APPROVED SEPTEMBER 14, 2016

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES
August 10, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Dr. Lili Corbus Mr. James Haden, Chair Mr. P.J. Henningson Mr. Rodric Lenhart Ms. Mattie Marshall Mr. Dominic Ristaino, Second Vice Chair Mr. Damon Rumsch, Vice Chair Ms. Claire Stephens Ms. Tamara Titus
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Ms. Jana Hartenstine Ms. Jessica Hindman One Vacancy
OTHERS PRESENT:	John Howard, Administrator Historic District Commission Ms. Kristi Harpst, Assistant Administrator Historic District Commission Ms. Wanda Birmingham, Assistant Administrator Historic District Commission Ms. Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission Mr. Thomas Powers, Assistant City Attorney Court Reporters

---

Chairman Haden called to order the Regular August meeting of the Historic District Commission at 1:04 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 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 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 ***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 and 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 decision to appeal. This is in accordance with Section 10.213 of the City Zoning Ordinance. Chairman Haden asked that everyone please turn to silent operation any electronic devices. Commissioners are asked to announce, for the record, if one leaves or arrives during the meeting. Mr. Haden said that those in the audience must be quiet during the hearings. An audience member will be asked once to be quiet and the need for a second request will be removal from the room.

Index of Addresses:

NOT HEARD IN JULY

NEW APPLICATIONS

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-137, 1925 WILMORE DRIVE – PAINTED BRICK

Existing Conditions

The existing home is a c. 1940 one and one half Cottage style brick home. The exterior has damaged brick and improper mortar work.

Proposal

The applicant has submitted an application and photographs to justify painting the brick exterior. There exists bad past repair work and bad patch work.

Staff Recommendation:

The Commission shall discuss the new evidence and testimony by the homeowner and will determine if painting the brick is justified.

FOR/AGAINST:

- Linda McGee, neighborhood resident, shared concern and does not believe that painting the brick house is warranted. She spoke in opposition to this application.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE.** Explore ways of repairing and cleaning the brick with an expert. If this proves to be unsuccessful, documentation from an expert will be a part of the resubmittal. ***Ms. Stephens seconded.***

VOTE: 9/0 **AYES**: CORBUS, HADEN, HENNINGSON, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: PAINTING THE BRICK CONTINUED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-146, 1915 MERRIMAN AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

Existing Conditions

The existing site is a vacant parcel in a block with mostly duplex residential structures. The site is approximately 3 to 4 feet above the sidewalk. The previous structure was a duplex; two sets of steps remain on the site. Setbacks are consistent along the block.

Proposal

The proposal is a new single family one and one half story house. Design features include traditional siding materials, eave brackets, and wood windows. The front porch is full width beneath a sweeping front facing gable. The height from grade is approximately 20'-2". The driveway will be extended to the rear of the house. The two sets of steps will remain and serve as a reminder of the duplex that was once there.

Staff Recommendation

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines.

FOR/AGAINST:

- Linda McGee, neighborhood resident, spoke in opposition and pointed out that two sets of steps at the sidewalk do not go with a single family house. She had a problem with window sill detail and wants to see more historic details.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application. The revised drawings will show:

- The double stairs remaining
- The height is appropriate, the block being unique
- The setback of the new porch should be equal to the adjacent property
- Choose a style and be consistent (overhangs, columns, and brackets)
- Gable end windows clarified
- Window sill and glazing details
- Correct the details on the siding, corner boards, and trim. ***Mr. Ristaino seconded***

VOTE: 8/1 **AYES**: CORBUS, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: HENNINGSON

DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED.

- **MR. RISTAINO DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HIMSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**

- **MR. HENNINGSON DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HIMSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICTION.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-149, 300 W. PARK AVENUE- NEW CONSTRUCTION

Existing Conditions
The existing site is a vacant parcel at the corner of Southwood and West Park Avenue in an area with one and two story homes. The site is approximately 3 feet above the sidewalk; the lot size is 50' x 200'. Setbacks are consistent along the block. An alley exists behind the property. Houses on the block range in height from approximately 20'-5" to 30'-5".

Proposal
The proposal is a new single family house and a detached garage. The height from grade is approximately 33'-3". Design features include cedar siding in the gables and a brick foundation. The front porch is full width. The applicant is requesting the use of cementitious lap siding.

The detached garage is one story and will be accessed from the alley. Exterior materials will match the house.

Staff Recommendation:
The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for garages/new construction.

FOR/AGAINST:

- Linda McGee, neighborhood resident, spoke in opposition to the proposed height, request for substitute siding, three car garage, details.

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines,*** Ms. Titus a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for its failure to meet guidelines re:

- Scale – at 32'7" this house will be taller than any historic house on the block
- Context – no other historic home on this block has two stories. ***Mr. Rumsch seconded.***

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** CORBUS, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION DENIED

- **MR. RUMSCH DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HIMSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-189, 1923 MERRIMAN – NEW CONSTRUCTION

Existing Conditions

The existing site is a vacant parcel located mid-block on Merriman Avenue. Adjacent houses are one story duplex structures, some of which are being removed by the City due to their location in the flood plain, leaving most of the block vacant.

Proposal

The proposal is a new single family home. Design features include a front porch with a shed roof supported by wooden columns atop brick piers, a front facing gable dormer, rear shed dormer and wood trim materials. Front porch depth is 8 feet. Proposed height is approximately 22 feet.

Staff Recommendation:

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for new construction.

FOR/AGAINST:

- No one accepted chairperson Haden's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST this application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – New Construction,*** Mr. Ristaino made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show:

- Craftsman details
- Open soffit
- V groove boxing overlayment of roof decking
- 16-18" overhang
- Brackets proportionally changed
- Siding determined
- Craftsman door to be approved by staff
- Siding detail overlap on windows and corner boards
- Columns clean and terminate with no extra trim on the top or bottom
- Window details 1.5" minimum sill detail
- Ms. Titus has a friendly amendment T&G wood front porch flooring perpendicular to house. ***Mr. Henningson seconded.***

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** CORBUS, HADEN, HENNINGSON, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED WITH REVISED DRAWINGS TO STAFF FOR PROBABLE APPROVAL.

- **MR. HENNINGSON HAD A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HIMSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-166, 1912 SOUTH MINT STREET – NEW CONSTRUCTION

Existing Conditions
The existing site is a vacant parcel located mid-block on South Mint Street, a large maturing tree exists in the front yard. The parcel narrows in width from the front to back. The distance between the sidewalk and existing grade is approximately 8 feet. The topography of the street and adjacent parcels vary. Adjacent houses are one, one and one half, and two stories of varying architectural designs. Setbacks vary between 25' and 35' from back of sidewalk.

Proposal
The proposal is a new single family home. Design features include a full width front porch, front facing gable dormers, rear shed dormer and wood trim materials. The rear dormer has a standing seam metal roof. Proposed height is +/23'. The tree in the front yard will be saved.

Staff Recommendation:
The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for new construction.

FOR/AGAINST:

- Linda McGee, neighborhood resident, suggested keeping the same number of panes rather than same size in the triple set of windows.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application. The revised drawings will show:

- Details of materials including dimensions
- Front dormer pushed back of the thermal wall
- Fenestration more respectful of the massing
- Mr. Rumsch friendly amendment: tree protection plan which includes specific dimensions, and fencing. ***Mr. Rumsch seconded***

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** CORBUS, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-2016-179, 1608 MERRIMAN AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

Existing Conditions
The existing site is a vacant parcel located mid-block on Merriman Avenue.

Proposal
The proposal is a new single family home. Design features include a full width front porch, a front facing gable dormer, rear shed dormer and wood trim materials. Front porch depth is 8 feet. Proposed height is approximately 25 feet.

Staff Recommendation
The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for new construction.

FOR/AGAINST:

- No one accepted chairman Haden's invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: The Commission made a unanimous decision NOT TO HEAR this application because there was not enough information presented. The commission gave the applicant some guidance on what to bring back.

- Drop the height of the house down
- Reduce dormer and push back off the thermal wall
- Reduce the height of the ceiling on the second floor
- Details of the windows, muntin dimensions, section
- Material details
- Site plan
- HVAC location

DECISION: APPLICATION NOT HEARD

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-180 – 421 GRANDIN ROAD - DEMOLITION

Existing

The c. 1933 house is listed as a Contributing structure in the Wesley Heights National Register of Historic Places Survey. The house was damaged by fire in 2015 and has been vacant since. The engineer's report notes smoke, water and structural damage along with other health and safety issues. Trees near the house were also damaged by the fire.

Proposal

The proposal is full demolition of the subject property.

Staff Recommendation:

The Commission will make a determination as to whether or not this house is determined to be contributing to the Local Historic District. With affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to 365-Day Stay of Demolition. Or, if the Commission determines that this property is no longer contributing, then demolition may take place without a delay.

FOR/AGAINST:

- No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak FOR or AGAINST this application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** – *Demolition***,** Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION to** identify the house as a structure contributing to the Wesley Heights Local Historic District. **Mr. Ristaino seconded.**

VOTE: 9/0 **AYES:** CORBUS, HADEN, HENNINGSON, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines –*** *Demolition*, Ms. Stephens made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** demolition with documentation of what is currently there (include height, width, square footage, and photographs). Mr. Lenhart seconded**.**

VOTE: 7/2 **AYES:** HADEN, HENNINGSON, LENHART, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: CORBUS, MARSHALL

DECISION: HOUSE IDENTIFIED AS A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE. APPROVE DEMOLITION.

- **MATTIE MARSHALL LEFT THE MEETING AT 4:55 PM**

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-164, 729 ROMANY ROAD – FRONT ADDITION

Existing Conditions
The existing structure is a C. 1942 one and one half story brick, Colonial style house. Most of the adjacent homes are of similar scale and constructed during the same period.

Proposal
The project is the extension of the existing front porch pad and the addition of a new handrail and standing seam metal roof to replace the existing roof. On the rear the existing door and windows on either side will be replaced with a bay window.

Staff Recommendation
The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for additions. The guideline for setback does not apply.

FOR/AGAINST:
- No one accepted Chairman Haden's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST this application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Front Addition,*** Ms. Titus made a MOTION to **APPROVE** this application as drawn. **Dr. Corbus seconded.**

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** CORBUS, HADEN, HENNINGSON, LENHART, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR FRONT ADDITION APPROVED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-153, 621 WOODRUFF PLACE – TREE REMOVAL

Existing Conditions
The rear yard contained three large maturing trees that were removed without HDC approval. The purpose of removal was to make improvements in the yard.

Proposal
The project is the addition of a retaining wall/bench wall, covered porch, and landscaping in the rear yard including removal of three large maturing canopy trees.

Staff Recommendation
The Commission shall determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for site features and provide recommendations for tree replacement.

FOR/AGAINST:

- No one accepted Chairman Haden's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST this application.

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with the ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application because they did not have a Certificate of Appropriateness prior to tree removal.

- Future landscape plan will show trees to be replanted: an oak planted near where canopy trees were removed and one of the owners' choice planted in a location the owner chooses.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** CORBUS, HADEN, HENNINGSON, LENHART, RISTAINO, RUMSCH STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR TREE REMOVAL DENIED. SEE MOTION FOR LANDSCAPE PLAN REQUIREMENTS.

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-156, 804 EAST KINGSTON AVENUE – TREE REMOVAL

Existing Conditions
The property is the site of a single family house with a large, mature tree in the right side yard and partially on the adjacent property. There is a second large maturing tree located in the rear yard.

Proposal
The project is the request to remove the large, mature tree in the side yard to accommodate a driveway for a future rear yard garage.

Staff Recommendation
The Commission shall determine if the tree should be removed and a replacement tree, if necessary, will be specified.

FOR/AGAINST:

- Lela Gatlin, adjacent property owner, spoke in opposition to the tree removal and asks that a tree protection plan be determined.

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Tree Removal,*** Mr. Henningson made a MOTION to **DENY** this application for tree removal. An arborist will specify a tree protection plan. **Ms. Stephens seconded.**

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** CORBUS, HADEN, HENNINGSON, LENHART, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR TREE REMOVAL DENIED

- **MS. STEPHENS HAD A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HERSELF FROM THE NEXT APPLICATION.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-172, 400 HERMITAGE COURT – ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

Existing Conditions
The existing site is a corner lot at Hermitage Court and Providence Road. The site is elevated approximately 4 to 5 feet above Providence Road. The principal structure is a two story house constructed in 1999. The house is approximately 28'-3" high. The house was approved for a renovation by the HDC in 2014, COA# 2014-266.

Proposal
The project is a detached garage in the rear yard. Access to the garage is from an existing driveway on Hermitage Court. The garage is approximately 5'-8" shorter than the house and will be near the rear property line adjacent to a vacant lot. Materials are wood shake and lap siding. The second story of the garage cantilevers over the first floor as a design element to make the elevations more interesting. A second project is the request for tree removal. A tree grows in the center of the back yard and will be much easier to remove before the garage construction begins. A pool is proposed for the future and it will have to be installed where the tree grows. A large maturing canopy tree will be planted somewhere in the yard.

Staff Recommendation:
The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for garages and will determine if tree removal is warranted, and determine a new tree location if necessary.

FOR/AGAINST:
- No one accepted Chairman Haden's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Accessory Structure,*** Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for:
- Scale and Massing, the second story is too large even without having the dimensions of the house
- The garage is not subservient to the house
- Tree removal is denied
- Ms. Titus friendly amendment Rhythm – the dormers are not recessed from the thermal walls and should read as an element to create a secondary accessory structure. ***Mr. Ristaino seconded.***

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** CORBUS**,** HADEN, HENNINGSON, LENHART, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR GARAGE AND TREE REMOVAL DENIED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-188, 1529 MERRIMAN AVENUE – GARAGE

The application was denied May 11, 2016 for its failure to meet the guidelines for Size, Massing in relation to both the streetscape and the garage not being secondary to the house it serves.

The Commission will first determine if the revised proposal has been substantially redesigned and/or if there is a change of circumstance before allowing the application to be heard.

Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to hear this application based on a substantial change. Claire seconded. The vote was unanimous.

Existing Conditions
The existing site is a formerly vacant parcel at the corner of Merriman Avenue and Larch Street. An HDC approved home is under construction. There are mature trees along the side and rear of the site. Adjacent structures are a mix of single family homes from various construction periods. An unused alley easement exists off Larch Street behind the subject property and adjacent to an existing driveway for the neighboring house. The setback of the abutting property on Larch Street is 30 feet from right of way/back of sidewalk (required zoning setback is 20 feet).

Proposal
The project is a new detached garage. Design features include architectural elements from the house including centered dormers, traditional siding materials, eave brackets, and wood windows. The height from grade is approximately 17 feet. The garage has been reduced to a single story structure.

Staff Recommendation:
The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for garages.

FOR/AGAINST:

- No one accepted Chairman Haden's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST this application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with the ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** Mr. Ristaino made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application with revised drawings to staff. The revised drawings will show:

- The garage moved two feet closer to the side property line
- Iron gate system over drive
- Landscaping
- Apron to sidewalk and Brick pavers

Dr. Corbus made a friendly amendment consult a specialist on the three tree choices. **Mr. Rumsch seconded.**

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** CORBUS, HADEN, HENNINGSON, LENHART, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, STEPHENS, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED WITH REVISED DRAWINGS TO STAFF FOR APPROVAL.

Mr. Powers reported the Zoning Board of Adjustment's decision regarding 1914 Lennox Avenue. The ZBA voted 3/2 to uphold the Historic District Commission's decision.
Mr. Howard stated that the owners will reapply to the Historic District for a different addition.

Ms. Titus made a MOTION to APPROVE the June minutes with two typos to be corrected. The motion was seconded and the vote was unanimous to approve the June minutes.

The Commission came out of closed session at 6:45 pm. A MOTION was made and unanimously approved to adjourn at 6:46 pm with a meeting length of 5 hours and 42 minutes.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission.