



---

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
August 14, 2024 | Room 267

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Nichelle Hawkins (Chair)  
Kim Parati (Vice Chair)  
Chris Barth (Second Vice Chair)  
Shauna Bell  
Christa Lineberger  
Brett Taylor  
Heather Wojcik

MEMBERS ABSENT: Sean Sullivan  
Scott Whitlock  
Vacant, Resident-Owner Dilworth  
Vacant, Resident-Owner Fourth Ward  
Vacant, Resident-Owner Hermitage Court  
Vacant, Resident-Owner Oaklawn Park  
Vacant, Resident-Owner Wilmore

OTHERS PRESENT: Candice Leite, HDC Staff  
Elizabeth Lamy, HDC Staff  
Jen Baehr, HDC Staff  
Marilyn Drath, HDC Staff  
JT Faucette, HDC Staff  
Jill Sanchez-Myers, Senior Assistant City Attorney  
Nicole Hewett, Assistant City Attorney  
Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

---

With a quorum present, Chair Hawkins called the August meeting of the Historic District Commission (Commission) meeting to order at 1:09 p.m. 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. 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. 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. Chair Hawkins swore in all Applicants and Staff and continued to swear in people as they arrived for the duration of the meeting. Appeals from the Historic District Commission are to the Zoning Board of Adjustment within thirty (30) days from the date of the decision to appeal. This is in accordance with Section 10.213 of the City Zoning Ordinance.

---

The Commission heard the applications for multiple prospective commissioners to fill vacant seats.

Ms. Parati moved to nominate Ms. Cameron Holtz for the Fourth Ward Resident-Owner Seat. Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion, and the Commission voted to approve it, 7-0.

Ms. Lineberger moved to nominate Ms. Sarah Curme for the Dilworth Resident-Owner Seat. Ms. Wojick seconded the motion, and the Commission voted to approve it, 5-2.

---

#### **INDEX OF ADDRESSES:**

##### **CONSENT**

HDCRMA-2024-00342, 420 E Tremont Av	Dilworth
HDCRMI-2024-00340, 1147 Langanore Pl	Dilworth
HDCRMA-2024-00199, 918 Magnolia Av	Dilworth

##### **NOT HEARD AT THE JULY 10 MEETING**

HDCCMA-2023-00991, 927 East Bv	Dilworth
HDCCMI-2023-01121, 1218 East Bv	Dilworth
HDCRMA-2023-01124, 2000 Dilworth Rd W	Dilworth
HDCRMIA-2023-00862, 1547 Merriman Av	Wilmore
HDCCMA-2023-00992, 224, 228, 232, & 236 W Kingston Av	Wilmore

##### **CONTINUED FROM THE JUNE 10 MEETING**

HDCRDEMO-2023-01189, 1514-1516 Hamorton Pl	Plaza Midwood
--------------------------------------------	---------------

##### **CONTINUED FROM THE JULY 10 MEETING**

HDCCMA-2023-01193, 1921 Charlotte Dr	Dilworth
HDCRMA-2023-00988, 501 N Poplar St	Fourth Ward
HDCRMA-2022-00897, 1411 & 1413 W 4 <sup>th</sup> St	Wesley Heights

##### **NEW CASES**

HDCRMIA-2023-01195, 928 Ideal Wy	Dilworth
HDCCMIA-2024-00063, 1513 S Mint St	Wilmore
HDCRMIA-2024-00068, 221 Grandin Rd	Wesley Heights
HDCRMIA-2024-00081, 1627 Oaklawn Av	McCrorey Heights

---

## CONSENT

---

### **ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: SULLIVAN, WHITLOCK

RECUSED: TAYLOR

### **APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA-2024-00342, 420 E TREMONT AV (PID: 12106817) – REAR ADDITION**

### **EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing building is 1-story Craftsman bungalow constructed c. 1920. Architectural details include a high, nearly pyramidal hip roof with a lower hip projection partial-width engaged front porch on shingled posts, deep eaves, wood double-hung windows in a 4/1 pattern, and an exterior unpainted brick chimney on the left elevation. The exterior is wood lap siding with corner boards and an unpainted foundation brick. The lot size is approximately 50' x 150'. Adjacent historic structures are 1 and 1.5 story residential buildings.

### **PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a 1-story rear addition that ties into the main ridge. The property topography slopes down from the rear to the front causing flooding and draining issues. See Sheet HDC 0.5 for photographs. The rear addition is constructed to create a brick water table that aligns with the height of the historic front porch low wall. The brick water table will function as a retaining wall which, along with the installation of additional perimeter drainage, will direct water away from the house and mitigate some of the rear yard flooding.

The addition will step in at both original rear corners and the corner boards will remain. On the right elevation the step-in is 4' in length before the addition bumps out toward the right property line. An engaged rear porch will mimic the design of the original front porch. No changes are proposed to the front elevation. A number of 3D models are provided, including one at the bottom of Sheet A2.0 showing the pedestrian perspective from the public right-of-way.

All existing windows are to remain, except for the double-hung at the rear of the right elevation. This window will be enlarged to match existing for egress purposes. All new windows are proposed to be Jeld-Wen Sitrine or Kolbe double-hung aluminum clad with exterior Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL) in a 4/1 pattern to match existing. Proposed exterior materials are traditional materials to match existing including wood lap siding, wood corner boards and wood window/door/roof trim, and brick foundation. All brick is noted as to remain unpainted.

There is one 23" mature canopy tree along the right property line, which is to remain and be protected during construction. A tree protection plan is provided. Post construction rear yard impervious surface is approximately 31%.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6.
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. Relocate dormer further back on the roof, or resize, so the window does not align with the original rear corner.
  - b. Reduce the massing of the proposed new chimney by matching the design of the original historic chimney.
  - c. The larger chimney base is being permitted because of its functional purpose as a retaining wall to address

draining issues.

- d. Provide a window trim detail with dimensions.
  - e. Provide window and door specifications that meet HDC requirements.
  - f. Provide brick/mortar sample to Staff for probable approval.
  - g. The shake siding should be individually applied shakes, not panels of shakes.
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 Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>: WOJICK      2<sup>nd</sup>: BARTH**

Ms. Wojick moved to approve the application with the conditions, A-G, that Staff recommended. She also added conditions that foundation specifications be submitted to show how the existing tree on the property will be preserved and that the applicant review the placement of the dormer with Staff.

She cited the Standards for new construction of residential buildings, Chapter 6.

Mr. Barth seconded the motion and then suggested the friendly amendment that the applicant be given the option of moving the dormer two feet forward.

Ms. Wojick accepted the friendly amendment.

**VOTE: 6/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR REAR ADDITION – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: SULLIVAN, WHITLOCK

RECUSED: TAYLOR

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2024-00340, 1147 LINGANORE PL (PID: 12310407) – REAR ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing building is a 1.5-story Cottage with Colonial Revival elements constructed c. 1950. The building has an L-shaped plan with the front door facing the left property line. The building has an attached street-facing garage. The front gable roofs on the main house and garage have pent eaves and triangular vents. Windows are 6/9 and 8/8 on the front elevation, 8/8 in the rear gable, and 6/6 everywhere else. The windows on the front and left elevations have operable shutters. The front door has a transom above and decorative trim surround. The exterior is painted brick. The lot size is approximately 75' x 180' x 85' x 168'. Adjacent structures are 1.5, 2, and 2.5-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a rear addition of an open porch and masonry fireplace with built-in log storage. The footprint of the porch addition is 16'-4" x 24'-0". Proposed materials are traditional to match existing, including an unpainted brick foundation, unpainted brick fireplace, lap siding on the gable ends, and architectural asphalt roof shingles. The chimney is taller than the original building and is visible from the front elevation as shown on Sheet A-4.0, which requires Commission review.

Staff approved a patio, unpainted brick retaining wall, and unpainted brick steps along the left and rear sides of the building under COA# HDCADMRM-2024-00571.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the Standards for New Construction of Residential Buildings, Chapter 6.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, Staff recommends Approval of the addition for meeting all 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. Confirm siding, eave, soffit, fascia and column materials and dimensions on addition with Staff.
  - b. Provide a beam/column detail for the porch addition.
  - c. Provide brick/mortar sample to Staff.
  - d. All new masonry will be unpainted.
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 Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>: BELL      2<sup>nd</sup>: BARTH**

Ms. Bell moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for new construction of residential buildings, Chapter 6. She added the following conditions: that the permit-ready construction drawings with final materials and dimensions of the siding, eave, soffit, and fascia be provided to Staff, that a beam and column detail and brick and mortar samples be provided, and that all new masonry will be unpainted. .

Mr. Barth seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 6/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR REAR ADDITION – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: SULLIVAN, WHITLOCK

RECUSED: TAYLOR

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA-2024-00199, 918 MAGNOLIA AV (PID: 12111824) – ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1-story Craftsman bungalow constructed c. 1925. Architectural features include a symmetrical façade a central entry flanked by 1/1 triple windows, wood shake siding, with lap siding and battens in the gable ends, brackets, and an unpainted exterior brick chimney. The front porch features a prominent open gable supported by round columns, a broken terracotta floor, and red square tile front porch steps. The lot size is approximately 60' x 223'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings and an institutional structure.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a rear addition, with a half-story connector on the second floor, and a rear porch that is no taller or wider than the original house. The overall dimensions of the addition are approximately 30'-0" x 38'-0". The rear porch dimensions are approximately 16'-0" x 21'-0". The height of the addition will match existing, and the half story connector will sit approximately 0'-4" below the main ridge. Proposed materials include unpainted brick foundation, wood shake, board and batten, and architectural shingles all to match existing. The rear porch also includes an unpainted brick chimney. All new windows and doors will be wood or aluminum clad wood with Simulated True Divided Light (STDL) molded muntins in a pattern to match existing. Post-construction, the rear yard open space will be approximately 79.5%, well above the required 50% minimum.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6.
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 to reduce the massing of the proposed new porch chimney.
  - b. Provide window and door specifications that meet HDC requirements.
  - c. Provide brick/mortar sample to Staff for probable approval.
  - d. The shake siding should be individually applied shakes, not panels of shakes.
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 Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>: WOJICK      2<sup>nd</sup>: LINEBERGER**

Ms. Wojick moved to approve the application with the conditions recommended by Staff as it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for new construction of residential buildings, Chapter 6. She specified that the applicant work with Staff on the details of the listed conditions and provide them with permit-ready plans.

Mr. Barth seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 6/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

**NOT HEARD AT THE JULY 10 MEETING**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: SULLIVAN, WHITLOCK

RETURNED: TAYLOR

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCCMA-2023-00991, 927 EAST BV (PID: 12311311) – ADDITIONS**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing building is a 2-story contemporary office building constructed c. 1982. The building sits on a corner lot along East Boulevard and Dilworth Road West with the main entrance facing the rear parking lot. Materials include unpainted brick and metal windows. The lot measures approximately 199.75' x 244.90'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential and commercial buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a new front addition, side addition, and rear addition to the existing building. The additions change the height, length, and setbacks along East Boulevard and Dilworth Road West.

East Boulevard

Existing building height is 27'-4"

Existing building length is 89'-4"

Existing building setback is 47.3'

Proposed addition heights range from 37'-4" to 39'-0". The proposed chimney extends an additional 5'-1".

Proposed overall length is 201'-6"

Proposed building setbacks range from 20'-0" to 23'-0"

Dilworth Road West

Existing building height is 27'-4"

Existing building overall length is 60'-0"

Existing building setback is 20.9'

Proposed addition heights range from 35'-8" to 37'-4". The proposed chimney extends an additional 5'-1".

Proposed overall length is 167'-5.75"

Proposed building setbacks range from 21'-0" to 22'-0"

Additions

Proposed dimensions of *Mass A*: 71'-1" x 30'-10"

Proposed dimensions of *Mass B*: 59'-9.5" x 52'-0"

Proposed dimensions of *Mass C*: 41'-8" x 64'-3.75"

Proposed dimensions of *Mass D*: 24'-6" x 26'-7"

Proposed dimensions of *Mass E*: 48'-11" x 36'-8"

Proposed dimensions of *Courtyard Beyond* along East Bv: 20'-6" x 18'-0" and 8'-5" x 10'-0"

Proposed dimensions of *Courtyard Beyond* along Dilworth Rd W: 10'-2.5" x 9'-0" and 19'-7.25" x 19'-3.25"

Proposed materials include unpainted red brick, Hardie Artisan Smooth Lap siding, asphalt shingle roof, and wood trim. Window are proposed to be 6/1 and 6/6 STD L Jeld-Wen Sitrine double-hung, aluminum clad wood with ½" to 1' wood muntins. Doors are 6-light Craftsman. 14 trees are proposed to be removed.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. New Façade Addition/New Construction
  - a. Massing, scale, height and width, rhythm, and setbacks.
  - b. Height of the new buildings adjacent to existing historic structures.
  - c. Overall massing adjacent to existing historic structures.
  - d. Materials
    - i. Brick and mortar sample needed.
    - ii. Provide specifications for windows and doors.

1. 3.5" bottom rail required.
2. Clarify if all windows are double-hung.
- e. Tapered porch columns look disproportionate to porch height.
2. Site Plan
  - a. Provide information about location of HVAC units, dumpsters, and any other site appurtenances.
    - i. Label location on site plan.
  - b. Provide additional information about trees to be removed, including size and species.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

One member of the public spoke against the project.

**MOTION: CONTINUE**

**1<sup>st</sup>: PARATI      2<sup>nd</sup>: BARTH**

Ms. Parati moved to continue the application. She requested that the applicant restudy the following aspects of the design in order to make them more congruous with the Dilworth district: context, setbacks and how they relate to surrounding historic setbacks, spacing, massing and complexity of form to include additional scale-reducing techniques and better relate to historic examples, roof forms to better relate to the majority of surrounding buildings, height and width to better align with other historic commercial buildings, scale to better line up in terms of cornices, eaves, porches, and windows with neighboring properties, and directional expression to better match surrounding buildings. She cited the following Standards: 7.2-7.3 for context; 7.4 for setbacks; 7.7 for massing and complexity of form; 7.8, numbers 1-5 for height and width; 7.9 for scale; 7.10 for directional expression; and 7.12 for roof forms. Ms. Parati added that they did not evaluate the remaining items on the application in order to focus on the high-level items first.

Mr. Barth suggested the friendly amendment that the applicant be required to provide an example of a parking deck in the district and more detailed drawings and information on this proposed feature. Ms. Parati accepted the amendment.

Mr. Barth seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 7/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, TAYLOR, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITIONS – CONTINUED.**

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: SULLIVAN, WHITLOCK

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCCMI-2023-01121, 1218 EAST BV (PID: 12111315) – FRONT PORCH ENCLOSURE, REAR ADDITION, & SITE WORK**

*This application was continued from the June 12, 2024 meeting for the following items:*

- Restudy of the porch enclosure; do not include a door in front of the historic door per Standards Porches, 4.8 and Front Doors and Entrances, 4.10.
- Restudy the front dormer to consider the scale of the dormer itself as it relates to the historic look of the one-and-a-half-story bungalow, per Standard Scale, 7.9.
- Restudy the rear addition for its massing, scale, and fenestration per Standards Massing and Complexity of Form, 7.7; Height and Width, 7.8; Scale, 7.9; and Addition, 7.17, number 6.
- Restudy the signs with the applicants paying close attention to Standards A.2, numbers 3, 4, and 5; and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards 2.5



### **EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1.5-story Craftsman constructed in 1918. Architectural features include a stone veneer front porch entrance with wide concrete columns on each end, a front gable dormer, a side gable main roof, a left-side brick chimney with stone veneer, and 4/1 windows. The lot size is approximately 60' x 150'. Adjacent structures are commercial buildings and 1 and 1.5-story historic residential buildings.

### **PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project includes enlarging the existing front dormer, enclosing the existing front porch, adding a rear addition, and site work, including new signage.

Front Dormer: The applicant is proposing raising the ridge of the dormer roof 2'-0". Materials and details to match existing.

Front Porch: The front porch is proposed to be enclosed with aluminum-framed glass and the front porch steps fixed. All other aspects of the front porch will remain the same as existing.

Rear Addition: The existing rear dormer addition will be removed. The new rear addition's proposed dimensions are not provided. Proposed materials are lap siding with a brick foundation. The proposed windows are to 4/1 double hung windows. As part of the rear addition, an ADA lift is proposed. The proposed ADA lift's measurements and materials are not provided.

Site Work: The application proposes to expand the existing walkway to provide space for temporary seating (front yard patio), relocate the existing mailbox at the front of the property, and upgrading the existing signage. Dimensions and materials of the walkway expansion (front yard patio) are not provided. The overall dimensions of the sign are 3'-5" x 4'-2". The applicant also proposes adjustments to the parking area. The parking area's adjustment details are not provided.

### **Revised Proposal**

Front Dormer: Proposed changes have been eliminated.

Front Porch: Applicant has redesigned the front glass porch and has removed the proposed glass from in front of the front door. New black metal handrails have been added to the existing stone step cheek walls.

Rear Addition: Applicant has redesigned the rear addition to include an addition with dormers.

Site Work: Applicant has provided revised information.

### **STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Front Porch:
  - a. Provide specification sheet for aluminum-framed windows.
  - b. Provide images of front steps with dimensions and material callouts.
  - c. New metal handrails to be attached at mortar joints or be free standing.
2. Rear Addition:
  - a. Left elevation fenestration and rhythm, Standards 6.15-6.16.
  - b. Provide images, material, and dimensions on proposed ADA lift.
  - c. Provide material specifications and details for:
    - i. Windows and doors.
    - ii. Window trim detail.
    - iii. Siding and trim details.
3. Site Work:
  - a. Provide details and materials of all proposed areas of hardscapes and seating area.

4. Minor revisions may be reviewed by Staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>: BARTH**

**2<sup>nd</sup>: PARATI**

Mr. Barth moved to approve the application with the following conditions: that the drawings be updated to reflect current as-built conditions, specifically regarding the fireplace and chimney on the left side, and that the permit ready drawings be submitted to Staff; that the applicants work with Staff on adding more fenestration to the left elevation, specifically the dormer and main level addition, using the right elevation as an example; that the applicants work with Staff on the specific materials of the seating area in the front yard requesting that they use non-permanent, permeable pavers that are made of historic natural materials; and that the applicant work with Staff on making the proposed front windows less impactful to historic architectural features by using a frameless glass rather than the proposed aluminum storefront windows. He also specified that the Commission was making an exception in their signage rules because the property is adjacent to a large parking lot, causing the visibility to mimic a corner lot. He cited the following Standards: 7.14, for windows; A.2, number 5, for the signage; and 8.4, number 6, for landscaping.

Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 7/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN, TAYLOR  
WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR FRONT PORCH ENCLOSURE, REAR ADDITION, & SITE WORK – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: SULLIVAN, WHITLOCK

RECUSED: TAYLOR

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA-2023-01124, 2000 DILWORTH RD W (PID: 12111822) – NEW CONSTRUCTION – RESIDENTIAL**

*This application was continued from the June 12, 2024 meeting for the following items:*

- Restudy the design paying close attention to the context in the immediate area, making sure that eaves and roof lines line up.
- Simplify the aesthetic so the overall structure feels more in keeping with the houses around it.
- Restudy all the elevations keeping with the Context, per Standard 6.2.
- Restudy the Massing and Complexity of Form, per Standard 6.8; Height and Width, per Standard 6.9, and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5.
- The main house details and the accessory structure were not evaluated.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is 2-story Colonial Revival constructed c. 1925. Architectural features include a symmetrical façade with a pedimented central entry supported by tapered fluted columns, side gable slate roof with pent eaves and wide trim band, a one-story flat roof wing, and unpainted brick exterior. The front entrance is flanked by side lights and windows are 6/1 double-hung wood with soldier course headers and stone sills. A small, flat roof one-story addition shelters a rear entry. The lot size is approximately 71.5' x 186.4' x 70.3' x 174.6'. Adjacent buildings are 2 and 2.5-story residential structures. The structure is listed as Contributing to the Dilworth National Register Historic District. On June

14, 2023, the Commission voted to approve demolition of the primary building and accessory building with a 365-day stay under application #HDCRDEMO-2023-00216.

**PROPOSAL:**

This proposed project is the new construction of a residential building and an accessory structure.

Primary Building:

At the tallest point, height is 33'-2" as measured from grade to ridge. Proposed width is 50'-5 ¼". Setbacks are not provided. Exterior material is primarily proposed to be stucco with cast stone sills and window surrounds. The stucco foundation will be delineated by a water table detail. Dormers and some accent walls proposed to be flush, stacked horizontal Boral siding with butt-joined corners. Roof material is proposed to be traditional slate. Front stoop is proposed to be bluestone pavers. Gothic arched front door is proposed to be wood. Windows proposed to be fixed and casement; material details are not provided.

Accessory Building:

At the tallest point, height is 22'-5 ½" as measured from grade to ridge. Proposed width is not provided. Setbacks are not provided. Exterior material is proposed to be flush, stacked horizontal Boral siding with butt-joined corners, also known as shiplap. The foundation will be stucco to match the primary building; foundation height is not provided. Roof material is proposed to be slate. The single garage door is proposed to be wood carriage-style. Windows proposed to be fixed and casement; material details are not provided.

*Revised Proposal*

- Revised context map.
- Massing and scale maps provided.
- Revised streetscape drawings.
- Massing and scale illustrations provided.
- Revised elevation drawings.
- Revised details drawings.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Front elevation (Dilworth Rd W)
  - a. Massing, width, scale.
2. Right Elevation (Magnolia Av)
  - a. Massing, width, scale, spacing, size.
3. Left Elevation
  - a. Foundation/water table height on central portion.
4. Cornices & Trim
  - a. Bracket size – An 8-foot bracket is too large. The size is incongruous with the style of architecture and Dilworth neighborhood.
  - b. Provide examples of Timber purlins used in other Tudor-style houses in Dilworth.
  - c. Painted timber columns – provide examples of these in other Tudor-style houses in Dilworth.
5. Doors & Windows
  - a. Window trim is too narrow in areas of siding for a Tudor-style house.
  - b. Non-traditional Boral trim materials proposed for windows and doors. Wood is typically required for window/door trim.
  - c. Shutter size on left elevation, first level.
  - d. Add mullion trim for all ganged windows on main house and accessory structure.
6. Porches
  - a. Bluestone is not an approvable material on front porches/steps, per Standard 6.17, number 3.
7. Lighting

- a. Lighting appears oversized for the building architecture and the Dilworth district.
- 8. Siding – Main Building & Accessory Structure
  - a. Flush, stacked horizontal siding with butt-joined corners, also known as shiplap, is incongruous with Tudor-style architecture.
- 9. Accessory Building
  - a. Paired windows in dormers. Pane size/orientation. Mullion trim needed.
  - b. Bracket size. A 6-foot bracket is too large. The size is incongruous with the style of architecture and Dilworth neighborhood.
- 10. Site plan – Missing required elements
  - a. Front setback dimensions at both front corners.
  - b. Show proposed setback in relation to the other existing houses on the block.
  - c. What is the 14' wide area shown between the front entrance and pea gravel front walkway?
- 11. Details needed:
  - a. Beam/column section from roof to foundation needed for the timber columns.
  - b. Materials samples for all non-traditional materials requested, including but not limited to Boral shiplap siding, Boral window trim, dressed timber columns, etc.
  - c. Will gutters/downspouts be installed? If so, show locations on plans.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: DENY**

**1<sup>st</sup>: BELL      2<sup>nd</sup>: WOJICK**

Ms. Bell moved to deny the application because it is incongruous with the district and Standards. She cited the following Standards: 6.1 through 6.4, for context; 6.5, for setbacks; 6.8, for massing and complexity of form; 6.9, for height and width; 6.10, for scale; 6.13, for roof form and materials; and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5.

Ms. Hewett requested that Ms. Bell provide specific justification behind the denial and add specific details for each standard in the motion.

Ms. Bell explained that for Standards 6.1-6.4, the project is incongruous with its surrounding context within a 360-degree view as described in the preamble of 6.2. It is wider, taller, and deeper than all adjacent structures. For Standard 6.5 for setbacks, it is not clearly defined how the setbacks relate to adjacent properties. For Standard 6.8 for massing and complexity of form, specifically numbers 1 and 2, the proposed house introduces more complex massing and detail than found on adjacent properties. For Standard 6.9, the proposed is taller and wider than adjacent structures. For Standard 6.13 for roof form and materials, the proposed is out of context with neighboring architecture. For the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the Commissioners pointed to numbers 3 and 4 which advise against creating a false sense of historical development. Ms. Lineberger suggested that the architectural style of the project is incongruous with the Colonial Revival style found in many of the surrounding buildings and that it would introduce a different type of architecture into an existing neighborhood.

Ms. Wojick seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 6/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION – RESIDENTIAL – DENIED.**

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: SULLIVAN, WHITLOCK

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMIA-2023-00862, 1547 MERRIMAN AV (PID: 11909710) – STEPS, CHEEK WALLS, & WALKWAY – AFTER THE FACT**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing is a 1-story American Small House constructed c. 1940. The building has a three-bay façade with a side gable main roof and the right bay is a projecting gable featuring a paired window. Architectural features include a partial width front porch supported by square wood columns, 6/6 windows, interior brick chimney, and unpainted brick exterior. The lot size is approximately 50' x 117'. Adjacent structures are 1-story single-family buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is to change the cheek walls leading up from the front sidewalk stone steps from stepped walls to angled walls using a cap stone that matches the gray rubble stone material used in the retaining wall and steps. A simple black metal railing will be installed along the side of each cheek wall.

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.

*Project Background*

This application is a resubmission of a previously denied project, HDCRMI-2022-00587.

- The cheek walls are part of a previously completed project (COA #HDCADMRM-2021-01088) that involved the replacement of an existing damaged front concrete walkway, concrete porch steps, sidewalk steps, and a replacement front retaining wall. This project's approval was for in-kind replacement of the walkway, porch and sidewalk steps, and a new brick retaining wall set back 18" from the back of the sidewalk. The cheek walls for the sidewalk steps were to be faced with a brick layer with a single wood handrail installed for the sidewalk steps.
- Due to an inability of the applicant to cancel the materials that were already on order, the project was completed out of compliance with the COA in terms of materials. As the project was not in compliance with the original COA, the applicant submitted a new application for the retaining wall, porch steps, sidewalk steps, and front walkway which was first heard by the Commission on January 11, 2023.
- The retaining wall was approved by the HDC on January 11, 2023, and the steps, cheek walls, and walkway were continued for the following items:
  - The steps, cheek walls, and walkway are to be restudied, per Standards 8.6, number 3, and 8.2.
  - Provide a visual representation of how the cheek walls, steps, and walkway will be integrated.
  - The cheek walls should be angled, not stepped.
- No revised proposal was received at the June 2023 meeting, the deadline for the Commission to decide on the project, and thus, the application for steps, cheek walls, and walkways was denied.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Refer to Standards for Fences and Walls, 8.6-8.8.
2. Provide a visual representation of how the cheek walls, steps, and walkway will be integrated.
3. The cheek walls should be angled, not stepped. Provide a visual representation on how the stepped cheek walls will be converted to angled cheek walls, including construction method and dimensions.
4. The Commission will determine if the proposed project meets the Standards.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>:     BARTH                      2<sup>nd</sup>:     BELL**

Mr. Barth moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards. He added the conditions that the applicant work with Staff to ensure that the cheek wall cap color and thickness matches that of the retaining wall cap, that the cheek wall be no taller than six inches above the slope grade on either side of the wall, that the infill between the stepped cheek walls and newly sloped cap be made of the same retaining stone material, and that the applicant work with Staff to ensure that the design of the black metal handrails match the historic district and are mounted in accordance with the Design Standards. Mr. Barth cited the Standards 8.6 and 8.7, for retaining walls.

Ms. Bell suggested that the motion reference Standard 6.18, number 5, for materials. Mr. Barth accepted the amendment.

Ms. Bell seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 7/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI,  
TAYLOR, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR STEPS, CHEEK WALLS, & WALKWAY – AFTER THE FACT – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

The applicant for HDCCMA-2023-00992 for 224, 228, 232, & 236 W Kingston Av chose to defer a hearing on the project due to time restraints, and will be heard at the September 11<sup>th</sup> meeting.

---

#### **CONTINUED FROM THE JUNE 10 MEETING**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: SULLIVAN, WHITLOCK

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRDEMO-2023-01189, 1514-1516 HAMORTON PL (PID: 08117423) – DEMOLITION – RESIDENTIAL**

*This application was not heard at the June 12, 2024 meeting due to the application being determined incomplete for the following items:*

- *Lack of documentation, including clear digital photos, 300 DPI or better of all sides of the building, and for Zoutewelle survey height.*

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1-story, Craftsman bungalow constructed c. 1924. The building has an engaged full-width front porch with square columns supporting a front gable roof. Two triangular brackets also support the roof. The front gable features cedar shake siding above four rows of lap siding and a central 4-pane window flanked by vents. The roof is bisected by two central brick chimneys. Originally a single-family structure, the building has been converted to a duplex. A large window opening on the left side was converted to a door, but the original window trim was left intact. The main entry is slightly off centered. The exterior is wood lap siding with an unpainted brick foundation. The front porch is wood tongue and groove running perpendicular to the front door, and the front porch steps are wood. The railing is not original. Lot size measures approximately 42.5' x 10', with a 10' alley running parallel to the right of the lot. Adjacent properties are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is full demolition of the building. The following information is presented for the Commission's review and consideration:

1. Zoutewelle survey – on order
2. Property survey
3. Digital photos of significant architectural details
4. Elevation drawings

*Revised Proposal:*

1. Zoutewelle Survey
2. Building Photos

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. A tree protection plan for the Oak at the front right corner of the property is needed.
2. The Commission will determine if the application is complete.
3. The Commission will determine whether the building has special significance to the Plaza Midwood Local Historic District. With affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to a 365-Day Stay of Demolition and require a 90-day waiting period to review new construction plans.
4. If the Commission determines that this property does not have any special significance to the district, then demolition may take place without a delay or upon the approval of new construction plans.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION 1: APPLICATION COMPLETE**

**1<sup>st</sup>: LINEBERGER      2<sup>nd</sup>: BELL**

Ms. Lineberger moved to determine the application is complete with all the required documentation provided by the applicant, which includes clear digital photos of all sides of the building; clear digital photos of significant architectural details and site features, including, but not limited to, windows, front doors, brackets, columns, trim, etcetera; a stamped and sealed property survey with setbacks and building dimensions with width and length clearly labeled; and a Zoutewelle survey to document height.

Ms. Bell seconded the motion.

**VOTE 1: 7/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, TAYLOR, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**MOTION 2: HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE**

**1<sup>st</sup>: LINEBERGER      2<sup>nd</sup>: BELL**

Ms. Lineberger moved to determine that the building has special significance and value toward maintaining the character of the Plaza Midwood Local Historic District because its year of construction was over 50 years ago and its architectural style.

Ms. Bell seconded the motion.

**VOTE 2: 7/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, TAYLOR, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**MOTION 3: APPROVE DEMOLITION**

**1<sup>st</sup>: LINEBERGER      2<sup>nd</sup>: BELL**

Ms. Lineberger moved to approve the project with a 365-day stay of demolition on the building due to its special significance and value towards maintaining the character of the district. She stated that receipt of accurate measured drawings of the building to be demolished is required for HDC records before plans for new construction will be considered by this Commission.

Ms. Bell seconded the motion.

Ms. Wojick suggested an amendment that a tree protection plan be provided during the demolition period and any future new construction. Ms. Lineberger and Ms. Bell both accepted the amendment.

**VOTE 3: 7/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, TAYLOR, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

Commissioner Barth left the meeting after the third motion.

**MOTION 4: RECONSIDER MOTION**

**1<sup>st</sup>: PARATI 2<sup>nd</sup>: LINEBERGER**

Ms. Parati moved to reconsider the third motion in order to hear evidence that was not able to be presented due to technical difficulties.

Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion.

**VOTE 4: 6/0**

**AYES: BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, TAYLOR, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**MOTION 5: APPROVE DEMOLITION**

**1<sup>st</sup>: LINEBERGER 2<sup>nd</sup>: BELL**

Ms. Lineberger moved to approve the project with a 365-day stay of demolition on the building due to its special significance and value towards maintaining the character of the district. She stated that receipt of accurate measured drawings of the building to be demolished is required for HDC records before plans for new construction will be considered by this Commission. She also requested that a tree protection plan be included in the demolition approval and that it remains in place for any future new construction.

Ms. Bell seconded the motion.

**VOTE 5: 6/0**

**AYES: BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, TAYLOR, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION – RESIDENTIAL -- APPROVED WITH A 365 DAY STAY.**

---

Prior to the start of the meeting, the applicant for HDCRMIA-2024-00068 for 221 Grandin Rd chose to defer a hearing on the project until the September 11<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Due to time constraints the following cases will be heard at the September 11, 2024 meeting:



HDCCMA-2023-01193 for 1921 Charlotte Dr  
HDCRMA-2023-00988 for 501 N Poplar St  
HDCRMA-2022-00897 for 1411 & 1413 W 4<sup>th</sup> St  
HDCRMIA-2023-01195 for 928 Ideal Wy  
HDCCMIA-2024-00063 for 1513 S Mint St  
HDCRMIA-2024-00081 for 1627 Oaklawn Av

With no further business to discuss, Chair Hawkins adjourned the meeting at 6:51 p.m.