



CHARLOTTE

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES

November 11, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Tim Bender
 Dr. Lili Corbus
 Mr. Don Duffy
 Mr. Tom Egan, Chair person
 Mr. James Haden
 Mr. Nasif Majeed
 Ms. Mattie Marshall
 Mr. Dominick Ristaino, Vice-Chair
 Mr. Damon Rumsch
 Ms. Claire Stephens
 Ms. Tamara Titus, Second Vice Chair

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Rodric Lenhart

OTHERS PRESENT: Mr. John Howard, Administrator
 Historic District Commission
 Ms. Wanda Birmingham, Staff
 Historic District Commission
 Ms. Linda Keich, Clerk to the
 Historic District Commission
 Mr. Thomas Powers, Assistant City Attorney
 Court Reporters

Chairman Egan called to order the Regular November meeting of the Historic District Commission at 1:00 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 complete a blue form and must be sworn in. Staff will present a description of the proposed project to the Commission. The Commission will first determine if there is sufficient information to proceed. If continuing, Commissioners and the applicants will then discuss the project. Audience members signed up to speak FOR or AGAINST will be called to the podium. Presentations by the applicants and audience members must be concise and focused on the **Policy & 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. The 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. While the Commission will not specifically exclude hearsay evidence, it is only given limited weight. Appeal from the Historic District Commission is to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. One has sixty (60) days from the date of the Approval or Denial to appeal. This is in accordance with Section 10.213 of the City Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Egan 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. Mr. Egan said that those in the audience must be quiet during the hearings. He will ask once that an audience member be quiet and the need for a second request will be removal from the room.

MS. TITUS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER MINUTES WITH AMENDMENTS. THE VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.

Index of Addresses:	<u>CONTINUED APPLICATIONS</u>	
	HDC 2015-208, 1508/1510 S. Mint Street	Wilmore
	<u>NEW APPLICATIONS</u>	
	HDC 2015-226, 1716 Winthrop Avenue	Dilworth
	HDC 2015-232, 1830 Ewing Avenue	Dilworth
	HDC 2015-235, 229 E. Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
	HDC 2015-236, 1914 Lennox Avenue	Dilworth
	HDC 2015-238, 804 E. Kingston Avenue	Dilworth
	HDC 2015-239, 1308 Lexington Avenue	Dilworth

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-208, 1508/1510 SOUTH MINT STREET– RENOVATION/ADDITION

The application was continued for further design study regarding lowering the center section of the building, choice of materials, maintaining the angled off corner, and the roof forms in general.

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a one story commercial building at the corner of South Mint Street and West Summit Avenue in the Wilmore neighborhood. The original building was constructed in 1926, and later additions from 1931. Several façade changes have occurred over the years including the addition and removal of doors and windows. The corner building features a mitered corner entrance, framed by columns and clay tiles on the roof edge. Existing masonry is painted or has a stucco coat.

Proposal

The proposal is a façade renovation which includes new windows, doors, and signage. Existing stucco will be removed to expose the original masonry. Existing doors and windows will be replaced in some areas to unify the entire building. A small canopy is proposed along the street sides. New exterior material on one section will be wood. Existing masonry will be repainted.

Updated Proposal – November 11, 2015

1. The mansard roof element on the corner of the building is retained.

2. The center building roof line has been lowered.
3. Material specifications for the metal siding have been included.
4. Proposed metal panels have been changed to wood.
5. All windows match.

Staff Recommendation

The HDC will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for Fenestration, Rhythm, Materials and Context.

FOR/AGAINST:

- Neighborhood Resident Nathan Gray spoke in favor of the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines - Additions***, Mr. Majeed made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** the addition based on evidence and testimony presented that proves that the ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** are met. Friendly amendment/clarification made by Ms. Titus and accepted by Mr. Majeed. It meets the guidelines for Fenestration – the new storefront windows and overhead doors are aluminum which match existing windows. Rhythm – maintained the mansard roof at the corner and parapet elements and restored midsection building height, Materials – all traditional materials and original restored where known. Context – Proposed is in keeping with the photos of surrounding commercial buildings. Dr. Corbus seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 **AYES:** BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, MAJEED, RUMSCH
RISTAINO, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: RENOVATION/ADDITION APPROVED.

- **MS. MARSHALL ARRIVED AT 1:21 AND WAS PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING**
- **MR. DON DUFFY DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HIMSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**
- **MR. EGAN DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HIMSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-226– 1716 WINTHROP AVENUE – HARDIE ON GARAGE

Existing Conditions

The property is located at the edge of a single family block and adjacent to an alley. A new detached garage was approved administratively in May 2015 and construction on the garage is near completion. Access to the garage is from the alley. The approved siding material is wood. A Notice of Violation was issued in October 2015 due to Hardieplank being installed as the siding material.

Proposal

The property owner is applying for approval of the Hardie siding on the new garage as it has been installed.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** and if an exception is warranted for the use of Non-traditional building materials.

FOR/AGAINST:

- Neighborhood resident John Phares spoke in opposition of allowing the substitute siding.
- Neighborhood resident Andrew Hassenbill spoke in favor of approving the substitute siding material as installed.
- Neighborhood resident Peter Bouve spoke in favor of approving the substitute siding material as installed.
- Neighborhood resident Jeff Tonidandel spoke in favor of allowing the substitute siding material as installed.

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Non-Traditional Building Materials*** and no exception warranted, Mr. Ristaino made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application - page 49- #3 The Commission will determine how well the proposed material and its proposed use are contextually appropriate in design, texture, and other visual qualities. The Historic District Commission will consider these products on a case by case basis. Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 4/5 **AYES:** TITUS, RUMSCH, MARSHALL, RISTAINO

NAYS: STEPHENS, CORBUS, BENDER, HADEN, MAJEED

DECISION: **MOTION FAILS.**

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information, Mr. Bender made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application for the need of additional details: 1) show why the new siding matches the COA, 2) show sample. Ms. Titus made a friendly amendment: show a tape measure up against the siding of the house and garage. Mr. Haden seconded.

VOTE: **9/0** **AYES:** BENDER, CORBUS, HADEN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **USE OF SUBSTITUTE SIDING ON GARGE CONTINUED.**

-
- **MR. EGAN LEFT THE ROOM AND WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**
-

APPLICATION: **HDC 2015-232 – 1830 EWING AVENUE – PAINTING BRICK**

The proposal is a renovation of the structure including an expansion of the attic, rear porch addition and reconstruction of a long removed corner tower. A new detached garage is proposed in the rear yard. Project details include wood siding (lap and shake patterns), wood windows and trim, new eaves and soffits to match existing, new screened porch and a new second floor rear addition. The proposed garage will have materials and details complementary and matching to the principal structure.

Updated Proposal – November 11, 2015

Amendments to the approved plans include a modification to the proposed turret, a larger dormer on the left side, and the addition of a small gable over the rear porch. Changes to the accessory building are removal of garage doors, remove the exterior stairs, and the removal of the shed dormers. The look of a carriage house will be created.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The HDC will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for additions and accessory buildings.

FOR/AGAINST:

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with **Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions**, Mr. Duffy made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application, the tower should be built to front elevation slide 76, building section on slide A-12, AC units in the rear yard, approval includes revised sheet A-11 replacing slide 78 in the binder showing previous submittal. Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, MAJEED, MARSHALL,
RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

-
- **MS. TITUS RECUSED HERSELF FROM THIS APPLICATION BECAUSE SHE RECEIVED AN ADJACENT NOTIFICATION.**
 - **MR. EGAN RETURNED TO THE MEETING AT 5:45 AND WAS PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.**
-

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-236 1914 LENNOX AVENUE –FRONT FAÇADE CHANGES

The application for a second story addition and fenestration changes was denied August 12, 2015. The basis for denial was inappropriate Size, Scale and Massing. The applicant has submitted a new application for review. The Commission will determine if the project has been substantially redesigned to allow further review.

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1925 one story Bungalow house with a front facing gable front porch roof and cross gable beyond over the main structure. The house is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register survey.

Proposal

The proposal is the relocation of the front door and centering it. A new window will be added on the left side to match the existing window on the right. New materials are noted on the plans as matching the existing. A rear addition has been reviewed and approved administratively that is neither taller nor wider than the existing structure and meets the **Policy & Design Guidelines** for additions in the rear yard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The HDC will determine if the project meets the Additions guidelines for Context, Rhythm, Fenestration and Materials.

FOR/AGAINST:

- No one accepted Mr. Egan’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 this application for centering the door and the new window to match the original window. Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO,
RUMSCH, STEPHENS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: FAÇADE CHANGES APPROVED

DR. CORBUS LEFT THE MEETING AT 5:55 AND WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-238 804 EAST KINGSTON AVENUE – REAR ADDITION

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1920 one and one half story Bungalow. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register survey.

Proposal

The proposal includes a rear porch addition and upper level expansion that raises the ridge approximately 2’-5” higher than the principal structure. Elements of the rear of the house will be removed. The additions will have materials and details to match the existing house. A door on the left side of the front facade will be replaced with a window. New windows are wood. A new driveway will be extended to the rear yard, a mature tree on the right side will be removed and a new tree planted in the rear yard. An existing garage will be demolished.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The HDC will determine if the project meets the Additions guidelines for Size, Scale, Massing, Context, Rhythm, Fenestration and Materials.

FOR/AGAINST:

- No one accepted Mr. Egan’s invitation to speak either for or against.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Ms. Titus made a MOTION to CONTINUE this application for revised drawing to show 1) existing four elevations, 2) original Zoutewelle survey, 3) Exterior trim boxing details. Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO,
RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: REAR ADDITION CONTINUED FOR MORE DETAIL INFORMATION.

MR. DUFFY DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AS THE PROJECT ARCHITECT AND REMOVED HIMSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.

APPLICATION: HDC 2015-239, 1308 LEXINGTON AVENUE – SIDE ADDITION/FENESTRATION CHANGES

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is c. 1950 brick one and one half story Cottage style home. The chimney has stone accents. The house is identified as a Non-Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register survey.

Proposal

The proposal is a one story addition to the left side of the house, and window and door replacement. The front elevation includes a centered entry door, a stoop with a small canopy and metal handrails. The canopy will be lifted to hit the roof higher. A previously enclosed side porch will become a sunroom with door facing the front. A blue stone patio will be added in front of new sun room. New windows and doors will match existing. Roof material over windows and entryways will be copper. New roof brackets will be wood. Siding materials will be brick and wood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The HDC will determine if the project meets the Additions guidelines for Size, Scale, Massing, Context, Rhythm, Fenestration and Materials

FOR/AGAINST:

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with **Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions/Fenestration changes**, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION to APPROVE** this application, with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show 1) Section through sunroom, 2) Columns at corners of sunroom, 3) intersect with roof and side wall resolution, 4) detailed patio drawing. Ms. Stephens seconded

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: EGAN, MAJEED, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: SIDE ADDITION/FENESTRATION CHANGES APPROVED WITH REVISED DRAWINGS TO STAFF FOR PROBABLE APPROVAL.

The meeting adjourned at 6:22 pm with a meeting length of 5 hours and 22 minutes.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission.