



Approved November 10, 2010

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES

October 13, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Roger Dahnert
Mr. Don Duffy
Ms. Mary Ellen George, Chair
Ms. Debra Glennon, Second Vice Chair
Mr. Greg Grueneich
Ms. Barbara Highfill
Ms. Paula Owens
Mr. Dominick Ristaino, Vice Chair
Ms. Karen Rush
Mr. Curtis Watkins

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Tom Egan
Ms. Meg Nealon

OTHERS PRESENT: Mr. John Rogers, Administrator
 Historic District Commission

 Ms. Wanda Birmingham, Secretary to the
 Historic District Commission

 Mr. Mujeeb Shah Khan, Assistant City Attorney

 Mr. Thomas Powers, Assistant City Attorney

 Ms. Terrie Hagler-Gray, Assistant City Attorney

With a quorum present Ms. George called the regular October meeting to order at 3:05 pm. She began the meeting with a welcome to all in attendance and by swearing in those present (and continued to do so throughout the meeting as others arrived). Due to the quasi-judicial nature of the Commission, staff and others who may speak are sworn in at every meeting. (Commissioners are sworn in by the City Clerk for the length of the appointment at the beginning of each term) Ms. George asked that everyone in attendance please sign in and when addressing the Commission to please state name and address for the record. Mr. Ristaino explained the meeting process. The review of each application consists of two parts. The first is the presentation portion. Staff presents the application then Commissioners and those speaking on behalf of the application will discuss the project. Next, members of the audience will be asked if anyone present wishes to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application. Again, there will be an opportunity for comments and questions from the Commission and the applicant. The second part is the discussion and deliberation portion of the meeting. At this point, discussion of the application is limited to the Commission members and staff only. Unless the Commission votes to re-open the meeting to ask additional questions or for clarification of some issue, the applicant and audience members do not participate in this portion of the discussion. Once discussion is complete, a MOTION will be made to APPROVE, DENY, or DEFER and a vote will be taken. A simple majority vote of those Commissioners present is required for a decision. Ms. George asked that all cell phones and any other electronic devices be turned

off completely or set to silent operation. She also asked that any Commissioner announce, for the record, their arrival and/or departure when this takes place during a meeting.

Mr. Shah Khan said as part of the office of the City Attorney’s “landscape of representation”, responsibilities are changing. The Historic District Commission will be represented by Thomas Powers, beginning in November. He is a new Assistant City Attorney who is the former City Attorney of Lumberton, NC. The Historic District Commission staff will be represented by Terrie Haigler Gray, an expert and resource on the Zoning Ordinance, she is long familiar with HDC and has filled in several times in the past. This new organization will erase any appearance of conflict of interest.

Index of Addresses:	1920 South Mint Street	Wilmore
	235 West Park Avenue	Wilmore
	723 Mt. Vernon Avenue	Dilworth
	201 West Park Avenue	Wilmore
	429 East Boulevard	Dilworth
	1824 South Mint Street	Wilmore
	615 Mt. Vernon Avenue	Dilworth
	1560 Merriman Avenue	Wilmore

Application: 1920 Mint Street – Addition.

This one story bungalow has two long shed dormers on the front. The proposal is to create a second story by raising the roof ridge, enlarging the dormers, and adding a rear side-to-side shed dormer. Columns and rail will be added to front porch. The chimney will be raised to be code compliant regarding the new dormers and roof. Stone will be added as a trim feature around the porch. Vinyl windows exist on the house and are proposed where new windows are added.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Ms. George's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions***, Mr. Watkins made a MOTION to APPROVE the application with revised plans to show: (1) sill treatment added, (2) front dormers tying at least 6" down from ridge, (3) stone planter detail in front pulled in a minimum of 8" from the edges of the house, (4) column detail and rail. Staff may approve vinyl windows with specifications and/or a sample. Mr. Ristaino seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, GEORGE, GLENNON,
GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, OWENS, RISTAINO, RUSH, WATKINS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: ADDITION APPROVED WITH STAFF TO REVIEW REVISED PLANS.

Application: 235 West Park Avenue – New Construction

A new house is proposed for an empty lot mid block. It will be a two story house with an attached garage in the rear. The application was deferred last month for some additional design work.

Applicant Comments: Owner Kevin Walsh said he took the recommendations and revised his plan accordingly. Following a discussion, it was noticed that windows were missing from the elevations and the roof was drawn wrong.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Ms. George's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on probably compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – New Construction***, Mr. Dahnert made a MOTION to send revised plans to a Design Review Committee for final APPROVAL. Revised plans will show (1) corrections to drawings (roof and windows), (2) change of head height – windows vs. doors, (3) add window(s) on side elevation(s), (4) explore adding a dormer over garage to mitigate height and blankness, (5) push front dormer back from thermal wall, (6) eliminate continuous right side wall with an offset. Committee appointed: Dahnert, Duffy, Watkins.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, GEORGE, GLENON, GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, OWENS, RISTAINO, RUSH, WATKINS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: DESIGN REVIEW MAY GIVE FINAL APPROVAL TO REVISED PLANS.

Application: 723 Mt. Vernon Avenue – New Construction.

A new single family house is proposed for this lot which has a house on it. This address backs up to Myrtle Square Condominiums and has been for sale and gone unsold for several years. The next door neighbors have bought the house with the intent to build a new house and move only next door. A 365 Day Stay of Demolition was imposed earlier in the year. The application was deferred in September for further design study. The application is for the new house and a lifting of the time remaining on the Stay of Demolition. HDC concerns included (1) prominent garage door facing street as part of house, (2) large scale/height of right elevation relative to adjacent house, (3) unbroken right side gables, (4) lack of adequate fenestration, (5) front setback paving.

Applicant Comments: Architect Harry Schrader pointed out the changes in the revised plans: (1) right elevation now has a hipped roof which lowers the mass presented to the adjacent house, (2) an offset with windows extends to the ground on the right elevation, (3) garage door has been pushed in 12", (4) overhang has been added over garage door, (5) ultimate height has been significantly reduced. The garage is set back 18'2" from the front porch corner and the drive width has been reduced to a single car width.

Dr. Burgess said all trees are healthy and will be protected except the street tree which is not in good shape.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Ms. George's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – New Construction***, Ms. Rush made a MOTION to APPROVE the plans for new construction with the note that the tree near the driveway will be protected. Ms. Owens seconded.

VOTE: 9/1 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH, OWENS, RISTAINO, RUSH, WATKINS

NAYS: HIGHFILL

DECISION: NEW HOUSE APPROVED

MOTION: Based on new construction plans approved Ms. Rush made a MOTION to LIFE the remainder of the Stay of Demolition to allow demolition for construction to begin. Ms. Owens seconded.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Ms. George's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, OWENS, RISTAINO, RUSH, WATKINS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: DELAY OF DEMOLITION LIFTED.

Mr. Watkins declared a conflict of interest and removed himself from the Commission for the next application.

Application: 201 West Park Avenue – Paint Brick.

This 1950s duplex is located on the very edge of the new Wilmore Historic District. A mural is partially painted on the side of the brick building for the hair salon and the owner of the business stopped immediately when he became aware of this issue that now needed approval. Approval was worked out with the owner prior to the area being designated historic, but the painting did not begin until after the designation. It is a large graphic but the point of view of Historic District is that this a painting of brick issue – no matter whether it is a solid color or a large multi colored graphic.

Application Comments: Salon owner Bradley Sanders said the large graphic fills a void for neighborhood artwork. He does not think he will have a problem with having to pull a sign permit – it is artwork.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Ms. George's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on exception to ***Policy & Design Guidelines - Painting Brick*** justified by Non Contributing quality of building and it being on the edge of the Historic District facing out of neighborhood, Mr. Dahnert made a MOTION to APPROVE the painting of this building – either just the mural or the entirety. Ms. Rush seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, GEORGE, GLENNON,
GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, OWENS, RISTAINO, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: BUILDING MAY BE PAINTED.

Application: 429 East Boulevard – Glass-in Front Porch.

This 2 story house is located at the corner of East Boulevard and Lyndhurst Avenue and has long been in a commercial use. It is now a hair salon. Glassing in the front porch was approved by the Commission in 2007 but the work was never done and the approval has now expired. The proposal is to do it just as the Commission approved it in the past – glass inboard of existing columns and rail. A low wall will accept glass panels and die into a channel at the top.

Applicant Comments: Contractor for owner said they will make the rail removable so that you can get to the glass wall from the outside for maintenance.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Ms. George's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Porch Enclosures***, Ms. Glennon made a MOTION to APPROVE the plans in concept. Details will be worked out in revised plans. Mr. Grueneich seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, OWENS, RISTAINO, RUSH, WATKINS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: ENCLOSING FRONT PORCH APPROVED IN CONCEPT.

Application: 1824 South Mint Street – Renovate.

This address is the long closed old neighborhood store at the corner of South Mint Street and West Worthington Avenue. It is a rectangular wooden building that had two residences above retail on the ground floor. The interior

has been gutted down to the exterior walls. The owner plans to convert it to a single family house. A masonry chimney has been removed from the side but will be rebuilt. A side porch entry will be added in the space where an entry once existed. The side yard will be fenced in. Standing seam metal will be the main roofing and on the new side porch. Little has been done to the property recently and it has been cited for a number of Code violations. He has been ordered to fix it up or Code Enforcement will go to City Council seeking permission to Demolish.

FOR/AGAINST: Code Enforcement Inspector Kim Sauer verified that the property has been cited for numerous violations. She said that she understands the HDC's jurisdiction and ability to impose up to a year delay of any demolition. Code Enforcement intends to follow through after any delay would expire. This address is on the Housing Appeals Board for December.

FOR/AGAINST: Contractor for an adjacent new home said they have heard for three years that renovation was coming. No one would even consider buying the new house he built because of this building. He wants the City to order it torn down as an eyesore and unsafe place. The adjacent homeowner said she does not feel safe by this building.

David Schweeman said he tried to do some work on the building 3 ½ years ago but there were major issues: (1) the corner of the building is 18" on the City's right of way, (2) chimney cannot be replaced due to the setback encroachment, (3) there is a water line beneath the property, (4) a drive cannot be created.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information, Mr. Watkins made a MOTION to DEFER the application. Mr. Rogers was asked to put this address on the Design Review Committee agenda and convey to the owner that it is in his

best interest to move quickly and that the HDC was very much in favor of his proposal. Mr. Duffy seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, OWENS, RISTAINO, RUSH, WATKINS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: RENOVATION APPLICATION DEFERRED.

Application: 615 Mt. Vernon Avenue – Side Porch Enclosure.

This two story brick house is between Euclid and Myrtle Avenues. A small one story side addition will be converted to a sun room. The siding will be removed. Fixed windows will be added all around. Dentil molding will be added to match that found on the house. Columns will be added to match those on the house and one half timbering details will be added.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Ms. George's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions***, Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE revised plans which show: (1) no dentil

molding on gable end, (2) cottage style 2/3 light windows, (3) metal rail at existing steps. Ms. Glennon seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: DAHERNT, DUFFY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH,
HIGHFILL, OWENS, RISTAINO, RUSH, WATKINS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: SIDE SUN PORCH APPROVED WITH REVISED PLANS.

Application: 1560 Merriman Avenue – Vinyl Siding.

This circa 1938 Contributing duplex is at West Park and Merriman Avenue. This has been recently purchased. Two front doors face the street with a small gable over each front door. One door has been erased with the addition of vinyl siding. Staff sent a letter to the owners of record but it was a former owner and no response was received.

Applicant Comments: New owner said that previous owners vinyl sided over the left front door. Windows have been partially replaced.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Ms. George's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on the need for further design study regarding the mitigation of the now missing front door, Mr. Ristaino made a MOTION to DEFER the application. Ms. Rush seconded.

VOTE: 10/1 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, OWENS, RISTAINO, RUSH, WATKINS.

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DEFERRED.

Mr. Rogers said that there was opposition to emailing the packets a number of years ago. There is a better way now. All will be sent an agenda electronically. Each address is a link. You will be able to blow up details. You will be able to print out only what you need. A demo will be ready in November and we can try out the whole thing in December with the intent to begin using it in January. Eventually cases can be posted on the web for the public. HDC is a secure website.

Ms. Highfill asked that a retreat be scheduled. She wants an agenda item to be garage doors.

September Minutes were approved unanimously with the direction to report any changes or corrections to Ms. Birmingham.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 with a meeting length of 3 hours and 25 minutes.

Wanda Birmingham, Secretary to the Historic District Commission

