

Approved July 14, 2010

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES

June 9, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Jonathan Crotty, Chair

Ms. Mary Ellen George, Vice Chair

Ms. Debra Glennon

Mr. Greg Grueneich

Ms. Barbara Highfill

Ms. Paula Owens

Mr. John Phares

Mr. Dominick Ristaino

Mr. Damon Rumsch

Ms. Karen Rush

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ms. Lucia Griffith

OTHERS PRESENT: Mr. John Rogers, Administrator

Historic District Commission

Ms. Wanda Birmingham, Secretary to the Historic District Commission

Mr. Mujeeb Shah Khan, Assistant City Attorney

With a quorum present, Chairman Crotty called the regular June meeting of the HDC to order at 3:03 pm. He began the meeting with a welcome to all in attendance and by swearing in those present (and continued to do so throughout the meeting as others arrived). Due to the quasi-judicial nature of the Commission, staff and others who may speak, are sworn in at every meeting. (Commissioners are sworn in by the City Clerk for the length of the appointment at the beginning of each term.) Mr. Crotty asked that everyone in attendance please sign in and when addressing the Commission to please state name and address for the record. Mr. Crotty explained the meeting process. The review of each application consists of two parts. The first is the presentation portion. Staff presents the application then Commissioners and those speaking on behalf of the application will discuss the project. Next, members of the audience will be asked if anyone present wishes to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application. Again, there will be an opportunity for comments and questions from the Commission and the applicant. The second part is the discussion and deliberation portion of the meeting. At this point, discussion of the application is limited to the Commission members and staff only. Unless the Commission votes to re-open the meeting to ask additional questions or for clarification of some issue, the applicant and audience member do not participate in this portion of the discussion. Once discussion is complete, a MOTION will be made to APPROVE, DENY, or DEFER and a vote will be taken. A simple majority vote of those Commissioners present is required for a decision. Mr. Crotty asked that all cell phones and any other electronic devices be turned off completely or set to silent operation. He also asked that any Commissioner announce, for the record, their arrival and/or departure when this takes place during a meeting.

Index of Addresses: 943 Romany Road Dilworth

928 East Park Avenue Dilworth

404 East Tremont Avenue Dilworth

900 East Worthington Avenue Dilworth

Application: 943 Romany Road – Demolition

This 1950s ranch is listed as Non Contributing in the National Register Survey. It is located at the corner of Lexington and Romany on a rise overlooking Latta Park. A façade renovation/addition of a front facing gable and columns was deferred in March for further (simpler) design study. New plans show the addition of French doors accessing an existing front terrace and new rails. Replacement windows will be replaced with casement windows to match the original. One the right side, a pair of wooden casements will be the replacement windows. On the left side, one window will be removed and a pair of wooden casements will be added. A 'Frank Lloyd Wright' type door will be the front door.

Applicant Comments: Architect Andy Woodruff said the plan accomplishes the need to square up and center the windows. Brick and mortar will match where replaced.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Crotty's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* – **Additions**, Mr. Phares complimented the scaled down project and made a MOTION to APPROVE the plans. Ms. Rush seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: CROTTY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, OWENS, PHARES, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: CHANGES APPROVED.

Application: 928 East Park Avenue – Changes to Approved Plans.

New construction plans were approved in May. This address is at East Park Avenue and Dilworth Road West, one the one of the lots created from a subdivision of a large lot facing Dilworth Road West. Approved plans show a new drive and two car garage off Dilworth Road West. A secondary entrance shows on East Park Avenue. Deed restrictions cause revisions to the approved plans: (1) detached two car garage has been removed from the plans, (2) the drive remains as access to a courtyard in the space where the garage previously showed, (3) outside fireplace deleted, (4) new garage beneath house on East Park Avenue side, (5) new drive, (6) and retaining wall, (7) standing seam metal roof changed to asphalt shingles.

Applicant Comments: Owner Jaime Rentch said they could not get clear title if they built in violation of the deed restrictions and therefore could not get a

loan. She said there is limited parking on East Park Avenue and difficult parking on Dilworth Road West which drives the need for a garage. There is not enough buildable space for a carport or porte cochere.

Contractor Harry Weibler said they discovered that the entire lot is uncompacted fill which will necessitate pylon foundation. The proposed garage location is the one that will best work for this discovery. The room over the garage will have a ceiling height of 8' which will allow some of the garage headroom to be captured on the interior. The foundation will only be 1' higher than past approved.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighbor Margaret Clifford said she is upset about the project overpowering everything on the street saying it does not blend with its surroundings.

Neighbor John Culver said it looks like the changes are causing an increase in height by 4' from the approved plans. The retaining wall and drive will encourage front setback parking with the set of steps cut into the wall. The building and site difficulty this lot presents is due to the way it was subdivided. The proposed height is not compatible. The lot was once big but now that it is small any new construction should be judged against East Park Avenue scale. Further design work is needed.

Neighbor Melissa Ellis pointed out that all have the same deed restrictions and that they will be faced again when the 3rd lot is up for redevelopment.

Neighbor Scott Wilkerson pointed out that the deed restrictions apply to this corner as it was a single lot.

MOTION: Based on the need for further design study regarding (1) garage location and presentation, (2) two curb cuts, Ms. George made a MOTION to DEFER the plans. Ms. Highfill seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: CROTTY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, OWENS, PHARES, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION WITH UNDERNEATH GARAGE DEFERRED FOR FURTHER DESIGN STUDY.

Application: 404 East Tremont Avenue – Change to Past Approved New Construction Plans.

This new house was approved with a drive to the left. The drive continued beside the house toward a future garage location. As built changes include: (1) house shifted on lot toward the left, (2) drive space eliminated on left, (3) drive added to right which barely clears front of house, (4) walkway beside house from new drive to back yard, (5) a rear patio and retaining wall have been added.

Applicant Comments: Owner Tom Reilly said there were drainage/water flow issues that made the City deny the drive location on the left so they had to move it to the right side. The rear patio and retaining wall have been submitted for staff to approve. The new drive is 10' wide and ends at a small bumpout on the side of the house.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Crotty's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on exception warranted to *Policy & Design Guidelines – Driveways* by circumstances of this particular lot, Ms. George made a MOTION to APPROVE a driveway that is extended to the bumpout of the gable on the right side. Ms. Owens seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: CROTTY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, OWENS, PHARES, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: DRIVE APPROVED WITH MODIFICATION.

Application: 900 East Worthington Avenue – Addition.

This c. 1925 house is located at the corner of Worthington Avenue and Park

Road. A much larger addition was approved in the past. This plan takes the

existing rear bumpout, adds a twin gable bumpout and fills in the space between

creating an engaged porch. Side gables will be enlarged.

Applicant Comments: Architect Allen Brooks said the scope has gotten

smaller after SHPO review for a Preservation Tax Credit project. By extending the

side gables, the proposed project became greatly simplified and eliminated the

need to raise the roof.

No one accepted Mr. Crotty's invitation to speak FOR or FOR/AGAINST:

AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines*, Additions,

Ms. George made a MOTION to APPROVE the plans with updated elevations. Mr.

Ristaino seconded.

VOTE: 10/0

AYES: CROTTY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH,

HIGHFILL, OWENS, PHARES, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: ADDITION APPROVED WITH CORRECTED PLANS.

Ms. Rush reported that the Nominating Committee for new officers met. The nomination is

Chair – Mary Ellen George Vice Chair – Dominick Ristaino.

Mr. Rumsch nominated Debra Glennon as 2nd Vice Chair.

Ms. Owens seconded. The vote was unanimous. New officers will take their seats on July 14.

Mr. Rogers directed attention to the recent article in Southern Living about Mr. Phares' front porch. After many years of being enclosed, the porch was reopened – losing interior space but reconnecting to the street with the open, livable porch space.

Mr. Rogers said there is an article on the Wilmore neighborhood in the Angie's List Magazine.

Mr. Rogers said he has been invited to be on a panel for the "Public Conversation" program.

Mr. Rogers said this was the last meeting for Mr. Crotty, Mr. Phares, and Mr. Rumsch after serving two full terms.

Minutes were approved and the direction was given that for any corrections or changes, notify Ms. Birmingham. Ms. Highfill did report one mistake that Ms. Birmingham will correct before the document goes on the website.

The meeting adjourned at 5:23pm with a meeting length of 2 hours and 20 minutes.
