



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
November 13, 2024 | Room 280

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 Heather Wojick
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Scott Whitlock Vacant, Resident-Owner Hermitage Court Vacant, Resident-Owner Oaklawn Park Vacant, Resident-Owner Wilmore
OTHERS PRESENT:	Kristi Harpst, HDC Staff Candice Leite, HDC Staff Elizabeth Lamy, HDC Staff Jen Baehr, HDC Staff Marilyn Drath, HDC Staff JT Faucette, HDC Staff Jill Sanchez-Myers, Senior Assistant City Attorney Nicole Hewett, Assistant City Attorney Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

With a quorum present, Chair Hawkins called the October meeting of the Historic District Commission (Commission) meeting to order at 1:14 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 moved to delay the decision on whether to recommend the proposed Elizabeth Local Historic District application to City Council until the applicants have time to return with a complete and revised application following their receipt of comments from the State Historic Preservation Office. Ms. Holtz seconded the motion.

The motion to delay whether to recommend the application was approved by a vote of 8/0.

INDEX OF ADDRESSES:

CONSENT

HDCRMA-2024-00858, 2306 Charlotte Dr	Dilworth
HDCRMI-2024-00821, 1730 Thomas Av	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMA-2024-00492, 1411-1413 W 4 th Street	Wesley Heights

CONTINUED FROM THE OCTOBER MEETING

HDCRMA-2024-00666, 1838 Merriman Av	Wilmore
HDCCMA-2023-00991, 927 East Bv	Dilworth
HDCCMA-2023-01193, 1921 Charlotte Dr	Dilworth

CONTINUED FROM THE SEPTMEBER MEETING

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

NEW CASES

HDCRMIA-2022-01157, 317 Westwood Av	Wilmore
HDCRMA-2024-00336, 3105-3121 Colyer Pl	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMAA-2024-00023, 1913 Wood Dale Tr	Wilmore
HDCRMA-2024-00278, 1561 Wilmore Dr	Wilmore
HDCRMI-2024-00782, 1824 S Mint St	Wilmore
HDCRMA-2024-00212, 1329 Lafayette Av	Dilworth
HDCCMI-2024-00486, 301 East Bv	Dilworth

CONSENT

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BELL, WHITLOCK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA-2024-00858, 2306 CHARLOTTE DR (PID: 12112403) – ADDITION – REAFFIRMATION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1.5-story Picturesque Revival house built c. 1932. Architectural features include a large gable front block with shed dormers on either side, engaged side porch with arched opening, and a slightly projecting gabled entrance with a broken pediment, fluted pilasters, and transom window surrounding the front door. Exterior materials include wood shake siding with beveled corners, 6/6 wood double-hung windows, and an unpainted brick chimney. The lot size is approximately 50' x 141' x 55' x 117'. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1.5, 2, and 2.5-story residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is a rear addition in place of a former patio area. The addition ties in below the existing ridge and the roof form and design matches the original. Materials will all match existing including the wood shake siding, window/door/roof trim, vents, and brick foundation. On the right elevation a vertical piece of trim will delineate the transition between the original house and new addition. The addition bumps in on the left elevation. No trees will be removed to construct the addition. The project requires full Commission review due to the size of the addition, but for the size, the project would be an Administrative review.

The project was previously Approved with Conditions by the Commission on April 13, 2022, under case number HDCRMA-2022-00070. A COA was issued but expired before permits were pulled. The applicant is requesting the Commission reaffirm of the previous approval with no changes to the project. The approval letter and COA are attached.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

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

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

1st: CURME 2nd: LINEBERGER

Ms. Curme moved to approve the application because it is not incongruous with the character of the district, citing HDC Standards Chapter 3. She also cited the Secretary of the Interior's Standards 2.5. She added the condition that the applicant be required to provide permit ready drawings and window and door specifications to Staff.

Ms. Hawkins recommended that Ms. Curme also reference HDC Standards Chapter 6, for new construction of residential buildings. Ms. Curme accepted the amendment.

Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

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

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BELL, WHITLOCK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2024-00821, 1730 THOMAS AV (PID: 08118608) – ACCESSORY BUILDING ADDITION & FENESTRATION CHANGES ON PRINCIPAL STRUCTURES

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1-story, Craftsman bungalow constructed c. 1930. The building was originally a duplex and has transitioned into a single-family residence. Architectural features include stucco and timber trim in the gables, 4/1 wood windows, and an unpainted brick exterior. An accessory building measuring approximately 18' x 18' and height of approximately 13'-9" is located at the rear of the lot. Lot size is approximately 50' x 150'. Surrounding structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single-family and multi-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is the rehabilitation of a historic accessory building, an addition to the accessory building, and fenestration changes on the principal structure.

1. Historic Accessory Building – Previously Approved Work
 - a. The existing garage is 18' deep and will be expanded to a depth of 22' to allow it to function as a one-car garage.
 - b. The addition will extend the existing face of the garage, reproducing the original façade in traditional materials to match existing, including a wood garage door.
 - c. No changes to height are proposed.
 - d. The exterior siding will be replaced in-kind.
 - e. Brick foundation to remain and be repaired/repointed.
 - f. This project was previously approved by the Commission on September 9, 2020, a COA was issued but expired before permits were pulled; the project was reaffirmed on November 9, 2022. The project was not completed, and the property changed ownership.
2. Historic Accessory Building – New Proposed Work
 - a. A new, wood man door will be installed on the right elevation, facing the main house.
3. Principal Structure – New Proposed Work
 - a. Fenestration Changes
 - i. On the rear elevation a window opening, filled with glass block, will be changed to a single exterior door.
 - ii. On the left elevation an existing sliding door will be changed to a wood French door with wood brickmould trim.
 - iii. The design of all doors will match the historic windows on the house.

4. Window Restoration
 - a. All windows on the house will be restored by Double-Hung. This project is Staff approvable and does not require Commission review.
5. Site Changes – New Proposed Work
 - a. Swimming pool. The proposed pool is Staff approvable and does not require Commission review.

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 Private Sites, Chapter 8.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, Staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6; Accessory Buildings, 8.10; and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item with the following Conditions:
 - a. Cedar shake siding should be individually applied shakes, not panels of shakes.
 - b. Work with Staff on the swimming pool details.
 - c. The non-compliant landscape timber edging should be removed and replaced with a compliant material, work with Staff.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

1st: HOLTZ 2nd: WOJICK

Ms. Holtz moved to approve the application because it is not incongruous with the district. She cited the Secretary of the Interior's Standards 2.5 as well as the Standards for new construction of residential buildings, Chapter 6. She also cited the Standards for private sites, 8.2 and 8.10. She added the following conditions: that the cedar shake be applied individually rather than in panels; that the applicant work with Staff on the details of the pool, specifically the material of the pavers; and that any noncompliant landscape timbering be removed and replaced with compliant materials.

Mr. Barth suggested the amendment that the applicant be required to ensure the pavers surrounding the pool are made of a material that better fits within the context of the district. Ms. Holtz accepted the amendment.

Ms. Wojick seconded the motion.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY BUILDING ADDITION & FENESTRATION CHANGES ON PRINCIPAL STRUCTURES – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BELL, WHITLOCK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA-2024-00492, 1411-1413 W 4TH ST (PID: 07101507) – ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU)

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1-story duplex cottage constructed c. 1938. Architectural details include a side-gable roof with two front-facing gables, a recessed corner porch with an archway, and front and side entrances with a single-family appearance. Other features include an unpainted brick exterior; 1/1, 4/4, and 6/6 double-hung windows; two broken terracotta tile front stoops; and arched gable vents. The lot size is approximately 50' x 108.34' x 62.5'. Adjacent structures are 1, 2, and 3-story single- and multi-family residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

1. The proposed project is for a 1.5 story Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU).
2. The proposed ADU footprint is 25'-0" x 20'-0" (shown on A-6.0) and height is 21'-3 ¾" (shown on A-5.1).
3. Proposed materials include unpainted brick to match existing on the principal structure and 6" Hardie Artisan lap siding with all wood trim details.
4. Windows are proposed to be double-hung 6/1 and 6/6 Simulated True Divided Lights (STD L) with wood trim. Window material is not specified.
5. Proposed garage door is wood.
6. Proposed man door material not specified.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and the City of Charlotte Design Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6 and Accessory 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 at least a 3-course brick foundation; work with Staff.
 - b. Roof trim and gable ends/return to match principal structure; work with Staff
 - c. Provide window and door specifications that meet HDC requirements to Staff.
 - d. All windows to have 6/6 muntin pattern to match original windows on 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 1st: SULLIVAN 2nd: BARTH

Mr. Sullivan moved to approve the application because it is not incongruous with the special character district. He cited the following Standards: for context, Chapter 3; for new construction of residential buildings, Chapter 6; for accessory structures, 8.10; and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, number 2.5. He added the following conditions: that permit ready drawings be submitted to Staff; that the applicant provide a three-course brick foundation; that the roof trim and gable end returns match the principal structure, that the applicant work with Staff to ensure all window and door specifications match the principal structure; and that all windows have a 6/6 pattern to match the original windows on the principal structure.

Mr. Barth seconded the motion.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

CONTINUED FROM THE OCTOBER MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BELL, WHITLOCK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA-2024-00666, 1838 MERRIMAN AV (PID: 11909208) – ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU)

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

1. **The Accessory Buildings, 8.10, numbers 3 and 7.** The building is 11 feet too wide, and not secondary to the main house. Also referencing the illustration at the bottom left of the page.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is 1-story, American Small House with Colonial Revival elements constructed c. 1948. Architectural features include an asymmetrical façade with a projecting front gable, a partial width front porch supported by simple square columns, round wood vent, and gable end exterior chimney. The original paneled front door with fan light, front door surround with fluted engaged pilasters, and original 8/8 and 6/6 windows remain intact. Adjacent structures are 1-story American Small Houses. The lot size is approximately 50' x 236'.

PROPOSAL:

Initial Proposal - October 9, 2024:

1. The proposed project is for a one-story Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU).
2. The proposed ADU footprint is wider than the main house and 5'- 11 ¼" shorter than the main house, as shown on Sheet A-050.
3. Proposed materials include unpainted brick to match existing on the main house and wood lap siding.
4. There are two siding design alternatives provided for the front elevation 1.) fiber cement, smooth finish, board and batten siding, or 2.) wood lap siding. The board and batten precedence shown on Sheet A203 is not located within the Wilmore Local Historic District, and the buildings shown are new construction.
5. Windows are proposed to be Windsor and Pella Reserve with 4/4 Simulated True Divided Lights (STD L) and wood trim. Window material is not specified. Skylights are proposed to be flush-mounted Velux.
6. Doors proposed to be Jeld-Wen. Material not specified.

Revised Proposal – November 13, 2024:

1. The ADU has been re-oriented on the lot.
2. Building footprint is the same at 19' – 2 1/8" x 41'-11 3/4".

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Provide updated rear yard permeability calculations that include the driveway and any other impermeable areas.
2. Window and door trim should be sized for fields of siding, should not be picture frame, and worked out with Staff.
3. A brick foundation is needed; work with Staff.
4. Provide window, door, and skylight specifications that meet HDC requirements to Staff.
5. Provide more information about the rear yard trees, including a tree protection plan.
6. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

1st: BARTH

2nd: SULLIVAN

Mr. Barth moved to approve the application with the following conditions: that the applicant update the rear yard permeability calculations to include the driveway and any other impermeable surfaces; that the applicant work with Staff to ensure that the window and door trim meet the Standards; that they work with Staff on the brick foundation; that the applicant work with Staff on a window design that matches the principal structure and is more vertically oriented; that the applicant provide a tree protection plan; and that they provide specifics for curveless skylights to Staff. He cited the following Standards: for doors and windows, 6.15 and 6.16; for private sites, 8.10; for trees, 8.5; and for foundations, 6.12.

Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

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

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: WHITLOCK

ARRIVED: BELL

APPLICATION:

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

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

- 1. Secretary of the Interior's Standards 2.5.; Context, 7.2-7.3, numbers 1 through 5; Setbacks, 7.4; Spacing, 7.5; Massing and Complexity of Form, 7.7; Roof Forms, 7.12, number 4; Height and Width, 7.8; Scale, 7.9:**
 - a. Show how the setback, spacing, massing and complexity of form, height and width, scale, etc., how all of those things fit within context of this particular streetscape.
 - b. Provide visuals and perspectives to show these details in addition to what is provided in the Zoutewelle survey.
 - c. The rear elevation should look more like the front elevation and vice versa. The front elevation should have more of a pedestrian feel to it, not unlike what the rear elevation is designed as being right now.
 - d. Provide more clear drawings, site plan, and elevations. Provide before and after elevations on separate pages, one elevation per page, so they can be read easier.
- 2. Trees. 8.5.** Provide a tree plan which includes the size/species/location of trees that will be taken out, trees that will be replanted, anything dealing with the trees.
- 3. Site Appurtenances, 8.9.** Show locations all site features on the site plan including the HVAC ground units, the dumpsters, the backflow preventers, and any other site features.
- 4. Sidewalks and Parking, 8.3 and Landscaping and Lawns, 8.4.** Provide a plan for permanent screening of the parking lot.
- 5.** Once the above items have been addressed, the Commission will review the details because the high-level items need to be addressed first.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

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

PROPOSAL:

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

East Boulevard

Existing building height is 27'-4"

Existing building length is 89'-4"

Existing building setback is 47.3'

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

Proposed overall length is 201'-6"

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

Dilworth Road West

Existing building height is 27'-4"

Existing building overall length is 60'-0"

Existing building setback is 20.9'

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

Proposed overall length is 167'-5.75"

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

Additions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Revised Proposal – October 9, 2024

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

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

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

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

Revised Proposal – November 13, 2024:

1. Trees to be removed shown on SP1.
2. Parking lot screening, tree plantings, HVAC location information, and site appurtenances shown on Sheet SP2.
3. Setbacks shown on Sheet SP3.
4. Front elevation design changes, front entry and awning, shown Sheets A-4.2 and A-12.
5. Rear elevation design changes, roof height of central portion lowered, and rear entry design simplified, shown on Sheets A-5.1 and A-12.
6. Streetscape renderings provided on Sheets A-7.1 and A-7.2

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Materials
 - a. Brick and mortar sample needed. May be provided to Staff for probable approval.
2. Site Plan
 - a. Provide information about front patio and walkway, including dimensions, materials, etc. May be provided to Staff for probable approval.
3. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION: CONTINUE

1st: TAYLOR 2nd: PARATI

Mr. Taylor moved to continue the application as the proposed project is incongruous with the Standards. He cited the following Standards for restudy: for context, 7.3, numbers 2 and 5; for height and width, 7.8; for foundations, 7.11; for doors and windows, 7.14; and for lighting, 8.11.

Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

Mr. Barth suggested the friendly amendment that the applicant be allowed to restudy these larger elements and also provide details on doors, windows, awnings, and other small details when they return. Mr. Taylor and Ms. Parati accepted the amendment.

VOTE: 10/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION – CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: WHITLOCK

RECUSED: CURME

APPLICATION:

HDCCMA-2023-01193, 1921 CHARLOTTE DR (PID: 12111901) – NEW CONSTRUCTION – COMMERCIAL

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

Revisit the following:

1. Context, 7.3.
 - a. As a general note, a lot of these things link back to it (Context). Continue looking inside the historic district at other historic examples.
2. Massing, 7.7.
 - a. Additional restudy of the connector between the two building masses.
3. Sidewalks and Parking, 8.3, numbers 9 through 13.
 - a. Explore reducing the driveway cut with zoning and come back to the HDC with an answer, because this does affect how the new construction and the parking requirements are viewed from the historic district.
 - b. Provide a vegetative screen in that location (the parking lot) as well as provide additional screening around the backflow preventer.
4. Cornices and Trim, 7.13.
 - a. Provide additional material callouts, a section cut through the box bay facing Kenilworth Avenue as well as the covered porches with attention to detail on the column-to-beam alignment.
5. Windows and Doors, 7.14.
 - a. Provide appropriate mull gaps between the box bay ganged windows.
 - b. Provide specifications for an appropriate window specification that the HDC has approved for new construction.
 - c. Study the light proportions on the connector window to be more vertically oriented for the divided sash.
 - d. Provide window sample due to the fact that the Commission has not previously approved this window.
6. Lighting, 8.11.
 - a. Provide lighting in entrances and exits as well as vertical circulation.
 - b. No lighting shall be placed as ornamental features on non-pedestrian sides of the building.
 - c. Lights should be lowered to more of a pedestrian level.
7. Materials, 7.16.
 - a. Provide additional information on what materials are, more than just the siding. Frieze board, fascia, columns, box beams, and the panelized box bay. More information on what the material is and dimensions.
8. Orientation, 7.6, numbers 1 and 2.
 - a. Reestablish the Charlotte sidewalks and entrances to the existing building so that we are reinforcing the primary entrance to this property and realizing that the entrances along Ideal Way and Kenilworth should be looked at as secondary and designed as such.
9. Fences and Walls, 8.6-8.7.
 - a. Provide additional information on the connector piece/gate stating its material and dimensions.
10. Shutters look great, appear to be operable and use the appropriate hardware. Add note to plans to indicate "the shutters are operational and will have appropriate hardware."
11. The Commission prefers the red brick sample as shown on the documents. Work with Staff on exact spec and colors.
12. Review trash can enclosure fence detail to be more in keeping with the Standards and work with Staff for that.

This application was discussed at the October 9, 2024 meeting with following non-binding recommendations:

1. Massing and Complexity of Form, 7.7. Restudy the massing on the Kenilworth right elevation dormer projection, the courtyard entry door projection, and porch.
2. Cornices and Trim, 7.13. Provide more information on the column/beam alignment details.
3. Site Plan. Add the pine trees and tree protection for the pine trees to the site plan.
4. Restudy the window proportions on the courtyard side.
5. Provide accurate height dimensions on all plans. Height dimensions need to be shown as measured from grade to ridge, not first floor to lower roof as currently provided.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The property is a 2-story office/multi-family building constructed in 1992. Architectural features include a complex roof form, a recessed off-center entry on Charlotte Drive, and two centrally located arched metal vents on the roof. Lot size measures approximately 128.55' x 164.46' x 144.09' x 180'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single family houses and 2-story multi-family and office buildings. A replacement retaining wall on the Ideal Way side and rear patio expansion were approved administratively under COA# HDCADMRM-2018-00518; and parking, landscaping, and site work were approved administratively under COA# HDCADMRM-2020-00416. The HDC approved the replacement of vinyl siding with cementitious board and batten siding, and entry door changes on the front and left elevations in June 2021 under COA# HDCRMI-2021-00149.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is new construction. An existing boutique hotel, the Kasa Edison House, will be expanded with the construction of a new building between the existing structure and Kenilworth Avenue. Proposed height is approximately 27'-9" as measured from first floor to ridge. At the front elevation along Charlotte Drive, the existing building height is 26'-9 1/4" at the left and approximately 25'-11" on the right (Ideal Way). The proposed building footprint is 97'-6" x 31'-4", slightly longer than the existing structure which measures approximately 94'-6" x 53'-5". Proposed materials are brick and cementitious wood grain lap siding and board and batten siding to match the existing structure. Railings are proposed to be metal. Windows are proposed to be single-hung wood in 6/1 and 4/1 patterns; muntin dimensions are not noted. Doors are proposed to be wood. Window trim proposed to be wood. Door trim materials are not noted. The project includes the removal of three (3) mature canopy trees; two Willow Oaks which measure 38" and 36" DBH and a 21" DBH Ash Tree. A certified arborist letter is provided for the Ash and one of the Willow Oaks.

Revised Proposal – September 11, 2024

1. Height is 29'-9" as measured from grade at the Ideal Way elevation.
2. Cornices and trim details provided; shown on A-400.
3. Window specs provided for Sierra Pacific H3 double-hung; shown on HDC-402.
4. Mullion trim revised to be 6" between most paired windows.
5. Lighting details unchanged; shown on A-401.
6. Plans updated to specify Hardie Artisan, non-grained, siding.
7. Courtyard elevation. Stair and handrail design changed. Changes also visible on Ideal Way elevation and parking lot elevation.
8. Courtyard elevation. Windows added on first and second levels.
9. Parking lot elevation. Chimney added.
10. Kenilworth elevation. Bump-out design changed from siding to paneling. Windows appear to be factory-mulled.
11. Window detail updated.
12. Kenilworth foundation height lowered. At Ideal Way, the corner foundation changed from 2'-6" to 1'-6". At stairs, foundation changed from 5'-0" to 4'-5". No measurement provided for parking lot elevation.
13. Backflow preventer relocated next to trash receptacles; shown on Site Plan, A-001. The design narrative specifies that the existing mechanical condenser is being relocated to a screened area on the roof.
14. The design narrative specifies that the low retaining walls will be 8" wide brick with a header course on top; shown on A-400.

Revised Proposal – October 9, 2024

1. New structure redesigned to be two separate buildings connected by an elevated walkway.
2. Parking lot design changes include the elimination of one parking space and the entrance drive reduced to 20' in width and straightened.
3. Backflow screening provided.
4. Gate detail provided.
5. Lighting Height Changed.

Revised Proposal – October 30, 2024

1. Parking Lot and Courtyard/Charlotte Drive elevation, roofs, and materials design changes, see Sheets A-001, A-200, A-201, HDC-100 and HDC-101.
2. Cornice, trim, column/beam, bridge, soffit, frieze, pedimented portico details updated, see Sheet A-400.
3. Pine trees noted to remain, see Site Plan Sheet HDC-003A.
4. Updated height dimensions are provided from first floor, not proposed grade, see Sheets A-200 and A-201.
 - a. The only elevation that has a grade-to-ridge dimension is Kenilworth on the parking lot side. See image 1 and 3 on A-201.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the November plans:

1. Building Height.
 - a. Provide building height as measured from proposed grade, not first floor.
2. Ideal Way Elevation
 - a. Sheet A-200 needs updated to show the foundation.
3. Parking Lot Elevation:
 - a. Window location is off-center. Windows were centered in the July plans.
4. Courtyard Elevation:
 - a. Beam column/alignment of entry door closest to Ideal Way.
5. What is the porch flooring material?
6. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

Staff has the following comments about the October plans:

1. Building Connector:
 - a. Why is the elevated connector required?
 - b. What do the connector elevations look like?
2. Parking Lot Elevation:
 - a. Height dimensions not provided.
 - b. Massing and complexity of form.
 - c. Roof forms.
 - d. Beam/column alignment.
 - e. Fenestration location and rhythm.
3. Courtyard Elevation:
 - a. Massing and complexity of form.
 - b. Height dimension shown as measured from first floor, not grade, to lower roof, not to the ridge.
 - c. Beam/column alignment.
 - d. Fenestration
 - i. Window and door placement.
 - ii. What are the blank green and tan squares above the window boxes?
 - iii. 4/1 window proportions on triple window.
4. Ideal Way Elevation:
 - a. Height dimension shown as measured from first floor, not grade, to lower roof, not to the ridge.
 - b. Beam/column alignment.
5. Kenilworth Elevation:
 - a. Height dimension not provided on parking lot side.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION 1: RESCIND

1st: PARATI 2nd: TAYLOR

Ms. Parati moved to rescind the motion made by the Commission at the October 9 meeting as it is understood now that the Commission provided nonbinding information at the October 9 meeting in order to help the applicant get closer to an approval.

Mr. Taylor seconded the motion.

VOTE 1: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION 1: DECISION TO CONTINUE FROM OCTOBER 9 MEETING – RESCINDED.

MOTION 2: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

1st: BARTH 2nd: WOJICK

Mr. Barth moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the district. He added the following conditions: that the applicant maintain the parking lot facing elevation as seen on presentation slide 28; that the applicant adjust the frieze board below the pent eave to be in line with the exterior wall rather than be overhung; that the applicant maintain the pent eave to main roof line gable condition as seen on slide 28; that the dormer condition reflect the November submittal; that the applicant maintain the brick on the lower level as seen in the November submittal; that the applicant maintain the Kenilworth Av elevation as shown in the October submittal; that the applicant work with Staff on verifying all dimensions and height measurements, consistency of the drawings with particular attention to grade, retaining, and foundation conditions, column details and alignment, and porch floor materials; and that the applicant provide a tree protection plan from a certified arborist. He cited the following Standards: for massing, 7.7; for foundations, 7.11; for cornices and trim, 7.13; for materials, 7.16; and trees, 8.5.

Ms. Lineberger suggested the friendly amendment that the applicant be required to provide a brick sample to Staff. Mr. Barth accepted the amendment.

Ms. Wojick seconded the motion.

VOTE 2: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION 2: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION – COMMERCIAL – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

CONTINUED FROM THE SEPTEMBER MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: WHITLOCK

LEFT: BELL

RETURNED: CURME

APPLICATION:

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

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

1. Restudy Buildings A and B for
 - a. New Construction for Residential Buildings, 6.1, preamble.
 - b. Context 6.2 and 6.3, numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.
 - c. Setbacks, 6.5, numbers 1, 2, 3 and 5.
 - d. Spacing, 6.6, numbers 1, 2, and 3.
 - e. Orientation, 6.7, number 3.
 - f. Massing and Complexity of Form, 6.8, numbers 1 through 6.
 - g. Height and Width, 6.9, numbers 1, 3, 4, and 5.
 - h. Scale, 6.10, number 1, 3, and 4.
 - i. Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5.
2. The Commission has not reviewed Buildings C through F.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

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

Background:

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

PROPOSAL:

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

1. Building A: a 2-story duplex, proposed to be 28'-11" in height from grade to ridge, with an additional 4'-0" below grade. Proposed setback is 43' to front thermal wall and 53' to front porch. Overall dimensions are 40'-0" x 46'-6".
2. Building B: a 3-story duplex, proposed to be 34'-8" tall from grade to ridge, with an additional 4'-0" below grade. Proposed setback is 59' to front thermal wall and 49' to the front porch. Overall dimensions are 40'-0" x 50'-4".
3. Building C: a 3-story triplex, proposed to be 33'-8" tall from grade to ridge, with an additional 4'-0" below grade. Has varied setbacks. The unit closest to Building B has a setback of 61' to the front thermal wall and 56' to the front porch. The other two (2) units have a setback of 59' to the front thermal wall and 49' to the front porch. Overall dimensions are 60'-0" x 50'-4".
4. Building D: a 3-story quadruplex, proposed to be 34'-8" tall from grade to ridge, with an additional 4'-0" below grade. Overall dimensions are 64'-0" x 40'-0".
5. Buildings E & F: a 3-story triplex, proposed to be 34'-8" tall from grade to ridge, with an additional 4'-0" below grade. Overall dimensions are 48'-0" x 40'-0".

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

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

provided. Doors are proposed to be Jeld-Wen Sitaline wood doors with glass. All trim and columns are proposed to be wood.

Revised Proposal – November 13, 2024:

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

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

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. All Buildings:
 - a. Massing, scale, height and width, foundations.
 - b. Provide setbacks from property lines.
 - c. Provide accurate drawings of all elevations, including both side elevations.
 - d. Provide larger 3D Isometric view of each elevation.
2. Building A1 & A2: Missing water table on front elevation, inaccurate column and beam details, inaccurate handrails detail, inaccurate window trim, dormer pitches, gable end details, foundation delineation.
3. Building B1, B2, & B3: Roof pitch, inaccurate column and beam details, inaccurate handrails detail, foundation delineation on rear, side elevation is missing covered deck details, gable end details, side roof canopy detail and precedent.
4. Building C1 & CH: Context, setback, spacing, massing and complexity of form, height and width, scale, foundation, rhythm, roof form, doors and windows, porches, and size. Provide precedent for a connected side carriage house.
5. Building C2: Roof form, inaccurate column and beam details, inaccurate handrails detail, inaccurate window trim, dormer pitches, gable end details, foundation delineation.
6. Materials:
 - a. Provide a column and beam detail.
 - b. Provide a brick and mortar sample.

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

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

One member of the public spoke against the project.

MOTION: CONTINUE

1st: PARATI 2nd: LINEBERGER

Ms. Parati moved to continue the application for a restudy of the following: the context for buildings A-2, B-2, B-3, and C-2, citing Standard 6.2; setbacks as it relates to the neighboring properties, citing Standard 6.5; spacing, Standard 6.6; height and width, Standard 6.9; and foundations, Standard 6.12. She said the Commission would like to see how the foundations of the first three buildings relate to their neighboring properties and how it would impact the height relative to the properties behind them. Ms. Parati added that the Commission was not reviewing other details at this time.

Ms. Lineberger suggested that the motion cite the following Standards: for context, 6.3, numbers 2, 3, and 4; for massing, 6.8; and for scale, 6.10, numbers 2, 3, and 4. Ms. Parati accepted the amendment.

Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion.

VOTE: 9/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION – MULTI-FAMILY – CONTINUED

NEW CASES

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: WHITLOCK

RETURNED: BELL

APPLICATION:

HDCRMIA-2022-01157, 317 WESTWOOD AV (PID: 11908715) – TREE REMOVAL & REPLANTING – AFTER THE FACT

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure was built in 1933 as a 1.5-story Bungalow with a side gabled roof and a shed-roof dormer on the front of the house. A rear addition, on the right side of the principal structure, was approved by Staff under COA# HDCADMRM-2020-00118. The lot size is approximately 55.20' x 127.60'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5-story residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is the removal of two large canopy Pecan trees located at the left side of the front yard. The diameter of both trees has not been provided. Both trees have been removed. A certified arborist's letter documenting that removal is needed due to disease, documented damage to a historic structure, or other reasons has not been provided.

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. A letter from a Certified Arborist, the Diameter Breast Height (DBH) measurement, and tree replanting plan were not provided by the applicant.
2. Staff recommends the Commission to Deny this application because removal of the large canopy trees in the front yard and rear yard is incongruous with Design Standards for Trees 8.5, numbers 1 and 2.
 - a. A certified arborist's letter documenting that removal is needed due to disease, documented damage to a historic structure, or other reasons was not provided.
 - b. Tree removal occurred without prior approval by the Commission.
 - c. A new application for replanting is required.
 - i. Per the Design Standards for Trees 8.5, number 6, the applicant should provide a replanting plan to Staff that includes the replanting of at least one large, maturing canopy tree on the property.
 - ii. New tree(s) to be selected from the approved plant species, large maturing canopy tree list as outlined in the Charlotte Land Development Standards Manual (CLDSM).
 - iii. The replacement tree should be approximately 2"-3" caliper in size and planted during the next replanting season).

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

Several members of the public spoke against the project.

MOTION: DENY

1st: SULLIVAN 2nd: BARTH

Mr. Sullivan moved to deny the application as it does not meet the Commission's requirements as stated in the Design Standards for trees, 8.5, numbers 1 and 2 and that the removal occurred prior to the Commission's approval. He required that the applicant provide a replanting plan that includes the replanting of two mature canopy trees selected from the Charlotte Land Development Standards Manual and that the trees should be approximately two to three-inch caliper in size and planted during the next replanting season per Standard 8.5, number 6. He also stated that if the applicant obtains a letter from a certified arborist stating that the trees needed to be removed, the replanting would not be necessary.

Mr. Barth seconded the motion.

Ms. Parati, Ms. Leite, and Ms. Hewett suggested the amendments that the Commission was denying the application specifically because a letter from a certified arborist was not obtained before the trees were removed and that Mr. Sullivan remove the condition requesting a letter because the trees were removed so long ago. Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Barth accepted the amendments.

VOTE: 10/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR TREE REMOVAL & REPLANTING – AFTER THE FACT – DENIED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: WHITLOCK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA-2024-00336, 3105-3121 COLYER PL (PID: 09506133, 09506134, 09506135, 09506136, & 09506137) – CHANGES TO AN APPROVED CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The property at 2010 The Plaza is the Van Landingham 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 HDCRMA-2020-00467. Design changes to Building Number 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 tallest point of the building one is the first unit facing The Plaza at a height of 33'-6", as measured from grade to ridge.
- The building setback is approximately 55'-2" from back of curb to front thermal wall.
- Materials include Nichiha Savannah lap siding and Miratec windowsills and soffits, and 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 and 3" fiber cement brick mold 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:

Staff conducted a final inspection on Building 1 on March 27, 2024 and found that the constructed project did not match the COA approved plans. This project is in the enforcement process. The deviation from approved plans is found on all four elevations and there are many design changes that Staff is unable to approve. 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 changes include:

Window changes, all elevations (Page S.1 - S.6)

- Style
 - Type (i.e. casement in place of double-hung)
 - Quantity (single window used where double window was indicated)
- Lite pattern
- Window size opening
- Proportion of window (vertical orientation vs horizontal orientation)

Door changes, South Elevation (facing Colyer Pl), North Elevation (facing Van Landingham Estate), and East Elevation (facing driveway) (Page S.1, S.5 - S.6)

- Front Entry door style and lite pattern different than COA

Elevation detail changes – South, East, and West Elevation (facing The Plaza) (Page S.1, S.4 - S.6)

- Paneling details (with diagonally oriented lap siding) on window bay bump-outs
 - Size of panels differs in various locations.
 - Some areas where three panels were indicated were built as two larger panels.

Elevation detail changes – North Elevation (Page S.2 - S.3)

- Misalignment of certain windows to defining eave/trim details.
- Misalignment of certain windows from third to second floor.

Elevation detail changes – South and West Elevations (Page S.4 - S.6)

- Cornice, fascia, and brick sill detail changes from approved detailing.

Elevation detail changes – North and South Elevations (Page S.2 - S.3, S.5 - S.6)

- Smooth panel siding installed on dormers instead of lap siding.

Elevation detail changes – South Elevation (Page S.5 - S.6)

- Proportion of brick between top of garage door and bottom of second story window is taller than approved elevation.

Roof changes – North, South, and West Elevations (Page S.2 - S.6)

- Shallower roof pitches than approved on certain dormers.

Staff approval changes include:

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

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 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. Staff has been requesting as-built drawings since April 25, 2024. To date, Staff has received two sets of inaccurate drawings that also lack dimensions and material notes and is at an impasse with the applicant.
 - a. Staff compiled a presentation that compares the details of the approved COA drawings, photographs of the as-built conditions, and the applicant provided drawings.
 - b. There are building elements that have changed between the approved drawings and the constructed project, but the applicant provided drawings show the previously approved elements instead of what are actually built.
2. Staff recommends the Commission to not hear this application at this time as there is insufficient information to review the proposed changes per Design Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6: Massing, 6.8; Height, 6.9; Roof Form, 6.13; Cornices and Trim, 6.14; Rhythm, 6.15-6.16.
 - Applicant to provide the following items to the Commission for comparison of approved elevations against the as-built elevations:
 1. Accurate as-built drawings for all elevations
 2. Window/door specifications
3. East Elevation (facing driveway) changes:
 - 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 all are installed using different styles (1/1 lite pattern) vs approved full lite windows.
 - c. Entry door style changed from an approved wood Craftsman style door with 3-lite pattern to full lite

door.

4. North Elevation (facing Van Landingham Estate) changes (Page S.2 - S.3):
 - a. All four dormers have shallower roof pitches than indicated on approved elevation.
 - b. Dormer #4 was sided with smooth siding vs approved lap siding.
 - c. Third floor of unit 3105 – the second window from the right is supposed to be a double and instead a large single window was installed.
 - d. Left-most window on third floor of unit 3121 is wider than the window next to it, when both windows were supposed to be the same per the COA. Both windows are also taller than approved.
5. West Elevation (facing The Plaza) changes (Page 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 a shallower pitch than in COA drawings.
 - i. This is indicated by additional space underneath the bottom of front porch dormer windows and bottom of wall, and additional space underneath bottom of brackets on left-most dormer.
 - 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 all are installed using different styles (1/1 lite pattern) vs approved full lite windows.
6. South Elevation (facing Colyer Pl) changes (Page 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 2' to 4' of brick between the top of the garage door and bottom of the second story windows. This equals approximately 5 to 12 courses of brick. The amount varies by unit.
 - ii. The as-built dimension is not labeled on the applicant provided plans. The building units have anywhere from 15 to 23 courses 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. 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. Entry door style changed from an approved wood Craftsman style door with 3-lite pattern to full lite door.
 - f. Third floor of unit 3105 – the second window from the left is supposed to be a double and instead a large single window was installed.
 - i. The window directly below it is a double per the COA but is too narrow in proportion.
 - g. Dormer #1 was sided with a smooth panel vs approved lap siding.
 - h. Dormer #2 has too much siding revealed on each side of the windows.
 - i. Eave of gable over unit 3105 runs into top of eave that runs across the front of unit 3109 instead of

them intersecting.

- i. This indicates possible lower roof pitch with roof over unit 3109.
 - j. 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 3121 comes down lower in built project vs approved elevation and contributes to this change.
7. Window changes, all elevations (Page S.1 - S.6):
- a. Some window changes, particularly increases in size, may be in response to meeting egress requirements.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION: DEFER

1st: HOLTZ 2nd: SULLIVAN

Ms. Holtz moved to defer the application to a future meeting because it is incomplete. She specified that the Commission needs accurate and detailed as-built drawings referencing what has changed before reviewing the application.

Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion.

VOTE: 10/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR CHANGES TO AN APPROVED CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – DEFERRED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: WHITLOCK

APPLICATION:

HDCRMAA-2024-00023, 1913 WOOD DALE TR (PID: 11907504) – PAINTED BRICK – AFTER THE FACT

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1-story brick American Small House constructed c. 1940. The building's front elevation is symmetrical with a central triangular portico covered stoop supported by Doric columns, with 1/1 windows on either side. The building has a gable roof, central brick chimney offset to the right from the center point of the house, and small bump out on the right front half of the house, clad with pre-district vinyl siding. The lot size is approximately 60' x 191'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5 story single-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is to paint the unpainted brick exterior of the entire house.

The project also includes repairs to the foundation, cracks in the walls, and gaps/missing mortar along the roofline, utility penetrations, and window frames.

Interior crawlspace structural repairs were made to address settling. After the interior structural work is complete, the applicant proposes to replace damaged bricks with new brick and infill exterior settlement cracks and gaps with new mortar.

The proposed mortar for all exterior repairs is a tan color, which is a different color than the original gray mortar. The proposed brick replacement around the crawl space door is an orange, smooth brick, which does not match the original dark red brick.

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

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Per the preamble of the Design Standards for Paint, 5.8, painting may be considered if documentation shows it will unify disparate parts of the building, provided the disparate work is not of one's own doing.
 - a. The rear elevation includes large patches of mismatched brick and mortar, as well as misaligned brick. These repairs are located under the middle window down to grade, as well as along the roofline, and should be indicated as previously completed work not by the current applicant.
 - b. Repairs using mismatched brick and mortar were made to various sections of the exterior walls, including the foundation, around the crawl space door, utility penetrations, the roofline along the gable ends, areas underneath window frames, and the chimney by the current applicant.
2. The project is incongruous with the Design Standards for Masonry 5.5, numbers 3, 4, 5 and 8, and Paint 5.8, number 7.
 - a. Repairs to missing mortar and cracks, undertaken by a contractor employed by the current applicant, were made using a tan color mortar which does not match the original gray mortar, which is incongruous with Design Standards for Masonry 5.5, preamble, and numbers 4, 5, and 8 (b).
 - b. New brick and mortar work completed around the crawl space door do not match the rest of the original masonry and was performed by the contractor employed by the current applicant, which is incongruous with Design Standards for Masonry 5.5, preamble, and numbers 4, 5, and 8 (b).
 - c. All exterior brick that was previously unpainted has been painted, which is incongruous with Design Standards for Masonry 5.5, number 3; and Design Standards for Paint 5.8, number 7.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION: APPROVE

1st: HOLTZ 2nd: BARTH

Ms. Holtz moved to approve this application because it met the Standards for paint and building materials, number 5.8. Specifically, she stated that the painted brick was being allowed because it unified the disparate parts of the property since the disparate condition was not of the applicant's own doing. She also cited the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Mr. Barth seconded the motion.

VOTE: 10/0

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR PAINTED BRICK – AFTER THE FACT – APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: WHITLOCK

LEFT: BARTH

APPLICATION:**HDCRMA-2024-00278, 1561 WILMORE DR (PID: 11908234) – ADDITION****EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1-story, front gable house with Craftsman elements. Architectural features include a front gable roof, 8/1 wood windows, and full-width front porch with wood columns on brick piers. Exterior materials are German wood lap siding with wood shakes in the gables. Lot size is 50' x 100'. Surrounding structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is in three parts:

1. The addition of a rear cross gable with dormer
 - a. Proposed footprint is 29'-4" x 30'-4".
 - b. Proposed height is 25'-9 ¾", with a 4'-7 ¼" ridge increase.
 - c. Proposed materials are wood lap siding to match existing with wood trim to match existing, shingle roof, and windows to match existing. Window material not provided.
 - d. Shed dormer is in-set from the rear and side thermal walls. Off-set dimensions not provided.
2. Rebuilding the existing rear covered porch with wood deck.
 - a. Proposed footprint is 8'-0" x 15'-8".
 - b. Proposed materials include wood handrails, no other materials provided.
 - c. Proposed rear yard permeability is 87%.
3. Basement window replacement
 - a. Proposed to replace a bricked-up window on the right elevation and replace the existing window on the rear elevation. Windows to match existing. Window material not provided.
 - b. Information on existing rear elevation window not provided.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Height and width; and scale of cross gable and dormer.
2. Provide dormer off-set dimensions.
3. Confirm wood lap siding will be German lap to match existing.
4. Provide window material specifications.
5. Window trim for ganged windows is typically 5.25".
6. Provide details on replacement windows.
7. Porkchop eaves on rear porch are incongruous with the Standards, work with Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

1st: **WOJICK** 2nd: **PARATI**

Ms. Wojick moved to approve the application because it is not incongruous with the district. She explained that there are extenuating circumstances influencing the decision of the Commission. The lot size, placement of the home on the lot, and setback requirements mean that an addition to the rear of the house is not possible. She added the following conditions: that the applicant work with Staff on the design of the cornices and trim since porkchop eaves are incongruous with the Standards; that they confirm window material and design specifications with Staff; that they ensure that the floors are not coplanar; that the siding match the original German lap siding on the principal structure, and that they work with Staff on the correct design framing detail for the gable end on the porch. She cited Standard 6.20, numbers 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6, for additions, 6.14, for cornices and trim, and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5.

Ms. Hewett asked her to clarify exactly why the new height is being allowed. Ms. Wojick explained that the addition is not higher than the surrounding historic buildings, including 1557 Wilmore Dr.

Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

VOTE: 6/3

AYES: CURME, HOLTZ, PARATI, SULLIVAN, TAYLOR, WOJICK

NAYS: BELL, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

Due to time constraints the following cases will be heard at the December 11, 2024 meeting:

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

With no further business to discuss, Chair Hawkins recessed the meeting at 7:03 p.m.