



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
November 14, 2018

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. James Haden, Chair  
Ms. Jessica Hindman, Vice-Chair  
Ms. Jana Hartenstine  
Mr. Jim Jordan  
Ms. Mattie Marshall  
Mr. John Phares  
Mr. Damon Rumsch  
Ms. Tamara Titus  
Ms. Jill Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. PJ Henningson

OTHERS PRESENT: Ms. Kristi Harpst, Program Manager of the Historic District Commission  
Ms. Candice R Leite, Staff of the Historic District Commission  
Ms. Linda Keich, Clerk to the Board  
Ms. Andrea Leslie-Fite, Senior Assistant City Attorney  
Ms. Candy Thomas, Adkins Court Reporter

---

With a quorum present, Mr. Haden called the regular November meeting of the Historic District Commission meeting to order at 1:06 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 2018-464	922 East Boulevard	Dilworth
HDC 2018-514	2003 Dilworth Road East	Dilworth
HDC 2018-446	620 East Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2018-445	1908 Dilworth Road East	Dilworth
HDC 2018-496	1015 East Boulevard	Dilworth
HDC 2018-417	700 Grandin Road	Wesley Heights

**NEW APPLICATIONS**

HDC 2018-613	Booth Gardens/421 Poplar Street	Fourth Ward
HDC 2018-529	325 West Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2018-576	208 Grandin Road	Wesley Heights
HDC 2018-016	415 Walnut Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDC 2018-575	305 Westwood Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2018-584	329 West Park Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2018-573	1201 Belgrave Place	Dilworth

---

**MS. TITUS HAD A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THIS APPLICATION.**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2018-446 620 EAST TREMONT AVENUE - ADDITION**

The application was continued from September for the following items:

1. Massing - Restudy of the rear and side elevations including roof form and massing to comply with guideline 6.10, item 4 and guideline 7.2, item 6.
2. Simplify the massing in relationship to the existing building and be sensitive to the scale of the existing building. Dormer straddling the hip is incongruous with the bungalow language.

***EXISTING CONDITIONS***

The existing structure is a 1 story Bungalow house constructed in 1915. Architectural features include a hip roof, full width engaged front porch, and centered dormer. Siding material is wood and brick foundation is painted. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single family houses and multifamily quadraplexes. The house height is approximately 21'-5". The lot size is 50' x 150' and lot topography slopes down away from the street. In the rear yard is a pool that will remain.

***PROPOSAL***

The proposal is a rear addition that is slightly taller and wider than the existing house. The hip addition ridge height on the left side is located behind a chimney and is approximately 2' above the existing ridge. The hip roof pitch matches existing. On the right side is a gable addition that ties into the left side hipped roof. Materials include wood siding, wood or aluminum clad windows, wood columns and brackets, and brick to match existing. New roof and window trim details will match the house. Post-construction the rear yard will be 50% permeable. There are no impacts to mature trees.

***STAFF RECOMMENDATION***

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for additions, 7.2 above.
2. 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 a restudy of the two roof elements on the left and right side that float over the roof and in accordance with 6.10 for roof forms **Mr. Rumsch** made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application.  
**Ms. Hartenstine Seconded.**

**VOTE: 5/3**      **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, MARSHALL, RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** HINDMAN, JORDAN, PHARES

**DECISION:** APPLICATION CONTINUED FOR A RESTUDY OF THE TWO ROOF ELEMENTS ON THE LEFT AND RIGHT SIDE.

---

**APPLICATION:** HDC 2018-514– 2003 DILWORTH AVENUE– FENCE

The application was continued from October for the following item:

1. An elevation drawing of the entire length of the fence with dimensions.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The existing site is a corner lot at Dilworth Road East and Ideal Way. The site slopes from front to back approximately 12 feet. The project is a brick fence along the side yard. A stop work order was issued due to the height of the brick columns which exceed 6 feet. The proposed brick fence is similar to others in the Dilworth neighborhood. Fence columns will be cut down to be 6-feet in height. The bottom portion of the fence is solid and ranging from 32-52 inches in height due to topography. The upper portion of the fence is brick lattice design stepped in from the base and approximately 20-40 inches in height. The total height of the fence will not exceed 6-feet. The project also includes the installation of an automatic metal driveway gate. A small planting strip is located between the fence and public sidewalk.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Fencing, 8.6, items 5, 6, and 9.
2. 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*, **Ms. Hartenstine** made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this project based on the application that provided what we required. The applicant revised drawing #3 for the detailed stepdown at the column, to revise the 27-inch and the 42 inch dimensions to have plus or minus as required in front of them.  
**Ms. Hindman seconded**

**VOTE: 7/2** **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, JORDAN, MARSHALL, PHARES, RUMSCH

**NAYS:** TITUS, WALKER

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR FENCE APPROVED.

---

**APPLICATION:** HDC 2018-445, 1908 DILWORTH ROAD EAST – ADDITION

The application was continued from October for the following items:

1. Additions, 7.2, item 3, maintain the original gable ends.
2. Re-study fenestration on side gables on the second story.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The existing structure is a 1.5 story Bungalow house with Colonial Revival elements constructed in 1924. Architectural features include a side gable roof and a full façade shed front porch. Siding material is brick with wood shake shingles in the gables. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single family houses. The house height is approximately 22’-3”. The lot size is 60’ x 180’.

**PROPOSAL**

The proposal is an addition and changes to a non-original front dormer that was added in the early 1990s. The addition would raise the ridge +/- 2’-9 ½” by extending the side gables and adding new front and rear dormers. Materials include wood shake siding to match existing and wood or aluminum clad windows. New roof and window trim details will match the house. There are no impacts to mature trees.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for additions, 7.2 above.
2. 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 Guidelines, Additions*, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application for meeting all the requirements of our continuance were met, I would like to ask that the window near the gable end on the left elevation be lowered.

**Ms. Marshall seconded.**

**VOTE:** 9/0      **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, JORDAN, MARSHALL, PHARES, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED**

**MR. PHARES HAD A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THIS APPLICATION.**

**APPLICATION: HDC 2018-496, 1015 EAST BOULEVARD – ADDITION/WINDOW REPLACEMENT**

The application was continued from October for the following items:

1. Save trees in front yard and provide a tree protection plan.
2. Keep the tapered columns.
3. Meet guideline for front entrance and canopy per guideline 4.10, item 6.
4. Relook at an accessible entrance based on guideline 8.10, item 1.
5. Retain existing windows on all elevations.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The existing structure is the C. Columbus Harmon House, a 2 story Craftsman frame building constructed in 1922. Architectural features include stucco and timbered gables, brackets and an engaged porch with gable projection on tapered stucco columns. Siding material is wood lap siding. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story commercial buildings. The lot size is 75’ x 200’.

**PROPOSAL**

The proposal is a new front porch, ADA ramp, new windows, and a new rear addition. An existing non-historic rear addition will be removed. The new rear addition will tie in below the existing ridge. Materials include brick columns, metal window system for the front porch area, and wood or clad replacement windows. New roof and window trim details will match the house. There is a mature tree near the front left corner of the existing porch.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

1. The Commission will determine if the Chinese Fir tree at the right corner of the building should be removed.
2. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for new porches and additions.
3. 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* **Ms. Titus** made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the second drawing for the primary elevation which is Alternate 1 front elevation that retains the original triple window on the first floor, because this alternate elevation meets our guidelines for windows 4.14, #6 “Avoid adding new openings or changing existing openings on primary elevations.”

**Mr. Rumsch seconded.**

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

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2018-417, 700 GRANDIN ROAD – NEW CONSTRUCTION/DETACHED ACCESSORY BUILDING**

The application was continued from September for the following items:

1. New Construction, 6.1-6.16 - select a consistent architectural style in the design.
2. Height, 6.6 – Height shall not exceed the tallest historic house on the block.
3. Scale, 6.7 - the relationship of the building to those around it. The major elements of the massing relating to the buildings around it (eaves, dormer heights, window heights) of the massing relating to the buildings around it.)
4. Provide more information about the trees on site and look for a way to save the tree in the middle of the lot.
5. Provide a cross-section elevation of the entire property to show the relationship of the garage to the primary structure.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The site is an existing vacant lot located mid-block along Grandin Road. Adjacent structures are single family. This section of Grandin Road has a variety of house sizes, heights, and architectural styles.

**PROPOSAL**

The project is a new single-family house and detached garage. Lot dimensions are 53' x 202.64'. The front setback will be in alignment with the existing adjacent houses. Building height is +/-33'-4" from grade. Materials include fiber cement lap siding, 8'd. front porch with wood tongue and groove flooring, and brick foundation. Windows to be wood or aluminum clad, no vinyl exterior components. Two mature trees in the rear yard would be removed and new maturing canopy trees will be replanted.

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**

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

**FOR/AGAINST:** Kim Parati spoke in favor of this application.

**MOTION:** Based on the need for additional information **Ms. Hartenstine** made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application for the applicant to bring back revised foundations to meet our guideline 6.9, revised fireplace to either vent-less or add a chimney based on guideline 6.5 and 6.12. Details of the siding height, exposure, and thickness based on precedents on neighboring properties with siding. Applicant to bring in evidence that the space between the houses complies with guideline 6.3, #1 and also complies with the Wesley Heights neighborhood covenants for side yard and front, I think it is just side yard. Drawings to show windows comply with guideline 6.12, #2. Revise garage door to meet guideline 8.9, #6 to appear as two separate doors. Remove Craftsman details, such as brackets, at the garage. Details to illustrate trim material meets guideline 6.11 at corner boards and trim boards where the material's proud of siding material.

**Mr. Rumsch seconded.**

**VOTE: 9/0**      **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, JORDAN, MARSHALL, PHARES, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION NEW CONSTRUCTION/ACCESSORY STUCTURE CONTINUED**

---

**MR. HADEN HAD A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HIMSELF FROM THE NEXT APPLICATION**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2018-613, 421 NORTH POPLAR STREET – WINDOW REPLACEMENT**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The four existing apartment buildings are all three stories in height and constructed in 1977. Materials include aluminum sliding windows, wood siding and trim.

**PROJECT**

The project is replacement windows on all four apartment buildings. The existing windows are the original aluminum sliding windows, which are beyond repair. The window type requested is a vinyl/PVC window in the same configuration/operation as the original aluminum windows. The applicant is also proposing to add wood trim around the new windows.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

1. The Commission will determine if the proposed replacement windows and trim meet the guidelines.
2. 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:** **Mr. Rumsch** made an exception to our *Charlotte Historic Design Guidelines*, to **APPROVE** this application as submitted due to the date of construction and original materials used in construction, which is the most appropriate substitute.  
**Ms. Walker seconded.**

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

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR WINDOW REPLACEMENT APPROVED**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2018-529, 325 WEST KINGSTON AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION**

**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 on two story residential structures. Demolition with a 365-day stay was approved on August 8, 2018. The applicant is submitting plans for the construction of a new single-family house. Existing single-family homes on the block are 1 to 2 stories and range in height from 17 to 26’.

**PROPOSAL**

The proposal is a new single-family house. Lot dimensions are 50’ x 134’. The front setback is approximately 36’-4” feet from ROW. The front setback aligns with the existing houses on the street. The siding material proposed is Hardie Artisan or Nichiha smooth lap siding and brick foundation. Trim materials are wood and cementitious where noted on the elevations. Windows are wood. Total height as measured from grade to ridge is approximately 26’-6”.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

1. The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for new construction.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**FOR/AGAINST:** Kim Parati spoke in Favor of this project.

**MOTION:** **Mr. Phares** made a MOTION to lift the 365 day stay of demolition on 325 West Kingston Avenue.  
**Ms. Titus seconded.**

**VOTE:** 5/4  
**AYES:** HADEN, HINDMAN, JORDAN, PHARES, TITUS  
**NAYS:** JORDAN, HARTENSTINE, MARSHALL, RUMSCH

**MOTION:** **Mr. Phares** made a motion to approve this application with the following revisions for staff to review. Guideline 8.2, #5, driveway to be no wider than ten feet or change to brick carriage strips. Guideline 6.15, trim, siding,

corner boards to be reviewed by staff. Artisan and clear wood are approved, but alternative products will require presentation to the full commission. Guideline 6.14, front porch tapered columns to meet 6.14 for proportions and details. **Ms. Hindman seconded**

**VOTE: 8/1**      **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, JORDAN, PHARES, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER  
**NAYS:** MARSHALL

**DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED WITH MODIFICATIONS FOR STAFF TO APPROVE.**

---

**MS. MARSHALL LEFT THE MEETING AT 5:20 AND WAS ABSENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING. SHE ATTENDED MORE THAN 50% OF THE MEETING.**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2018-576, 208 GRANDIN ROAD – NEW CONSTRUCTION**

***EXISTING CONDITIONS***

The site is a vacant parcel. The current applicant is submitting new plans for a single-family house. Existing homes on the block are 1 to 2.5 stories and range in height from 20' to 33'.

***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 is approximately 41 feet from ROW. Proposed building materials are brick foundation, Hardie Artisan smooth lap siding with wood trim. The front porch is concrete with a brick rowlock edge and foundation. Total height as measured from grade to ridge +/- 28'-4". Four trees located in the middle of the lot are proposed for removal and new tree(s) will be replanted.

***STAFF RECOMMENDATION***

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for New Construction.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**FOR/AGAINST:** William Panzarella spoke in Opposition to the project

**MOTION:** **Ms. Walker** made a motion to continue this application for:

- The applicant to lower the height of the overall house.
  - Explanation for what the tree is and why it should come down.
  - Follow Guideline 6.8 for Directional Expression #1 Make sure that the directional expression of new residential building is compatible with that of the surrounding houses in the block.
  - Reference guideline 6.6 for Height and width of the house. The actual size of a new building can either contribute to, or conflict with, the contributing structures in a historic district. Height and width are two primary considerations for making new buildings fit within the context of a historic districts.
- Ms. Hartenstine seconded.**

**VOTE: 7/1**      **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, JORDAN, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER  
**NAYS:** PHARES

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED**

---

**MS. HINDMAN WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**

**APPLICATION: HDC 2018-016, 415 WALNUT AVENUE – ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The existing structure is a one-story Bungalow style house constructed in 1926 with a front porch that continues on the left side. Other features include a hipped roof, wood siding, a hipped front dormer, brick chimney, side gables, and paired windows on the front. A one-story rear addition was added c. 2007/2008.

**PROPOSAL**

The project is an addition of a cross gable that raises a portion of the roof approximately 4’-4” in height. Behind the existing original porch, the left wall would be extended approximately 7’ closer to the left property line. The existing rear deck and arbor will be extended to be full-width. No changes to the front of the house, including the front porch and original front dormer. New materials are wood siding and trim to match existing.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff has the following concerns:

1. Massing of the rear dormer.
2. 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* Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for its failure to meet the following guidelines:

- 7.2, #2 the proposed visually overpowers the existing building, #3 the new addition is attached in such a manner that if it were removed, the integrity and essential form of the building would be impaired; #5 the roof line for the new addition is not secondary to the existing structure; #6, the design of the new addition is not compatible with the existing building.
- The proposal fails to meet all of these guidelines because it is adding a full second story to a one-story bungalow on a block of one-story houses.
- Mr. Rumsch added a Friendly amendment, Rhythm under new construction, guideline 6.1 that says at the bottom Details. The streetscape is what I’m referring to.
- Ms. Titus added to the motion specifically that it disrupts the rhythm of the streetscape on this block.  
**Mr. Rumsch seconded.**

**VOTE:** 6/1      **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, JORDAN, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** PHARES

**DECISION:**      **WINDOW REPLACEMENT CONTINUED.**  
**APPROVE ADDITION WITH CONDITIONS**

---

- **MR. RUMSCH WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**
- 

**APPLICATION: HDC 2018-575, 305 WESTWOOD AVENUE - ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The existing structure is a one-story Bungalow style house constructed in 1933. Architectural features include full width front porch under a gable roof supported by square brick columns. Other features include side gable roof, wood Dutch lap siding with wood shingles in the gables and wood brackets. All brick on the house is painted (foundation, porch columns, chimney). A rear addition with fiber cement siding and a concrete block foundation was added in 2010 just prior to the creation of the Wilmore Local Historic District. A Notice of Violation (NOV) was issued by Code Enforcement in 2016 for the stockade-style wood fence, and compliance is being worked through with staff.



**PROPOSAL**

The project is an addition that raises the main ridge approximately 5'-8". No changes will be made to the existing footprint. On the left elevation an existing triple window will be changed to a set of French-style doors that open onto a new wood deck. Request for alternate materials on the second level addition to match the fiber cement siding on 2010 rear addition.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff has the following concerns with the application:

1. Roof Form Massing, Doors and Windows, Rhythm and Materials.
2. 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* Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for its failure to meet the following guidelines:

- 7.2, #2 the proposed visually overpowers the existing building, #3 the new addition is attached in such a manner that if it were removed, the integrity and essential form of the building would be impaired; #5 the original roof as visible from the public right of way should not be raised, and roof lines for new additions should be secondary to those of the existing structure. Number 6, make sure the design of the new addition is compatible with the existing building.
- The proposal fails to meet all of these guidelines, because it is adding a full second story to a one-story bungalow and raises the ridge five feet, eight inches on a house where the original height is only 17 feet, six inches.
- applicant has failed to show a site plan to indicate a reason why the addition cannot go back as opposed to up which is required by our guideline 7.2, number 1

**Mr. Jordan seconded.**

**VOTE:** 6/0      **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, JORDAN, PHARES, TITUS  
**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**      **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION DENIED**

---

**APPLICATION HDC 2018-584, 329 WEST PARK AVENUE, ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The existing structure is a one-story Bungalow style house constructed in 1926 with a partial front porch with a gable roof. Other features include a side-gable roof with brackets, a brick chimney and painted brick foundation. A rear addition was added in 2008 prior to the creation of the Wilmore Local Historic District.

**PROPOSAL**

The project is an addition that raises the main ridge approximately 5'-3". No changes will be made to the existing footprint. On the right (Wickford Place) elevation a paired window will be changed to a bump out with a triple window. New windows on the second level will be wood casements with a muntin pattern to match existing. Requested siding material is Hardie shingle siding.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff has the following concerns with the application:

1. Massing, height, and windows
2. 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*, Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for its failure to meet the following guidelines:

- 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.
- #5 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 the new addition is compatible with the existing building.
- This proposal would add five feet, three inches to a historic house that is only 19 feet tall. Adding a second story to a one-story bungalow fails to respect the original structure. The original house has already been added onto, and this would be an overpowering addition to an addition

**Mr. Rumsch seconded.**

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

**DECISION:**      **APPLICATION DENIED**

**APPLICATION: HDC 2018-573, 1201 BELGRAVE PLACE – DETACHED GARAGE**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The main building is a 1.5 story Colonial Revival style brick house constructed in 1963. Architectural features include a full-width engaged front porch supported by round columns, and windows with an 8/12 muntin pattern. The addition of the three front dormers and the rear dormer were approved in 2004. The rear addition and sport court were approved in 2013

**PROPOSAL**

The project is the demolition of the existing two-vehicle carport constructed c. 2004. and the construction of a 1.5 story detached garage in the rear left corner of the property. The garage footprint measures approximately 24'-8" x 26'-4". The garage height is approximately 23'-6". Windows will be wood and exterior material requested is Hardie Artisan smooth lap siding. The front of the garage has a gabled dormer to coordinate with the house.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

1. Rear dor ner massi ng
2. Inconsi stent w ndow and door patter n
3. Mi nor revi si ons may be revi ewed 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. Hartenstine** made a motion to continue this application. The revised drawings will show the following:

- Existing elevations with materials deemed appropriate by our guidelines.
- Mr. Jordan Friendly amendment the elevations in relationship to the slope of the lot.
- Cross section between the relationship of the garage to the house.

**Mr. Rumsch seconded.**

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

**DECISION:**      **APPLICATION CONTINUED**

**Minutes for October were unanimously approved with revision made by Ms. Titus.**

**ADJOURNED: 6hrs 20 mins**