



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
August 8, 2018

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. James Haden, Chair
Ms. Jessica Hindman, Vice-Chair
Ms. Jana Hartenstine
Mr. PJ Henningson
Mr. James Jordan
Mr. John Phares
Mr. Damon Rumsch
Ms. Tamara Titus, 2nd Vice-Chair

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ms. Kim Parati
Ms. Mattie Marshall
Ms. Jill Walker

OTHERS PRESENT: Mr. John Howard, Administrator of the Historic District Commission
Ms. Kristi Harpst, 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

With a quorum present, Mr. Haden called the regular August 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:

CASES NOT HEARD JULY

HDC 2018-332	620 East Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
--------------	-----------------------------	----------

CONTINUED

HDC 2017-220	409 Renssalaer Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2018-329	1000 East Morehead Street	Dilworth
HDC 2018-217	601-621 West Boulevard	Wilmore

NEW APPLICATIONS

HDC 2018-393	517 Walnut Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDC 2018-334	1749 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore
HDC 2018-388	239 West Park Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2018-389	2208 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore
HDC 2018-397	1765 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore
HDC 2018-358	1727 Dilworth Road East	Dilworth
HDC 2018-244	617 S. Summit Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDC 2018-256	2107 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2018-412	325 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-332, 620E. WORTHINGTON AVENUE – ALTERNATE MATERIALS

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a 2.5 story Colonial style home constructed in 1911. Lot dimensions are 55' x 140'. A driveway is located in the left side yard leading to the rear yard.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is a substitute material on the approved garage. The proposed material is composite wood lap siding (LP Smartside) or Nichiha Savannah Smooth Siding.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The HDC will determine if the proposed material is an appropriate substitute.

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* Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION to APPROVE the (Nichiha half inch smooth siding)** this application because it meets the following guideline:

- 6.15, #2 while wood is the most appropriate material for new houses, non-grained cementitious siding may be permitted for new construction. Smooth cementitious or composite siding that matches the traditional dimension of wood siding is permitted for new accessory buildings. Additions to historic structures using non-traditional materials will be evaluated on a case by case basis.
- The dimensions and details match the existing historic structure.

Mr. Rumsch Seconded

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, PHARES, RUMSCH
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **ALTERNATE MATERIAL APPROVED.**

-
- **MS. TITUS HAS JOINED THE MEETING.**
-

APPLICATION: **HDC 2018-220 – 409 RENSSALAER - ADDITION**

The application was continued from July for the following items: Failure to comply with design guidelines 6.10.2, 6.10.3, 7.2.3 and 7.2.6.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a one story Colonial style house constructed in 1930 and listed as a contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places. The site elevation drops from front to rear approximately 5 to 7 feet. 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 existing house. All primary and trim materials are wood. New windows and trim are shown on the elevations.

Revised Proposal – July 11, 2018

1. The applicant has modified the rear elevation roof form to address massing including a revised dormer design on the left and right side.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The proposed addition meets the guideline for massing, 6.5.
2. The proposed addition is part of the new roof and toward the rear of the house and secondary to the main house. The proposal meets the applicable for additions - Roof Form and Materials, 6.10.
3. The proposal meets the guidelines for additions, 7.2 and is not incongruous with the District.

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*, Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application for meeting the following guidelines:

- 6.10- #2 Consider employing roof dormers if they are commonly used in nearby historic houses. The style of the dormer should relate to the style of the house.

- 6.10 - #3 Reflect the pitch and gable orientation of surrounding historic buildings in the design of a new dwelling. For instance, if the context is primarily gable-roofed houses, avoid a shallow hipped roof.
- 7.2 - #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.
- 7.2 - #6 Make sure that the design of the 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, foundation, fenestration, and materials.

Ms. Titus seconded

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

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED**

- **MS. HINDMAN RECUSED HERSELF FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-329, 1000 EAST MOREHEAD STREET – ADDITION

The application was continued for the following items: 1) Revisit the east elevation on Morehead Street to further study the fenestration, size and rhythm as it relates to its roof form and mass in which the fenestration is located as outlined in sections 6.10, 6.11, 6.12 and 6.5. And also requesting the applicant bring precedents from existing building windows for muntin spacing and other Gothic precedents to support the east elevation.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is Covenant Presbyterian Church constructed in 1950 with subsequent additions in the 1990s. The primary façade material is stone.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is an addition to connect the sanctuary and education building. Materials, windows and architectural details match and complement the existing structures. Trees to be removed would be replaced with new trees.

Revised Proposal – August 8, 2018

1. The applicant has revised the Gothic style window proportions on the East Morehead elevation and provided historic examples, a window schedule and other supporting documentation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The proposal meets the guidelines for additions, sections 6.10, 6.11, 6.12 and 6.5.
2. The project is not incongruous with the District.

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 – New Construction***, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as submitted for meeting our guidelines for the following:

- 6.10, Roof Form and Materials
- 6.11, Cornices and Trim

- 6.12, Doors and Windows
- 6.5, Massing and Complexity of Form

The applicants have provided evidence of historic gothic structures, as well as existing fenestration on the campus that justify the current fenestration and roof prow on the Morehead elevation.

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 5/2 **AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSN, JORDAN, RUMSCH, TITUS
NAYS: HARTENSTINE, PHARES

DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED AS DRAWN

- **MS. HINDMAN JOINED THE MEETING FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**
-

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-217, 601-621 WEST BOULEVARD – NEW CONSTRUCTION

The application was continued from June for the following items. 1) Restudy of the interior of the space for context and to change the streetscape elevation to be more residential and fit into the neighborhood.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The structure is a multi-family building constructed in 1959 with a 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 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 stormwater 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.

Revised Proposal – August 8, 2018

1. The site has been revised to reflect the new open space along West Boulevard and the elimination of one townhouse unit.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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 compliance with *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines – New Construction*, Mr. Phares made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application for being in compliance with the guidelines for new construction.

- We approve the landscaping and retaining walls as an exception under guidelines 8.4 (8a), which states certain modern materials for landscape and site features are not allowed including interlocking concrete blocks with beveled edges.
- Staff can approve the retaining wall material and landscaping.
- Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment to approve the second floor balcony three-quarter-inch
- Hardie material as proposed. Mr. Henningson accepted the friendly amendment.

Mr. Henningson seconded.

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

DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED AS SUBMITTED AND STAFF TO APPROVE THE RETAINING WALL MATERIAL AND LANDSCAPING.

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-393, 517 WALNUT AVENUE – ADDITION, AND DETACHED ACCESSORY BUILDING

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing house is a one story Bungalow style single family house with brick exterior and wood siding in the gables. The house was constructed in 1926. The lot dimensions are 55' x 192.5' with a slight grade increase from front to rear. Surrounding single family houses are 1-2 stories in height.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is an addition on the left rear side and new detached garage. The addition would raise the ridge approximately 3'-8" and extend into the rear yard 22' with new side gables. The addition includes a breezeway connection to the garage. The garage footprint is approximately 27'-10" x 40'-3" and the height is approximately 20'-11". New materials include wood siding, wood garage doors, cementitious trim where noted, and wood windows. Original windows to remain are identified on the plan. The front porch and other features on the front façade will remain.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- The front and sides of the addition will be visible from the street and the house is not taller than an original house in the surrounding context.
- The HDC will determine if the addition meets guidelines in 7.2 and 6.10.
- The HDC will also determine if the accessory building is secondary to the house per the guidelines on page 8.9.

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 – Addition/Accessory Structure** Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for its failure to meet guidelines:

- 8.9, #2 – Place new outbuildings, such as garages or sheds, to the rear of lots that are large enough to accommodate them, following the applicable zoning requirements. New outbuildings cannot be located in front or side yards. The garage is not sited at the rear of the lot.
- 8.9, #3 – Design new outbuildings to be compatible with the style and character of the primary historic building on the site, especially in scale, elements and roof form. Any new outbuilding must be clearly secondary to the main structure on the site. – The

proposed garage is taller than the original house, and the footprint is similar to the main house, so the proposed building does not read as a secondary structure.

- 7.2, #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 original building would be unimpaired.
- 7.2, #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, foundation, fenestration, and materials.

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 6/2 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, JORDAN, RUMSCH, TITUS
NAYS: HINDMAN, PHARES

DECISION: ADDITION/GARAGE DENIED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-334, 1749 WILMORE DRIVE– ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing house is a one story Bungalow style single family house constructed in 1933 with a slight grade decrease from front to rear. Surrounding single family houses are 1-1.5 stories in height. The masonry foundation is painted brick.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is an addition on the rear of the house. The addition is not taller or wider than the house but the addition is more than 50% in square footage of the original house. The footprint of the addition is 28' x 32'. Original windows, materials and details to remain are noted on the elevations. New siding is Dutch lap to match the house, existing non-compliant windows would be replaced. The rear deck is wood. Corner boards delineate the new addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The proposal 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 the *Charlotte Historic Design Guidelines*, Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as submitted for meeting all of the guidelines for additions.

- 7.2, 1-8 - Addition

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

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

DECISION: ADDITION APPROVED AS SUBMITTED.

- **MR. HENNINGSON HAD A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND RECUSED HIMSELF FROM THE MEETING.**
-

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-388, 239 WEST PARK AVENUE – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing house is a one story Bungalow style single family house constructed in 1931 with a slight grade decrease from front to rear. Architectural features include a hipped roof, front gable dormer, side facing dormer and traditional materials. Surrounding single family houses are 1-2 stories in height.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is an addition toward the rear of the house with an attached garage. The footprint of the addition is approximately 21' x 32'. Original windows, materials and details to remain are noted on the elevations. New siding is wood lap to match the house. The highest roof peak is approximately 27'-6". New roof pitches match existing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. The front and sides of the addition will be visible from the street and the house is not taller than an original house in the surrounding context.
2. The HDC will determine if the addition meets guidelines in sections 7.2, 6.10 and other applicable guidelines for additions.

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

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

- 7.2, #1 – Attempt to locate the addition on the rear elevation so that it is minimally visible from the street.
- 7.2, #2 – Limit the size of the addition so that it does not visually overpower the existing building.
- 7.2, #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.
- 7.2, #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, direction expression, roof forms, foundation, fenestration, and material.
- 8.9, #2 – Place new outbuildings, such as garages or sheds, to the rear of lots that are large enough to accommodate them, following the applicable zoning requirements. New outbuildings cannot be located in front or side yards.
- 8.9, #3 – Design new outbuildings to be compatible with the style and character of the primary historic building on the side, especially in scale, elements, and roof form. Any new outbuilding must be clearly secondary to the main structure on the site.
- The proposal fails all of these guidelines for reasons including, but not limited to, the fact that the proposed addition is 9'9" taller than the original structure. Also, the proposal has not been reviewed for other guidelines.

Ms. Hartenstine seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, JORDAN, PHARES, RUMSCH, TITUS
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: ADDITION DENIED

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-389, 2208 WILMORE DRIVE- ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing house is a one story American Small house constructed in 1938 with a slight grade decrease from front to rear. Surrounding single family houses are 1-1.5 stories in height. The lot dimensions are 50' x 160'.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is an addition toward the rear of the house. The addition is not taller or wider than the house but the addition is more than 50% in square footage of the original house. The footprint of the addition is 24' x 26'. Original windows, materials and details to remain are noted on the elevations. New siding is wood lap. The rear deck is wood. Window design is 1/1 to match existing where noted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The proposal 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* Ms. Hindman made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application with the following conditions for staff to approve

- Review the rhythm of the fenestration on the left side, the transition of cladding to the foundation, and the window trim and corner board size and thickness.
- 6.12 – DOORS AND WINDOWS
- 6.9 – FOUNDATIONS
- 6.11 – CORNICES AND TRIM
- Staff will review the handrail.

Mr. Henningson seconded.

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

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS FOR STAFF TO REVIEW.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-397 – 1765 WILMORE DRIVE – ADDITION, CHIMNEY REMOVAL, WINDOW REPLACEMENT

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing house is a one story Bungalow style house constructed in 1933 on a corner lot. Features include cedar shake and wood siding. Windows are wood and the foundation is painted brick. The chimney above the roof has been removed.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is to enclose the rear porch with siding and screens, add handrails, remove chimney removal and replace doors. New siding, windows and handrails are wood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for additions.
- The HDC will determine the corrective action for the chimney.

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 – Addition/Chimney Removal/Window Replacement*, Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with conditions for staff to approve:

- Staff will approve a door for the front and the side or the front and rear,
- Staff will approve detail relating to the side porch and the deck, the enclosure of the side porch
- Rebuild the chimney up to the roofline
- Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment that this is separate from a porch enclosure because there is a long history of rear porches being converted on this type of house

Mr. Rumsch seconded

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

DECISION: **ADDITION/WINDOW REPLACEMENT APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS FOR STAFF APPROVAL.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-358 – 1727 DILWORTH ROAD EAST – WINDOW REPLACEMENT

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing house is a 1.5 story Colonial style single family house constructed in 1941. Features include three dormers on the front elevation and four windows on the first floor of the main house. Windows are wood.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is the installation of 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.” The window patterns would be consistent with the original windows as *colonial* grid style. There are 2 windows to be replaced in their original openings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The HDC will determine if window replacement is necessary and if the replacement window type meets the guidelines.

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 – Window Replacement* Mr. Henningson made **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for its failure to meet the following guidelines:

- 4.14, #1 – Retain and preserve windows that contribute to the overall historic character of a building including frames, sash, glass, muntins, sills, trim, surrounds, and shutters. Ensure that all hardware is in good operating condition.
- 4.13 –
- The applicant failed to show evidence that the windows were beyond repair.
- Ms. Hartenstine made a friendly amendment Guideline 4.14, #10 says Replace entire windows only when they are missing or beyond repair.

Mr. Rumsch seconded

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

DECISION: **WINDOW REPLACEMENT DENIED**

APPLICATION HDC 2018-244 – 617 SUMMIT AVENUE – NON TRADITIONAL SIDING

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing house is a 1.5 story Bungalow style single family house constructed in 1940. Existing siding is wood, ½” thick.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is the installation of smooth *LP Smartside* on the ADU. *LP Smartside* is a composite wood siding product.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The HDC will determine if the proposed material is an appropriate non-traditional siding material.

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* Mr. Phares made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for its failure to meet our guidelines in thickness and surface texture. We are approving the applicant’s use of a half-inch cementitious siding with a smooth surface that has been approved by this commission for the ADU we are approving the use of wood siding to match that which is existing on the main dwelling unit. Guideline 5.2, #1 which states Retain wood as one of the dominant framing, cladding, and decorative materials. Applicant may use cementitious siding such as, but not limited to, Nichiha.

Ms. Hartenstine seconded

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

DECISION: **SUBSTITUTE SIDING DENIED.**

APPLICATION HDC 2018-256, 2107 THE PLAZA – SKYLIGHT ON FRONT OF ROOF

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing house is a 1.5 story Colonial style single family house constructed in 1936. Features include a small window in the front gable and a front facade chimney.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is the installation of a skylight on the left side of the primary roof. The skylight is a deck mounted system.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The proposed location does not meet Design Guideline item 4.5.3 for the location of skylights.

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* Ms. Hartenstine made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for its failure to meet the following guideline:

- 4.5, #3 – Retain architectural features including dormers, cornices, exposed rafter tails, and chimneys. New dormers should be appropriately designed for the style of the structure in massing and material. Do not add skylights unless placed inconspicuously.

Mr. Rumsch seconded

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

DECISION: **SKYLIGHT DENIED.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-412 – 325 WEST KINGSTON AVENUE - DEMOLITION

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 and two story residential structures.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is full demolition of the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will make a determination as to whether or not the buildings are determined to have special significance to the Wilmore Local Historic District. With affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to a 365-Day Stay of Demolition. Or if the Commission determines that this property is no longer contributing, then demolition may take place without a delay.

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

MOTION: Based on *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines – Demolition*, Mr. Rumsch made **MOTION** to **RECOGNIZE** the structure as having special significance to the Wilmore local Historic District.
Ms. Hartenstine seconded

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

MOTION: Based on *Charlotte Historic District Design Guidelines – Demolition*, Mr. Rumsch made **MOTION** to **APPROVE** demolition and institute the maximum 365-day stay.
Ms. Titus seconded

DECISION: **DEMOLITION APPROVED WITH THE MAXIMUM 365 DAY STAY**

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

The meeting adjourned at 4:59 with a meeting length of 3hours and 49 minutes.
Linda Keich, Clerk to Historic District Commission