



---

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
February 12, 2025 | Room 267

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Nichelle Hawkins (Chair) Kim Parati (Vice Chair) Chris Barth (Second Vice Chair) Sarah Curme Cameron Holtz Christa Lineberger Sean Sullivan Brett Taylor Scott Whitlock Heather Wojick
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Shauna Bell Vacant, Resident-Owner Hermitage Court Vacant, Resident-Owner Oaklawn Park Vacant, Resident-Owner Wilmore
OTHERS PRESENT:	Kristi Harpst, HDC Staff Candice Leite, HDC Staff Jen Baehr, HDC Staff Marilyn Drath, HDC Staff JT Faucette, HDC Staff Nicole Hewett, Assistant City Attorney Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

---

With a quorum present, Chair Hawkins called the January meeting of the Historic District Commission (Commission) meeting to order at 1:03 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. 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. Lineberger made a motion to approve the November 2024 HDC meeting minutes. Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion. It passed 10/0.

Ms. Curme made a motion to approve the December 2024 HDC meeting minutes. Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion. It passed 10/0.

---

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

##### **CONSENT**

HDCRMI-2025-00007, 1936 Park Rd	Dilworth
HDCCMCI-2025-00060, 420 W 5 <sup>th</sup> St	Fourth Ward
HDCRMA-2024-00800, 1511 Mimosa Av	Plaza Midwood

##### **NOT HEARD AT THE JANUARY 8, 2025 MEETING**

HDCCMA-2024-00803, 407 East Bv	Dilworth
HDCRMI-2024-00799, 1700 Van Buren Av	McCrorey Heights
HDCRMA-2024-00679, 1607 Dilworth Road W	Dilworth
HDCRDEMO-2024-00797, 804-806 Brookside Av	Dilworth
HDCRDEMO-2024-00341, 1311 Myrtle Av	Dilworth

##### **CONTINUED FROM THE OCTOBER 9, 2024 MEETING**

HDCRMIA-2023-01195, 928 Ideal Wy	Dilworth
----------------------------------	----------

##### **CONTINUED FROM THE DECEMBER 11, 2024 MEETING**

HDCRMAA-2024-00676, 1541 Wickford Pl	Wilmore
--------------------------------------	---------

##### **CONTINUED FROM THE JANUARY 8, 2025 MEETING**

HDCCMA-2023-00992, 224, 228, 232, & 236 W Kingston Av	Wilmore
HDCRMA-2024-00212, 1329 Lafayette Av	Dilworth
HDCRMA-2023-01199, 1433 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood

##### **NEW CASES**

HDCRMAA-2024-00338, 317 W Park Av	Wilmore
HDCRMA-2024-00684, 220 S Summit Av	Wesley Heights
HDCRMA-2024-00683, 610 N Pine St	Fourth Ward

---

## CONSENT

---

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

ABSENT: BELL

### **APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2025-00007, 1936 PARK ROAD (PID: 12108705) – WINDOW CHANGES – REAFFIRMATION**

### **EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 2.5-story Victorian constructed in 1905. It was converted to a multi-family use years ago and remains so today. Architectural details include engaged gable dormers, a shed porch on square posts, and scalloped frieze details. Exterior materials include shingle siding on the main house, vertical siding with scalloped edges in the gable ends, and a brick foundation. The lot measures approximately 56' x 195'. Adjacent historic structures are 1 and 1.5-story single family buildings.

### **PROPOSAL:**

The applicant is seeking reaffirmation of only one portion of a previously approved project.

- A non-original bay window on the front elevation will be removed.
- The 21/1 window on the right elevation, second level, will be installed in the opening.
- The applicant believes that the 21/1 window is the original front window that was relocated from the front elevation at some point.
- On the right elevation, a new paired window will be installed. The header height of the new windows will be changed to match the rest of the second level windows. New windows are drawn as 6/6, but specifications are not provided.

The proposed window changes were originally approved as part of a larger project, under application number 2016-072, by the HDC on May 11, 2016. Permits were not pulled, and the COA expired. The entire project was reapproved by the HDC on June 12, 2019, under application number HDCRMI-2019-00261. Permits were not pulled, and the COA expired.

### **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, and the City of Charlotte Design Standards for Rehabilitation of Building Elements, Windows 4.12-4.14.
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 window specifications that meet HDC Standards to Staff for probable approval.
  - b. All new trim should be wood to match existing.
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>:**

**CURME**

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

**HOLTZ**

Ms. Curme moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the special character of the district and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as well as the City of Charlotte Design Standards for the Rehabilitation of Building Elements for windows, 4.12-4.14. She added the conditions that the applicant provide permit ready drawings and window specifications to Staff for final review as well ensure that all new trim be wood to match the original.

Ms. Holtz seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 10/0**

**AYES: BARTH, CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, LINEBERGER, PARATI, SULLIVAN, TAYLOR, WOJICK, WHITLOCK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR WINDOW CHANGES – REAFFIRMATION – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

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

ABSENT: BELL

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCCMI-2025-00060, 420 W 5<sup>TH</sup> ST (PID: 07805308) – WINDOW/DOOR CHANGES & SITE WORK – REAFFIRMATION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

Charlotte Fire Station Number 4 is a flat-roofed, three-bay, 2-story unpainted brick building on West Fifth Street in Fourth Ward. Adjacent structures are high-rise and mid-rise multi-family buildings. Windows are replacements. There is a small, shed roof addition on the rear. Lot size is approximately 60' x 168'.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is replacing non-original windows and doors, removing a small non-historic addition on the rear, adding an ADA ramp at the rear, changing a window to a door on the rear elevation, and installing non-permanent planters around an existing concrete apron in front of the building. Proposed windows are aluminum clad. New doors are proposed as aluminum. Brick cleaning, graffiti removal, and masonry repointing notes are provided on Sheets A6.0 and A6.1.

The project was originally approved by the HDC on July 12, 2023, under application number HDCCMI-2023-00237. Final, permit-ready construction plans were not provided within the 12-month timeframe making the approval null and void.

With the exception of a minor change to the ADA ramp design, the project remains unchanged from the original approval.

**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, and the City of Charlotte Design Standards for Rehabilitation of Building Elements, Chapter 4; Building Materials, Chapter 5; New Construction for Non-Residential Buildings, Chapter 7; and Private Sites, Chapter 8.
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 window and door specifications that meet HDC Standards to Staff for probable approval.
  - b. Provide final specifications for building and site details (planters, lighting, etc.) to Staff for review and

probable approval.

- c. Work with Staff masonry professional to ensure that the existing masonry on the historic structure remains unpainted and that it is cleaned and preserved in a proper manner.
  - d. Work with Staff masonry professionals as far as attaching the ramp in a non-damaging way to the historic structure.
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>: PARATI      2<sup>nd</sup>: HOLTZ**

Ms. Parati moved to approve the project because it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. She cited the following Standards: for rehabilitation of building elements, Chapter 4; for building materials, Chapter 5; for new construction of non-residential buildings, Chapter 7; and for private sites, Chapter 8. Ms. Parati added the following conditions: that permit ready drawings with window and door specifications meeting HDC Standards are submitted to Staff; that final building and site details be provided to Staff for final review; that the applicant work with the Staff masonry professional to ensure all existing masonry remains unpainted and is preserved; that the applicant work with the Staff masonry professional to ensure the ramp is attached in a non-damaging way.

Ms. Holtz seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 10/0**

**AYES: BARTH, CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, LINEBERGER, PARATI, SULLIVAN, TAYLOR, WOJICK, WHITLOCK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR WINDOW/DOOR CHANGES & SITE WORK – REAFFIRMATION – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

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

ABSENT: BELL

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA-2024-00800, 1511 MIMOSA AV (PID: 08119135) – ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1.5-story American Small House built c. 1947. The building has minimal Colonial Revival details such as the symmetrical front elevation and 6/6 double-hung wood windows. The side entry door and windows are original to the house. The interior brick chimney is not painted. The exterior has asbestos shingle covering the original wood lap siding and a painted brick foundation. The metal awnings and wood shutters are not original. The lot size is approximately 54' x 203'. Adjacent historic structures are a mixture of 1 and 1.5-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a rear addition, front porch addition, siding restoration, and gable end window changes.

**Rear Addition:**

The existing house is approximately 22'-10" in height. The rear addition will tie in below the original ridge and is no wider than the original house. The corner boards will provide a visual transition between the original building and new addition. The unpainted brick foundation of the new addition will also provide a visual transition from the original building. Materials are proposed to be smooth finish lap siding, either Hardie or Nichiha Savannah, fiber cement fascia and soffit, and a brick foundation. Windows are proposed to be wood, double hung 6/6 to match existing. The screen porch will be wood. Post-construction rear yard permeable area is not provided.

#### Front Porch Addition:

The proposed full-width front porch measures approximately 26'-0" x 8'-0". The porch will have a shed roof supported by simple square columns. The new foundation and steps will be unpainted brick. Porch floor is proposed to be wood. A wood railing is also proposed.

#### Other Changes:

1. The asbestos siding will be removed, and the original wood lap siding restored.
2. The double-hung windows in both gable ends will be removed and replaced with casement windows to meet code egress requirements. The casement windows will be detailed to look like a double-hung.
3. The side entry landing (left elevation) will be extended to the rear and a new set of stairs added.
4. One tree, a 15" Water Oak, is proposed for removal along the right property line.
5. The 42' Oak tree is to remain and tree protection is shown on the site plan.

#### **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, and the City of Charlotte Design 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. Provide window and door specifications that meet HDC Standards to Staff for probable approval.
  - b. Corner board and window/door trim should be wood to match existing.
  - c. Front porch railings should be built to historically correct dimensions, with the use of a booster rail to meet code requirements.
  - d. Porch flooring should be tongue and groove wood, installed perpendicular to the front door.
  - e. Provide a correct beam/column detail in the final plans.
  - f. All new brick to be a traditional color and remain unpainted. Provide final brick/mortar selections to Staff for probable approval.
  - g. Provide a tree protection plan for the 42" Oak in the rear yard.
  - h. Provide rear yard permeability calculations.
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>: SULLIVAN      2<sup>nd</sup>: LINEBERGER**

Mr. Sullivan moved to approve the project as it is not incongruous with the Historic District and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Rehabilitation as well as the City of Charlotte Design Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6. He added the conditions that permit ready construction drawings satisfying items 2(a) through 2(h) from the Staff Recommendations are submitted to Staff for final review.

Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 10/0**

**AYES: BARTH, CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, LINEBERGER, PARATI, SULLIVAN, TAYLOR, WOJICK, WHITLOCK**

**NAYS: NONE**

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

---

**NOT HEARD AT THE JANUARY 8 MEETING**

---

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

ABSENT: BELL

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCCMA-2024-00803, 407 EAST BV (PID: 12308305) – ROOF REPLACEMENT – NON-TRADITIONAL MATERIAL REQUEST**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 2.5-story Queen Anne constructed c. 1900. The building has a front gabled main block with lower side gabled projections. Roof is slate with decorative fish scale detailing on both the main roof and lower side gabled projections. Building eaves appear to be wrapped in vinyl or aluminum. The building has two internal brick chimneys. Other architectural features include wood lap siding with corner boards on the main block, wood fish scale siding in the front and side gables, 1/1 windows, and an original front door with a transom above and a decorative pilaster surround. The front porch is a later addition, completed c. 1920, and has a front gable with dentil cornice supported by Doric columns. The lot size measures approximately 50' x 140'. Adjacent historic structures are 1- and 2-story residential-style architecture currently used for residential and commercial purposes.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a request to remove the original slate roof, remove all chimneys above the roof line, and install new CertainTeed architectural shingle. The rear addition is not original to the structure and its roof has architectural shingle.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The neighboring buildings flanking 407 East Blvd have had architectural shingle since before 1987, when Dilworth was listed in the National Register of Historic Places.
2. The property is a Contributing structure to the Dilworth National Register District, which makes the property eligible for historic tax incentives for rehabilitation projects meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.
3. The proposed project is incongruous with Secretary of Interior's Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9.
4. The proposed project is incongruous with Charlotte Design Standards for Rehabilitation of Building Elements, Chapter 5 and Roofs, 4.5, numbers 1, 3, and 4.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: CONTINUE**

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

Ms. Holtz moved to continue this application because it is incongruous with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards as well as the City of Charlotte's Historic Design Standards. She cited the following Standards: the Secretary of the Interior's Standards 2.5, numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9; the HDC Standards for Roofs, 4.5, numbers 1, 3, and 4; and the HDC

Standards for rehabilitation of building elements, 5. She stated that the Commission was continuing the request to provide the applicant time to consult with experts to review the condition of the roof and asked the applicant to work with Staff in order to provide the Commission with appropriate information so they can fully consider the application at a future meeting.

Ms. Harpst recommended that the motion include a suggestion for the Applicant regarding repairing or replacing the roof of the building. Ms. Holtz suggested that the applicant work with experts on the question of whether to replace or repair the roof and chimneys.

Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

Mr. Barth suggested that the motion cite the Standards for chimneys, 4.7, numbers 1 through 5. Ms. Holtz and Ms. Parati accepted the friendly amendment.

**VOTE: 10/0**

**AYES: BARTH, CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, LINEBERGER, PARATI, SULLIVAN, TAYLOR, WOJICK, WHITLOCK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ROOF REPLACEMENT – NON-TRADITIONAL MATERIAL REQUEST – CONTINUED.**

---

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

ABSENT: BELL

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2024-00799, 1700 VAN BUREN AV (PID: 07839807) – FENESTRATION & MATERIAL CHANGES**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1-story Ranch house constructed c. 1950. The house is one of the only structures in McCrorey Heights oriented with the front elevation facing a side street. Architectural features include a low hip roof with deep eaves, a projecting hip-roof front bay, and unpainted tan brick. Windows are 6/6 replacements. The front door is also a replacement. The projecting front bay appears to be an in-filled front porch and has a tall 3-part picture window and vinyl siding. An attached front gable roof garage has been added. The left, rear, and attached garage are also clad in vinyl siding. Major renovations were completed c. 1998. Lot dimensions are approximately 57' x 150'. Adjacent historic buildings are 1-story residential structures.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is for front elevation changes to the historic main house and changes to a non-original garage addition.

**Main house, proposed front elevation changes:**

1. Replacement of non-original front door. New door will be 4-light, steel.
2. New light fixture next to front entry door.
3. Replacement of metal porch column with a new 6"x6" square painted wood post.
4. Replacement of metal porch railings with a new railing (wood, metal, and cable.)
5. Enlarge a 6/6 window opening to a 2'-6" x 5'-0" casement that matches the existing 3-part window on the front elevation. A new brick sill will be installed.

**Garage, proposed changes:**

1. Front elevation:



- a. Remove existing overhead garage door and infill vinyl siding to match existing and add three casement windows to match the 3-part window on the front elevation.
  - b. Gable end changes to include a new roof skirt, extended gable overhang, and new triangular gable vent. Vinyl siding to remain in gable end.
  - c. New planter box noted, but not shown on drawings.
2. Right Elevation:
  - a. Enlarge window opening for a new entry door.
  - b. New shed roof supported by square painted wood posts.
  - c. Replace 6/6 window with a new 6/6 vinyl window.
3. Rear Elevation:
  - a. New shed roof above the new rear patio.
  - b. Addition of one window at the rear elevation.
  - c. Replacement door in existing opening.
4. Vinyl siding to remain on left, right, and rear elevations

#### **STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Main House, front elevation changes:
  - a. New wood column should have capitol and base trim.
  - b. New railing should be either all metal or all wood. The combination of wood, metal, and cables is incongruous for front porch rail designs and the architecture of the original house.
  - c. Enlarging and changing the design of an original window opening on the front elevation is typically not approved.
2. Garage changes:
  - a. All columns should have capitol and base trim.
  - b. Planter box
    - i. Provide information about the new planter box on the front elevation (A4) and site plan (A8)
    - ii. Will the planter box permanently installed or movable?
    - iii. Built-in planters are on front elevations throughout McCrorey Heights; however, they are typically masonry.
  - c. Window/Door changes
    - i. How will vinyl siding be repaired when existing window/door openings are changed?
    - ii. Doors facing the street should be wood.
    - iii. Window on rear should be 6/6 to match the rest of the window on the house.

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

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

#### **MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

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

Ms. Lineberger moved to approve the application because it is not incongruous with the Standards for additions, 6.20-6.24 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5. She added the following conditions: that the applicant retain the original front window unless a replacement is required for egress, then the applicant can work with Staff on an appropriate replacement; that existing metal column and railing details are preserved; that door and window trim, retaining wall, front door replacement, and light fixture details are all approved by Staff. She specified that the Commission is making an exception for front yard parking Standards 8.2 because of the unique site constraints. Ms. Lineberger cited the following Standards: for front door replacement, 4.10 number 2; for trim, 4.11; for windows and doors, 4.14 to 4.16; for light fixtures, 4.16, number 2; for railings and columns, 5.7; for parking, 8.2; for retaining walls, 8.7, number 12.

Ms. Hewett requested that Ms. Lineberger specify why the Commission was making an exception for front yard parking. Ms. Lineberger explained that it was due to the unique lot size, restricting the ability to add an addition to the rear, as well as the house's front elevation facing a side street instead of the primary street.

Ms. Holtz seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 7/3**

**AYES: CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, LINEBERGER,  
TAYLOR, WOJICK, WHITLOCK**

**NAYS: BARTH, PARATI, SULLIVAN**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR FENESTRATION & MATERIAL CHANGES – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

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

ABSENT: BELL

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA-2024-00679, 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 a 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 two shed dormers on the rear elevation. Proposed material is stucco with wood trim to match existing, and 6/6 double-hung windows to match existing. Exterior dimensions of dormers not provided.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Provide exterior dormer dimensions.
2. Provide window specifications to Staff for probable approval.
3. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

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

Mr. Taylor moved to approve this application because it is not incongruous with the special character of the Historic District as described in Chapter 3 of the Design Standards, is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standard for Historic Rehabilitation on page 2.5, and because it meets Design Standards for additions, 6.20 through 6.24. He added the condition that the Applicant work with Staff for approval of dimensions, window specifications, and any other minor changes.

Mr. Barth seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 10/0**

**AYES: BARTH, CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, LINEBERGER, PARATI, SULLIVAN, TAYLOR, WOJICK, WHITLOCK**

**NAYS: NONE**

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

---

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

ABSENT: BELL

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRDEMO-2024-00797, 804-806 BROOKSIDE AV (PID: 12109332) – DEMOLITION – RESIDENTIAL**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1.5-story brick duplex with Colonial Revival elements constructed c. 1954. Architectural features include a side gable roof with wood triangular vents, a central brick chimney, and multi-pane wood windows in an 8/8 and 6/6 pattern. The front elevation is symmetrical with two small front stoops. The stoops are covered by front gable roofs with German lap siding and are supported by simple square wood columns. Both stoops have a simple metal railing. The front entrances have different doors, the one on the left has a six-panel Colonial Revival wood front door and the one on the right has a 3-light Mid-Century style door. The right and left elevations both have secondary side entries. The lot measures approximately 50' x 138'. Adjacent historic buildings are 1- and 1.5-story single-family residential houses.

**PROPOSAL:**

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

1. Property survey.
2. Digital photos of all sides of the building.
3. Digital photos of architectural details.
4. Zoutewelle survey.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Measured drawings or sketch plans with notations of height, width, and setbacks are not provided.
2. Home inspector letter from Digs Doctor references photos, but photos were not provided.
3. Context/Adjacent structures photos do not include addresses.
4. The Commission will determine whether the building has special significance to the Dilworth 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.
5. 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>: SULLIVAN      2<sup>nd</sup>: BARTH**

Mr. Sullivan 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.

Mr. Barth seconded the motion.

**VOTE 1: 10/0**

**AYES:** BARTH, CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, LINEBERGER,  
PARATI, SULLIVAN, TAYLOR, WOJICK, WHITLOCK

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION 1: APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION – RESIDENTIAL – COMPLETE.**

**MOTION 2: HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE**

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

Mr. Sullivan moved to determine that the building has special significance and value toward maintaining the character of the Dilworth Local Historic District because of its architectural style, a brick duplex with Colonial Revival elements, and year of construction in 1954.

Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

**VOTE 2: 10/0**

**AYES:** BARTH, CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, LINEBERGER,  
PARATI, SULLIVAN, TAYLOR, WOJICK, WHITLOCK

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION 2: APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION – RESIDENTIAL – DEEMED HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT.**

**MOTION 3: APPROVE DEMOLITION**

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

Mr. Sullivan 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. He 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. Holtz seconded the motion.

**VOTE 3: 10/0**

**AYES:** BARTH, CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, LINEBERGER,  
PARATI, SULLIVAN, TAYLOR, WOJICK, WHITLOCK

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION 3: APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION – RESIDENTIAL – APPROVED WITH 365 DAY STAY.**

---

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

ABSENT: BELL

RECUSED: CURME, WOJICK

**APPLICATION:**

HDCRDEMO-2024-00341, 1311 MYRTLE AV (PID: 12309402) – DEMOLITION – RESIDENTIAL

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1-story, brick single-family house constructed in 1941. The house is a hybrid cottage/bungalow with a cross gable roof. Architectural features include Bungalow massing with a half-façade engaged porch under a massive front gabled projection. The side entry on the left elevation is street facing. The lot measures approximately 75' x 175'. Adjacent buildings are 1- and 2-story single-family residential houses.

**PROPOSAL:**

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

1. Property survey
2. Digital photos of all sides of the building
3. Digital photos of architectural details
4. Elevation drawings
5. Zoutewelle survey

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The Commission will determine if the application is complete.
2. The Commission will determine whether the building has special significance to the Dilworth 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.
3. 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>:     WHITLOCK     2<sup>nd</sup>:     TAYLOR**

Mr. Whitlock 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.

Mr. Taylor seconded the motion.

**VOTE 1: 5/3**

**AYES:     BARTH, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN, TAYLOR,  
                 WHITLOCK**

**NAYS:     HAWKINS, HOLTZ, PARATI**

**DECISION 1: APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION – RESIDENTIAL – COMPLETE.**

**MOTION 2: HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE**

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

Mr. Whitlock moved to determine that the building has special significance and value toward maintaining the character of the Dilworth Local Historic District because of its architectural style, a hybrid cottage bungalow, and year of construction in 1941.

Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion.

**VOTE 2: 6/2**

**AYES: BARTH, HOLTZ, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN,  
TAYLOR, WHITLOCK**

**NAYS: HAWKINS, PARATI**

**DECISION 2: APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION – RESIDENTIAL – DEEMED HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT.**

**MOTION 3: APPROVE DEMOLITION**

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

Mr. Whitlock 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. He 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.

Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion.

**VOTE 3: 6/2**

**AYES: BARTH, HOLTZ, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN,  
TAYLOR, WHITLOCK**

**NAYS: HAWKINS, PARATI**

**DECISION 3: APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION – RESIDENTIAL – APPROVED WITH 365 DAY STAY.**

---

**CONTINUED FROM THE OCTOBER 9 MEETING**

---

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

ABSENT: BELL

RETURNED: CURME, WOJICK

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMIA-2023-01195, 928 IDEAL WAY (PID: 12112201) – SITE CHANGES & SIDE PORCH ENCLOSURE, AFTER THE FACT**

***This application was continued from the October 9, 2024, meeting for the following items:***

1. Per Design Standards for Windows, 4.14 and Secretary of the Interior's Standards 2.5.
  - a. For the proposed window changes on the front elevation, provide more information about the historically appropriate aesthetic for this style of house. Given that it is an enclosed porch, what window historically would have worked well in that space? This information is needed to determine the appropriate replacement window.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 2-story English Cottage constructed c. 1920. Architectural features include a prominent central brick chimney, asymmetrical façade with projecting right side entry bay with steep gable roof, steeply pitched gable roof with catslide on the left, and shed roofing over the second story that ties into the central steep gable. Windows are predominately 6/6 double-hung with a large second-story arched window on the front facing Sarah Marks Avenue, and an 8/8 double-hung and 8/8 casement window on the front façade to the left of the chimney. The rear of the home also has a protruding entry bay with a steep gable roof extending from the ridge of the right-side shed roof. The exterior is painted wood lap siding. The gabled portico over the front entry has standing seam metal roofing. The lot size is irregularly shaped with an angled street frontage of approximately 68' x 116' x 50' x 161'. Surrounding structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings.

## **PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project requiring Commission review includes several parts:

1. Widening the driveway closest to the house. The gravel driveway in the front yard will be widened approximately 10' to the right to create a gravel motor court wide enough for two cars. The original driveway is approximately 76' long and 12' wide.
2. Walkway changes. The existing brick-lined stone walkway that curves from front stoop to driveway will be removed following construction of motor court. A new steppingstone walkway set in a bed of mulch will be installed, leading from the front stoop to the public sidewalk at the corner of Ideal Way and Sarah Marks Avenue.
3. Side Porch Enclosure. The existing wood screen (60-square with a center decorative element) was replaced with a fixed 16-pane window on the front elevation. The change occurred between May 2021 and August 2022 per Google imaging. The window change may be due to an addition being built sometime between May 2021 and August 2022. The space appears to have been converted to finished interior space in photos from Zillow dated from November 2021.

The remaining parts of the proposed project do not require Commission review and may be approved by HDC Staff:

- Installation of artificial turf in the rear yard behind an existing fence.
- Re-positioning of (4) fence panels to provide better access to parking and shared driveway at the rear of the property that opens onto Sarah Marks Avenue.
- Change of material to shared driveway located along rear property line.
- New patio in rear yard.
- Front portico metal roof replacement because it is a like-for-like material change.

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.

### *Revised Proposal – February 12, 2025*

- Additional information about the windows prior and existing conditions is provided.
- Context photos of homes with additions in the Dilworth neighborhood are provided.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The historic windows on the house have vertically oriented panes.
2. The window muntins create horizontally oriented panes.
3. The muntins create a thicker trim condition at the top and bottom of the window.

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

One neighbor spoke up to voice concerns regarding the tree on the property line between the Applicant's property and their own.

## **MOTION: CONTINUE**

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

Ms. Holtz moved to continue the application, requiring that the Applicant provide a window replacement that matches either the lattice of the original porch or the vertical orientation of the adjacent windows and that they match the muntins to those of the historic windows with appropriate muntin sizes, weight of the headers and sash, and a more vertical orientation to match the existing historic windows. She cited the HDC Standards for window, 4.14, as well as the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5.

Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

## **VOTE: 10/0**

**AYES: BARTH, CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, LINEBERGER, PARATI, SULLIVAN, TAYLOR, WOJICK, WHITLOCK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR SITE CHANGES & SIDE PORCH ENCLOSURE – AFTER THE FACT – CONTINUED.**

---

**CONTINUED FROM THE DECEMBER 11 MEETING**

---

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

ABSENT: BELL

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMAA-2024-00676, 1541 WICKFORD PL (PID: 11908701) – ADDITION & CHANGES TO APPROVED COA – AFTER THE FACT**

**This application was continued from the December 11, 2024 meeting for the following items:**

1. Per Doors and Windows, 6.15
  - a. Front elevation.
    - i. There is a window that was proposed to be there that is not there. Provide a wider view of the structure from the street that shows a better perception of the proportion of space and how it is perceived in real life, not from an elevation drawing.
  - b. Right elevation.
    - i. The window configuration, not the window itself, but the location of the fenestration on the house needs to be reviewed.
    - ii. If the windows cannot be grouped together as twins as originally proposed, the applicant should explore options for a single window or different general configuration that would work with the interior configuration as well as the exterior configuration.
  - c. All windows on addition, including rear elevation.
    - i. The window light configuration and style needs to be addressed and changed to better meet the Design Standards in context for architectural style of the house. Changing to the six over six and the four over four would be requested.
2. Per Cornices and Trim, 6.14:
  - a. The Commission is expecting that the boxing revisions will bring the house into consistency and align the soffits.
  - b. Pork chop eave details should be eliminated, and a historic eave condition be applied.
  - c. The existing soffit on the front of the house should not be modified.
3. Applicant to confirm the accuracy of the roof pitch on the rear addition and that the drawings are accurate. The Commission requests additional information on roof pitch because visually it appears to be at a different pitch than what it drawn at on the plans.
4. The Commission understands that the grade is different than was originally proposed and accept that as fact.
5. On the rear elevation, the Commission understands that the existing grade and site elevation allows for the removal of the previously proposed retaining wall.
6. The Commission is only addressing the larger high-level items noted in this Continuance. Changes to the high-level item will have a ripple effect on other items, which will need to be discussed at a future meeting

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a one-story, American Small House with Colonial Revival elements constructed c. 1936. Architectural features include fluted pilasters around the front entry, 6/6 double-hung wood windows, and a central brick chimney. The exterior is painted brick. The front porch is partial width under a shed roof. It was slightly expanded



to the left and right at some point and partially enclosed with a screen-system. Lot size is irregular, measuring approximately 82 x 113' x 27' x 125'. Surrounding structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single family buildings.

### **PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is to make changes to the COA that was approved by the Commission at the June 9, 2021, meeting (COA# HDCRMA-2021-00009). A final inspection of the completed project was conducted in May 2023 and Staff found that the constructed project did not match the COA approved plans. This project is in the enforcement process. The deviation from approved plans includes design changes that Staff is unable to approve. The applicant is proposing to come into compliance by requesting the Commission's approval of the design changes following a previous application's denial at the August 9, 2023 meeting (HDCRMA-2023-00258).

Changes to the approved COA include:

### **Front Elevation**

1. Window eliminated on left-side addition.

### **Right Elevation**

1. Second Level Windows:
  - a. Paired windows are separated.
  - b. Sash-bar added to "B" casement windows to appear as double-hung.

### **Left Elevation**

1. The first-floor addition is approximately 2' longer than approved plans.
2. The second-floor addition extends beyond the plane of the first-floor elevation.
  - a. The second floor is supposed to have stucco the entire length of the addition instead of just having stucco in the bump-out and having brick extend up from the same plane of the first floor. This triangular area of brick will be framed out and stucco applied to bring this area of the elevation flush with the rest of the stucco bump-out. A painted wood trim band will separate the first and second floors in this area and be aligned with the eave line on the first floor.
3. First Level Windows
  - a. Changed from 6/6 to 4/4. The 4/4 windowpanes have a horizontal orientation.
4. Second Level Windows
  - a. Paired windows are separated.
  - b. Window lights are horizontal on "C" windows.
  - c. Sash-bar added to "B" casement windows to appear as double-hung

### **Rear Elevation**

1. Door Changes
  - a. Entry door on the left side has been omitted.
  - b. Sidelights have been removed from center door.
2. Brick retaining wall at base of columns was omitted.
3. Second Level Windows
  - a. Light pattern changed from 9-light with vertically oriented rectangular panes to 6-light with square panes.

### **Foundation Changes – Right, Left, & Rear Elevations**

1. The site was re-graded.

### **Eave Changes – All Elevations**

1. Eaves on original house extended to create an overhang.
2. Eave depth not consistent on original house or on addition.

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.

Revised Proposal – February 12, 2025:

- Photos detailing eaves and boxing on original structure provided.
- Front Elevation
  - Photo of view of front elevation from center of street provided, see Sheet A4.0
- Left Elevation
  - Additional information provided about roof pitch for main eave at the rear of house.
- Rear Elevation
  - Sketch illustrating how rafters and roofing will be extended on left side of elevation to align with right side provided.
- Right Elevation
  - Additional information provided about roof pitch of rear-most gable.
  - Sketch aligning ends of both eaves on rear-most gable provided.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Right Elevation
  - a. Photos provided by applicant prior to construction show that the depth of the overhang was different than on the left elevation, indicating that the original eaves were altered by previously completed work.
2. The Commission will determine if the proposed project meets the Design Standards for Additions.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

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

Ms. Wojick moved to approve the application because it is not incongruous with the Historic District and is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5. She also confirmed that the applicant addressed and restudied the items that the Commission had requested including a restudy of the doors and windows, cornice and trim details, boxing revisions, aligning the soffits, eliminating the pork chop eave detailing to maintain the historic eave, verification of the roof pitch, and application of stucco to create a more traditional material application. She cited the following Standards: for doors and windows, 6.15; for cornices and trims, 6.14; for stucco, 5.4.

Mr. Whitlock seconded the motion.

Mr. Barth suggested that the applicant be required to work with Staff to ensure that the muntin pattern of Window C be vertically oriented. Ms. Wojick and Mr. Whitlock accepted the friendly amendment.

**VOTE: 7/3**

**AYES: BARTH, CURME, HAWKINS, SULLIVAN, TAYLOR, WOJICK, WHITLOCK**

**NAYS: HOLTZ, LINEBERGER, PARATI**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION & CHANGES TO APPROVED COA – AFTER THE FACT – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

CONTINUED FROM THE JANUARY 8 MEETING

---

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

ABSENT: BELL

LEFT: BARTH

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCCMA-2023-00992, 224, 228, 232, & 236 WEST KINGSTON AV (PID: 11908904, 11908905, 11908906, & 11908907) – NEW CONSTRUCTION – MULTI-FAMILY**

***This application was continued from the January 8, 2025 meeting for the following items:***

Restudy the following:

Per Design Standards 6.12-6.18, continue the front buildings only for the following items:

1. Provide additional historic architectural detailing and dimensions for materials; porches; column and beam relationship on the porches; eave lines; cornices; including more substantial overhangs on the main roof lines.
2. Provide additional details about proposed doors and windows, and the door/window trim, which should be more in keeping with the Design Standards, specifically referencing the details shown on page thirty-seven of the presentation.
3. Provide additional information about gutter locations. Typically, gutters are applied to fascia boards. Provide a historic example in the Wilmore neighborhood that has concealed, integrated gutters.
4. Provide additional information about materials for roofing, siding, trim, railings, foundations, vents, doors and windows, porch flooring and steps

Continue the back buildings only for the following:

1. Restudy the back buildings as it approaches the rear property line for items such as Context, 6.1-6.4; Setback, 6.5; Massing, 6.8, Height, 6.9, Scale, 6.10, and Directional Expression, 6.11.
2. Apply the same comments contained in the first motion on details as it relates to the back buildings. Per Design Standards 6.12 – 6.18, for foundations, roof forms and materials, cornices and trim, doors and windows, porches, and materials.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The four parcels are currently vacant. A 365-Day Stay of Demolition was approved by the HDC on September 13, 2017, and the COA for demolition was issued September 14, 2018.

***Background***

Originally, each of the four parcels contained a 1-story residential-style structure. The buildings were connected with heated space. 236 West Kingston was constructed c. 1923 and connected to 232 W Kingston. 228 and 224 were also connected to make one building and were constructed c. 1936 and 1940, respectively. Adjacent structures are commercial and 1-story single-family homes. Across the street are single and multi-family buildings. The historic multi-family building at 241 West Kingston Avenue was constructed in 1949, the height is approximately 32' measured from grade. The single-family house at 245 West Kingston was constructed in 1954 and its approximate height is 33'. The single-family house at 251 West Kingston Avenue was constructed in 1936, with a pre-Historic District rear addition height of approximately 40'.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is the construction of six (6) new multi-family structures. The site is composed of:

1. Building A: a 2-story duplex, proposed to be 28'-11" in height from grade to ridge, with an additional 4'-0" below grade. Proposed setback is 43' to front thermal wall and 53' to front porch. Overall dimensions are 40'-0" x 46'-6".
2. Building B: a 3-story duplex, proposed to be 34'-8" tall from grade to ridge, with an additional 4'-0" below grade. Proposed setback is 59' to front thermal wall and 49' to the front porch. Overall dimensions are 40'-0" x 50'-4".
3. Building C: a 3-story triplex, proposed to be 33'-8" tall from grade to ridge, with an additional 4'-0" below grade. Has varied setbacks. The unit closest to Building B has a setback of 61' to the front thermal wall and 56' to the

front porch. The other two (2) units have a setback of 59' to the front thermal wall and 49' to the front porch. Overall dimensions are 60'-0" x 50'-4".

4. Building D: a 3-story quadruplex, proposed to be 34'-8" tall from grade to ridge, with an additional 4'-0" below grade. Overall dimensions are 64'-0" x 40'-0".
5. Buildings E & F: a 3-story triplex, proposed to be 34'-8" tall from grade to ridge, with an additional 4'-0" below grade. Overall dimensions are 48'-0" x 40'-0".

Proposed setbacks of the front three (3) buildings on West Kingston Avenue vary from approximately 45'-61' to the front thermal walls and 49' - 53' to the front porches.

Proposed materials include brick foundation, Hardie Artisan lap siding with smooth Azek Straight Edge Shingle siding, and asphalt shingle roof. Windows are proposed to be double-hung Jeld-Wen Sitrine, all wood, in 1/1 and 6/1, with a rectangular light pattern. All windows are proposed with 5/8" muntins and tradition trim. Proposed tree removal is not provided. Doors are proposed to be Jeld-Wen Sitrine wood doors with glass. All trim and columns are proposed to be wood.

Revised Proposal – November 13, 2024:

1. Building A1: a 1-story structure, proposed to be 24'-6" in height from grade to ridge. Proposed setbacks are 74' to front thermal wall and 66' to front porch from the back of curb. Setbacks from property line are not provided. Overall dimensions are 36'-0" x 35'-4.5", with an 8'-0" deep front porch.
2. Building B1: a 2-story structure, proposed to be 28'-2" tall from grade to ridge. Proposed setbacks are 74' to front thermal wall and 66' to front porch from the back of curb. Setbacks from property line are not provided. Overall dimensions are 37'-0" x 35'-4.5", with an 8'-0" deep front porch.
3. Building C1: a 2-story structure, proposed to be 29'-10" tall from grade to ridge. Proposed setbacks are 74' to front thermal wall and 66' to front porch from the back of curb. Setbacks from property line are not provided. Overall dimensions are 37'-0" x 35'-4", with an 8'-0" deep front porch.
4. Building CH: a 1-story structure, proposed to be 22'-4" tall from grade to ridge. Proposed setbacks are 89'-4" to front thermal wall from the back of curb. Setbacks from property line are not provided. Overall dimensions are 20'-0" x 20'-0" with a side connector.
5. Building A2: a 1-story structure, proposed to be 24'-4" in height from grade to ridge. Proposed setback from the rear property line is 15'-0" and the proposed setback from the driveway is 20'-0" to the front porch. Side setback information is not provided. Overall dimensions are 36'-0" x 37'-0", with an 8'-0" deep front porch.
6. Building B2: a 2-story structure, proposed to be 28'-2" tall from grade to ridge. Proposed setback from the rear property line is 15'-0" and the proposed setback from the driveway is 20'-0" to the front porch. Overall dimensions are 36'-0" x 37'-0", with an 8'-0" deep front porch.
7. Building B3: a 2-story structure, proposed to be 28'-2" tall from grade to ridge. Proposed setback from the rear property line is 15'-0" and the proposed setback from the driveway is 20'-0" to the front porch. Overall dimensions are 34'-0" x 37'-0", with an 8'-0" deep front porch.
8. Building C2: a 2-story structure, proposed to be 29'-10" tall from grade to ridge. Proposed setback from the rear property line is 15'-0" and the proposed setback from the driveway is 20'-0" to the front porch. Proposed side setback is 5'-0". Overall dimensions are 34'-0" x 37'-0", with an 8'-0" deep front porch

Proposed changes to materials include Jeld-Wen Sitrine Aluminum-clad windows, and the removal of Azek Straight Edge Shingle siding. All other proposed materials remain the same.

Revised Proposal – January 8, 2025

1. Revised drawing set provided.
2. Summary page on Height & Width, Setbacks, and Spacing provided.
3. Setbacks from property lines provided on setbacks page.
4. Proposed landscape plan provided.
5. Form analysis provided.

6. Section analysis provided.

Revised Proposal – February 12, 2025

1. Revised drawing set provided.
2. Height and Width of front building remains the same as proposed at January meeting.
3. Height of rear buildings steps down in the rear, width remains the same as proposed at January meeting.
4. Updated details page provided.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Building A1 & A2:
  - a. Update side elevations to show rear porch on building A1.
  - b. Restudy brick foundation banding on front elevation.
  - c. Restudy beam proportion and on front porch.
    - i. Restudy eave and beam relationship.
  - d. Restudy trim band and eaves relationship.
  - e. Restudy eave returns on all elevations.
    - i. Clarify if rear gable is a pediment.
  - f. Restudy gable eave and window trim relationship on rear elevation.
2. Building B1, B2, & B3:
  - a. Update side elevations to show rear porch and front gable stoop on building B1.
  - b. Update side elevations to show front gable stoop on building B2 and B3.
  - c. Correct drawing error on front and rear elevations at main eave and beam location.
  - d. Restudy gable eave and beam relationship on front porch.
  - e. Restudy the panel detail on both side elevations.
    - i. Beef up trim and add trim to panel.
  - f. Restudy rear double dormers.
    - i. Consider one dormer that bumps-in on all sides.
    - ii. Restudy dormer window to siding relationship.
3. Building C1 & CH:
  - a. Update side elevations to show rear porch on building C1.
  - b. Restudy window and siding relationship (above doors) on front elevation.
  - c. Clarify cheek wall material and/or correct drawing error.
  - d. Restudy gable eave returns and trim band/eaves relationships.
    - i. Clarify if gables are pediment roofs.
  - e. Commission to determine if glass connector meets the Standards.
  - f. Restudy gable eave and window trim relationship on rear elevation.
  - g. Restudy the panel detail on the left side elevations.
    - i. Beef up trim and add trim to panel.
4. Building C2:
  - a. Restudy window and siding relationship (above doors) on front elevation.
  - b. Clarify cheek wall material and/or correct drawing error.
  - c. Restudy the panel detail on the left side elevations.
    - i. Beef up trim and add trim to panel.
  - d. Restudy rear cantilever dormer.
    - i. Consider a true dormer.
5. Details and Materials:
  - a. Add beam to column detail page.
  - b. Update drawing errors on handrail detail.
  - c. Provide porch flooring and front step materials for all buildings.
  - d. Provide a brick-and-mortar sample.

- e. Provide gutter/downspout specifications.
    - i. Update drawing to include gutters/downspouts
  - f. Clarify all trim and details will be wood, including proposed shake siding.
6. Site Plan:
- a. Provide information about location of HVAC units, dumpsters, and any other site appurtenances.
  - b. Provide information about tree removal.
  - c. Work with Staff on fence detail

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: DENY**

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

Ms. Lineberger moved to deny this application because it is incongruous with the Historic District and fails to meet the HDC Standards for new construction, Chapter 6, including Standards 6.1-6.4 for context, 6.6 for spacing, 6.8 for massing and complexity of form, 6.9 for height and width, 3.10 for scale, and 6.12-6.18.

Ms. Holtz seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 5/4**

**AYES: CURME, HOLTZ, LINEBERGER, PARATI, SULLIVAN**

**NAYS: HAWKINS, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION – MULTI-FAMILY – DENIED.**

---

Due to time constraints the following cases will be heard at the March 12, 2025 meeting:

- HDCRMA-2024-00212 for 1329 Lafayette Av
- HDCRMA-2023-01199 for 1433 The Plaza
- HDCRMAA-2024-00338 for 317 W Park Av
- HDCRMA-2024-00684 for 220 S Summit Av
- HDCRMA-2024-00683 for 610 N Pine St

With no further business to discuss, Chair Hawkins recessed the meeting at 7:00 p.m.