

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES

December 10, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Mr. Don Duffy Mr. Tom Egan, Chair Mr. James Haden Mr. Rodric Lenhart Ms. Mattie Marshall Mr. Dominick Ristaino, Vice Chair Mr. Michael Sullivan Ms. Tamara Titus, Second Vice Chair Ms. Lisa Yarbrough
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Mr. Tim Bender Dr. Lili Corbus
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 Court Reporters

Chairman Mr. Egan calle Commission at 3:05 pm. He beg the procedure. All interested pa blue form and must be sworn in proposed project. HDC Staff wil **& Design Guidelines.** The Comr sworn witnesses who will be sut wishing to speak – pro or con – v

[Type a quote from the document or the summary of an interesting point. You can position the text box anywhere in the document. Use the Drawing Tools tab to change the formatting of the pull quote text box.] of the Historic District d Commissioners and explaining on – must have completed a sent a description of the on compliance with the **Policy** nt. The Applicant may present I Staff. Other interested parties rorn testimony. The Applicant

will be given an opportunity to respond to comments by interested parties. After hearing each application, the Commission will review, discuss, and consider the information that has been gathered and presented. A Motion for Approval, Continuation, or Denial will be made. All exhibits remain with the Commission. If an Applicant feels there is a conflict of interest of any Commissioner or there is an association that would be prejudicial, it will be revealed at the beginning of the hearing of a particular case. The Commission is a quasi-judicial body and can accept only sworn testimony. Staff will report 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 Approval or Denial to appeal. This is in accordance with Section 10.213 of the City Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Ristaino 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. Mr. Ristaino said that those in the audience must be quiet during the hearings. He will ask once that an audience member be quiet and the need for a second request will be removal from the room.

Index of Addresses:	CONTINUED APPLICATIONS			
	HDC 2014-226 704 East Park Avenue	Dilworth		
	HDC 2014-229 1940 Park Road	Dilworth		
	HDC 2014-233 1125 Belgrave Place	Dilworth		
	HDC 2014-234 1613 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore		
	NEW APPLICATIONS			
	HDC 2014-212 824 Park Avenue	Dilworth		
	HDC 2014-252 1309 Lexington Avenue	Dilworth		
	HDC 2014-256 1508 School Street	Plaza Midwood		
	HDC 2014-262 2114 Dilworth Road East	Dilworth		
	HDC 2014-266 400 Hermitage Court	Hermitage Court		
	HDC 2014-267 318 W. 8 th Street	Fourth Ward		
	HDC 2014-268 1712 Euclid Avenue	Dilworth		
	HDC 2014-271 1511 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood		

APPLICATION: HDC 2014-226 – 704 East Park Avenue – Addition.

This application was continued from November for the following revisions: 1) Rear yard open space calculation, 2) Ridge Height, 3) False side window treatment, 4) Adjacent setbacks, 5) Tree replacement location, and 6) Material Notes.

This is a c. 1942 one story brick house overlooking Latta Park. The front door is recessed from the front thermal wall and to the far right. The roof is a side to side cross gable. This house is listed as Non-Contributing in the Dilworth National Register Survey (most likely because it was not quite 50 years old when the Survey was done in the mid-1980s).

Proposal-September 10, 2014

Additions include a large front facing gable entered over two pair of windows (existing bay window will be removed and replaced with the two pair of windows). Existing windows to the left of the front will be removed and replaced with another two pair of windows. A pair of windows will be added in new front facing gable. All windows will match each other in a pattern of 4 vertical over one. A small shed dormer will be centered over the left pair of windows. A hipped roof front porch will be added across the front and beneath the new gable, Porch roof will be supported by wooden columns atop brick piers. The pitch of the right side gable will be increased to accommodate the new second floor. One story hipped roof rear addition will extend into back yard. Left elevation has a new gable to accommodate second floor. All new siding will be shakes. New windows provide a unified style.

Revised Proposal – November 12, 2014

The application is resubmitted before the 6 month rule based on substantial redesign from the denied application. A summary of the changes to reflect less-ornate 1940s era houses include:

- 1. Front Elevation
 - a. Lower front gable.

- b. Window light pattern and details reflect existing.
- c. Less detailed roof. Includes duplication of dentil mold from existing structure.
- d. Gable material changed to brick.
- 2. Side Elevations
 - a. Single gable changed to offset gables.
 - b. Gable material changed to brick and wood lap siding.
 - c. Window light pattern and details reflect existing.
 - d. Simplified porch columns.
- 3. Rear Elevation
 - a. Siding material changed to wood lap.
 - b. Window light pattern and design reflects existing.

The applicant is also requesting the removal of a tree in the rear yard and a new brick patio.

Revised Proposal – December 10, 2014

The following is a summary of the plan revisions:

- 1. Adjacent setbacks included.
- 2. Rear yard open space 76.8%.
- 3. Tree location in the rear yard shown on site plan.
- 4. Ridge height from FFE is approx. 22'-2.5" and 25'-3" from grade, shown as the maximum.
- 5. Left side false window treatment noted.
- 6. Material notes included.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission shall determine if the proposal addresses the unresolved issues and meets the guidelines.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood resident John Phares spoke in opposition.

MOTION: Based on compliance with **Policy & Design Guidelines** – **Addition**, Mr. Ristaino MADE a MOTION to APPROVE 1) similar size, 2) scale is good, 3) Massing proportions are good, 4) Fenestration match, 5) Rhythm is compatible, 6) setbacks good, 7) materials match house, 8) context is similar to the adjacent houses, 9) ceiling porch wood reference slide #6 – average setback. Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 8/1 AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL TITUS, RISTAINO, YARBROUGH

NAYS: SULLIVAN

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

APPLICATION: <u>HDC 2014-229</u>– 1940 Park Road – Porte Cochere Addition

The request for the porte cochere addition was continued for the following revisions: 1) The size of the addition, 2) Side yard setback dimension, 3) Scale is out of proportion with the principal structure.

This c. 1940 one and one half story bungalow is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. It is located beside the traffic circle at Park Road/Tremont Avenue/Brookside Avenue. A rear addition was approved by the Commission September 10, 2014.

Proposal – November 12, 2014

The proposal is the addition of a porte cochere. The addition is connected to the house by a breezeway. Materials (wood) and other design details match the home.

Revised Proposal – December 10, 2014

The following is a summary of the plan revisions:

- 1. The width of the addition is reduced to 12' from 13'.
- 2. The length is reduced to 16' from 27'.
- 3. The roof has been changed to a side facing gable to reflect the principal structure

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission shall determine if the proposal addresses the unresolved issues and meets the guidelines.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood resident Marcia Rowse spoke in opposition.

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with **Policy & Design Guidelines** – **Porte Cochere Additions,** Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to DENY failed to meet 1) size – not site compatible, 2) massing - detracts, 3) setbacks – violates by stepping out front, 4) Ms. Titus it does not meet re context. Ms. Yarbrough seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL SULLIVAN, TITUS, RISTAINO, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR PORTE COCHERE DENIED.

APPLICATION: <u>HDC 2014-234</u> – 1613 Wilmore Avenue – New Construction

This application was continued for: 1) Scale (height of first floor), 2) Context images, 3) Porch depth and ceiling material, 4) Window/ detail and size on side elevations, 5) Wall section and boxing detail, 6) Adjacent setbacks, 7) Gable vents.

Details of Proposed Request

Existing Conditions

The existing property is vacant. Surrounding single family homes are primarily 1 and 1.5 stories. The setback along the subject block is a range of approximately 17' to 20' from the front porch to back of sidewalk. A similar setback condition exists across the street.

Proposal

The proposal is a 1.5 story single family home, a detached garage in the rear yard and removal of a tree in the rear yard. Plan details include:

- 1. 6' front porch
- 2. 21'-11" setback measured from the porch
- 3. Overall height of 27' from FFE. Foundation height approximately 2'-4".
- 4. Wood lap and cedar shake siding
- 5. Wood windows and trim
- 6. Wood roof trim details and brackets
- 7. Tapered columns with brick piers
- 8. T&G porch deck and ceiling
- 9. Garage materials to match home

Revised Proposal – December 10, 2014

The following is a summary of the plan revisions:

- 1. Adjacent setbacks added.
- 2. The first floor height at porch beam is specified as 10'.
- 3. Porch depth is 6'-6" from thermal wall to inside of columns, 8'-6" to outside of column.
- 4. Porch ceiling material is T&G.
- 5. Photos of adjacent structures included.
- 6. Window and wall sections added.
- 7. Window sizes have been changed on side elevations.
- 8. Gable vents added.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission shall determine if the proposal addresses the unresolved issues and meets the guidelines.

FOR/AGAINST: Marcia Rowse spoke in opposition of this case.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Mr. Ristaino made a MOTION to CONTINUE this application for further design study and clarification re: 1) Different Dormer, 2) Pull Back, 3) Fenestration, 4) Siding, 5) Rhythm, 6) Material Details, 7) Rail Details (Historic). Mr. Duffy seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: BENDER, DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, MARSHALL, SULLIVAN, TITUS, RISTAINO, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2014-212 - 824 E. Park Avenue - Addition

Details of Proposed Request

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a 1.5 story brick single family home c. 1941 and listed as a contributing structure. The house sits on a curving street across from Latta Park. Adjacent homes along the block are 1 and 1.5 stories in height. Height of the existing structure is approximately 20'.

Proposal

The proposal is a second story addition, toward the rear of the home, exterior improvements and new patio/driveway. Details of the addition include:

- 1. The second story addition includes an extension of the façade on the far left side to meet thermal wall.
- 2. Approximate height is 26'-8".
- 3. All new brick veneer to match existing.
- 4. Addition of a front shed dormer with metal window well.
- 5. Roof trim details to match existing.
- 6. Second story material includes cedar shake on side and rear elevations.
- 7. New full size STDL windows match existing pattern (6/6) and details.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission shall determine if the proposal meets the Guidelines for additions. The guideline for Setback is not applicable..

FOR/AGAINST:

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information, Mr. Ristaino made a MOTION to CONTINUE for: 1) Size, 2) Scale, 3) Massing – change hinge point to gable 1 shingle lower, 4) fenestration 6/9 or 6/6, 5) metal roof – slightly lower, 6) sub materials – lapped wook, 7) sills – (historic), 8) remove shutters, 9) landscape plan, 10) rear yard calculation. Ms. Titus seconded

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: BENDER, DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, MARSHALL, SULLIVAN, TITUS, RISTAINO, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.

APPLICATION: <u>HDC 2014-256</u> – 1508 School Street – Addition.

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a one story single family home c. 1929. Exterior features include roof brackets, exposed rafter tails, small 'eyebrow' vents and 4/1 windows. Adjacent properties are primarily one story.

Proposal

The proposal is an addition at the rear of the home that will tie into the exiting ridge. A portion of the addition will extend to the right, behind the port cochere and visible from the street. Features of the addition include:

- 1. Exterior materials to match the existing structure.
- 2. Roof details to match existing.
- 3. New full size windows to match existing.
- 4. Additional work includes the removal of a side deck and stoop, construction of a new stoop and repair of existing siding.

RECOMMENDATION: The Commission shall determine if the proposal meets the applicable guidelines for additions.

MOTION: Based on compliance with **Policy & Design Guidelines** – **Addition,** Mr. Duffy MADE a MOTION to APPROVE 1) drop hinge point 6 inches, 2) show HVAC location on site plan, 3) Materials match existing. Mr. Ristaino seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL TITUS, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

APPLICATION: <u>HDC 2014-262</u> – 2114 Dilworth Road E. – Painting of unpainted brick.

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a one story brick home c. 1925 and listed as a contributing structure. The home is not painted.

Proposal

The proposal is to paint the brick exterior due to defects. The applicant has submitted photographs of the existing defects.

RECOMMENDATION: The Commission shall determine if the existing conditions warrant the request for painting the brick exterior.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Mr. Ristaino MADE a MOTION to CONTINUE for A brick expert to go out and give an opinion on whether or not the brick can be repaired. To bring written documentation to the next meeting. Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 8/1 AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: SULLIVAN

BECAUSE OF A CONFLICT OF INTEREST MR. DUFFY RECUSED HIMSELF FROM THIS APPLICATION.

BECAUSE OF A CONFLICT OF INTEREST MS. YARBROUGH RECUSED HERSELF FROM THIS APPLICATION.

APPLICATION: <u>HDC 2014-266</u> – 400 Hermitage Court – Renovation/Redevelopment.

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a two story home constructed in 1999. A proposal to renovate the home was approved by the HDC July 9, 2014 as part of a larger redevelopment plan.

Proposal

Revisions to the approved plan include:

- 1. Retention of the existing windows.
- 2. New windows on the left side, second story.
- 3. Retention of existing vents in side gables.
- 4. Addition of porch and overhang on the rear elevation.
- 5. Addition of cedar window shield and brackets to new and existing windows.
- 6. Removal of connected dwellings to the rear.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission shall determine if the proposal meets the applicable guidelines for additions.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* – Renovation/Redevelopment, Ms. Titus made a MOTION to APPROVE with revised drawings for staff approval. The revised drawings will show 1) no shield over the vents, 2) all details remain previously approved, 3) reduce size. Mr. Ristaino seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO,SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR RENOVATION/REDEVELOPMENT APPROVED.

MS. MARSHALL LEFT THE MEETING AT 8:25 AND WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE REST OF THE MEETING.

APPLICATION: <u>HDC 2014-267</u> – 318 W. 8th Street – Siding Change/Removal and Reconstruction of Accessory Building/ Tree Removal

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a two story single home constructed in 1978. Existing siding material is vinyl and sun room is fiberglass. The adjacent homes are Victorian and contemporary designs.

Proposal

The proposal is divided into three different projects:

- 1. Removal of the existing vinyl siding to be replaced with cementitious (Hardie) lap siding.
- 2. Renovation of sun room
 - a. Removal of fiberglass roof and replace with shingles
 - b. Decrease roof pitch to 6:12
 - c. Installation of sky lights
 - d. Replacement of existing sliding glass doors
- 3. Tree removal
 - a. A large magnolia tree that blocked the primary view of the home was removed without approval. A tree replanting plan may be considered.

Staff Recommendation: The Commission shall determine 1) If the proposal for non-traditional materials is appropriate, 2) If the proposed renovation plan is appropriate, 3) A location for tree replacement.

MOTION: Based on compliance with Policy & Design Guidelines – Siding Change

Mr. Ristaino MADE a MOTION to APPROVE the siding plans will show 1) Hardie NC, 2) Exception to Artisan will be too havy, 3) wood would fail with no overhang. Mr. Haden seconded.

VOTE: 8/0	AYES:	DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART,
		RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR HARDIE SIDING APPROVED.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* – Removal and Reconstruction of Accessory Building Mr. Duffy MADE a MOTION to APPROVE 1) fiberglass to asphalt shingle roof, 2) flush mounted, clad low profile. Mr. Ristaino seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, RISTAINO,SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR RECONSTRUCTION OF ACCESSORY STRUCTURE APPROVED

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines* – Tree Removal Mr. Duffy MADE a MOTION to APPROVE the removal of a magnolia and replaced with another ornamental tree. Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, RISTAINO,SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR TREE REMOVAL APPROVED

APPLICATION: HDC 2014-268 – 1712 Euclid Avenue – New Construction of Quadraplex.

Existing Conditions

The existing site is located in the center of a block between East Blvd., Cleveland Ave., East Kingston Ave., and Euclid Ave. with alleyways on three sides. The site is zoned B-1(PED). Primary access to the site will be provided through a driveway from East Boulevard. There are several mature trees around the site. Adjacent structures are single family and multi-family with commercial uses along East Boulevard.

Proposal

The proposal is the construction of a two story quadraplex on the vacant parcel. Plan details include the following:

- 1. Parking will be provided along the alleyways.
- 2. Trees to remain are reflected on the site plan.
- 3. Mechanical systems are located at the rear.
- 4. Maximum height is approximately 33'-4.75".
- 5. Exterior materials are cedar shake and wood lap.
- 6. Windows are wood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission shall determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for new construction.

MOTION: Based the need for additional information Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to CONTINUE for, 1) size calculations, 2) Scale is ok, 3) Massing verify building height, 4) fenestration, 5) wall section, 6) shutters need to be correct, 7) setbacks ok, 8) Design choice batten board, 9) landscape – 3 trees out and 2 back. Mr. Ristaino seconded

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, , RISTAINO,SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED

APPLICATION: HDC 2014-271 – 1511 The Plaza – Shed

Existing Conditions: This large house on The Plaza is undergoing a major, recently approved, renovation and addition to the rear and side. A carriage house to be located in the left rear corner has been put on a back burner while the main renovation is accomplished.

Now proposed is a small garden shed, highly detailed of natural materials, to the left of the house and behind the existing porte cochere. But the location is technically the side yard which brings it to the full Commission.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission shall determine if the proposed accessory structure's location is an exception to **Policy & Design Guidelines** warranted by the large side yard and highly landscaped lot.

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with **Policy & Design Guidelines Shed** in the side yard Ms. Titus determined the changes presented did not reflect the design, scale and style of the original structure. In particular, the following design guidelines were deemed in violation 1) Context – Accessory buildings are not allowed in the side yards within local historic districts. Therefore, and exception to the Policy and Design Guidelines was not granted. Ms. Yarbrough seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: DUFFY, EGAN, HADEN, LENHART, , RISTAINO,SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED

Application: HDC 2014-233 – 1125 Belgrave Place - Fence

This application was continued for insufficient information: 1) Exterior elevation of the fence.

Details of Proposed Request

Existing Conditions

The site is a single family home on the edge of the District. The abutting property to the rear is zoned O-2 (Office) and is currently being developed as a 5-story, 184 unit multi-family building. An 8' tall privacy fence, approved by the HDC in 1993, exists along the rear of an adjacent single family property.

Proposal

The proposal is the construction of an 8' tall section of privacy fence in the rear yard to help screen the multi-family building.

Revised Proposal – December 10, 2014

The revised application clarifies the requested exception for the privacy fence as follows:

- 1. Request for an exception to construct an 8' tall privacy along the rear property line.
- 2. An exception to allow a continuous panel fence design along the exterior to match the adjacent fence, both facing the 5-story multi-family development which is not in the District.
- 3. The fence panels would step down every few feet, similar to the adjacent fence.

Staff Recommendation: The Commission shall determine if an exception will be granted for an 8' tall privacy fence along the rear yard given the existing conditions.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Ms. Yarbrough made a MOTION to CONTINUE this application for 1) Applicant was not present at 9:50 pm and the meeting began at 3:00 pm, 2) not enough information to approve need a design drawing of property line showing contour and changes in grade. Mr. Duffy seconded.

VOTE7/1 AYES: DUFFY, HADEN, LENHART, , RISTAINO,SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: EGAN

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR FENCE CONTINUED

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 pm with a meeting length of seven hours fifteen minutes. Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission