

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES

November 10, 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. Meg Nealon
Ms. Paula Owens
Mr. Dominick Ristaino, Vice Chair

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ms. Karen Rush
Mr. Curtis Watkins

OTHERS PRESENT: Mr. John Rogers, Administrator

Historic District Commission

Ms. Wanda Birmingham, Secretary to the

Historic District Commission

Ms. Terrie Hagler-Gray

Assistant City Attorney

Mr. Thomas Powers

Assistant City Attorney

Mr. Mujeeb Shah-Kahn

Assistant City Attorney

With a quorum present Ms. George called the regular November meeting to order at 3:08 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. Mr. Ristaino 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, member 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 members

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 the meeting.

Index of Addresses:	1516 Merriman Avenue	Wilmore
	1824 South Mint Street	Wilmore
	2100 Charlotte Drive	Dilworth
	524 East Worthington Ave.	Dilworth

Application: 1516 Merriman Avenue – Façade Changes.

This application was recently deferred for further design study and additional drawings. This house was a side-by-side duplex with twin front doors beneath small gables – each with its own front stoop. A previous owner applied vinyl siding and covered over the left front door as part of a conversion to this becoming a single family house. The Commission last discussed adding a window where the door once existed and possibly connecting the stoop floors to become one terrace across the front with a shed roof connecting the two dormers.

Applicant Comments: Owner Charles Dibiazue said he recently bought the house with this conversion already underway. He said he can add a single window where the door once was which will match others on the house. The two sets of steps can be removed and a set of center steps can be added.

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. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE the application based on a drawing to staff which shows: handrail, window detail, roof details, concrete repair, erase the word "future" on back door. Mr. Egan seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, EGAN, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, NEALON, OWNES, RISTAINO

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: CHANGES APPROVED WITH REVISED PLANS TO STAFF.

Application: 1824 South Mint Street – Renovation.

This is the old store building at Mint Street and West Worthington Avenue. The owner intends to renovate this gutted structure into a single family house. Plans were recently reviewed by the Commission and deferred for some changes and adjustments to be made to the plans. Revised plans show a masonry chimney, simplified and organized fenestration, deck/entrance and porch on the right side. This building is under Code Enforcement for Demolition due to the deteriorated condition. The Housing Appeals Board has this on hold until the HDC decision.

Applicant Comments: Owner Mark Santo explained that the chimney was removed because it was being pushed inward from the roadwork done by the City. German siding will be reused and matched. The building will be leveled out on the inside eliminating the stress of jacking up the exterior walls. Mr. Santo said he has already invested a lot of money into this building and he wants to renovate this building. His timeline has been a direct result of a failed real estate market. The plan is to start immediately after approval. This may be the last building of its kind remaining in Charlotte.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighbor Mat Miller said much needs to be replaced. Neighbors are concerned that the HDC process is being used as a delay tactic when tearing it down and rebuilding it would be a better plan.

MOTION: Based on the need for finalized plans, Mr. Dahnert made a MOTION to APPROVE in concept the renovation plans with wooden windows and a masonry chimney to show on revised plans for future Commission review. Mr. Egan seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, EGAN, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, NEALON, OWNES, RISTAINO

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: RENOVATION APPROVED IN CONCEPT.

Mr. Dahnert declared a conflict as a neighbor and recused himself for the next application.

Application: 2100 Charlotte Drive – Addition.

Addition plans for this c. 1935 house include changing out a flat roof over a 1978 enclosed back porch to a hipped roof. This new roof would also encompass a rear facing gable on the second floor.

Applicant Comments: Owner Bob Rondeau said a hipped roof would make the roof mass seem less as it recedes away when one is looking up at it.

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

MOTION: Based on the need for further design study regarding a gabled roof, and the need for completed drawings of the entire elevation which show appropriate column detailing and windows and doors and gutters and gutter board, Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to DEFER the application. Ms. Nealon seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, EGAN, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, NEALON, OWENS, RISTAINO

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DEFERRED.

Application: 524 East Worthington Avenue - Addition.

A three story (including basement) addition is proposed for this c. 1911 house. Shingles will side the entire addition and a unique flare detail on the house will be copied on the new addition. Other details including brackets, overhang, soffit/fascia treatment, windows, doors, roof pitch will match existing.

Applicant Comments: Architect Kent Lineberger pointed out that more than one half the surrounding homes have a second story sitting up on top. All the programmatic needs of the clients are being met on the rear of the house. The second story addition sits well back from the front of the house. He answered that he could shift an off center peak to line up with the existing gable but feels this would not be seen from the street anyway because it is so far back. The fall off of the lot is being used as an advantage by adding living space in a basement on the rear.

MOTION: Based on the need for further design study of ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions*** regarding scale, size, massing, and context, Ms. Nealon made a MOTION to DEFER the application. Mr. Duffy seconded.

VOTE: 8/2 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, NEALON, RISTAINO

NAYS: EGAN, OWENS

DECISION: APPLICATION DEFERRED FOR FURTHER DESIGN STUDY TO REDUCE SIZE OF ADDITION.

- Mr. Rogers went through the meeting agenda, showing electronically how the packets will arrive to Commissioners in the future. Each agenda item will be a link that can be viewed and manipulated to see details and additional information. In December a packet will be mailed for the last time and the electronic version will be also available. In January the packets will be emailed with not paper version mailed.
- Mr. Rogers was asked to correct and update the roster on the internet.
- Mr. Rogers was asked to make past approved changes to the ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** and to get notebooks to Commissioners.

The meeting adjourned at 5:28 pm with a meeting length of 2 hours and 20 minutes.

Wanda Birmingham, Secretary to the Historic District Commission