



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
June 12, 2019
Room 267

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. James 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 (2nd 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. Cindy Kochanek, Staff of the Historic District Commission
Ms. Linda Keich, Clerk to Historic District Commission
Ms. Andrea Leslie-Fite, Assistant City Attorney
Ms. Velicia Marseille, Court Reporter

With a quorum present, Chairman Haden called the regular June meeting of the Historic District Commission (Commission) meeting to order at 1:18 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 2019-261, 1936 Park Road	Dilworth
HDC 2019-274, 1619 Lyndhurst Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2019-269, 1824 South Mint Street	Wilmore

CONTINUED

HDC 2018-436, 1827 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore
HDC 2019-085, 1101 Myrtle Avenue	Dilworth

NEW CASES

HDC 2019-264, 630 E Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2019-299, 1716 Merriman Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2019-267, 1508 Dilworth Road	Dilworth
HDC 2019-232, 330 E Kingston Avenue	Dilworth

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

MS. HINDMAN RECUSED HERSELF FROM THIS APPLICATION.

MR. PHARES RECUSED HIMSELF FROM THIS APPLICATION.

APPLICATION: HDC 2019-261, 1936 PARK ROAD – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 2-story Victorian house, constructed in 1905. It was converted to a multi-family use many years ago and remains so today. Architectural details include a shed porch on square posts and scalloped frieze boards. It also has polygonal bay windows on the front. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5 story single family buildings. A porch addition was approved in December 2013 (2013-186) and reaffirmed as part of the May 11, 2016 approval.

PROPOSAL:

The project is the repair of the side entrance, replacement of a gable roof with a flat roof on the left side toward the rear and a front porch addition. The hand rail on the new side roof deck will match existing hand rails. Other features include new entry doors, repair or replacement of stairs and siding on the first floor. On the second floor a new shed roof replaces a gable dormer with new windows and doors. A French door is proposed to replace a window on the rear elevation. On the right elevation a second story window is replaced with two smaller windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the guidelines for Additions, page 7.2.
2. Staff Recommends full approval for meeting all the Guidelines per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

MR. PHARES RECUSED HIMSELF FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION

APPLICATION: HDC 2019-269, 1824 SOUTH MINT STREET – NEW CONSTRUCTION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing site is a vacant corner lot with parcel dimensions of approximately 36.6' X 160'. The previous structure was a two-story commercial structure. Adjacent structures are two stories in height. The required setback is 30 feet from ROW.

PROPOSAL:

The project is the construction of a single-family house and garage. Design features include brick foundation, wood lap siding, wood shakes, wood windows with simulated true divided lights (STDL), metal porch roof, and wood trim as noted on the plans. A detached one-story garage is located at the rear of the property. Materials, windows and other trim details will match the house corner boards on the garage are optional. New trees will be planted per site plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets guidelines for New Construction as outlined above.
2. Staff recommends full approval for meeting all the Guidelines, per 10.4.1 of the Rules of 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 for or against this project.

MOTION: APPROVED 1st: Mr. Henningson 2nd: Ms. Walker

Mr. Henningson made a motion to approve this application upon receipt of the full construction plans for staff to approve.

**VOTE: 8/0 AYES: HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, RUMSCH
TITUS, WALKER
NAYS: N/A**

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED WITH STAFF TO APPROVE FULL CONSTRUCTION PLANS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

MR. RUMSCH WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.
MS. MARSHALL WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.
MR. PHARES RETURNED TO THE MEETING FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.
MR. JORDAN ARRIVED AT THE MEETING AT 2:30.
MS. HARTENSTINE ARRIVED AT THE MEETING AT 2:30.

APPLICATION: HDC 2018-436, 1827 WILMORE DRIVE – FRONT PORCH COLUMNS, FRONT WALKWAY CHANGES, REAR ADDITION (DECK), PARKING

The application was continued from March for the following items:

1. *Rear porch, continued for complete drawings.*
2. *Trees, more information needed.*
3. *Curb cut, more information needed.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing property is a two-story brick Quadruplex with Colonial Revival elements constructed c. 1933. Architectural features include a hip roof, 6/1 wood windows, and a small covered front porch. Siding material is unpainted brick. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1-2 story single family houses. The lot size is approximately 95' X 202'.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is new rear deck addition visible from West Boulevard. A number of small shrubs and brush will need to be removed to build the deck, as well as two canopy trees. At the March 13, 2019 meeting, the project requested changes to the front porch columns which was approved. Proposed changes to the front walkway and expansion of an existing front yard parking pad was denied.

REVISED PROPOSAL – JUNE 12

1. Rear porch and parking area re-designed.
2. Photos of rear yard included to show tree coverage.
3. Trees to be removed to build a parking area has been noted on the site plan.
4. Curb cut information provided.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. The proposal for the rear deck addition is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Rehabilitation of Building Elements – Porches, 4.8 and for Additions, 7.2 above.
2. Recommend minimizing the appearance of the support posts through the addition of underpinning and/or landscaping.
3. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff (such as approval of an appropriate deck rail detail, underpinning detail, etc.).

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: APPROVED W/ CONDITIONS

1st: Mr.Henningson

2nd: Ms. Parati

Mr. Henningson made a motion to approve as written with the one caveat that we add staff approval to a landscape plan that includes both lattice underpinning and landscape screening.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

MR. JORDAN WAS ABSENT FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION

MS. HARTENSTINE WAS ABSENT FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION

APPLICATION: HDC 2019-085, 1101 MYRTLE AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

The application was continued from May for the following items:

1. Pedestrian interest to the unit on the corner of Myrtle and Lexington.
2. Show height for other historic single-family homes, including the homes on Myrtle.
3. Tree protection program.

4. *Detail what trees are being removed, added and staying, including the size.*
5. *Revisit the patios in the front yard or show historic precedence.*
6. *Provide detail on the brick mold, trim, soffits, material etc.*
7. *Show historic precedence for recessed openings for the front entryway.*
8. *Revisit rhythm of the three buildings to show differentiation.*
9. *Provide details on the retaining wall, including elevations and materials.*
10. *Tree planting proposal for trees on the site, not just in the public right of way, per Guideline 8.5 #5.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a two-story multi-family apartment building constructed in 1980. Adjacent structures are a mix of single-family, multi-family, and commercial uses. The residential structures are a mix of one-story, one-and-one half story, and two-story heights. On December 16, 2018, the HDC voted to approve the demolition which may take place upon the approval of new construction plans and to waive the 90-day waiting period for the review of new construction plans.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is a new three-unit townhome project with detached garages. Front setback of the project is approximately 22’ from back of the existing city sidewalk on Myrtle Avenue and 17’-8” from the back of the city sidewalk on Lexington Avenue. Proposed trees are noted on the site plan. Townhome heights are +/- 29’ from grade at Lexington Avenue and +/- 32’ from grade at Myrtle Avenue. Materials include brick veneer siding, aluminum clad Simulated True Divided Light (STDL) windows, wood doors, wood shutters. Garage heights are 16’-0” from grade. Garage siding material is Hardie Artisan lap siding smooth with mitered corners.

REVISED PROPOSAL – JUNE 12

1. Corner unit changed to have two entries – Myrtle and Lexington.
2. Zoutewelle surveys for heights of single-family homes.
3. Trees detailed on site plan (existing, to be removed, and new).
4. Patios in front yard removed.
5. Trim details labeled.
6. Recessed and asymmetrical entry photos included.
7. Retaining wall shown on elevations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. Lack of differentiation in building designs.
2. Additional information needed about materials (garage doors, front entry doors, permeable paver drive, etc.).
3. Tree protection plan for the existing trees to remain.
4. Additional details + dimensions needed about the brick retaining wall + piers along Myrtle, and 4’ wall on Lexington.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: CONTINUED

1st: Ms. Titus

2nd: Mr. Phares

Ms. Titus, moved to continue this application for all of the 10 points that it was continued from May, with the exception of the following two points:

- No. 1 Pedestrian interest to the unit on the corner of Myrtle and Lexington; that condition of the previous continuance has been met.
- No. 5: Revisit the patios in the front yard or show historic precedence; that condition of the continuance has been met.

All eight remaining conditions from the May continuance are the reasons for our continuance today, and I would like to invoke the full record discussion as to why those conditions have not been met.

VOTE: 9/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MARSHALL, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER
NAYS: NONE

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:
MS. HINDMAN RECUSED HERSELF FROM THE NEXT APPLICATION.
MR. RUMSCH RETURNED TO THE MEETING FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.
MR. HENNINGSON WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.
MS. MARSHALL WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.

APPLICATION: HDC 2019-264, 630 E TREMONT AVENUE – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:
The existing structure is a 1.5 story brick cottage-style house constructed in 1925. Design features include a steep side gable block with steeply pitched front gable projection, engaged front porch on square columns. Adjacent structures are one to two story houses and multi-family dwellings. Lot size is approximately 50’ x 150’.

PROPOSAL:
The proposal is a new covered porch to replace an existing deck. Design features include a new brick chimney, square wood columns to match existing, and a brick foundation. To accommodate the new porch roof, a pair of double-hung windows on the main house will be replaced with smaller windows to match existing. An alternate proposal includes enclosing the porch with Simulated True Divided Light (STD L) wood casement windows and painted wood panels. All traditional materials to match existing. The existing deck is over a concrete pad. No changes made to the existing landscape wall around the tree or the paver patio in the rear yard. No changes to rear yard permeability.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The proposal for the rear porch is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Additions, 7.2 and New Construction above.
2. 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: APPROVED W/ CONDITIONS **1st:** MS. TITUS **2nd:** MR. JORDAN
Ms. Titus, moved to approve this application with a detailed hand rail drawing to be approved by staff.

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

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

MS. HINDMAN RETURNED TO THE MEETING FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.
MS. JORDAN WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.

APPLICATION: HDC 2019-299, 1716 MERRIMAN AVENUE – ADDITION

The application was denied April 10, 2019 for the following: roof form and materials, windows, and additions.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1-story American Small House with Craftsman elements constructed in 1928. Architectural features include exposed rafters, 6/1 wood windows, an engaged front porch supported by square wood columns, wood vent details, and a brick chimney. The lot size is approximately 50' x 118'.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is an addition with a proposed ridge height is 19'-10 ½". On the front elevation both single windows will be changed to paired windows. There are also changes to the windows on the right elevation. The existing non-original front door will be replaced with a new wood door. Proposed materials are brick foundation, wood lap siding and trim to match existing and new windows will be either double-hung or casement with Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL) in a 6/1 pattern to match existing. Post-construction the rear-yard impermeable area will be 28%. There are no impacts to mature canopy trees. Note: The driveway and patio shown on the site plan are approvable at the staff level.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff had the following concerns with the proposal:

1. Additional clarity needed on which original windows will remain and which will be replaced.
 - a. Window placement on floorplan (sheet 2) does not match front elevation (sheet 4).
2. Left elevation - horizontally oriented window panes on the casement window.
3. Rear elevation - gable end window trim and roof trim relationship.
4. 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: CONTINUED **1st:** Ms. Hindman **2nd:** Mr. Rumsch

Ms. Hindman, I move to continue this application for fenestration and rhythm, guideline 6.12, matching brick at the chimney extension, that the drawing should reflect the existing conditions, and the front windows, the existing front windows are to remain, guideline 4.14 #6.

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

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

MS. MARSHALL RETURNED TO THE MEETING AND WAS PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.
MR. JORDAN RETURNED TO THE MEETING AND WAS PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.
MS. WALKER RECUSED HERSELF FROM THE NEXT APPLICATION.

APPLICATION: HDC 2019-267, 1508 DILWORTH ROAD – PAINTED BRICK

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing house is a 2.5 story Colonial Revival/Georgian style home with a brick side porch and crenellated roof line, constructed in 1927. The site has a pool, pond and other landscape features in the left and rear yards. The lot size is approximately .875 acres. The pool house was constructed in 1997.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is a request to paint the brick pool house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. Guidelines for Masonry, 5.5 item 3, and Paint 5.8, item 7, require unpainted brick to remain unpainted; however, the reference is to historic masonry. The guidelines are silent on whether or not new brick can be painted, only referencing brick as a traditional material appropriate for new construction in Materials, 6.15, item 1.

Therefore, the Commission will make a determination if the 1997 pool house may be painted.

2. 2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: DENIED 1st: Mr. Hartenstine 2nd: Ms. Marshall

Ms. Hartenstine, made a motion to deny this application to paint the existing pool building based on our guidelines for masonry 5.5 no. 3, leave unpainted masonry unpainted. Guideline 8.9 for accessory buildings in reference to designing outbuildings to be capable with the style and character of the primary historic building on the site, especially in scale, elements, and reform. Guideline 5.8, No 7, and then also because the applicant has not demonstrated that this outbuilding competes with the primary structure and as well they've indicated that the structure is not visible from the road.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

PAINTED BRICK DENIED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

MR. HENNINGSON RETURNED TO THE MEETING FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION

APPLICATION: HDC 2019-264, 330 EAST KINGSTON AVENUE – ADDITION OF WATER-REPELLANT TO BRICK CHIMNEY

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is 2.5 story building known as the Rev. Alexander Martin house constructed in 1905. Architectural features include a high hip slate roof with hip roofed dormer, two story side projecting bays, German siding. Front porch is one story, full facade with second floor balcony with balustrade and supported by flat paneled columns. It is a multi-family building. Adjacent structures are 1.5, 2 and 2.5 story single-family and multi-family houses.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is the application of a water-repellant coating to the primary brick chimney stack, located on the left elevation and visible from Euclid Avenue. The proposed product is ChimneySaver Water-Base Water Repellent.

According to the product specification sheet the product is absorbed approximately ¼” into the brick and bonds with the brick to prevent new water from entering the brick but allows any trapped vapor to escape. ChimneySaver is activated by ultraviolet light, unlike other water repellent products that break down under ultraviolet rays.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. Based on product specifications and the limited area of application, the product appears to meet the Design Guidelines for Masonry, page 5.6 #7.
2. Commission will determine if the proposed product is appropriate for use on the chimney.

MOTION: APPROVED

1st: Ms. Marshall **2nd:** Mr. Phares

Ms. Marshall, made a motion to approve this application because it meets our guidelines 5.6, No. 7

VOTE: 11/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPROVED.

Ms. Marshall made a motion to approve the minutes for April and May, as amended by Ms. Titus. The vote was unanimous. Ms. Walker second the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 5:09 pm.

Linda Keich
Clerk to Historic District