



Approved June 8, 2011

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES

April 13, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Roger Dahnert

Mr. Don Duffy

Mr. Tom Egan

Ms. Mary Ellen George, Chair

Ms. Debra Glennon, Second Vice Chair

Ms. Barbara Highfill

Ms. Meg Nealon

Ms. Paula Owens

Ms. Karen Rush

Mr. Curtis Watkins

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Greg Grueneich

Mr. Dominick Ristaino, Vice Chair

OTHERS PRESENT: Mr. John Rogers, Administrator

Historic District Commission

Ms. Wanda Birmingham, Secretary to the

Historic District Commission

Mr. Mujeeb Shan Khan, Senior Assistant

City Attorney

With a quorum present Ms. George called the regular April meeting of the Historic District Commission to order at 3:08 pm. She 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.) Ms. George asked that everyone in attendance please sign in and when addressing the Commission to please state name and address for the record. Ms. George 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. Ms. George asked that all cell phones and any other electronic devices be turned off completely or set to silent operation. She also asked that any Commissioner announce, for the record, their arrival and/or departure when this takes place during the meeting.

Index of Addresses:	1824 South Mint Street	Wilmore
	816 Mt. Vernon Avenue	Dilworth
	1715 Euclid Avenue	Dilworth
	401 East Kingston Avenue	Dilworth
	516/520 Grandin Road	Wesley Heights
	1600 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore
	1333 Carlton Avenue	Dilworth
	530 Hermitage Court	Hermitage Court
	1542 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
	1330 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
	1715 Wickford Place	Wilmore

Application: 1824 Mint Street – Renovation Final
Approval.

This building at Mint Street and West Worthington Avenue has been vacant for some time and has been a neighborhood store since it was built. Conceptual Approval was granted in November for this two story building to be converted to a single family house. The building rests very close to the City

sidewalk on the Worthington Side. The 'front door' is on Mint Street and a new entry will be created facing into the side yard. Changes from the plans last seen include (1) 1/1 windows arranged in a symmetrical pattern, (2) new raised chimney to be Code compliant, (3) sign on front to remain as well as a pipe vent, (4) six panel wood front door.

Mr. Egan arrived and was present for the remainder of the meeting.

Applicant Comments: Owner Mark Santo said the plans retain the "utility" of the store building and do not "fancy it up". There is not another building of this type remaining in Charlotte. He is ready to get permits and has contractors ready to start.

FOR/AGAINST: Mr. Watkins reported that the neighborhood is very excited to see this project started.

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions***, Mr. Dahnert made a MOTION to APPROVE the final renovation plans. Ms. Nealon seconded.

VOTE: 9/0/1 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, GEORGE, GLENNON, HIGHFILL,
NEALON, OWENS, RUSH, WATKINS

NAYS: NONE

ABSTAIN: EGAN

DECISION: FINAL PLANS APPROVED (FENCE DETAILS WILL BE WORKED OUT
WITH STAFF).

Application: 816 Mt. Vernon Avenue – Addition.

A side porch addition was deferred for further design study to minimize and simplify the plan. Revised plans show (1) a hipped roof, (2) siding lowered, (3) screens dropped down, (4) simpler fireplace brick pattern (to street).

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***, Ms. Rush made a MOTION to APPROVE the revised side porch addition plans. Mr. Dahnert seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, EGAN, GEORGE, GLENNON,
HIGHFILL, NEALON, OWENS, RUSH, WATKINS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: SIDE PORCH ADDITION APPROVED AS REVISED.

Application: 1715 Euclid Avenue – Demolition.

This c. 1905 house has been added on to randomly over the years creating several apartments. The most recent attempt at renovation has left the house (1) with no floor, (2) partially boarded up, (3) no staircase. The apartments are far from meeting code. It has been on the market for years. This application is for Demolition with the request of no delay.

Applicant Comments: They would prefer to sell the house and not demolish it but any interest has been for the lot.

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

MOTION: Mr. Dahnert made a MOTION to recognize the house as Contributing. Mr. Watkins seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, EGAN, GEORGE, GLENNON, HIGHFILL, NEALON, OWENS, RUSH, WATKINS

NAYS: NONE

MOTION: Based on the house being determined to be Contributing, Mr. Dahnert made a MOTION to impose the maximum 365 Day Stay of Demolition. Mr. Egan seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, EGAN, GEORGE, GLENNON, HIGHFILL, NEALON, OWENS, RUSH, WATKINS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: HOUSE DETERMINED TO BE CONTRIBUTING. MAXIMUM DELAY IMPOSED.

Application: 401 East Kingston Avenue – Porch Enclosure.

This house was built in the last decade and is at the intersection of Kingston Avenue and Euclid Avenue. An integrated side porch (away from the side street) is to be enclosed. The porch is recessed and only breeches the side elevation by a few inches. Double hung windows will be installed above solid panels between existing columns. Fixed planes will be added in the inches from the house to the column.

Applicant Comments: Owner Rick Harris said all new material will match existing.

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 – Porch Enclosure***, Mr. Egan made a MOTION to APPROVE in CONCEPT the enclosure of the side porch with revised plans which will show (1) fewer number of windows, (2) 1/1 window pattern, and the (3) corner detail to be reviewed by Staff. Mr. Dahnert seconded.

VOTE: 10/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, EGAN, GEORGE, GLENNON, HIGHFILL, NEALON, OWENS, RUSH, WATKINS

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: SIDE PORCH ENCLOSURE APPROVED IN CONCEPT. STAFF WILL REVIEW FINAL PLANS.

Application: 516/520 Grandin Road – Window Replacement.

Two 4-family apartment buildings sit side by side, owned by one owner. The windows are deteriorated and the proposal is to replace them all on both

buildings. This was recently deferred for more information in the form of a section. A grant has been awarded to replace the windows but to use the grant, wood is not an option for this owner. Vinyl is the material being presented. Muntin pattern will be replicated with molded, permanently affixed, exterior muntin bars. The trim will be the same except where it will be corrected to the right size.

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 – Windows***, Ms. Rush made a MOTION to APPROVE the replacement windows as presented. Ms. Owens seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, GEORGE, GLENNON, HIGHFILL, NEALON, OWENS, RUSH, WATKINS

NAYS: EGAN

DECISION: WINDOW REPLACEMENT APPROVED.

Application: 1600 Wilmore Drive – New Construction.

A demolition was past approved and the unusually shaped, small lot is now empty. The new construction plans show a narrow, two story house with an upper and lower front porch. There is a shed dormer to the side street. Due to the small allowable building footprint, there will be living space pushed into the 3rd floor. Materials include wood siding, wooden shakes, wooden 3/1 windows.

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 – New Construction***, Mr. Egan made a MOTION to APPROVE in CONCEPT the new construction plans with final plans to come back to the full Commission. Mr. Watkins seconded.

VOTE: 9/1 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, EGAN, GEORGE, HIGHFILL, NEALON, OWENS, RUSH, WTKINS

NAYS: GLENNON

DECISION: NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED IN CONCEPT.

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

Application: 1333 Carlton Avenue – Front Porch Enclosure.

This c. 1999 house has a front porch across 2/3s of the house front. The proposal is to enclose one of the three porch bays. Windows will be added above the existing stone knee wall of the third bay to create a sunroom/office on the front of the house. There will be three windows with transoms inboard of the columns. A dipped element in the stone will be filled in to create a straight surface beneath the bank of windows. A window will be centered on the end wall.

Applicant Comments: Mr. Duffy pointed out that they are preserving the existing columns, matching the windows, and reusing rock. This addition will come off like a sleeping porch. Mrs. Martin said a small open porch will remain that is still a gracious entry with room for a pair of rocking chairs.

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 – Porch Enclosures***, Mr. Egan made a MOTION to APPROVE the porch enclosure with the addition of sidelights. Mr. Dahnert seconded.

VOTE: 5/4 AYES: DAHNERT, EGAN, GLENNON, OWENS, WATKINS

NAYS: GEORGE, HIGHFILL, NEALON, RUSH

DECISION: PORCH ENCLOSURE APPROVED WITH REVISED PLANS WHICH SHOW SIDELIGHTS.

Ms. Highfill declared a conflict of interest as an adjacent property owner and recused herself from the Commission for the next application.

Mr. Watkins left at 5:55 pm and was not present for the remainder of the meeting.

Ms. Owens left at 5:55 and was not present for the remainder of the meeting.

Application: 530 Hermitage Court – Front Additions.

This proposal is to add a terrace across the front of the house. Also on the plans is a 25'x20' paved area in the front yard adjacent to the driveway. This area will have a small retaining wall along the front side and is also labeled 'terrace'.

Applicant Comments: Owner Lisa Yarbrough said they need an area for the children to play – especially with the shared drive situation. This is not being designed as a parking area.

FOR/AGAINST: Adjacent Property Owner Barbara Highfill said this looks like an interesting suggestion.

MOTION: Based on the need for further design study to create something that relates to the house rather than the driveway, Ms. Nealon made a MOTION to DEFER the application. Ms. Glennon seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, EGAN, GEORGE, GLENNON, NEALON, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DEFERRED.

Application: 1542 Thomas Avenue – Front Yard Tire Tracks.

Two sets of tire track have been added from curb cut into front yard, stopping short of the house. They are gravel with grass between. This application is in response to the violation of adding these tire tracks without prior HDC approval.

Applicant Comments: Owner Michael Luick said there is no street parking within two blocks of his house. His is the last house that would have access via the rear alley but there is no turn around space. He appealed to the Commission for an exception to the parking guidelines. He often works until late at night and so does his girlfriend. It is not a safe situation to have to walk several blocks alone late at night. And it is very inconvenient if carrying anything.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood Resident Kathleen Rooney said she would definitely want to be able to park at her house.

MOTION: Based on the need for further investigation re: (1) the possibility of a common drive, (2) alley use logistics, (3) possibility of getting it legalized to park on the street, Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to DEFER the application. Ms. Rush seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, EGAN, GEORGE, GLENNON, HIGHFILL, NEALON, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DEFERRED.

Application: 1330 Thomas Avenue – Front Addition.

This former duplex has twin gabled stoops on both corners of the front. The proposal is to bridge the two gables with a shed roof. This was approved in 2000 but the approval has expired and the owner is now ready to do the project. Gutters and downspouts will be added.

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***, Ms. Nealon made a MOTION to APPROVE the roof connection element with new downspouts and gutters located appropriately. Ms. Rush seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, EGAN, GEORGE, GLENNON, HIGHFILL, NEALON, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: ROOF CONNECTION APPROVED.

Application: 1715 Wickford Place – Addition.

This house has a recently opened front porch. Columns atop brick piers support porch roof. The owner would like to add another pair of columns/piers flanking the front steps.

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

MOTION: Based on the need for design resolution regarding (1) engaging new piers, (2) beefing up the existing columns, (3) leaving it like it is, (4) what the impact and construction details of a possible rail required might be, Ms. Nealon made a MOTION to DEFER the application. Ms. Rush seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: DAHNERT, DUFFY, EGAN, GEORGE, GLENNON, HIGHFILL, NEALON, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION DEFERRED.

March Minutes were unanimously approved with the usual direction to report any changes, or errors to Mrs. Birmingham.

With business completed the meeting adjourned at 7:10 pm with a meeting length of four hours and two minutes.

Wanda Birmingham, Secretary to the Historic District Commission