



---

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
June 11, 2025 | Room 267

MINUTES

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Vacant, Resident-Owner Hermitage Court  
Vacant, Resident-Owner Oaklawn Park  
Vacant, Resident-Owner Wilmore

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

---

With a quorum present, Chair Hawkins called the June meeting of the Historic District Commission (Commission) meeting to order at 1:22 p.m. Chair Hawkins began the meeting by introducing the Staff and Commissioners and explaining the meeting procedure. All interested parties planning to give testimony – FOR or AGAINST – must submit a form to speak and must be sworn in. Staff will present a description of each proposed project to the Commission. The Commissioners and the Applicants will then discuss the project. Audience members signed up to speak either FOR or AGAINST will be called to the podium for each agenda item. Presentations by the Applicants and audience members must be concise and focused on the ***Charlotte Historic District Design Standards***. The Commission and Staff may question the Applicant. The Applicant may present sworn witnesses who will be subject to questioning by the Commission and Staff. The Applicant will be given an opportunity to respond to comments by interested parties. After hearing each application, the Commission will review, discuss, and consider the information that has been gathered and

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

---

Ms. Parati made a motion to recommend Christopher Allred for the Wesley Heights Resident-Owner Seat on the Commission. Ms. Wojick seconded the motion. It passed 11/0.

Ms. Parati made a motion to confirm the appointment of Commission officers for the upcoming term. Ms. Holtz seconded the motion. It passed 11/0.

Ms. Curme made a motion to approve the April 2025 HDC meeting minutes. Ms. Bell seconded the motion. It passed 6/0.

Ms. Bell made a motion to approve the May 2025 HDC Meeting Minutes. Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion. It passed 6/0.

---

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

##### **CONSENT**

HDCRMA-2025-00316, 509 E Tremont Av  
HDCRMA-2025-00318, 1714 The Plaza  
HDCRMI-2025-00250, 916 E Park Av  
HDCRMA-2025-00331, 2204 Charlotte Dr

Dilworth  
Plaza Midwood  
Dilworth  
Dilworth

##### **NOT HEARD AT THE MAY 14, 2025 MEETING**

HDCRMIA-2024-00857, 304 W Park Av  
HDCRMIA-2024-00673, 415 E Kingston Av  
HDCRMIA-2024-00855, 406 E Park Av

Wilmore  
Dilworth  
Dilworth

##### **CONTINUED FROM THE APRIL 9, 2025 MEETING**

HDCRMA-2024-00684, 220 S Summit Av

Wesley Heights

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

HDCRMA-2025-00105, 2225 The Plaza

Plaza Midwood

#### **NEW CASES**

HDCRMI-2025-00182, 1622 Van Buren Av	McCrorey Heights
HDCRMIA-2024-00490, 405 E Tremont Av	Dilworth
HDCRMAA-2025-00109, 700 Templeton Av	Dilworth
HDCRMA-2025-00110, 408 Heathcliff St	Wesley Heights
HDCRDEMO-2025-00006, 712 Templeton Av	Dilworth
HDCCMI-2025-00183, 1823 Cleveland Av	Dilworth

---

## CONSENT

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA-2025-00316, 509 E TREMONT AV (PID: 12105803) – ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – REAFFIRMATION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a new construction single-family building. Construction began in 2021 and was approved by the Commission on September 9, 2020, under application number HDCRMA-202-00266, with amended plans approved under application number HDCRMA-2022-00296. Lot size is approximately 50' x 150'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5-story single-family buildings.

The original structure was a one-story Craftsman bungalow constructed in 1915. Architectural features included a side gable roof with a front gable porch supported by brick columns, original 8/1 wood windows, wood shake shingle siding brackets. Height was approximately 21.2'. On February 12, 2020, the HDC placed a 365-day stay of demolition on the property (HDCRDEMO-2019-00795).

**PROPOSAL:**

- The applicant is seeking reaffirmation of a previously approved accessory structure in the rear yard.
- The accessory structure is a detached single-car garage originally approved for construction on September 9, 2020, under application number HDCRMA-2020-00266.
- The COA was issued on April 1, 2021; however, permits were not pulled for the accessory structure and the COA has expired.
- The accessory structure design remains unchanged from the originally approved plans.
- The reaffirmation is limited to the accessory structure and does not include any portion of the principal structure.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the 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. The reaffirmation is limited to the accessory structure and does not include any portion of the principal structure.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

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

Ms. Holtz moved to approve the project as it is not incongruous with the special character of the district and meets the Standards for the new construction of residential buildings, Chapter 6, and accessory buildings, 8.10. She added the condition that permit-ready drawings be submitted to Staff for final review and that the reaffirmation be limited to the accessory structure and does not include any portion of the principal structure.

Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 11/0**

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

NAYS: NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – REAFFIRMATION – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.****ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: NONE

RECUSED: HOLTZ

**APPLICATION:**

HDCRMA-2025-00318, 1714 THE PLAZA (PID: 09506204) – REAR ADDITION

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1-story Bungalow built c. 1931. Architectural features include a side gable roof with a front gable dormer and Colonial Revival details such as the original front door and side lights, paired 6/1 double-hung windows, and covered side porch with simple Tuscan columns supporting the side gable roof. Exterior materials include a painted brick foundation and wood shingle siding. The lot size measures approximately 66' x 170'. Adjacent historic structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single-family buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is the removal of a non-original rear porch and construction of a one-story rear addition which will tie in below the primary ridge.

- The addition only spans half the width of the existing house due to a 48" Oak tree in the rear yard, which will remain and be protected throughout construction, see Sheet HDC3.
- The addition is in two segments, see Sheet HDC8.
  - The first segment is inset 6" from the original right corner of the house and has an approximate footprint of 17'-7" wide x 27'-8" deep.
  - The second segment roof is stepped down and walls are stepped in 1'-0" on each side. The approximate footprint is 15'-7" wide x 13'-0" deep.
- Proposed materials include a brick foundation, red cedar wood shingle exterior, wood trim, and architectural shingle roof.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and the City of Charlotte Design Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter

- 6.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, Staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the Standards and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with permit-ready construction drawings submitted to Staff for final review, with the following Conditions:
    - a. Provide 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 and paired windows with mullion trim.
    - d. All brick to remain unpainted.
    - e. New wood shingles shall be individually applied and not panels of shingles.
  3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

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

Ms. Lineberger moved to approve this application because the project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the City of Charlotte's Design Standards for new construction for residential buildings, Chapter 6. She added the following conditions: that permitready drawings be provided to Staff for final review; that the applicant provide manufacturer specifications that meet HDC Standards for the new windows and doors; that they provide brick and mortar samples; that they provide detailed drawings for railing and paired windows with mullion trim; that they ensure the brick is to remain unpainted; and that new wood shingles be applied individually and not in panels.

Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 10/0**

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

**NAYS:** NONE

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

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

RETURNED: HOLTZ

**APPLICATION:**

HDCRMI-2025-00250, 916 E PARK AV (PID: 12311319) – ADDITION & SITE CHANGES

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1.5-story brick English Cottage built c. 1939. Architectural features include a large prominent front chimney with a projecting gable double-arched front porch to the left and a gable dormer with German lap wood siding to the right. Exterior materials include 6/1 wood windows, a 3-light wood front door, a 15-light door to the left that opens out onto the front porch, and a second-floor dormer addition with wood lap siding. The lot size is approximately 49' by 168'. Adjacent historic structures are 1.5, 2, and 2.5-story single-family buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is the addition of a side entry on the left elevation.

- On the left elevation, the window closest to the rear left corner of the house is proposed to be changed to an

entry door, see Sheet A2.2.

- The new entry door is proposed to be aluminum clad in a style to match the existing windows on the house.
- A new brick stoop and step will be installed. The stoop is approximately 4'-6" deep.
- A hipped portico roof supported by wood Colonial style brackets will be installed over the new entry door. All trim will be wood to match existing.
- The existing driveway will be removed, and a new concrete carriage track drive will be installed. The new driveway will be extended toward the rear of the house stopping just before the new stoop, see Sheet A0.1
- The fenestration changes on the non-original addition on the rear elevation/rear right corner are Staff approvable due to location.

#### **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 proposed brick/mortar samples to Staff for probable approval, with all brick to remain unpainted.
  - b. Provide manufacturer specifications that meet HDC Standards for the new door.
  - c. Provide final dimensions of the new stoop and step.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

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

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

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

**1<sup>st</sup>:**   **BELL**

**2<sup>nd</sup>:**   **HOLTZ**

Ms. Bell moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the special character of the district and meets and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the City of Charlotte's Design Standards for new construction for residential buildings, Chapter 6, and Standards for private sites, Chapter 8. She added the following conditions: that the Applicant provide permit-ready drawings to Staff for final review; that they provide proposed brick and mortar samples to Staff; that all brick remain unpainted; and that they provide manufacturer specifications that meet HDC Standards for the new door; and that they provide final dimensions of the new stoop and step.

Ms. Holtz seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 11/0**

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

**NAYS:**   **NONE**

#### **DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION & SITE CHANGES – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

RECUSED: TAYLOR

#### **APPLICATION:**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a two-story Colonial Revival house built in 1934. The building has a symmetrical front elevation with a portico over the entrance, gable roof and 6/1 double-hung windows. The exterior has wood lap siding and a brick foundation. The lot size is approximately 50' x 150'. Adjacent historic structures are a mixture of 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a 2-story addition and a 1-story screen porch on the rear of the house. The proposed additions increase the square footage of the existing building more than 50%, requiring Commission review.

A non-historic addition on the rear of the building will be removed. The proposed rear additions will tie in below the original ridge. The additions are stepped in 2 feet from the rear corners of the original house. Proposed materials include a brick foundation, Nichiha Savannah smooth finish lap siding with an 8 inch exposure, asphalt shingle roofing on the 2-story addition, and either an EPDM or TPO roofing membrane for the flat roof on the screen porch. Windows are proposed to be aluminum clad, double-hung, 6/1 Simulated True Divided Light (STDL) to match the original windows. The screens in the porch will be integrated with the columns and beams. The new recessed covered entry at the rear corner of the left elevation is proposed to have a random ashlar bluestone stoop. The brackets, columns, trellis, and arbor on the left elevation are proposed to be wood. Fascia, frieze, soffit, and window/door trim materials are not provided. Post-construction rear yard impermeable area is 49.7%.

The replacement of the existing asphalt driveway with a new concrete driveway shown on the proposed site plan on sheet SP.1 may be approved by Staff.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and the City of Charlotte Design Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, Staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the Standards and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with permit-ready construction drawings submitted to Staff for final review, with the following Conditions:
  - a. All trim including but not limited to, fascia, frieze, soffit, and window/door trim will be wood to match existing.
  - b. Screen porch frames will be wood.
  - c. Provide window and door specifications that meet HDC Standards.
  - d. The skylight will be flush mounted.
  - e. Provide a door trim detail.
  - f. Provide a brick and mortar sample to Staff for probable approval.
  - g. All masonry will remain unpainted.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

1<sup>st</sup>: PARATI

2<sup>nd</sup>: HOLTZ

Ms. Parati moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the special character of the district and meets and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the City of Charlotte Design Standards for new construction for residential buildings, Chapter 6. She added the following conditions: all trim must be wood to match

existing; the screen porch frames must be wood; that the Applicant provide window and door specifications that meet HDC Standards; that the skylight will be flush mounted; that they provide a door trim detail; that they provide a brick and mortar sample to Staff; and that all masonry will remain unpainted.

Ms. Holtz seconded the motion.

VOTE: 10/0

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

NAYS: NONE

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

---

**NOT HEARD AT THE MAY 14, 2025 MEETING**

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

RETURNED: TAYLOR

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMIA-2024-00857, 304 W PARK AV (PID: 11908709) – CHIMNEY CHANGES – AFTER THE FACT**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1-story brick Bungalow duplex built c. 1936, that has since been converted to single-family use. Architectural features include a side gable roof, center front chimney, projecting gable front porch to the right with rectangular brick columns and a cross-gable to the left. An engaged side porch and entry door is on the front far left of the building. Exterior materials include stucco gable ends with wood louvered vents, 6/6 wood windows, and a 6-lite Craftsman-style wood front door. A brick addition to the rear of the house nearly doubles the square footage of the original building and features a hip roof that ties into to the principal structure. The lot size is approximately 49' by 188'. Adjacent historic structures are 1 and 1.5-story single-family buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project consists of changes to the primary chimney located in the front center of the main side-gable roof. Approximately six courses of mismatched brick have been added around only the rear flue at the top of the chimney by previous owners. This brick will be removed, along with one layer of original brick from the top of the entire chimney. Six new courses of brick will then be installed at the top of the chimney. The brick to be used will be an exact match to the original as it is being obtained from former furnace chimney located in the basement. The mortar color and tooling will be redone to match existing. Following the masonry repair, a stainless-steel chimney cap will be installed.

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. The applicant provided a list of addresses of historic houses with chimney repairs and/or chimney caps installed:
  - a. 701 Romany Rd: Chimney cap – has been installed since least March 2008, no approval on file.
  - b. 905 Romany Rd: Chimney cap – has been installed since at least March 2008. Case file photos from HDC# 2000.135.D.98 show the chimney without a chimney cap, indicating the cap was installed sometime between 2000 – 2008.

- c. 500 E Park Av: Mortar repair and chimney cap – changes to chimney have been in place since at least March 2008, no approval on file.
  - d. 624 E Kingston Av: Chimney brick and mortar repair – COA# 2016-151 issued July 16, 2016. Project for roof line modifications and additions was approved by HDC on July 13, 2016 and included chimney refurbishment.
  - e. 321 E Park Av: Chimney brick and mortar repair – no approval on file.
2. Recommended Motion: Approval with Conditions.
- a. The proposed chimney repair is congruous with the Design Standards for Masonry 5.5, numbers 2, 4, and 5; and the Design Standards for Chimneys 4.7, numbers 1, 2 and 3.
  - b. Applicant to re-install former brick detailing in original location to distinguish the difference between the top of the original chimney and the addition of new courses of brick to make the chimney taller.
3. Recommended Facts:
- a. The primary brick chimney has been retained and repaired using original brick from another part of the home.
  - b. The proposed reworking of the mortar color and tooling of the repair will match that of the original chimney.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

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

Ms. Curme moved to approve the application because it is not incongruous with the following Standards: for masonry, 5.5, numbers 2, 4, and 5; and for chimneys, 4.7, numbers 1, 2, and 3. She added the condition that the Applicant reinstall the former brick detailing in the original location to distinguish between the top of the original chimney and the addition of new courses of bricks to make the chimney taller. She added the facts that the original primary chimney had been retained and was repaired using original brick from another part of the home and that the mortar color and tooling of the repair will match that of the original chimney.

Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 11/0**

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR CHIMNEY CHANGES – AFTER THE FACT – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

**APPLICATION:**

HDCRMIA-2024-00673, 415 E KINGSTON AV (PID: 12308206) – LANDSCAPE CHANGES – AFTER THE FACT

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 2-story Bungalow built c. 2005. Architectural features include a large side gable roof with central reverse shed dormer with two sets of 8-lite French doors opening out into the space. Exterior materials include 6/1 wood windows, a 6-lite wood Craftsman-style front door, stacked-stone front porch column bases, steps, and cheek walls, Craftsman paired wood front porch columns, and wood lap siding. Lot size is approximately 50' by 140'. Adjacent historic structures are 1.5, 2, and 2.5-story single-family buildings.

## **PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project consists of the installation of artificial turf in the front yard.

1. The product to be installed is Tiger Turf Diamond Supreme Fescue, a polyethylene material.
2. The turf will be installed in two sections, each flanking the primary walkway.
3. Each section of turf will be surrounded by planting beds with various shrubs and plantings.
4. The total square footage of the turf to be installed is approximately 500 square feet.

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. The Commission needs to make one (1) decision about this project:
  - a. Review the replacement of traditional material (grass + ground cover) with a non-traditional material (artificial turf).
  - b. Recommended Motion: Denial.  
The installation of artificial turf in the front yard is incongruous with Design Standards for Private Sites, 8.1; Landscaping and Lawns, 8.4, numbers 2 and 6; and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, numbers 2, 3, 6, and 9.
  - c. Recommended Facts:
    - i. Front yards in Dilworth have grass, natural vegetation ground cover, and planting beds.
    - ii. The artificial turf product installed in the front yard is made of polyethylene, a non-traditional material, replacing the front yard grass and ground cover.

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

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

### **MOTION: DENY**

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

Ms. Parati moved to deny this application because artificial turf in front yards is incongruous with the following Standards: for private sites, 8.1; for landscaping and lawns, 8.4, numbers 2, 4, and 6; and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, numbers 2, 3, 6, and 9. She added the following facts: that the artificial turf installed in front of 415 East Kingston Avenue is a nontraditional material and it is incongruous with the Dilworth district which typically has grass, natural vegetation, or planting beds in front yards and that there are natural options that were available for ground cover and can be used in shaded areas

Ms. Bell seconded the motion.

Ms. Wojick suggested the amendment that Standard 8.4, number 3 be cited as it provides guidelines on replacing diseased or dead plants and that there is a list of approved plant species available in the Charlotte Land Development Standards Manual that could be a helpful resource for the applicant

Ms. Parati and Ms. Bell accepted the amendment.

Ms. Parati added Standard 8.4, number 4, to her motion which offers direction that the dominant landscape design in the historic district should be repeated when installing new plantings.

## **VOTE: 11/0**

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

**NAYS:** **NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR LANDSCAPE CHANGES – AFTER THE FACT – DENIED.**

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMIA-2024-00855, 406 E PARK AV (PID: 12308224) – LANDSCAPE CHANGES – AFTER THE FACT**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 2.5-story Queen Anne built c. 1989. Architectural features include a partial width front porch that wraps around the front right corner with a gable portico directly over the main entry; a complex cross gable roof with pyramidal tower on the right side; and a large brick chimney on the rear elevation. An engaged porch with square columns that match the front porch is located on the second floor, directly above the main entry. A third-floor gable bump out on the left front elevation features a band of decorative millwork and Juliet balcony in front of a triple window with central arched window. Exterior materials include wood lap siding, wood shingle siding on the upper gable ends, and 1/1 windows. Lot size is approximately 50' by 190'. Adjacent historic structures are 2 and 2.5-story single-family buildings. Dilworth Elementary School is directly across the street from the subject property.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project consists of the installation of artificial turf in the front yard.

1. Front product to be installed is Everlast Artificial Grass Venice Fescue Light, a monofilament polyethylene material.
2. The turf will be installed in two sections, each flanking the primary walkway.
3. Each section of turf will be surrounded by planting beds with various shrubs and plantings.
4. The total square footage of the turf to be installed is approximately 500 square feet.

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. The Commission needs to make one (1) decision about this project:
  - a. Review the replacement of traditional materials (grass, mulch, and planting beds) with a non-traditional material (artificial turf).
  - b. Recommended Motion: Denial.  
The installation of artificial turf in the front yard is incongruous with Design Standards for Private Sites, 8.1; Landscaping and Lawns, 8.4, numbers 2 and 6; and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, numbers 2, 3, 6, and 9.
  - c. Recommended Facts:
    - i. Front yards in Dilworth have grass, natural vegetation ground cover, and planting beds.
    - ii. The artificial turf product installed in the front yard is made of monofilament polyethylene, a non-traditional material, replacing the front yard grass and ground cover.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

One person accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak and offered comments in opposition to the proposed request.

**MOTION: DENY**

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

Ms. Lineberger moved to deny the application as the installation of artificial turf in the front yard is incongruous with the following Standards: for private sites, 8.1; for landscaping and lawns, 8.4, numbers 2, 3, 4, and 6; and the Secretary of

the Interior's Standards, numbers 2, 3, 6, and 9. She added the fact that front yards in Dilworth have grass and natural ground cover and that the proposed turf is an artificial product made of monofilament polyethylene, replacing the front yard grass and ground cover.

Ms. Parati offered a friendly amendment that there are other ground coverings and natural vegetation options that thrive in shaded areas. Ms. Lineberger accepted that amendment, then Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

Mr. Taylor offered a friendly amendment that artificial turf is a synthetic material not allowed in front yards in the historic district but would be permissible in the rear yard behind a fence.

Ms. Lineberger and Ms. Parati accepted the amendment.

**VOTE: 11/0**

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR LANDSCAPE CHANGES – AFTER THE FACT – DENIED.**

---

#### **CONTINUED FROM THE APRIL 9, 2025 MEETING**

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

#### **APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA-2024-00684, 220 S SUMMIT AV (PID: 07101501) – ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT**

*This application was continued from the April 9, 2025 meeting for the following items:*

1. *Proposed project is incongruous with the following Standards:*
  - a. *Context, 6.1-6.4*
  - b. *Massing, 6.8*
  - c. *Accessory buildings, 8.10.*
2. *The Commission did not review any further details of the project at this time.*

#### **EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing 2-story building was originally constructed as a duplex c. 1939. Architectural features include a side gable roof, symmetrical six-bay front façade, and 6/6 double-hung wood windows. Exterior is unpainted brick. Originally, matching front porches were separate with brick columns, arched openings, and front-facing gables. A central connector and railings were added to the front porches during the c. 2007-2008 renovations. The accessory structure and existing 1-story rear addition were also constructed c. 2007-2008. The lot size measures approximately 50' x 187'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings.

#### **PROPOSAL:**

The project is an addition to an existing brick accessory structure.

- The existing accessory structure has a footprint of 29'-10" x 24'-0". The addition will expand the footprint to 29'-10" x 32'-0 1/2".
- The existing accessory structure height, as measured from grade to ridge, is approximately 15'-10". The addition will create a new overall height, as measured from grade to ridge, of approximately 23'-10".
- The proposed materials are shingle roof with unpainted brick to match existing. The new windows are proposed

to be double-hung Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL) in a 6/6 pattern to match existing. Existing window and door material unknown.

*Revised Proposal – April 9, 2025*

- Revised drawing set provided.
- Proposed new height as measured from grade to ridge is approximately 22'-4 ½".
- Proposed new footprint is 29'-10" x 35'-0".
- Proposed materials remain the same.
- Rear yard permeability is 52%.

*Revised Proposal – June 11, 2025*

- Revised drawing set provided.
- Proposed height remains the same at approximately 22'-4 ½", as measured from grade to ridge.
- Proposed new footprint is 28'-10" x 29'-10"
- Proposed materials remain the same with the addition:
  - Hardie Artisan Siding with 7" exposure.
  - Metal roof over entrance.
- Rear yard permeability is 55.04%.
- Dormers have been added.
- Cross-gable addition added.
- Proposed front door is Craftsman in style

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Context, Massing, Height & Width, Scale, and Roof Form:
  - a. Structure does not appear to be secondary in massing or footprint to the primary structure.
2. Windows and Doors, and Rhythm:
  - a. Restudy front door to match Colonial Revival style.
  - b. Restudy window and door rhythm and locations on right elevation.
  - c. Provide window and door specifications that meet HDC requirements.
3. Cornice and Trim, and Materials:
  - a. Porkchop eaves are incongruous with the Standards 6.14, number 3.
  - b. Restudy eaves and eaves return.
  - c. All brick is to remain unpainted.
  - d. Provide metal roof specifications.
4. Site Work
  - a. Provide location of mechanicals on site plan.
  - b. Provide tree protection.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

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

Mr. Sullivan 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, 2.5. He cited the following Standards: for context, 6.1 through 6.4; for massing, 6.8; for height and width, 6.9; for scale, 6.10; for roof forms, 6.13; for windows and doors, 6.15 and 6.16; for cornices and trim, 6.14; for materials, 6.18. He added the following conditions: that the Commission was approving the metal roof; that the Applicant must add a first-level window on the right elevation and that it must be approved by Staff; that the Applicant restudy the main door on the front elevation and consider options and work with Staff on selection; that they restudy

eave details in two locations and choose a pent eave return of at least 12 to 18 inches on the main gable; that all brick remain unpainted per Standard 5.5 for masonry; and that the Applicant submit a tree protection plan per Standard 8.5.

Ms. Parati suggested that the motion cite the Standards for accessory buildings, 8.10, numbers 2 and 3. Mr. Sullivan accepted the amendment.

Ms. Wojick suggested that the motion include the condition that the Applicant work with Staff for approval of the site work, citing Standards 8.1 through 8.12. Mr. Sullivan accepted the amendment.

Mr. Whitlock seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** 11/0

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

CONTINUED FROM THE MAY 14, 2025 MEETING

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

**APPLICATION:**

HDCRMA-2025-00105, 2225 THE PLAZA (PID: 08119147) – NEW CONSTRUCTION, RESIDENTIAL – PRINCIPAL & ACCESSORY BUILDINGS

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

1. *Per Design Standards for Context, pages 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4, restudy how this house fits within the context of the 360-degree context.*
2. *Per Design Standards for Setback, page 6.5, and Spacing, page 6.6, the setback needs to be in keeping with the historic homes along this site. Provide information about setback and spacing, including on the spacing of the houses along this lot.*
3. *Per Design Standards for Massing, page 6.8, restudy the massing.*
4. *Per the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, page 2.5, numbers 9 and 10.*
5. *The Commission is not addressing anything past what's been stated, because those items will surely be impacted with a restudy of the items that have already been listed.*

**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.

The Commission approved Demolition of the structures with a 365-day stay on December 11, 2024, under application HDCRDEMO-2024-00678.

**PROPOSAL:**

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

**Principal Structure**

1. Height as measured from grade to ridge is 26'-6" at the front elevation. The lot slopes up to the rear property line. At the rear elevation, height as measured from grade to ridge is 24'-10  $\frac{3}{4}$ ".
2. Setback to front porch is 23'-6  $\frac{1}{2}$ ".
3. Setback to front thermal wall is 29'-0  $\frac{3}{4}$ "
4. Right side yard setback is 11'- 5  $\frac{1}{4}$ ".
5. Left side yard setback is not provided.
6. Proposed footprint measures approximately 40' wide x 66' deep, inclusive of the 8'-8" partial width front porch.
7. Proposed materials include brick foundation and chimney, 8" lap siding with corner boards, shake siding in the side gables, wood porch railing, and a wood screen porch on the rear.
8. Details and materials of other architectural elements not noted.
9. The Oak tree in the middle of the rear yard will be removed; a Certified Arborist letter is attached.

**Accessory Structure**

1. Height as measured from grade to ridge is 20'-10  $\frac{1}{2}$ ", which is 6" lower than the main ridge of the principal structure.
2. Proposed footprint measures approximately 27'-8" deep x 29' wide.
3. Proposed materials include: 6" lap siding with 5" wood corner boards.
4. Siding material specifications not provided.
5. Details and materials of other architectural elements not noted

***Revised Proposal – June 11, 2025***

1. Setbacks and position on lot changed, see Sheet A-3.1
  - a. Setback to front porch is 33'-6  $\frac{1}{2}$ "
  - b. Setback to front thermal wall is 39'-0  $\frac{1}{2}$ "
  - c. Setback from property line to right elevation thermal wall is 8'-0"
  - d. Setback from left property line to left elevation thermal wall is not provided.
2. Width reduced to 37'-0".
3. Height lowered to 25' -7  $\frac{1}{2}$ ", as measured from grade to ridge at the front elevation. The lot slopes up to the rear property line. At the rear elevation, height as measured from grade to ridge is 24'- 0  $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Sheet A-5.1.
4. Accessory structure is approximately 2'-0" shorter than the principal structure.
5. Retaining wall height lowered, see Sheet A-8.0.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Main House
  - a. Height, width, massing
    - i. The building is taller and wider than any other building on the block.
  - b. Height
    - i. Proposed height, as measured from grade to ridge, is 25'-7" at the front elevation.
    - ii. Height of tallest historic building on the block is 25'-6" (2201 The Plaza).
  - c. Width/Massing:
    - i. Proposed width of new building is approximately 37'.
    - ii. Applicant's exhibit A-3.3 provides the width of all houses on the same side of the block. Widths range from 29'-6  $\frac{3}{4}$ " to 38'-7  $\frac{1}{4}$ ".

- iii. The widest house (38'-7 1/4") is rectangular in form with a height of only 20.9".
    - 1. The 38'-7 1/4" width includes a 1-story open side porch.
  - iv. The 2225 The Plaza building as shown on the width exhibit is the existing historic building, not the proposed new construction.
2. Spacing
- a. Provide a spacing exhibit that shows existing spacing of the buildings on this block.
3. Site Plan - Missing Required Elements.
- a. Setback from left property line to left elevation thermal wall is needed.
4. Detail and Material Information Needed:
- a. Siding and trim specifications.
  - b. Window and door specifications.
  - c. Window and door trim detail.
  - d. Eave detail.
  - e. Column/beam detail.
  - f. Brick/mortar sample.
  - g. Cap material of columns and stair sidewalls.
  - h. Front porch material.
  - i. Gutters/downspouts - locations, details, and materials (if planning to install).
  - j. Fence design and height information needed.
5. Accessory Building:
- a. Massing. Two-story coplanar walls.
  - b. Windows
    - i. Rear elevation: window trim relationship to roof trim.
    - ii. Right elevation: window proportions are too short and wide.
    - iii. Front, right, left elevation: second level window proportions are too short and wide.
  - c. A taller foundation is needed.
  - d. Material details needed (doors, foundation, siding, etc.).
  - e. Retaining wall height details needed.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

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

Ms. Wojick moved to approve the Application as it is not incongruous with the Historic District. She cited the Standards for new construction for residential buildings, Chapter 6, and for accessory structures, 8.10. She added the following conditions: that the Applicant work with Staff on all of the items in number 4 on the Staff Memo, (a) through (j); that the construction-ready drawings be provided to Staff for approval and that they have no coplanar walls on the second floor of the accessory structure; that the Applicant address items 5, (a) through (e), on the Staff Memo with Staff; and that the Commission was approving the front and right elevations and site plan from the June submittal and the left and rear elevations from the May submittal.

Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion.

Mr. Barth suggested that the motion require the Applicant to show an increase in soffit overhangs for the accessory structure to 12 and 18 inches with plumb-cut fascia and sloped soffits on the dormers and that there be no pork chop eaves. He also suggested that the Applicant be required to ensure that the triple window on the front right gable be centered to the ridge. Ms. Wojick and Mr. Sullivan accepted the amendment.

**VOTE: 8/3**

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

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION, RESIDENTIAL – PRINCIPAL & ACCESSORY BUILDINGS – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

**NEW CASES**

---

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

ABSENT: NONE

RECUSED: BELL

LEFT: WOICK

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2025-00182, 1622 VAN BUREN AV (PID: 07839706) – ACCESSORY STRUCTURE**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing 1-story Ranch house was originally constructed between 1955 – 1956 for J. Dwight & Ruby B. Martin, a dentist and teacher, respectively. The house is uniquely situated on the lot, set diagonally facing the intersection of Van Buren Avenue and Creek Street. Architectural features include a prominent interior brick chimney, large triple windows to the right of the recessed front entry and a low, layered hip roof. The front stoop roof is supported by three, thin metal columns. The exterior is unpainted Roman brick in a traditional red color, with the exception of a small front projection which is painted (pre-district). The front door and windows are replacement 1/1 (installed pre-district). The front walkway curves down to access Creek Street. There is a detached metal carport at the rear of the property facing Creek Street. The lot size is slightly irregular measuring approximately 75' x 150' x 114' x 137'. Adjacent structures are 1-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a new 1-story accessory structure at the rear of the lot.

- The existing carport will be removed, and a new two-vehicle garage will be constructed in approximately the same location.
- The new garage will be oriented the same as the carport and have the same relationship to the main house, situated close by not connected. The garage doors (labeled as right elevation on the plans) will face Creek Street.
- The garage sidewall height is approximately 9'-9 1/2" as measured from grade. The hip roof has a 4/12 pitch. The main house measures approximately 16.4' from grade to ridge.
- Proposed footprint is approximately 22' in width (street facing) and 40' in depth.
- The proposed materials include a brick foundation and Hardie lap siding with corner boards.
- A concrete walkway will be installed between the new garage and main house to connect the existing concrete driveway to an existing rear entry on the main house and existing patio in the rear yard.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Provide plans in addition to the presentation.
2. Provide the overall height of the new structure as measured from grade to ridge.
3. Provide the distance between the main house and the new accessory structure.
4. Provide materials information including:
  - a. Siding and trim materials.
  - b. Window/door materials.
  - c. Confirm all brick will remain unpainted.

5. Staff may approve minor changes, such as window and door trim details.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

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

Mr. Whitlock moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the following Standards: for accessory structures, 8.10; for new construction of residential buildings, Chapter 6; and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5, numbers 9 and 10. He added the following conditions: that the garage not exceed 24 feet in width; that they work with Staff to match details for brick, windows, doors, and trim; that the brick will remain unpainted; that they provide the distance between the house and the new structure for Staff to approve; that they provide the final; and that the approved siding is Hardie Artisan smooth finish.

Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 9/0**

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

**NAYS:** NONE

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

---

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

ABSENT: WOJICK

RETURNED: BELL

**APPLICATION:**

HDCRMIA-2024-00490, 405 E TREMONT AV (PID: 12105702) – ADDITION & PAINTED BRICK – AFTER THE FACT

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1.5-story Bungalow built c. 2014. Architectural features include side gable roof on the front half of the house with full width engaged front porch. The front porch features wood columns atop unpainted masonry piers. Rear second floor twin gables tie in below main ridge, and the rear elevation includes a screened porch and rear facing gable. Exterior materials include 9/16 wood double-hung windows, a 6-light wood Craftsman-style front door, wood lap siding with wood shakes on the dormer and second floor, and unpainted brick foundation and front porch steps.

A pool, accessory structure, landscaping, and site work (including outdoor kitchen) in the rear yard was approved administratively under COA# HDCADMRM-2023-00132. Lot size is approximately 52' by 152'. Adjacent historic structures are 1 and 1.5-story single-family and multi-family buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project consists of two parts.

1. Painted brick. The following elements will be painted with a mixture of dark gray/black paint and water:
  - a. Foundation walls on principal and accessory structures.
  - b. Front porch piers on principal structure.
  - c. Brick used in rear yard landscaping around pool.
  - d. Brick base of outdoor kitchen.
2. Side Addition. A storage shed addition will be constructed on the right elevation between two windows, close to

the front right corner of the house.

- a. The addition will be approximately 9' in height.
- b. The footprint will measure approximately 5' x 8'.
- c. The shed entry door will be on the rear elevation not visible from the street.
- d. Proposed materials include a shed roof with architectural asphalt shingles, wood lap siding, solid slab steel entry door, and trim to match the house.

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. Provide applicant submitted current conditions photos for the administrative COA# HDCADMRM-2023-00132 that show the house with tan siding, white trim, and unpainted brick. The COA was written for the brick elements of the new landscaping features to match the unpainted brick on the house. See attached COA.
2. The applicant provided the following list of addresses from the neighborhood with painted brick and/or additions. Staff researched HDC files for each address. Application information is included below.
  - a. 811 E Tremont Av – Brick has been painted since at least September 2007. No approval on file.
  - b. 600 E Tremont Av – Brick painted between March 2008 and June 2014. No approval on file.
  - c. 517 E Tremont Av - Brick has been painted since at least September 2007. No approval on file.
  - d. 409 E Tremont Av - Brick has been painted since at least September 2007. No approval on file.
  - e. 2010 Park Rd - Brick has been painted since at least September 2007. No approval on file.
  - f. 2000 Park Rd - Brick has been painted since at least September 2007. No approval on file.
  - g. 2237 Park Rd - Brick has been painted since at least September 2007. No approval on file.
  - h. 2223 Sarah Marks Av - Brick has been painted since at least September 2007. No approval on file.
  - i. 2209 Sarah Marks Av - Brick has been painted since at least September 2007. No approval on file.
  - j. 2111 Sarah Marks Av - Brick has been painted since at least September 2007. No approval on file.
  - k. 2121 Sarah Marks Av - Brick has been painted since at least September 2007. No approval on file.
  - l. 300 E Tremont Av - Brick has been painted since at least September 2007. No approval on file.
  - m. 2005 Cleveland Av - Brick has been painted since at least September 2007. No approval on file.
  - n. 608 E Tremont Av - Brick has been painted since at least September 2007. No approval on file.
  - o. 719 E Tremont Av - Brick has been painted since at least September 2007. No approval on file.
  - p. 529 E Tremont Av - Brick has been painted since at least September 2007. No approval on file.
  - q. 612 E Tremont Av – COA# HDCRMI-2019-00161 was issued for front stoop changes and was approved by the HDC May 8, 2019. Upon final inspection of the project, it was discovered that the new front steps were painted. A Notice of Violation was issued April 8, 2022. An active violation case is ongoing at this address, and changes from the COA will be a Commission review.
  - r. 2011 Park Rd - Brick has been painted since at least September 2007. No approval on file.
  - s. 536 E Tremont Av – New construction c. 2016; COA# 2014-153 was approved by the HDC August 13, 2014. Foundation wall and front porch column bases have been painted since the house was built. No approval on file.
  - t. 1920 Park Rd - Brick has been painted since at least September 2007. No approval on file.
  - u. 609 E Tremont Av - Brick has been painted since at least September 2007. No approval on file.
  - v. 1923 Euclid Av – It appears a thin layer of concrete was added on top of a broken tile stoop floor and some of it has worn away on the edges, revealing a brick color. The rowlock brick border of the stoop is a different color of brick than the foundation wall. This condition has been in place since at least June 2009. No approval for porch floor repairs is on file.
  - w. 1917 Euclid Av – Brick appears to be the same traditional brick color from Google photos dating to 2022, 2021, and 2014. The lighting of the photos varies. The same line of dirt along the bottom of the brick is present in photos from 2022 and 2021. No request for brick changes is on file.
  - x. 1916 Lyndhurst Av - Brick has been painted since at least September 2007. No approval on file.

- y. 400 E Tremont Av – Attached shed on the left elevation of the principal structure was constructed between March 2016 and February 2019 per Google. No approval for the shed addition is on file.
  - z. 2205 Park Rd – Attached addition on left elevation of the principal structure has been in place since at least September 2007. No approval is on file.
  - aa. 1919 Springdale Av – Detached shed placed on concrete blocks has been in place in the right side yard since February 2019 and is visible from the street. No approval is on file.
3. The Commission needs to make two (2) decisions about this project:
- a. Decision 1: Painting the previously unpainted brick foundation and front porch piers. Painting the new brick on the accessory structure foundation wall, landscaping around pool, and base of outdoor kitchen.
  - b. Decision 2: Construction of new side addition.
4. For Decision 1: Painting the unpainted brick foundation and front porch piers; and painting the new brick on the accessory structure foundation wall, landscaping around pool, and base of outdoor kitchen.
- a. Recommended Motion: Denial.  
The project is incongruous with the Design Standards for Masonry 5.5, numbers 3 and 7; and Paint 5.8, number 7.
  - b. Recommended Facts:
    - i. All exterior brick on the primary house that was previously unpainted has been painted.
    - ii. Painting brick or masonry is not considered a change of color, but a fundamental change in the character of a building
    - iii. The principal structure and landscape features are new construction dating from 2014 and 2024. The new landscape features and materials were to match the principal structure's unpainted brick foundation and front porch piers, as originally approved in 2014.
    - iv. The applicant did not provide documentation showing painting will unify disparate parts of the building.
    - v. The new brick on the rear yard landscaping around the pool, foundation wall of accessory structure, and base of outdoor kitchen have been painted.
5. For Decision 2: Side addition.
- a. Recommended Motion: Denial.  
The shed addition is incongruous with Design Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Additions 6.20, numbers 1, 6 and 7 and Standards for Parking 8.2, number 6.
  - b. Recommended Facts:
    - i. The addition blocks the length of the existing driveway and creates front yard parking.
    - ii. The shed addition is in a prominent, visible location between the front two windows on the right elevation.
    - iii. The character of the shed addition does not match that of the principal structure's massing, rhythm, materials, or context.
    - iv. The addition extends from the right elevation of the primary structure, widening the original footprint of the house.
6. 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 Hawkins' invitation to speak.

#### **MOTION 1: DENY**

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

Ms. Holtz moved to deny the application for the painted masonry because it is incongruous with the Standards for masonry, 5.5, numbers 3 and 7, as well as the Standards for paint, 5.8, number 7. She added the following supporting facts: that the exterior brick on the primary house was previously unpainted; that this is not considered a change of color, but a fundamental change in the character of the building; that principal structure and landscape features are new

construction dating from 2014 and 2024; and that the new landscape features and materials were to match the principal structure's unpainted brick foundation and front porch piers as originally approved in 2014 . She also added that the Applicant did not provide necessary evidence that painting the masonry would unify disparate elements of the principal building.

Ms. Bell seconded the motion.

**VOTE 1: 10/0**

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION 1: APPLICATION FOR PAINTED MASONRY – DENIED.**

**MOTION 2: DENY**

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

Ms. Holtz moved to deny the application for the addition because it is incongruous with the Standards for residential buildings. She cited the following Standards: for additions, 6.20, numbers 1, 6, and 7; and for parking, 8.2, number 6. She noted the following facts: that the addition blocks the length of the original driveway; that it is in a prominent location on the right elevation between two windows; the character of the shed addition does not match that of the principal structure's massing, rhythm, materials, or context; and the addition extends from the right elevation of the primary structure, widening the original footprint of the house.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that the motion make note that the new addition creates front yard parking. Ms. Holtz accepted the amendment.

Ms. Bell seconded the motion.

**VOTE 2: 10/0**

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

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION 2: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION – DENIED.**

---

*The Commission voted 9-0 to defer case number HDCRMAA-2025-00109 for 700 Templeton Avenue due to a lack of sufficient information.*

---

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

ABSENT: WOJICK

LEFT: BARTH

RECUSED: PARATI

**APPLICATION:**

HDCRMA-2025-00110, 408 HEATHCLIFF RD (PID: 07103107) – PAINTED BRICK

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1-story Bungalow built in 1938. Architectural features include a front gable with rear hipped roof, side gable accents, a partial front gable porch projection with blue or gray flagstone flooring and wood triple picket handrail, and partial rear basement. Exterior materials include stucco and beam front gable detail, wood double columns

on brick base with concrete cap, wood and metal handrails, 3/1 and 2/1 double-hung replacement windows, 8-light front gable window, a 3-light wood Craftsman-style front door, left side chimney, and unpainted tri-color brick. Lot size is approximately 56.28' by 129.33'. Adjacent historic structures are 1 and 1.5-story single-family buildings.

#### **PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is painting the unpainted brick exterior of the principal structure. The applicant is proposing to paint the historic tri-colored brick with Sherwin-Williams Loxon XP Waterproofing Masonry Coating in white or a neutral shade. Painting will include the body of the structure, foundation, front porch, and chimney.

#### **STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The Commission needs to determine if applicant's proposal to paint previously unpainted brick with a waterproof paint is in compliance or not in compliance with the Design Standards.
  - a. Determination: Yes, in compliance.
    - i. Recommended Motion: Approval
      1. "I move to Approve this project for meeting the Design Standards for Masonry, 5.5, and Paint, 5.8."
    - ii. Recommended Facts:
      1. The applicant provided documentation that shows the project will 'unify disparate parts' and the 'disparate brick work is not of the applicant's own doing'.
  - OR
  - b. Determination: No, not in compliance. Please select either option "a." or "b."
    - i. If the project is not in compliance due to missing or insufficient documentation, then:
      1. Recommendation Motion: Continuance.  
"I move to Continue this project because sufficient documentation has not been provided that shows disparate brick/mortar work that is not of the applicant's own doing."
    - ii. If the project is not in compliance because the documentation provided does not show that painting is needed to unify various disparate parts of the building, then:
      1. Recommended Motion: Denial  
"I move to Deny this project because the project is incongruous with the Design Standards for Masonry, 5.5, numbers 3 and 7, and Paint, 5.8, number 7 and the Preamble."
      2. Recommended Facts: Denial
        - a. All existing unpainted brick is proposed to be painted with a waterproof paint.
        - b. Painting brick or masonry is not considered a change of color, but a fundamental change in the character of a building.
        - c. The applicant did not provide documentation showing painting will unify disparate parts of the building.

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

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

#### **MOTION: CONTINUE**

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

Ms. Bell moved to continue the application to give the Applicant an opportunity to work with the Staff mason or another historic mason to explore solutions to solve the problems without painting the masonry. She cited the Standards for masonry, 5.5 and 5.6.

Ms. Holtz seconded the motion.

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

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

NAYS: **NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR PAINTED BRICK – CONTINUED.**

---

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

ABSENT: BARTH, WOJICK

LEFT: HOLTZ, WHITLOCK

RETURNED: PARATI

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRDEMO-2025-00006, 712 TEMPLETON AV (PID: 12305616) – DEMOLITION – RESIDENTIAL**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1.5-story Colonial Cottage constructed c. 1941. Architectural features include side gable roof with two front gables, partial width front porch with square columns, 6/6 replacement windows, Tudor-style arched front gable window, right-side chimney, decorative eave detail, and painted brick. The lot measures approximately 50' x 150'. Adjacent buildings are 1 and 1.5-story residential structures.

**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

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

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

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION 1: APPLICATION COMPLETE**

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

Ms. Lineberger moved to determine the application is complete with all the required documentation provided by the applicant, which includes clear digital photos of all sides of the building; clear digital photos of significant architectural details and site features, including, but not limited to, windows, front doors, brackets, columns, trim, etcetera; a stamped and sealed property survey with setbacks and building dimensions with width and length clearly labeled; and a Zoutewelle survey to document height.

Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion.

VOTE 1: 7/0

AYES: BELL, CURME, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI,  
SULLIVAN, TAYLOR

NAYS: NONE

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

**MOTION 2: HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE**

1<sup>st</sup>: LINEBERGER    2<sup>nd</sup>: BELL

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

Ms. Bell seconded the motion.

VOTE 2: 7/0

AYES: BELL, CURME, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI,  
SULLIVAN, TAYLOR

NAYS: NONE

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

**MOTION 3: APPROVE DEMOLITION**

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

Ms. Lineberger 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. She 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 and noted that the plans have already been received.

Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion.

VOTE 3: 7/0

AYES: BELL, CURME, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI,  
SULLIVAN, TAYLOR

NAYS: NONE

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

---

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

ABSENT: BARTH, HOLTZ, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

LEFT: SULLIVAN

**APPLICATION:**

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

**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.

#### **STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Elevated Plaza.
  - a. Maintain historic grading and elevations within public view, per Standard 8.6, number 1.
  - b. This property does not have the grade required for a true retaining wall, per Standard 8.7, number 11.
  - c. Maintain historic rolled curb, per Standard 8.4, number 1.
  - d. A planting strip of 18" (minimum) to 24" (preferred) between fences/walls and public rights-of-way is required, per Standard 8.7, number 11.
  - e. Confirm there will be a planting strip between new paving and the building foundation, per Standard 8.2, number 8.
  - f. 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."
  - g. Provide perspective drawings to better show final project outcome.

2. 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.
3. Mechanical Enclosure.
  - a. Restudy the height of mechanical enclosure. 6'-0" is typically the max height for fencing or screening, per Standard 8.6, number 4.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: CONTINUE**

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

Ms. Parati moved to continue the application. She required the following: accurate drawings to reflect existing grading and elevations; a restudy of grade issues to determine if a true retaining wall is required; that the historic rolled curb is maintained; that a planting strip of 18 to 24 inches be placed between the fence and the wall and the public right of way; that a planting strip be placed between the new paving and building foundation; a restudy of the handrails to ensure that the material and design is not incongruous with the Dilworth Historic District; perspective drawings to illustrate the final project outcome and pictures of the railing installed on the adjacent building; a restudy of the pattern of the walkway to ensure it follows historic patterns, and a restudy of the mechanical enclosure for height as 6' is typically the maximum allowed for fences and screening. She cited the following Standards: for sidewalks, 8.2, number 2; for walls and fences, 8.6, numbers 1, 4, and 6, and 8.7, number 11; and for landscaping and lawns, 8.4, numbers 1 and 5; and 8.2, number 8.

Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 6/0**

**AYES: BELL, CURME, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI,  
TAYLOR**

**NAYS: NONE**

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

---

With no further business to discuss, Chair Hawkins adjourned the meeting at 7:11 p.m.