



Approved October 8, 2025



CHARLOTTE
HISTORIC
PRESERVATION

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

September 10, 2025 | Room 267

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Nichelle Hawkins, Vice Chair, At-Large
Heather Wojick, Second Vice Chair, At-Large
Christopher Allred, Resident-Owner Wesley Heights
Sarah Curme, Resident-Owner Dilworth
Cameron Holtz, Resident-Owner, Fourth Ward
Christa Lineberger, Planning Commission Representative
Ann Stanley, Resident-Owner Hermitage Court
Sean Sullivan, At-Large

MEMBERS ABSENT: Shauna Bell, Chair, Resident-Owner McCrorey Heights
Emily Sowash, Resident-Owner Wilmore
Brett Taylor, Business Operator of Dilworth
Scott Whitlock, At-Large

Vacant, Resident-Owner Oaklawn Park
Vacant, Resident-Owner Plaza Midwood

OTHERS PRESENT: Kristi Harpst, HDC Staff
Candice Leite, HDC Staff
Jen Baehr, HDC Staff
Marilyn Drath, HDC Staff
Elizabeth Lamy, HDC Staff
JT Faucette, HDC Staff
Erin Chantry, Division Manager – Design & Preservation
Jill Sanchez-Myers, Sr. Assistant City Attorney
Paige Inman, Assistant City Attorney
Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

With a quorum present, Vice Chair Hawkins called the September meeting of the Historic District Commission (Commission) meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. Vice Chair Hawkins 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 Standards***. 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 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 Chair Hawkins asked that everyone please silence any electronic devices. Commissioners are asked to announce, for the record, if one leaves or arrives during the meeting. Vice Chair Hawkins requested that those in the audience remain quiet during the hearings. An audience member will be asked once to be quiet and the need for a second request will require removal from the room. Vice Chair Hawkins swore in all Applicants and Staff and continued to swear in people as they arrived for the duration of the meeting. In accordance with N.C.G.S. § 160D-947(e), subsections (4) and (5), and UDO Article 14.1.M.1, an appeal of quasi-judicial decisions may be made to the Mecklenburg County Superior Court as provided in N.C.G.S. § 160D-1402 within the time specified in N.C.G.S. § 160D-1405(d).

Ms. Curme moved to approve the August 13, 2025 meeting minutes. Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion, and it passed 8-0.

INDEX OF ADDRESSES:

CONSENT

HDCRMI-2025-00525, 2015 Dilworth Rd W	Dilworth
HDCRMI-2025-00451, 1945 Park Rd	Dilworth

CONTINUED FROM JULY 9, 2025 MEETING

HDCRMA-2024-00336, 3105, 3109, 3113, 3117, & 3121 Colyer Pl	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMA-2025-00247, 1724 Wilmore Dr	Wilmore
HDCRMAA-2025-00109, 700 Templeton Av	Dilworth

NEW CASES

HDCRMA-2025-00326, 409 Walnut Av	Wesley Heights
HDCRMI-2025-00453, 400 E Kingston Av	Dilworth
HDCRMIA-2025-00321, 1016 Isleworth Av	Dilworth

CONSENT

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BELL, SOWASH, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2025-00525, 2015 DILWORTH RD W (PID: 12111709) – FRONT PORCH CHANGES

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Known as the Patterson House, the existing building is a 2-story Colonial Revival constructed c. 1927. Architectural details include a low hip roof with deep overhangs and a main entry under curved hood. Other details include wood lap

siding with corner boards, paired 6/1 windows, and unpainted brick foundation. The lot size measures approximately 66' x 160' x53'. Adjacent structures are 1.5 and 2-story residential buildings.

In 2005, the Commission approved a rear addition, removal of existing front porch and stoop, and replacement with a new, full width front porch (COA #2005-77-D-56).

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project front porch floor changes. The 2005 front porch floor is a tile material. The applicant is proposing to change the front porch floor to brick.

The other items are Staff approvable, including the front porch railing removal, new storm door, and rear addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation numbers 9 and 10, and the City of Charlotte Design Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings: Porches, 6.17.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, Staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the Standards and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with permit-ready construction drawings submitted to Staff for final review, with the following Conditions:
 - a. Work with Staff on final pattern selection.
 - b. New brick shall match existing brick and remain unpainted.
 - c. Provide a brick/mortar sample to Staff for final review and approval prior to ordering/installation.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Vice Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

1st: **CURME** **2nd:** **WOJICK**

Ms. Curme moved to approve this application, as it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, numbers 9 and 10, and the City of Charlotte Design Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings and Porches, 6.17. She added the conditions that the applicant work with Staff on the final pattern selection and that the new brick shall match the existing brick and remain unpainted. Finally, she added that the applicant must provide a brick and mortar sample to Staff for approval prior to installation.

Ms. Wojick seconded the motion.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: **ALLRED, CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, LINEBERGER,
STANLEY, SULLIVAN, WOJICK**

NAYS: **NONE**

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR FRONT PORCH CHANGES – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BELL, SOWASH, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2025-00451, 1945 PARK RD (PID: 12108827) – ADDITION – SOLAR PANELS

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1.5-story Craftsman bungalow constructed c. 1920. Architectural details include a front bracketed gable roof, full-width engaged front porch with slightly tapered columns on top of brick piers, small side-shed dormers located between brick chimneys, exposed rafter tails, and small brackets. Lot size measures approximately 50'x 184' x 55' x 171'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single family buildings.

The removal of the aluminum wrap and restoration of the original wood siding and trim was approved under COA# HDCADM-2021-00181. A one-story rear addition and window changes were approved by the HDC on October 13, 2021, under COA# HDCRMI-2021-00601.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is the addition of solar panels on the roof. The panels will be flush mounted and no-tilt. Proposed solar panel locations are:

- Left elevation: shed dormer
- Right elevation: shed dormer, main roof behind the shed dormer, and main roof between the two side gable roofs.

No panels will be placed in front of the shed dormers. The new exterior mechanical equipment will be installed on the left elevation of the main house at the rear; co-located with existing mechanical equipment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The project is not incongruous with the Dilworth Historic District and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation numbers 1, 2, 9 and 10, and the City of Charlotte Design Standards for Rehabilitation of Building Elements: Roofs, 4.5, and New Construction for Residential Buildings, Additions, 6.20-6.24.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, Staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the Standards and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with permit-ready construction drawings submitted to Staff for final review, with the following Conditions:
 - a. The solar panels are placed in minimally visible locations, mostly on the right elevation behind the dormer. If location changes are needed, the project will return to the Commission for review.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Vice Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION: APPROVE

1st: **WOJICK** **2nd:** **HOLTZ**

Ms. Wojick moved to approve the application move to approve this application, because the project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, numbers 1, 2, 9, and 10, and the City of Charlotte Design Standards for Rehabilitation of Building Elements, Roofs, 4.5, and for New Construction of Residential Buildings, Additions, 6.20 through 6.24. She explained that the project was being approved because the solar panels are in minimally visible locations, mostly on the right elevation behind the dormer. She specified that if location changes are needed, the project will return to the Commission for review.

Ms. Holtz seconded the motion.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: **ALLRED, CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, LINEBERGER,
STANLEY, SULLIVAN, WOJICK**

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION – SOLAR PANELS – APPROVED.

CONTINUED FROM THE JULY 9, 2025 MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BELL, SOWASH, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA-2025-00247, 1724 WILMORE DR (PID: 11909510) – ADDITION

This application was continued from the July 9, 2025 meeting for the following items:

The proposed project is incongruous with the Design Standards for the following items:

1. *Context, Massing, Height & Width, Scale, and Roof Form:*
 - a. *Restudy Massing and Complexity of Form, per Standards 6.8; 6.20 numbers 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6; and Secretary of the Interior's Standards numbers 2, 9, and 10.*
 - b. *Restudy Height & Width, per Standard 6.9 and 6.20-6.24.*
 - c. *Restudy addition as a 1-story on the rear, per Standard 6.20-6.24.*
 - d. *Restudy Roof Massing, per Standards 6.8, 6.20 numbers 2 and 3; and Secretary of the Interior's Standards numbers 2, 9, and 10.*
 - e. *Restudy Roof Form, per Standards 6.8, 6.9, 6.10, 6.13 number 4; and Secretary of the Interior's Standards numbers 2 and 10.*
 - f. *Restudy coplanar dormer walls.*
2. *Doors & Windows, Rhythm, Details, and Materials:*
 - a. *Restudy Doors & Windows and Rhythm, per Standards 6.15-6.16.*
 - b. *Provide lap siding specifications.*
 - c. *Provide window and door specifications.*
 - d. *Provide trim and details specifications.*
 - e. *Provide beam and column detail.*
3. *Site Plan:*
 - a. *Provide driveway dimensions.*
 - b. *Label site plan with tree information, including species and diameter at breast height (DBH).*
 - c. *Provide tree protection information.*
 - d. *Provide rear yard calculations.*
 - e. *Show location of mechanicals on site plan.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1-story Bungalow built in 1933. Architectural features include a full-width front porch with painted brick and wood columns, a front gable roof with wood shake siding, a painted brick foundation, German lap and vinyl siding, 3/1 and 1/1 double-hung windows, a central unpainted brick chimney, and a right-side brick chimney with painted brick below the roofline. Lot size is approximately 50' x 227.50'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5-story single-family structures.

PROPOSAL:

The project is a rear addition, with covered deck, that is taller and wider than the existing structure. The upper addition raises the main ridge approximately 3'-10". The existing rear shed, and deck will be removed. The proposed overall first-floor footprint measurements approximately 36'-0" x 32'-8". Materials include an unpainted parged block foundation,

5/16" thick lap siding (material and reveal not provided), 3/1 double-hung wood windows with trim to match existing, wood handrails on the side entry, and a shingle roof to match existing. Materials for trim and details not provided. Driveway dimensions not provided. Rear yard permeability not provided. Tree information not provided.

Revised Proposal – September 10, 2025

- Revised presentation provided.
- Massing, height & width, and roof restudy provided.
- Revised footprint measures approximately 38'-0" x 28'-8", with bump-in.
 - Bump-in happens at the 22'-0" mark moving back from the start of the addition.
 - Bump-in dimension not provided.
- Two height increase options.
 - Option 1: Height Increase 3'-6"
 - Option 2: Height Increase 4'-6"
- Revised site plan provides driveway and tree information.
- Siding is proposed to be Hardie Artisan and wood sake. Main structure is all wood.
- Windows are proposed to be Sierra Pacific wood double-hung.
- Brackets are proposed to be wood. No other trim detail material provided.
- Column and beam detail provided.
- Replace existing concrete front porch steps with unpainted brick steps.
- Replacement of the front porch handrails with new wood handrails.
- Removal of a secondary chimney proposed.
- The addition of a Hardie Artisan 12'-0"x 10'-0" shed proposed.
- Rear yard post-construction impervious is 17%.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Context, Massing, Height & Width, Scale, and Roof Form:
 - a. Option 1: Height Increase 3'-6"
 - i. Height is 0'-6" above the typical 3'-0" approval.
 - ii. Window and door header heights do not align with main structure.
 - b. Option 2: Height Increase 4'-6"
 - i. Height is 1'-6" above the typical 3'-0" approval.
 - ii. Window and door header heights do align with main structure.
 - c. Restudy coplanar dormer walls on left and right elevation.
 - d. Restudy rear gable pitch to eliminate knee wall and intersection with gable end on right and left elevations.
 - e. Provide addition bump-in dimension.
 - f. Secondary chimneys located to the rear may be considered for removal, per Standard 4.7, number 4.
2. Doors & Windows, Rhythm, Details, and Materials:
 - a. Restudy gable end windows.
 - i. Too close to the brackets.
 - b. Provide window and door specifications.
 - i. May be provided to Staff for probable approval.
 - c. Confirm all trim and details will be wood.
 - d. Restudy beam and column detail and alignment.
 - i. Consider an engaged column on the right side of rear porch.
3. Site Plan:
 - a. Repair and replace only damaged elements of porches by matching materials, per Standard 4.8, number 2.
 - i. Brick proposed for front steps should match unpainted brick on existing foundation.

- ii. If secondary chimney is approved for removal, consider reusing brick for front steps and side entrance steps, if approved.
- b. Hardie Artisan 12'-0"x 10'-0" shed, may be provided to Staff for probable approval.
 - i. Commission to determine if additional windows are needed.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Vice Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION: CONTINUE

1st: SULLIVAN 2nd: LINEBERGER

Mr. Sullivan moved to continue the application because the proposed project is incongruous with the following Standards: for massing, 6.8; for height and width, 6.9; for scale, 6.10; for roof forms, 6.13; for windows, 6.15 and 6.16; for driveways, 8.2, number 8. He required that the applicant restudy the following: the coplanar dormers, suggesting a four to six-inch reduction in width; raising the header heights on the addition's windows and doors to be consistent with the existing structure; details for the gable windows; and the rear porch columns and beams, specifically noting the column that is closest to the side of the house. He also required the applicant to confirm that there is a driveway strip that allows 12 to 24 inches of planting strip between the driveway and the side of the house.

Ms. Lineberger suggested that the motion require the applicant to relate the height of the new foundation to the height of foundations on historic buildings found within the context of the new building when lowering grade to achieve greater overall height to the new building. She cited the Standard for foundation, 6.12, number 1. Mr. Sullivan accepted the amendment.

Ms. Wojick suggested that the motion include a requirement to reuse the bricks from the secondary chimney that will be removed from the back. She cited standard 4.7, number 4. Mr. Sullivan accepted the amendment, noting that the removal of the secondary chimney is congruent with the referenced Standard.

Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion.

VOTE: 8/0

**AYES: ALLRED, CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, LINEBERGER,
STANLEY, SULLIVAN, WOJICK**

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION – CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BELL, SOWASH, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA-2024-00336, 3105, 3109, 3113, 3117, & 3121 COLYER PL (PID: 09506133, 09506134, 09506135, 09506136, & 09506137) – CHANGES TO AN APPROVED CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – AFTER THE FACT

This application was continued from the July 9, 2025 meeting for the following items:

The following items were continued for additional review and rework based on the fact that the details do not meet the current Design Standards and are lacking information that was previously approved.

1. *Doors and Window Changes, per Design Standard 6.15.*

- a. *Provide a restudy for the windows on the South Elevation Unit 3105 as shown on Slide 23. There have been modifications to the second- floor and third-floor windows, and neither one of those changes meet the Standards for window proportion and light pattern and are inconsistent with the rhythm of the rest*

- of the building.*
- b. *Provide a restudy of the windows on the North elevation, where there is misalignment of certain windows to eave details, misalignment of windows from third floor to second floor.*
 - c. *Door changes. Review and resubmit different door designs. The one light configuration is inconsistent with the Standards.*
2. *Cornices and Trim Changes, per Design Standard 6.14.*
 - a. *There are too many different details that are being presented for the cornice, fascia, and soffit details. The Commission needs to understand more specifically what the overall consistency is going to be and whether or not that means that there are soffit depth changes or rake fascia board changes. All cornice, fascia, and soffit designs need to be brought back in detail.*
 - b. *The overall project needs to be reviewed for bracket locations, size, and scaling*
 3. *Column details, per Design Standards for Masonry, 5.5 and Cornices and Trim, 6.14*
 - a. *The column details need to be reviewed and a new proposal brought back for both the column and the cap details. Will the cap detail be a concrete cap, a rowlock, or other?*
 4. *Elevations Changes*
 - a. *Review the proportions brick between the top of the garage doors and the bottom of the second floor windows and propose an alternative.*
 - b. *The panel detailing with the diagonal orientation for the siding is inconsistent with the Standards; provide an alternative design for consideration.*
 - c. *Lighting locations, as shown are above the garage doors, need to be re-evaluated and re-presented with alternative solution(s).*
 - d. *On the South and West elevations, the brick sills and the engagement of the porch roof and how the flashing engages with them needs to be addressed and re-presented.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The property at 2010 The Plaza is the VanLandingham Estate, a designated local historic landmark. The four-acre property has two accessory buildings with fairly dense landscaping.

On May 12, 2021, the Commission approved the construction of four new buildings that comprise a total of 22 townhomes under application number COA# HDCRMA-2020-00467. Design changes to Building One, which faces The Plaza, were approved by the Commission on April 13, 2022 under COA# HDCRMA-2022-00236. The construction of the other three buildings each have their own individual COA.

Building One Approval Summary:

- The height of Building One is 33-6", measured from grade to ridge at the tallest point (the unit facing The Plaza).
- The building setback is approximately 55'-2" from back of curb to front thermal wall.
- Materials include Nichiha Savannah smooth lap siding, Miratec windowsills and soffits, corner boards that sit proud of the siding, and brick.
- The windows are Jeld-Wen 2500-series double-hung wood with traditional wide rails, 1/1 lite pattern, 3" fiber cement brickmould, and brick rowlock sill.
- The entry doors are wood, and the garage doors are the Wayne Dalton 9510 six light steel overlay garage doors in a carriage house style, with hardware added to the double-doors to give the appearance of separate doors.
- Roofing material is asphalt shingle with wood fascia and decorative brackets.
- On the front unit facing The Plaza, the front walkway connecting to The Plaza is pea gravel, approximately 5' wide.

PROPOSAL:

This project is in the enforcement process. Staff conducted a final inspection on Building One on March 27, 2024, and found that the constructed project did not match the COA approved plans. The deviation from approved plans is found on all 4 elevations. Staff is unable to approve many of the design changes. The applicant is proposing to come into compliance by requesting the Commission's approval of design changes to Building One, which faces The Plaza and

Colyer Place. The applicant is also requesting that if these changes are permitted, that Staff be able to approve the same changes to Building 4, as applicable.

The changes include:

Overall height changes, all elevations (Page A.1 – A.4; S.1 – S.6)

- a. North, South, and West elevation approved height is 33'-6"; as-built height is 31.28'.
- b. East elevation approved height is 28'-2"; as-built height is 23.56'.

Roof changes – North, South, & West Elevations (Page A.1 – A.2, A.4; S.2 - S.6)

- a. Shallower roof pitches than approved on certain dormers.

Window changes, all elevations (Page A.1 – A.4; S.1 – S.6)

- a. Style
 - i. Type (i.e. casement in place of double-hung)
 - ii. Quantity (single window used where double window was indicated)
- b. Lite pattern.
- c. Window size opening.
- d. Proportion of window (vertical orientation vs horizontal orientation).

Door changes, South Elevation (facing Colyer Pl), North Elevation (facing VanLandingham Estate), & East Elevation (facing driveway) (Page A.1 – A.4; S.1– S.6)

- a. Front entry door style and lite pattern.
- b. Back door style and lite pattern.

Foundation changes, all elevations (Page A.1 – A.4; S.1 – S.6)

- a. Foundation heights changed from approved plans due field changes in grade.
- b. Handrails and guardrails for porches, patios, and stoops were eliminated.

Cornices and Trim changes, all elevations (Page A.1 – A.4; S.1 – S.6)

- a. Cornice and trim details do not match the COA and are proportionally incorrect and/or are missing.

Elevation detail changes:

- a. South, East, & West Elevations (Page A.1 & A.3; S.1, S.4 – S.5)
 - i. Paneling details (with diagonally oriented lap siding) on window bay bump-outs.
 - ii. Size of panels differs in various locations.
 - iii. Some areas where three panels were indicated were built as two larger panels.
- b. North Elevation (Page A.4; S.2 - S.3)
 - i. Misalignment of certain windows to defining eave/trim details.
 - ii. Misalignment of certain windows from third to second floor.
 - iii. Lighting location moved from approved location next to door to above the doors.
- c. South & West Elevations (Page A.1-A.2; S.4 - S.6)
 - i. Cornice, fascia, and brick sill detail changes.
- d. North & South Elevations (Page A.2 and A.4; S.2 - S.3, S.5 - S.6)
 - i. Smooth panel siding installed on dormers instead of lap siding.
- e. South Elevation (Page A.2; S.5 - S.6)
 - i. Proportion of brick between top of garage door and bottom of second story window is taller than approved elevation.

Staff approvable changes include:

- a. Omission of some decorative brackets.
- b. HVAC screening change.
- c. Handrails to one set of entry stairs as required by Building Code.
- d. Garage door lite pattern.
- e. Rear patio door style and lite pattern.

The project is considered an After-the-Fact review, with the Commission reviewing the project on its merits as if work has not yet occurred.

Revised Proposal – September 10, 2025

1. Windows and Doors Changes:

Items provided by Applicant:

- a. As-built window schedule, with specific windows noted as not meeting egress requirements.
- b. Additional notes explaining the window changes for the South and North Elevation of Unit 3105.

Items not provided by Applicant:

- a. A restudy of the windows on the North elevation regarding misalignment of windows from third floor to second floor.
- b. A restudy for the windows on the South Elevation of Unit 3105 regarding modifications to the second floor and third-floor windows.
- c. Restudy of the door designs.

2. Cornice and Trim Changes:

Items provided by Applicant:

- a. Proposals for trimming gutters at eave intersections.

Items not provided by Applicant:

- a. Revised cornice information for the entire building.
- b. Further review of bracket locations, size, and scaling for the entire building.

3. Column Details:

Items provided by Applicant:

- a. Additional photos of front porch column caps of Unit 3105.

Items not provided by Applicant:

- a. No new information or proposal regarding column caps.

4. Elevation Changes:

Items provided by Applicant:

- a. Mass reduction techniques are proposed on the South Elevation above the garage doors.
- b. Restudy of the three-panel detail below triple windows.
- c. Requested lighting restudy partly provided, with an alternate exterior light fixture selection on the South Elevation.
- d. Additional information regarding masonry flashing.

Items not provided by Applicant:

- a. New lighting locations as shown are above the garage doors.
- b. No revisions to the brick sills and flashing engagement

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Doors and Window Changes, per Design Standard 6.15.
 - a. No changes are proposed to the plans submitted/reviewed at the July meeting.
2. Cornices and Trim Changes per Design Standard 6.14.
 - a. No changes are proposed to the plans submitted/reviewed at the July meeting.
3. Column details, per Design Standards for Masonry, 5.5 and Cornices and Trim, 6.14.
 - a. No changes are proposed to the plans submitted/reviewed at the July meeting.
4. Elevations Changes
 - a. The addition of wood trellis with small brackets above the garage doors does not match the architectural style of the rest of the building.
 - b. The diagonal siding in the double panels under triple windows will be replaced with three smooth finish fiber cement panels that align with the triple windows.
 - i. The change to smooth paneling is more contemporary and does not match the architectural

- style of the rest of the building.
- ii. Trim detailing around the revised panels has not been specified.
 - iii. It is unclear if the remaining panels with diagonal siding will remain as-is or also switch to a smooth finish.
- c. The brick sill on above the front porch roof of Unit 3105 is still covered with flashing, and no alternative has been proposed.
- d. Light Fixtures:
- i. No new location for light fixtures has been provided.
 - ii. The alternate style of light fixture is not incongruous with Standards for Lighting 8.12, numbers 4, 6, and 8.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Vice Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION 1: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

1st: WOJICK 2nd: LINEBERGER

Ms. Wojick moved to approve the application for the new roof line over the existing garage doors with a metal detailing and bracket design. She required that the applicant create construction documentation for this design and that they work with Staff on the final detailing of the materials, proportion, and scale of the elements. She also added that the motion would approve the recessed lighting to be included in that structure. She added the following Standards: for roofs, 6.13; and for lighting, 8.12.

Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion.

VOTE 1: 8/0

**AYES: ALLRED, CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, LINEBERGER,
STANLEY, SULLIVAN, WOJICK**

NAYS: NONE

DECISION 1: APPLICATION FOR ROOF CHANGES & LIGHTING– APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

MOTION 2: CONTINUE

1st: WOJICK 2nd: HOLTZ

Ms. Wojick moved to continue the application for the following: a restudy of the window proportion and lite pattern of second and third floor windows on all elevations of Unit 3105 to ensure that the bottom windows present as being equal or bigger than the top windows, referencing Slide 4 of the supplement and citing Standards 6.15 and 4.14; referencing Slide 5 of the supplement that new door configurations that meet Standard 6.15; a restudy of the boxing detail to ensure it is consistent across the building and matches what was approved and that correct gutter information needs to be presented, citing Standards 414 and 6.14 and referencing Slide 6; a restudy of the bracket size, location, and scaling to match the approved details which had an offset between the header and column, citing Standards 6.14 and 5.5 for masonry; a restudy of the siding as the diagonal siding presented does not meet the Standard for siding; technical information on the waterproofing and explaining why the wall flashing is needed and how that impacts the siding orientation, design, and paneling detailing referencing Slide 10 of the supplement and citing the Standard for masonry, 5.5.

Ms. Holtz seconded the motion.

VOTE 2: 8/0

**AYES: ALLRED, CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, LINEBERGER,
STANLEY, SULLIVAN, WOJICK**

NAYS: NONE

DECISION 2: APPLICATION FOR CHANGES TO APPROVED COA – CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BELL, SOWASH, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK

RECUSE: LINEBERGER

APPLICATION:**HDCRMAA-2025-00109, 700 TEMPLETON AV (PID: 12305619) – MATERIAL CHANGES – AFTER THE FACT**

This application was continued from the July 9, 2025 meeting for the following items:

Bring a sample for Commission consideration of the existing brick with the stain recommended by Staff. The sample size should be four feet by three feet at minimum, so it shows both the brick size and relationship to the proposed mortar.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The original structure was a 1-story brick house constructed in 1936. The lot size is approximately 50' x 148'. Adjacent residential structures are a mix of 1 ½ and 2-story structures. A multi-family development is located behind the house.

A 365-day stay of demolition was placed on the property on July 13, 2016 (Case# HDC 2016-123).

The HDC approved an addition and accessory building on this site under application number HDC 2016-274 at the March 8, 2017 meeting. Under the approval, COA# HDC 2016-274, the original brick exterior was to remain, with new brick added to match existing.

The original brick was completely removed and new brick/mortar that does not match the original historic brick was installed. Neither the removal of the brick nor the new brick was approved by either the Commission or Staff.

At the April 12, 2023 meeting, a proposal to stain the new brick a more traditional brick color was denied by the HDC (under application number HDCRMAA-2023-00061).

PROPOSAL:

Proposal – July 9, 2025

The Applicant's proposal includes two options:

Option 1: Keep brick exterior as constructed on the principal structure. Brick is Evelyn Bay Grey. Applicant's presentation indicates they will bring a physical sample to the meeting.

Option 2: Bring the color of the new brick into compliance with the originally approved project (COA# HDC 2016-274), by staining the new brick a traditional red color using a Beek stain, color C-142. Applicant's presentation indicates they will bring a physical sample of the Evelyn Bay Grey brick stained with the proposed Beek stain to the meeting

The project is considered an After-the-Fact review, with the Commission reviewing the project on its merits according to the Design standards as if work has not yet occurred.

Revised Proposal – September 10, 2025

- Via email dated 8/25/2025, Applicant to provide physical sample of stained brick on September 10, 2025, HDC meeting day.
- Stain manufacturer is KEIM, color unknown

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The Commission is to decide if staining the existing brick a more traditional red meets the Design Standards.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Vice Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION: CONTINUE

1st: **SULLIVAN** **2nd:** **HOLTZ**

Mr. Sullivan moved to continue the application. He required the applicant to provide examples of the brick that is on the property with various levels of stain and dilution, using pages 8, 9, and 10 of the agenda supplement for guidance on stain colors. He cited the Standard for masonry, 5.5. He also added the requirement that the applicant bring at least one four-by-three feet sample of the brick currently on the house to showcase the stain and brick and mortar joint relationship and that the selected stain has more traditional-looking appearance color and texture

Ms. Holtz seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: ALLRED, CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ,
STANLEY, SULLIVAN, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR MATERIAL CHANGES – AFTER THE FACT – CONTINUED.**NEW CASES****ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: BELL, SOWASH, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK

RETURN: LINEBERGER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA-2025-00326, 409 WALNUT AV (PID: 07101312) – ACCESSORY DWELING UNIT

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is one-story, Craftsman constructed c. 1930. Architectural features include wrapped porch on the left-side with painted stucco columns, painted stucco siding, wood shake gable ends with 4-light window and shutters, a red brick chimney located on the front-left side, concrete front steps with stucco wingwalls at the porch, and concrete steps to the public sidewalk. Features also include wood double-hung 6/1 windows and a wood fan light front door. The lot size is approximately 55.71' x 187.50'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

- The proposed project is a one-story Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU).
- The footprint of the new garage measures approximately 39'-8" x 27'-2". See sheet A-3.0.
- The height, as measured from grade to ridge, is approximately 16'-6". 1'-8" will be subgrade. See sheet A-3.1.
- Proposed materials include unpainted brick foundation, stucco siding, wood cedar shake in the gable ends, wood trim and details, and architectural shingle roof. See sheet A-4.1.
- Windows are proposed to be wood double-hung 1/1 and 4-light Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL) with wood trim. Material specification sheet not specified. Trim detail drawing not provided. See sheet A-4.1.

- Doors proposed to be wood. Material specification sheet not specified. See sheet A-4.1.
- Post-construction, the rear-yard impermeable area will be 26.69%. See sheet A-0.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Massing, Height and Width, Scale, and Size:
 - a. Accessory buildings should be clearly secondary, especially in scale, massing, and other architectural elements, per Standards 8.10, number 3 and 6.5-6.6.
2. Foundation
 - a. Height of the foundation should relate to historic foundation heights.
3. Doors & Windows, and Rhythm:
 - a. Provide window specification sheet.
 - b. Window light pattern should match historic window light pattern on main house.
 - c. Provide brickmold window trim detail.
 - i. Window trim should match trim on main structure.
 - ii. Ganged window trim should match ganged trim on main structure.
 - d. Provide door specification sheet.
 - e. Doors include 9-light/2-panel and single-light/single-panel.
 - f. Square light pattern on garage doors is incongruous with light pattern on main structure.
4. Materials and Details:
 - a. Will the stucco be over concrete block?
 - b. Will gutters/downspouts be installed on accessory building?
 - i. If so, then locations, details, and materials are needed.
5. Site Work:
 - a. Will the existing rear yard parking pad be retained?
 - i. Revisit rear-yard impermeable area to include parking pad.
 - b. Will a retaining wall be needed along the side elevations?
 - c. Include mechanicals on site plan.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Vice Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION: CONTINUE

1st: **WOJICK** **2nd:** **SULLIVAN**

Ms. Wojick moved to continue the application for a restudy of the height, width, scale, and size. She suggested that the applicant give special attention to the overall height of the walls and how that impacts the overall height of the structure and the potential footprint of structure. She also required a restudy of the door and window rhythms as well as accurate construction drawings of the main house for comparison to the proposed ADU. She cited the following Standards: for height, width, scale, and size, 6.8 through 6.10; for doors and windows, 6.15 through 6.16; for drawings, 8.10, number 3.

Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: ALLRED, CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, LINEBERGER,
STANLEY, SULLIVAN, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT – CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BELL, SOWASH, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2025-00453, 400 E KINGSTON AV (PID: 12308301) – WINDOW/DOOR CHANGES

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Known as the Mallonee-Jones House, the existing structure is a 2-story Queen Anne completed in 1895. The building is one of two houses still standing in Dilworth designed by Charlotte's first professional architect, C.C. Hook. Architectural features include a high hip center second with multiple side and front gabled projections with sunburst motif; a wraparound front porch; second story one-bay balconies; and an off-center gabled entry. The building has a two-story rear ell with engaged porch. The exterior is German lap siding with wood corner boards, original front door, and 1/1 wood windows. The 1929 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map shows that a portion of the wraparound porch on the left elevation was enclosed as a sunporch. The lot size measures approximately 50' x 140'. Adjacent historic structures are 2 and 2.5-story residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is in two (2) parts: 1. Changes to the 1929 sunporch enclosure; 2. converting a rear storage area to heated space.

1. Changes to the 1929 sunporch enclosure. Window changes on the front/left elevation of the wraparound porch are proposed. The project details area as follows:
 - a. Left elevation:
 - i. Install two (2) new 16-pane wood windows to match existing.
 - ii. New wood casing and trim to match existing will also be installed.
 - iii. See Sheet HDC-5.
 - b. Front elevation:
 - i. Remove the 1/1 living room window to create a permanent opening to the sun porch from the main house. See Sheet HDC-10B.
 - ii. Repair or replace the window at the front porch. Two (2) options are provided. For both options, all new siding and trim will match existing. See Sheets HDC-4 and HDC 10-B.
 1. Option 1: Maintain existing 16-pane window and repair.
 2. Option 2: Relocate the original 1/1 living room window to this space.
2. Converting a rear storage area to heated space. See Sheets HDC-6, HDC-7, and HDC-10.
 - a. Remove lattice, trim, and fixed 4-pane window.
 - b. Install wood German lap siding and wood corner boards to match existing.
 - c. Install paired casement wood windows.
 - d. Install new rear wood entry door and new unpainted brick steps. New door will have a transom in a design to match an existing decorative window on the right elevation.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Front Elevation.
 - a. Living room window:
 - i. Will the cased opening change? Or since the window goes nearly to the floor, will all the original window trim remain?
2. Converting a rear storage area to heated space.
 - a. Confirm new entry door and windows will be wood.
3. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Vice Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**1st:** **HOLTZ****2nd:** **LINEBERGER**

Ms. Holtz moved to approve the applications it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for doors and windows, 6.15 and 6.16. She added the following conditions: that the applicant move forward with Option 1 for the front elevation; that they provide detailed drawings of the siding to Staff for approval; that the rear storage area's trim and siding reveal details be submitted to Staff for approval to ensure that it clearly reads as an addition; and that all doors and windows be fully wood with details provided to Staff for review.

Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: **ALLRED, CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, LINEBERGER,
STANLEY, SULLIVAN, WOJICK**

NAYS: **NONE**

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR WINDOW & DOOR CHANGE – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: BELL, SOWASH, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMIA-2025-00321, 1016 ISLEWORTH AV (PID: 12311117) – FRONT DOOR REPLACEMENT – AFTER THE FACT

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 2-story brick Colonial Revival built c. 1936. Architectural features include a side gable roof with pent eaves, a covered entry stoop with triangular portico on the right of the front elevation, and a brick interior chimney on the left elevation. The original side porch on the left elevation has been converted to heated living space and is clad in vinyl siding. Exterior materials include an 8-lite wood front entry door and 6/1 double-hung wood windows with wood louvered shutters. The lot size is approximately 55' x 204'. Adjacent buildings are 1.5 and 2-story single and multi-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is the replacement of an original front door, and the scope of work includes:

1. The historic 8-lite wood front entry door will be removed.
2. The proposed replacement door is a mahogany half-lite door with an Art Deco-inspired sunburst window design.
3. The exterior trim around the door will not change.

The project is considered an After-the-Fact review, with the Commission reviewing the project on its merits as if work has not yet occurred.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The Commission needs to make one (1) decision about this project:
 - a. Review the replacement of the historic 8-light wood front door with a new Art Deco-style door with half-lite sunburst window.
2. For Decision 1: Replacement of historic front door.
 - a. A historic 8-light front door has been removed and is not available to evaluate if it can be repaired.
 - b. Recommended Motion: Denial.
 - i. The replacement of the historic front entry door is incongruous with the Design Standards for Front Doors and Entrances 4.10, numbers 1 and 2; and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards 2.5, numbers 2, 3, and 6.

- c. Recommended Facts:
- i. The new door is an Art Deco-style door with half-lite sunburst window, which is incongruous with the Colonial Revival style of the building.
 - ii. The existing front door is a historic door.
 - iii. The existing door is not available to evaluate if it can be repaired.
3. Applicant should work with Staff to bring the project into compliance with Historic District Design Standards, as required by the Unified Development Ordinance.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Vice Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION: DENY

1st: **LINEBERGER** **2nd:** **HOLTZ**

Ms. Lineberger moved to deny the application as it does not meet the Standards for front doors and entrances, 4.10, numbers 1 and 2, nor the Secretary of the Interior's Standards 2.5, numbers 2, 3, and 6. She added that the applicant can work with Staff to bring the project into compliance with the Historic District Design Standards as required by the Unified Development Ordinance

Ms. Holtz seconded the motion.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: **ALLRED, CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, LINEBERGER,**
STANLEY, SULLIVAN, WOJICK

NAYS: **NONE**

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR FRONT DOOR REPLACEMENT – AFTER THE FACT – DENIED.

With no further business to discuss, Vice Chair Hawkins adjourned the meeting at 5:41 p.m.