



APPROVED JUNE 12, 2019

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

April 10, 2019

Room 267

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Jim Haden,(Chairperson)  
Ms. Jana Hartenstine  
Mr. PJ Henningson  
Ms. Jessica Hindman (Vice-Chairperson)  
Mr. Jim Jordan  
Ms. Mattie Marshall  
Ms. Kim Parati  
Mr. John Phares  
Mr. Damon Rumsch  
Ms. Tamara Titus (2<sup>nd</sup> Vice-Chairperson)  
Ms. Jill Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT: NONE

OTHERS PRESENT: Ms. Kristi Harpst, Administrator of the Historic District Commission  
Ms. Candice Leite, Staff of the Historic District  
Ms. Linda Keich, Clerk to Historic District Commission  
Ms. Cindy Kochanek, Staff of the Historic District Commission  
Ms. Andrea Leslie-Fite, Assistant City Attorney  
Ms. Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

---

With a quorum present, Chairman Haden called the regular April meeting of the Historic District Commission (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 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. 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. Chairman 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 removed from the room. Chairman Haden swore in all Applicants and Staff and continued to swear in people as they arrived for the duration of the meeting. Appeal from the Historic District Commission is to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. One has thirty (30) days from the date of the decision to appeal. This is in accordance with Section 10.213 of the City Zoning Ordinance.

Index of Addresses:

**CONSENT ITEM**

HDC 2019-151, 1932 Dilworth Rd. W Dilworth

**NEW CASES**

HDC 2019-160, 708 E Tremont Ave Dilworth  
HDC 2019-045, 1716 Merriman Ave Wilmore  
HDC 2018-661, 429 West Blvd Wilmore  
HDC 2019-121, 223 E Park Ave Dilworth  
HDC 2019-079, 729 Woodruff Pl Wesley Heights  
HDC 2019-157, 1751 Merriman Av Wilmore  
HDC 2019-101, 815 Berkeley Av Dilworth

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

N/A

**APPLICATION:** HDC 2019-151, 1932 DILWORTH ROAD W – ADDITION

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 2-story Dutch Colonial Revival structure constructed c.1925, located at the corner of Dilworth Road West and Magnolia Avenue. Architectural features include a full façade shed dormer, a curved hood over the front entry, wood lap siding on the first level and shake siding on the second level, and 4/1 windows.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is a rear addition no taller or wider than the existing structure. The lower level is a new unheated covered porch and the upper level is heated living space, like an earlier addition on the left rear elevation. The addition connects below the main ridge. All materials (windows, columns, porch rail, trim, etc.) are wood to match existing. A new stone chimney will also be constructed to match the existing stone chimney on the left elevation. Post construction, the rear yard will be 28% impermeable. No trees are proposed for removal.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets guidelines for Additions, page 7.2, and New Construction above.
2. Staff Recommends full approval for meeting all the Guidelines per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION:** APPROVED                      1<sup>st</sup>: Ms. Jill Walker                      2<sup>nd</sup>: Ms. Tamara Titus

Ms. Walker, I make a motion to approve this consent agenda item, as it meets the policy and design guidelines, specifically those for additions, 7.2 and new construction, 6.1

**VOTE:** 11/0

**AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, JORDAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER, HINDMAN

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR AN ADDITION APPROVED

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

MS. HINDMAN RECUSED HERSELF FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.

**APPLICATION:** HDC 2019-160, 708 E. TREMONT AVENUE – ADDITION

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing property is a one-story Craftsman bungalow constructed in 1920. The architectural features include a telescoping effect created by a low gabled block, and slightly lower off-center gable with hip roofed porch supported by brick piers and square wood columns. Siding is wood shake. Lot dimensions are 50' x 150'.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is a rear addition that does not raise the original main ridge on the house. The addition ridge is approximately 11" taller than the main ridge and bumps out slightly on the right side. Materials include brick foundation, wood shake siding, wood trim/brackets, and wood windows with Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL) in a 1/1 pattern to match existing. Windows to be re-used, restored, and replaced are noted on the plans. The existing brick foundation and brick foundation on the new addition are proposed to be painted. The proposal also includes the reconstruction of the front left corner of the house which is failing, all new materials (siding, windows, trim, etc.) will match existing. Post-construction the rear yard will be 41% impervious.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. Overall, the proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Additions, 7.2 and New Construction above.
2. Long expanse of blank wall on right elevation of proposed addition.
3. Proposed painted brick.
4. Ensure driveway extension does not include paving up to the foundation.
5. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak for or against this project.

**MOTION:** DENIED/CONTINUED

**1<sup>st</sup>:** Mr. Henningson

**2<sup>nd</sup>:** Ms. Titus

Mr. Henningson, made a motion to deny the following two components: per guideline 4.4, number 6, do not paint the brick. Per guideline 8.2, number 8, do not pave up to the foundation and allow for a planting strip of six to twelve inches in width. I want to continue the following: Per guideline 4.4, number 8, repair windows to match the same dimensions as the original. Guideline 4.4, number 1, retain original windows on the left elevation to the left of the chimney, and new windows should match the style and dimension of the original. Per guideline 6.12, number 1, revisit the fenestration on the right side of the addition. Rear columns to match the style and the dimension of the columns on the front. And I want to add a tree protection plan.



Friendly Amendment: Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment that the discussion of the dormer references the supplemental materials that were received today, Ms. Titus accepted the friendly amendment.

**VOTE:** 11/0

**AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** N/A

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION DENIED

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

MS. HINDMAN RECUSED HERSELF FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.

**APPLICATION:** HDC 2018-661, 429 WEST BOULEVARD - ADDITION

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The house is a one-story American Small House with Tudor Revival features constructed in 1938. According to Sanborn Maps the structure was originally built as a duplex. Exterior features include a symmetrical brick façade, chimneys and half timbering details on both side gable ends, and nearly full width front porch. The stuccoed entry way appears to be a later addition, as evidenced by the following: a.) the stucco material and half-timbering does not match the gable ends (half-timbering on the front gable is flush with the stucco), b.) trim detailing particularly at the bottom corners of the gable, c.) the enclosure is not centered on the front elevation and is located closer to the paired windows on the right; all of which is incongruous with symmetry and details found throughout the rest of the structure.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project includes a new covered front porch built over the existing brick/concrete porch floor, and changes to window and door openings on the right and left elevations. Materials are all traditional to match existing. The new window openings and existing windows to be repaired are noted on the floor plan (A1.1). Proposed new double-hung windows will be aluminum clad in a 6/1 pattern to match existing. The small rear addition shown on the plans is not for HDC review; due to size and location the project was reviewed Administratively under COA# HDCADMRM-2018-00662.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

1. The proposal for the front porch is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Additions, 7.2 and New Construction above.
2. Commission will determine if changes to window and door openings on the right and left elevations meet the guidelines.
3. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION:** APPROVED

**1<sup>st</sup>:** Mr. Henningson

**2<sup>nd</sup>:** Ms. Walker

Mr. Henningson made a motion to approve this application, as written with the following comments: The applicant must reuse old brick, to match the existing mortar and existing brick per Guideline 5.8. Do not paint brick. We are approving the removal of the existing front porch because it's not original.

**VOTE:** 10/0

**AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, JORDAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION APPROVED

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

MR. HENNINGSON HAD A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND RECUSED HIMSELF FROM THE APPLICATION.

**APPLICATION:** HDC 2019-121, 223 EAST PARK AVENUE—REPLACEMENT WINDOWS

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing building is an attached Townhouse-style residential structure constructed in 1997. Materials include wood siding, double-hung wood windows, and wood trim.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is replacement windows on the front and rear elevations. The existing windows are the original 1997 double-hung and casement wood windows. The requested replacements are Anderson Fibrex composite windows in the same configuration/operation as the original windows. The applicant will present a window sample at the meeting.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

1. The Commission will determine if the proposed replacement windows meet the Guidelines.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

Larry Sullivan – Owner of Renewal by Anderson

**MOTION:** CONTINUED

**1<sup>st</sup>:** Ms. Hindman

**2<sup>nd</sup>:** Ms. Marshall

Ms. Hindman moved to continue this application for a physical mock-up, which may be on this structure visible from the public right of way or standalone at the homeowner’s discretion and head jam and sill details specific to this project. Homeowner may proceed with previously approved products at the staff level. The understanding is that this mock-up may be reversed if it is chosen to be placed on the structure and that the mock-up is only for illustrative purposes and further review.

Friendly amendment:

Ms. Hartenstine, the first-floor window, please.

**VOTE:** 10/0

**AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HINDMAN, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, TITUS,  
WALKER, JORDAN, MARSHALL

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR WINDOW REPLACEMENT CONTINUED

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

N/A

**APPLICATION:** HDC 2019-157, 1751 MERRIMAN AVENUE – NON-TRADITIONAL MATERIALS

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The house is a one-story American Small House with Tudor Revival element constructed in 1949. Exterior features include a prominent brick chimney, fixed diamond pane window, small engaged front porch, wood windows in a 1/1 pattern, and German-lap wood siding.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project request is to remove the original German-lap wood siding from the main house and install new Nichiha Savannah Smooth fiber cement siding on both the main house and the rear addition. All window trim, corner boards, roof trim, etc. is also proposed to be changed from wood to fiber-cement on both the original house and the addition. Requesting painted brick foundation on the rear addition to match existing painted foundation on the original house. A new driveway measuring approximately 18’ wide + 2’ of decorative pavers and 51.3’ long is also proposed. Due to size and location, the rear addition itself is eligible for Administrative approval; however, the siding/trim material changes to the main house, proposed driveway, and painted brick foundation on the addition all require HDC approval.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

1. The Commission will determine the appropriate course of action for non-traditional material use, the proposed driveway, and the painting of the rear addition foundation.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION:** DENIED/CONTINUED      **1<sup>st</sup>:** Mr. Rumsch    **2<sup>nd</sup>:** Mr. Phares

Mr. Rumsch made a motion to deny the removal of the German lap siding. I move to approve painting of the foundation. I move to continue for more detail of the driveway and the transition from the existing siding to the siding of the addition if she’s going to be using a different material. With a note to maintain foundation height all the way around the house.

Ms. Titus, the denial is building materials wood 5.2, number 1, 2, 3, and 7.

Ms. Hindman, the front yard parking and carriage tracks are 8.2.

Ms. Walker, the paint is building materials, 5.8.

Ms. Hindman, can you specify new foundation in the paint. I would just request of staff with this transition to a different material, it’s going to come back with some issues that would lend to a domino effect of details that go with that, like sill, corner board. For the nontraditional, it needs to match the corner boards and the other trim. It’s going to be shy with the nontraditional material, and that’s not the intent.

**VOTE:** 11/0

**AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR NON-TRADITIONAL MATERIALS AND REMOVAL OF ORIGINAL SIDING DENIED  
CONTINUED FOR DRIVEWAY AND NON-TRADITIONAL MATERIALS ON ADDITION  
APPROVED FOR PAINTING PANTED BRICK

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

MR. JORDAN LEFT THE MEETING 6:00 PM

MR. PHARES LEFT THE MEETING 6:00 PM

**APPLICATION:** HDC 2019-101, 815 BERKELEY AVENUE – TREE REMOVAL

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is 1.5 story Colonial Revival brick house constructed in 1932. Notable architectural features include a large three-light front gabled dormer, one-story sun porch, and side wing. Adjacent structures are two story single-family homes. Lot size is approximately 75’ x 175’.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is to remove a 50” Willow Oak in the rear yard. A letter from a ISA TRAQ Certified Arborist is included for the Commission’s review.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff (such as review/approval of replacement tree).

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak for or against this application.

**MOTION:** DENIED                                    **1<sup>st</sup>:** Mr. Rumsch    **2<sup>nd</sup>:** Ms. Marshall

Mr. Rumsch moved to deny for the tree to be removed. According to the October 29, 2018 letter from Heartwood, the October 29 letter from Heartwood does not recommend that the tree needs to be removed either for structure or for health.

Amendment:

Ms. Leslie-Fite, pursuant to Guideline 8.5, 6 number 2.

**VOTE:** 8/1

**AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, RUMSCH, TITUS,

**NAYS:** WALKER

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION DENIED FOR TREE REMOVAL