

Approved September 15, 2010

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES

August 11, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Roger Dahnert

Mr. Don Duffy

Mr. Tom Egan

Ms. Mary Ellen George, Chair

Ms. Debra Glennon, Second Vice Chair

Mr. Greg Grueneich

Ms. Barbara Highfill

Ms. Paula Owen

Ms. Karen Rush

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Dominick Ristaino, Vice Chair

Two Vacancies

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 George called the regular August meeting of the HDC to order at 3:06 pm. She 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.) Ms. George asked that everyone in attendance please sign in and when addressing the Commission to please state name and address for the record. Ms. George explained the meeting process. The review of each application consists of two parts. The first is the presentation portion. Staff presents t 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 reopen 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. Ms. George asked that all cell

phones and any other electronic devices be turned off completely or set to silent operation. She also asked that any Commissioner announce, for the record, their arrival and/or departure when this takes place during a meeting.

Index of Addresses: 2101 Dilworth Road East Dilworth

1721 The Plaza Plaza Midwood

1600 Wilmore Drive Wilmore

612 Mt. Vernon Avenue Dilworth

1114 Belgrave Place Dilworth

1200 Myrtle Avenue Dilworth

Mr. Dahnert declared a conflict of interest and removed himself from the Commission for the first application.

Application: 2101 Dilworth Road East – Addition.

This c.1929 house is located at the corner of Dilworth Road East and Carling Avenue. It is a two story painted brick house with an enclosed side porch. The porch is in bad condition and the plan is to remove it and rebuild and enclosed porch with a master bath addition above. This application was deferred in July for additional design study. Revised plans show hard coat stucco as the exterior material, redesigned transom windows to better align, Tudor elements eliminated.

Applicant Comments: Architect Michael O'Brien, explained that the brick pier of the fence has been removed and the pillars will be stucco where one is needed. Brackets have been beefed up with a curve that matches the one seen over the front door. Trim will match the house.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* – Additions, Ms. George made a MOTION to APPROVE the addition. Ms. Owens seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, OWENS, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: ADDITION APPROVED.

Mr. Egan declared a conflict of interest as an Adjacent Property Owner and removed himself from the Commission for the next application.

Application: 1721 The Plaza – Window Replacement.

Original 4/1 windows are to be replaced. The material of choice is extruded Fibrex. Details will match existing.

Applicant Comments: Mr. Haddox, representing the window company of choice, explained the attributes of the window. The color is part of the extrusion, providing a molecular bond but it is paintable. The material is a mix of wood and vinyl. The wood gives it the strength to allow the parts to be thin like the original. They are warranted for as long as the purchaser owns his house. It is certified green and blocks 95% UV rays.

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

MOTION: Based on exception warranted to *Policy & Design Guidelines* – **Window Replacement** by attributes of product being presented as able to match existing windows, Mr. Dahnert made a MOTION to APPROVE the replacement windows. Ms. Rush seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, OWENS, RUSH

DECISION: REPLACEMENT WINDOWS APPROVED AS PRESENTED.

Application: 1600 Wilmore Drive – Addition.

This house is at the corner of Wilmore Drive and West Park Avenue. It has been sitting partially renovated for many months. The City was in the final stages of requiring this house to be demolished when Wilmore became a Local Historic District in May. The City has not applied to the HDC for Demolition but has been working with the new owners on their plans to renovate. Plans show a small roof extension on the sides relative to an existing inset. A rail will be added for the engaged balcony above the front door. Stone will be added around brick piers on front porch. New HardiePlank is on the house as part of the unfinished previous renovation. The proposal would be to add Hardie anywhere any additional siding is necessary – it would be the Artisan in the bay and the rail above the front door. The new windows will be replaced to be HDC compliant. Shakes will be replaced with Cedar.

Applicant Comment: Architect Diana Ramirez said the dormers remain but the main ridge will be raised by a foot.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with and exception warranted to **Policy & Design Guidelines**, Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE the application with staff empowered to sign off on final plans which show: (1) brackets removed, (2) window choice – size, configuration, material, (3) details (ex. mitered HardiePlank corners), (4) stone column/pier information. Ms. Rush seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, EGAN, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, OWENS, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: ADDITION/RENOVATION APPROVED WITH STAFF TO SIGN OF ON FINAL PLANS – SEE MOTION.

Application: 612 Mt. Vernon Avenue – Enclose Porch.

This c. 1938 brick one and one half story house has a side porch that was previously enclosed. A series of slider windows will be removed and replaced with windows which match the house. There will be neither change to footprint nor roof.

Applicant Comments: Contractor Mike Randal said he is having a very hard time matching all the elements of the brick but he is still looking. If matching can't happen he would like to use lapped wood siding that exists in the dormers.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* – Additions, Mr. Dahnert made a MOTION to APPROVE the closing in of the side porch with either matching brick or siding to match that found in the dormers, windows

match front windows both in configuration, alignment, if siding is used maintain appropriate sub sill. Ms. Rush seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, EGAN, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, OWNENS, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: ENCLOSE SIDE PORCH APPROVED.

Application: 1114 Belgrave Place – Rear Porch Addition.

A rear screened porch addition was approved in the past but the Certificate has expired. This application is the same as before – a rear porch that wraps to the side due to a large side yard. Standing seam metal is the roof material.

Applicant Comments: Architect John Fryday answered a question about the choice of roofing saying that metal roofs exist on the street and slate would be too expensive.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* – Additions, Mr. Egan made a MOTION to APPROVE the screened porch plans with one addition – beam will be added. Ms. Highfill seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, EGAN, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, OWENS, RUSH

DECISION: REAR SCREENED PORCH APPROVED (AGAIN) WITH ADDITION OF BEAM.

Application: 1200 Myrtle Avenue – Drive/Parking.

This new duplex is located at the corner of Myrtle Avenue and Templeton Avenue. Though it has been completed for several years, this unit facing Myrtle has never sold. Now a potential buyer makes the sale contingent upon being able to add parking. The lot is not wide enough to accommodate a driveway on the side of the house. And the existing drive is dedicated to the other unit. This proposal is for a drive to come off Templeton and nose up to the unit in its side yard, not encroaching on the front yard of the other half.

FOR/AGAINST: Nancy Berger, mother of the potential buyer, said parking is very limited on the street.

MOTION: Based on exception warranted by extenuating circumstances of lot and ownership of parking to *Policy & Design Guidelines* – Parking, Ms. Glennon made

a MOTION to APPROVE in CONCEPT a single 12-13' wide drive of a permeable surface. Commission will see plans that include an arborist's opinion regarding protection parameters of the existing trees. Ms. Rush seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, EGAN, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, OWENS, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: SINGLE DRIVEWAY APPROVED IN CONCEPT.

Mr. Nick Presti has a proposed development project that is proposed just outside the Plaza Midwood Local Historic boundary. A portion of Phase 2 will be in the historic district but will not be built until Phase 1 is selling. He wants the entire project to look cohesive and has asked the HDC to take a look and give an opinion of the elevations that have been developed. Some comments: (1) Put Kilgo Way through in the beginning, (2) elevations have a "beachy" look, (3) make more contextual regarding the neighborhood, (4) there should be other ways to deal with a retention pond – suggest LID, (5) think about alleyways.

Mr. Duffy said he has seen David Furman's redevelopment plan for the Strawn Apartments site in Dilworth and it looks good.

Ms. Owens reminded all of the wine and cheese social at the McNinch house on August 30.

The Minutes were approved and the direction was given that for any corrections or changes, notify Ms. Birmingham. Mr. Egan did report one mistake that Ms. Birmingham will correct before posting to the website.

The meeting adjourned at 5:34 pm with a meeting length of two hours and twenty eight minutes.

Wanda Birmingham

Secretary to the Historic District Commission