



---

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
January 8, 2025 | Room 267

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Nichelle Hawkins (Chair) Chris Barth (Second Vice Chair) Shauna Bell Sarah Curme Cameron Holtz Christa Lineberger Sean Sullivan Brett Taylor Scott Whitlock Heather Wojick
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Kim Parati (Vice Chair) 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 Elizabeth Lamy, 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 1:11 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).

---

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

##### **CONSENT**

HDCRMI-2024-01015, 1721 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMI-2024-00802, 814 Berkeley Av	Dilworth
HDCRMI-2024-01014, 2020 Charlotte Dr	Dilworth

##### **NOT HEARD AT THE DECEMBER 11 MEETING**

HDCRMA-2024-00212, 1329 Lafayette Av	Dilworth
--------------------------------------	----------

##### **CONTINUED FROM THE OCTOBER 30 MEETING**

HDCRMA-2023-01199, 1433 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMI-2024-00210, 1901 Thomas Av	Plaza Midwood

##### **CONTINUED FROM NOVEMBER 13 MEETING**

HDCCMA-2023-00992, 224, 228, 232, & 236 W Kingston Av	Wilmore
---	---------

##### **NEW CASES**

HDCCMAA-2024-00667, 922 East Bv	Dilworth
HDCRMIA-2024-00489, 1544 Merriman Av	Wilmore
HDCCMA-2024-00803, 407 East Bv	Dilworth
HDCRMI-2024-00799, 1700 Van Buren Av	McCrorey Heights
HDCRMA-2024-00679, 1607 Dilworth Rd W	Dilworth
HDCRDEMO-2024-00797, 804-806 Brookside Av	Dilworth
HDCRDEMO-2024-00341, 1311 Myrtle Av	Dilworth

---

#### **CONSENT**

---

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

ABSENT: LINEBERGER, PARATI

##### **APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2024-01015, 1721 THE PLAZA (PID: 08118605) – FRONT PORCH CHANGES & ADDITION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1-story Craftsman bungalow built c. 1930. Architectural features include a symmetrical three-bay façade with a central entrance flanked by paired windows, side gable roof, and small shed roof front dormer. The front terrace is partial width, and the central portion has a front gable portico supported by square wood columns. The portico is a non-original feature of the house. Exterior materials are wood lap siding with mitered corners, a painted brick foundation, an unpainted brick chimney on the right elevation, deep eaves with exposed rafters, 4/1 windows, and an original front door. The lot measures approximately 66' x 170'. Adjacent historic buildings are a mix of 1- and 2-story residential structures.

**PROPOSAL:**

As built, the front porch is partial width. A non-original portico covers the central portion. A terrace is located to the left of the portico. A large tree damaged the front portico and terrace during last fall's Hurricane Helene.

The proposed project is to re-build a new, full-width front porch. No other changes to the building are proposed.

**Details of the proposed project include:**

1. The porch depth will be slightly expanded toward the 30' deed restricted front set-back.
2. Dimensions of existing and proposed porch footprint are not provided.
3. The new front porch roof is proposed to tie into the original house roof, see Sheet A2. The original shed-roof front dormer will not be impacted.
4. The front gable and ends of the new porch roof are proposed to be shake shingles.
5. All trim and porch columns are proposed to be wood with design and dimensions to match existing.
6. The foundation and front steps are proposed to be brick, unpainted, to match existing.
7. Roof material is asphalt shingle to match existing.
8. Porch floor and ceiling materials are not provided.

An emergency COA may be issued to reconstruct the front portico to pre-damaged conditions; however, since the applicant requested to change the design and expand the front porch, full Commission review is required.

**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, Porches 4.8 and New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6.
  - a. The proposal is similar to previously approved front porch additions at 825 Romany Road (2024), 318 Grandin Rd (November 2019), 429 West Blvd (May 2019), and 1910 Ewing Drive (2016).
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. Eave lines of original house should not be changed. Front porch roof needs to be inset and distinctly separate from the original house roof.
  - b. Front porch foundation should not be flush with house corners but should step-in from both corners of the house.
  - c. Provide porch footprint dimensions.
  - d. New masonry should not be painted. Brick/mortar should match original on the house.
  - e. Shake siding should be individually applied, not panels of shake.
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>: WOJICK**

Ms. Curme moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the special character of the district and meets the requirements of Chapter 3 of the Standards and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5. She added the conditions 2(a) through 2(e) of the Staff recommendations. Ms. Curme also cited the Standards for porches, 4.8 and new construction for residential buildings, Chapter 6.

Ms. Wojick seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 9/0****AYES: BARTH, BELL, CURME, HOLTZ, HAWKINS,  
SULLIVAN, TAYLOR, WOJICK, WHITLOCK****NAYS: NONE****DECISION: APPLICATION FOR FRONT PORCH CHANGES & ADDITION – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

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

ABSENT: LINEBERGER, PARATI

**APPLICATION:****HDCRMI-2024-00802, 814 BERKELEY AV (PID: 12309518) – SIDE PORCH CHANGES****EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing building is 2-story Colonial Revival constructed c. 1928. The building has a symmetrical façade with a central portico and partial width brick terrace that connects to a 1-story side porch with balustraded roof. The front portico and side porch have wide beams with dentil molding supporting by round Tuscan columns and square pilasters. Other architectural features include a side-gable slate roof with a decorative dentil mold cornice, 6/6 double-hung wood windows flanked by operational wood shutters, and an exterior painted brick chimney flanked by quarter round louvered wood vents on the right elevation. Exterior material is wood lap siding with corner boards and an unpainted brick foundation. The lot size measures approximately 75' x 160'. Adjacent historic buildings are 1.5, 2, and 2.5-story residential structures.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is changes to an existing side porch. The applicant proposes to remove the porch's original beam, round Doric columns, and square pilasters. The non-original screens are proposed to be removed. The new porch will have flat pilasters connected by casement windows atop a paneled base. The porch floor will remain unchanged. Proposed materials are not provided. New windows are proposed to be Marvin Signature Ultimate casement with 7/8" Simulated True Divided Light (STD L) muntins.

**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 Design Standards – Rehabilitation of Building Elements, Porches 4.8 and 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. The porch changes should be reversible and should not damage original architectural features.
  - b. Original architectural features of the porch are to remain.
    - i. Do not remove and replace the original columns, pilasters, beam and/or trim.

- c. Consider eliminating the window muntins to provide a more glassy, open appearance. Or, consider full-length windows, instead of a paneled base.
  - d. Provide window and door specifications that meet HDC Standards.
  - e. All materials are to be traditional with design and dimensions 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>: SULLIVAN      2<sup>nd</sup>: WOJICK**

Mr. Sullivan moved to approve the application because it is not incongruous with the district. He cited the Historic District Commission Standards for porches, number 4.8, and new construction, Chapter 6. He also cited the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5. Mr. Sullivan added the conditions provided in the Staff recommendations, 2(a) through 2(e).

Ms. Harpst suggested Mr. Sullivan remove the word "consider" from condition (c) so that the applicant understands that it is not a suggestion, and that the approval was conditioned on full length windows instead of a paneled base. Mr. Sullivan accepted the suggestion from Ms. Harpst.

Ms. Wojick seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 9/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR SIDE PORCH CHANGES – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

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

ABSENT: LINEBERGER, PARATI

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2024-01014, 2020 CHARLOTTE DR (PID: 12111102) – ACCESSORY BUILDING**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1.5 story Colonial Revival cottage constructed in 1936. Architectural features include side gable roof and an oversized projecting front gable porch. Siding material is brick. Adjacent structures are 1- and 2-story single family houses. The house height is approximately 20'-9". The lot size is 55' x 140'.

**PROPOSAL:**

A large tree damaged the original 1-story garage during last fall's Hurricane Helene. The applicant is proposing to demolish the remainder of the structure and rebuild a new 1.5-story accessory structure on top of the existing concrete slab and unpainted brick foundation wall. Details of the proposed project include:

1. Accessory structure proposed height as measured from existing slab to ridge is approximately 19'-0". Height of the main house is approximately 20.9' at the right front corner and 21.5' at the front left corner. A property cross-section is provided on Sheet A3, but does not note final, as-built height difference between proposed accessory structure and main house.
2. Proposed exterior material is Hardie Artisan lap siding, smooth finish with wood corner boards.

3. Gable end windows proposed to be casement and dormer windows double-hung. All windows will have clear glass with Simulated True Divided Light (STD L) muntins in a 6/1 pattern to match the main house.
4. Window manufacturer and materials is not specified.
5. The man door on the right elevation is proposed to be fiber glass.
6. Material of garage door not provided.
7. Gutters and downspouts will be 6" half round copper to match the house.
8. There are no impacts to mature trees.

An emergency COA may be issued to reconstruct the damaged structure to pre-damaged conditions; however, since the applicant requested to change the design on a visible corner lot, full Commission review is required.

#### **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, and Accessory Structures, 8.10.
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 as-built height difference between the main house and the accessory structure on the section drawing (Sheet A3). As-built, the new accessory structure should be visibly 1'-0" shorter than the main house in elevation.
  - b. Dormer roofs should tie in 6" below the main ridge.
  - c. Materials:
    - i. New Hardie Artisan siding should be smooth finish.
    - ii. Boral is not approved.
    - iii. All trim should be wood (corner boards, roof, window, door, etc.)
  - d. Windows and Doors:
    - i. Dormer windows need to have appropriately sized mullions and trim for a field of siding.
    - ii. First level windows should be added to the right and rear elevations.
    - iii. The proposed full height brackets flanking the man-door on the right elevation are too large proportionally for the space.
    - iv. New garage door and the man door on the right elevation shall be wood.
    - v. Provide window and door specifications that meet HDC Standards.
  - e. If rebuilding on the original footprint is not permitted by Zoning, the applicant may work with Staff to bring the building into compliance with the minimum required setbacks, with the structure being set as close to the rear right corner of the parcel as possible.
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>:     TAYLOR                    2<sup>nd</sup>:     WHITLOCK**

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the application because it is not incongruous with the character of the district and because it is consistent with the Design Standards. He cited the following Standards: for new construction, Chapter 6; and for accessory buildings, 8.10. Finally, he required that the applicant meet conditions 2(a) through 2(e) in the Staff recommendations, with the exception of 2(c)(ii) and 2(d)(ii). He specified that the motion would omit the condition that first level windows be added to the right and rear elevations.

Mr. Whitlock seconded the motion.

Ms. Bell suggested that the motion specify that the first level windows were not being required because the building is in the private domain and in proximity to the fence. Mr. Taylor and Mr. Whitlock accepted the amendment.

**VOTE: 9/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY BUILDING – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

**CONTINUED FROM THE DECEMBER 11 MEETING**

---

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

ABSENT: LINEBERGER, PARATI

RECUSED: CURME, TAYLOR

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA-2024-00212, 1329 LAFAYETTE AV (PID: 12309304) – ACCESSORY STRUCTURE & FRONT PORCH CHANGES**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing building is a 2-story Colonial Revival constructed c. 1936. Architectural details include a side gabled roof, painted brick, 6/6 windows, front door with sidelights, and a round portico front stoop with round columns and a second-floor balcony. The lot size is approximately 80' x 175'. Adjacent historic structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is in two parts:

1. The expansion of the front stoop to a full width uncovered front porch.
  - a. Proposed footprint is 45'-2" x 6'-0" with an 8'-8" rounded section at the front left corner that connects to the existing left side porch.
  - b. Proposed materials are broken red tile to match existing with an unpainted brick border and an unpainted brick foundation to match existing.
2. The addition of a new accessory structure.
  - a. Existing accessory structure to be demolished.
  - b. Proposed footprint is 30'-0" x 28'-0".
  - c. Proposed height is 24'-0" from grade.
  - d. Proposed materials include shingle roof, unpainted brick foundation, wood lap siding with a 7" exposure, wood trim/details, 6/6 windows, wood garage doors, and aluminum railing. Window material not provided, handrail detail not provided, and bracket detail not provided.
  - e. Proposed rear yard permeability is 67.39%.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The Commission will determine if the front porch addition meets the Standards.
  - a. Information on applicant provided examples.
    - 908 Mt. Vernon Av – New Construction built in 2004.
    - 1326 Dilworth Rd – Front porch existed pre-district.

- 1515 Dilworth Rd (*wrong image provided*) – Front porch cannot be verified. The front and side porch exist on a site survey submitted with a rear addition application in 2008.
  - 1508 Dilworth Rd (*labeled as 1515 Dilworth in image*) – Front porch existed pre-district.
2. Accessory Structure:
- a. Massing, height and width, scale, and size.
  - b. Two-story and coplanar walls.
  - c. Provide window and door materials and specifications.
  - d. Provide detail page for window/door trim, handrails, and brackets.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION 1: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

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

Ms. Wojick moved to approve the application for the expansion of the front porch with the condition that the sides step in from the existing foundation of the house and that the brick remain unpainted. She specified that the sides must step in a minimum of four inches from the existing foundation but must correlate with the existing coursing of the brick foundation. She cited the following Standards: for porches, 4.8; and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5.

Ms. Holtz seconded the motion.

**VOTE 1: 7/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HOLTZ, HAWKINS,  
SULLIVAN, WOJICK, WHITLOCK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION 1: APPLICATION FOR FRONT PORCH – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

**MOTION 2: CONTINUE**

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

Ms. Wojick moved to continue the application for the accessory structure. She required that the applicant restudy the massing and scale of the dormers and proposed roof lines in order to reduce the scale of the structure. She cited the Standards for massing, 6.8, scale, 6.10; and accessory structures, 8.10.

Mr. Barth suggested the friendly amendment that the applicant be required to analyze the rhythm of the fenestration on the dormers in order to make them more consistent with other historic structures in the area. Ms. Wojick accepted the amendment.

Mr. Barth seconded the motion.

**VOTE 2: 7/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HOLTZ, HAWKINS,  
SULLIVAN, WOJICK, WHITLOCK**

**NAYS: TAYLOR**

**DECISION 2: APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE– CONTINUED.**

---

**CONTINUED FROM THE OCTOBER 30 MEETING**

---

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

RETURNED: CURME, TAYLOR



**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA-2023-01199, 1433 THE PLAZA (PID: 08117117) – NEW CONSTRUCTION – RESIDENTIAL**

***This application was continued from the October 30, 2024, meeting for the following items:***

1. Context.
  - a. Provide additional information about context and specifically reference unaltered historic properties.
2. Massing and complexity of form, Standard 6.8.
  - a. Restudy the relationship of this new structure to the historic neighbors.
  - b. Explore the general architectural style to solidify the details as related to the volume of massing, including roof form.
3. Height.
  - a. Explore reducing the height.
  - b. Provide more specifics and details on heights and how the volume of the roof lines present themselves on the proposed new construction as compared to the other historic houses on the street. That can be a beneficial visual for the Commissioners to review.
4. Scale.
  - a. Provide more scale reducing elements to break up the one and a half story element and help with the pedestrian view.
5. Roof form and materials, 6.13 and 6.18.
  - a. Restudy roof form as part of the massing restudy.
  - b. Provide examples of metal roofing being used on historic front porches on style of architecture.
  - c. Restudy the dormers design.
    - i. The location of the windows.
    - ii. Ratio of siding to window is incongruous with the Craftsman style in the district.
    - iii. The dormers and how they break the eave line are incongruous with the Craftsman style in the district.
6. Materials, 6.18.
  - a. Provide examples of historic houses with board and batten and/or shiplap on this street, within the context view.
7. Windows and doors, 6.15, number 1, A through D.
  - a. Restudy the fenestration and provide more consistency.
  - b. Provide an example of the two-over-one window muntin design.
  - c. In terms of spacing and widths of moldings, please review window trim dimensions, especially mullion trim on ganged windows.
8. Provide the rear yard permeability percentage, per Standard 8.4, number 7. The rear yard is measured from rear thermal wall of the proposed main structure to the rear property line, with 50% of the rear yard needing to remain permeable.
  - a. If the impermeable area is not meeting the 50% requirement, provide alternatives for pervious materials that will allow the 50% permeability requirement to be met.
9. Reference the Staff's notes on pages 2 and 3 when restudying the proposed project.
10. Not reviewing the accessory structure at this time.
11. Setbacks, Spacing, and Orientation all meet the Design Standards
12. Foundation seems to be consistent with the neighborhood.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1-story, American Small House with Colonial Revival elements constructed c. 1933.

Architectural features include a side gable, boxed eave roof with two small gable dormers on the front elevation, a partial width engaged front porch supported by wood square columns (the handrail is not original), and wood double-hung 6/6 windows. Some windows, such as on the dormers, have traditional wood window trim. Some windows have

brick mould trim. It appears the large front window is a later replacement. Exterior materials include wood German lap siding with corner boards and a painted brick foundation. Originally a single-family structure, the building is currently divided into three units. Multiple rear additions have been constructed over the years.

A simple, one-story accessory building is located at the rear of the property. The front elevation faces School Street. The left elevation, which faces the house, is constructed on top of a CMU retaining wall. The building has a front gable roof, 6/6 windows with brick mould trim, and German lap wood siding with wood corner boards. The lot is irregular and measures approximately 55' x 132' x 28' with a 10' alley at the rear. Adjacent historic properties are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings.

On July 10, 2024, the Commission voted to approve demolition of the primary building and accessory building with a 365-day stay under application #HDCRDEMO-2023-01198.

### **PROPOSAL:**

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

#### **Primary Building:**

The tallest height is 27'-4.5" as measured from grade to ridge at the front left corner, and 33'-6" at the rear of the property. The property slopes down both to the right and to the rear. Proposed width is 28'-4" and steps in between 2'-0" and 1'-8" along the right elevation. Setbacks are 35'-4". The proposed exterior materials are Hardie Artisan lap siding with a 9" reveal, cementitious board and batten in the dormers and gable ends, and an unpainted brick foundation. Both asphalt and metal are proposed for the roofs. The windows are proposed to be 2/1 SDL Sierra Pacific Westchester aluminum-clad in both double-hung and casement. Column and trim materials are unknown.

#### **Accessory Building:**

At the tallest point, height is 21'-1 1/2" as measured from grade to ridge. The overall dimensions are 20'-8" x 14'-0". Setbacks are not provided. The proposed exterior materials are Hardie Artisan lap siding with a 9" reveal, unpainted brick foundation, and asphalt roof. The single garage door details are unknown. Windows proposed to be 2/1 SDL Sierra Pacific Westchester aluminum-clad casement, and the man door is proposed to be wood.

#### **Site Work:**

Both a retaining wall and fence are proposed. The fence is wood and 3'-0" tall. The retaining wall is unpainted brick, and the height is unknown. Staff can approve true retaining walls and fencing.

### **Revised Proposal – January 8, 2025**

1. Revised drawing set provided.
2. Main structure design changes include roof massing, windows & doors, and materials.
3. Accessory structure design changes include orientation, height, and massing.
4. Main structure height changes from 27.3' (October) to 28.7' (January).
5. Accessory structure height changes from 21.3' (October) to 18.17' (January).
6. Metal roofs and board & batten have been eliminated.
7. Materials include Hardie Artisan lap siding with a 9" reveal, wood shakes, unpainted brick, asphalt shingle roof, and Sierra Pacific Westchester Aluminum-clad windows.
8. Details page provided.

### **STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Main Structure
  - a. Height.
  - b. Roof form and massing (left elevation).

- c. Windows and doors, and rhythm (left elevation).
  - d. Window/eave location on rear and left elevations.
  - e. Window style (2/1) is incongruous with the Craftsman-style and district.
  - f. Provide brick sample.
- 2. Accessory Building
    - a. Windows and doors, and rhythm.
    - b. Provide garage door material.
    - c. Provide brick sample.
  - 3. Site Work
    - a. Provide dimensions for retaining wall.
    - b. Provide fence detail to Staff for probable approval.
    - c. Provide brick sample.

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

Mr. Barth moved to continue the application. He required the applicant to review the following: height, focusing on minimizing, roof forms, scale-reducing techniques, architectural style, context regarding height, and directional expression; the front dormer, requiring the front wall of the dormer be pushed back behind the main floor thermal wall and that the applicant provide examples of a similar style from within the District; restudy the rear and School Street eave heights as it relates to the roof form; the fenestration along the left elevation to better balance solid and void across the elevation, particularly as it responds to the main floor; specifications for the garage door, requiring that the applicant represent the garage door as a two-door carriage style; materials, requiring that the applicant either put siding on the second floor to mimic the left side of the main floor or carry the corner boards from the second floor down to the foundation as is seen typically seen on historic houses, otherwise the applicant would need to provide context for the current design; brick, requiring a sample of the intended brick; Staff notes, requiring a review of all Staff recommendations with special attention to site work, requiring further fence and retaining wall details as well as further mitigation of damage to the tree brought up by the neighbor.

Mr. Barth cited the following Standards: for height, 6.9; for massing, 6.8; for directional expression, 6.11; for roof forms, 6.13; for context, 6.1 through 6.4; for doors and windows, 6.15 and 6.16; for accessory structures, 8.10; for trees, 8.5; and for materials, 6.18. Mr. Barth also specified that the Commission was not reviewing other architectural details at the time.

Ms. Holtz seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 6/3**

**AYES:     BARTH, BELL, CURME, HOLTZ, SULLIVAN, WHITLOCK**

**NAYS:     HAWKINS, TAYLOR, WOJICK**

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

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

ABSENT: PARATI

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2024-00210, 1901 THOMAS AV (PID: 08119333) – DOOR CHANGES**

**This application was continued from the October 30, 2024 meeting for the following items:**

1. Rear porch removal.
  - a. Provide a restudy of rear elevation and the relationship of the rear porch with the dormer.
  - b. Provide more information on the existing conditions including elevation drawings.
2. Siding, per Materials 6.18.
  - a. Provide evidence that the siding that was removed was indeed not salvageable and needed to be replaced.
  - b. Provide the dimensions, details, and specifications for the existing, original siding versus the requested replacement siding.
3. Front door, per Front Doors and Entrances, 4.10.
  - a. Provide specifications for the existing front door that was removed, what the door looked like, and what the specification of that is, as well as the specifications for the proposed replacement door.
4. Per Standard 4.4, Rehabilitation of Historic Foundations and Standard 6.12, Foundations.
  - a. Provide details and specification for the replacement of the foundation with the vents.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1.5-story Craftsman Bungalow constructed in 1929. Architectural features include a clipped side gable roof, covered front porch, front door with sidelights, vinyl siding, painted chimney and foundation, and 6/1 windows. Lot size is approximately 50' x 150'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5 story single-family structures.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is in five parts.

**Part 1: Door Change Front Elevation.**

The proposal is the removal of the front door entrance on the side of the front bump out, and the restoration of the front elevation to the original 1929 condition. The existing door is proposed to be removed and the wall filled in with vinyl to match existing.

**Part 2: Side Door Addition.**

The proposal is the removal of the non-original side entrance addition on the left elevation, and the restoration of the left elevation to the original 1929 condition. The addition is proposed to be removed and the wall filled in with vinyl to match existing.

**Part 3: Rear Porch.**

The proposal is the removal of the rear porch. It is unclear if the existing porch is historic. The 1950s Sanborn Map does show a rear porch in the location of the existing rear porch. The 1929 Sanborn Map shows no rear porch. The existing porch has a shed roof with asphalt shingle, painted brick foundation, and screening with vinyl sided half walls.

**Part 4: Window.**

The proposal is the removal of the existing windows. The material of the existing window has not been provided but looks to be non-original with grids-between-the-glass (GBG).

**Part 5: Siding.**

The proposal is the removal of the historic siding. Staff approved the vinyl siding to be removed and the existing historic wood lap siding to be restored under application # HDCADMRM-2024-00059. Information about the historic siding has not been provided. Information on the new siding has not been provided.

**Revised Proposal – January 8, 2024:**

1. Applicant statement provided.
2. Rear porch drawing provided.

3. Front door images provided.
4. Siding and foundation images provided.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Rear Porch Removal.
  - a. Window and siding proportions.
  - b. Match existing historic materials and details.
2. Siding.
  - a. Provide documentation of original siding conditions.
  - b. Provide proposed siding specifications and sample.
  - c. Match existing historic materials and details.
3. Door Change on Front Elevation & Side Door Addition.
  - a. Match existing historic materials and details.
  - b. Do not use synthetic siding, such as vinyl or aluminum to cover existing wood.
  - c. Base the design of reconstructed wood elements on pictorial or physical evidence from historic sources.
4. Window.
  - a. Provide documentation of existing conditions.
  - b. Provide proposed window specifications.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION 1: DENY**

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

Mr. Barth moved to deny the removal of the front door, citing the Standard for doors, 4.10.

Ms. Wojick suggested that the motion also deny the removal of the historic siding. Mr. Barth accepted the amendment and cited the Standard for siding, 5.2.

Ms. Hewett requested that Mr. Barth provide additional specific facts supporting the motion. Mr. Barth explained that the Commission did not receive photographic evidence of the deterioration of the original siding and door and that it was beyond repair.

Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion.

**VOTE 1: 10/0**

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

**NAYS:     NONE**

**DECISION 1: APPLICATION FOR FRONT DOOR & SIDING REMOVAL – DENIED.**

**MOTION 2: CONTINUE**

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

Mr. Barth moved to continue the rear porch, requiring the applicant to restudy the roof form, minimizing the nonconforming dormer following the Commission's recommendations regarding columns, eave lines, roof form, railings, and doors. He cited the Standard for porches, 6.17.

Ms. Wojick seconded the motion.

**VOTE 2: 10/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION 2: APPLICATION FOR REAR PORCH – CONTINUED.**

**MOTION 3: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

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

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

Mr. Barth moved to approve the application for the foundation changes, stating that the Commission had testimony from the applicant who had replaced dilapidated sections of the foundation. He required that the applicant work with Staff to remove the veneer brick and stucco on the foundation and match the existing stucco or parging on the historic foundation.

Ms. Wojick suggested that the motion also approve the replacement of the siding and door. Mr. Barth accepted the amendment and required that the applicant work with Staff on the style, dimensions, materials, and details for the door and siding. Mr. Barth cited the Standards for foundations, 4.4 and 6.12.

Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion.

**VOTE 3: 10/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION 3: APPLICATION FOR FOUNDATION CHANGES – FRONT DOOR AND SIDING REPLACEMENT – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

**CONTINUED FROM THE NOVEMBER 13 MEETING**

---

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

ABSENT: PARATI

**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 November 13, 2024 meeting for the following items:**

Restudy the following:

1. Context, 6.2, and Context, 6.3, numbers 2, 3, 4, and 5.
  - a. Show the context of the back buildings, Buildings A-2, B-2, B-3, C-2, as they relate to the neighboring properties behind them.
2. Setbacks, 6.5
  - a. Show the context as it relates to setbacks. Provide information about the setbacks of all neighboring properties on the same side of the street and across the street from the subject properties.
3. Spacing, 6.6
  - a. Provide the spacing dimensions stated at a glance per HDC requirements.
4. Massing, 6.8
5. Height and Width, 6.9
  - a. Provide the height and width dimensions stated at a glance per HDC requirements.
6. Scale, 6.10, numbers 2, 3, and 4
7. Foundations, 6.12

- a. Provide information about how the foundations of the first three buildings relate to their neighboring properties.
  - b. Provide information about how the foundations of the back properties impact the height relative to the properties behind it.
8. Not reviewing for details at this time. Keeping the review high level to make sure that all of the buildings on this particular property are within context of their surrounding areas.

#### **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.

#### **STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. All Buildings:
  - a. Massing, scale, height and width, foundations.
  - b. Provide larger 3D Isometric view of each elevation.
2. Building A1 & A2: Inaccurate column and beam details, inaccurate handrails detail, inaccurate window trim, dormer pitches, gable end window/eave relationship, foundation delineation front and rear elevation.
3. Building B1, B2, & B3: Inaccurate column and beam details, inaccurate handrails detail, foundation delineation on rear, side roof canopy detail and precedent, restudy window "c" on front elevation.
  - a. Is the delineation banding on rear of building B2/B3 a drawing error?
4. Building C1 & CH: Context, setback, spacing, massing and complexity of form, height and width, scale, foundation, rhythm, roof form, porches, and size. Provide precedent for a connected side carriage house. inaccurate column and beam details, inaccurate handrails detail, inaccurate window trim, foundation delineation on rear elevation.
5. Building C2: Inaccurate column and beam details, inaccurate handrails detail, inaccurate window trim, foundation delineation on rear elevation, restudy window "c" on front elevation and window "d" on rear elevation.
6. Materials:
  - a. Restudy column and beam detail.



- b. Provide a brick-and-mortar sample.
  - c. Restudy handrail detail.
  - d. Provide specifications for windows and doors.
    - i. Jeld-Wen Siteline 3.5" bottom rail required.
  - e. Restudy ganged window trim.
7. Site Plan:
- a. Provide information about location of HVAC units, dumpsters, and any other site appurtenances.
  - b. Provide information about tree removal.
  - c. Provide fencing design detail, dimensions, and materials.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION 1: CONTINUE**

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

Mr. Barth moved to continue the application for the front buildings. He required that the applicant work with Staff in order to ensure that the following architectural details reflect the historic context of the District: materials; porches, highlighting column and beam relationship; eave lines that provide a more substantial overhang on the main roof line; cornices; doors and windows; and trim, noting that the proposed window trim has too many pieces. Mr. Barth also asked to see more details on the integrated gutters and historic examples in the neighborhood. He requested more information on the material for the roofing, siding, trim, railings, foundation, vents, porch floorings, and steps. He cited HDC Design Standards 6.12 through 6.18.

Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion.

**VOTE 1: 10/0**

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

**NAYS:   NONE**

**DECISION 1: APPLICATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE FRONT BUILDINGS – CONTINUED.**

**MOTION 2: CONTINUE**

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

Mr. Barth moved to continue the application for the rear buildings, requiring a restudy of, and details for, everything stated in the previous motion as well as the following: setback; massing; height; context; directional expression; and scale, especially as the buildings approach the rear property line. He cited HDC Design Standards 6.1-6.5 and 6.8-18.

Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion.

**VOTE 2: 10/0**

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

**NAYS:   NONE**

**DECISION 2: APPLICATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE REAR BUILDINGS – CONTINUED.**

---

**NEW CASES**

---

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

ABSENT: PARATI

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCCMAA-2024-00667, 922 EAST BV (PID: 12108108) – SIDING & TRIM REPLACEMENT – AFTER THE FACT**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1.5 story Colonial Revival cottage constructed in 1920. Architectural features include side gabled roof with two gabled dormers, eaves with exposed rafter tails, decorative brackets, and a recessed corner porch. Siding material is wood lap siding with corner boards and ribbon-course wood shingles above the first floor on the gable ends. The building is currently occupied by a commercial use. The lot size is approximately 67' x 190'. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1 and 2-story former residential houses that are now used for commercial purposes and commercial buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is the replacement of all exterior siding with new fiber cement lap siding. All wood trim around the windows, doors, and trim bands between floors will be replaced with new fiber cement boards. Any decorative molding and windowsills will be removed. All fascia boards will be replaced with new fiber cement boards. All eaves will be boxed in with fiber cement and new soffits will be wood beadboard. The front side porch ceiling will be replaced with wood beadboard. All new fiber cement materials will have a wood grain finish.

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.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Staff recommends the Commission Deny the application for siding and trim replacement for the following reasons:
  - a. Boxing-in the eaves is incongruous with Design Standard 4.5 for Roofs, number 3; as well as Design Standard 6.14 for Cornices and Trim, number 3.
    - i. Exposed rafter tails are an original architectural feature of the building and are to be retained, not concealed.
    - ii. Pork chop eaves are not permitted on eave returns.
  - b. Trim replacement is incongruous with Design Standard 4.11 for Trim, numbers 1 through 4; Design Standard 6.14 for Cornices and Trim, numbers 1 and 2, and Design Standard 5.2 for Wood, numbers 6 through 8.
    - i. Certain trim elements such as molding and windowsills have been removed entirely from the building.
    - ii. Window casements, door trim, and transition banding have been replaced; and their dimensions, profiles, and proportions do not match those of the original features.
    - iii. Instead of replacing decayed/deteriorated materials in-kind, trim was replaced with fiber cement with wood grain finish.
    - iv. All of the trim was replaced instead of being repaired only where necessary.
  - c. The replacement of original siding is incongruous with Design Standard 5.2 for Wood, numbers 1 through 4 and 6 through 8.
    - i. An alternate material (fiber cement) was used for replacement siding instead of completing in-kind repairs.
    - ii. The ribbon-course wood shingles on the upper floor gable ends of the building have been replaced with fiber cement lap siding – removing an original architectural feature of the building.
    - iii. The profile, thickness, and reveal of the new lap siding does not match that of the original siding.
    - iv. All of the siding was replaced instead of being repaired only where necessary.
2. Applicant should work with Staff to bring the project into compliance with Historic District Design Standards, as required by the Unified Development Ordinance.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

Several members of the public spoke against the project.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

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

Mr. Whitlock moved to approve the application with the conditions that all replacement materials be made of wood. He cited the following standards: for siding, 4.5, number 3; for cornices, 6.14, numbers 1 through 3; for trim, 4.11, numbers 1 through 4; for materials, 5.2, numbers 1 through 4 and 6 through 8.

Ms. Hewett suggested that Mr. Whitlock explain in the motion that the application was being approved because the applicant agreed, in the meeting, to correct the replacements and restore them to their original materials and condition. Mr. Whitlock accepted the suggestion.

Ms. Wojick seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 9/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR SIDING & TRIM REPLACEMENT – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

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

ABSENT: PARATI, BARTH

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMIA-2024-00489, 1544 MERRIMAN AV (PID: 11910311) – STUCCO FOUNDATION – AFTER THE FACT**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1-story bungalow constructed c. 1933. Architectural features include an engaged full-width front porch under a hip roof supported by simple, square columns; a small hip dormer with wood shakes, central chimney, and 4/1 double-hung wood windows. The exterior is clad in painted German lap siding and the brick foundation is painted. The lot measures approximately 50' x 150'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5-story single-family buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is changes to a COA that was approved by Staff on August 20, 2021 (COA# HDCADMRM-2021-00596) and changes made without a COA.

Changes that require Full Commission review include:

1. Stucco foundation. The entire painted brick foundation wall needs structural repairs due to cracking, displaced settlement, and deteriorated brick. Per the recommendation of a Structural Engineer employed by the applicant, steel mesh will be applied to the foundation wall and finished with stucco in compliance with current Building Code. COA# HDCADMRM-2021-00596 was approved for repairs to the existing brick foundation.
2. Window removal. The applicant requesting to replace one historic 6/6 double-hung wood window on the rear elevation with a frosted plate glass window.

Changes that may be approved by HDC Staff include:

1. Front Elevation
  - a. Repair/restoration of front porch.

- b. Repair/restoration to front dormer.
  - c. Addition of a true retaining wall.
- 2. Rear Elevation
  - a. Repair/restoration of siding and trim.
  - b. Removal of secondary rear chimney.
  - c. Addition of basement level left-side French-doors.
  - d. Window/door change on main level.
  - e. Deck handrail design change.
- 3. Right & Left Elevation
  - a. Repair/restoration of siding and trim.
  - b. Basement door/window change.
  - c. Basement window replacement

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.

#### **STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

- 1. Staff recommends the Commission Deny the stucco foundation for the following reasons:
  - a. The stucco application over-top of original brick foundation is incongruous with Design Standards 4.4 for Foundations, numbers 1, 5 and 7 and the approved COA.
    - i. The applicant provided information that the foundation deterioration was due to water infiltration as the lot slopes downhill.
    - ii. The applicant provided information that while structural repairs were made to the foundation, no information was provided regarding regrading or installation of drainage to remedy the building's water infiltration problems.
    - iii. Deteriorated historic material (brick) was not repaired or replaced to match, and instead was covered over with stucco.
  - b. The stucco application ovetop of the original brick as means of repairing the damaged brick is incongruous with Design Standards 5.5 for Masonry, numbers 2, 4, 5 and number 8, letter g.
    - i. Covering the original brick foundation conceals any original masonry detailing that may have been present and defining of the overall character of the building.
    - ii. The method of using stucco to shore up the foundation does not respect the size, texture, color, or pattern of the historic foundation material (brick).
    - iii. Materials used to repair cracking and unsound mortar do not match the historic material.
    - iv. Covering the brick foundation with stucco has changed the appearance of primary elevations.
- 2. Staff recommends the Commission Deny the window removal on the rear elevation because it is incongruous with Design Standards 4.14 for Windows, numbers 1, 2, 3, 5, and 7.
  - a. Instead of repairing/restoring the historic 6/6 double-hung wood window, the window was replaced with frosted plate glass, changing the appearance of a window that contributes to the overall historic character of the building.
- 3. Applicant should work with Staff to bring the entire project into compliance with Historic District Design Standards, as required by the Unified Development Ordinance.

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

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

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

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

Mr. Sullivan moved to approve the application for the stucco foundation as it is not incongruous with the special character of the district, citing the following Standards: for foundations, 4.4; and for masonry, 5.5. Mr. Sullivan also

specified that an exception was being made for this case because of the engineer's report and specific recommendations that the applicant provided.

Ms. Holtz seconded the motion.

**VOTE 1: 9/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION 1: APPLICATION FOR STUCCO FOUNDATION – APPROVED.**

**MOTION 2: DENY**

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

Mr. Sullivan moved to deny the application for the fenestration change. He specified that the denial is because the new window design and location is incongruous with the special character of the Historic District and the architecture of the property and that it moved the window from its original location. He cited the Standards for windows, 4.12 and 4.14.

Mr. Whitlock seconded the motion.

**VOTE 2: 9/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION 2: APPLICATION FOR FENESTRATION CHANGES – DENIED.**

---

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

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

With no further business to discuss, Chair Hawkins recessed the meeting at 7:26 p.m.