



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
June 13, 2018

MINUTES

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ms. Mattie Marshall
Ms. Jana Hartenstine
Mr. PJ Henningson
Mr. John Phares

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 Historic District Commission
Ms. Andrea Leslie-Fite, Senior Assistant City Attorney
Ms. Candy Thomas, Adkins Court Reporter
Ms. Beth Morgan, Adkins Court Reporter

With a quorum present, Mr. Haden called the regular June meeting of the Historic District Commission meeting to order at 1:05 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 2017-578	517 E. Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2018-093	224-226 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2018-218	712 E. Park Avenue	Dilworth

NEW APPLICATIONS

HDC 2018-217	601-621 West Boulevard	Wilmore
HDC 2018-267	214 Grandin Road	Wesley Heights
HDC 2018-272	1525 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore
HDC 2018-275	300 E Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2018-212	1539 Merriman Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2018-276	1425 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2018-264	325 W Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2018-241	2015 Dilworth Road E	Dilworth

MS. HINDMAN WAS THE APPLICANT ON THE FIRST APPLICATION AND SHE RECUSED HERSELF FROM THE COMMISSION.

APPLICATION: HDC 0217-578, 517 E. TREMONT AVENUE - ADDITION

The application was continued from May for the following items:

- Guidelines 7.2 #2 - Limit the size of the addition so that it does not visually overpower the existing building.
- Guideline 6.5 Massing - the relationship of the buildings various parts to each other.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a one story c. 1920 Bungalow house. It is listed as a Contributing in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places Survey. From the National Register Survey, design features include a "side gable roof with a shed porch on paired posts on large piers."

PROPOSAL

An addition was approved by the HDC November 29, 2017. The applicant is requesting to add two small shed dormers to the previously approved addition. The dormers are lower than the new addition and partially visible from the street. Materials and trim will match the previously approved addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The proposed addition is part of the new roof and facing toward the rear. The proposal meets the **Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines** – 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 Design Guidelines** Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as submitted.
Ms. Stephens Seconded

VOTE: 3/3 **AYES:** HADEN, RUMSCH, STEPHENS
 NAYS: PARATI, TITUS, WALKER

DECISION: VOTE WAS A TIE – MOTION FAILS

MOTION: Based on the need for further design study Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application with for:

- Guidelines 6.5 Massing and complexity of form – The overall massing of a building relates to the organization and relative size of the building sections or parts of a building in relationship to each other and other buildings on the street.
 - 1 – Relate massing to those of existing adjacent historic houses.
 - 2 – Use forms for new construction that relate to the forms of the majority of Surrounding buildings.

Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 4/2 **AYES:** PARATI, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER
 NAYS: HADEN, RUMSCH

DECISION: ADDITION CONTINUED.

MS. HINDMAN WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THIS NEXT APPLICATION.

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-093 – 224-226 W. KINGSTON AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

The application was continued from March for the following items:

- 6.2, Setbacks – Relate the setback of any new construction and additions to the setback of the existing historic buildings in the immediate surrounding.
- 6.3, Spacing – Space new construction according to the historic precedent in the immediate surroundings of the proposed new construction.
- 6.6,#1 - Height and Width – the relationship to height and width of buildings in the project surroundings
- 6.7, Scale - the relationship of the building to those around it and the human form
- 6.8, Directional Expression - the vertical or horizontal proportions of the building as it relates to other buildings.
- 6.9, Foundations – the height of foundations as it relates to other buildings in the project surroundings

- 6.12, Doors and Windows – the placement, style and materials of these components.
- 6.14, Porches – as it relates to the stylistic expression of the proposed building and other buildings in the district.
- 6.15, Materials – proper historic materials or approved substitutes.

EXISTING CONTEXT

The four properties are one story structures that were re-used for a day care; existing zoning is R-22 Multi-Family. The buildings are connected with heated space. 236 West Kingston Ave. 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 approved by the HDC 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. Its adjacent single family house (245 West Kingston Avenue) was constructed in 1954, approximate height is 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 new construction of townhouses on the four parcels. The project is in the rezoning process to 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 behind the alley easement in the rear yard. Existing 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 on the front elevations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The project meets the guidelines for setback, spacing, orientation, directional expression and size.
2. 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: Kelsey Mayo, Adjacent property owner, spoke in opposition of this application.
Dennis Mayo, Adjacent property owner, spoke in opposition of this application.

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with **Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines**, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION to DENY** this application for its failure to meet guidelines:

- 6.6 – Height - the relationship to height and width of buildings in the project surroundings. Proposed 38 to 43 feet in height from grade. This does not meet the historic height of 241W Kingston across the street which is the historic multifamily building that this must be compared to. This building should not exceed 32 feet from grade which is the tallest building in a 360 degree angle.
- 6.9, Foundations - The height of foundations as it relates to other buildings in project surroundings. Per the Zoutewelle survey, the foundation height of the proposal is two feet, and it does not reflect the historic foundation height of the two historic homes which are adjacent to the property.
- 6.7, Scale - The relationship of the building to those around it and the human form. The rear of the buildings do not relate to the surrounding structures.
- 6.2, Setback – In relationship to setback of immediate surroundings. The buildings are 16 feet closer to the street than the adjacent historic properties on the block, on this side of the street. This does not make it within ten percent of the historic setback of the adjacent structures.

- 6.4, Orientation – The direction of the front of the building as it relates to other buildings in the district. The orientation of the front entrance does not face the street as required by our guidelines.

Ms. Parati seconded

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HADEN, PARATI, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION DENIED

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-218, 712 E. PARK AVENUE – ADDITION

The application was continued from March for the following items:

- Restudy the massing of the upstairs dormer
- Add information on materials and dimensions
- Retain the window on the ground floor per guideline 4.14 #1

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a brick 1.5 Picturesque Revival house constructed in 1941. Features include a front chimney flanked by two quarter round windows and two full size windows on the main floor. The property faces Latta Park.

Proposal-May 9, 2018

The project is a dormer addition, window replacement, arbor, and canopy over the front door. The proposed new right side window is a paired bay window that is the same width (7') as the dormer above. The new canopy is a gable roof supported by two brackets. Materials and trim are wood.

Revised Proposal-June 13, 2018

- The applicant has provided additional information on the proposed window design to enlarge the first level window including examples of bay and paired windows within the surrounding context.
- The scale of the dormer has been reduced.
- Additional information has been provided for materials and dimensions.
- Sheet A-3 includes a statement from the property owner on the preferred design.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- The proposed bay window does not meet guideline 4.14.1 and 4.14.6. However, the HDC will determine if an exception will be granted based on the existence of similar bay window designs on the block.
- The revisions for the porch roof and dormer meet the applicable guidelines for additions and roofs.
- Overall, the proposal is not incongruous with the District. Minor revisions 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 compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines – Additions*, Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as drawn with the double windows below and the reduced – sized dormer, drawing A-3 on my plan.
Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HADEN, PARATI, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: ADDITION APPROVED AS DRAWN

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-217, 601-621 WEST BOULEVARD, & 541 W. WORTHINGTON AVENUE (VACANT) – NEW CONSTRUCTION, PHASE II

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The structure is a multi-family building constructed in 1959 and vacant lot behind it. The properties are in the rezoning process. The structure is 2-3 stories, clad in brick with masonry porticos. There are a variety of mature trees on the both properties. The vacant parcel has significant topography changes with mature trees. The West Boulevard parcel also has a change in topography, approximately 12 to 14 feet. Adjacent buildings are single family residential and non-residential buildings. The first phase of the redevelopment project was approved by the HDC April 11, 2018. A 365-Day Stay of Demolition was placed on the property July 12, 2017.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is the construction of townhomes on the subject parcels. Front setbacks along West Boulevard are equal to and greater than existing. The site sections A and B show the proposed changes to existing grade and relative building heights to adjacent structures. A retention pond is required for storm water control. Grade changes are designed with masonry, terraced retaining walls and metal fencing. Trees to be removed and new trees are noted on the site plans.

The townhouse buildings reflect the approved plans dated April 11, 2018 including materials, approved design details and rooftop mechanical units. Building heights are generally 32 to 33 feet measured from grade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- Staff comments include the spacing and massing of buildings 1 and 2 relative to buildings 3 and 4 and the massing of building 2.
- Overall, the proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the majority of the design guidelines. Minor revisions 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 Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application for further design study on the context of the interior site. Change the streetscape to be more residential to match its surroundings. Reserve the right to restudy the entire project.
Ms. Stephens seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HADEN, PARATI, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER
 NAYS: NONE

DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED.

**MS. HINDMAN JOINED THE MEETING AT 3:40 PM AND WAS PRESENT FOR THE REST OF THE MEETING.
MR POWERS ASSISTANT ATTORNEY SAT IN FOR MS. LESLIE-FITE**

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-267, 214 GRANDIN ROAD – NEW CONSTRUCTION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing site is a large parcel that will be subdivided for construction of a new single family house. The existing structure is a two story Colonial style home constructed in 1920. Adjacent structures are single family, multi-family and institutional. Setbacks along the block are +/- 49.5’ from ROW.

PROPOSAL

The project is a new single family house. Lot dimensions are 50' x 187.5'; the lot line is reduced slightly on the left side. The front setback will be in alignment with the existing house on the parcel. Building height is +/-29' from grade. Materials include fiber cement lap siding, board and batten on the upper level and brick foundation. Windows to be wood or aluminum clad, no vinyl exterior components. A mature tree in the rear yard would be removed and a new tree(s) replanted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for new construction.
- Minor revisions 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 non-compliance with **Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines – New Construction** Ms. Parati made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for the following:

- 6.8, Directional Expression – the vertical or horizontal proportions of the building as it relates to other buildings.
- 6.7, Scale – the relationship of the building to those around it and the human form.
- 6.1 #16, Context – the overall relationship of the project to its surroundings.
- All the other houses within this block are horizontal, and this house is vertical.

Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, PARATI, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION DENIED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-272, 1525 WILMORE DRIVE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing site is a vacant single family parcel 50’x150’. Adjacent residential structures are 1 and 1.5 story single family houses. There are no trees on the lot.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is a new 1.5 story single family house. The front setback is approximately 43’ from ROW. The height from finished floor to ridge is approximately 22’. Exterior materials are wood lap siding, wood trim and brick. Windows are wood double hung on the front and side elevations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for new construction.
- Minor revisions 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 compliance with the **Charlotte Historic Design Guidelines**, Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application for with the following conditions:

- Porch should be 8 feet deep
- The front dormer should be set further back from the thermal wall
- The house setback should match the block
- The window substitution is not approved at this time.

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, PARATI, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

MS. PARATI LEFT THE MEETING AT 4:40 pm

APPLICATION: **HDC 2018-275, 300 E. WORTHINGTON AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION**

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The site is at the edge of the Dilworth Local Historic District and within the South End Transit Overlay District. The existing building is a 1.5 story Bungalow style structure constructed in 1930. The property is zoned B-1 which also allows residential development. The site slopes from front to rear approximately 8-10 feet. Adjacent structures are a mix of 1 and 2 story residential buildings, mixed use and institutional buildings. A 365-Day Stay of Demolition was placed on the structure June 14, 2017.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is a new two story Queen Anne style single family house and detached garage. The height from grade to ridge is approximately 25.6'. Details include wood siding, windows and trim, 8'd. front porch, 16' d. rear porch, round tapered columns and brick foundation. The accessory building is approximately 24' in height and secondary to the house in size and scale with materials and details to match the house. The applicant has provided examples of design precedents in the District and historic references for the proposed architectural style.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for new construction.
- Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

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

MOTION: Based on the need for further design study, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application. Revised plans will include:

- Restudy of the turrets
- Restudy of the kitchen window.
- Full presentation of materials.

Ms. Hindman seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-212 1539 MERRIMAN AVENUE - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a two story house constructed in 1940. Major alterations and additions were made to the house in recent years. The site is a corner lot at Merriman Avenue and Larch Street. Current height is approximately 30' from finished floor to ridge.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is a redesign of the house to improve issues with massing, fenestration, rhythm and other conflicts with the current design guidelines. Features of the redesign include the addition of a new front porch roof and columns, front gable dormer, new side gable roofs, revised window locations on the side and rear elevations, removal of the corner patio and balcony, and new board and batten detail in the gables. Proposed materials are stone and cementitious siding, and wood windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Given the existing design of the house, the proposed redesign improves the massing, directional expression, roof form, materials, fenestration pattern and rhythm. The massing of the rear addition is an unresolved issue.

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, Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application. Revised plans will include changes re:

- Restudy of the back elevation
- Increase the dimension on the double columns
- Window trim needs to be corrected at the window sill
- Consider a wraparound porch because it is a corner lot

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HADEN, PHARES, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-276 – 1425 THOMAS AVENUE - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a one story Bungalow house constructed in 1929. Lot dimensions are 50'x132'.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is a one story addition that is not taller or wider than the house but greater than 50% in sq. footage. Exterior materials are cedar shake siding and stone foundation, all to match existing. Trim and window materials are wood. The new addition is defined by a vertical trim band.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The proposed addition is not incongruous with the District and 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 *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines – Additions*, Ms. Hindman **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with conditions: The revised plans will be reviewed by staff. The revised plans will show:

- Fenestration restudy
- The existing window configuration in the cottage style be correctly shown on the existing elevations and preserved in the renovation

Mr. Rumsch seconded

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS FOR STAFF REVIEW**

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-264 – 325 W. KINGSTON AVENUE - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a one story Bungalow style house constructed in 1938. Exterior features include a hipped roof, wide eaves and brick exterior. Adjacent structures are one to two story residential structures.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is a two story addition that begins behind the front façade and new brick porch columns. The new height from finished floor is approximately 23'. The siding material proposed is Hardie Artisan lap siding and brick. The addition includes a covered rear patio. Trim materials are wood and cementitious where noted on the elevations. Windows are wood or aluminum clad.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The proposed addition is inconsistent with the following guidelines for additions:

- Attempt to locate the addition on the rear elevation so that it is minimally visible from the street.
- Limit the size of the addition so that it does not visually overpower the existing building.
- Attempt to attach new additions or alterations to existing buildings in such a manner that, if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the building would be unimpaired.
- Maintain the existing roof pitch. Roof lines for new additions should be secondary to those of the existing structure. The original roof as visible from the public right-of-way should not be raised.
- Make sure that the design of a new addition is compatible with the existing building. The new work should be differentiated from the old while being compatible with its massing, form, scale, directional expression, roof forms and materials, foundation, fenestration, and materials.

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 Design Guidelines – Additions*, Ms. Titus made **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for its failure to meet guidelines:

- 7.2 by creating a full two story addition on a one story house and raising the overall height more than eight feet, the proposal violates five of our guidelines under 7.2
- #1 – Attempt to locate the addition on the rear elevation so that it is minimally visible from the street.
- #2 – Limit the size of the addition so that it does not visually overpower the existing building.
- #3 – Attempt to attach new additions or alterations to existing buildings in such a manner that, if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the building would be unimpaired.
- #5 – Maintain the existing roof pitch. Roof lines for new additions should be secondary to those of the existing structure. Typically, the original roof as visible from the public right-of-way should not be raised.

- #6 – Make sure that the design of a new addition is compatible with the existing building. The new work should be differentiated from the old while being compatible with its massing, form, scale, directional expression, roof forms, and materials, foundation, fenestration, and materials.

Ms. Stephens seconded

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **ADDITION DENIED**

Application: HDC 2018-241 – 2015 DILWORTH ROAD E - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a two story Dutch Colonial Revival house constructed in 1926. Materials are brick and lap wood siding covered by vinyl siding. A screened porch is located on the right side.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is an addition and new porch columns. The left side addition is on the right side and replaces the side porch. The applicant is applying for fiber cement lap siding. Front porch materials are fiber cement and wood. Windows are wood with exterior muntins.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The HDC will determine if the fiber cement materials warrant an exception. The remaining elements of the project are not incongruous with the District and meet the guidelines for additions.

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 Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application for:

- Correct representation of the gambrel roof details
- Restudy of the window fenestrations on the left side gambrel end
- Specification and dimensions for trim and siding
- Restudy the front porch

Ms. Stephens seconded

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS, WALKER
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **ADDITION CONTINUED**

- **MS. TITUS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE MAY MINUTES WITH REVISIONS. THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.**
-

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 with a meeting length of 6 hours and 15 minutes.
Linda Keich, Clerk to Historic District Commission