



Approved September 10, 2025



CHARLOTTE  
HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION

---

## HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

August 13, 2025 | Room 267

### MINUTES

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Shauna Bell, Chair, Resident-Owner McCrorey Heights  
Christopher Allred, Resident-Owner Wesley Heights  
Sarah Curme, Resident-Owner Dilworth  
Christa Lineberger, Planning Commission Representative  
Emily Sowash, Resident-Owner Wilmore  
Sean Sullivan, At-Large  
Brett Taylor, Business Operator Of Dilworth  
Scott Whitlock, At-Large

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Nichelle Hawkins, Vice Chair, At-Large  
Cameron Holtz, Resident-Owner, Fourth Ward  
Heather Wojick, Second Vice Chair, At-Large  
Vacant, Resident-Owner Hermitage Court  
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, Chair Bell called the August meeting of the Historic District Commission (Commission) meeting to order at 1:07 p.m. Chair Bell 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 Bell 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 Bell 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 Bell 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 July 9, 2025 meeting minutes. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion, and it passed 8-0.

---

**INDEX OF ADDRESSES:**

**CONSENT**

|                                       |          |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| HDCRMI-2025-00447, 1607 Dilworth Rd W | Dilworth |
| HDCRMA-2025-00253, 1907 S Mint St     | Wilmore  |
| HDCRMI-2025-00452, 320 E Park Av      | Dilworth |

**CONTINUED FROM MARCH 12, 2025 MEETING**

|                                       |             |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| HDCRMAA-2024-00271, 522-524 N Pine St | Fourth Ward |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|

**CONTINUED FROM THE JULY 9, 2025 MEETING**

|                                      |          |
|--------------------------------------|----------|
| HDCRMAA-2025-00109, 700 Templeton Av | Dilworth |
|--------------------------------------|----------|

**NEW CASES**

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| HDCRMA-2025-00325, 1624 Dilworth Rd E                   | Dilworth |
| HDCRMI-2025-00369, 1904 Wood Dale Tr                    | Wilmore  |
| HDCRMA-2025-00324, 1953-1955 Woodcrest Av               | Wilmore  |
| HDCRMAA-2025-00249, 1817 S Mint St                      | Wilmore  |
| HDCRMAA-2025-00195, 465 W Worthington Av/1901 S Mint St | Wilmore  |

---

**CONSENT**

---

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

ABSENT: HAWKINS, HOLTZ, WOJICK

**APPLICATION:**

HDCRMI-2025-00447, 1607 DILWORTH RD W (PID: 12311201) – ADDITION

## **EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing building is a 2.5-story Colonial Revival with Tudor elements constructed c. 1938. Architectural details include a side gable main block with a slightly lower projecting side section, a 1-story gable wing with Tudor detailing, and three varying height and pitched front gables, including the central entry. Each gable includes one arched bay. The left elevation features brick gable-end chimney flanked by triangular windows and topped with terracotta chimney pots. Most of the original windows have been retained and are double hung wood in a 6/6 pattern. Replacement windows have a 1/1 pattern. The 1-story rear wing is a later addition. The lot size is irregular with all sides of the building visible from the public right-of-way, measuring approximately 130' x 57' x 120' x 90' x 91'. Adjacent structures are 2 and 2.5-story residential buildings.

## **PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a new shed dormer on the rear elevation. The new shed dormer will mirror the previously approved dormer with a 3/12 roof pitch and one egress window. The window will be casement with a wider sash bar to give the appearance of a 6/6 double hung. Proposed material is stucco with wood corner board trim and roof details to match existing. Exterior dimensions of dormers not provided.

Rear dormers on the main house were Approved with Conditions at the January 8, 2025 HDC meeting under application number HDCRMA-2024-00679.

The side porch addition was Approved with Conditions at the May 14, 2025 HDC meeting under application number HDCRMA-2025-00005.

## **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 1, 2, 9, and 10, and the City of Charlotte Design Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, all of 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. Provide exterior dormer dimensions.
  - b. Provide a roof plan.
  - c. Adjust window placement so sill does not intersect with roof.
  - d. Provide window specifications that meet HDC Standards to Staff for probable approval.
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 Bell's invitation to speak.

## **MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>:**   **CURME**      **2<sup>nd</sup>:**   **SULLIVAN**

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 1, 2, 5, 9, and 10, and the City of Charlotte Design Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6. She added the conditions that the applicant will submit permit-ready construction drawings to Staff for final review which would include providing exterior dormer dimensions; a roof plan; possibly adjusting the window placements; a sill that does not intersect with the roof; and providing window specifications that meet the HDC Standards to Staff for probable approval.

Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: ALLRED, BELL, CURME, LINEBERGER, SOWASH,  
SULLIVAN, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK

NAYS: NONE

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

---

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

ABSENT: HAWKINS, HOLTZ, WOJICK

**APPLICATION:**

HDCRMA-2025-00253, 1907 S MINT ST (PID: 11907602) – REAR ADDITION

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The building is a 1-story brick American Small House with Colonial Revival elements constructed in 1946. Architectural features include side gable roof, symmetrical façade with a central entry flanked by single 6/1 windows, and a central chimney with a unique dental detail on the cornice. Other features include a partial-width front porch with a shed roof supported by square columns over the front door and left window, and small gable roof over the right front window. The small front gable has wide lap siding with a scallop detail, but the rest of the building is brick. The lot size is slightly irregular, measuring approximately 50' x 130' x 60' x 120'. Adjacent historic buildings are 1 and 1.5-story residential structures. The exterior was approved for painting due to extenuating circumstances by the Commission on January 15, 2020, under application number HDCRMA-2019-00570.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is a one-story rear addition. The new roof will tie in beneath the original ridge. The proposed footprint measures approximately 25'- 0 1/8" x 33' - 9 1/16". On the right elevation, the addition will be stepped-in slightly from the original building.

Proposed materials include Nichiha Savannah smooth finish lap siding with wood corner boards, which differentiates the addition from the original building's brick exterior. Other materials include wood window and door trim, wood or aluminum clad windows with Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL), and aluminum clad French doors on the rear elevation.

Post-construction, the rear yard impermeable area will be approximately 30.2%. No trees will be removed. No other site changes are proposed; the existing concrete driveway and rear yard fencing are to remain.

**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 1, 2, 9, and 10, and the City of Charlotte Design Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, all of 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. The new roof should tie in 4-6" below the original ridge.
  - b. At the right rear corner of the original building the addition should be stepped-in the width of a corner board at minimum.
  - c. Eave/fascia design, details, and materials should meet HDC Standards and match existing on the original building.
  - d. Provide window and door specifications that meet HDC Standards for Staff approval.

- e. Provide detail drawings with dimensions and materials noted for ganged window trim, door trim, roof trim, corner boards, siding, roof pitches, etc.
  - f. New brick should be a traditional color and remain 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 Bell's invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>: TAYLOR      2<sup>nd</sup>: SULLIVAN**

Mr. Taylor 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 New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6. He added the condition that the applicant provide permit-ready drawings to Staff for final approval that incorporate the conditions listed in items (a) through (f) from the Staff memo.

Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 8/0**

**AYES: ALLRED, BELL, CURME, LINEBERGER, SOWASH,  
SULLIVAN, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK**

**NAYS: NONE**

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

---

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

ABSENT: HAWKINS, HOLTZ, WOJICK

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2025-00452, 320 E PARK AV (PID: 12307611) – FRONT PORCH ROOF REPLACEMENT**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing building is 2.5-story Colonial Revival constructed c. 1897. Architectural features include a symmetrical façade a pair of gabled dormers, decorative dentil mold cornice, a side gable roof with pent eaves and Palladian style windows/vents in the gable ends, and a hip roof wraparound porch supported by slender Doric columns. A portion of the porch has been infilled on the left side. The second level has an engaged front porch. Exterior materials include wood lap siding with corner boards, painted brick foundation, unpainted brick chimneys, 1/1 windows, and a slate roof. The lot size is approximately 125' x 140'. Adjacent structures are 1.5, 2, 2.5, and 3-story residential buildings.

The Commission approved the addition of a front stoop/steps, covered side porch, second floor balcony railing, and fenestration changes to the left and right elevations under applications HDCRMI-2023-00377 and HDCRMI-2025-00181.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a front porch roof replacement. The existing front porch roof material is rubber membrane. The front porch roof has a low, flat pitch and is not visible from the sidewalk/street. The applicant has provided photographs taken from the sidewalk and from across the street to demonstrate visibility. Because of the flat condition of the porch roof, shingles cannot be used.

The applicant is requesting to replace the existing rubber membrane roof on the front porch with a standing-seam copper roof. The copper roof is proposed to have a tin/zinc coating to provide a natural, weathered gray color. The proposed project does not change the pitch, size, or shape of the existing roof.

The applicant asserts that the non-original rubber membrane roof on the front wraparound porch is leaking and causing damage to the building. The original porch roof material is not clear based on the available historic photographs. Due to the location of the project on the front elevation and proposed roof material change, Commission review is required.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The project is not incongruous with the Dilworth district and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, Section 2.5, number 9 and the City of Charlotte Design Standards for Rehabilitation of Building Elements, Roofs, Section 4.5.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, Staff recommends Approval of the project due to the flat roof condition of the porch, with no visibility of the porch roof material from the public right of way, 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. The pitch, size, and shape of the front wraparound porch roof will not change.
  - b. The new porch roof will replicate a historic standing-seam roof that has a thin raised seam at the joints.
  - c. The existing slate roof on the rest of the building will not change.
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 Bell's invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>:** WHITLOCK    **2<sup>nd</sup>:** TAYLOR

Mr. Whitlock moved to approve the application because the project is not incongruous with the Dilworth district and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 2.5, number 9 and the City of Charlotte Design Standards for Rehabilitation of Buildings/Roofs, 4.5. He added the conditions included in the Staff memo, number 2, items (a), (b), and (c).

Mr. Taylor seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 8/0**

**AYES:** ALLRED, BELL, CURME, LINEBERGER, SOWASH,  
SULLIVAN, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR FRONT PORCH ROOF REPLACEMENT – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

CONTINUED FROM THE MARCH 12, 2025 MEETING

---

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

ABSENT: HAWKINS, HOLTZ, WOJICK

**APPLICATION:**

This application was continued from the March 12, 2025 meeting for the following items:

Bring back the necessary information for the Commission to make a decision on this particular case including, but not limited to:

- Architectural drawings,
- Dates of materials that were removed,
- Contextual information, and
- Pictures showing precedent (i.e. photos of other historic houses that have similar original conditions) within a 360-degree range of the subject property, for why those changes should be allowed.

This application was not heard at the July 9, 2025 meeting for the continued items being incomplete.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1-story hip-roof duplex Cottage constructed c. 1911. The building is notably symmetrical with small covered front porches, a central brick chimney stack, and a glassy Dutch gable at the rear of the roof. Siding material is wood German lap siding. The lot size is approximately 40' x 189'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 2-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is the new construction of a new single-family residential building and a new detached accessory building in the rear yard.

1. Roof Changes
  - a. The applicant is proposing to remove the existing pent gable on the rear of the structure and adding a full gable end. The new gable end will have German lap siding, to match the rest of the building, or cedar shingle. Architectural drawings not provided.
2. Window Changes
  - a. The applicant is proposing changes to the windows in the new gable end. All the existing windows will be removed, and a set of triple aluminum-clad Andersen four-square windows added.
  - b. The applicant is also proposing removing the existing 1970s skylights, located on both the right and left side, and adding an eyebrow dormer to each side. The eyebrow dormers will have a small square Prairie-style window installed in the center of the gable. Architectural drawings not provided.
  - c. On the rear, the applicant is proposing replacing two sliding glass entry doors (one for each unit of the duplex) with fiberglass full light French doors. The double 6/1 wood windows on the left of the rear elevation (Unit 522) will also be replaced with new windows.
3. Accessory Building
  - a. The applicant is proposing the addition of a 2-story accessory building located in the rear right corner of the lot. The footprint of the building is approximately 12' x 12', and height from grade to ridge is not provided. The building will feature a gable roof and engaged second floor porch that opens out from the left elevation. Materials include natural cypress lap siding with 6" reveal and cedar shingle accents over the entry door, brick entry steps, Jeld-Wen 8-lite French entry doors (material unknown), and a large aluminum-clad Andersen 6-lite arch top casement window on the second floor. Architectural drawings not provided.

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

1. Some contextual information provided.
2. Roof Changes
  - a. Before and after aerial views provided.
  - b. Before and after photos provided.
3. Accessory Building
  - a. Applicant proposes to eliminate the second floor.

*Revised Proposal – August 13, 2025*

1. Existing and as-built architectural drawings provided.
2. Window and door specifications provided.
3. Accessory Building
  - a. Applicant proposes to withdraw the accessory building from this application and submit new separate application.

#### **STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. A decision is required at the August 13, 2025, meeting.
2. Emergency repairs are Staff approvable provided they are true repairs, not changes to a roof form and the addition of two (2) new dormers.
3. Side Elevation Dormer Windows:
  - a. Jeld-Wen, Siteline, Aluminum clad, fixed window.
  - b. The new dormer windows are not incongruous with the Design Standards for Windows 6.15, numbers 1, 3, and 4.
4. Rear Elevation - New Windows and Doors:
  - a. Original windows on the house are 6/1 wood, double-hung.
  - b. Upper level, installed windows are 1/1 composite, Anderson 100 Series Fibrex, awning.
  - c. Ground floor, installed windows are 1/1 vinyl, Comfort View 900 Series, single-hung.
  - d. The plans state that the new exterior French doors are fiberglass, but the product sticker indicates that the doors are steel. The material of the rear French doors is unclear.
  - e. The composite and vinyl 1/1 windows are incongruous with the Design Standards for Windows 4.14, numbers 10, 17, 18, and 19; Doors and Windows 6.15, numbers 3 and 4; and Materials 6.18, numbers 1 and 3.
5. Rear Elevation – Trim:
  - a. From the photo provided, the window and door trim appear to be wood.
  - b. The new door and window trim is not incongruous with the Design Standards for Trim 6.15, numbers 1 and 2.
6. A revised front elevation drawing is needed that shows the new dormers.

#### **SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Bell's invitation to speak.

#### **MOTION 1: APPROVE**

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

Ms. Curme moved to approve the application for roof changes, dormers, and small dormer window changes as it is not incongruous with the character of the district as described in Chapter 3 of the Design Standards and is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. She cited the following Standards for additions, 6.20 and 6.24, and for roofs, 4.5.

Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion.

#### **VOTE 1: 8/0**

**AYES:** ALLRED, BELL, CURME, LINEBERGER, SOWASH,  
SULLIVAN, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK

NAYS: NONE

**DECISION 1: APPLICATION FOR ROOF CHANGES, DORMERS, & DORMER WINDOW CHANGES – APPROVED.**

**MOTION 2: DENY**

1<sup>st</sup>: SULLIVAN      2<sup>nd</sup>: TAYLOR

Mr. Sullivan moved to deny the application for the gable end windows and doors on the rear elevation, both levels. He asked that the applicant work with Staff on submitting a new application for approvable windows and doors. He cited the following Standards: for windows, 4.12 through 4.14; for trim, 4.11.

Mr. Taylor suggested that the applicant also work with Staff on the exterior trim and siding. Mr. Sullivan accepted the amendment.

Mr. Taylor seconded the motion.

**VOTE 2: 8/0**

AYES: ALLRED, BELL, CURME, LINEBERGER, SOWASH,  
SULLIVAN, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK

NAYS: NONE

**DECISION 2: APPLICATION FOR REAR WINDOW & DOOR CHANGES, SIDING, & TRIM REPLACEMENT – DENIED.**

---

**CONTINUED FROM THE JUNE 11, 2025 MEETING**

---

Case HDCRMAA-2025-00109 for 700 Templeton Avenue was deferred by the applicant.

---

**NEW CASES**

---

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

ABSENT: HAWKINS, HOLTZ, WOJICK

RECUSED: TAYLOR

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA-2025-00325, 1624 DILWORTH RD E (PID: 12311214) – ADDITION & ACCESSORY BUILDING**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 2-story Colonial Revival built c. 1938. Architectural features include a side gable with a large intersecting second story pediment gable portico, with a lunette in the center of the pediment. The portico spans most of the front elevation and features dentils, a decorative frieze board, and undersized square columns with trim. The structure, right-side chimney, and left-side one-story bump-out, are all unpainted brick with wood trim and details. The windows are 6/6 and the front door is a solid wood 6 panel door with sidelights and an arched transom. Lot size measures approximately 60' x 155.64'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is a rear addition to the principal building, new accessory building, and site work.

### Proposed Rear Addition

- The existing rear porch and patio will be removed and replaced with a new 2-story addition, with a wraparound cantilevered roof over the right-side first floor.
- Height of the addition, as measured from grade to ridge, is not provided. Height, as measured from finished floor to ridge is 25'- 11 ½". The ridge of the new addition will tie-in 3-0' - 2 ¾ " beneath the original ridge of the historic house. See Sheets HDC-5 and HDC-7.
- The addition will step-in from the rear corner of the original house on the left-side and will wrap around the rear corner on the right-side. Left-side step-in dimension not provided. Right-side extension, from thermal wall to thermal wall, dimension is 4'-4". Right-side cantilevered roof dimension is not provided.
- The footprint of the new, 2-story addition measures approximately 33'-7 ½" x 10'-5". See Sheet HDC-3.
- The addition is proposed to have a first-floor cantilevered roof. The cantilevered roof dimensions not provided. Materials include Craftsman style wood structural outriggers and a standing seam metal roof. See Sheets HDC-3, HDC-6, and HDC-7.
- Proposed materials are a 7" exposure Hardie Artisan lap siding with metal corners, unpainted brick siding to match existing with rowlock cap flashed in copper, unpainted brick foundation, 5/4 x 10 lap siding base around first floor (material unknown), asphalt shingles, 6/6 aluminum-clad windows, aluminum-clad French doors, trim and detail material unknown, and steel railing on Juliette balcony.

### Proposed Accessory Building

- The new garage accessory structure is proposed to be 2-stories. Height, as measured from grade to ridge, is 21'-5 ½", and is approximately 6'-8 ½" below the main ridge. See Sheets HDC-5 and HDC-7.
- The footprint of the new garage measures approximately 32'-5 ½" x 26'-8". See Sheet HDC-3.
- The garage is proposed to have a first-floor cantilevered roof to match the roof on the new addition of the main house. The cantilevered roof dimensions not provided. Materials include Craftsman-style wood structural outriggers and an asphalt shingle roof. See Sheet HDC-3, HDC-6, and HDC-7.
- Proposed materials are a 7" exposure Hardie Artisan lap siding with metal corners, unpainted brick foundation, base and trim band (material unknown), asphalt shingle roof, 6/6 aluminum-clad windows, aluminum-clad French doors, and trim and detail material unknown.
- Post-construction the rear-yard impermeable area will be 39.53%.

### Site Work – Can be Staff approved.

- Adding a wood trash enclosure to the right-side of the main structure. Dimensions not provided.
- Lower an existing brick wall in the rear yard. Dimensions not provided.
- Add brick and pea gravel walkways and a patio. Dimensions not provided.
- Add a chicken coop, if permitted per Zoning. Material and dimensions not provided.

### **STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Context, Massing, Height and Width, Scale, Roof Form & Material, Cornices & Trim and Size:
  - a. Provide information about the height of the rear addition.
    - i. Height should be measured from grade to ridge.
  - b. Provide historic examples of cantilevered roofs on primary structures and accessory structures, per Standard 6.1-6.4 – Context.
  - c. Restudy cantilevered roof on the addition and accessory structure, per Standards 6.8 – Massing, 6.13 – Roof Form and Material, and 6.14 – Cornices and Trim.
  - d. Restudy the style of cantilevered roof on the primary structure and accessory structure, per Standard 3.10
    - i. Roof reads as Craftsman with deep eaves and structural rafter tails.
  - e. Restudy lower right-side of addition to ensure the bump-out does not create front yard parking, per

- Standard 6.9 and 8.2, number 2.
- f. Restudy accessory structure, per Standards 8.10, number 3 and 6.5-6.6.
    - i. Accessory building should be clearly secondary, especially in scale, massing, and other architectural elements.
    - g. Restudy left elevation of the accessory structure for true dormers.
2. Foundations:
- a. Restudy the foundation on both the addition and accessory structure, per Standard 6.12, preamble.
    - i. Provide information on foundation belt, what material is the belt?
3. Doors & Windows, and Rhythm:
- a. Restudy right side and rear elevations of accessory structures for fenestration and rhythm, per Standard 6.15-6.16.
  - b. Restudy rear elevation of addition for symmetry, per Standard 6.15-6.16.
  - c. Restudy right and left elevation of addition.
    - i. Typically, larger windows are on the first level.
    - ii. Restudy the window and roof relationship on the right elevation.
  - d. Restudy square light pattern on both the addition and accessory structure.
  - e. Restudy ganged window trim detail.
    - i. Typical ganged window trim has a 5 ¼" mullion.
4. Materials and Details:
- a. Restudy material transition between the brick and siding on the addition.
  - b. Provide brick/mortar sample for addition and accessory building. Brick to remain unpainted.
  - c. Provide sample and specs on metal corners for addition and accessory building.
  - d. Provide materials for belt, trim, and on addition and accessory building.
  - e. Provide specifications on storage door for accessory building.
  - f. Provide railing detail for Juliette balcony on addition.
  - g. Will gutters/downspouts be installed on addition and accessory building?
    - i. If so, then locations, details, and materials are needed.
5. Site Work:
- a. Provide trash enclosure detail.
    - i. Stockade style fencing is not approved.
  - b. Provide brick wall detail, including existing and proposed elevation drawings.
  - c. Provide dimensions for walkways and patios.
  - d. Add chicken coop detail, including elevations and materials.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Bell's invitation to speak.

**MOTION: CONTINUE**

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

Mr. Sullivan moved to continue the application as it is incongruous with the Standards for context, 6.1 through 6.4. He required the applicant to provide examples of cantilevered roofs on primary and accessory structures and restudy the cantilevered roof on the additions and accessory structure. He cited the following Standards: for massing, 6.8; for roof form and materials, 6.13; for cornices and trim, 6.14; and for the scale and massing of the accessory buildings, 8.10. He added that the Commission was only reviewing high level aspects of the application at the time and not details or material selections.

Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 7/0**

**AYES: ALLRED, BELL, CURME, LINEBERGER,  
SOWASH, SULLIVAN, WHITLOCK**

**NAYS: NONE**

## **DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION & ACCESSORY BUILDING – CONTINUED.**

---

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

ABSENT: HAWKINS, HOLTZ, WOJICK

RETURNED: TAYLOR

### **APPLICATION:**

HDCRMI-2025-00369, 1904 WOOD DALE TR (PID: 11907424) – ADDITION & SITE CHANGES

### **EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1.5-story brick American Small House constructed c. 1940. Architectural features include a side gable with double-hung windows in the gable ends, painted brick siding, central painted brick chimney, asphalt shingles, a right-side single-story screen porch, arched wood door with three lights, and 8/8 and 6/6 double-hung windows. The existing front stoop has a non-original metal awning with thin metal columns and metal handrails. Lot size measures approximately 60' x 170.68'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings.

### **PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is in three parts.

#### **1. Front Dormer Addition:**

- a. The two new front gable dormers will be located on-center above both the left and right-side existing windows.
- b. Each dormer measures approximately 7'-3 ½" tall x 5'-6" wide and will sit below the main ridge. Dimension of the dormer offset from the main ridge not provided.
- c. Proposed materials are German lap siding with a 6" exposure, asphalt shingle roof, 8/8 aluminum-clad windows with square lights, and wood corner boards, trim, and details to match existing.

#### **2. Front Covered Stoop Addition:**

- a. The existing aluminum awning and metal columns will be removed. The existing painted brick steps will remain.
- b. The new stoop will measure approximately 4'-6" deep x 8'-3" wide and will be approximately 13'-3 ½" from grade to ridge.
- c. Proposed materials are German lap siding with a 6" exposure in the gable end, asphalt shingle roof, wood box columns, and wood trim and details to match existing.

#### **3. Front Walkway Replacement:**

- a. The existing concrete walkway will be removed.
- b. The new walkway will be Brookstone Full Range brick in a herringbone pattern with brick border.
- c. Dimensions to remain the same at 5' wide at the front porch and tapering down to 4' wide at the driveway.

### **STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

#### **1. Front Dormer Addition:**

- a. Size, Massing, Scale, Roof Form and Materials
  - i. Preserve original roof shapes, per Standard 4.5, number 2.
  - ii. Roof features should be located on less visible location of the roof, per Standards 6.13 and 6.20, number 1.
  - iii. Restudy dormer size, massing, and scale, per Standards 6.5-6.6, 6.8, 6.10, and 6.13, number 4.
  - iv. Limit the size of the dormer so that it doesn't visually overpower the existing building, per Standard 6.20, number 2.

- v. Match eave design to existing structure, per Standards 6.13, number 5.
  - b. Doors & Windows
    - i. Restudy window proportions as it relates to the dormer and light pattern, per Standard 6.8 and 6.15-6.16.
  - c. Context /Adjacent Structures
    - i. 2018 Wood Dale Tr, pre-district.
    - ii. 400 W Kingston Av, pre-district.
    - iii. 1941 Wood Crest Av, pre-district.
    - iv. 1812 (1808) Merriman Av, pre-district.
    - v. 1549 Wilmore Dr, unknown.
    - vi. 1945 Wilmore Dr, pre-district.
2. Front Stoop Addition:
- a. Retain and repair all existing historic entrances, per Standard 4.10, number 1.
  - b. Do not replace or enlarge entrances, per Standard 4.10, number 2.
  - c. Match eave design to existing structure, per Standards 6.13, number 5.
  - d. Context /Adjacent Structures:
    - i. 1902 Wood Dale Tr, pre-district.
    - ii. 2001 Wood Dale Tr, pre-district.
    - iii. 2014 Wood Dale Tr, pre-district.
    - iv. 2010 Wood Dale Tr, pre-district.
    - v. 2013 Wood Dale Tr, pre-district.
    - vi. 2021 Wood Dale Tr, pre-district.
3. Front Walkway Replacement:
- a. Retain existing historic walkways, per Standard 8.2, numbers 1, 2, and 7.
4. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Bell's invitation to speak.

**MOTION 1: CONTINUE**

**1<sup>st</sup>: TAYLOR      2<sup>nd</sup>: SULLIVAN**

Mr. Taylor moved to continue the application for the front dormer addition, window changes, and front walkway changes. He required a restudy of those aspects of the application, citing the following Standards: for dormer size and massing, 6.5, 6.6, 6.8, 6.10, 6.13, number 4, 6.20, number 2, and 6.13, number 5; for window proportions and light patterns, 6.8, 6.15, and 6.16; and for front walkways, 8.2, numbers 1, 2, and 7. He asked that the applicant also relook at the retaining walls when revising the proposed walkway changes.

Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion.

**VOTE 1: 8/0**

**AYES: ALLRED, BELL, CURME, LINEBERGER, SOWASH,  
SULLIVAN, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION 1: APPLICATION FOR FRONT DORMER ADDITION, WINDOW CHANGES, & WALKWAY CHANGES –  
CONTINUED.**

**MOTION 2: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>: TAYLOR      2<sup>nd</sup>: CURME**

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the application for the front stoop roof addition as it meets Standard 6.13, number 5. He added the condition that the applicant work with Staff on the details.

Ms. Curme seconded the motion.

VOTE 2: 8/0

AYES: ALLRED, BELL, CURME, LINEBERGER, SOWASH,  
SULLIVAN, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK

NAYS: NONE

**DECISION 2: APPLICATION FOR FRONT STOOP ADDITION – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

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

ABSENT: HAWKINS, HOLTZ, WOJICK

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA-2025-00324, 1953-1955 WOODCREST AV (PID: 11906310) – WINDOW REPLACEMENT WITH NON-TRADITIONAL MATERIALS**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1-story unpainted brick duplex constructed c. 1941. The building has a low hipped roof and some Colonial Revival elements such as the 6/6 windows, wide trim band under the roof, and partial width front porch to serve one unit. The front porch has a gable roof with lap siding and is supported by thin wood columns. The second unit is accessed by a side entry porch. The side entry porch has a front gable roof with lap siding supported by decorative metal columns. The side entry porch also has a metal railing that matches the columns. The building's rear porch has been converted to heated space, enclosed by a flat room, vinyl siding, and metal awning windows. The porch gable ends and soffit are wrapped in vinyl. The window/door trim is wrapped in aluminum. The lot size is approximately 92' x 160'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is window replacement.

There are 16 window openings with a total of 22 original, double-hung wood windows on the building. The original wood window trim is wrapped in aluminum.

All 22 windows and original wood trim are proposed to be removed and replaced with either:

1. Lansing Windows – Series 40 – Vinyl. Full replacement windows will trim and factory mullions.
2. Tucker 2100 Series Wood Windows. Full replacement windows with trim. Mull conditions not specified

On the enclosed rear porch, there are six (6) metal awning windows. There is no trim around the rear porch windows. The metal windows are also proposed to be replaced to match whichever windows will be installed on the original house

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The applicant asserts that four (4) adjacent properties have vinyl windows. Staff researched all 4 properties and found that:
  - a. 1954 Woodcrest Av – directly across the street. Windows pre-date the Wilmore Local District designation.
  - b. 2238 Wilmore Av – directly next door, right side. Windows pre-date the Wilmore Local District designation.
  - c. 2231 Wilmore Av – across the street. Addition, renovation, and window/door changes approved by the Commission in August 2015, under application number HDC 2015-152. Windows are wood. Old guidelines.
  - d. 1920 Woodcrest Av – down and across the street. Windows pre-date the Wilmore Local District

- designation.
2. The Commission needs to make multiple decisions about this project:
    - a. Determine if removal of the original wood windows meets the Standards.
    - b. Determine if removal of original wood trim meets the Standards.
    - c. Determine if proposed replacement window and trim material meet the Standards.
      - i. Lansing Windows – Series 40 – Vinyl.
        1. Full replacement 6/6 GBG windows
        2. Vinyl trim and factory mulls
      - ii. Tucker 2100 Series Wood Windows.
        1. Full replacement windows with trim.
        2. Mull conditions not specified.
    3. Questions about the proposed replacement windows:
      - a. Will any of the window openings change in size to accommodate the new replacement windows?
      - b. Is it possible to retain the following original windows:
        - i. Front Elevation – Single window, labeled Window 16, under front porch roof. Appears to be in good condition. Retaining this window meets Standard 4.14, numbers 1 and 2.
        - ii. Right Elevation – Single window, labeled Window 2, under side porch roof. Appears to be in good condition. Retaining this window meets Standard 4.14, numbers 1 and 2.
      - c. Is it possible to relocate an original paired window from another elevation to the Front elevation, paired window labeled Window 1. Relocation will meet Standard 4.14, number 8.
      - d. The proposed Lansing replacement windows are vinyl and factory mulled, which is incongruous with the Standards for Windows 4.14, numbers 13, 18, and 19.
      - e. The proposed Tucker wood replacement windows meets Standards 4.14, numbers 18 and 19.
    4. For removal of original wood trim:
      - a. Existing trim is aluminum wrapped. Photo documentation of the condition of the trim is not provided.
        - i. Per Standard 4.14, number 12, "Explore using sash replacement kits and retain existing wood window frames. This approach reduces potential damage to the surrounding interior and exterior historic materials."
        - ii. If new trim is needed, it should be wood to match existing, per Standards for: Trim, 4.11, numbers 1 and 2; and Building Materials: Wood, 5.2 numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8.
      - b. How will trim be installed on the rear porch enclosure? The existing material is vinyl. Additional information is needed about how the windows installation will finish out.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Bell's invitation to speak.

**MOTION: DENY**

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

Ms. Lineberger moved to deny the application for the window replacement as it does not meet the Standards for windows, 4.14, numbers 1 through 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16. She also cited the Secretary of the Interior's Standards 2.5, numbers 1, 2, 5, and 6.

Mr. Whitlock seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 8/0**

**AYES: ALLRED, BELL, CURME, LINEBERGER, TAYLOR,  
SOWASH, SULLIVAN, WHITLOCK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR WINDOW REPLACEMENT WITH NON-TRADITIONAL MATERIALS – DENIED.**

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

ABSENT: HAWKINS, HOLTZ, WOJICK

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMAA-2025-00249, 1817 S MINT ST (PID: 11907703) – CHANGES TO AN APPROVED CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – AFTER THE FACT**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

On August 12, 2022, the Commission approved the construction of a new single-family house under application number HDCRMA-2022-00333. The approved structure is a 2-story Bungalow built c. 2024. Architectural features include a partial width engaged front porch with brick column bases and square composite columns, cross gable main roof, gable bump out on the left front of the house and shed dormers on the rear half of the structure. Exterior materials include 6/1 aluminum clad windows, 6-lite wood Craftsman-style front entry door, brick foundation, and smooth finish fiber cement lap siding. The lot size is approximately 54' x 200'. Adjacent historic structures are 1 and 1.5-single-family structures. The Wilmore Community Center Garden is diagonally across the street.

**PROPOSAL:**

Staff conducted a final inspection on March 18, 2025 and found that the constructed project did not match the COA-approved plans. This project is in the enforcement process. The deviation from approved plans is found on all 4 elevations and there are design changes that Staff is unable to approve. The applicant is proposing to come into compliance by requesting the Commission's approval of design changes to existing structure.

The changes include:

1. Overall Changes – All Elevations
  - a. The overall height of the building has increased by approximately 1'- 2", as measured from grade to ridge.
  - b. The length and width of the as-built project has not changed from the approved plans.
  - c. Window changes – All Elevations: (Pages A8 through A11 for as-built windows, page C2 for approved windows).
    - i. The windows are taller and narrower than the approved plans.
      - a. Window type 1 on the approved plans changed in dimension from 2'-8" x 5'-0" to 2'-7" x 5'-1".
      - b. Window type 4 on the approved plans changed in dimension from 2'-0" x 4'-0" to 2'-1" x 4'-1".
      - c. Window type 5 on the approved plans changed in dimension from 2'-4" x 4'-6" to 2'-5" x 4'-5".
    - ii. The make and model of window changed from Pella Architect aluminum-clad series to Windsor Pinnacle aluminum-clad series.
  - d. Foundation changes – All Elevations: (Pages A1 through A4).
    - i. The foundation wall height is shorter than the approved plans.
  2. Front Elevation changes - COA vs As-Built: (Page A1)
    - a. The overall height of the building has changed from the approved 23'-10.75" to 25', as measured from grade to ridge.
    - b. Main front gable height, as measured from grade to ridge changed from 21'-8.75" to 23'-9.25".
    - c. The height from finished floor to top of gable has changed from 14'-9" to 16'.
    - d. The height of the left-side gable bump out has increased. Dimension not provided.
    - e. Distance of central gable offset from the main ridge has decreased. Dimension not provided.
    - f. Front porch roof pitch has changed from 2.5:12 to 4:12.
    - g. Front porch beam is taller than approved plans. Dimension not provided.
    - h. Small section of gutter and downspout wrapped around the front eave on the right side (on the second story).

- i. Two steps that span the distance between cheek wall and front porch column are shown on the approved plans, and the constructed project has one step to grade that is not as wide and lacks a left-side cheek wall.
3. Front Elevation – Applicant Proposed Changes: (Page A5)
- a. Installation of a trim band across the central gable, located underneath the second-floor window.
  - b. Lowering the existing trim band on the left-side gable bump out to align it with the end of the eave.
  - c. The addition of a wood louvered gable vent in the left-side bump out.
4. Right Elevation changes - COA vs As-Built: (Page A2)
- a. Height of central gable is taller in constructed project than approved plans. Dimension not provided.
  - b. Frieze band is missing in constructed project on the front half of the elevation in between floors.
  - c. Proportion of triple-window bump out is different than constructed project. Windows are centered in bump out and missing brackets underneath.
  - d. Space between bottom of bump out and grade differs from constructed project to COA. Dimension not provided.
  - e. Column trim details are different proportions from the approved plans. Dimension not provided.
  - f. Height of dormer wall has changed from 66" to 100".
5. Right Elevation proposed changes – Applicant Proposed Changes: (Page A6)
- a. The addition of frieze trim along the top of the dormer wall.
  - b. The addition of a new continuous sill and apron detail along the bottom of the dormer windows.
  - c. Over-building the existing 4:12 roof on the front porch to convert it to a 6:12 pitch.
6. Rear Elevation changes - COA vs As-Built: (Page A4)
- a. Rear porch beam is wider than approved plans. Dimension not provided.
  - b. Configuration of man door and sliding doors differs from COA (man door is missing on constructed project).
  - c. Height of rear gable is taller in constructed project than the COA. Dimension not provided.
  - d. Pitch of dormer roofs have changed from 2:12 to 3:12.
  - e. Roof pitch of central gable has changed from 7:12 to 10:12.
7. Left Elevation changes - COA vs As-Built: (Page A3)
- a. Trim band and header detailing above the stoop differs from COA. The stoop on the COA includes two brick steps in between brick cheek walls, and the stoop itself is a concrete cap with brick foundation. The constructed stoop is a concrete slab with brick border and is only the height of a rowlock + one regular course of brick.
  - b. Central left-side gable is taller than approved plans. Dimension not provided.
  - c. Frieze band is missing in constructed project on the front half of the elevation in between floors.
  - d. Height of dormer wall has changed from 66" to 100".
8. Left Elevation proposed changes – Applicant Proposed Changes: (Page A7)
- a. The addition of frieze trim along the top of the dormer wall.
  - b. The addition of a new continuous sill and apron detail along the bottom of the dormer windows.
  - c. The addition of an additional 9" of trim above the engage stoop header to close the gap between it and the existing trim band between floors.

The following Changes have been approved at the Staff level under the application COA# HDCADMRA-2025-00308:

1. Driveway removal/relocation
2. Outdoor fireplace in rear yard
3. Rear concrete patio
4. Rear yard parking pad
5. Fence

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. Massing, Height and Width, Scale, Roof Forms and Massing, and Size:
  - a. Provide accurate drawings with dimensions and material call-outs.
  - b. The overall height of the building has enlarged with roof and finished floor increases.
  - c. Knee wall design between first and second floors.
  - d. Truncated gables on right and left elevations.
  - e. Roofs and roof pitches have changed or are missing.
  - f. Roof elements have changed or are missing.
  - g. Zoutewelle streetscape with as-built elevation is provided on page SS1 of the presentation.
2. Cornices and Trim and Materials:
  - a. Trim details are different proportions or missing.
  - b. Beams are wide.
3. Foundations:
  - a. Foundation height is not proportional to the building and is shorter than the approved plans.
  - b. Foundation wall height changes the character of the left-side stoop. The existing stoop reads as an extension of the parking pad (page F8).
  - c. Since the foundation wall is shorter, only one step is needed to access the front porch, which changes the character of the front elevation and entrance (page F2).
  - d. The foundation wall height changes the character of the rear patio. The covered patio reads as an extension of the additional slab-on-grade patio directly beyond it (page F7).
4. Doors and Windows and Rhythm:
  - a. The windows changes do not match the Bungalow style of architecture.
  - b. The installed make and model of window are windows that Staff can approve.
  - c. Window trim detail has been provided on page A1.
5. Site plan:
  - a. As-built site plan has been provided by the Applicant (page SS2).
  - b. Primary structure is setback 42.2' from the front property line.
6. Front Elevation changes:
  - a. Dimension of central gable offset from the main ridge is not provided.
  - b. Height from grade to left-side bump-out ridge is not provided.
  - c. Small section of gutter and downspout wrapped around the front eave on the right side (second story) does not reflect traditional gutter and downspout installation and location (page F2).
7. Right Elevation changes:
  - a. Truncated gable roof and half wall.
  - b. Column-beam detail provided by Applicant (page A1).
  - c. Column trim details are different proportions from the approved plans (page A2).
8. Rear Elevation changes:
  - a. The 10/12 roof pitch is incongruous the Bungalow style of architecture.
  - b. The increased height of the dormers makes the second story appear more massive.
  - c. Lack of fenestration.
9. Left Elevation changes:
  - a. Truncated gable roof and half wall.

## **SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

One person accepted Chair Bell's invitation and spoke in opposition to the project.

### **MOTION: DENY**

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

Mr. Whitlock moved to deny the application, citing the following Standards: for massing, 6.8, number 6; for height and width, 6.9, numbers 1 and 2; for foundations, 6.12, number 1; for roof forms, 6.13, numbers 1 and 4; for doors and windows, 6.15; for setback, 6.5, numbers 1 and 2; for cornices and trims, 6.14, number 1.

Ms. Harpst suggested that he add supporting facts for the decision into the motion.

Mr. Whitlock added the following: that the house is 2.3 feet taller than the closest historic home; that the foundation is not in line with the foundations of the other historic houses per the Zoutewelle survey and is much lower and pushed down into the ground; that the pitch on the rear gable is not consistent with the bungalow style of the property; that the door, trim, and cornice details do not match the architectural style of the house and should take cues from the surrounding historic buildings and bungalow style; that the dormers should not go down to the ridge of the vent; and that the porch beams are incorrect.

Mr. Taylor added the following amendment items: that the scale of the rear pitch is too high; that the rhythm and ratio of the fenestration on the main front gable is wrong and the ratio of windows to siding is out of proportion; that the massing of the dormers and amount of siding on front gable are out of proportion with the first floor and overpowers it; that the main gable on the rear elevation is larger, taller, and more massive than the first floor and the two shed dormers are equally out of proportion; that the scale of the knee wall is inappropriate; that the second floor and above-the-first-floor ceiling height is too tall, wide, and massive compared to the first floor; and that the triple window bump out is inappropriate and needs to be restudied. Mr. Whitlock accepted his amendment.

Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: ALLRED, BELL, CURME, LINEBERGER, SOWASH,  
SULLIVAN, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY BUILDING & SITE WORK – DENIED.

---

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

ABSENT: HAWKINS, HOLTZ, WOJICK

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMAA-2025-00195, 465 W WORTHINGTON AV/1901 S MINT ST (PID: 11907601) – CHANGES TO AN APPROVED  
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – AFTER THE FACT**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The primary structure is a 1-story American Small House with Colonial Revival elements constructed in 1946. Architectural features include a symmetrical three-bay façade with a central entry portico, central chimney, 8/8 double-hung wood windows, and a decorative cornice. Materials are painted brick with wood siding in the gable ends. Lot size is approximately 68 x 130 x 42 x 154. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5 story single-family structures. The lot is located at the edge of the Wilmore local historic district abutting the Wilmore Walk Townhome development which is located outside of the district.

A rear addition to the principal structure and the construction of a new Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) accessed from the alley was previously approved by the Commission on January 27, 2021, under application number HDCRMA-2020-00479.

Design changes to the approved COA for the ADU were approved by the Commission on December 14, 2022, under application number HDCRMA-2022-00378. The approved structure is a one-story ADU built c. 2023. Architectural features include a central entry with two bump outs offset on each side, front stoop, and side gable roof. Exterior

materials include 6/6 wood windows, Colonial Revival-style wood front entry door, brick foundation, and wood lap siding.

**PROPOSAL:**

Staff conducted a final inspection on January 13, 2025, and found that the project deviates from the COA. This project is in the enforcement process. There are changes on all 4 elevations that Staff is unable to approve. The applicant is proposing the following design changes listed below.

The changes include:

1. Foundation changes – All Elevations:
  - a. As built, the foundation is a single brick rowlock at the front, right, rear, and a portion of the left elevation. The applicant is proposing to keep the foundation as built.
    - i. Front Elevation. As approved, the foundation was to be 24" from grade.
    - ii. Right and Left Elevations. As approved, the foundation was to be 36" at the highest point from grade.
    - iii. Rear Elevation. As-approved, the foundation was between 24"-36 from grade.
2. Front Elevation changes:
  - a. Front Stoop Steps. As built the front stoop steps are as wide as the stoop landing. The applicant is proposing to keep the steps as built.
    - i. As approved the front stoop steps were to be stepped in from the landing.
  - b. Windows. As-built, the windows are 6/6 double-hung.
    - i. As approved the windows were to be an 8/8 lite pattern.
3. Right (West) and Left (East) Elevation changes:
  - a. Roof changes. As built, the distance between the main roof and the front of the side bump out roofs is 1", with the side bump out roof overlapping the main ridge roof trim. The applicant is proposing to keep as built.
    - i. As approved, there was approximately 4" between the main roof trim and the side bump out roofs.
  - b. Vertical detailing. As-built, the vertical detailing below the "false eave" has been eliminated, and applicant is proposing to keep as-built.
  - c. Side bump outs. As built, the bump outs sit approximately 6" to 8" behind the main thermal wall.
    - i. As approved, the bump outs were supposed to sit a minimum of 1'-0" behind the main thermal wall.

Staff has already worked with the applicant to bring the following items into compliance as shown on the attached presentation:

- a. Revision of pork chop details and soffits.
- b. Addition of window trim drip caps
- c. Removal of window trim aprons.
- d. Removal of extra molding around doors.

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. Foundation changes – All Elevations:
  - a. The single brick rowlock at the base of the building is not a true foundation. The Standards require new construction to "Relate the height of new foundation to the height of foundations on historic buildings," per Standard 6.12, number 1.
2. Front Elevation changes:

- a. Window change to 6/6 lite pattern matches the 6/6 windows found on the principal structure.
- 3. Right (West) and Left (East) Elevation changes:
  - a. Vertical detailing.
    - i. As built, the vertical detailing is missing below the “false eave” on both side elevations.
    - ii. Left Elevation. Missing vertical detailing below “false eave” is in conflict with the location of the utility connections.
  - b. Roof changes.
    - i. As-built, the main roof and the front of the side bump out roofs overlap and do not allow for the entire width of the rake board on the main roof. This condition does not relate to the roof form of historic buildings per Standard 6.13, number 1.
    - ii. The dimensions between the main roof and side bump outs rear roof slope have not been provided.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Bell's invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

**1<sup>st</sup>: SULLIVAN    2<sup>nd</sup>: TAYLOR**

Mr. Sullivan moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the special character of the district as described in Chapter 3 of the Design Standards and because it is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, 2.5. He added the following conditions: that at least one foot of brick foundation be exposed by removing surrounding mulch and soil; that the width of the stairs on the front stoop be reduced to the previously approved width; and that the bricks at the ends of the stoop be solids. He cited the following Standards: for porches, 6.17; for roof details, 6.13; for foundations, 6.12; and for windows, 6.15.

Mr. Taylor suggested that the foundation be made to round the corner and then feather back to meet existing grade. Mr. Sullivan accepted the amendment.

Ms. Lineberger suggested an amendment that the applicant be made to add the vertical trim at the false eave on the east and west elevations per the original COA. Mr. Sullivan accepted the amendment.

Mr. Taylor seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 8/0**

**AYES: ALLRED, BELL, CURME, LINEBERGER, SOWASH,  
SULLIVAN, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR CHANGES TO AN APPROVED CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – AFTER THE FACT –  
APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

With no further business to discuss, Chair Bell adjourned the meeting at 6:52 p.m.