

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES

January 30, 2013

MEMBERS PRESENT:           Dr. Lily Corbus  
                                      Mr. Roger Dahnert  
                                      Mr. Don Duffy  
                                      Mr. Tom Egan  
                                      Ms. I-Mei Ervin  
                                      Ms. Mary Ellen George, Chair  
                                      Ms. Debra Glennon, Second Vice Chair  
                                      Mr. Tom Low  
                                      Mr. Dominick Ristaino, Vice Chair  
                                      Ms. Lisa Yarbrough

MEMBERS ABSENT:           Mr. Bradley Norvell  
                                      One Vacancy

OTHERS PRESENT:           Mr. John Rogers, Administrator of the Historic District Commission  
                                      Ms. Wanda Birmingham, Secretary to the Historic District Commission  
                                      Mr. Thomas Assistant City Attorney

With a quorum present Vice Chairman Ristaino called the rescheduled January meeting of the Historic District Commission to order at 3:11 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. Ristaino 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 discuss the project. Next members of the audience will be asked if anyone present wishes to speak either FOR or AGAAINST the application. Again there will be an opportunity for comments and questions from the Commission the applicant. The second part of 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. Mr. Ristaino 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 the meeting.

Ms. George arrived.

Index of Addresses:	231 West Park Avenue	Wilmore
	307 East Boulevard	Dilworth
	400 East Boulevard	Dilworth
	917 Berkeley Avenue	Dilworth
	747 Romany Road	Dilworth
	611 North Pine Street	Fourth Ward
	1122 Buchanan Street	Dilworth
	612 East Tremont Avenue	Dilworth

Application: 231 West Park Avenue – Addition.

An application for a second story addition was recently deferred. Design Review was offered and accepted to help with further design study. This is a small, wood sided house with a hipped roof. Revised plans show a cross gable behind existing roof ridge for a full two story rear addition, new rear hip will tie below new ridge, details include exposed rafter tails, 18” overhang, brackets, siding to match existing. Board and batten siding will occur in gable ends.

Design Review Report: Mr. Duffy reported that the revisions show an organized intentional plan. One thing....there needs to be a definite transition between board and batten siding and the lapped wood.

Mr. Low reported that cornerboards will be necessary on the new second floor. He suggested adding a 10" entablature at the board and batten and lapped wood convergence.

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, Materials**, Mr. Ristaino made a MOTION to APPROVE (note: front gables match new side ones, siding will be wood, STDL windows). Mr. Dahnert seconded.

VOTE: 9/0                      AYES: CORBUS, DAHNERT, DUFFY, EGAN, ERVIN, GEORGE, GLENNON, LOW, RISTAINO

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: SECOND STORY ADDITION APPROVED.

---

Application: 307 East Boulevard – Signage.

This c. 1900 original Queen Ann is a Historic Landmark. It has long been a non residential use and new tenants propose a sign to identify their business. It is an 18 ½ square foot box whose letters will glow from within. **Policy & Design Guidelines** say 10 square feet is the allowance for a single tenant occupation. Lighting is defined as exterior fixtures (spots or goose neck). The application is asking for an exception to both the size and back lighting.

Applicant Comments: Owner Mr. Michelson said they want the sign to reflect their business not the house.

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

MOTION: Based on the Commission's need for a better grasp of how the sign will actually fit and look, Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to DEFER with the suggestion that a full size mock up (a piece of board or cardboard) be placed in the yard for staff to photograph and applicants will investigate and submit spectrum of light information. Mr. Egan seconded.

VOTE: 9/0                      AYES: CORBUS, DAHNERT, DUFFY, EGAN, ERVIN, GEORGE, GLENNON, LOW, RISTAINO

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: SIGNAGE APPLICATION DEFERRED.

---

400 East Boulevard – Signage.

The new owner of what we know as the large old Raycom building is the Charlotte Housing Authority. The signage plan is for a lit logo and CHA on the building directly over the main entrance.

Applicant Comments: Architect John Fryday said the sign needs to be lit and visible at night due to night classes and the need to be able to see the entrance. The big '400' has been moved to the ends of the building.

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

MOTION: Based on the scale of the building, and the fact that it is open at night, Mr. Dahnert made a MOTION to Approve the back lit sign. Ms. Yarbrough seconded.

VOTE: 9/0                      AYES: CORBUS, DAHNERT, DUFFY, EGAN, ERVIN, GEORGE, GLENNON, LOW, RISTAINO

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: SIGNAGE APPROVED.

---

Mr. Duffy removed himself from the Commission and was sworn in to become the applicant for the next application. Mr. Powers received an affirmation from the Commission that no preferential treatment to Mr. Duffy would be given.

---

Application: 917 Berkeley Avenue – Replace Garage.

This two story brick c. 1937 Tudor detailed house has a deteriorated one story garage that sits very close to the property line. It is not big enough to park two cars. The adjacent garage is also close to its property line, leaving scarcely room to park a roll-out between the two adjacent walls. The plan is to demolish the existing garage and build a new 1 ½ story garage in compliance with setbacks of today. It will be brick, with board and batten and stucco on the second floor. Stair way to ½ story will be interior.

Applicant Comments: Architect Don Duffy explained that the garage is at the end of its useful life: doesn't function as a two car garage, is in violation of today's Code, can not be renovated due to location/Code, has no foundation, deteriorated materials and water damage. The plan is to move the location of a new garage over to get some space between the garages, and gain some storage above. Details will match house and the new garage will align with the face of the adjacent garage. Owners will continue to share the drive.

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

MOTION: Based on photographs and testimony given, Mr. Dahnert made a MOTION to APPROVE DEMOLITION of the existing dilapidated garage. Mr. Egan seconded.

VOTE: 8/0                      AYES: CORBUS, DAHNERT, EGAN, ERVIN, GEORGE, GLENNON, LOW, RISTAINO  
NAYS: NONE

MOTION: Based on compliance with **Policy & Design Guidelines – Accessory Structures**, Mr. Egan made a MOTION to APPROVE the new garage as drawn. Dr. Corbus seconded.

VOTE: 9/0                      AYES: CORBUS, DAHNERT, DUFFY, EGAN, ERVIN, GEORGE, GLENNON, LOW, RISTAINO  
NAYS: NONE

DECISION:                  EXISTING GARAGE WILL BE DEMOLISHED AND NEW GARAGE IS APPROVED.

---

Application:     747 Romany Road – Window Replacement.

This c. 1956 house overlooks Latta Park. The application to replace the windows was deferred last month for additional photographs of the rear and a former rear addition. The house has an unusual 3 horizontal panes of glass window pattern. The owner would like to replace the existing windows on the original part of the house with traditional 1/1 double hung windows. The addition and house do not match now.

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

MOTION:                  Based on the need to see a drawing of head/jamb/sill and a window sample, Mr. Dahnert made a MOTION to DEFER. Mr. Egan seconded.

VOTE: 9/0                      AYES: CORBUS, DAHNERT, DUFFY, EGAN, ERVIN, GEORGE, GLENNON, LOW, RISTAINO

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DEFERRED.

---

Mr. Dahnert left at 5:45 pm and was not present for the remainder of the meeting.

---

Mr. Egan left at 6 pm and was not present for the remainder of the meeting.

---

Application: 611 North Pine Street – New Construction.

This site in the Fourth Ward is a lot that has been vacant for decades. It is a deep lot that goes from single family on Pine Street to butt up to multi family projects which face Graham Street on the rear. The plan is for two High Victorian detailed duplex townhomes. Both buildings face Pine Street though one is up close and the other is pushed to the back and only partially visible from the street. They are mirror image units with garages and parking.

Applicant Comments: Architect Angie Lauer explained that these urban infill homes are condominiums not town homes. She has used materials found in the neighborhood and they are historically appropriate. The buildings are consistent with each other. The multi layering is a very period appropriate treatment. In response to a comment from staff, parking spaces were moved out of the front setback of the front unit onto the side but they would prefer leaving the greenspace on the side and moving them back to the front. Plain sides of a building are appropriate for the High Victorian style and are already seen in the neighborhood. Paving will be the Fourth Ward Pavers.

FOR/AGAINST: Adjacent Property Owner Dennis Rash offered suggestions to this project and history of Fourth Ward's redevelopment in general.

MOTION: Based on compliance with **Policy & Design Guidelines New Construction**, Dr. Corbus made a MOTION to APPROVE the rear building (Victoria by name) with revised plans for staff to review which show joined windows, detailed garage door, banding on bay. Ms. Ervin seconded.

VOTE: 8/0                      AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, ERVIN, GEORGE, GLENNON, LOW, RISTAINO

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: VICTORIA DEFERRED FOR STAFF TO REVIEW FINAL PLAN REVISIONS.

---

MOTION: Based on the need for further design study of front unit (Victor by name) re execution of High Victorian details, a streetscape exhibit, fence detail, photographs, measurements, off street parking study (one space acceptable on site) Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to DEFER. Ms. Ervin seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, ERVIN, GEORGE, GLENNON, LOW, RISTAINO

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: VICTOR DEFERRED. Mr. Ristaino declared a conflict of interest for the next application and removed himself from the Commission.

---

Mr. Duffy said he could be objective and unbiased even though he had talked with the owners of the next project early on in their process. Mr. Powers asked him questions to which Mr. Duffy answered: He has no knowledge of the present drawings. He has no prejudice over not being hired as the Architect. The applicant said he is fine with Mr. Duffy remaining on the Commission. The Commission said Mr. Duffy may review and vote on the next application.

---

Application: 1122 Buchanan Street – Addition.

This is a story and one half house on the side street beside St. Patrick's Cathedral. It sits up on a hill. The plans call for a front facing gable over the front door and a shed dormer to the right of the new gable. A clipped cross gable will create the new second floor living space. Materials and details will match existing house.

Applicant Comments: Architect John Fryday said it is a tight site. The house is less than 4' off the property line and the addition is pulled in to accommodate the setback. All the windows on the ground floor remain. A rear porch shows but the final decision regarding open/screen has yet to be determined.

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 final details of the new front gable and new shed dormer, Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to DEFER these details while acknowledging that overall mass, scale, sides ,rear show no problem. Ms. Yarbrough seconded.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, ERVIN, GEORGE, GLENNON, LOW,

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DEFERRED.

---

Application: 612 East Tremont Avenue – Addition.

This c. 1915 house has been altered over the years. One thing is that a front porch was enclosed and a small stoop is the entry. The plan is to add a new full front porch with piers and columns supporting the roof. The front door will be centered, a window to match others on the house will be added to right of front door, and a new walk will connect to the street. The new porch will extend into the front setback and a variance will be necessary to build this.

Applicant Comments: Architect Gray Stout said other houses line up with the thermal wall and it will be necessary to gain an additional three feet in a variance to make this project possible. The request is for new brick to be painted to match the house.

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

MOTION: Based on the appropriateness of a full front porch and compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions***, Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to approve a front porch and send a letter of endorsement for a variance of 3.5 feet. Ms. Ervin seconded.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, ERVIN, GEORGE, GLENNON, LOW, RISTAINO

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: PORCH APPROVED. LETTER OF SUPPORT WILL GO TO ZBA.

---

- December Minutes were unanimously approved with the usual direction to report any changes or corrections to Mrs. Birmingham.

With business completed the meeting adjourned at 7:05 pm for a meeting length of three hours and 54 minutes.

---

Wanda Birmingham, Secretary to the Historic District Commission