



Approved February 10, 2010

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES

January 13, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Jonathan Crotty, Chair  
Ms. Mary Ellen George, Vice Chair  
Ms. Debra Glennon  
Mr. Greg Grueneich  
Ms. Barbara Highfill  
Mr. Jeff Koenig  
Mr. John Phares  
Mr. Dominick Ristaino  
Mr. Damon Rumsch  
Ms. Karen Rush

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ms. Lucia Griffith

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

With a quorum present, Chairman Crotty called the regular January meeting of the HDC to order at 3:05 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. Crotty asked that everyone in attendance please sign in and when addressing the Commission to 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 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. Crotty asked that all cell phones and any other electronic devices be either 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.

Index of Addresses:	600 East Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
	715 East Kingston Avenue	Dilworth
	424 East Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
	928 East Park Avenue	Dilworth

Application: 600 East Tremont Avenue – Paint Brick.

This application for painting the brick house was deferred from December for further design study. Once a duplex, this two story building is being returned to single family use. Additions to the left were done in two stages, a one story addition was added then in recent years a 2<sup>nd</sup> story addition was added over the past addition, filling in the top left corner. The lines of these additions are visible due to brick not being matched perfectly and/or different mortar. Because the lot falls from the street to the creek, a basement with an engaged rear-entry garage creates a full three stories on the rear. The basement level is painted cinder block. A corner settlement/crack has been very visibly repaired. All these things make the new owner ask for permission to paint the building.

Applicant Comments: Owner Bill Fitzgerald said the brick is in poor condition and no longer available. The texture is a rough score which was not matched. Painting the brick would unify the unmatched parts.

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

MOTION: Based on exception warranted to ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Painting Brick***, Mr. Rumsch made a MOTION to APPROVE the painting of this brick house to unify the disparate parts of poorly matched additions, visible repair, unmatching masonry. Staff will approve a plan which shows contrasting color choices – foundation, trim, body. Ms. Rush seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: CROTTY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, KOENIG, PHARES, RUMSCH, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: PAINTING BRICK APPROVED WITH STAFF TO REVIEW COLOR CHOICES FOR APPROPRIATE CONTRAST.

---

Application: 715 East Kingston Avenue – Siding Replacement and Rail Addition.

---

Mr. Ristaino arrived at 3:22 and was present for the remainder of the meeting.

---

The application is to remove the aluminum siding and replace it with HardiePlank. A natural finish wood rail with wide flat pickets is to replace the existing porch rail.

Applicant Comments: Contractor Jonathan Taylor explained that years ago when the aluminum siding was installed over the original siding, the siding was damaged and is full of nail holes. You can see how split is the siding from inside where you can see the backside where it was applied right onto the studs with no sheathing. He said he would also like to face the existing brick piers with stone as well as the foundation and the steps.

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

MOTION: Based on no exception warranted to **Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions, Replacement Siding, and Porch Rails**, Mr. Rumsch made a MOTION to DENY the application of HardiePlank, the application of stone, and the design of the porch rail. NOTE: Future application will include any treatment to piers, foundation, and steps TOGETHER with new rail design. Mr. Koenig seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: CROTTY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, KOENIG, PHARES, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DENIED.

---

Application: 424 East Tremont Avenue – Replace Front Porch Columns.

Currently existing are square columns on piers. The proposal is to add tapered columns which will match the ghost lines seen on the piers and at the top beam. Shadow lines show the dimensions.

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. Phares made a MOTION to APPROVE the proposal with staff to see final plans which show the taper of the columns, base treatment, cap treatment, and any other details. Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: CROTTY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, KOENIG, PHARES, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: COLUMN REPLACEMENT APPROVED WITH STAFF TO SEE FINAL PLANS.

---

Application: 928 East Park Avenue – New Construction.

Feedback is being sought on the new construction plans for the vacant lot in the point of Dilworth Road West and East Park Avenue. For many years this has been the highly landscaped side yard of the house facing Dilworth Road West. The property has recently been subdivided to create three parcels. In order to create three legal lots, an addition was removed from the side of the house. New construction plans show a three story house with two entrances – one on Dilworth Road West and the other on East Park Avenue – a wraparound porch, detached garage, and a mix of appropriate materials and details. The architect has the flu and is asking for feedback to be conveyed to him for further design development. Only the trees within the proposed footprint will be removed.

FOR/AGAINST: Adjacent Property Owner Diane Bounds pointed out that the point is not a 90 degree angle which will impact the setbacks. Mr. Rogers answered that the building footprint has been determined by the Zoning Administrator and it is outlined on the plans. The proposed building falls well within.

Adjacent Property Owner Liz Hartley said the neighborhood is left with a big red mud pit with ½ a house gone. She said drug transactions take place there and homeless people sleep there.

Another neighbor said this property has been a contentious issue to the neighbors for a long time. The owners promised that the house would be “returned to the original condition” but it has been abandoned, is an eyesore, and is left unfinished.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information, Mr. Rumsch made a MOTION to DEFER the application with suggestions and missing pieces identified. A streetscape exhibit showing the new house plugged in to both the Dilworth Road West and the East Park Avenue context will be necessary.

Increase scale of drawings for better evaluation.

A plan view exhibit that shows the proposed structures and adjacent structures on both streets will be necessary.

Lower overall height.

Simplify the overall plan.

Reduce the number of proposed materials.

Include a tree plan which identifies each tree to be removed and a tree replacement plan which shows compensation for ones lost.

Create and identify connectivity from front porch to City sidewalk.

Ms. Rush seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: CROTTY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRUENEICH, HIGHFILL, KOENIG, PHARES, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DEFERRED WITH FEEDBACK.

---

The Wilmore Neighborhood proposed Local Historic District process is postponed for at least a month. The Greater Galilee Church, in the middle of the proposed Local Historic District, has recently been denied a rezoning. With the statutory implications that would kick in as soon as the HDC reviews and supports a proposal for a new Local Historic District, it makes political sense for this to be delayed. Planning is brokering a win/win situation for the church and the neighborhood. The proposed boundaries are being realigned to concentrate on the residential core of the neighborhood.

Mr. Rogers polled HDC members to see if there was any opposition to the rezoning. None was indicated.

MINUTES were APPROVED unanimously with the direction from Mr. Crotty that any corrections be reported to Mrs. Birmingham.

The meeting adjourned at 4:46 pm with a meeting length of one hour and 41 minutes.

---

Wanda Birmingham, Secretary to the Historic District Commission