



Approved May 13, 2009

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES

April 15, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Jonathan Crotty, Chair  
Ms. Mary Ellen George, Alternate Vice Chair  
Ms. Lucia Griffith  
Ms. Barbara Highfill  
Mr. Jeff Koenig  
Mr. John Phares  
Mr. Damon Rumsch  
Ms. Karen Rush  
Mr. Terry Sheffield, Vice Chair

MEMBERS ABSENT: None  
2 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

Ms. Tamara Titus, Liaison between DCDA and HDC

Sign In Sheet

With a quorum present, Chairman Crotty called the regular April meeting to order at 3:10 pm. He began with a welcome to all in attendance and by swearing in those present (and continued to do so through the meeting as other 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. Crotty asked that everyone in attendance please sign in and when addressing the Commission please state name and address for the record. Mr. Crotty 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, 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 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. Crotty asked that all cell phones and any other electronic devices be either turned completely off or set to silent operation. He also asked that all

Commissioners announce, for the record, their arrival and departure when this takes place during the meeting.

Index of Addresses:	1319 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
	1039 Arosa Avenue	Dilworth
	724 East Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
	1918 Park Road	Dilworth
	Springfield Square	Fourth Ward

---

Mr. Rumsch previously volunteered to assist the owners in their process as they seek final approval and removed himself from the commission for the next application.

---

Application: 1319 Thomas Avenue – Renovation/Addition.

This application was deferred in March for need of better documentation. Knowing that it would require his recusal from any future Commission discussion on this particular issue, Mr. Rumsch, who holds the Plaza Midwood seat on the Commission, volunteered to meet on site with the applicants to offer advice and guidance on what the Commission would need to see in the way of documentation and plans. This early Victorian cottage is the first structure in the Historic District on Thomas Avenue. A renovation/addition

was approved. Changes to the approved plans happened in the field, one-by-one for different reasons. The slope of the front porch had to be changed due to a Code requirement. A long-ago fire called for changes to the roof structure. The warranty of the new roof called for more than two courses of siding as previously drawn. Mandatory egress required a different size of upper windows. Head room in the newly created upstairs needed more height. “As Is” changes include a front facing gable with side walls, a rear facing gable addition, new front columns.

Applicant Comments: Mr. Rumsch said there were some soffit/rake integration problems to be worked out on the right side. Also, a rear screened porch was corrected to be a successful layer not a strange angle condition.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Crotty’s invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on adequate information presented to determine compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions***, Ms. Rush made a MOTION to APPROVE the additions – front facing vent may be lowered. Ms. George seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: CROTTY, GEORGE, GRIFFITH, HIGHFILL, KOENIG, PHARES, RUSH, SHEFFIELD

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: ADDITION APPROVED.

---

Application: 1039 Arosa Avenue – Additions.

This address is located behind Covenant Presbyterian Church and beside the Randolph Scott House. While in the midst of applying for Preservation Tax Credits, Conceptual Approval was recently given for this application which includes a two story rear addition that wraps to the right side. A new small dormer on the rear springs from the roof ridge. An existing sunroom on the left side of the front will be extended to the rear along the side of the house. Entrance will be enhanced with a pediment and columns. Rubber “slate” to match the existing slate roof will be used on rear-facing roof planes. The State had no changes for Preservation Tax Credits.

Applicant Comments: Architect Allen Brooks said the existing slate roof is in bad shape with the tiles just sitting on the roof. They will reuse the slate on roof planes that face the street.

Contractor Rich Norvell said the proposed slate-like material will provide a very good match. The color is guaranteed for 50 years.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Crotty’s invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions*, Ms. Griffith made a MOTION to approve the addition with changes: (1)

Proposed columns on addition portion that wraps on the right will be changed to brick piers which do not protrude from beam that rests on top, (2) Proposed addition portion that wraps on the right will have a brick knee wall, (3) Slate roofing to match, (4) All columns will be brick. Mr. Phares seconded. NOTE: If a different roofing product is chosen, that will come back to the Commission for review.

VOTE: 9/0            AYES: CROTTY, GEORGE, GRIFFITH, HIGHFILL, KOENIG,  
PHARES, RUMSCH, RUSH, SHEFFIELD

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: ADDITION APPROVED WITH CHANGES. APPROVAL DOES NOT  
INCLUDE SUBSTITUTE ROOFING.

---

Application:            724 East Tremont Avenue – Addition and New Front  
Porch.

The existing front porch will be removed and a new front-facing gabled front porch will be added. Columns atop brick piers will support new gable roof. Existing shed dormer will be replaced with a front facing gabled dormer with a triple window. Front to back ridge will be created from peak of new front upper gable. Side gables will be added, tying onto new roof at ridge. Existing cross gable roof will remain unchanged with new addition above it. The footprint will not increase. Materials (including siding, windows, brick, roofing) and details

(including window configuration, soffit/fascia treatment, overhang, siding, cornerboards, brackets, trim) will match existing.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions***, Mr. Rumsch made a MOTION to APPROVE the additions with verification of (1) cornerboards on addition match existing, (2) porch rail will be appropriate, (3) window detail in center gable will match existing, (4) ridge height note, (5) brick columns will have poured concrete cap or row lock. Ms. Griffith seconded.

VOTE: 9/0      AYES: CROTTY, GEORGE, GRIFFITH, HIGHFILL, KOENIG, PHARES, RUMSCH, RUSH, SHEFFIELD

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: ADDITIONS APPROVED WITH ADDITIONAL NOTES ON PLANS FOR STAFF TO SEE.

---

Mr. Phares removed himself from the Commission to become the applicant for the next application.

---

Application: 1918 Park Road – Addition.

A small addition is proposed for the right side of this house near the back. A valley disappears into an existing roof line. This is to be a Preservation Tax Credit project. Fifty square feet will be added with a set of trip windows facing the side property line.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood resident Tamara Titus complimented the project saying that John Phares leads by example.

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions***, Ms. Griffith made a MOTION to APPROVE the application. Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: CROTTY, GEORGE, GRIFFITH, HIGHFILL, KOENIG, RUMSCH, RUSH, SHEFFIELD

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED.

---



Ms. George declared a conflict of interest as an Adjacent Property Owner and removed herself from the Commission for the next application.

---

Application: Springfield Square in Fourth Ward – Vinyl Siding.

This large complex was built in two phases in the early 1980s. It is clad in wooden shakes that are failing. The request is to reclad the building in vinyl siding.

FOR/AGAINST: Adjacent Property Owner Mary Ellen George said one phase is being maintained and the other should be able to do so as well. She asked that if approval is granted for a different material then it should be wholesale replacement rather than patchwork.

MOTION: Based on no exception warranted to Policy **& Design Guidelines - Substitute Siding**, Ms. Rush made a MOTION to DENY the application of vinyl siding. Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: CROTTY, GRIFFITH, HIGHFILL, KOENIG, PHARES, RUMSCH, RUSH, SHEFFIELD

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: VINYL SIDING DENIED.

---

A resident of Plaza Midwood asked the Commission to revisit a past decision. A metal storage building was added without approval to a very visible back yard at the corner of The Plaza and Belvedere. Through an Enforcement Letter from staff, the owner submitted an application. The Commission DEFERRED the application asking for alternatives. No corrective measure been proposed (removing it, relocating it, screening it, etc.) by the owner. Neighbor Lee Thompson said he worked with staff and constructed a storage building and got staff approval. His is much less visible than the one being discussed. Mr. Rumsch said the time has passed for the owner to fix it and asked that staff send a letter within 15 days that says to remove the building, apply for something that is compliant or the matter will be turned over the LUESA for Enforcement. Mr. Thompson thanked the Commission and said he will call to hear the outcome in July.

A discussion took place on the use of Non-Traditional Building Materials and Green Issues in Local Historic Districts. Mr. Crotty asked that Mr. Rogers determine what the National Trust has to say on the issues. Erasure of simplicity is the biggest impact these materials and applications create.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 pm with a meeting length of 2 hours and 35 minutes.

---

Wanda Birmingham, Secretary to the Historic District Commission

