



**CHARLOTTE™**

---

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**November 13, 2019, Room 280**

MINUTES

- MEMBERS PRESENT: Ms. Kim Parati (Vice-Chairperson)  
Mr. Chris Barth  
Mr. P.J. Henningson  
Ms. Jessica Hindman (2<sup>nd</sup> Vice-Chairperson)  
Mr. Jim Jordan  
Ms. Christa Lineberger  
Mr. Chris Muryn  
Mr. John Phares  
Mr. Damon Rumsch  
Ms. Jill Walker
- MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. James Haden (Chairperson)
- 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. Linda Keich, Clerk  
Ms. Andrea Leslie-Fite, Assistant City Attorney  
Ms. Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

---

With a quorum present, Vice-Chairman Parati called the regular November meeting of the Historic District Commission (Commission) meeting to order at 1:13 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. Vice-Chairman Parati 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. Vice-Chairman Parati 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. Vice-Chairman Parati 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:

**NOT HEARD OCTOBER 11, 2019**

HDCRMI 2019-00599	1936 Park Road	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2019-00538	1511 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMI 2019-00444	429 West Park Avenue	Wilmore
HDCADMRM 2019-00287	304 Westwood Avenue	Wilmore
HDCRMI 2019-00517	1740 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore

**CONTINUED**

HDCRMI 2018-00035	2101 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMA 2019-00423	625 E Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2019-00514	318 Grandin Road	Wesley Heights
HDCCMA 2019-00529	1529 & 1537 S Mint Street	Wilmore

**NEW CASES**

HDCDMI 2019-00695	501 West Park Avenue	Wilmore
HDCRMA 2019-00588	612 S. Summit Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDCADMRM 2019-00466	1516 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMI 2019-00482	1712-1714 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMI 2019-00565	619 Mt. Vernon Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2019-00617	2007 Dilworth Road E	Dilworth
HDCRMA 2019-00154	629 S. Summit Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDCRMI 2019-00683	325 S. Summit Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDCRMI 2019-00567	0 W. 10 <sup>th</sup> Street	Fourth Ward
HDCRMI 2019-00603	809 Berkley Avenue	Dilworth

---

**NOT HEARD OCTOBER 11, 2019**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

ABSENT: HADEN

MS. HINDMAN RECUSED HERSELF FROM THE NEXT APPLICATION.

MR. PHARES RECUSED HIMSELF FROM THE NEXT APPLICATION.

**APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2019—00599, 1936 PARK ROAD - ADDITIONS**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure was constructed in 1905 and identified as a contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places. The home is described as a two-story Victorian with a shed porch on square posts and scalloped frieze boards. It also has polygonal bay windows on the front. The side entrance repair, addition/roof changes and fenestration changes were approved in May 2016 (COA# 2016-072)

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is the addition of a shed roof to the side entrance. The roof will be supported by brackets.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. The proposed bracket design is incongruous with the Victorian elements on the building. A bracket/corbel that is a simple nod to Victorian-style would fit better than the proposed Craftsman-style bracket, as outlined in Porches, page 6.14 #3.
2. The proposal for the shed roof addition is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Additions 7.2.
3. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION: APPROVED**

**1<sup>st</sup>: WALKER**

**2<sup>nd</sup>: RUMSCH**

Ms. Walker moved to approve the shed roof addition to the side entrance of the house, because it meets our guidelines for additions.

**VOTE:** 8/0

**AYES:**

LINEBERGER, HENNINGSON, MURYN, BARTH, JORDAN, PARATI, RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:**

NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

ABSENT: HADEN

MS. LINEBERGER RECUSED HERSELF FROM THE NEXT APPLICATION

MR. PHARES RETURNED TO THE MEETING AT 1:22 PM FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.

MS. HINDMAN RETURNED TO THE MEETING AT 1:22 PM FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.

**APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2019-00538, 1511 THE PLAZA – SOLAR PANELS**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a two-story Craftsman constructed in 1920. Architectural features include a full-width front porch that terminates at a porte cochere, decorative shingles in the gables, exposed rafters, brackets, 8/1 windows. Lot size is approximately 100’ x 159’. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single-family houses. A rear addition, accessory structure and swimming pool were approved under previous applications (COA# 2014-191, COA# 2015-0053).

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is the addition of solar panels to the asphalt shingle roof of the main building and an accessory building. The panels will be flush mounted, no-tilt and have a life span of approximately twenty years. Proposed locations are the



Ms. Walker made a friendly amendment, because the painting resolves the disparate brick problems, and the door is sympathetic to the original I would like to reference 5.8 of the Preamble.

**VOTE:** 9/0

**AYES:** LINEBERGER, HINDMAN, MURYN, BARTH, JORDAN, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR PAINTED BRICK AND DOOR REPLACEMENT APPROVED

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

ABSENT: HADEN

MR. HENNINGSON RETURNED TO THE MEETING AT 2:08 FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.

**APPLICATION:** HDCADMRM 2019-00287, 304 WESTWOOD AVENUE – ADDITION

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is one-story American Small House constructed in 1936, wrapped in aluminum siding. All windows and doors appear to be replacements. The front porch columns were replaced prior to Wilmore’s designation as a local historic district. The front porch is concrete with brick foundation. Lot size is approximately 54’ x 150’. Adjacent structures are 1-1.5 story single-family houses.

**PROPOSAL:**

1. The proposal is changes to the front porch. Front porch changes include a metal roof and a brick tile overlay on the concrete front porch floor.
2. The new driveway is run up to the foundation of the house. Staff suggested removing a portion of the concrete that abuts the foundation; however, upon further investigation and discussion with the concrete installer, attempts to remove a portion of the drive will damage the foundation of the house.
3. The new driveway gate is approvable at the Administrative level. The owner is also working with staff to bring the new storage shed up to compliance for the doors and siding.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. Brick tile installed over original concrete front porch floor.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION:** DENIED/APPROVED **1<sup>st</sup>:** HENNINGSON **2<sup>nd</sup>:** BARTH Mr. Henningson moved to approve the metal roof because it meets guidelines 4.5 for roofs. Mr. Henningson moved to deny the stairs and porch per guidelines 4.8, #2 - repair and replace damaged elements and guidelines 6.14, #3 and #5. Mr. Henningson moved to deny the concrete driveway up to the house, it violates guidelines 8.2, #8 - do not pave up to the foundation.

Ms. Hindman stated for the record I can think of three different solutions to the concrete up to the side of the house. Therefore, I don’t think we are boxing the applicant into any one direction.

**VOTE:** 10/0

**AYES:** LINEBERGER, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MURYN, BARTH, JORDAN, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR METAL ROOF APPROVED. STAIRS, PORCH AND DRIVEWAY DENIED.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

ABSENT: HADEN

**APPLICATION:** HCDRMI 2019-00517, 1740 WILMORE DRIVE – SIDING CHANGES

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a one-story Craftsman bungalow constructed in 1933. Architectural features include a nearly full-width front porch supported by brick piers and tapered columns, and paired 4/1 windows. Originally, the porch wrapped around the right side of the house, but this area has since been converted to heated living space. Currently, the entire house is wrapped in vinyl and aluminum, with the exception of the brick piers and wood columns. All brick on the house, including the foundation and piers, is painted. Lot size is approximately 50' x 160'. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single-family houses. Previous projects include an accessory structure (shed) approved at the Administrative level in 2017 (COA# HDCADMRM-2017-00299) and a wood deck approved at the Administrative level in 2019 (COA# HDCADMRM-2019-00518).

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is the removal of all original German lap siding, front porch bead board ceiling, and all trim on the entire structure. The new siding will be wood lap siding with corner boards. The siding and trim has already been replaced on the rear elevation.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. At the time of approval for the Accessory building (shed), the entire house was covered in vinyl siding with corner boards.
2. Window trim is picture frame on the rear elevation.
3. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Ms. Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION:**

**APPROVE/DENIED**

**1<sup>st</sup>:** HENNINGSON

**2<sup>nd</sup>:** RUMSCH

Mr. Henningson moved to deny replacing the German lap siding with Cedar Lap siding based on guidelines 5.2 and 5.3, #3, 6, 7 and 8, which is to repair the existing and match the original siding. Mr. Henningson moved to approve replacing the bead board on the front porch, because it is repairing the existing and matching the original on the house. Mr. Henningson moved to deny the picture frame window trim based on guidelines 4.11, #1 and 2 which says repair the existing to match the original of the house.

**VOTE:** 6/4

**AYES:** HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, PARATI,  
PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** LINEBERGER, JORDAN, MURYN, BARTH

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR SIDING, AND PICTURE FRAME WINDOW TRIM DENIED. BEAD BOARD APPROVED.

---

## CONTINUED CASES

---

### **ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

ABSENT: HADEN

### **APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2018-00035, 2101 THE PLAZA - PAINTED BRICK**

#### ***The application was continued from August 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.

Project Timeline Re-cap:

July 10<sup>th</sup> Meeting: 2101 The Plaza, 2018-0035, first heard. Continued for additional information.

August 14<sup>th</sup> Meeting: Project heard and a partial decision rendered.

Approved: Painting the foundation per Guidelines, page 5.8 included in the preamble, "Painting may be considered if documentation shows it will unify disparate parts of the building."

Continued: To allow applicant time to investigate the possibility of 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.

September 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting: Deferred to allow staff time to work with property owner.

October 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting: Deferred to allow staff time to work with property owner.

#### *Revised Proposal – August 14*

1. Additional information provided.

#### *Revised Proposal – November 13*

1. Property owner worked with staff as requested by the HDC, and provided information about the results from the paint removal test using the product recommended by the National Park Service.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Additional information about red brick painted foundations provided by staff.
2. 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 Ms. Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION:**        **DENIED**                                **1<sup>st</sup>:** HINDMAN                                **2<sup>nd</sup>:** PHARES

Ms. Hindman moved to deny this application because the project does not meet 5.8 of the preamble and 5.5, #3 for paint and masonry at the chimney and columns. We are offering five remediation options to work with staff for resolution.

1. Rebuild with natural brick
2. Remove paint
3. Faux paint color similar to historic masonry
4. Clay paint
5. Paint in a red family of color similar to historic masonry

**VOTE:** 10/0

**AYES:** LINEBERGER, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MURYN, BARTH, JORDAN, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR PAINTED BRICK DENIED

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

ABSENT: HADEN

MS. HINDMAN RECUSED HERSELF FROM THIS APPLICATION.

**APPLICATION:** HDCRMA 2019-00423, 625 EAST TREMONT AVENUE – ADDITION

*The application was continued from September for the following items:*

- ***Re-study of massing and form***
  - ***Additions, page 7.2, 5 and 6, roof form on side and rear not congruent with existing architecture***
  - ***Roofs, page 4.5, preamble, and number 2, and eliminate the carport, not congruent with existing architecture***
- ***Porches, a detailed study of the front columns (section diagram)***

**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 end. 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.

*Revised Proposal – September 11*

- Addition begins further back from the front of the house and uses hip roof forms
- Roof form changed on left, right, and rear elevations.

*Revised Proposal – November 13*

- Addition begins further back from the front of the house and uses hip roof forms
- Roof form changed on left, right, and rear elevations.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. The original house remains completely intact, no changes to the exterior walls, additions are reversible, similar to the additions approved at 719 East Tremont Avenue in April 2018 and at 517 Walnut Avenue in October 2018.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Ms. Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this app

**MOTION: APPROVED**

**1<sup>st</sup>: JORDAN**

**2<sup>nd</sup>: PHARES**

Mr. Jordan moved to approve the alternate drawing for this application as drawn

**VOTE:** 9/0

**AYES:** LINEBERGER, HENNINGSON, JORDAN, MURYN, BARTH, PARATI, PHARES,  
RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

ABSENT: HADEN

MS. HINDMAN RETURNED TO THE MEETING AT 4:30 PM FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION,

**APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2019-00514, 318 GRANDIN ROAD, FRONT PORCH ADDITION**

*The application was continued from October for the following items:*

- *Accurate, proportionate to scale drawings of the front and side elevations, provide a beam and column detail, rowlock detail, and accurate drawings of the side porch roof*

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

Known as the White House, the building is a 1.5 story Craftsman constructed in 1926. Architectural features include a front and side-gabled roof with an asymmetrical four-bay façade, 4/1 windows and front portico, supported by non-original fluted aluminum columns. Exterior materials are cedar shake and unpainted brick. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5 story single-family and multi-family buildings. Lot size is approximately 55' x 187.5'.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is for changes to the front porch and a side porch. The front porch will be widened to 10' deep. All non-historic brick knee walls will be removed on both the front and side porches. Proposed materials are wood columns and trim, and a brick foundation to match existing. No changes to existing windows on the front, left, or right elevations are proposed. An enclosed side porch will be re-opened with columns and trim to match the front porch.

A TRAQ Qualified Certified Arborist, provided a letter documenting the 19" false cypress tree's structural defects, and was approved for removal, with replanting required, at the Administrative level.

Revised Proposal – November 2019

1. Revised drawings provided, including beam/column detail and rowlock detail.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

1. The proposal for the front porch is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Porches 4.8 and 6.15, Additions 7.2, and New Construction above.

2. Proposal is similar to previously approved front porch additions at 1910 Ewing Drive (2016) and 429 West Blvd (May 2019).
3. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Ms. Parati's invitation to speak for or against this application

**MOTION:      APPROVE W/ CONDITIONS                      1<sup>st</sup>: HINDMAN                      2<sup>nd</sup>: RUMSCH**

Ms. Hindman moved to approve this application because it does meet the continuation requirements.

Mr. Henningson made a friendly amendment: The application meets 6.15 and 4.8 for porches and 7.2 additions.

Mr. Barth made a friendly amendment: Applicant to work with staff on trim, column beam detailing and alignment. Pediment returns etc. The whole addition.

**VOTE:** 10/0                      **AYES:** LINEBERGER, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, BARTH, MURYN, JORDAN, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS FOR STAFF TO REVIEW DETAILS.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

ABSENT: HADEN

MR. MURYN LEFT THE MEETING AT 4:40 PM AND WAS ABSENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.

**APPLICATION: HDCCMA 2019-00529, 1529 AND 1537 SOUTH MINT STREET -BUILDING REHABILITATION**

***The application was continued from October for the following items:***

- ***Fenestration:*** *Submit evidence as to which windows are original versus not. Provide more information as to the current conditions of the windows, and information to justify that the windows should be replaced versus repaired.*

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

1529 South Mint Street was constructed c. 1962 and 1537 South Mint Street was constructed c. 1967. Both structures are utilitarian concrete block buildings constructed as service garages. Lot size is 150 x 150. Adjacent structures are commercial buildings, parking lots and single family residential to the rear along Westwood Avenue and Wickford Place.

1529 South Mint appears to originally have been a small flat roof building, and a later addition with shallow pitch gable roof added to the back. Window and door opening sizes also vary between the front portion and back addition. The most notable features on 1529 South Mint street are the original windows on the left and right elevations.

1537 South Mint Street is four-bay concrete block building. The fourth bay on the right elevation appears to be a later addition to the structure. The building has a minimalist parapet roof delineated by Roman brick found on many mid-century buildings, which is difficult to see because the brick is painted. This brick feature wraps around the left elevation for a few courses under the flat roof. There appear to be two original windows on the far rear right elevation.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is for new window/door openings, changes to existing openings, and the addition of awnings, lighting, signage and murals.

- Fenestration openings and material is confirmed, the final locations and designs of all doors and windows are not. Material: 2" x 4" aluminum storefront. Design: fixed storefront, roll-up doors, roll-up windows.
- Mural locations are confirmed. Design: Abstract, realistic, or historical to tell the story of the Gold District. Materials: Either painted or three dimensional with use of metals, woods, synthetic materials, clays or stones.
- Signage locations are estimates and not confirmed.
- Awning locations and dimensions are estimates; materials to be wood and metal.
- Lighting location are conceptual; form is to be downward-directed goose neck lighting and sconces. Design may include contemporary, industrial and period lighting.

*Revised Proposal – October 9*

- Window design changed.
- Awning and lighting specs provided.
- Additional information provided about dumpster locations and screening.

*Revised Proposal – November 13*

- Additional information provided about existing windows.
- Revised elevation drawings.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. Awnings may be reviewed under ‘Additions’; additional information (dimensions/materials) needed about proposed awnings.
2. Murals may be reviewed under applicable Secretary of the Interiors Standards 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, and 10.
3. Limit LED lighting warmth levels to 2500k.
4. Verify that signage meets HDC standards in addition to the TOD standards outlined in the proposal.
5. Brick rowlock detail missing from elevation drawings.
6. Details/specs needed about roll up doors.
7. Information about outdoor seating area wall surround.
8. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION: APPROVED/CONTINUED      1<sup>st</sup>: HENNINGSON      2<sup>nd</sup>: RUMSCH**

Mr. Henningson moved to approve the lighting and to exclude the signage, awnings, and murals.

Mr. Henningson moved to continue the windows and fenestration. Provide more detail on the windows, accurate drawings, samples of the windows, and rowlock detail. Restore the original windows per guideline 4.14. Continue the roll-up doors by providing dimension and material detail. Provide material detail for the dumpster screening and the outdoor seating area.

Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment to exclude the outdoor seating area because it falls under the category of the tenants to decide on it.

**VOTE:** 9/0

**AYES:** LINEBERGER, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, BARTH, JORDAN, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR LIGHTING APPROVED.

THE WINDOWS AND FENESTRATION, ROLL UP DOORS, AND DUMPSTER SCREENING CONTINUED.

---

**NEW CASES**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

ABSENT: HADEN, MURYN

MR. JORDAN LEFT THE MEETING AT 5:40 PM AND WAS ABSENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.

**APPLICATION: HDCCMI 2019-00695, 501 WEST PARK AVENUE - INSTITUTIONAL BUILDING ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The Greater Galilee Baptist Church was constructed in 1932, and the McKissick Building, was constructed in 2003. The campus is located in the heart of the Wilmore Local Historic District, with the sanctuary and fellowship hall located in a triangle of West Park Avenue, South Mint Street and Spruce Street. Wilmore Drive is on the back side of the campus. A long process was completed in 2010 to reconfigure the campus and relocate houses. The Commission approved the project on March 9, 2011 and the COA was issued August 22, 2011 (COA# 2010-080A).

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is in two parts:

1. Reaffirmation of previously reviewed and approved plans for site improvements, lighting, sidewalks, tree preservation/planting, and architectural elevations for the new sanctuary (COA# 2010-080A).
2. Review of new plans for changes to existing door and window openings and the relocation of access stairs on the McKissick Building. On the rear elevation a doorway will be changed to a window and infilled with brick. The new stairs will be screened from the street with a block foundation and brick wall to match existing and a wire mesh screen.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Re-affirm COA# 2010-080A, which includes site improvements, lighting, sidewalks, tree preservation/planting, architectural elevations for new sanctuary.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Ms. Parati's invitation to speak for or against this application.

**MOTION 1: APPROVED**

**1<sup>st</sup>: RUMSCH**

**2<sup>nd</sup>: WALKER**

Mr. Rumsch moved to reaffirm the previously approved plans.

**VOTE:** 8/0

**AYES:** LINEBERGER, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, BARTH, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH,  
WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

COA 2010-080A REAFFIRMED.

**MOTION 2: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>: HINDMAN 2<sup>nd</sup>: WALKER**

Ms. Hindman moved to approve this application because it meets our guidelines for context with the condition that staff review the door.

**VOTE:** 8/0

**AYES:** LINEBERGER, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, BARTH, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH,  
WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS FOR STAFF TO REVIEW DETAILS.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

ABSENT: HADEN, MURYN, JORDAN

MS. PARATI RECUSED HERSELF FROM THE NEXT APPLICATION.

**APPLICATION:** HDCRMA 2019—00588, 612 SOUTH SUMMIT AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

Known as the Gantt House, the main building is a 1-story bungalow, with Craftsman and Colonial Revival elements, constructed c. 1926 according to the National Register listing. A portico and porch combination shields two of the three facade bays of this small frame dwelling. One story high, it has a hipped roof crossed by clipped gables on the sides. The slightly off-center front entry has sidelights which coordinate with the 4/1 sash windows on the facade. The house is currently wrapped in vinyl siding. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2 story single family homes. The lot size is 50' x 197.5'. House height is 22.8'. Demolition was approved with a 365-day delay on February 13, 2019 (HDCRDEMO 2019-00039).

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is for new construction of a single-family structure and the rehabilitation of the existing accessory building.

The new single-family structure will be sited in approximately the same location as the current house. The front porch begins at approximately 38' and the existing house front porch begins at 39.4'. The proposed height of the new structure is 26'-10 7/16". Proposed materials include Hardie Artisan siding, wood trim, and aluminum clad windows.

An existing two-story accessory structure is proposed for rehabilitation. Work includes removal of the dilapidated entrance stair and replacement with a new stair that meets code requirements. Replacing all double-hung wood windows with new single-hung aluminum clad windows. Removal of the vinyl/aluminum wrap and original siding and trim beneath wrap. Installing new Hardie Artisan siding and wood trim. Reconfiguring the garage door locations.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

New Construction:

1. Fenestration on right elevation.
2. Proposed windows are Single-Hung.
3. Confirm wood shakes will be individually applied and not pre-fabricated panels of shake.
4. Front porch railing transition to handrail down front steps.
5. Front porch floor material.
6. Front railing material.
7. Front door material.
8. Beam & column detail that shows column trim/alignment.
9. Bracket detail.

Accessory Building Rehabilitation:

1. Materials of garage doors.
2. Proposed windows are Single-Hung.
3. Confirm wood shakes will be individually applied and not pre-fabricated panels of shake.



The proposal also includes a request to keep a newly installed wood fence, that meets all HDC requirements except height on the left and right side-yards.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. Creation of additional front yard parking area through the introduction of gravel to the left of the front walkway and installation of planting beds along the left side of the house where a concrete driveway used to be located.
2. Removal of original concrete walkway and replacement with stepping stones.
3. Removal of all grass in front yard.
4. Use of landscape timbers as planting bed borders.
5. Left and right side-yard fence height. Rear yard fences may be 6-feet to the rear corner of the house, and then are required to step down along the side yard if the fence is to end at the front corner of the house. Fences that tie in at the front corner of a house are limited to 4' in height to be approved at the Administrative level.
6. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Ms. Parati's invitation to speak for or against this application.

**MOTION:**        **DENIED/APPROVED**                    **1<sup>st</sup>:** HENNINGSON                    **2<sup>nd</sup>:** PHARES

Mr. Henningson moved to deny this application for the following:

1. It will create Front yard parking, Guideline 8.2, #6 for the front yard.
2. The front grass is replaced with gravel violates guideline 8.4 #6.
3. The original front walkway was replaced and needs to be retained per guidelines 8.2 #1 and #2.
4. Landscape timbers are prohibited per guideline 8.4 #8.
5. Fencing on the left side guideline 8.6, #4. The fence on the left should be no higher than four feet.
6. Approve the height of the fencing on the right side, because its repairing an existing condition.

Ms. Hindman stated for the record, I think that with some simple modifications, this could be brought into compliance.

**VOTE:** 6/1                                    **AYES:** HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, BARTH, PARATI, PHARES, WALKER  
**NAYS:** RUMSCH

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR FRONT YARD LANDSCAPING/PARKING CHANGES DENIED. THE HEIGHT OF THE RIGHT-SIDE FENCING IS APPROVED.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**

ABSENT: HADEN, MURYN, JORDAN, LINEBERGER  
MR. RUMSCH RECUSED HIMSELF FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.

**APPLICATION:** HDCRMI 2019-00482, 1712-1714 THOMAS AVENUE – FRONT YARD LANDSCAPING

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a one-story Bungalow duplex constructed c. 1930. Architectural features include a symmetrical façade with a steep pitch center gable and side porches, exposed rafters and 4/1 windows. Lot size is approximately 50' x 150'. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single-family and multi-family structures.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is for changes to the front yard. All grass in the front yard was removed and replaced with gravel. The two front yard trees will remain and a square planting bed will be created around each.



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.
2. Removal of original broken tile front porch floor.
3. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Ms. Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION:      APPROVED W/ CONDITIONS      1<sup>st</sup>: HINDMAN      2<sup>nd</sup>: HENNINGSON**

Ms. Hindman moved to approve this application with the condition that staff approves the materials because it meets our guidelines 7.2 - Additions and 6.14 - Porches. No using polymer products, use wood or cementitious.

**VOTE:** 7/0

**AYES:** HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, BARTH, PARATI, PHARES, RUMSCH, WALKER

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH THE CONDITON THAT STAFF APPROVES THE MATERIALS.

---

**APPLICATIONS NOT HEARD IN NOVEMBER**

HDCRMI 2019-00617, 2007 Dilworth Road E

HDCRMA 2019-00154, 629 S. Summit Avenue

HDCRMI 2019-00683, 325 S. Summit Avenue

HDCRMI 2019-00567, 0 W. 10<sup>th</sup> Street

HDCRMI 2019-00603, 809 Berkley Avenue

Ms. Parati adjourned the meeting at 7:40 PM.

Linda Keich, Clerk to Historic District Commission