BOULEVARD – ROOF/FENESTRATION CHANGES

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The building is a c. 1968 one story commercial structure. The façade is painted brick and the mansard style parapet roof is not a structural element to the building. Roof top mechanical units are located toward the rear.

PROPOSAL

The project is the removal of the mansard parapet, repainting, removal of the front awnings, and fenestration replacement with new storefront windows and doors. The front right picture window is to be replaced with two matching windows. Some window openings on the side elevations are to be bricked in or changed in size. Bricked in areas can be undone in the future. The roof top mechanical units will not be visible from the street.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for fenestration and roof form.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines*, Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application:

- Mansard roof removal
- Paint brick that was beneath the mansard
- Awning removal
- Continue for final drawings with materials, entry canopies, fenestration changes, landscaping.

Based on the need for additional information, issues to be CONTINUED are

- Materials
- Fenestration
- Landscaping.

Mr. Henningson seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, PARATI, PHARES,
STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

**DECISION: APPROVED MANSARD REMOVAL, PAINTING UNDER MANSARD, AWNING REMOVAL
CONTINUE FOR FINAL DRAWINGS WITH MATERIALS, ENTRY CANOPIES, AND
FENESTRATION CHANGES.**

A motion was made by Ms. Titus and seconded by Ms. Hindman to approve the September and October minutes with some minor corrections. The vote was unanimous to approve the September and October minutes with amendments.

The Historic District Commission ended at 7:20 pm with a meeting length of six hours and 31 minutes.

Respectfully Submitted,
Linda Keich
Staff
Historic District Commission