



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
December 11, 2024 | Room 267

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Nichelle Hawkins (Chair)
Kim Parati (Vice Chair)
Sarah Curme
Cameron Holtz
Brett Taylor
Scott Whitlock
Heather Wojick

MEMBERS ABSENT: Chris Barth (Second Vice Chair)
Shauna Bell
Christa Lineberger
Sean Sullivan
Vacant, Resident-Owner Hermitage Court
Vacant, Resident-Owner Oaklawn Park
Vacant, Resident-Owner Wilmore

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

With a quorum present, Chair Hawkins called the December meeting of the Historic District Commission (Commission) meeting to order at 1:10 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-2024-00677, 514 W Kingston Av	Wilmore
HDCRMI-2024-00941, 424 Grandin Rd	Wesley Heights
HDCCMI-2024-00951, 1100 East Bv	Dilworth

NOT HEARD AT THE NOVEMBER 13 MEETING

HDCRMI-2024-00782, 1824 S Mint St	Wilmore
HDCRMA-2024-00212, 1329 Lafayette Av	Dilworth
HDCCMI-2024-00486, 301 East Bv	Dilworth

CONTINUED FROM THE OCTOBER 30 MEETING

HDCRMA-2024-00201, 1712 Winthrop Av	Dilworth
HDCCMA-2024-00211, 424-428 West Bv	Wilmore

CONTINUED FROM NOVEMBER 13 MEETING

HDCCMA-2023-00991, 927 East Bv	Dilworth
--------------------------------	----------

NEW CASES

HDCRMAA-2023-01192, 1902 Wood Dale Tr	Wilmore
HDCRMI-2024-00665, 918 Magnolia Av	Dilworth
HDCCMAA-2024-00667, 922 East Bv	Dilworth
HDCRDEMO-2024-00341, 1311 Myrtle Av	Dilworth
HDCRDEMO-2024-00678, 2225 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMAA-2024-00676, 1541 Wickford Pl	Wilmore

CONSENT

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BELL, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2024-00677, 514 W KINGSTON AV (PID: 11907130) – REAR ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1-story American Small house constructed in 1951. Architectural features include a partial width front porch with a gable projection supported by simple square wood columns, a triple window on the front elevation, and a central unpainted brick chimney. The exterior is unpainted brick. The lot size is irregular, measuring approximately 50' x 139' x 107' x 169.70'. Surrounding historic structures are 1-story brick American Small houses and an institutional building. In August 2017, the Commission approved a brick addition to the right and rear side under COA# 2017-445.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is a rear addition in place of a former patio area. The addition ties in below the existing ridge and the gable roof form, 6/12 pitch, and design matches the original. Proposed materials are wood or Hardie Artisan lap siding, Hardie corner boards, Kolbe Ultra double-hung windows, and an unpainted brick foundation.

There are four (4) trees being removed to construct the addition as Shown on A-6.1. A letter from a Certified Arborist is provided.

1. Tree 1 = 23" Southern Red Oak
2. Tree 2 = 25" Southern Red Oak. State of decline, eligible for Administrative approval to remove.
3. Tree 3 = 22" Southern Red Oak
4. Tree 4 = 38" Oak. Heritage Tree, not the purview of the Commission

The project requires full Commission review due to the removal of two healthy trees because of the proposed addition, but for this, the project would be an Administrative review.

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 Standards for 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 final window and door specifications that meet HDC Standards.
 - b. Provide a window detail with trim dimensions.
 - c. All trim to be wood, including corner boards.
 - d. A wood retaining wall is not approvable; final plans must note a retaining wall material that meets HDC Standards.
 - e. Tree removal approved, with no replanting required due to the existing wooded conditions of the lot.
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

1st: **HOLTZ** 2nd: **PARATI**

Ms. Holtz moved to approve the application as it not incongruous with the special character of the district as described in the Design Standards and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. She added the conditions that the final window and door specifications, as well as trim details, meet HDC Standards and that the trim be made of wood. She also specified that the final plans must note a retaining wall made of an approvable material, not wood. Finally, she specified that the tree removal would be approved without a requirement to replant.

Ms. Harpst requested that Ms. Holtz specify why an exception was being made regarding the tree replanting. Ms. Holtz specified that an exception was being made because the lot is heavily wooded as indicated by the certified arborist's letter.

Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, PARATI, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR REAR ADDITION – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BELL, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2024-00941, 424 GRANDIN RD (PID: 07102506) – SITE FEATURE

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing building is a 2-story residential structure constructed in 2007. The site is a corner lot on Grandin Road and Litaker Avenue. The house is approximately 6-8 feet above the street with a walkway and stairs to the front sidewalk. A large mature tree is sited in the left side yard. Small ornamental trees are in the front yard. The lot is irregular measuring approximately 61.70' x 189' x 29.2' x 187.50'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings and a greenway.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is a new free-standing fireplace in the rear yard. The fireplace will be located between the existing 10' tall wood pergola and the existing rear yard fence. The fireplace will be screened from the right-of-way by the existing 6' fence, with only the chimney visible above the fence.

1. The new fireplace will have an overall footprint of 5' x 12'.
2. The structure's overall height is approximately 12'.
3. The chimney portion will measure 5' in height and 3' in depth.
4. Proposed material is stone to match the existing fence columns.

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 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 a material sample to Staff for probable approval.
 - b. Provide rear yard permeability calculations to Staff.
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

1st: CURME 2nd: PARATI

Ms. Curme moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the special character of the district as described in Chapter 3 of the HDC Design Standards and it is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Design Standards, 2.5. She added the conditions that a material sample and rear yard permeability calculations be provided to Staff.

Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, PARATI, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR SITE FEATURE – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BELL, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

APPLICATION:

HDCCMI-2024-00951, 1100 EAST BV (PID: 12111407) – ACCESSORY BUILDING CHANGES

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 2-story Picturesque Revival – Mediterranean style brick building constructed in 1928. Architectural features include traditional massing with a low hip tiled roof and a broad, full-facade tiled roof porch supported by Classical columns extending across a 1-story side wing. An original accessory structure, a 3-bay garage, is located at the rear of the lot. The garage structure is unpainted brick with a hip roof. Its footprint measures approximately 28.3' x 22.9', not including a later shed roof side addition. Lot dimensions are approximately 75' x 200'. Adjacent structures are 1- and 2-story residential structures currently used for residential, institutional, and commercial purposes. An ADA-compliant ramp was added to the principal structure and was approved by the Commission on December 9, 2020, under COA# HDCRMI-2020-00584.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is for front elevation changes to an original garage accessory structure. The front elevation has previously been altered. The plate glass windows, window box planter, and bottom portions of the original garage doors on Bays 1 and 2 will be removed. A new triple window, an entry door, and lap siding will be installed. On Bay 3, the entry door will be moved closer to the right front corner of the building and a new window will be installed. All windows are proposed to be double-hung with Simulated True Divided Lights (STD L) tempered glass in a 4/1 pattern. New siding is proposed to be wood to match existing. Damaged/missing eaves details at the front right corner will be repaired/replaced to match existing.

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 window and door specifications that meet HDC Standards.
 - b. Window pattern should be 6/1 to match the main house.

- c. New entry doors should be wood with a design to match the main house.
- d. Retain the vertical trim that delineates the former garage bay locations.
- 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

1st: WHITLOCK 2nd: TAYLOR

Mr. Whitlock moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for rehabilitation as well as the HDC Standards for the new construction of residential buildings, Chapter 6, and accessory structures, number 8.10. He added the following conditions: that window and door specifications be provided to Staff, that the window pattern be six over one to match the house, that new entry doors be wood and designed to match the house, and that the vertical trim be maintained to delineate the former garage bay locations.

Mr. Taylor seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, PARATI, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR BUILDING CHANGES – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

NOT HEARD AT THE NOVEMBER 13 MEETING

Case HDCRMA-2024-00212 for 1329 Lafayette Avenue was heard as a workshop item.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BELL, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2024-00782, 1824 SOUTH MINT ST (PID: 11907312) – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 2-story new construction with Craftsman details built in 2020. Architectural features include double front gable roofs, full width front porch and 6/6 windows. The lot size is approximately 36.60' x 152.10. Adjacent structures are 1 and 2-story single-family residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is a second level rear addition that is aligned with the existing ridge. The proposed footprint is 14'-3 1/2" x 18'-9 1/2". Materials include wood lap siding, shake siding, asphalt roof shingles and wood trim details; all to match existing. Proposed windows are aluminum clad with a 6/6 muntin pattern to match existing. Proposed door material not provided. Proposed handrail material and detail not provided.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Massing and scale.
2. Coplanar walls.
3. Provide material specifications for window and doors.
4. Provide a window trim detail.
5. Provide handrail detail.
6. Revise eave detail on rear elevation.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION: CONTINUE

1st: HOLTZ 2nd: WOJICK

Ms. Holtz moved to continue the application as it currently does not meet the HDC Design Standards. She requested a restudy of the project, citing the following Standards: for massing, 6.8; for context, 6.1, numbers 1 through 4; and for scale, 6.10.

Ms. Wojick seconded the motion.

VOTE: 6/1

**AYES: CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, PARATI,
WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

NAYS: TAYLOR

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION – CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BELL, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

APPLICATION:

HDCCMI-2024-00486, 301 EAST BV (PID: 12307501) – MURAL

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing building is a mid-century modern Commercial structure constructed c. 1957. The brick exterior is painted but the stone accent panels on the front elevation are not. The front steps are stone and are flanked by built-in stone planters. Other original architectural features include metal windows on the side and rear elevations and an original (or early) metal railing roof feature with curved ends. Lot size is approximately 50' x 140'. There is a 10' alley in the rear. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1, 1.5, 2, and 2.5-story commercial buildings, some of which are former residential buildings that have been converted to commercial uses. On March 29, 2023 under COA# HDCCMI-2022-00706, the Commission approved a replacement storefront windows and doors to match the original design, new awnings over the front and rear entrances, and a new front porch rail.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is to install a painted mural on the painted brick wall on the front elevation. The proposed mural project includes the following steps:

1. Clean existing wall and apply a primer.
2. Install a weather-resistant acrylic paint mural.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The project appears to meet Design Standards for Murals, page 5.9, numbers 1 and 2.
2. The unique design of the structure, with the large, uninterrupted brick panel on the front elevation provides a natural location for a mural. This is a special circumstance of this particular building which may allow for the project to be approved.
3. The project has not met the requirements of the Design Standards Murals, page 5.9, number 9.
 - a. A maintenance plan is not provided.
 - b. Specifications about the priming and paint materials are not provided.
 - c. Information is needed about the suitability of the wall to receive the mural, and the potential impact to the historic masonry is not provided.
 - d. Verification is needed that the proposed materials shall not cause unreasonable permanent damage to historic cladding and is appropriate for long-term use on the wall surface.
4. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

1st: WOJICK 2nd: PARATI

Ms. Wojick moved to approve the application because it is not incongruous with the special character of the district per the Standard for murals, 5.9, numbers 1 and 2. She requested that the applicant work with Staff on a maintenance plan, including specifications for priming and painting materials.

Ms. Parati suggested that the motion note that an exception is being made to Standard, 5.9, number 4, for this specific building because of the unique architecture of the building and that the mural is not covering any distinctive architectural features.

Ms. Wojick accepted the amendment.

Mrs. Parati seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, PARATI, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR MURAL – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

CONTINUED FROM THE OCTOBER 30 MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BELL, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA-2024-00201, 1712 WINTHROP AV (PID: 12308410) – ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

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

1. Accessory Structures, 8.10, number 3.
 - a. The building is clearly secondary in height.
 - b. The footprint needs restudied.
 - c. Provide something that minimizes the width of the footprint, so that it has a better relationship to the

primary structure.

2. Address Staff notes for Accessory Building, 1.d and 1.e.
 - a. Provide details page to include design/dimension/material for window trim, beam and column, handrails, and lighting.
 - b. Provide window and door materials and specifications to HDC Staff for review and probable approval.
3. Site plan.
 - a. Provide brick fence designs with dimensions and details.
 - b. Provide size and species of trees to be removed.
 - c. Provide rear yard setback information from the alley easement line to the structure.
4. Please provide further study on fenestration for the next iteration by adding fenestration on the left elevation, lower floor, and potentially, the rear elevation, second floor

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing building is a 2.5-story Victorian with Colonial Revival elements constructed c. 1910. Architectural details include a cross gabled roof with small gabled front dormer vent, pent eaves on all gables, dentil cornices on the front elevation, central chimney, and 1/1 double-hung wood windows. The full width front porch is supported by Doric columns, and there are transom windows above the large picture window on the first floor and front door. The exterior is lap siding on the first level and shake siding on the second level. The lot size is approximately 50' x 190'. Adjacent historic structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings and institutional structures.

PROPOSAL:

The project is the addition of a new accessory structure. The existing garage is to be demolished. Two trees are proposed to be removed: species unknown. The new structure's proposed footprint is approximately 28'-4.5" x 29'-3", with a 11'-0" x 21'-2.5" covered patio. The overall height, as measured from grade to ridge, is approximately 27'-4.25". The proposed materials are individually applied wood shake and wood lap siding with a 4.5" exposure, an unpainted brick foundation, and an asphalt roof, all to match the primary structure. The proposed windows are to be Jeld-Wen wood double-hung in a 1/1 pattern to match the primary structure. The project also includes a new concrete driveway, concrete parking pad, and brick wall, all of which can be approved by Staff. The post-completion rear yard impermeable area will be approximately 47.18%.

Revised Proposal – December 11, 2024:

1. *Revised design provided.*
2. *Structure moved out of alley easement.*
3. *Coved porch moved to the interior lot.*
4. *Updates to fenestration.*
5. *Window and door detail provided.*
6. *Lighting detail provided.*
7. *Column and beam detail provided.*
8. *Brick fence detail provided.*
9. *Tree protection provided for large Oak tree.*

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

One member of the public spoke against the project.

MOTION: APPROVE

1st: TAYLOR **2nd:** HOLTZ

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the special character of the district as described in the Design Standards Chapter 3 and it is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, page 2.5. He cited the Standard for accessory buildings, 8.10, as well as for new construction of residential buildings, Chapter 6.

Ms. Holtz seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BELL, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

APPLICATION:

HDCCMA-2024-00211, 424-428 WEST BV (PID: 11907801) – MATERIALS & DESIGN DETAILS – NEW CONSTRUCTION

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

The project is being reviewed for Standards 7.11 Foundations, through 7.16, Materials.

1. Foundations, 7.11.
 - a. Provide a sample of the foundation material, which should be a cast concrete product.
2. Roof Form and Materials, 7.12.
 - a. The townhome dormers, the shed dormers with the open balconies, should be reconfigured to be more in keeping with the district's dormers and balconies.
3. Cornices and Trim, 7.13.
 - a. Restudy the details and elevations to make sure that they match with each other.
 - b. Re-evaluate the relationship between the headers and the columns.
 - c. Re-evaluate the proportions of the columns, make sure that there is a plumb cut.
 - d. Make sure that the soffits, the roof rafters, and the fascia boards have a plumb cut condition.
4. Doors and Windows, 7.14.
 - a. Restudy the window size configurations to present a more consistent traditional relationship of window sizes.
 - b. The larger window with the narrower adjoining window needs redesign to be more in keeping with the historic school structure, being symmetrical in design with either one single window by itself or a larger window with two flanking windows.
5. Storefronts, 7.15.
 - a. Please provide the specific information requested about the awning construction and the transom window size relationship, preferably relating back to the school in proportion, if possible.
6. Materials, 7.16.
 - a. Provide a cast concrete sample.
 - b. Provide a brick sample with the mortar sample.
 - c. Provide a powder coated aluminum sample for the awning and the railings, specifically with the profiles and cross sections.
7. Address the items in the Staff memo for siding and trim, window and door specifications, roofs, and details.
8. Further refine the drawings for consistency between elevations and section details.
9. Provide additional details on lighting that is attached to the building only. Not reviewing site lighting at this time.
10. Not addressing Chapter 8, Standards for Private Site at this time.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The Wilmore Elementary School was designed by Louis H. Asbury, Sr. and originally constructed in 1925. Two additions were made to the school. In 1948, the building was expanded to the east to house a cafeteria, auditorium, one classroom, and nurses' room. The last addition was in 1970s when the rectangular wing was added to the front of the building and an addition at the rear of the building was constructed to contain a new library, workroom, lounge, classroom, administrative spaces, and two conference rooms. The 1948 addition was designed by architect Martin E. Boyer, Jr., and the 1970s addition by Tebee P. Hakwins & Associates.

The original building and 1948 classroom addition is two stories in height (34.4' including parapet), six bays long and one bay in depth. The building forms an L-shape with a one-bay by one-bay second on the northwest portion of the building. The building is clad in unpainted brick with a metal-capped parapet wall and what appears to be a flat gravel roof. The original building has stone water tables on all elevations with additional stone details on the south elevation. Wood double-hung windows comprise the majority of the fenestration and are presented either singular or in groups of three. Above the windows are brick soldier course lintels and at their base, brick sills. The lot size is approximately 400' x 400'. Adjacent structures are 1.5- and 2-story residential buildings.

On February 14, 2024, the Commission voted to Approve the Site Plan and both the Townhomes and Gateway (mixed-use) buildings for *Context, Setback, Spacing, Orientation, Massing & Complexity of Form, Height & Width, Scale, and Directional Expression*, under application #HDCCMA-2023-00283, with the condition of restoring and rehabilitating the historic Wilmore School building. All other aspects of the project were denied.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is for the materials and design details for the previously approved mixed-use building and townhomes surrounding the historic Wilmore School building under application #HDCCMA-2023-00283. The proposal also includes window and door changes on the existing historic Wilmore School building. The decision letters and previously reviewed project plans are enclosed.

1. Townhomes: 2-3-stories with dormers and front porches.

Proposed materials include:

- a. Foundation: precast water table.
- b. Siding: 5/8" Hardie Artisan lap siding with fiber cement trim; red/brown modular brick.
- c. Windows and Doors: aluminum-clad windows and doors with simulated divided lite in a mix of 4/1 and 6/1 muntin patterns.
- d. Roof and Dormers: asphalt shingles; standing seam metal roof on front stoop.
- e. Details: wood column with brick base; wood and aluminum powder coated railing with fiber cement trim.

2. Gateway Building (mixed-use): 3-4-stories with a corner storefront.

Proposed materials include:

- a. Foundation: precast water table.
- b. Siding: glass fiber reinforced concrete; precast band detail; red/brown modular brick with accent coursing; 5/8" Hardie Artisan lap siding with fiber cement trim and parapet; and precast parapet.
- c. Windows and Doors: aluminum-clad windows and doors with simulated divided lite in an 8/8 muntin pattern; and aluminum storefront windows and doors on storefront.
- d. Roof: flat roof details not provided; aluminum canopy over doorways; trellis roof details not provided.
- e. Details: wood and aluminum powder coated railing with fiber cement trim; metal roll up trash door; signage details not provided; lighting details not provided; unit privacy wall details not provided.

3. Wilmore School – proposed changes include:

- a. East Elevation: Create a new window opening and replace windows to match existing.
- b. West Blvd/Front Elevation: Replace existing doors and frame with new doors to match the original 1948 doors.

- c. West Elevation: Remove/replace stairs, landing, and railing; details not provided.
- d. South Elevation: Door and window changes and canopy addition; detail not provided.

Revised Proposal – December 11, 2024

1. Revised drawings provided.
 - a. Side-by-side comparison not provided.
2. Window configuration updated on the Gateway building, pgs. A4.11, A5.11, and A5.12.
3. Window light pattern updated to 6/1 on the Townhome building, pg. A4.21.
4. Ceiling added to open dormer balcony, pg. A4.24.
5. Proposed lighting added to materials pages, pgs. A5.11, A5.12, and A5.13.
6. Column and beam update on Townhome building, pgs. A5.13 and A8.03.
7. Updates to detail drawings, pgs. A6.13, A6.22, A6.32.
8. Roof and Canopy details updated, pgs. A8.72, A8.75 and A8.78.
9. Landscape and site work details provided.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the November plans:

Townhomes and Gateway Building:

1. Siding and Trim
 - a. Provide brick sample.
 - b. Provide fiber cement trim sample.
 - i. Wood trim is typically required.
 - c. Provide precast specifications and sample.
2. Window and Doors specifications.
 - a. Restudy the fenestration on the East and West elevations of the Townhomes.
 - b. Provide window trim detail.
 - i. 5.25" mull is typically required for ganged windows
 - c. Provide storefront window specifications.
 - d. Provide door specifications for all doors.
3. Roofs
 - a. Dormer design.
 - i. Location of windows.
 - ii. Ratio of siding to windows is incongruous with historic dormer design.
4. Details
 - a. Provide privacy wall specifications and details.
 - b. Provide signage specifications and details.
5. Site Plan
 - a. Provide dimensions of outdoor retail seating areas.
 - b. Minor landscaping and fencing can be approved by Staff.

Wilmore School Building:

1. East Elevation/Right Elevation:
 - a. Provide window specifications.
2. West Blvd/Front Elevation:
 - a. Provide door specifications.
3. West Elevation/Left Elevation:
 - a. Provide stair, landing, and railing details for Wilmore School building.
4. South Elevation/Rear Elevation:
 - a. Provide canopy details.
 - b. Provide window and door specifications.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

1st: WOJICK 2nd TAYLOR

Ms. Wojick moved to approve the application because it is not incongruous with the special character of the district as described in Chapters 6 and 7 of the Design Standards and it is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, 2.5. She cited the following additional Standards: 7.11 through 7.16, including a review of materials; lighting, 8.11; new construction for residential buildings, 6.10 through 6.13; cornices and trim, 6.14; and materials, 6.18. She requested that the applicant provide construction drawings with additional dimensions and a complete sample board to Staff and that they work with Staff to address site conditions per Chapter 8.

Mr. Taylor seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR MATERIALS & DESIGN DETAIL – NEW CONSTRUCTION – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

CONTINUED FROM THE NOVEMBER 13 MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BELL, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

APPLICATION:

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

This application was continued from the November 13, 2024 meeting for the following items:

1. Context, 7.2-7.3, numbers 2 and 5
2. Height and Width, 7.8
3. Foundations, 7.11
4. Windows, 7.14
5. Lighting, 8.11
6. Provide detailed drawings for doors, windows, awnings, etc. for consideration by the Commission during the next review.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

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

PROPOSAL:

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

East Boulevard

Existing building height is 27'-4"

Existing building length is 89'-4"

Existing building setback is 47.3'

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

Proposed overall length is 201'-6"

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

Dilworth Road West

Existing building height is 27'-4"

Existing building overall length is 60'-0"

Existing building setback is 20.9'

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

Proposed overall length is 167'-5.75"

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

Additions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Revised Proposal – October 9, 2024

The proposed project changed applicants and has been completely redesigned. On the right and rear elevations, window openings will be enlarged on the existing building with the existing brick detailing will be replicated.

The project includes additions to the front, left, and rear elevations:

- 1. Front elevation – 25'-0"*
- 2. Left elevation – 11'-0"*
- 3. Rear elevation – enclosing the U-shaped area and bumping out 8'-0" from the existing rear thermal wall.*

Site changes include expanding the existing surface parking lot to the left property line. The parking lot will also be aligned with the new front thermal wall of the building.

Revised Proposal – November 13, 2024:

- 1. Trees to be removed shown on SP1.*
- 2. Parking lot screening, tree plantings, HVAC location information, and site appurtenances shown on Sheet SP2.*
- 3. Setbacks shown on Sheet SP3.*
- 4. Front elevation design changes, front entry and awning, shown Sheets A-4.2 and A-12.*
- 5. Rear elevation design changes, roof height of central portion lowered, and rear entry design simplified, shown on Sheets A-5.1 and A-12.*

6. Streetscape renderings provided on Sheets A-7.1 and A-7.2.

Revised Proposal – December 11, 2024:

1. First level design changes:
 - a. Front Elevation, Sheet A-4.1,
 - b. First bay of Right and Left Elevations, Sheet A-4.2 and A-5.2, and
 - c. Central portion of the Rear Elevation, A-5.1.
2. Updated renderings provided on Sheets A-6.1 and A-6.2.
3. Window details provided on Sheet A-11.
4. Entry details provided on Sheet A-12.
5. Brick details provided on Sheet A-13.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Right and Rear elevation labels are swapped on the Renderings pages, Sheets A-6.1 and A-6.2.
2. Materials
 - a. Brick and mortar sample needed. May be provided to Staff for probable approval.
3. Site Plan
 - a. Provide information about front walkway, including dimensions, materials, etc. May be provided to Staff for probable approval.
4. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

Several members of the public spoke against the project.

MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

1st: PARATI 2nd: WOJICK

Ms. Parati moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the district. She cited the following Standards: for context, 7.2 and 7.3, numbers 2 and 5; for height and width, 7.8; for foundations, 7.11; for windows, 7.14; for lighting, 8.11; and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5.

Ms. Wojick seconded the motion.

Ms. Holtz recommended that the motion request a sample of the final brick be provided to Staff. Ms. Parati and Ms. Wojick both accepted the amendment.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, PARATI, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

NEW CASES

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BELL, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

APPLICATION:**HDCRMAA-2023-01192, 1902 WOOD DALE TR (PID: 11907425) – PAINTED BRICK – AFTER THE FACT****EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1.5-story brick American Small House constructed c. 1940. The building's front elevation is symmetrical with a central triangular portico covered stoop supported by square tapered columns, with 8/8 windows on either side. Each front façade window has a small field of siding underneath it to fill in a larger original window opening. The building has a gable roof and small bump out on the left front half of the house, clad with painted asbestos siding. The lot size is approximately 60' x 150'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5 and 2-story single-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is to paint the entire unpainted brick exterior to unify a previous owners mismatched repairs.

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. Per the preamble of the Design Standards for Paint, 5.8, painting may be considered if documentation shows it will unify disparate parts of the building, provided the disparate work is not of one's own doing.
 - a. The entire exterior of the house has multiple instances of inconsistent mortar joints and repairs, mortar smeared along the face of bricks surrounding a repair, and misaligned brick. The rear elevation, in particular, includes large patches of mismatched brick and mortar. These inconsistencies are previously completed repairs and were not made by the current applicant.
2. The project is incongruous with the Design Standards for Masonry 5.5, number 3 and the Design Standards for Paint 5.8, number 7.
 - a. All exterior brick that was previously unpainted has been painted.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION: APPROVE**1st: TAYLOR 2nd: PARATI**

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the application as the painted brick unified disparate elements of the building. He cited the Standard for Painted Brick, 5.8, preamble.

Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

Ms. Hewett requested that Mr. Taylor provided further details as to why an exception to the Standards was being made for this case. Mr. Taylor amended the motion to explain that photos of the property show that the disparate elements of the building existed before the current owner had purchased the property, which is an exception allowed for in the Standard cited.

Ms. Parati accepted the amendment.

VOTE: 4/3**AYES: HAWKINS, PARATI, TAYLOR, WOJICK****NAYS: CURME, HOLTZ, WHITLOCK****DECISION: APPLICATION FOR PAINTED BRICK – AFTER THE FACT – APPROVED.**

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BELL, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

RECUSED: TAYLOR

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2024-00665, 918 MAGNOLIA AV (PID: 12111824) – FRONT PORCH CHANGES

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

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

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is the replacement of the existing broken terracotta tile porch floor with brick with a brick border. Brick floor pattern unknown. Footprint size of existing front porch is to remain unchanged.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Refer to Standards for Porches, 4.8, numbers 1 through 3.
2. Refer to Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, 2.5, numbers 2 through 6.
3. Refer to Standards for Masonry, 5.5 numbers 2, 4, and 5.
4. Proposed brick shall match existing brick on primary structure.
5. Provide proposed brick pattern.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

1st: PARATI 2nd: WHITLOCK

Ms. Parati moved to approve the application because it is not incongruous with the district and is replacing a non-historic porch material with another historic material. She required that the new porch be made of concrete or brick and that, if brick is selected, the pattern should be double basket weave. She cited the following standards: for porches, 4.8, numbers 2 and 3; and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5.

Mr. Whitlock seconded the motion.

Ms. Holtz made a friendly amendment to direct the applicants to have the final brick selections and design approved by Staff before installation.

Ms. Parati and Mr. Whitlock both accepted the amendment.

VOTE: 6/0

**AYES: CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, PARATI,
WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

NAYS: NONE

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

Case HDCCMAA-2024-006672 for 922 East Boulevard was deferred by the Applicant.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BELL, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

RETURNED: TAYLOR

APPLICATION:

HDCRDEMO-2024-00678, 2225 THE PLAZA (PID: 08119147) – NEW CONSTRUCTION – RESIDENTIAL

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1.5-story Craftsman bungalow constructed c. 1930. Architectural features include a symmetrical façade with central front door flanked by paired windows, a front gable dormer with triple vent detail, and a nearly full-width, partially engaged front porch with a shed roof supported by square brick columns and a curved beam. Other details include exposed rafters, brackets, an unpainted brick foundation, and an exterior unpainted brick chimney on the right elevation. There is a small bump-out behind the chimney. The lot measures approximately 66' x 200'. Adjacent buildings are 1 and 1.5-story residential structures. This property is at the edge of the Plaza Midwood district and is also adjacent to commercial structures located outside the district boundaries.

PROPOSAL:

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

1. Digital photos of all sides of building
2. Digital photos of significant architectural details
3. Property survey
4. Elevation drawings
5. Zoutewelle survey
6. Tree Letter for the White Oak located in the rear yard

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

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

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

Several members of the public spoke against the project.

MOTION 1: APPLICATION COMPLETE

1st: WHITLOCK

2nd: PARATI

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.

Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

VOTE 1: 7/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION 1: APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION – RESIDENTIAL – COMPLETE.

MOTION 2: HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

1st: WHITLOCK 2nd: PARATI

Mr. Whitlock moved to determine that the building has special significance and value toward maintaining the character of the Plaza Midwood Local Historic District because of its architectural style and year of construction.

Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

VOTE 2: 7/0

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

NAYS: NONE

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

MOTION 3: APPROVE DEMOLITION

1st: WHITLOCK 2nd: PARATI

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.

Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

VOTE 3: 7/0

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

NAYS: NONE

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

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BELL, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

APPLICATION:

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

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 regraded.

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.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Front Elevation
 - a. Refer to Standard 6.15, number 1 for Doors and Windows.
2. Right Elevation Changes:

- a. Original eaves on the main house should not be changed.
- b. Inconsistent eave overhang dimensions.
- c. Site re-grading has lessened the amount of brick foundation wall that is exposed.
- 3. Left Elevation Changes:
 - a. The eaves on the front and rear of the addition will be lengthened to align with the eave on the main house.
 - b. The style of the center bay of second story windows has changed from 9-light casement windows to 6-light casements. Windowpanes are horizontal on "C" 6-light casement windows.
 - c. The first-floor windows have changed from a 6/6 light pattern to a 4/4 lights pattern, which have a horizontal orientation.
 - d. Site re-grading has lessened the amount of brick foundation wall that is exposed.
- 4. Rear Elevation Changes:
 - a. The second story window grid pattern change creates square panes, which does not match the vertically oriented 6/6 windows on the historic house.
 - b. Site re-grading has eliminated the need for the retaining wall at the base of the columns.
- 5. 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: CONTINUE

1st: WOJICK 2nd: TAYLOR

Ms. Wojick moved to continue the application, requesting that the application restudy the fenestration, including the rhythm, placement, light configuration, and style. She also requested a wider view of the structure from the street so the Commission could assess the proportion of space as it relates to window placement on the front elevation. On the right elevation, Ms. Wojick asked that the boxing be revised to align the soffits, and that the pork chop details be eliminated. She stated that the existing soffit of on the front of the house not be modified. She cited the Standards for new construction of residential buildings, Chapter 6, specifically 6.20 for additions, 6.14 for cornices and trim, and 6.15-6.16 for doors and windows.

Ms. Leite asked Ms. Wojick to confirm her comments about the roof. Ms. Wojick clarified that she wants the applicant to restudy the roof detail on the rear and confirm the roof pitch. She noted that the Commission will review these high-level items before reviewing other details in future meetings.

Mr. Taylor seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: CURME, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, PARATI, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION & CHANGES TO APPROVED COA – AFTER THE FACT – CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BARTH, BELL, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

LEFT: CURME

APPLICATION:

HDCRDEMO-2024-00341, 1311 MYRTLE AV (PID: 12309402) – DEMOLITON – 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. Zoutewelle survey
2. Property survey
3. Digital photos of all sides of the building
4. Elevation drawings

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The Commission will determine if the application is complete.
2. Digital photos of significant architectural details are needed.
3. 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.
4. If the Commission determines that this property does not have any special significance to the district, then demolition may take place without a delay or upon the approval of new construction plans.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION: INCOMPLETE

1st: PARATI 2nd: HOLTZ

Ms. Parati moved to determine that the application is incomplete due to the lack of digital photos of significant architectural details and site features, including but not limited to windows, front door, brackets, columns, and trim.

Ms. Holtz seconded the motion.

VOTE: 6/0

**AYES: HAWKINS, HOLTZ, PARATI, TAYLOR,
WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION – RESIDENTIAL – DETERMINED TO BE INCOMPLETE.

After discussing the HDC Annual Report to City Council, Ms. Wojick voted to approve the submission. Ms. Holtz seconded the motion, and it was approved by a vote of 7/0.

Ms. Holtz moved to approve the minutes from the October 9 and 30 meetings. Ms. Parati seconded the motion, and the Commission voted to approve the minutes by a vote of 6/0.

Ms. Parati moved to approve the minutes from the September 11 meeting. Mr. Whitlock seconded the motion, and the Commission voted to approve the minutes by a vote of 6/0.

With no further business to discuss, Chair Hawkins adjourned the meeting at 7:21 p.m.