HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
August 14, 2019 – Room 267

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. James Haden (Chairperson)  
Ms. Kim Parati (Vice-Chairperson)  
Mr. Jim Jordan  
Mr. John Phares  
Mr. Damon Rumsch  
Mr. Chris Barth  
Ms. Christa Lineberger  
Mr. Chris Muryn  
Mr. Sean Langley

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ms. Jessica Hindman (2nd Vice-Chairperson)  
Mr. P.J. Henningson  
Ms. Jill Walker

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

With a quorum present, Chairman Haden called the regular August meeting of the Historic District Commission (Commission) meeting to order at 1:08 pm. He began the meeting by introducing 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 the 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. Chairman Haden asked that everyone please silence 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 require removal 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 a decision of 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 AGENDA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HDCRDEMO 2019-00421</td>
<td>408 Grandin Road</td>
<td>Wesley Heights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONTINUED CASES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HDCRMI 2018-00035</td>
<td>2101 The Plaza</td>
<td>Plaza Midwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDCRMI 2019-00351</td>
<td>2101 The Plaza</td>
<td>Plaza Midwood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEW CASES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HDCRMA 2019-00314</td>
<td>2121 Sarah Marks Avenue</td>
<td>Dilworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDCRMA 2019-00423</td>
<td>625 E. Tremont Avenue</td>
<td>Dilworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDCRMI 2019-00416</td>
<td>1624 The Plaza</td>
<td>Plaza Midwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDCRMA 2019-00361</td>
<td>224-236 W. Kingston Avenue</td>
<td>Wilmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDCRMI 2019-00288</td>
<td>1928 S. Mint Street</td>
<td>Wilmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDCADMRM 2019-00359</td>
<td>1711 Merriman Avenue</td>
<td>Wilmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDCADMRM 2019-00381</td>
<td>719 E. Tremont</td>
<td>Dilworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDCRMI 2019-00335</td>
<td>423 N. Pine Street</td>
<td>Fourth Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDCRDEMO 2019-00402</td>
<td>1311 Myrtle Avenue</td>
<td>Dilworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDCCDEMO 2019-00399</td>
<td>712 N. Smith Street</td>
<td>Fourth Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDCCDEMO 2019-00389</td>
<td>718 N. Smith Street</td>
<td>Fourth Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

ABSENT: HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, WALKER, LINEBERGER

**APPLICATION:** HDCRDEMO 2019-00421, 408 GRANDIN ROAD – CONSENT AGENDA

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a one-story single-family house constructed in 1925. Notable architectural features include a two-bay façade, entry with full-length sidelights and a tripartite window, a hipped roof that extends forward to rest on a three bungalow-style supports, a full-width engaged front porch, interior chimneys, and Craftsman-style 4/1 wood sash windows. The parcel is zoned R-5 and the lot dimension is 55’ x 187.5’. Adjacent uses are single-family and multi-family residential.
On July 2, 2019 a rear yard tree split and fell on the house destroying it. The only architectural elements that appear to be salvageable are a few original windows on the right and left elevations.

**PROPOSAL:**
The proposal is full demolition of the house without a 365-day delay.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure staff recommends that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item. 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.

2. Staff recommends Approval for the demolition of 408 Grandin without a delay due to the house being unsalvageable. The Commission may request that any original wood windows, trim, and other historic materials that are still intact on site be salvaged for subsequent reuse per the Design Guidelines for Demolition page 9.2, #8.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

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

**MOTION: APPROVED W/ CONDITIONS**

Ms. Parati moved to approve the demolition based on 9.2, number 6 and number 8. The property, by an act of God, has already been demolished. Staff should work with the property owner to salvage as much of the original material as possible and will document the dimensions/footprint of the house, including height, width, and setbacks.

**VOTE:** 8/0

**AYES:** HADEN, BARTH, PARATI, MURYN, JORDAN, PHARES, RUMSCH, LANGLEY

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS, WITHOUT A 365 DAY STAY.

**APPLICATION:** HDCRMI 2018-00035, 2101 THE PLAZA– CONTINUED CASES

The application was continued from July for the following items:

1. Provide more information to justify painting to unify disparate parts, including brick and mortar joints on chimney versus columns.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**
The existing home is a 1.5 story Bungalow constructed in 1930 with a brick foundation and chimney. A front porch with brick columns was approved by the HDC in 2002.

**PROPOSAL:**
The brick columns and chimney were painted without a COA by the owner. The owners are requesting to keep the painted brick. The applicant states the porch brick was different in color and texture than the original brick.
STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
The Commission shall determine if an exception shall be granted for the painted brick based on the evidence provided. Other options include faux finish painting, clay paint faux-finish that removes the paint over time or other appropriate methods for removal.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:
No one accepted Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED & APPROVED 1st: MS. PARATI 2nd: MR. PHARES
Ms. Parati moved to continue this application for more information on whether or not approved methods of paint removal, which will be determined by staff, will work towards restoring the brick on the columns and the chimney. Ms. Parati moved to approve the painting of the foundation brick based on our guideline on page 5.8 included in the preamble, “Painting may be considered if documentation shows it will unify disparate parts of the building.”

VOTE: 8/0
AYES: HADEN, BARTH, PARATI, MURYN, JORDAN, PHARES, RUMSCH, LANGLEY
NAYS: NONE

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR PAINTING BRICK CONTINUED FOR THE COLUMNS AND CHIMNEY; APPROVED FOR THE FOUNDATION.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:
ABSENT: HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, WALKER
MS. LINEBERGER ARRIVED AT 1:55PM

APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2019-00351, 2101 THE PLAZA – CONTINUED CASES
The application was continued from June for the following items:
1. Provide dimensions and materials for the porch and trellis
2. Re-study the fenestration on the rear elevation
3. Provide documentation on any fenestration that is not original on the rear elevation

EXISTING CONDITIONS:
The existing home is a 1.5 story Bungalow constructed in 1930 with a brick foundation and chimney. A front porch with brick columns was approved by the HDC in 2002.

PROPOSAL:
The rear wood deck is proposed to be replaced with a new, larger deck. The proposed deck will be the width of the entire rear of the house and includes a wood trellis feature on the left side. The existing doors and windows on the rear elevation are proposed to be replaced with three sets of French doors. Door material is aluminum clad. Per the applicant exhibit the French doors and windows on the rear elevation are all sash-kit replacements. While staff agrees that the French doors and paired double-hung windows do not appear to be original to the house, the single double hung windows do appear to be historic windows.

Revised Proposal – August 14
1. Dimensions provided for materials only. Total height, width, depth of trellis and deck not provided.
2. Fenestration design unchanged.
3. Some documentation provided.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**
Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:
1. Staff would request that the applicant provide dimension information (height, width, depth) for the deck and trellis. Otherwise, the existing deck is a modern addition, and the replacement deck and trellis feature are not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Additions, page 7.2.
2. The Commission will determine if the paired windows and the single windows can be converted to door openings.
3. Minor revisions may be approved by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**
No one accepted Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION:  APPROVED W/ CONDITIONS**  
Mr. Phares moved to approve this application as submitted as being in compliance with our guidelines for new additions, including 4.14 with the conditions that staff review the dimensions for the deck, the trellis and the specifications for the doors.

**VOTE:** 9/0  
**AYES:** HADEN, BARTH, PARATI, MURYN, JORDAN, PHARES, RUMSCH, LANGLEY, LINEBERGER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**
APPLICATION FOR REAR DECK APPROVED WITH STAFF TO APPROVE DETAILS

---

**APPLICATION:**  
**HDCRMA 2019-00314, 2121 SARAH MARKS AVENUE – ADDITIONS**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**
The existing structure is a one-story Bungalow style house constructed in 1926. Architectural features include a hipped main roof with engaged front porch supported by a square brick column, and a small centered hip-roof dormer. Siding material is wood German lap. Existing masonry is not painted except the stairs and pier caps. Lot size is approximately 50’ x 125’. The house height is approximately 20.2’. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single family houses.

**PROPOSAL:**
The proposal is a cross gable addition toward the rear of the house and an 8’ rear addition. Height increase is 3’-3 ¼”. The screened in front porch will be opened and front porch repaired. Materials include wood German lap siding, wood shake siding, and brick to match existing. The proposal will also add windows on the right elevation and remove/change the configuration of windows on the left elevation. One of the front doors will be replaced. New roof and window trim details will match existing. A garage addition is also proposed. One 12” hackberry tree is proposal for removal in the rear yard. The rest of the trees proposed for removal are 10” or less in diameter and may be removed without Commission approval.
**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**
Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:
1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Additions, 7.2 above.
2. The original house remains completely intact, no changes to the exterior walls, similar to the addition approved at 517 Walnut Avenue in October 2018.
3. Left elevation: window changes.
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 & APPROVED W/ CONDITIONS**
Mr. Phares moved to continue this application, because it does not comply with guidelines 7.2; number 1 and 5 for new additions, and guidelines 4.5; the preamble and number 2, for preserving original roof forms. Also within this continuance is the front door which does not comply with 4.10, number 2. The accessory structure that is proposed does meet our guidelines and is approved with staff to approve details.

**VOTE:** 8/0

**AYES:** HADEN, BARTH, PARATI, MURYN, JORDAN, PHARES, LANGLEY, LINEBERGER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**
APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED FOR ROOF FORM & FRONT DOOR. APPROVED FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE.

**APPLICATION:** HDCRMA 2019-00423, 625 E. TREMONT AVENUE – ADDITIONS

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**
The existing structure is a one-story Bungalow constructed in 1920. Architectural features include a pyramidal roof with gabled façade porch on posts and piers, exposed rafter tails and brackets in the gable. Siding material is cedar shake. Existing brick is painted. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single-family and multi-family buildings. Lot size is approximately 50’ x 150’. House height is approximately 22’-8”.

**PROPOSAL:**
The proposal is a cross gable addition toward the rear of the house and a new covered rear porch addition. Height increase is approximately 2’-0”. The proposal also includes the addition of a 6’-0” wide cantilevered carport on the right elevation. Materials include wood shake and brick foundation to match existing. No changes to existing windows on the front, left, or right elevations are proposed. No impacts to mature canopy trees.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**
Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:
2. Carport addition is incongruous with the bungalow architecture and Dilworth neighborhood.
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: CONTINUED

Mr. Rumsch moved to continue this application because the roof forms on the side and the back are not congruent with the existing architecture of the house as per our guidelines 7.2, 1 and 6; 4.5, preamble; and 4.5, section 2, and to eliminate the carport and restudy the columns; a detailed study of the columns. Mr. Haden added a friendly amendment to see a site plan.

VOTE: 9/0

AYES: HADEN, BARTH, PARATI, MURYN, JORDAN, PHARES, LANGLEY, LINEBERGER, RUMSCH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED FOR ROOF FORM, COLUMNS STUDY & SITE PLAN.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:
ABSENT: HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, WALKER

APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2019-00416, 1624 THE PLAZA – ADDITIONS

EXISTING CONDITIONS:
The existing structure two-story Colonial Revival style house constructed in 1934. Architectural features include a one-story screen porch on the left elevation, front portico, front door with transom and sidelights, and 8/8 double-hung wood windows. Siding material is unpainted brick. Lot size is 73’ x 192.5’. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single family houses.

PROPOSAL:
The proposal the reconfiguration of a small one-story rear addition, which is not believed to be original to the house. The addition’s new roof will tie in below the existing ridge. There is no change to the existing building footprint. Materials include Hardie Artisan smooth finish lap siding, wood corner boards and trim. The foundation is brick piers and new horizontal wood lattice will be installed between the piers. New roof and window trim details will match the house. There no impacts to mature trees.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:
1. Left elevation: Fenestration configuration. Windows labeled “G” and “F” have horizontally oriented panes.
2. Rear elevation: Horizontally oriented panes on windows labeled “D” and “E”.
3. Rear elevation: Bay window, how is it supported?
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: MR. RUMSCH 2nd: MS. PARATI
Mr. Rumsch moved to continue this application to restudy the right elevation for fenestration and for the offset between the addition and the existing building, to restudy the rear elevation for fenestration, and detailing on the bay window, per our guidelines 6.12, number 1, (a) through (d) of our guidelines.

**VOTE:** 9/0

**AYES:** HADEN, BARTH, PARATI, MURYN, JORDAN, PHARES, LANGLEY, LINEBERGER, RUMSCH

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**
APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED FOR FENESTRATION.

**APPLICATION:** HDCRMA 2019-00361, 224-236 W. KINGSTON AVENUE – MULTI FAMILY

*Application was removed from the agenda at the applicant’s request.*

**APPLICATION:** HDCRMI 2019-00288, 1928 S. MINT STREET – FRONT PORCH

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**
The existing structure is a 1.5 story Bungalow constructed in 1927. Architectural features include a side gable roof with two small shed roof dormers, a full width front porch with brick piers and columns wrapped in vinyl. Siding material is vinyl. Adjacent structures are 1 – 1.5 story single family houses. Lot size is approximately 50’ x 150’. Existing brick is painted.

**PROPOSAL:**
The proposal is for changes to the columns, ceiling and railing on the front porch. After removing the vinyl wrap, it was discovered that the front porch columns are not columns but pieces of wood assembled to create a base for the vinyl wrap. The proposed front porch columns are square 8 x 8 with a cap and base. The existing ceiling is plywood and requested to change to bead board. The right-side of the porch will receive a new railing. Originally, only the right-side had, and needed, a railing. All materials to be wood.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**
Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:
1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Porches, 4.8.
2. Porch Rails: Additional information needed about the height of the proposed rail. If height is 36” to meet code, then the design will be out of proportion with the front porch brick piers and front windows. Recommend adjusting the height and massing of the porch rail to historic proportions and add a booster rail to meet code, per Porches, 7.2, item 7.
3. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff (such as the porch rail design).

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**
No one accepted Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.
MOTION:  APPROVED W/ CONDITIONS  1st: MR. RUMSCH  2nd: MS. LINEBERGER

Mr. Rumsch moved to approve this application as submitted, with the condition that staff approve the handrail, column details and final design.

VOTE:  9/0  AYES: HADEN, BARTH, PARATI, MURYN, JORDAN, PHARES, LANGLEY, LINEBERGER, RUMSCH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR FRONT PORCH APPROVED WITH STAFF TO APPROVE DETAILS.

ABSSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:
ABSENT: HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, WALKER

APPLICATION:  HDCADMRM 2019-00359, 1711 MERRIMAN AVENUE – ALTERNATIVE MATERIALS

EXISTING CONDITIONS:
The existing structure is a one-story house constructed in 1946. The house appears to be a blend of Cottage and Bungalow design. Architectural features include a front gable roof, two brick chimneys, 6/6 wood windows and a partial width front porch with a hipped roof supported by brick piers and battered columns. Existing brick piers and chimneys are not painted. The foundation is concrete block. Siding material is asbestos shingle, which is believed to be original to the house, some of which are broken, cracked, or missing. An infilled rear porch has Masonite siding. Lot dimensions are approximately 50’ x 170’. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single family houses.

PROPOSAL:
The proposed project is to remove the original asbestos shingle siding and replace it with fiber-cement siding. The new fiber-cement siding is similar in profile, depth, and dimension. The proposed project also includes the replacement of the original wood windows with new wood windows. A rear addition and other rehabilitation work that met the criteria for staff review has already been approved.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:
1. Existing asbestos shingle cannot be repaired and is no longer manufactured.
   a. One potential option is to replace broken shingles with intact salvaged shingles.
   b. Another option is to allow for replacement with a new material that matches the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities, per Standard #6.
2. Will the existing wood trim (window, doors, roof, etc.) be repaired and re-installed or replaced?
3. Since there is no evidence that lap wood siding was ever installed on this house, the replacement of the asbestos shingle with lap wood siding would conflict with Standard #3.
4. The Commission will determine if the proposed replacement window and trim, where required, meet the Guidelines.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:
No one accepted Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION:  APPROVED  1st: MS. PARATI  2nd: MR. JORDAN
Ms. Parati moved to allow the replacement and repair of the asbestos siding with the new alternative material based on guidelines 2.5 of the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, numbers 6 and 9. Also to approve the window replacement, should they meet code, based on the feedback from Mica Howard saying that the windows needed to be replaced.

VOTE: 9/0       AYES: HADEN, BARTH, PARATI, MURYN, JORDAN, PHARES, LANGLEY, LINEBERGER, RUMSCH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR ALTERNATIVE MATERIALS & WINDOWS APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:
ABSENT: HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, WALKER

APPLICATION: HDCADM RM 2019-00381, 719 E. TREMONT AVENUE – ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES

EXISTING CONDITIONS:
The existing structure is a 1.5 story Bungalow style house constructed in 1915. Architectural features include a hipped main roof, full width front porch and centered dormer. Siding material is cedar shake. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single family houses. The house height is approximately 22’. Existing brick foundation is painted. A rear addition was approved by the Commission on April 11, 2018 under COA# HDCRMA-2018-00083.

PROPOSAL:
The proposal is the addition of two new brick piers in the front yard. The new piers measure 2’ x 2’ x 2’ and flank original historic steps. The new brick piers have already been installed and are painted without the prior approval of staff or the Commission.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:
1. Massing, scale, painted brick.
2. The proposed brick piers are incongruous in both size and location to the smaller cottages and bungalows along E. Tremont and E. Worthington Avenue in the Dilworth local historic district.
3. Piers flanking a walkway are not a historic landscape element, and do not follow the historic design precedent of the surrounding environment, per Sidewalks and Parking Guidelines 8.2, item 2.
4. Piers flanking a walkway are conjectural features and should be avoided, per Standard #3.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:
No one accepted Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: DENIED       1st: MS. PARATI       2nd: MR. RUMSCH
Ms. Parati moved to deny this application based on guidelines 2.5, number 3; 5.5, number 3; 5.8, number 1; and 8.2, number 2 and number 1.

VOTE: 9/0       AYES: HADEN, BARTH, PARATI, MURYN, JORDAN, PHARES, LANGLEY, LINEBERGER, RUMSCH

NAYS: NONE
DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES DENIED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:
ABSENT: HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, WALKER

APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2019-00335, 423 N. PINE STREET – FRONT PATIO

EXISTING CONDITIONS:
The existing structure is a three-story brick contemporary house constructed in 1989. The house fronts on Fourth Ward Park. Lot dimensions are approximately 50’ x 60’. The property is zoned UR-2. As an urban lot, the house is built to the rear lot line and there is no backyard. Adjacent structures are 2-5 story single-family and multi-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:
The proposal is changes to an existing front patio located behind a metal fence and a 3’-3” brick retaining wall. Existing moveable furniture and a grill is proposed to be replaced with a new built-in table and grill area. The table and outdoor grill will measure 3’ in height, except for the grill cover. Materials include brick to match the existing house and granite. There no impacts to mature trees.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:
1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Additions, 7.2.
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: APPROVED
1st: MS. LINEBERGER 2nd: MR. RUMSCH
Ms. Lineberger moved to approve the project per the preamble of additions because the front is the back and the back is the front for this house and Fourth Ward Park serves as a backyard for this neighborhood.

VOTE: 9/0
AYES: HADEN, BARTH, PARATI, MURYN, JORDAN, PHARES, LANGLEY, LINEBERGER, RUMSCH
NAYS: NONE

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR FRONT PATIO APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:
ABSENT: HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, WALKER

APPLICATION: HDCRDEMO 2019-00402, 1311 MYRTLE AVENUE – DEMOLITION RESIDENTIAL
Application was not heard due to insufficient information.
ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:
ABSENT: HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, WALKER


EXISTING CONDITIONS:
The existing structure is a one-story metal industrial building constructed in 1991 and located on the edge of the Fourth Ward Local Historic District. The lot dimensions are approximately 78’ x 200’. Adjacent uses are multi-family, industrial, and commercial. There is one mature tree on the site, at the right rear. The parcel is currently Zoned I-1 and is being proposed for a Rezoning to UMUD-O under petition 2019-092.

PROPOSAL:
The proposal is full demolition of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
1. The Commission will determine if the application is complete.
2. If the application is determined to be complete, then the Commission will determine whether or not the building has special significance to the Fourth Ward Local Historic District. With affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to 365-Day Stay of Demolition.
3. If the Commission determines that this property is does not have any special significance to the district, then demolition may take place without a delay or upon the approval of new construction plans.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:
No one accepted Mr. Haden’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: 1st: MS. PARATI 2nd: MR. RUMSCH
Ms. Parati moved to determine that the building does not have special significance and value toward maintaining the character of Fourth Ward Local Historic District because it does not meet any of the HDC’s criteria for special significance.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: HADEN, BARTH, PARATI, MURYN, JORDAN, PHARES, LANGLEY, LINEBERGER, RUMSCH
NAYS: NONE

MOTION: 1st: MS. PARATI 2nd: MR. RUMSCH
Ms. Parati moved to approve the demolition. Since this building does not have special significance or value toward maintaining the character of the district, the demolition may take place upon the sooner of the approval of new construction plans or the expiration of the 365 days. The 90-day waiting period to submit new construction plans is waived.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: HADEN, BARTH, PARATI, MURYN, JORDAN, PHARES, LANGLEY, LINEBERGER, RUMSCH
NAYS: NONE

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR COMMERCIAL DEMOLITION APPROVED.
ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:
ABSENT: HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, WALKER

APPLICATION: HDCCDEMO 2019-00389, 718 N. SMITH STREET – DEMOLITION COMMERCIAL

EXISTING CONDITIONS:
The existing structure is a one-story brick warehouse building constructed in 1932 located on the edge of the Fourth Ward Local Historic District. Architectural features include a front parapet stepped roof and metal windows (4 window bays on the front façade have been infilled). The building dimensions and lot dimensions are the same: 75.5’ (front width) x 96’ (left elevation length) x 88.82’ (rear width) x 141.83’ (right elevation length). Adjacent uses are multi-family, industrial, and commercial. There are no mature trees on the site. The parcel is currently Zoned I-1 and is being proposed for a Rezoning to UMUD-O under petition 2019-092.

PROPOSAL:
The proposal is full demolition of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
1. The Commission will determine if the application is complete.
2. If the application is determined to be complete, then the Commission will determine whether or not the building has special significance to the Fourth Ward Local Historic District. With an affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to 365-Day Stay of Demolition.
3. If the Commission determines that this property is does not have any special significance to the district, then demolition may take place without a delay or upon the approval of new construction plans.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:
Kathleen Jordan, an adjacent property owner, spoke in opposition of this application.

MOTION: 1st: MS. PARATI 2nd: MR. RUMSCH
Ms. Parati moved to determine that the building has special significance and value toward maintaining the character of the Fourth Ward Local Historic District, because of the year of construction (typically 50 years or older) and architectural style.

VOTE: 9/0  
AYES: HADEN, BARTH, PARATI, MURYN, JORDAN, PHARES, LANGLEY, LINEBERGER, RUMSCH
NAYS: NONE

MOTION: 1st: MS. PARATI 2nd: MR. RUMSCH
Ms. Parati moved to approve the project with 365-day stay of demolition on the building due to its special significance and value toward maintaining the character of the district. Receipt of accurate measured drawings of the building(s) to be demolished are required for HDC records before plans for new construction will be considered by this Commission.

VOTE: 9/0  
AYES: HADEN, BARTH, PARATI, MURYN, JORDAN, PHARES, LANGLEY, LINEBERGER, RUMSCH
DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR COMMERCIAL DEMOLITION APPROVED WITH A 365-DAY STAY OF DEMOLITION.

Meeting adjourned at 6:00 pm.

Candice R. Leite
Staff to Historic District Commission