



CHARLOTTE

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES

November 13, 2013

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Tim Bender
Mr. Don Duffy
Mr. Tom Egan, Chair
Ms. Debra Glennon, 2nd Vice Chair
Ms. Karen Labovitz
Ms. Mattie Marshall
Mr. Brad Norvell
Mr. Dominick Ristaino, Vice Chair
Ms. Lisa Yarbrough

MEMBERS ABSENT: Dr. Lili Corbus
Mr. Roger Dahnert
Ms. I-Mei Ervin

OTHERS PRESENT: Mr. John Howard, Administrator
Historic District Commission
Ms. Wanda Birmingham, Assistant Administrator
Historic District Commission
Ms. Linda Keich, Clerk to the
Historic District Commission
Mr. Thomas Powers, Assistant City Attorney

Mr. Egan called to order the Regular November meeting of the Historic District Commission at 3:05 pm. He began the meeting by introducing the Staff and Commissioners and explaining the procedure. All interested parties who planned to give testimony – pro or con – must have completed a blue form and must be sworn in. An HDC Staff member will present an outline and description of the proposal and its impact on the subject property and the district's integrity. HDC Staff will then make a Staff recommendation and/or suggestion regarding the application. The Commission may question the Applicant and Staff may question the Applicant. The Applicant may present sworn witnesses who will be subject to questioning by the Commission and Staff. Other interested parties wishing to speak – pro or con – will be given

reasonable time to present sworn testimony. The Applicant will be given an opportunity to respond to comments by interested parties. After hearing each application, the Commission will review and discuss the information and evidence gathered and: consider and adopt a Motion for Approval, Deferral, or Denial and adopt Findings of Fact. Interested parties may remain present during the deliberations but may not address the Commission. All exhibits remain with the Commission. If an Applicant feels there is a conflict of interest of any Commissioner or an association that would be prejudicial, it will be revealed at the beginning of the hearing of a particular case. The Commission is acting in a quasi-judicial capacity for purposes of the hearing and can accept only sworn testimony. Staff will give a synopsis of any additional comments received. While the Commission will not specifically exclude hearsay evidence, it is only given limited weight. Appeal from the Historic District Commission is to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. One has sixty (60) days from the date of the issuance or notification of Denial within which to appeal. This is in accordance with Section 10.213 of the City Code. In order to receive a written copy of the decision of the Board, one MUST FILE A WRITTEN REQUEST for a copy of the Commission’s decision by completing the form. This form must be filed with the Commission’s Clerk at the time of the hearing. Mr. Egan asked that everyone please turn to silent operation any electronic devices. Commissioners are asked to announce, for the record, if one leaves or arrives during the meeting.

Index of Addresses:	1611 Mimosa Avenue	Plaza Midwood
	405 East Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
	323 Rensselaer Avenue	Dilworth
	1701 Park Road	Dilworth
	601 Mount Vernon Avenue	Dilworth
	2309 Dilworth Road West	Dilworth

John Howard stated we had three cases that fell off the agenda

- 1936 Park Road – This will be approved administratively
- 1700 Heathcliff, This will go before City Council for Demolition and then back to the Historic District Commission
- 1315 Lexington Avenue- They are correcting the height to that was shows on the approved plans.

Application: 1611 Mimosa Avenue – Façade Change.

The existing home is a 1 and one half story Cape Cod style which was built in 1950. Adjacent structures are primarily similar in size single family homes of various styles.

At the Special October Meeting an application for an upper addition and a rear addition and a front porch addition was approved with the condition that the dormers in the front roof plane remain (and not be removed as requested). New information from the applicant is that

the dormers are not original and poorly constructed. This application is for the removal of the dormers only.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission shall determine whether the dormers should remain based on evidence presented by the applicant.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* – Mr. Duffy made a motion to approve as submitted. Ms. Yarbrough seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: BENDER, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON, LABOVITZ, MARSHALL,
NORVELL, RISTAINO, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: DORMER REMOVAL APPROVED AS SUBMITTED.

APPLICATION: 405 East Tremont - New Construction.

Based on the need for more information the New Construction portion of the application was deferred in October for additional information: (1) site plan, (2) an exhibit which clearly shows existing vs. proposed, (3) all wood materials, (4) accurate topo exhibit, (5) clearly noted details, (6) plans that match elevations, (7) streetscape exhibit, (8) tree protection plan, (9) material samples if other than wood. The Stay of Demolition clock was ticking since September. Ms. Glennon seconded

The subject property is a one story brick duplex built in 1950. It is identified as a Non Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. Adjacent structures along the block include a matching duplex and various types of one and two story single family homes. Setbacks along the block are generally consistent.

The proposal is for the construction of a new one and half story home. Details of the home include:

- Brick foundation
- Paired columns
- Full width front porch, 7' in depth
- Traditional style windows within Policy
- Wood siding
- Exposed rafter tails
- Wood details and trim - columns, railing, pickets, brackets, corner boards
- Cedar accent siding on the gables and dormers

Based on comments from October a revised site plan has been submitted including plans that show setbacks along the street. A streetscape drawing with heights of adjacent structures has been provided. A letter from an arborist outlines the tree protection plan. Samples of the brick and window details have been submitted. The revised elevations include additional dimensions. The primary materials are brick and wood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff believes the proposal meets the Guidelines for Size, Scale, Massing, Fenestration, Materials, Rhythm, Setback, Landscaping and Context.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood Resident John Phares asked what took so long to ask for demolition. He commended the applicant on the street scape exhibits saying they are very clear. He agreed with the commission on fenestration change, roof slope, but questioned the 70' length of the house.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* – New Construction, Mr. Ristaino made a motion to approve with revisions to go to staff for possible approval: 1) thicken window sill to historically accurate, 2) soffit details, 3) wall section exhibit, 4) rear redesign.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: BENDER, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON, LABOVITZ, MARSHALL, NORVELL, RISTAINO, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED WITH REVISIONS TO STAFF

APPLICATION: 323 Rensselaer Avenue – Renovation/Addition.

Based on the need for more information this application was deferred in October for exhibits which show:

1) existing elevations vs. proposed , 2) demo plans, 3) dimensions, 4) streetscape, 5) details of materials and application, 6) setbacks, 7) black lines – better graphics.

This property is a single story house constructed in 1905 with a gable roof and full width front porch supported by two columns. The site has a significant slope from front to back and is adjacent to an office development facing East Boulevard and a renovated single family home on the other side. The existing siding appears to be wood shingles. Existing homes along the street are 1 and 1.5 story bungalow type designs. Mature trees do not exist on the property

The proposal is a renovation of the entire home including the foundation repair and expansion. Additional interior space will be captured with three new shed dormers on one

side, and a new gable including a small addition to the first floor at the rear. The existing front gable will be raised approximately two feet. One existing exterior chimney will be repaired and the second chimney removed. The front porch will be redesigned, adding two columns and new wood decking. Windows will be replaced with 3/1 and 2/1 design windows. The applicant is also proposing to remove the existing siding and replace with a cedar shake and board and batten material and salvage brick from the existing home and reuse it where he can.

Based on comments from October the applicant has submitted revised elevation drawings to show the amount of change to the existing structure including dimensions. Exterior materials will be a combination of cedar shake siding to match current style and reclaimed brick for the foundation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff states the project meets the Guidelines for Fenestration, Massing, Size, Scale and Context. Details to consider are Materials. The guidelines for setback and landscaping are not applicable.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood Resident John Phares was concerned that what is proposed is uncharacteristic of a bungalow. He was also concerned about massing on left side and the proposed metal roofs

MOTION: Mr. Norvell made a motion to defer with revised plans to show: 1) roof pitch maintained, 2) revised dormers stepped back, 3) work with what is there, 4) correct material notes and application thereof, 5) symmetry - match Left and Right sides . Mr. Duffy seconded.

VOTE: 4/5 AYES: DUFFY, MARSHALL, NORVELL, RISTAINO

NAYS: BENDER, EGAN, GLENNON, LABOVITZ, YARBROUGH

MOTION FAILED

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines- Additions* Mr. Bender made a motion to DENY this application.

VOTE: 5/4 AYES: BENDER, EGAN, GLENNON, LABOVITZ, YARBROUGH

NAYS: DUFFY, MARSHALL, NORVELL, RISTAINO

DECISION: APPLICATION DENIED

APPLICATION: 1701 Park Road – New Construction

This is a c. 1920 house and is identified as a contributing structure in the National Register of Historic Places Inventory. It appears as it has for many years but the understanding is that it

is completely gutted to the exterior walls and basically abandoned for eight years. Demolition was requested in April and a 365 Day Stay of Demolition was imposed. This property does qualify for Preservation Tax Credits . It is a one and one half story Colonial Revival design with balanced facade fenestration and a covered center entrance. The exterior is wood shingle siding. The home is set back slightly from the adjacent homes on either side.

The proposal is to demolish the existing home and construct a new 2 story dwelling.

The proposed project is a new two story home on a lot that slopes downward from right to left. The front setback will be in alignment with adjacent homes. The overall height of the home is 31'-9" measured from the finished floor to the ridge. The adjacent homes are approximately 18'-7" and 30'-10" as noted on the plans, measured from the finished floor. The front façade features a large gable that centers the home, a smaller gable offset to the left and opposing gables on the side elevations. The front porch has stone piers with tapered columns supporting the roof. Windows are 3 over 1. Access to the garage is through a porte cochere that has conditioned space above it. Siding is a combination of cedar shake on the lower level and 'board and batten' on the upper levels. The left elevation introduces a chimney. Trim banding is continued on all sides. The roof features exposed rafter ends.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Howard stated the Commission will make a determination as to whether or not this house fits with the descending height order of the street. The Commission will discuss style and application of materials.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood Resident Tamara Titus expressed concern over another Contributing structure being lost. She also talked about the size being inappropriate and stated it is twice the size of the adjacent houses.

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* - New Construction, Mr. Duffy made a motion to deny this application based on Size, Scale, Massing. Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 9/0
AYES: BENDER, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON,
LABOVITZ, MARSHALL, NORVELL, RISTAINO, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DENIED.

APPLICATION: 601 Mount Vernon Avenue- Additions

The subject property is a split level home built in 1954. Several alterations have occurred to the home including the brick being painted and a large shed dormer added to the front and

mismatched windows on the main structure. The house sits on a corner lot with the driveway access from Euclid Avenue. Adjacent structures along the street are primarily two story of various designs. Setbacks along the subject block face are generally consistent.

In September the proposed additions include a bathroom and front porch, an attached garage and deck on the rear, a covered patio, second floor balcony to the rear, a breakfast nook to the rear and cedar shake siding to replace the existing metal siding. The new room additions will be clad in cementitious siding.

The application was denied in September 2013. Before deliberating on the current project the Commission must determine if the applicant has made substantial changes from the previous plan. Based on the current submittal the following revisions have been made:

1. The front addition has been changed to a full width porch, keeping the streetscape consistent
2. A detached garage has substituted the two car attached garage
3. The windows on the front shed dormer will be replaced with 6 over 1 windows
4. The size and mass of the primary structure has been reduced by detaching the garage
5. 6 over 1 windows are being introduced all around the house

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Howard stated the revised plans are more sensitive to the streetscape on both sides and project details such as fenestration and materials are consistent. The overall size, scale massing rhythm and setback of the home have been improved and contextually appropriate to the immediate area. Based on the changes in response to Commission concerns from September, Staff believes this project has met the Substantial Change criteria.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood Resident Chris had questions about the garage.

Neighborhood Resident John Phares asked questions about the house.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* - Additions, Mr. Ristaino made a motion to APPROVE with revisions to come to staff for possible approval: 1) columns to match up to boxing, 2) 1 ½" to 2" sills, 3) 5/4" quarter trim, 4) windows within policy, 5) hinge of garage dormers below ridge, 6) porch floor correct material, 7) drip edge over window and, 8) trim band. Ms. Labovitz seconded.

VOTE: 9/0

AYES: BENDER, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON,
LABOVITZ, MARSHALL, NORVELL, RISTAINO, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED WITH REVISIONS TO STAFF.

APPLICATION: 2309 Dilworth Road West- Second Story Addition

The existing home is a one story cottage style home with full brick façade, centralized entrance, and balanced window pattern. The home was constructed in 1947 and is not identified as a Contributing structure in the National Register Survey. The setbacks are consistent along the block face with adjacent homes that are one and one and one half stories in height.

This proposal is for an addition that would add a full second story from the front thermal wall to the rear of the house. The side walls will remain in line. The façade will undergo several changes including a relocated entrance, gable redesign and relocation, new window design and arrangement and a deeper porch with more traditionally designed columns. The chimney would be extended relative to the addition, which is approximately 5'-8" taller than the existing ridge to proposed ridge. The side elevations introduce an asymmetrical gable toward the front. Windows are primarily 4 over 1 of various sizes. The rear of the home steps down to a covered porch. Materials consist of brick, wood lap siding and wood shingles.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Howard reported that the proposal meets zoning requirements for setback and yards. The proposed footprint also appears to be consistent with other homes in the area. The massing of the home is improved with the addition of front and rear porches, side gables and stepping down part of the rear. The arrangement of windows assists in establishing the rhythm of the façade and overall massing. Windows on the side elevations in some instances may not be proportionate or may be out of rhythm. The overall size and scale of the home is inconsistent with the existing character of the street. However, two story homes exist in the Dilworth Local Historic District adjacent to one or one and one half story homes.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood Tamara Titus spoke in opposition stating the only thing going for this project that it is a Non-Contributing structure.

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* - Additions, Mr. Ristaino made a motion to deny this application based on Size, Scale, Massing and Context. Ms. Glennon seconded

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: BENDER, DUFFY, EGAN, GLENNON, LABOVITZ, MARSHALL, NORVELL, RISTAINO, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DENIED.

OTHER BUSINESS

- Information was given to the Commissioners about their attendance.
- Attorney Powers stated he and John and Wanda are working on the Policies and Procedures that gives them permission to go out and research the properties that come before them.
- Minutes for two October Minutes were approved unanimously with the usual direction to report any changes or corrections to Ms. Keich.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 pm with a meeting length of five hours and fifty five minutes.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission