



# CHARLOTTE

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
March 14, 2018

## 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, 2 <sup>nd</sup> 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. Andrea Leslie-Fite, Assistant City Attorney for the City of Charlotte Adkins Court Reporters

---

With a quorum present, Mr. Haden called the regular March meeting of the Historic District Commission meeting to order at 1:00 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 each proposed project to the Commission. The 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 **Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines**. The Commission and Staff may question the Applicant. The Applicant may present sworn witnesses who will be subject to questioning by the Commission and Staff. The Applicant will be given an opportunity to respond to comments by interested parties. After hearing each application, the Commission will review, discuss, and consider the information that has been gathered and presented. During discussion and deliberation, only the Commission and Staff may speak. The Commission may vote to reopen this part of the meeting for questions, comments, or clarification. Once the review is completed, a MOTION will be made to Approve, Deny, or Continue the review of the application at a future meeting. A majority vote of the Commission members present is required for a decision to be reached. All exhibits remain with the Commission. If an Applicant feels there is a conflict of interest of any Commissioner, or there is an association that would be prejudicial, that should be revealed at the beginning of the hearing of a particular case. The Commission is a quasi-judicial body and can accept only sworn testimony. Staff will report any additional comments received and while the Commission will not specifically exclude hearsay evidence, it is only

given limited weight. Appeal from the Historic District Commission is to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. One has sixty (60) days from the date of the decision to appeal. This is in accordance with Section 10.213 of the City Zoning Ordinance. Chairman Haden asked that everyone please turn to silent operation any electronic devices. Commissioners are asked to announce, for the record, if one leaves or arrives during the meeting. Mr. Haden said that those in 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 2017-742	601 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2017-683	409 Rensselaer Avenue	Dilworth

**NEW APPLICATIONS**

HDC 2018-093	224, 228, 232, 236 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2018-070	1953 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore
HDC 2018-091	515 Walnut Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDC 2018-071	227 West Park Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2018-074	1901 Dilworth Road East	Dilworth
HDC 2017-713	400 E Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2018-024	1508 Dilworth Road	Dilworth
HDC 2018-072	424 Grandin Road	Wesley Heights

**APPLICATION: HDC 2017-742, 601 W. KINGSTON AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION**

The application was continued from February for the following:

- Revise the fenestration pattern on the side elevations of both buildings
- Revisit the massing of the Worthington Avenue Building
- Provide a window sample and brick and mortar sample
- Provide a section showing the HVAC placement
- Provide material note on garage doors.

***EXISTING CONDITIONS***

The structures are multi-family buildings constructed in 1959; Zoning is R-22 Multi Family. All structures are two stories, clad in brick, with central porticos. Adjacent buildings are single family residential. The HDC placed a 365-Day Stay of Demolition on the entire property on July 12, 2017.

***PROPOSAL***

The project is Phase 1 which is the construction of townhomes on one side of West Boulevard and townhomes facing West Worthington Avenue. Setbacks are parallel to the street. Building heights vary depending on topography. Primary materials are brick and stone. Detail materials are wood clad windows, metal balcony railings, cast concrete, and wood trim garage doors. Walkway location reflects the ROW setback required by NCDOT.

***REVISION – FEBRUARY***

- Building names (on the buildings) have been revised.

- Massing of the second building at the corner of West Kingston and West Worthington has been revised to appear as four individual town houses.

**REVISION – MARCH**

- Window and door changes have been made on side elevations of Building 1 (West Boulevard), and all sides of building 2 (West Worthington) as a result of revisions to the elevations (massing).
- A typical wall section with the HVAC location has been included. The units will be screened by the parapet wall and not visible from public streets.
- Additional material notes have been provided on exterior doors and locations of Hardie trim (soffit, balcony trim).
- Center units will share a roof line with the end units stepping down.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

1. Regarding the revised elevation which shows the center two units being in the same plane and the two end units stepping down, the Commission will determine which design option best meets the guidelines for massing and fenestration for Building 2 overall, either option for Building 2 meets all guidelines for New Construction.
2. The non-traditional trim material as noted may be allowed on new construction.
3. HVAC screening is shown on the plans.
4. Staff believes the proposal meets the guidelines for new construction. Minor detail changes may be reviewed by staff as recommended by the HDC.

**FOR/AGAINST:** Mr. Michael Lewis, neighborhood resident spoke in favor of this project.

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines – New Construction*, Mr. Phares made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application as being in compliance with HDC Guidelines pg. 6.15. . It is required that a red brick be used and staff approved as being in context. GFRC is being approved, and the snap-on brick mold as exceptions to HDC guidelines on materials for this multi-family new construction. The three-part massing elevation per guideline 6.8 of directional expression is approved over the four-part individual townhomes.  
**Ms. Stephens seconded.**

**VOTE:** 6/4      **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PHARES, STEPHENS, TITUS

**NAYS:** HARTENSTINE, PARATI, RUMSCH, WALKER

**DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED AS REVISED WITH A RED BRICK EXTERIOR FOR STAFF TO APPROVE.**

- **MR. HENNINGSON ARRIVED AT 1:27 PM JOINED THE COMMISSION AT 2 PM.**

**APPLICATION: HDC 2017-683, 409 RENSSELAER AVENUE– ADDITION**

The application was continued from February for the following:

- Revise the front porch design so as to not diminish the unique quality of the original, existing porch
- On the rear, consider a steeper roof pitch on the dormers
- Reduce the massing of the addition overall
- Use consistent window lite pattern.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The existing structure is a c. 1930 one and one half story Colonial style house. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. The site elevation drops from front to rear approximately 5 to 7 feet and is adjacent to vacant land which will become a mixed use project to the rear. Existing height is approximately 17'.

**PROPOSAL**

The project is an addition to the front and rear. The front addition includes hand rails, porch columns, and new porch roof. The rear addition begins at the ridge of the original house and follows the same pitch. Proposed ridge height is +/- 18'-9". Design features of the addition include clipped gables, and trim and widows to match the house. All primary and trim materials are wood. New windows and trim are shown on the elevations.

**REVISION - MARCH**

- The front porch design has been revised to retain the asymmetrical roof and brackets, and the addition of an arbor over an extended porch deck with a shallow pitch membrane roof.
- Changes to the roof massing on the rear elevation include removal of the full width roof over the 3rd floor balcony substituted by a gabled dormer over a balcony on the left side, a centered window and a gabled canopy over the right window; second floor roof pitch has been reduced to a 3:12 pitch.
- All full size windows are 6/1.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

- Staff believes the proposal meets the contextual *Charlotte Historic district Design Guidelines* for **Additions**.
- The applicant has revised the plans based on HDC comments regarding massing and a front porch design to better complement the house and meet the *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines* for **Porches and Massing**.
- Minor detail changes may be reviewed by staff.

**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 rear and side elevations, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** the application.

**NOTE:** The front elevation is **APPROVED** as revised.  
*Mr. Rumsch seconded.*

**VOTE: 9/2**      **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PHARES, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** HENNINGSON, PARATI

**DECISION: FRONT ELEVATION APPROVED AS REVISED AND THE REAR AND SIDE ELEVATIONS CONTINUED FOR FURTHER DESIGN STUDY.**

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

**APPLICATION: HDC 2018-093, 224-236 WEST KINGSTON AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The four properties are one story structures that were past used for a day care. The existing zoning is R-22 Multi-Family. The buildings are connected with heated space. 236 West Kingston Avenue was constructed in 1923 and connected to 232. 228 and 224 were also connected to make one building. They were constructed in 1936 and 1940 respectively. A 365-Day Stay of Demolition was imposed by the Historic District Commission on September 13, 2017. Adjacent structures are commercial and single family (one story) on the block. Across the street are single and multi-family buildings. The historic multi-family building at 241 West Kingston Avenue was constructed in 1949, the height is approximately 32' measured from grade. The adjacent single family house (245 West Kingston Avenue) was constructed in 1954 with an approximate height of 33'. The single family house at 251 West Kingston Avenue was constructed in 1936 with a pre-Historic District rear addition height of approximately 40'.

**PROPOSAL**

The proposal is the demolition of the four existing houses and the new construction of townhouses on the four parcels. The project is in the rezoning process to obtain a more urban residential district. Front setbacks reflect the existing setback of 236 West Kingston Avenue at approximately 40'. Site features include an 8' side yard and fence along the single family side and 10 foot buffer at the alley easement in the rear yard. Existing, removal, and proposed trees are noted on the site plan.

Building heights are approximately 40-45 feet. Materials include cementitious siding and soffits, applied stone on columns and foundation, and wood handrails. Fenestration patterns and material palette vary per individual townhouse unit.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

- The project meets the guidelines for setback, spacing, orientation, directional expression, and size.
- Staff concerns include the contextual criteria of massing (side and rear elevations), height, scale, foundations, roof form, cornices and trim, windows, porches, materials, and rhythm.

**FOR/AGAINST:** Neighborhood Resident Kelso Mayo spoke in opposition to the project.

Neighborhood Resident Jason Groenwold spoke in support of the project.

Neighborhood Resident Mike Lewis spoke in opposition to the project.

**MOTION:** Based on non-compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines – New Construction*, Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for the following:

- Setback - 6.2 - provide evidence of the relative setback in the historic district
- Spacing between building 6.3 - provide evidence of spacing; based on height, 6.6 and the Zoutewelle survey for height
- Scale – 6.7 Directional Expression, 6.8 foundation, 6.9 massing, 6.5 materials, 6.15 porches, 6.14 and fenestration

*Ms. Titus seconded.*

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION DENIED**

---

**Assistant City Attorney Ms. Leslie-Fite asked the commission to strike the previous decision for missing exhibits from the packet and to CONTINUE the application.**

**MOTION:** Ms. Walker made a **MOTION** to withdraw the previous motion. *Ms. Marshall seconded* and the vote was unanimous.

**MOTION:** Ms. Walker made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** the application for need of additional exhibits. *Mr. Phares seconded.*

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2018-070, 1953 WILMORE DRIVE – NEW CONSTRUCTION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The site is a large single family parcel that will be subdivided for new construction. The site has a creek and utility easements through it that cannot be built upon. The grade of the site slopes downward approximately 6-8 feet from front to rear. A retaining wall exists on the left side toward the rear. The new lot frontage is along a curve and the elevation of the street falls toward the property. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single family homes. Setbacks along the street are generally +/- 33'. The applicant has included a similar site condition at 2119 Wilmore Drive for consideration of the front setback. The lot division is in subdivision review now.

**PROPOSAL**

The proposal is a new single family house. Proposed front setback is 29' from thermal wall to ROW and approximately 21' from the front porch. A new driveway is located on the left side for access to the rear yard and new garage beneath the house.

Architectural features include an 8' front porch with brick piers and wood columns, raised concrete/smooth stucco foundation, wood or metal clad windows, cementitious siding, and wood for window and roof trim. Height from finished first floor to ridge on the front elevation is approximately 23'. The applicant has provided precedents of historic homes with attached garages below the first floor.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

- Because of site constraints, including easements and the curvilinear lot frontage, staff believes an exception may be appropriate for the front setback.
- Unresolved items are the window pattern on the first floor left and rear elevation, and lap siding dimensions on the body of the house.
- Staff believes the project meets the contextual guidelines for new construction. Minor details may be reviewed by staff as recommended by the HDC.

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

**MOTION:** Based on the need for additional information Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application. The revised plans will show:

- Site plan that includes location of all the trees and if any trees will be removed.

- A clearer detail on the height survey , to understand the height of the structure vs. the other structures on the block.
- Information to validate the neighbor with the garage in the basement is historic.

***Ms. Titus seconded***

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**     **NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED FOR MORE INFORMATION.**

---

**APPLICATION:**     **HDC 2018-091, 515 WALNUT AVENUE - ADDITION**

***EXISTING CONDITIONS***

The site is a corner lot on Walnut Avenue that abuts a greenway and is approximately 10 feet above Litaker Avenue. The existing structure was originally constructed in 1929 and modified, then again with HDC approval. The lot size is 55' x 192.5'. Existing features include brick exterior, bungalow style porch, a gabled dormer and shed roof dormer on the front, and a shed dormer on the rear. The applicant has included examples of houses in the neighborhood of similar size.

***PROPOSAL***

The proposal is a rear addition that is neither taller nor wider than the house but is located on a corner lot and the proposed square footage is greater than 50% of the existing house. The footprint of the main addition is 24'x42'. The addition includes a garage on the first level under living space and porches on the ground floor and second floor. Architectural features include a brick façade, wood porch columns. The proposal includes Hardie siding on the rear of the addition and existing dormers. There are no impacts to mature trees.

***STAFF RECOMMENDATION***

- Massing – The relationship of the parts of the new addition as shown from the rear and left side appear out of proportion.
- Directional Expression – The vertical or horizontal proportions of the building as it relates to other buildings. Staff concern of the horizontal dimension on the left side.
- Rhythm – The relationship of windows, doors, recesses and projections on rear and left side.
- Doors and Windows – The placement, style and materials of these components. Staff concern with window to wall ratio on the rear and left side.

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

**MOTION:**     Based on non-compliance with ***Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines – Additions***, Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for the following:

- Massing
- Directional expression
- Fenestration – doors and windows
- Rhythm
- The accessory building is not secondary to the original structure
- See guidelines 8.9, three

***Mr. Phares seconded.***

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**      **ADDITION APPLICATION DENIED .**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2018-071, 227 WEST PARK AVENUE - ADDITION -**

***EXISTING CONDITIONS***

The existing structure is a c. 1931 one story Bungalow. House height is 18’ from the first floor to ridge. The foundation and porch piers are painted brick. Adjacent structures are 1 to 2 stories in height. The tallest original house on the street is at the corner of West Park Avenue and Southwood Avenue, 255 West Park Avenue. A mature canopy tree in the rear yard will remain. The applicant has included an approved plan similar to the current proposal.

***PROPOSAL***

The project is an addition to the rear that maintains the existing pitch and increases the ridge approximately 4’-8”. The front elevation does not change with the exception of a new front door and chimney extension. The addition begins toward the middle of the house and continues toward the rear with side dormers, a rear facing gable, and rear porch. Existing windows and other details to remain are noted on the elevations. New windows will match existing in trim and material. Other architectural features include cedar shake and lap siding, wood trim details, open eaves with brackets, exposed rafter tails, and a brick foundation. Eave dimensions will match existing.

***STAFF RECOMMENDATION***

- The proposed ridge height does not exceed the tallest historic single family height nor change the form and pitch of the original roof.
- Staff believes the proposal meets the contextual ***Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines for Additions.***
- Minor detail changes may be reviewed by staff.

**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. made a **MOTION to CONTINUE** this application for the following:

- Sections 4.5 and 6.10, roof forms and transitions
- Section 8, a tree protection plan
- Section 6.12, additional window details and information with staff to advise.

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

**NAYS:** RUMSCH

**DECISION:**      **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED**

---

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



---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2018-074, 1901 DILWORTH ROAD EAST, ADDITION**

***EXISTING CONTEXT***

The existing structure is a c. 1928 one and one half story Picturesque Revival style house. Exterior material is textured stucco. The site is at the corner of Dilworth Road East and Worthington Avenue.

***PROPOSAL***

The project is an addition to the rear that is neither taller nor wider than the house and proposed square footage is less than 50%. The addition is visible from East Worthington Avenue. Architectural features include cedar shake and lap siding, painted stucco masonry foundation, brick fireplace, wood trim, screened porch, and a cross gable roof with same pitch as existing side gables. Porch roof material is standing seam metal. Rear yard permeable space is 85%. The height of the addition is approximately 22' feet. There are no mature trees impacted.

On the right elevation a picture window is proposed to be replaced by three casement windows.

***STAFF RECOMMENDATION***

1. Standing seam metal is appropriate for a secondary roofing material.
2. The picture window appears to be non-original and not compatible with the house and replacement with a complimentary style is appropriate.
3. Staff believes the proposal meets all applicable contextual guidelines for additions.
4. Minor detail changes may be reviewed by staff with HDC recommendation.

**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** this application with the exception that the new brick chimney is unpainted.  
***Mr. Rumsch seconded.***

**VOTE: 10/0**     **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PHARES  
STEPHENS, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER  
**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**     **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH NEW BRICK CHIMNEY IS UNPAINTED**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2017-713, 400 E. WORTHINGTON AVENUE - ADDITION**

***EXISTING CONDITIONS***

The existing structure is a c. 1920 one and one half story Bungalow style house. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register survey. The site elevation drops from front to rear approximately 10 feet. The rear elevation has a garage beneath the first floor.

***PROPOSAL***

The project is a rear deck addition similar to the design at 328 East Worthington Avenue. The deck roof ties into the rear gable below the eaves. Primary and trim material is wood. Deck dimension is 14' x 23' including the stair. Roof trim and eave dimensions will match existing. There are no impacts to mature trees.

***STAFF RECOMMENDATION***

Staff believes the porch addition meets all applicable guidelines for additions. Minor detail changes may be reviewed by staff with HDC recommendation.

**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. Hartenstine made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with revisions to staff for probable approval. The revised plans will show:

- The porch beam detail to match the front porch
- Add brackets
- Provide the rake detail
- Paint the support columns and bracing

**Ms. Marshall**

**VOTE:** 9/2      **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, PARATI, STEPHENS, RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** HINDMAN, PHARES

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

**APPLICATION: HDC 2018-024, 1508 DILWORTH ROAD – ACCESSORY BUILDING**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The existing house is a c. 1927 large two and one half story Colonial Revival/Georgian style home with a brick side porch and crenellated roof line. The site has a pool, pond, gazebo, pool house, and other landscape features. The lot size is approximately .875 acres with several large mature trees on the property. The lot width is approximately 167’ in the rear and 219’ in the front. The house is setback approximately 102’ from ROW. Adjacent setbacks are approximately 47’ to 55’ from ROW. The rear yard of the subject house to property line is approximately 47’.

**PROPOSAL**

Proposed is a 25’x39’ detached garage to be located in the rear yard, removal of two trees to accommodate the garage, and the planting of five new large maturing trees on site. The detached 1.5 story garage is approximately 21’-10” in height. Exterior materials are wood lap siding and trim, cedar shake roof and wood garage doors. Windows and trim will match the house. The applicant has submitted tree inspection reports of existing and previously removed trees on the property.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

1. Trees. The tree reports on the two trees in question contain the information required to permit removal by HDC staff per the guidelines for trees. The proposed number and species of replacement trees also meets City arborist standards.
2. Locating the garage in the rear yard further defines the accessory building as secondary to the primary structure.
3. Staff believes the proposal meets the guidelines for accessory buildings.
4. Minor detail changes may be reviewed by staff with HDC recommendation.

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

**MOTION:** **MOTION:** Based on compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines – Accessory Structures* Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with revised plans to staff for probable approval. Staff will review the following:

- Garage details and materials to match the main house
- Tree protection plan
- Details compatible and to match house
- Tree removal.

**Ms. Hindman seconded**

**VOTE:** 9/2 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

**NAYS:** WALKER, PHARES

**DECISION:** **APPLICATION FOR TREE REMOVAL AND GARAGE APPROVED WITH SOME ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR STAFF TO REVIEW FOR PROBABLE APPROVAL.**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2018-024, 424 GRANDIN ROAD**

**Existing Conditions**

The existing house is a two story home constructed in 2007. The site is a corner lot on Grandin Road and Litaker Avenue. The house is approximately 6-8 feet above the street with a walkway and stairs to the City sidewalk. A large mature tree is sited in the left side yard. Small ornamental trees are in the front yard.

**Proposal**

Proposed is removal of the existing walkway and stair to the right side front of the porch and construction of a new winding walkway and stair from the left of the front porch of the house to the left front corner of the property. The steps to the City sidewalk will be removed and replaced at the corner. The applicant has submitted examples of corner walkways in Wesley Heights. Proposed materials are stone and concrete.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff could not find evidence of prior construction on the parcel though a corner walkway exists on the same street block at 401 Grandin Road and appears to be original.

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

**MOTION:** Based on non-compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Guidelines – Landscaping*, Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for the following:

- Moving sidewalk due to guideline 8.2
- 8.2 retain historic walkways

**Mr. Phares seconded.**

**VOTE:** 8/3 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, RUMSCH

**DECISION:** **APPLICATION FOR LANDSCAPING DENIED.**

---

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

Linda Keich, Clerk to Historic District Commission