



Approved August 13, 2025



CHARLOTTE  
HISTORIC  
EST. 1976  
PRESERVATION

---

## HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

July 9, 2025 | Room 267

### MINUTES

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Shauna Bell, Chair, Resident-Owner McCrorey Heights  
Nichelle Hawkins, Vice Chair, At-Large  
Heather Wojick, Second Vice Chair, At-Large  
Cameron Holtz, Resident-Owner Fourth Ward  
Brett Taylor, At-Large  
Scott Whitlock, At-Large

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Sarah Curme, Resident-Owner Dilworth  
Christa Lineberger, Planning Commission Representative  
Sean Sullivan, At-Large  
Vacant, Resident-Owner Hermitage Court  
Vacant, Resident-Owner Oaklawn Park  
Vacant, Resident-Owner Plaza Midwood  
Vacant, Resident-Owner Wilmore  
Vacant, Resident-Owner Wesley Heights

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Kristi Harpst, HDC Staff  
Candice Leite, HDC Staff  
Jen Baehr, HDC Staff  
Marilyn Drath, HDC Staff  
Elizabeth Lamy, HDC Staff  
JT Faucette, HDC Staff  
Erin Chantry, Division Manager – Design & Preservation  
Jill Sanchez-Myers, Sr. Assistant City Attorney  
Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

---

With a quorum present, Chair Bell called the July meeting of the Historic District Commission (Commission) meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. Chair Bell began the meeting by introducing the Staff and Commissioners and explaining the meeting procedure. All interested parties planning to give testimony – FOR or AGAINST – must submit a form to speak and must be sworn in. Staff will present a description of each proposed project to the Commission. The Commissioners and the Applicants will then discuss the project. Audience members signed up to speak either FOR or AGAINST will be called to the podium for each agenda item. Presentations by the Applicants and audience members must be concise and focused on the ***Charlotte Historic District Design Standards***. The Commission and Staff may question the Applicant. The Applicant may present sworn witnesses who will be subject to questioning by the Commission and Staff. The Applicant will be given an opportunity to respond to comments by interested parties. After hearing each application, the Commission will review, discuss, and consider the information that has been gathered and presented. During discussion and deliberation, only the Commission and Staff may speak. The Commission may vote to reopen this part of the

meeting for questions, comments, or clarification. Once the review is completed, a MOTION will be made to Approve, Deny, or Continue the review of the application at a future meeting. A majority vote of the Commission members present is required for a decision to be reached. All exhibits remain with the Commission. If an Applicant feels there is a conflict of interest of any Commissioner, or there is an association that would be prejudicial, that should be revealed at the beginning of the hearing of a particular case. The Commission is quasi-judicial body and can accept only sworn testimony. Staff will report any additional comments received and while the Commission will not specifically exclude hearsay evidence, it is only given limited weight. Chair Bell asked that everyone please silence any electronic devices. Commissioners are asked to announce, for the record, if one leaves or arrives during the meeting. Chair Bell requested that those in the audience remain quiet during the hearings. An audience member will be asked once to be quiet and the need for a second request will require removal from the room. Chair Bell swore in all Applicants and Staff and continued to swear in people as they arrived for the duration of the meeting. In accordance with N.C.G.S. § 160D-947(e), subsections (4) and (5), and UDO Article 14.1.M.1, an appeal of quasi-judicial decisions may be made to the Mecklenburg County Superior Court as provided in N.C.G.S. § 160D-1402 within the time specified in N.C.G.S. § 160D-1405(d).

Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the June 11, 2025 meeting minutes. Ms. Wojick seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0.

---

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

##### **CONSENT**

HDCRMI-2025-00370, 1501 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMI-2025-00372, 600 Mt Vernon Av	Dilworth
HDCRMA-2025-00315, 1911 S Mint St	Wilmore

##### **CONTINUED FROM MARCH 12, 2025 MEETING**

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

##### **CONTINUED FROM THE MAY 14, 2025 MEETING**

HDCRMA-2025-00107, 404 W Park Av	Wilmore
----------------------------------	---------

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

HDCCMI-2025-00183, 1823 Cleveland Av	Dilworth
--------------------------------------	----------

##### **NEW CASES**

HDCRMAA-2025-00109, 700 Templeton Av	Dilworth
HDCRMA-2024-00336, 3105, 3109, 3113, 3117, 3121 Colyer Pl	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMAA-2025-00249, 1817 S Mint St	Wilmore
HDCRMA-2025-00247, 1724 Wilmore Dr	Wilmore
HDCRMA-2025-00317, 1566 Wilmore Dr	Wilmore
HDCRMI-2025-00188, 1165 Linganore Pl	Dilworth
HDCRMI-2025-00190, 1147 Linganore Pl	Dilworth
HDCRDEMO-2025-00252, 1740 Merriman Av	Wilmore
HDCCMIA-2025-00319, 916 East Bv	Dilworth
HDCRMIA-2025-00321, 1016 Isleworth Av	Dilworth

---

## CONSENT

---

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

ABSENT: CURME, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2025-00370, 1501 THE PLAZA (PID: 08118702) – REAR ADDITION & ACCESSORY BUILDING**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 2-story Craftsman built c. 1933. Architectural features include a symmetrical façade, a hipped roof with deep eaves supported by closed brackets, and prominent flanking exterior chimneys. The brick house has a full-width front porch with engaged carport supported by square brick columns and a red tile front porch floor. The left elevation has a one-story sunroom. Most of the building's windows are paired, and all windows have an 8/1 pattern (square panes with tall panes underneath). The original front door is flanked by sidelights matching the window design. The lot is slightly irregular, measuring approximately 92' x 168' x 125' x 159'. Adjacent historic structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is in two parts, 1.) rear addition and 2.) a new accessory building. Post-construction of both projects, the rear yard impervious area will be 20%. The property is a corner lot, which requires Commission review.

1. Rear addition, the project details are as follows:
  - a. Removal of the existing rear porch.
  - b. A new heated addition and unheated rear porch will be constructed. The addition will tie in below the primary ridge.
  - c. The total footprint measures approximately 34' x 17'.
  - d. Height is approximately 17', as measured from grade to ridge.
  - e. A paired window on the rear elevation will be removed and reused if possible.
  - f. Proposed materials are brick and mortar to match existing and wood trim to match existing. Rear porch floor proposed to be bluestone, which will not be visible.
2. A new accessory building, the project details are as follows:
  - a. A new shed with an approximate footprint of 12' - 1 ½" x 17'- 1 ½" is proposed for the back right corner of lot, per Site Plan on Sheet 2.
  - b. The shed height is proposed to be approximately 11'- 8", as measured from floor to ridge, per Sheet 9.
  - c. The elevation facing School Street will have a wood door, per Sheet 9.
  - d. Exterior materials are wood lap siding with a 6" reveal, wood corner boards, and wood trim, per Sheet 9.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, numbers 1, 2, 5, 9 and 10; and the City of Charlotte Design Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6, and Accessory Buildings, 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 manufacturer specifications that meet HDC Standards for the new windows and doors.
  - b. Provide final proposed brick/mortar samples to Staff for probable approval.
  - c. Provide detail drawings for railing.
  - d. Provide detail drawing for the paired windows with mullion trim.

- e. All brick to remain unpainted.
  - f. Staff to approve final lighting and patio paver selections.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Bell's invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

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

Ms. Hawkins moved to approve this application, as it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, numbers 1, 2, 5, 9, and 10, and the City of Charlotte Design Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6, and Accessory Buildings, 8.10. She added the conditions that the applicant will submit permit-ready construction drawings to Staff for final review and that conditions A through F of the Staff recommendations be applied. She specified that these items are found on page four of the presentation.

Ms. Holtz seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 6/0**

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

**NAYS:** NONE

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

---

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

ABSENT: CURME, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

**APPLICATION:**

HDCRMI-2025-00372, 600 MT VERNON AV (PID: 12305718) – REAR ADDITION

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1-story American Small House with Colonial Revival elements built c. 1947. Architectural features include a side gable roof and two front gables, all with pent eave returns, a large exterior chimney on the right gable end, and a smooth finish stucco exterior. The front entry surround has fluted pilasters and a replacement front door. All windows are replacements. The lot is slightly irregular, measuring approximately 60' x 165' x 75' x 161'. Adjacent historic structures are 1, 1.5, 2, and 2.5-story single-family buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is in two parts, 1.) a rear addition, and 2.) a covered porch addition. The proposed project is no taller or wider than the original house, but is located on a corner lot, which requires Commission review.

1. Rear addition, the project details are as follows:
  - a. The footprint measures approximately 8'-2" x 14'-3" and will be inset 8'-9" from the left rear corner of the house.
  - b. The addition will have a standing seam shed roof that connects below the original primary ridge.
  - c. Proposed exterior materials include smooth coat stucco and wood trim to match existing.
  - d. Windows and doors will be aluminum in a design and dimensions similar to the existing windows.
  - e. Fascia and soffit materials are noted as wood to match existing.
2. Covered porch addition, the project details are as follows:
  - a. The porch footprint measures approximately 15'-8" x 19'-1 1/2".
  - b. According to the dimensioned floor plan and rear elevation, the porch appears to be inset from the rear left corner of the original house.

- c. The porch will be cantilevered over an existing pond.
- d. The porch will have an architectural shingle gable roof. The gable end will be open timber framing, which will not be visible from the street.
- e. Proposed material is stained wood.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, numbers 1, 2, 5, 9 and 10, and the City of Charlotte Design Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, Staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the Standards and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with permit-ready construction drawings submitted to Staff for final review, with the following Conditions:
  - a. Provide manufacturer specifications that meet HDC Standards for the new windows and doors.
  - b. Provide post-construction rear yard permeability calculations.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

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

No one accepted Chair Bell's invitation to speak.

#### **MOTION: APPROVE**

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

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the application move to approve this application, because the project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, numbers 1, 2 5, 9, and 10, and the City of Charlotte Design Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6.

Ms. Holtz seconded the motion.

#### **VOTE: 6/0**

AYES: BELL, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

#### **DECISION: APPLICATION FOR REAR ADDITION – APPROVED.**

---

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

ABSENT: CURME, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

#### **APPLICATION:**

HDCRMA-2025-00315, 1911 S MINT ST (PID: 11907603) – ADDITION – REAFFIRMATION

#### **EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a brick American Small House built c. 1940. The house has a few minimal Colonial Revival/Tudor elements visible in the 6/6 window configuration and the front gable roof detailing.

#### **PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a reaffirmation of a previously approved shed roof addition over the existing front stoop. The project was originally approved by the Historic District Commission on December 8, 2021 under application HDCRMA-2021-00606. The Certificate of Appropriateness was issued on January 18, 2022 and has expired. The Certificate of Appropriateness is attached.

The proposed shed roof will have a 3:12 pitch. A square column is proposed to support the roof at the front right corner. A simple railing is proposed around the existing stoop and steps. Materials are traditional to match existing, including an asphalt shingle roof and wood for the column, railing, and all trim.

#### **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, Standards 3, 9, and 10 and the City of Charlotte Design Standards for Porches, 4.8, and New Construction for Residential Buildings, Additions, 6.20 - 6.24.
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. That the new handrail design be adjusted to a historic height with a booster rail used obtain code height.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

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

No one accepted Chair Bell's invitation to speak.

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

1<sup>st</sup>:    HOLTZ            2<sup>nd</sup>:    HAWKINS

Ms. Holtz moved to approve the project as it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 3, 9, and 10. She also cited the Design Standards for porches, 4.8, and for residential additions, 6.20 through 6.24. She added the conditions that the applicant design the handrail to match historic height and that a booster rail will be used to obtain code height.

Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion.

#### **VOTE: 6/0**

AYES: BELL, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

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

---

**CONTINUED FROM THE MARCH 12, 2025 MEETING**

---

*The Commission voted 5-0 to defer case number HDCRMAA-2024-00271 for 522-524 North Pine St due to a lack of sufficient information. The Commission noted that a decision on the application is required at the August 2025 meeting.*

---

**CONTINUED FROM THE MAY 14, 2025 MEETING**

---

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

ABSENT: CURME, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

#### **APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA-2025-00107, 404 W PARK AV (PID: 11908405) – ADDITION**

*This application was continued from the May 14, 2025 meeting for the following items:*

*Porches, 6.17. Restudy of the rear elevation of the deck with detailed information about deck columns and supports, with dimensions and design information.*

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing property 1-story Craftsman bungalow constructed c. 1931. Architectural features include clipped gables on the main roof and front porch roof with shingle siding, brackets, triple ganged windows, front door with sidelights, and wood lap siding with corner boards. Lot size is approximately 50' x 150'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 2-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

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

- The existing height is 18'-9 5/8", as measured from grade to main ridge, and the main ridge will not be raised.
- The addition will tie in behind the original ridge and will be approximately 3'-9 ½' taller than the original house, see Sheets S-2 and A-3.
- The footprint of the new addition measures approximately 20' deep x 32'-1" wide, see Sheet A-1.
- On the right and left elevations, a notch is added to provide a visual transition between the original rear corners of the house and the new addition. Detail provided on Sheet A-1.
- On the original house, left elevation, a new side-entry door is proposed to be installed.
- Skylights are proposed on the rear gable dormer.
- An at-grade, brick or concrete patio is also proposed. Dimensions not provided.
- HVAC will be located on the rear.
- No trees will be impacted by this project.

*Revised Proposal – July 9, 2025*

- Rear deck design revised to include brick and wood columns with wood brackets supporting the second level deck

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The project specifications and details are needed:
  - a. Dimensions of the brick columns, wood columns, wood brackets, and wood beam.
  - b. Column/beam detail.
  - c. Railing detail with dimensions.
  - d. Brick/mortar sample.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by Staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Bell's invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

1<sup>st</sup>: WHITLOCK    2<sup>nd</sup>: HOLTZ

Mr. Whitlock moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, page 2.5, as well as the City of Charlotte's Design Standards for new construction, chapter 6, and for additions, 6.20 through 6.24.

Ms. Holtz seconded the motion.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that the motion include the conditions outlined in the Staff analysis, number 1, items A through D. Mr. Whitlock and Ms. Holtz accepted the amendment.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: BELL, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

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

---

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

---

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

ABSENT: CURME, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCCMI-2025-00183, 1823 CLEVELAND AV (PID: 12105301) – SITE WORK**

*This application was continued from the May 14, 2025 meeting for the following items:*

1. Maintain the historic grading and elevation within public view per Standard 8.6, number 1.
2. Provide an accurate set of drawings that reflect the current conditions, i.e. the number of stairs for the current grade.
3. Restudy grade issues that require a true retaining wall, retaining wall to be functional, not decorative per Standard 8.7, number 11.
4. Maintain the historic rolled curb per standard 8.4, number 1.
5. Add planting strip of 18 inches to 24 inches between the fence and the walls and the public right-of-way per Standard 8.7, number 11.
6. Add planting strip between the new paving and the building foundation per Standard 8.2, number 8.
7. Restudy the handrail material and design to be clear of plantings and structures that obstruct the view of the main building per Standard 8.4, number 5.
8. Provide perspective drawings. Include pictures of the adjacent building with a railing.
9. Walkways in front and side yards or those that are substantially visible from the street should follow the historic design patterns of the surrounding environment per Standard 8.2, number 2.
10. Restudy the height of the mechanical enclosure. Six feet is typically the max height for fencing or screening per Standard 8.6, number 4.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The site includes the former Dilworth Methodist Church South (1829 Cleveland Av), and the Local Historic Landmark Leeper-Wyatt building (1823 Cleveland Av) which was relocated to the church parking lot.

The former Dilworth Methodist Church South building was constructed c. 1915. Architectural features include a hip roof and domed belvedere, round arched bays with fanlights, and rectangular transoms over the front bays. The front elevation has a classical portico with a pedimented fanlight gable on massive Doric columns. The exterior is unpainted brick with cast stone accents. The existing building measures approximately 34.4' in height from grade to ridge, and 50.4' in height to the highest point.

The Leeper-Wyatt Building was constructed c. 1903. Architectural features include unpainted brick with details including laid in common bond one-to-five, horizontal and arched brick lintels, and brick corbeling. The building also features a flat roof with built-up tar and gravel on wood that slopes to the rear and is enclosed on the front and sides by parapet walls with unpainted terracotta coping; large 1/1 double-hung windows, and a large set of storefront windows with fluted

pilasters on either side. The original building measures approximately 32' in height from grade to ridge, and 42' in height once the glass addition is added. The lot size is approximately 150' x 150'. Adjacent structures are a mix of 1 and 2-story residential and commercial structures.

The locally landmarked Leeper-Wyatt Building relocation was approved by the Commission at the December 13, 2023 HDC Meeting, and COA# HDCCMA-2023-00663 has been issued.

#### **PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is in three parts.

1. Elevated Plaza:

- a. An elevated plaza will be located along the front of the Leeper-Wyatt building. The footprint measures approximately 26'- 9.75" x 11'-3.75".
- b. The plaza will also extend along right side of the building. The footprint measures approximately 53'-10" x 14'-6".
- c. The elevated plaza is approximately 2' - 3.75" in height at the tallest point, and slopes down moving back towards the rear of the property, dying into the grade.
- d. Materials include unpainted brick, concrete slab, concrete steps, and metal handrails.

2. Walkway Patio (at grade):

- a. New walkways will connect the existing sidewalks (running along the left of the church) to the new elevated plaza (located along the right of the Leeper-Wyatt), creating walkways that can be used as patio areas between the two structures.
- b. The walkways range in width from 5'-0" to 10'-8".
- c. The walkway running along the front between both buildings has a max slope of 1:12 with simple metal handrails.
- d. Proposed walkway material is concrete.

3. Mechanical Enclosure:

- a. The new wood mechanical enclosure is located behind the Leeper-Wyatt building.
- b. The proposed footprint measures approximately 12'-0" x 11'-6" and will be approximately 6'-10" tall.
- c. Proposed materials include 4x4 wood pine posts with 1x6 horizontal wood pine stats, painted black.

#### *Revised Proposal – July 9, 2025*

- Revised drawing set provided.
- Perspective drawings provided, pg. HDC-9
- Historic rolled curb maintained, pg. HDC-3 and HDC-9
- Planting strips added, pg. HDC-3 and HDC-9
- Mechanical enclosure height reduced to 6'-0", pg. HDC-8
- All other items remain the same or information was not provided.

#### **STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Provide accurate drawings. See missing information on pg. HDC-6.
2. Elevated Plaza:
  - a. Maintain historic grading and elevations within public view, per Standard 8.6, number 1.
  - b. Any new retaining wall should be a true retaining wall, not a decorative feature, and be no taller than necessary to function, per Standard 8.7, number 11.
  - c. Restudy handrail material and design. Perhaps consider a glass railing that would not obstruct the building. Standard 8.4, number 5 states, "setbacks must be clear of plantings and structures that obstruct the view of the main building on a property."
3. Walkway Patio (at grade):
  - a. Walks and walkways in front and side yards, or those that are substantially visible from the street in new construction, should follow the historic design patterns of the surrounding environment, per Standard

8.2, number 2.

- b. Locate access ramps or other structures to the side or rear of the building, per Standard 8.11, number 1.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Bell's invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE**

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

Ms. Wojick moved to approve the application for site work because the applicant addressed the issue with the last presentation and the project meets the following Standards: Chapter 7 for non-residential construction, for sidewalks and parking, 8.2-8.3; for landscaping and lawns, 8.4; for trees, 8.5; for fences and walls, 8.6-8.8; for access ramps, 8.11; and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5.

Mr. Taylor seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 6/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR SITE WORK – APPROVED.**

---

**NEW CASES**

---

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

ABSENT: CURME, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMAA-2025-00109, 700 TEMPLETON AV (PID: 12305619) – MATERIAL CHANGES – AFTER THE FACT**

*This application was not heard at the June 11, 2025 meeting for being incomplete.*

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The original structure was a 1-story brick house constructed in 1936. The lot size is approximately 50' x 148'. Adjacent residential structures are a mix of 1 ½ and 2-story structures. A multi-family development is located behind the house.

A 365-day stay of demolition was placed on the property on July 13, 2016 (Case# HDC 2016-123).

The HDC approved an addition and accessory building on this site under application number HDC 2016-274 at the March 8, 2017 meeting. Under the approval, COA# HDC 2016-274, the original brick exterior was to remain, with new brick added to match existing.

The original brick was completely removed and new brick/mortar that does not match the original historic brick was installed. Neither the removal of the brick nor the new brick was approved by either the Commission or Staff.

At the April 12, 2023 meeting, a proposal to stain the new brick a more traditional brick color was denied by the HDC (under application number HDCRMAA-2023-00061).

**PROPOSAL:**

The applicant's proposal includes two options:

1. Keep brick exterior as constructed on the principal structure. Brick is Evelyn Bay Grey. Applicant's presentation

- indicates they will bring a physical sample to the meeting.
2. Bring the color of the new brick into compliance with the originally approved project (COA# HDC 2016-274), by staining the new brick a traditional red color using a Beek stain, color C-142. Applicant's presentation indicates they will bring a physical sample of the Evelyn Bay Grey brick stained with the proposed Beek stain to the meeting.

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

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The applicant provided the following list of addresses from the neighborhood with similar brick color or painted brick. Staff researched HDC files for each address. Application information is included below.
  - a. 801 Mt Vernon Pl. New construction c. 2023; COA# HDCRMA-2022-00150. Project was approved by the HDC on May 11, 2022 with brick to be Taylor Executive Grade Modular Blade Cut brick with a light neutral buff (white sand).
  - b. 712 Templeton Av. Brick has been painted since at least March 2015. No approval is on file.
  - c. 720 Templeton Av. Brick has been painted since at least May 2014. No approval is on file.
2. The Commission needs to decide if applicant's Option 1 or Option 2 meets the Design Standards.
  - a. Option 1: Keep the existing brick/mortar as constructed.
  - b. Option 2: Stain the existing brick to be a traditional red, using Beek C-142 stain.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Bell's invitation to speak.

**MOTION: CONTINUE**

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

Ms. Holtz moved to continue the application, requiring a 3'x 4' sample of the existing brick with the stain that Staff recommended be provided for review

Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 5/1**

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

**NAYS:** **TAYLOR**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR MATERIAL CHANGES – AFTER THE FACT – CONTINUED.**

---

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

ABSENT: CURME, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA-2024-00336, 3105, 3109, 3113, 3117, & 3121 COLYER PL (PID: 09506133, 09506134, 09506135, 09506136, & 09506137) – CHANGES TO AN APPROVED CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – AFTER THE FACT**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The property at 2010 The Plaza is the VanLandingham Estate, a designated local historic landmark. The four-acre property has two accessory buildings with fairly dense landscaping.

On May 12, 2021, the Commission approved the construction of four new buildings that comprise a total of 22 townhomes under application number COA# HDCRMA-2020-00467. Design changes to Building One, which faces The

Plaza, were approved by the Commission on April 13, 2022 under COA# HDCRMA-2022-00236. The construction of the other three buildings each have their own individual COA.

**Building One Approval Summary:**

- The height of Building One is 33-6", measured from grade to ridge at the tallest point (the unit facing The Plaza).
- The building setback is approximately 55'-2" from back of curb to front thermal wall.
- Materials include Nichiha Savannah smooth lap siding, Miratec windowsills and soffits, corner boards that sit proud of the siding, and brick.
- The windows are Jeld-Wen 2500-series double-hung wood with traditional wide rails, 1/1 lite pattern, 3" fiber cement brickmould, and brick rowlock sill.
- The entry doors are wood, and the garage doors are the Wayne Dalton 9510 six light steel overlay garage doors in a carriage house style, with hardware added to the double-doors to give the appearance of separate doors.
- Roofing material is asphalt shingle with wood fascia and decorative brackets.
- On the front unit facing The Plaza, the front walkway connecting to The Plaza is pea gravel, approximately 5' wide.

**PROPOSAL:**

This project is in the enforcement process. Staff conducted a final inspection on Building One on March 27, 2024, and found that the constructed project did not match the COA approved plans. The deviation from approved plans is found on all 4 elevations. Staff is unable to approve many of the design changes. The applicant is proposing to come into compliance by requesting the Commission's approval of design changes to Building One, which faces The Plaza and Colyer Place. The applicant is also requesting that if these changes are permitted, that Staff be able to approve the same changes to Building 4, as applicable.

**The changes include:**

1. Overall height changes, all elevations (Page A.1 – A.4; S.1 – S.6)
  - a. North, South, and West elevation approved height is 33'-6"; as-built height is 31.28'.
  - b. East elevation approved height is 28'-2"; as-built height is 23.56'.
2. Roof changes – North, South, & West Elevations (Page A.1 – A.2, A.4; S.2 - S.6)
  - a. Shallower roof pitches than approved on certain dormers.
3. Window changes, all elevations (Page A.1 – A.4; S.1 – S.6)
  - a. Style
    - i. Type (i.e. casement in place of double-hung)
    - ii. Quantity (single window used where double window was indicated)
  - b. Lite pattern.
  - c. Window size opening.
  - d. Proportion of window (vertical orientation vs horizontal orientation).
4. Door changes, South Elevation (facing Colyer PI), North Elevation (facing VanLandingham Estate), & East Elevation (facing driveway) (Page A.1 – A.4; S.1– S.6)
  - a. Front entry door style and lite pattern.
  - b. Back door style and lite pattern.
5. Foundation changes, all elevations (Page A.1 – A.4; S.1 – S.6)
  - a. Foundation heights changed from approved plans due field changes in grade.
  - b. Handrails and guardrails for porches, patios, and stoops were eliminated.
6. Cornices and Trim changes, all elevations (Page A.1 – A.4; S.1 – S.6)
  - a. Cornice and trim details do not match the COA and are proportionally incorrect and/or are missing.
7. Elevation detail changes:
  - a. South, East, & West Elevations (Page A.1 & A.3; S.1, S.4 – S.5)
    - i. Paneling details (with diagonally oriented lap siding) on window bay bump-outs.

- ii. Size of panels differs in various locations.
- iii. Some areas where three panels were indicated were built as two larger panels.
- b. North Elevation (Page A.4; S.2 - S.3)
  - i. Misalignment of certain windows to defining eave/trim details.
  - ii. Misalignment of certain windows from third to second floor.
  - iii. Lighting location moved from approved location next to door to above the doors.
- c. South & West Elevations (Page A.1-A.2; S.4 - S.6)
  - i. Cornice, fascia, and brick sill detail changes.
- d. North & South Elevations (Page A.2 and A.4; S.2 - S.3, S.5 - S.6)
  - i. Smooth panel siding installed on dormers instead of lap siding.
- e. South Elevation (Page A.2; S.5 - S.6)
  - i. Proportion of brick between top of garage door and bottom of second story window is taller than approved elevation.

Staff approvable changes include:

- a. Omission of some decorative brackets.
- b. HVAC screening change.
- c. Handrails to one set of entry stairs as required by Building Code.
- d. Garage door lite pattern.
- e. Rear patio door style and lite pattern.

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

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Overall height changes, all elevations (Page A.1 – A.4; S.1 – S.6):
  - a. The overall height has been lowered approximately 3"-5".
  - b. Height and width must be compatible with historic buildings, per Standard 6.9, number 1.
2. Window changes, all elevations (Page A.1 – A.5; S.1 - S.6):
  - a. Some window changes, particularly increases in size and style, may be in response to meeting egress requirements. See window schedule on pg. A.5.
  - b. Relate window openings for new construction to historic context, per Standard 6.15, number 1, letters a-d.
3. Door changes, South Elevation (facing Colyer Pl), North Elevation (facing the VanLandingham Estate), & East Elevation (facing driveway) (Page A.1 – A.4; S.1 – S.6):
  - a. Front door style changed from an approved wood Craftsman style door with 3-light pattern to full light door.
  - b. Back door style and lite pattern changed from approved 6-light to full light door.
  - c. Relate door openings for new construction to historic context, per Standard 6.15, number 1, letters a-d.
4. Foundation changes, all elevations (Page A.1 – A.4; S.1 – S.6):
  - a. Overall foundation has been lowered approximately 8" to 1'-10".
  - b. Handrails and guardrails were removed per building code.
  - c. Relate the height of new foundation to the height of foundations on historic buildings, per Standard 6.12, number 1.
5. Roof changes – North, South, & West Elevations (Page A.1 – A.2, A.4; S.2 - S.6):
  - a. Use roof forms, such as gable or hipped, or combinations of forms in the design of new residential buildings that relate to existing surrounding examples, per Standard 6.13, number 1.
6. Cornices and Trim changes, all elevations (Page A.1 – A.4; S.1 – S.6):
  - a. Ensure that the proportion and scale of the trim relates to the scale and proportion of trim on historic buildings within the context of the new building, per Standard 6.14, number 2.

7. East Elevation (facing driveway) changes (Page A.3; S.1):
  - a. Panel detail between first and second story details was drawn as a triple panel to line up with the triple window. The constructed project features two larger panels.
  - b. Dormer windows (casement) are installed using different styles (1/1 lite pattern) vs approved full lite windows.
  - c. Size of dormer windows (W35) have changed from 6-0 x 2-0 to 6-0 x 3-0. See window schedule pg. A.5.
8. North Elevation (facing VanLandingham Estate) changes (Page A.4; S.2 - S.3):
  - a. All four dormers have shallower roof pitches than indicated on approved elevation. The pitch has changed from 6:12 to 4:12.
  - b. Dormer #4 was sided with smooth siding vs approved lap siding, pg. S.2.
  - c. Third floor of Unit 3105 ("A" pg. A.4) – the second window from the right (W67) is supposed to be a double, and instead, a large single window was installed. The window size has changed from 4-6 x 4-6 to 3-0 x 4-6. See window schedule pg. A.5.
  - d. Light fixtures and locations should be compatible with the character of the surrounding area, per Standard 8.12, number 4.
9. West Elevation (facing The Plaza) changes (Page A.1; S.4):
  - a. Cornice/frieze detail is more complex in COA drawing along the top of the front porch. Constructed project features a wider simple flat frieze board. The tops of the brick columns also feature a trim cap in the COA, and those caps are missing.
  - b. Fascia along front of second story appears wider than approved.
  - c. Panel detail between first and second story details was drawn as a triple panel to line up with the triple window. The constructed project features two larger panels.
  - d. Both dormer roofs have changed from 6:12 to 4:12.
  - e. Brick windowsill details do not match COA drawings.
    - i. Sill under left triple window on first floor was built with brick sill. Brick sill was not on approved elevation.
    - ii. Brick sills of second floor windows above the front porch roof are covered by first floor porch roof flashing.
  - f. Dormer windows (casement) all are installed using different styles (1/1 lite pattern) vs approved full lite windows.
  - g. The windows on the left-most dormer (W01, not labeled on pg. A.1) have changed in size from a 6-0 x 2-0 to 6-0 x 3-0 window. On the right dormer, the left window (W02, "A" pg. A.1) has changed from 2-0 x 2-0 to a 2-0 x 3-0. The right most windows on the right dormer (W03, "A" pg. A.1) have changed from 4-6 x 2-0. See window schedule pg. A.5.
  - h. The ground floor windows have changed in size. The windows on the left bump out (W08, not labeled on pg. A.1) have changed from 9-6 x 4-6 to 9-6 x 5-2. The windows on the front porch (W09, "A" pg. A.1) have changed from 5-6 x 4-6 to 5-6 x 5-2. See window schedule pg. A.5.
10. South Elevation (facing Colyer Pl) changes (Page A.2, S.5 - S.6):
  - a. As constructed, the amount of brick between the top of the garage door and bottom of the second story windows is much larger than COA plans.
    - i. The COA plans allow for approximately 2-4.5 feet of brick between the top of the garage door and bottom of the second story windows. The amount varies by unit.
    - ii. In the constructed project, each unit has anywhere from approximately 3-6.5 feet of brick between the top of the garage door and the bottom of the second story windows.
    - iii. This change in elevation proportion may indicate that the first floor's height has increased.
  - b. All 4 dormers have shallower roof pitches. The pitch has changed from 6:12 to 4:12. Eave details above second floor of entry door to unit 3117 are also lower than in the COA elevation.
    - i. Some of the shallower pitches are evident in profile where a bracket was indicated on the approved elevation, but there was not room for the bracket in the constructed project.
    - ii. The pitches may have been changed to accommodate the extra height on the first floor and maintain the approved total height of the building.

- c. Size of panels with diagonal siding differing in height vs being uniform in size across three bays is another indication of a possible change in floor height.
- d. Cornice/frieze detailing is missing over entrance to Unit 3109.
- e. Third floor of Unit 3105 – the second window from the left (W12) is supposed to be a double, and instead, a large single window was installed.
  - i. The window directly below it (W14) is a double per the COA but is too narrow in proportion. See window schedule pg. A.5.
  - ii. No new dimensions have been provided for the currently installed windows.
- f. The double-windows on the third floor of Unit 3113 (W23) have changed in size but no new dimensions have been provided. See window schedule pg. A.5.
- g. The double-windows on the third floor of Unit 3117 (W28) have changed from 5-6 x 3-6 to 5-6 x 4-6. See window schedule pg. A.5.
- h. The double-windows on the third floor of Unit 3121 (W32) have changed from 4-6 x 3-6 to 4-6 x 4-6. See window schedule pg. A.5.
- i. Dormer #1 was sided with a smooth panel vs approved lap siding.
- j. Dormer #2 has too much siding revealed on each side of the windows.
- k. Eave of gable over Unit 3105 runs into top of eave that runs across the front of Unit 3109 instead of intersecting.
  - i. This indicates possible lower roof pitch with roof over Unit 3109.
- l. Gable detail over Unit 3121 does not match proportion of detail drawn in COA.
  - i. Eave line across the front of top floor of Unit 3119 and part of Unit 3121 comes down lower in constructed project vs approved elevation and contributes to this change.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Bell's invitation to speak.

**MOTION 1: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

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

Ms. Wojick moved to approve the following parts of the application as they meet the City of Charlotte's Design Standards: the height changes on all elevations, specifying that the north elevation faces the VanLandingham Estate; the roof changes on the north, south, and west elevations from a 6 pitch to a 4 pitch; the foundation changes due to grade changes for all elevations; that the details of the handrails and guardrails for the porches, patios, and stoops be worked out with Staff, , the third floor dormer window changes from casement to double-hung; and the changes to the third floor single double-hung window in the gable end on the north elevation..

Ms. Wojick specified that the approvals outlined above are limited to Building 1 and that drawings for Building 4 would need separate review.

Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion.

**VOTE 1: 6/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION 1: APPLICATION FOR HEIGHT/ROOF/FOUNDATION/WINDOW CHANGES – AFTER THE FACT – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

**MOTION 2: CONTINUE**

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

Ms. Wojick moved to continue the remaining items on the application as they do not meet the Design Standards and lack information. She listed the following items and the reasons for their review: the window changes on the south elevation, Unit 3105, for window proportion, lite pattern, and rhythm; the door changes on Unit 3105, for inconsistent lite configuration; the cornice and trim changes, for inconsistency and lack of detail on the soffit and fascia changes; the

column details, for a redesign with a focus on the caps; the spacing between the top of the garage doors and the bottom of the windows as it is inconsistent with the Standards; the siding, for an alternative to the diagonal orientation to be proposed; bracket locations, size, and scaling on the whole project; on the north elevation, for misalignment of windows to eave details, misalignment of windows from the third to the second floor, and inappropriate lighting locations; the south and west elevations, for inappropriate brick sills and the engagement of the porch roof and how the flashing engages with them needs to be addressed and represented; and the proportion of brick between the top of the garage door and bottom of the second floor windows needs to be reevaluated and represented. She added that the applicant can work with Staff on the details for railings, HVAC screening, garage door lite pattern rear patio doors, and rear patio door lite patterns.. She cited the following Standards: for doors and windows, 6.15; for cornices and trims, 6.14; and for masonry, 5.5.

Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion.

**VOTE 2: 6/0**

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION 2: APPLICATION FOR CHANGES TO AN APPROVED CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – AFTER THE FACT – CONTINUED.**

**MOTION 3: APPROVE**

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

Ms. Wojick moved to approve the smooth panel siding on the small dormers on the north and south elevation as they meet the Design Standards for materials, 6.18.

Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion.

**VOTE 3: 6/0**

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION 3: APPLICATION FOR SIDING CHANGES – AFTER THE FACT – APPROVED.**

---

*The Commission voted 6-0 to defer case number HDCRMAA-2025-0049 for 1817 S Mint St due to a lack of sufficient information including site plans, detailed architectural drawings, a streetscape survey including the new construction, and window trim details.*

---

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

ABSENT: CURME, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

**APPLICATION:**

HDCRMA-2025-00247, 1724 WILMORE DR (PID: 11909510) – ADDITION

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1-story Bungalow built in 1933. Architectural features include a full-width front porch with painted brick and wood columns, a front gable roof with wood shake siding, a painted brick foundation, German lap and vinyl siding, 3/1 and 1/1 double-hung windows, a central unpainted brick chimney, and a right-side brick chimney with painted brick below the roofline. Lot size is approximately 50' x 227.50'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5-story single-family structures.

**PROPOSAL:**

The project is a rear addition, with covered deck, that is taller and wider than the existing structure. The upper addition raises the main ridge approximately 3'-10". The existing rear shed, and deck will be removed. The proposed overall first-floor footprint measurements approximately 36'-0" x 32' -8". Materials include an unpainted parged block foundation, 5/16" thick lap siding (material and reveal not provided), 3/1 double-hung wood windows with trim to match existing, wood handrails on the side entry, and a shingle roof to match existing. Materials for trim and details not provided. Driveway dimensions not provided. Rear yard permeability not provided. Tree information not provided.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Context, Massing, Height & Width, Scale, and Roof Form:
  - a. Restudy Massing and Complexity of Form, per Standards 6.8; 6.20 numbers 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6; and Secretary of the Interior's Standards numbers 2, 9, and 10.
  - b. Restudy Height & Width, per Standard 6.9 and 6.20-6.24.
  - c. Restudy addition as a 1-story on the rear, per Standard 6.20-6.24.
  - d. Restudy Roof Massing, per Standards 6.8, 6.20 numbers 2 and 3; and Secretary of the Interior's Standards numbers 2, 9, and 10.
  - e. Restudy Roof Form, per Standards 6.8, 6.9, 6.10, 6.13 number 4; and Secretary of the Interior's Standards numbers 2 and 10.
  - f. Restudy coplanar dormer walls.
2. Doors & Windows, Rhythm, Details, and Materials:
  - a. Restudy Doors & Windows and Rhythm, per Standards 6.15-6.16.
  - b. Provide lap siding specifications.
  - c. Provide window and door specifications.
  - d. Provide trim and details specifications.
  - e. Provide beam and column detail.
3. Site Plan:
  - a. Provide driveway dimensions.
  - b. Label site plan with tree information, including species and diameter at breast height (DBH).
  - c. Provide tree protection information.
  - d. Provide rear yard calculations.
  - e. Show location of mechanicals on site plan.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Bell's invitation to speak.

**MOTION: CONTINUE**

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

Mr. Whitlock moved to continue the application as it does not meet the Design Standards. He requested the applicant restudies the items and Standards referenced in the Staff memo including: item 1 for context, massing, height and width, scale, and roof form, A through F; item 2 for doors and windows, rhythm, and material details, A through E; and item 3 for site plan, A through E.

Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 6/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

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

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

ABSENT: CURME, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

**APPLICATION:**

HDCRMA-2025-00317, 1566 WILMORE DR (PID: 11909701) – ACCESSORY BUILDING & SITE WORK

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1-story Bungalow built c. 1933. Architectural features include a side gable roof with a front gable dormer and interior brick chimney. The windows are 1/1, and the front door is a replacement. The full width front porch is supported by round Tuscan columns. The exterior is wrapped in vinyl siding and aluminum trim, and the foundation is parged. There are additions on the rear and a second level shed dormer. The lot size measures 50' x 200'. Adjacent historic structures are 1 and 1.5-story buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is in two (2) parts: 1.) a new accessory building, and 2.) rear yard changes. The proposed fencing changes and removal of the existing wood deck are Staff approvable.

1. A new accessory building, the project details are as follows:
  - a. At the rear of the property, a new accessory dwelling unit (ADU) will be constructed.
  - b. The ADU will be a 1.5-story structure, measuring 23 feet in height from grade to ridge at the lowest elevation.
  - c. Materials include Hardie Artisan or Nichiha Savannah lap siding and wood trim.
  - d. A new concrete driveway will be installed at the rear of the property, providing access to the ADU from W. Park Avenue.
2. Rear yard changes, the project details are as follows:
  - a. Installation of an inground, shotcrete swimming pool with a footprint measuring approximately 16' x 32'.
  - b. Pool materials include natural stone paving and matching stone coping, as shown on Sheet A-4.0.
  - c. Due to the sloping topography, retaining walls will be constructed to regrade and level portions of the yard. Integrated steps will be installed for access between elevations.
  - d. The retaining walls will be capped with materials that match the natural stone paving and faced with either thin brick veneer or painted stucco.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Accessory Building (ADU):
  - a. Roof pitches need labeled.
  - b. Consider a brick or stucco foundation to match the primary building.
  - c. Front Elevation (facing back of main house)
    - i. Dormer:
      1. The renderings show a paired window, centered on the wall, see Sheet A-6.0.
      2. The plans show a single window, located off-center, see Sheet 1.02.
    - ii. Will downspouts be run down the face of both columns? The front elevation only shows the downspout on the left column.
  - d. Left Elevation (W. Park Avenue Elevation)
    - i. On the second level, center the window on the wall under the peak of the gable.
    - ii. On the first level, add a matching window, similarly spaced.
    - iii. Will an outdoor shower be installed as shown on the renderings, Sheet A-6.0?
  - e. Right Elevation
    - i. Fenestration and Rhythm - blank walls on first and second levels.
  - f. Materials and Details
    - i. Will the building corners be mitered or have corner board trim? Cornerboard trim is noted, but not shown on the drawings.

- ii. Corrected beam/column detail needed to add the beam and base/cornice trim on the column.
  - iii. Window specifications needed.
  - iv. Door specifications needed.
  - v. Confirm that siding will be smooth finish.
2. Site Work:
- a. Rear yard permeability calculations are needed.
  - b. All site features (e.g. pavers, retaining walls, steps) need to be labeled on the Proposed Site Plan, Sheet A-3.0.
  - c. Details, dimensions, and materials of all site features are needed.
  - d. Retaining wall and integrated steps details, materials, and dimensions are needed. A detail drawing would be helpful.
3. The proposed new fencing and deck removal may be reviewed and approved by Staff.
4. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Bell's invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

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

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the application because it is not incongruous with the special character of the district as described in Chapter 3 of the Design Standards and is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation on page 2.5. He added the following conditions: that the ADU's roof pitches be reevaluated to meet manufacturer's recommendations and correctly labeled; that the applicant consider a brick or stucco foundation to match the principal structure; that the front elevation window changes per Staff analysis, sheets A-60, Sheet 1.02 be included in the final plans; that downspouts run down to face both columns; that the applicant work with Staff on the centering of the windows and gables; that the applicant work with Staff on the details on the outdoor shower; that the applicant work with Staff on the fenestration of the right elevation; that the applicant work with Staff on column details, window specifications, and door specifications; that the ADU corner details are worked out with Staff; that the front of the building is recalculated to meet the Standards; that all features, pavers, retaining walls, and steps are labelled on the site plan; that the applicant provide a section of the site and the location of the retaining walls and heights; and that the applicant work with Staff on fencing. He also asked that the applicant work with Staff on centering the window and gables on the left elevation facing the street. He cited the following Standards: for landscaping and lawns, 8.4; for fences and walls, 8.6; for accessory buildings, 8.10; for new construction of residential buildings, Chapter 6.

Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 6/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

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

---

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

ABSENT: CURME, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

**APPLICATION:**

HDCRMI-2025-00188, 1165 LINGANORE PL (PID: 12310409) – WINDOW/DOOR CHANGES & SITE CHANGES

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

Known as the Ira Stone House, the existing structure is a 1.5-story Picturesque/Tudor Revival built c. 1930. The front of the house faces Romany Road. Architectural features include a main block under a hipped roof with a number of steeply

gabled and shed projections. A massive chimney is beside the gabled entry projection. The masonry entry is arched with its original door. The entire structure is executed in (unpainted) broken and rough brick giving it the structure a distinctive texture. The gables and shed dormers have lap wood siding. Windows are original metal casements with transoms above. An accessory structure matching the style and design of the main house was constructed in 2015. The lot size is slightly irregular measuring approximately 78' x 158' x 98' x 150'. Adjacent historic structures are 1.5 and 2-story single-family buildings. The Commission approved changes to the driveway entry (rear of the house) at the April 9, 2025 meeting, under application #HDCRMI-2025-00187.

#### **PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is in three (3) parts: 1.) remove an original window and install new French doors; 2.) install a swimming pool in the side yard; and 3.) brick wall changes.

1. Remove an original metal window and install a new pair of French doors, the project details are as follows:
  - a. The front of the house faces Romany Road.
  - b. The window proposed for removal is a front room (dining room) of the house.
  - c. The window proposed for removal is an original, metal casement window with a transom.
  - d. The width of the original window opening does not appear to be changing to accommodate the new door.
  - e. The proposed new French doors are metal in a design inspired by the original window design.
  - f. The door panes will measure 9" x 11" to match the size of the original window panes.
2. Install a swimming pool in the side yard, the project details are as follows:
  - a. The proposed pool measures 18'-6" x 10'-6".
  - b. The proposed decking is bluestone and new turf.
3. Brick wall changes, the project details are as follows:
  - a. The existing brick wall and landscaping was approved in 2019 (COA#HDCADMRM-2019-00610).
  - b. The brick wall opening will be infilled with new brick to match existing.
  - c. The steps to the front yard will be removed.
  - d. The current brick wall is 4' in height at its tallest point, sloping down to the wall opening/steps to front yard.
  - e. The applicant is requesting to raise the entire brick wall to 54" (4'-6").

#### **STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Window to Door Change:
  - a. Windows visible from the street are typically required to remain, especially if located in the front two rooms of the house, because these are character-defining features of the building. The proposed change does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 1, 2, 5, and 9; Design Standards for Windows, 4.12-4.14, Preamble, 1 and 6; and Design Standards for Additions, 6.20-6.24, number 3.
2. Swimming Pool:
  - a. Provide information about the type and material of the "turf" proposed to be installed.
  - b. Provide information, including materials and dimensions, about the fire and water feature to be installed.
  - c. Provide more information about the gate and pergola connecting the primary house to the accessory structure.
  - d. Permanent screening is required for the pool equipment.
3. Fence Changes:
  - a. Consider an alternative design approach to meet the pool enclosure code requirements.
  - b. The current brick wall is 4' in height, as prescribed by the Design Standards, Fences and Walls, 8.6-8.7, number 8.
  - c. Changing the design of the existing brick wall will create a long-unbroken expanse, which does not meet Design Standards for Fences and Walls, 8.6-8.7, number 9.
  - d. All brick should remain unpainted.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Bell's invitation to speak.

**MOTION 1: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

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

Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application for the windows and door changes as they meet the Design Standards. She explained the exception that Commission was making due to the unique conditions of the lot and the orientation of the home on the lot, as well as the fact that the header height and width of the existing opening will not change and that the applicant is matching the lite dimensions of the existing window and transoms. . She also added that this elevation essentially acts as the rear of the house. She added the following Standards: for windows, 4.14, numbers 14, 16, and 17; 6.20; and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5, numbers 1 and 10.

Ms. Holtz seconded the motion.

**VOTE 1: 6/0**

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION 1: APPLICATION FOR WINDOW AND DOOR CHANGES – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

**MOTION 2: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

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

Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application for the swimming pool with the conditions that the applicant work with Staff to provide detailed information on the type and dimensions of turf that will be installed, the fire and water feature, the gate and pergola connecting the principal structure with the accessory structure, mechanical screening for the pool equipment, dimensions for all features surrounding the pool, and rear yard calculations. She cited the Standard 8.4, number 7.

Ms. Wojick seconded the motion.

**VOTE 2: 6/0**

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION 2: APPLICATION FOR POOL & SITE FEATURES – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

**MOTION 3: DENY**

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

Ms. Hawkins moved to deny the proposed changes to the fence. She cited the Standards for fences and walls, 8.6 and 8.7, numbers 8 and 9. She explained that the current brick wall meets the Standards and that the proposed change would create a long, unbroken expanse which would not meet Standards.

Ms. Holtz seconded the motion.

**VOTE 3: 6/0**

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION 3: APPLICATION FOR FENCE CHANGES – DENIED**

---

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

ABSENT: CURME, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

RECUSED: TAYLOR

**APPLICATION:****HDCRMI-2025-00190, 1147 LINGANORE PL (PID: 12310407) – DRIVEWAY CHANGES****EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

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

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is the expansion of the existing driveway and front walkway for accessibility.

- Existing driveway measures approximately 8'-10".
- Proposed driveway measures approximately 15'-7 ¾" at the widest point.
- Proposed driveway expansion material is brick pavers to match existing.
- Front walkway dimensions not provided.
- Proposed walkway dimensions not provided.
- Proposed walkway material is brick pavers to match existing.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Driveway:
  - a. The relationship between a building and its site features defines the character of the property and may be considered an important, per Standard 8.1.
  - b. Retain existing historic driveways, per Standard 8.2, number 3.
  - c. Driveways should be as narrow as possible. Historic driveways are 8' in width, per Standard 8.2, number 5.
  - d. Do not place paved areas for parking in the front yard, per Standard 8.2, number 6.
  - e. Do not replace grass in front yards with paving, per Standard 8.4, number 6.
2. Walkway:
  - a. Retain existing historic walkways, per Standard 8.2, number 1.
  - b. Walks and walkways in front and side yards, or those that are substantially visible from the street in new construction, should follow the historic design patterns of the surrounding environment, per Standard 8.2, number 2.
  - c. Locate access ramps or other structures to the side or rear of the building, per Standard 8.11, number 1.
  - d. Ensure that any solution is reversible; that it may be built, used, and removed without permanent damage to the historic features of the building, per Standard 8.11, number 2.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Bell's invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS****1<sup>st</sup>: WOJICK      2<sup>nd</sup>: HAWKINS**

Ms. Wojick moved to approve the applications as the site creates unique restrictions for the applicant. The proposed construction is not removing the existing driveway, it is extending it to allow for the required accessibility that the homeowners require. She explained that it is reversible and added the condition that the plans be modified to accurately depict the situation at the left property line. Ms. Wojick also added that this approval is limited to the

property due to the particular circumstances and that the different materials being used will make clear which parts of the driveway are existing and which are new. She cited the following Standards: for sidewalks, 8.2; for access ramps, 8.11, number 2; and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5, numbers 5, 9, and 10.

Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: 5/0

AYES: BELL, HAWKINS, HOLTZ, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

NAYS: NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR DRIVEWAY CHANGES – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

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

ABSENT: CURME, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

RETURNED: TAYLOR

**APPLICATION:**

HDCRDEMO-2025-00252, 1740 MERRIMAN AV (PID: 11909408) – DEMOLITION – RESIDENTIAL

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is 1-story, American Small House constructed c. 1948. Architectural features include a symmetrical façade with a projecting front gable supported by replacement metal columns, exterior brick chimney, and 1/1 replacement windows. The entire house is wrapped in vinyl and aluminum. The lot size is approximately 50' x 141'. Adjacent structures are 1-story American Small Houses.

**PROPOSAL:**

The Commission previously reviewed this building for demolition at the June 8, 2022 meeting, approving the demolition with a 365-Day Stay under application number HDCRDEMO-2022-00168. The applicant did not request the COA in the required 12-month timeframe, making the approval null and void.

On January 11, 2023, new construction was Approved with Conditions, and COA# HDCRMA-2022-00524 was issued on January 29, 2024. The COA was renewed on January 29, 2025, and is valid through January 29, 2026.

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

- Zoutewelle survey
- Property survey
- Digital photos of all sides of building
- Digital photos of significant architectural details
- Elevation drawings.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Driveway Commission will determine if the application is complete.
2. The Commission will determine whether or not the building has special significance to the Wilmore Local Historic District. With affirmative determination, the Commission can apply up to a 365-Day Stay of Demolition.
3. If the Commission determines that this property does not have any special significance to the district, then demolition may take place without a delay or upon the approval of new construction plans.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Bell's invitation to speak.

**MOTION 1: HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE**

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

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

Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion.

**VOTE 1: 6/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION 1: APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION – DEEMED HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT.**

**MOTION 2: WAIVE 365-DAY STAY**

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

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the project, opting to waive the 365-day stay of demolition on the building due to the existing COA for new construction on the site.

Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion.

**VOTE 2: 6/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION 2: APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION – APPROVED WITH NO 365-DAY STAY.**

---

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

ABSENT: CURME, LINEBERGER, SULLIVAN

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCCMIA-2025-00319, 916 EAST BV (PID: 12108109) – CHIMNEY & MATERIAL CHANGES – AFTER THE FACT**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1.5-story Colonial Revival built c. 1930 and has since converted to office use. Architectural features include a symmetrical design with shed roof front porch, a cross-gable roof with clipped side gables, open eaves, square wood columns, a front brick chimney with corbelling detail that is located near the right side of the building, and symmetrical gable bump outs on the right and left elevations that step back from the front thermal wall. The rear elevation features a central clipped gable dormer and there is an engaged rear stoop on the left elevation. Exterior materials include 15-lite wood casement windows on the front of the building, 12/1 wood double hung windows, brick foundation, and cedar shingle siding. The lot size is approximately 75' x 192'. Adjacent buildings are 1 and 2 story single-family and commercial structures.

**PROPOSAL:**

The project consists of two parts, 1.) primary chimney removal, and 2.) original wood fascia and rake boards replacement with a non-traditional material. The applicant is working with Staff to remove the vinyl wrap that was added to wood brackets, soffit, and rafter tails and re-expose these original, character-defining building elements.

1. Chimney removal, the project details are as follows:

- a. The chimney is painted brick, located on the front elevation near the right corner.
- b. The chimney has been removed below the roof decking.
- c. The subsequent opening has been covered over with new roof sheathing and asphalt architectural

- shingles.
- d. The applicant is proposing to restore the missing chimney to its original condition.
2. Original wood fascia and rake boards replacement with a non-traditional material, the project details are as follows:
    - a. The original fascia and rake boards are wood.
    - b. The existing wood fascia and rake boards were replaced with new elements constructed out of a white synthetic/PVC material.
    - c. The newly installed fascia has increased in width to 8".
    - d. The proposal is to keep the new 8" wide synthetic, PVC fascia and rake boards.

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

#### **STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The Commission needs to make two decisions about this project:
  - a. Decision 1: Restoration of the original chimney.
  - b. Decision 2: Removal of existing wood fascia material, and installation of new, wider synthetic/PVC fascia.
2. For Decision 1: Restoration of original chimney.
  - a. The original chimney has already been removed and its condition cannot be evaluated.
  - b. Recommended Motion: Approval with Conditions.
    - i. The proposed restoration of the original chimney is not incongruous with the Design Standards for Chimneys 4.7, numbers 1-3; Masonry, 5.5, numbers 2, 3 and 4; and the Secretary of Interior's Standards 2.5, numbers 2, 5 and 6.
  - c. Recommended Facts:
    - i. The chimney will be rebuilt to match the style and materials of the original chimney.
    - ii. The brick and mortar should match original brick on the building.
    - iii. The new brick chimney should not be painted.
3. For Decision 2: Removal of wood fascia and rake boards and install 8" wide synthetic/PVC fascia.
  - a. The original fascia and rake board material is not available to evaluate if repair is possible.
  - b. The applicant did not provide the measurements of the original fascia and rake boards.
  - c. Recommended Motion: Denial.
    - i. The removal and replacement of historic wood fascia and rake boards with wider synthetic material is incongruous with the Design Standards for Trim 4.11, numbers 1, 2, and 4; Wood 5.2, numbers 1-4 and 6-9; and the Secretary of Interior's Standards 2.5, numbers 2, 5, and 6.
  - d. Recommended Facts:
    - i. The new fascia and rake boards are 8" wide, which is an increase in proportion from the original width of fascia and rake boards.
    - ii. The new fascia and rake board material is synthetic/PVC and is a non-traditional material.
4. 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]:**

No one accepted Chair Bell's invitation to speak.

#### **MOTION 1: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**      1<sup>st</sup>:    HOLTZ      2<sup>nd</sup>:    HAWKINS

Ms. Holtz moved to approve the restoration of the original chimney because the proposed restoration is not incongruous and meets the following Standards: for chimneys, 4.7, numbers 1 through 3; for masonry, 5.5, numbers 2, 3, and 4; and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5, numbers 2, 5, and 6.5(c). She explained that the original chimney cannot be evaluated as it has already been removed, but the chimney will be rebuilt to match the style and

materials of the original chimney as documented in photographs. She added the conditions that the new brick and mortar match that of the house, that the new chimney should not be painted, and that the applicant work with Staff to bring the project into compliance as required by the Unified Development Ordinance.

Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion.

**VOTE 1: 5/1**

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

**NAYS:** TAYLOR

**DECISION 1: APPLICATION FOR CHIMNEY REPAIR – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

**MOTION 2: DENY**

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

Ms. Holtz moved to deny the application for the removal of the wood fascia, rake boards, and soffits and the installation of synthetic materials as a replacement material is incongruous with the Design Standards and inappropriate for the property. She added that the original fascia, board, and soffit materials are not available for evaluation. She also explained that the new elements are a different proportion than the original and made of a non-traditional material which is not approved by the Commission. She cited the following Standards: for trim, 4.1, numbers 1, 2, and 4; for materials, 5.2, numbers 1 through 4 and 6 through 9; and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards 2.5, numbers 2, 5, and 6.

Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion.

**VOTE 2: 5/1**

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

**NAYS:** TAYLOR

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

---

*The applicant chose to defer a hearing on case number HDCRMIA-2025-00321 for 1016 Isleworth Av.*

---

With no further business to discuss, Chair Bell adjourned the meeting at 7:14 p.m.