HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
March 8, 2017

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Mr. James Haden, Chair Ms. Jana Hartenstine Mr. P. J. Henningson Ms. Mattie Marshall Mr. Dominic Ristaino, 2nd Vice-Chair Mr. Damon Rumsch, Vice Chair Ms. Tamara Titus Ms. Jill Walker
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Ms. Jessica Hindman Ms. Deb Ryan Ms. Claire Stephens One Vacancy
OTHERS PRESENT:	Mr. John Howard, Administrator of the Historic District Commission Ms. Kristi Harpst, Staff of the Historic District Commission Ms. Wanda Birmingham, Staff of the Historic District Commission Mr. Thomas Powers, Assistant City Attorney for the City of Charlotte Adkins Court Reporters

Chairman Haden called to order the Regular March meeting of the Historic District Commission at 1:03 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 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. 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. 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 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:

CONTINUED

HDC 2016-321, 1816 Wickford Place (lot 1)	Wilmore
HDC 2016-322, 1816 Wickford Place (lot 2)	Wilmore
HDC 2016-323, 1816 Wickford Place (lot 3)	Wilmore
HDC 2016-324, 1816 Wickford Place (lot 4)	Wilmore
HDC 2017-00012, 247 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2017-0025, 620 Woodruff Place	Wesley Heights
HDC 2016-274, 700 Templeton Avenue	Dilworth

NEW APPLICATIONS

HDC 2017-090, 617 W. Park Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2017-107, 612 E. Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2017-060, 2309 Charlotte Drive	Dilworth
HDC 2017-106, 1825 Merriman Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2017-067, 625 Hermitage Court	Hermitage Court
HDC 2017-074, 336 Settlers Lane	Fourth Ward
HDC 2017-070, 609 Pine Street	Fourth Ward
HDC 2017-091, 1608 Merriman Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2017-055, 1230 E. Worthington Avenue	Dilworth

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

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-00012-247 W. KINGSTON AVENUE - ADDITION

The project was continued from February for further design study regarding massing and scale. The massing of the second story (side gables and dormers) is too heavy compared to the first level. Revisions to the addition on the sides will most likely resolve the massing issues with the rear elevation (would automatically increase the pitch of the roof slope on the dormers). The front porch design should be simpler with hand rails. The retaining wall should be revised by removing the piers and reducing the overall height.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a one and one half story American Small House style constructed in 1937. The house is approximately 6 feet above the sidewalk. Adjacent houses are between and 1 and 2 stories in height. Architectural features include brick exterior, front facing gable, a small partially covered porch, elevated foundation and dormers on the front and side elevations. The existing windows are vinyl.

PROPOSAL

Proposed is the addition of dormers to the front and side, a new front porch to connect, new rear porch, and new windows. The upper level expansion does not expand the footprint. The addition increases the ridge height approximately 4'-9". The front porch features squared columns, expanded deck, handrails and brick piers. The

existing small front dormer will be removed. The side elevations include new windows toward the rear and raising the chimney +/-4'. Siding material is lapped wood. The site will also require grading to improve water drainage. The applicant is also requesting the improvement of the front retaining wall to include brick with metal fencing atop, similar to the adjacent wall/fence.

Revised Proposal – March 8

1. The porch columns have been simplified by removing the brick piers and removing the boxing.
2. The side gables have been shortened and faced with brick. A window has been added.
3. The brick stair wall has been replaced with a wood hand rail.
4. The side shed dormer has an additional window.
5. The roof slope on the shed style addition has been increased to a 12:3 pitch.

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 Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information and further design study Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application. The revised drawings to staff will show:
Further design study to reduce the massing on the side elevations.
Mr. Henningson seconded.

VOTE: 6/0 **AYES**: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-00025, 620 WOODRUFF PLACE - ADDITION

The project was continued for further design study regarding Massing, Fenestration, and Rhythm. Suggestions included pulling the proposed side dormers in farther from the first floor exterior wall and increase the pitch of the shed dormer roof. Consider continuing the shed dormer design on the sides. Provide historically accurate window details on second level. Suggestions may resolve the Rhythm issue.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 1942 one story, side gabled duplex. Exterior features include a clay tiled front and side porch, 6/6 wood windows and brick exterior. It is listed as a contributing structure in the Wesley Heights National Register of Historic Places. Adjacent structures are 1 and 2 story single and multi-family dwellings.

PROPOSAL

The project is a conversion of the duplex to a single family dwelling with an upper level addition within the existing footprint. The new addition is a cross gable that extends from the existing ridge with an increase of approximately 4'. New materials include brick to match existing and wood trim with windows to match existing in material and trim. Other design features include an expanded front porch deck with wood columns and a new front shed dormer.

PROPOSAL – MARCH 8

1. The side dormers are inset 1'-3" from the first floor wall.
2. Windows in the side gables have been reduced in size.
3. Additional window details have been provided

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 Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** – **Additions,** Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** with revised drawings to staff for probable approval. The revised drawings will show:

- Increase height of chimney
- 4 inch window trim
- Window sill extending 1 inch beyond trim
- Adjust window on dormer to no larger than code requires
- Add handrail and guardrail to meet code
- Add column detail
- Match brick and mortar (no painting)
- HVAC unit located in the rear behind building

Ms. Hartenstine seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES**: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

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

- **MS. MARSHALL ARRIVED AT 1:55 PM AND WAS PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2016- 1816 WICKFORD PLACE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

The application was continued in February for further design study regarding Scale, Massing, and Fenestration. The second floor height is too tall, revised drawings should accurately show the height dimensions. The house has conflicting proportional elements such as window sizes and floor height on the cross gable model. Provide revised window details (trim and sill, no picture frame), add vents/windows in rear gables.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 1938 one story, single family house. It is located on the edge of the Wilmore Historic District. The HDC placed a 365-day Stay of Demolition on the property January 13, 2016. The parcel is zoned R-43 Multi-Family and is approximately .34 acres in size. The lot dimension is 150' x 100'. Adjacent uses are multi-family, industrial, commercial and single family. There are mature trees on the site what will be the individual sites. Trees to be saved, replaced or removed are identified on the plans. The applicant has filed a rezoning application for Urban Residential-1 to construct four single family houses. The required minimum setback is 14', required minimum rear yard is 10' and required minimum lot width is 20'. The Floor Area Ratio (FAR) does not apply to single family structures on individual lots.

PROPOSAL
The proposal is the construction of four single family structures with a focus on house plans for lot 1 and the overall site layout for the four structures. Proposed lot dimensions are 37.5' x 100'. There are two models being proposed and will be identified as Lot/Plan 1, 2, 3 and 4. The setback of the proposed house for Lot 1 is the same as the existing structure which will set the location for Lots 2, 3, and 4. All homes are one and one half stories, and feature 8' in depth front porches, wood siding, wood windows, brick foundations, and wood corner boards. The applicant is requesting cementitious siding for the porch columns and soffits.

The underlying zoning will require an 8' planting strip and 6' sidewalk. New landscaping and tree save opportunities are shown on the site plan. Included in the plan is a new private alley along the rear of the four houses. The revised plans also include numeric evidence of comparable lot coverages in the neighborhood, pervious area more clearly shown on the site plan, and updated window design and placement.

Revised Proposal – March 8
1. Lot 1 is a side gable design with a front facing shed dormer
2. The height has been reduced 1 foot on each of the proposed houses
3. Window design and proportion has been revised
4. Window details have been revised
5. Vents have been added to rear gables

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** – New Construction.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information, Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application. The revised application will include below for the 3 Infill lots. NOTE: Size, Scale and Massing is approved
- Front elevation variations one to the other
- All exterior details to include trim, siding, windows, columns, rafter tails, brackets, overhangs, siding what reveal, details of brick
- Window sample

Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES**: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENINGSON, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED ON 3 INFILL LOTS**

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-324 1816 WICKFORD PLACE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

The application was continued in February for further design study re Scale, Massing, Fenestration. The second floor height is too tall, revised drawings should accurately show the height dimensions. The house has conflicting proportional elements that need to be resolved such as window sizes and floor height on the cross gable model. The revised submission will show window details (trim and sill, no picture frame), vents/windows added in rear gables.

EXISTING CONDITIONS
The existing structure is a c. 1938 one story single family house. It is located on the edge of the Wilmore Local Historic District. The HDC placed a 365-day Stay of Demolition on the property January 13, 2016. The parcel is

zoned R-43 Multi-Family and is approximately .34 acres in size. The lot dimension is 150' x 100'. Adjacent uses are multi-family, industrial, commercial and single family. There are mature trees on the site. Trees to be saved, replaced or removed are identified on the plans. The applicant has filed a rezoning application for Urban Residential-1 to construct four single family houses. The required minimum setback is 14', required minimum rear yard is 10', and required minimum lot width is 20'. The Floor Area Ratio (FAR) does not apply to single family structures on individual lots.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is the construction of four single family structures with a focus on house plans for lot 1 and the overall site layout for the four structures. Proposed lot dimensions are 37.5' x 100'. There are two models being proposed and will be identified as Lot/Plan 1, 2, 3 and 4. The setback of the proposed house for Lot 1 is the same as the existing structure which will set the location for Lots 2, 3, 4. All homes are one and one half stories (approx. 25' to 28' in height), and feature front porches 8' in depth, wood siding, wood windows, brick foundations, and wood corner boards. The applicant is requesting cementitious siding for the porch columns and soffits.

The underlying zoning will require an 8' planting strip and 6' sidewalk. New landscaping and tree save opportunities are shown on the site plan. Included in the plan is a new private alley at the rear for the four houses. The revised plans also include numeric evidence of comparable lot coverages in the neighborhood, pervious area more clearly shown on the site plan and updated window design and placement.

Revised Proposal – March 8

1. Lot 4 is a front gable design with a shed dormers and wraparound porch
2. The height has been reduced 1 foot
3. Window design and proportion has been revised
4. Window details have been revised
5. Vents have been added to rear gables
6. A large mature tree in the front yard will be preserved

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** – New Construction.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information, Ms. Hartenstein made a **MOTION** to **CONTINUE** this application. The revised drawings will show for the 3 Infill lots.

- Tree protection plan addressing both preconstruction treatment to include impact of structural recommendations for both front and rear corners of the house
- Historically accurate details for window trim (head, jamb, trim and sills), column trim,
- Rafter tails (exposed) and brackets on elevations provide detail for both
- Confirm that smooth miratec will be used
- Cornerboard details illustrating depth difference from siding

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES**: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENINGSON, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED ON 3 INFILL LOTS**

APPLICATION: HDC 2016-274, 700 TEMPLETON AVENUE

The application was continued from December for the following: 1) Accurate drawings with the substituted right elevation, 2) Landscaping plan and HVAC location, 3) Fence elevation and location on site plan and, 4) Setback of adjacent two houses on site plan or survey.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing structure is a c. 1936 one story brick house at the corner of Templeton and Euclid. Adjacent properties are one and two story single family houses. A multi-family development is located directly behind the house. A 365-Day Stay of Demolition was placed on the property July 13, 2016.

PROPOSAL

The project is a new single family house and detached garage. The proposed height is approximately 24'-6". Materials are brick with wood trim, the chimney on the right side will be removed. Other features include wood clad windows and new front and rear porches. The detached garage is approximately 20' in height with materials and architectural details to match the house and wood garage doors. Rear yard pervious area is approximately 58%.

REVISION – JANUARY 11

1. The plans include a section of the porch footing and deck and the footings are indicated on the elevations.

REVISION – FEBRUARY 8

1. The applicant has submitted revised foundation design and screen specs

REVISED PROPOSAL – MARCH 8

1. The front porch and right side elevation have been simplified in design and massing.
2. Proposed landscaping, HVAC and fence location is identified on site plan. A design for the fence has not been finalized but will be submitted for staff to review
3. Adjacent setbacks are provided and identified as 38' from ROW for the subject property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for additions. The guideline for setback does not apply because there is no change to the front.

FOR/AGAINST:

- Ms. April Whitlock, adjacent property owner is excited and stated that she is ready for this project to start because it fits perfectly within the neighborhood.

MOTION: Based compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** – **Additions,** Ms. Marshall made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE**. Mr. Ristaino made a friendly amendment that was accepted: revised drawings to show the following:

- All trim and boxing details match existing
- All new wood siding match historical details
- Windows ¼ inch shadow line between trim and siding, if cornerboards exist the same projected shadow lines
- Window trim 4 inch minimum for (wood siding) widow sills
- 1 1/8 – 1 ½ inch thickness minimum with A1" projection past window trim
- Siding to boxing proper frieze to siding to rake details with appropriate and historically accurate trim and details
- All wood products are smooth grained (or substitutes)
- 5 inch or 6 inch reveal, wood

365 Day Stay of demolition has been waived with this approval of renovation plans.
Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH REVISED DRAWINGS TO STAFF FOR PROBABLE APPROVAL. 365 DAY STAY OF DEMOLITION REMOVED WITH APPROVED PLANS.**

- **MS. TITUS DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HERSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-107-612 E. WORTHINGTON AVENUE - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS
The existing structure is a c. 1915 two and one half story Four Square/Bungalow style house. Features include a brick main floor with wraparound porch and a shingled second floor with a gabled front and eave brackets. Other houses on the block are a mix of one and two story houses.

PROPOSAL
The project is an addition of a cross gabled dormer which requires removal of a portion of the roof. The addition is approximately 2'-6" above the existing ridge. The chimney will be extended per code. Window details, siding and trim materials will match existing. Final ridge height is +/-33' from grade.

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 Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** – **Addition,** Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE this** application as submitted
Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES:** HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH,WALKER
NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED AS SUBMITTED.**

- **MS. MARSHALL DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HERSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-060 -2309 CHARLOTTE DRIVE - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS
The existing structure is a c. 1925 one and one half story Colonial Revival style house . The property is on the edge of the Dilworth Historic District. It faces Ordermore Avenue to the rear which is not in the district but the back of the house is visible from this street.

PROPOSAL
The project is a rear porch addition over the existing deck, with new handrail and stairs. The height of the porch roof is 13' from deck to ridge. The system enclosing the deck is 'Weatherlite' that uses vinyl glazed windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for additions and window material. The guideline for setback does not apply.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based on no exception warranted to ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** – **Additions,** Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application due to the lack of historical details and traditional building materials.
Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES**: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER,

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION DENIED .**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-106 - 1825 MERRIMAN AVENUE – ADDITION.

EXISTING CONDITIONS
The existing structure is a 1 story American Small House constructed in 1945. Exterior features include a bay window and partial brick exterior. Adjacent houses are one and one and half stories in height. The house is approximately 6-8 feet above the sidewalk and set back approximately 38' from ROW.

PROPOSAL
The project is a rear addition that does not affect the front or sides of the house and is not highly visible from the street. The finished floor/foundation is consistent with the existing structure. Exterior materials include parged masonry walls and wood. The addition is of a very contemporary style that is almost free standing but for a light touch connector. Site features include a new retaining wall and terrace. Existing trees will remain.

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 Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based on non- compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** – **Additions –** Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for:

- Failure to compliment the original structure
- Failure to reflect the design or architectural style of the original structure
- Fenestration – window placement and size and style do not reflect the original structure

- Rhythm – not drawn from original
- Materials – not drawn from the original structure

Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 5/3 **AYES**: HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, RUMSCH

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR ADDITION DENIED.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-067 – 625 HERMITAGE COURT – ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

The application was denied in December for the following items: 1) Size – Provide numeric evidence to show proposed relationship exists within the immediate neighborhood; 2) Scale – The second floor height is too tall; 3) Massing – The designs have conflicting architectural details and proportional elements such as window size. The new procedures do not require proof of substantial redesign.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The site is a corner lot at Hermitage Court and Hermitage Road. The house is a c. 1933 Colonial style with lapped wood siding. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Myers Park National Register of Historic Places Survey. Site features include a porte cochere with a circular driveway on the right side, mature trees and a brick wall along the side yard.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is a 24'x24' detached, one story garage to be located on the right side. This requires removal and reconstruction of a portion of the existing brick wall, and a partial relocation of the driveway. The garage footprint is 24' x 24' and will engage into the brick wall. Exterior material is brick to match the wall. Roof material is slate to match the house, garage doors are wooden carriage style.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for accessory buildings.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** – **Accessory Structure,** Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** making an exception to our guidelines in the placement of structure in the side yard because the back yard is inaccessible.

- Wall height fits with existing brick wall height
- New brick will match existing brick wall
- Slate will match that on house
- Asphalt to match existing driveway.

Mr. Ristaino seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES**: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR AN EXCEPTION FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE IN THE SIDE YARD APPROVED**

- **MR. RISTAINO LEFT THE MEETING AT 5:19 AND WAS ABSENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-074, 336 SETTLERS LANE – WINDOW/DOOR REPLACEMENT

EXISTING CONDITIONS
The building is a three story condominium in the Fourth Ward Historic District. The subject property faces West 10th Street. The building was constructed in 1988. Existing windows are wood and without muntin bars.

PROPOSAL
The proposal is the installation of full vinyl replacement windows and fiberglass door. Window opening sizes will not change

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
The Commission will determine if the material and design specified is appropriate.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based on no exception warranted to ***Policy & Design Guidelines* – Window/Door Replacement**, Ms. Hartenstine made a **MOTION** to **DENY** this application for vinyl windows. ***Ms. Titus seconded***.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES**: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR WINDOW/DOOR REPLACEMENT DENIED**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-070, 609 PINE STREET – SUBSTITUTE MATERIAL

Existing Conditions
A Certificate of Appropriateness application was approved by the HDC September 9, 2015 for a new single family house. Approved material is wood lap siding.

Proposal
The applicant is applying for cementitious lap siding (Hardie 'Artisan') with 4" reveal and 6" corner boards.

Staff Recommendation
The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for substitute materials.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines* – *SUBSTITUTE MATERIALS,*** Mr. Henningson made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application to use Hardie Artisan - Smooth. All wood details and reveal to remain the same. Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES**: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTE MATERIAL APPROVED USING HARDI ARTISAN SMOOTH**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-091, 1608 MERRIMAN AVENUE – SUBSTITUTE MATERIAL

Existing Conditions
A Certificate of Appropriateness application was approved by the HDC December 14, 2016 for a new single family house. Approved material is lapped wood siding.

Proposal
The applicant is applying for cementitious lap siding (Hardie Artisan) with a 6" reveal.

Staff Recommendation
The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for substitute materials

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** – ***Substitute Materials,*** Ms. Titus made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this application as submitted with construction details and methods to be listed on the COA as stated by the applicant in the hearing. Substitute material for the columns will remain the as approved.
Mr. Henningson seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES**: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR THE USE OF SUBSTITUTE MATERIAL APPROVED, NO SUBSTITUTE MATERIAL FOR COLUMNS**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-075, 1230 EAST WORTHINGTON AVENUE – TREE REMOVAL

Existing Conditions
The existing structure is a single family house constructed in 1947. A mature red maple tree exists near the house in the rear yard.

Proposal
The proposal is the removal of the tree because of tree roots exposed above ground. The applicant would plant a large maturing tree in the corner of the rear yard.

Staff Recommendation
The Commission will determine if an exception shall be granted for tree removal.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** – **Tree Removal**. Mr. Rumsch made a **MOTION** to **APPROVE** this tree removal and replacement. A city approved large maturing canpy tree will be planted on the property.
Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES**: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR TREE REMOVAL APPROVED WITH A CITY APPROVED TREE TO BE PLANTED ON THE PROPERTY.**

APPLICATION: HDC 2017-090, 617 W. PARK AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

Existing Conditions
The existing site is a vacant lot with parcel dimensions of approximately 74' x 55'. The applicant has received a variance for the front setback and rear yard because of the parcel size and configuration. The adjacent parcel is similar in size and configuration. An alley easement exists between the properties and is unimproved but encroached upon by the adjacent owner. Adjacent structures are one to two stories in height.

Proposal
The proposal is the construction of a single family house. Design features include brick and shake siding, 6/6 pattern full size windows and wood trim. The front setback will be approximately 12' from ROW and align with the adjacent property. The HVAC unit is located in the rear yard. The driveway on the left side will continue as far as possible to the rear. If the alley access issue can be resolved, the owner will utilize the alley for access.

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

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either **FOR** or **AGAINST** the application.

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

- Remove stone veneer at base (brick or brick watertable)
- Revise left elevation to address material transition from brick siding and to address massing on rear dormer so it is not co-planer with the left elevation
- Front dormer – revise windows to address dormer scale (suggest three grouped windows)
- Show section and detail of front entrance canopy
- Show driveway with carriage track to rear of house per guidelines
- Remove rear door side lite.

Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 **AYES**: HADEN, HARTENSTINE, HENNINGSON, MARSHALL, RUMSCH, TITUS, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: **APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED**

A **MOTION** was made to approve the February minutes with revisions by Ms. Titus. Mr. Rumsch seconded and the vote to approve was unanimous.

With a meeting length of 5 hours and 31 minutes, the meeting adjourned at 6:30 pm.

Linda Keich, Clerk to Historic District Commission