



---

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
September 11, 2024 | Room 267

MINUTES

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Heather Wojick  
Vacant, Resident-Owner Dilworth  
Vacant, Resident-Owner Fourth Ward  
Vacant, Resident-Owner Hermitage Court  
Vacant, Resident-Owner Oaklawn Park  
Vacant, Resident-Owner Wilmore

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

---

With a quorum present, Chair Hawkins called the September meeting of the Historic District Commission (Commission) meeting to order at 1:10 p.m. Chair Hawkins began the meeting by introducing the Staff and Commissioners and explaining the meeting procedure. All interested parties planning to give testimony – FOR or AGAINST – must submit a form to speak and must be sworn in. Staff will present a description of each proposed project to the Commission. The Commissioners and the Applicants will then discuss the project. Audience members signed up to speak either FOR or AGAINST will be called to the podium for each agenda item. Presentations by the Applicants and audience members must be concise and focused on the **Charlotte Historic District Design Standards**. The Commission and Staff may question the Applicant. The Applicant may present sworn witnesses who will be subject to questioning by the Commission and Staff. The Applicant will be given an opportunity to respond to comments by interested parties. After

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

---

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

##### **CONSENT**

HDCRMI-2024-00672, 2401 Charlotte Dr	Dilworth
HDCCMI-2024-00207, 1829 Cleveland Av	Dilworth
HDCCMI-2024-00685, 325 W Summit Av/1501 S Mint St	Wilmore

##### **NOT HEARD AT THE AUGUST 14 MEETING**

HDCCMA-2023-00992, 224, 228, 232, & 236 W Kingston Av	Wilmore
HDCCMA-2023-01193, 1921 Charlotte Dr	Dilworth
HDCRMA-2022-00897, 1411 & 1413 W 4 <sup>th</sup> St	Wesley Heights
HDCRMA-2023-00988, 501 N Poplar St	Fourth Ward
HDCRMIA-2023-01195, 928 Ideal Wy	Dilworth
HDCCMIA-2024-00063, 1513 S Mint St	Wilmore
HDCRMIA-2024-00068, 221 Grandin Rd	Wesley Heights
HDCRMIA-2024-00081, 1627 Oaklawn Av	McCrorey Heights

##### **NEW CASES**

HDCRMA-2024-00336, 3105-3121 Colyer Pl	Plaza Midwood
HDCCDEMO-2024-00090, 304 E Worthington Av	Dilworth
HDCCDEMO-2024-00091, 308 E Worthington Av	Dilworth

---

#### **CONSENT**

---

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

ABSENT: BELL, WOJICK

##### **APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2024-00672, 2401 CHARLOTTE DR (PID: 12112607) – FRONT PORCH CHANGES**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing building is a 1.5-story Picturesque Revival constructed c. 1925. Architectural features include a T-gable with shed dormers on the front gable which contains a paired arched bay, shingle siding, 6/6 windows, and a replacement front door. The gabled entry projection contains a frontispiece surmounted by a small arched bay. The lot size is approximately 150' x 158'. Adjacent structures 1, 1.5, and 2-story single-family and multi-family buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a new brick front stoop covered by an open gable roof. The roof will be supported by two (2) square posts and a cross beam. The fascia and gutters will match existing. Proposed materials are traditional to match existing. The project is completely reversible.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district, is completely reversible, and meets the Secretary of Interior's Standards and the Design Standards for Additions and New Construction, 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 new brick (foundation/steps) should remain unpainted.
  - b. Downspout to be run down the sides of the new posts.
  - c. The posts, beam, fascia, and any other trim shall be painted to match the house trim.
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>: BARTH**

Ms. Lineberger moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the district, is completely reversible, and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and with the conditions that all new brick will remain unpainted, that the downspout run down the side of the new posts, and that all news posts, beams, fascia, and trim be painted to match the house trim.

She cited the Standards for new construction of additions for residential buildings, Chapter 6.

Mr. Barth seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 7/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

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

---

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

ABSENT: BELL, WOJICK

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCCMI-2024-00207, 1829 CLEVELAND AV (PID: 12105301) – FRONT DOOR & SITE CHANGES**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing building is the former Dilworth Methodist Church South, constructed c. 1915. The Colonial Revival brick building was designed by architect Marvin W. Helms and built by L. Vaughn. The building has a hip roof surmounted by a domed belvedere. Architectural features include round arched bays in the rear section with fanlights, rectangular transoms over the front section bays, and a Classical portico with a pedimented fanlight gable over massive Doric columns. Front door and sidelights appear to be replacements, but the fanlight is original. All masonry is unpainted. The lot size is approximately 150' x 150'. Adjacent structures 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential and commercial buildings. The HVAC relocations and installations were staff approved under COA# HDCADMC-2024-00452. The signage was staff approved under COA# HDCADMC-2024-00206.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a new front door, front entrance steps, and site work.

**Site Changes – Sheets HDC-1 and HDC-3**

1. Patio. New concrete patio with brick inlay, edging, and planter.
2. Front walkway. New concrete walkway edged in brick to access the side patio and to connect with an existing walkway on the left.
3. Staff approvable work:
  - a. Rolled curb (labeled as concrete wall on plans) to be restored where it was previously removed.
  - b. Banquette seating, Tuuci free standing umbrella, and other noted patio features are moveable and will not be permanently installed. They do not require approval.
  - c. Remove existing fencing and evergreen hedge.
  - d. Install new metal fence.

**Front Elevation – Sheets HDC-2, HDC-4, and HDC-5**

1. Front steps. The concrete steps and landing to be removed and re-poured to be even. A new metal handrail will also be installed.
2. Front door. The existing front door appears to be a replacement. The proposed double-front door is wood with paneled sidelights.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Secretary of Interior's Standards, the Design Standards for Rehabilitation of Building Elements, Chapter 4, 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. All brick to remain unpainted.
  - b. Provide a tree protection plan from a Certified Arborist for the 10" and 18" Willow Oaks in the front yard.
  - c. Work with Staff on all Staff approvable site changes.
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>:     WHITLOCK     2<sup>nd</sup>:     SULLIVAN**

Mr. Whitlock moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards as well as the Historic District Commission Standards for rehabilitation and building elements, Chapter 4. He also cited the Standards for private sites, Chapter 8. He added the following conditions: that all new brick

remain unpainted, that the applicants provide a tree protection plan for the 10” and 18” Willow Oaks in the front yard, and that they work with Staff on all Staff-approvable site changes.

Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 7/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR FRONT DOOR & SITE CHANGES – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

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

ABSENT: BELL, WOJICK

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCCMI-2024-00685, 325 W SUMMIT AV/1501 S MINT ST (PID: 11908314) – REAFFIRMATION**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

There are three existing structures on the parcel. The lot size is approximately 154’ x 158’ x 199’ x 150’. Adjacent structures are commercial buildings, parking lots, and single family residential to the rear along Westwood Avenue and Southwood Avenue.

Building 1 – 1501 S. Mint Street: Constructed c. 1953, the building is a 1-story, concrete building with brick water table on the front elevation. Originally constructed as an automobile repair shop with gas pumps, it converted to a retail use in 2018. On the front elevation there are two garage bays, a man-door, and a large storefront window that wraps around the left elevation.

Building 2 – 1501 S. Mint Street: Constructed c. 1955, the building is a 1-story, concrete building with simple stretcher bond brick facades on the street facing elevations (front and right). Originally constructed as an automobile repair shop, the front elevation has two garage bays, a man-door, and square 6-light aluminum window. The building sits sideways on the lot, with the front elevation facing Building 1. The right elevation facing S. Mint Street has a 6-light aluminum window that matches the one on the front elevation.

Building 3 – 325 W. Summit Avenue: Constructed c. 1957, the building is a 1-story, concrete and brick building. The street facing elevations, front and right, have brick facades with an American bond pattern. The left and rear facades are concrete block. The front façade faces W. Summit Avenue and features a brick parapet. It has a symmetrical façade with a central entry flanked by two rectangular picture windows openings. The windows are metal with 20-square panes. The front and right elevations also feature painted signage advertising “Branch Office, Southern Elevator Co., Passenger and Freight Elevators.” The right elevation facing S. Mint Street has an entry-door and three small metal windows. The building also has two brick chimneys.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is reaffirmation of a previously approved project, new dumpsters and screening, with minor changes at 1501 S Mint Street (Building 1). The proposed dumpster location is unchanged. A new walk-in cooler and condenser will be added at the rear of the building. Both the dumpster and the cooler will be screened. The dumpster and walk-in cooler screening is proposed to be wood panels approximately 8’-0” in height. An additional wood screening panel is proposed to be installed facing W. Summit Avenue to screen the condenser. The height of the panel is not provided. Screening details are shown on Sheet SP101 and a section showing the pedestrian view is shown on Sheet SP102.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for Site Appurtenances, 8.9.
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 screening panels must have a piece of trim across the top.
  - b. The 8'-0" height of the screening is permitted due to the height of the walk-in cooler and the special conditions of this particular lot and building, where all 4 sides of the building are visible from public-rights-of-way.
  - c. The additional condenser screening is not required; the additional height of the panel draws unnecessary attention to the condenser.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

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

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the application with the conditions recommended by Staff as it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for Site Appurtenances, 8.9. He specified that the screening must have one piece of trim across the top and that the applicant not add any screening above the 8 foot line.

Mr. Whitlock seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 7/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

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

---

**NOT HEARD AT THE AUGUST 14 MEETING**

---

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

ABSENT: BELL, WOJICK

**APPLICATION:**

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

**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 adjacent single-family house, 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:

- 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".
- 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".
- 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".
- 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".
- 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 W. Kingston vary from approximately 45'-61' to the front thermal walls and 49'- 53' to the front porches.

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

### **STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. All Buildings
  - a. Massing and complexity of form, scale, height and width, rhythm, context, and roof forms.
  - b. Height of the new buildings adjacent to existing structures.
  - c. Overall massing adjacent to existing structures.
  - d. Provide footprint dimensions and/or floorplans.
  - e. Provide accurate drawings.
  - f. Provide larger 3D Isometric view of each elevation.
  - g. Setback dimensions of Building A. Building A is shown as having a setback of 43' to the front thermal wall; however, Building A sits farther back than Building B, which is shown as having a 59' setback to the front thermal wall.
2. Building A: Dormer pitches, column placement on rear elevation, window rhythm, and roof forms.
3. Building B: Dormer pitches and window placement near eaves.
4. Building C: Massing and complexity of form, scale, height and width, rhythm, and roof forms.
5. Building D: Dormer pitches, rear first level roof form and column placement, window rhythm and light patterns.
6. Building E: Dormer pitches, massing left elevation, window rhythm and light patterns.
7. Building F: Dormer pitches, massing right elevation, window rhythm and light patterns.
8. Materials
  - a. Provide an Azek Straight Edge Shingle siding sample.
    - i. Individually applied wood shingles in a staggered pattern is typically required.

- b. Provide the beam and base in the column and beam detail.
  - c. Provide a brick-and-mortar sample.
  - d. Provide specifications for windows and doors.
    - i. Jeld-Wen Sitrline 3.5" bottom rail required.
  - e. Restudy ganged window trim.
9. 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**

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

Ms. Parati moved to continue the application for buildings A and B. She specified that the Commission had not reviewed buildings C-F. She cited the following Standards: for context, 6.2 and 6.3, numbers 1 through 5; for setbacks, 6.5, numbers 1, 2, 3, and 5; for spacing, 6.6, numbers 1, 2, and 3; for massing and complexity of form, 6.8, numbers 1 through 6; for height and width, 6.9, numbers 1 through 5; for scale, 6.10, numbers 1, 3, and 4; and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5.

Mr. Taylor seconded the motion.

Mr. Barth offered a friendly amendment that the motion cite the preamble for Standard 6.1, for residential new construction, and Standard 6.7, number 3, for orientation. Ms. Parati and Mr. Taylor accepted the amendment.

**VOTE: 7/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

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

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

ABSENT: WOJICK

ARRIVED: BELL

**APPLICATION:**

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

*This application was continued from the July 14, 2024 meeting for the following items:*

*Revisit the following:*

- Context, 7.3.
- Massing, 7.7.
- Trees and Lawns, 8.4.
- Cornices and Trim, 7.13.
- Windows and Doors, 7.14. Provide window sample due to the fact that the Commission has not previously approved this window.
- Lighting, 8.11.
- Materials, 7.16. Looking again at materials with the Hardie Artisan.



- Sidewalks and Parking, 8.3. Re-looking at the stair and walkway redesign.
- Provide additional details; look back at Staff notes for those additional details.
- Foundations, 7.11. Re-look at the foundation on Kenilworth.
- Site Plan, 8.9. Provide an accurate site plan. Provide details about screening the backflow preventer and any other site features and mechanical units, including condensing units.
- Fences and Walls, 8.6-8.8. Detail the retaining walls.

#### **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:***

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.

#### **STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Front Ideal Way Elevation:
  - a. Brick foundation not shown.
  - b. Height dimension shown as measured from first floor, not grade.
2. Windows:
  - a. 4/1 window proportions.
  - b. Kenilworth elevation. Windows appear to be factory-mulled in the paneled bump-out. Redesign is needed.
3. Materials/Details
  - a. What material(s) are proposed for fascia, soffit, and frieze?
  - b. Beam/column detail needed.
4. Site Work
  - a. Backflow preventer screening is needed between the unit and parking lot.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

Several members of the public spoke against the project.

**MOTION: CONTINUE**

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

Mr. Barth moved to continue the application and asked the applicant restudy the following: the context surrounding the project, suggesting they continue to look at other historic examples in the district per Standard 7.3; the massing of the connector between the two buildings per Standard 7.7; the parking and potential of reducing the driveway cut after discussing it with Zoning, and to provide vegetative screening around the parking lot and backflow preventer per Standard 8.3, numbers 9-13; provide appropriate mull gaps between the box bay ganged windows, specifications for an appropriate window selection that HDC has approved for new construction in the past, study the light proportions on the connector window to be more vertically oriented for the divided sash, and to provide a window sample since the Commission has never approved the proposed selection, all per Standard 7.14 for windows and doors; provide lighting at entrances and exits and vertical circulation, noting that no lighting should be placed on ornamental features or on non-pedestrian sides of the building, and that all lights should be lowered to a pedestrian level per Standard 8.12 for lighting; provide additional details on material selections for frieze board, fascia, columns, box beams, and panelized box bay per Standard 7.16 for materials; the potential to reestablish sidewalks on Charlotte Drive and at entrances to the existing building to reinforce the primary entrance of the property, noting that entrances along Ideal Way and Kenilworth Avenue should be viewed and designed as secondary, per Standard 7.6, numbers 1 and 2 for orientation; provide additional detail on the connector piece and gate, including material and dimensions, per Standards 8.6-8.7 for fences and walls; that notes are added to the plans that indicate that the shutters are operational and have the appropriate hardware; that the applicant should work with Staff on brick selections; and that the trash enclosure fence detail should be reviewed to be more in keeping with the Standards.

Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 8/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

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

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

ABSENT: WOJICK

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA-2022-00897, 1411 & 1413 W 4<sup>TH</sup> ST (PID: 07101507) – ADDITION**

*This application was continued from the July 10, 2024 meeting for the following items:*

- Secretary of the Interior's Standards, 2.5 and New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6.
- Doors and Windows, 6.15-6.16.
  - The windows on both sides where there were doors, consider an alternate application for Window D.
  - For Window A in the gables that is replacing the arch-top vent, provide something more in keeping with what is there. The possibility of doing a radius window there or some type of rectangular window that would allow for the margins and for the details to match.
- Cornices and Trim, 6.14. Provide a pent eave rear elevation detail.
- Roof Form and Materials, 6.13. Rework the dormer gable trim on the shed dormer to match the detail at the front elevation.
- Massing, 6.8 and Additions, 6.20, number 5. The massing of the shed dormer, and minimize the roof extension height, proposed at four feet. Provide something that would be less than three feet. Consider the scale of the shed dormer.

#### **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:**

The proposed project is a second level rear addition, with dormers, that extends above the existing ridge by approximately 4'-0". The height of the original house as measured from grade to ridge is 20'-2 1/2". The proposed height from grade to ridge is 24'-2 1/2". The proposed ridge increase steps-in approximately 1'-0" on both the left and right sides. The addition also requires the brick chimney to be raised for code compliance, and the existing vents in the gable ends will be replaced with windows for egress. The proposed brick chimney increase is approximately 4'-7". The second level addition measures approximately 35'-10 3/4" x 55'-0". The proposed rear bump-out addition measures approximately 3'-0" x 11'-6". Proposed materials include wood lap siding with corner boards, wood window trim, and unpainted brick for the chimney extension and bump-out's foundation.

#### ***Revised Proposal***

- Window D on both elevations, which is labeled as Window C on the August submittal, is changed to have salvaged brick infilled below instead of a wood panel as originally proposed.
- Window A in the gable end has been made smaller and changed to a casement with a wider sash-bar to look like a double-hung.
- Dormer and rear elevation roof condition changed.
- Dormer eave detail changed.
- Roof extension (addition) height lowered to 3'-0" taller than the original ridge height. This eliminates the need to extend the chimney.

#### **STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Windows:
  - a. Left and Right Elevation.
    - i. Horizontal light proportions of Window C. Light proportions should be vertical.
  - b. Left Elevation.
    - i. Light pattern change from 6/6 to 1/1 on the first-floor window at the rear of the left elevation.
    - ii. National Register for Wesley Heights notes 6/6 sash windows for this property.
  - c. Provide window material specifications.

- d. Provide a window trim detail for:
  - i. ganged windows in field of siding, and
  - ii. new gable end windows in field of brick.
2. Provide trim detail with dimensions for new trim that is to match the details at the front elevation.
3. HVAC location and screening needed on site plan.
4. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

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

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

Mr. Whitlock moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6. He asked that the applicant work with Staff on minor changes including the windows and finding a solution using vertically-oriented panes.

Mr. Taylor seconded the motion.

Mr. Barth suggested the friendly amendments that the applicant work with Staff to preserve the original entrances on the left and right sides, determine window specifications and window trim details for the ganged and gable end windows and to finalize HVAC location and screening details on the site plan. He cited Standards 6.15-6.16 for doors and windows and 6.14 for cornices and trim.

Mr. Whitlock and Mr. Taylor accepted the amendments.

**VOTE: 8/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

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

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

ABSENT: WOJICK

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA-2023-00988, 501 N POPLAR ST (PID: 07803623) –NEW CONSTRUCTION – MULTI-FAMILY– ALTERNATIVE MATERIALS**

*This application was continued from the July 10, 2024, meeting for the following items:*

- Window Options 1 and 2, per Doors and Windows 6.15, number 3. If desired, bring back the E Series.
- Trim details, Options 1 and 2, per Cornices and Trim, 6.14.
- The seven-foot trash screening, per Fences and Walls 8.6

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The site is a vacant lot. The previous structure was a 2-story, duplex constructed c. 1978. Architectural features included a flat roof, wide vertical T1-11 siding with a wide trim band separating the first and second levels, vertically oriented windows, a cantilevered front patio with solid vertical sidewalls, and a brick foundation. A covered stair provided access to the second level at the rear. A solid wall in the same material as the house partially enclosed the rear yard and provided screening for parking. The lot size is approximately 56' x 100'. Adjacent structures are 2- and 3-story residential structures. On September 14, 2022, the Commission approved the immediate demolition of the building because the

applicant intended to recycle, repurpose, and deconstruct as much of the house as possible versus demolishing it. The COA for HDCRDEMO-2022-00552 has been issued and the structure has been demolished.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is the second round of revisions to the new construction project HDCRMA-2022-00775, which was Approved with Conditions by the HDC on June 14, 2023. The first round of revisions, case HDCRMA-2024-00171, was Approved on April 10, 2024.

*Revised Proposal*

- Revised information for alternative materials.
- Revised drawing set.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. When new non-traditional materials are requested, specification sheets and physical samples are required by the Commission.
2. Refer to HDC Standards listed below:
  - a. Trim 4.11, number 4
  - b. Windows 4.14, number 19
  - c. Wood 5.2, number 5
  - d. Doors and Windows 6.15, numbers 1-3
  - e. Materials 6.18, numbers 1-4 & 6
  - f. Site Appurtenances 8.9, preamble and number 3
  - g. Fences and Walls 8.6
3. The Commission will determine if the proposed project meets the Standards.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak.

**MOTION 1: APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS**

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

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

Mr. Barth moved to approve the following items with conditions: the trash screening fence provided the details are adjusted to follow fencing standards, that it not exceed 6' in height, and that caps and trim pieces are added per Standards 8.6-8.8; the alternative materials for the flat trim around windows, corner boards, frieze, fascia, and trim for cornices and for items up on the roof plane in dealing with the soffits, eaves, windows, and doors, adding the comment that this approval does not include any boxed-out beams and columns; that the soffit panels are only in a bead board or V-groove configuration and are not to be flat panels unless additional images are provided at a later date; and the alternative material may also be used for the brackets and corbels because they are high up, out of the pedestrian space, and are not easily visible up close. He cited the Standard for materials, 6.18, number 4.

Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion.

**VOTE 1: 8/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION 1: APPLICATION FOR TRASH SCREENING FENCE, ALTERNATIVE MATERIALS, AND ALTERNATIVE BRACKET/CORBEL MATERIALS – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

**MOTION 2: DENY**

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

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

Mr. Barth moved to deny the application for the alternative window specifications as it does not meet the Standards for windows for new construction, citing Standards 6.15-6.16.

Ms. Parati seconded the motion.

Ms. Hewett requested that Mr. Barth provide further evidence from the Standards for the motion and a justification from the discussion as to why the application was being denied.

Mr. Barth then specified that the proposed windows' frame reveals and shadow lines are incongruous with historic examples. He cited Standard 6.15, numbers 1 through 4 and 6.16.

**VOTE 2: 8/0**

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

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION 2: APPLICATION FOR ALTERNATIVE WINDOW DESIGN – DENIED.**

---

Mr. Whitlock offered a correction about his attendance during the August 14, 2024 meeting. With that correction noted, Ms. Lineberger moved to approve the minutes from the July 10, 2024 and August 14, 2024 meetings. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by a vote of 7/0.

Due to time constraints the following cases will be heard at the October 9, 2024 meeting:

- HDCRMIA-2023-01195 for 928 Ideal Wy
- HDCCMIA-2024-00063 for 1513 S Mint St
- HDCRMIA-2024-00068 for 221 Grandin Rd
- HDCRMIA-2024-00081 for 1627 Oaklawn Av
- HDCRMA-2024-00336 for 3105-3121 Colyer Pl
- HDCCDEMO-2024-00090 for 304 E Worthington Av
- HDCCDEMO-2024-00091 for 308 E Worthington Av

With no further business to discuss, Chair Hawkins adjourned the meeting at 6:56 p.m.