CHARLOTTE

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES

October 8, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Mr. Tim Bender
Dr. Lili Corbus
Mr. Don Duffy
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. Tom Egan, Chair
2 Vacancies

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

In Chairman Mr. Egan's absence Vice Chairman Mr. Ristaino called to order the Regular October meeting of the Historic District Commission at 3:00 pm. He began the meeting by introducing the Staff and Commissioners and explaining the procedure. All interested parties planning to give testimony – pro or con – must have completed a blue form and must be sworn in. Mr. Howard or Mrs. Birmingham will present a description of the proposed project. HDC Staff will then make a Staff recommendation based on compliance with the ***Policy & Design Guidelines.*** The Commission 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, 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 2014-070	1700 Heathcliff Street	Wesley Heights
HDC 2014-098	325 E. Tremont Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2014-168	425 Rensselaer Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2014-164	1319 Thomas Avenue	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2014-170	1817 Merriman Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2014-203	2120 Dilworth Road E	Dilworth

NEW APPLICATIONS

HDC 2014-115	224 N. Poplar Street	Fourth Ward
HDC 2014-136	513 Pine Street	Fourth Ward
HDC 2014-193	424-436 E. Park Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2014-198	712 East Boulevard	Dilworth
HDC 2014-210	525 East Boulevard	Dilworth
HDC 2014-216	2037 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDC 2014-221	417 W Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2014-223	1615 Dilworth Road W	Dilworth

MS. TITUS MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT THE CHANGES TO THE RULES FOR PROCEDURES AND THE NEW APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE FORM. MS. YARBROUGH SECONDED. ANY ADDITIONAL CHANGES WILL BE PRESENTED AND CONSIDERED AT THE 2:00 MONTHLY BUSINESS PREMEETING AND VOTED ON IN THE FOLLOWING REGULAR MEETING.

VOTE: 8/1 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: SULLIVAN

APPLICATION: HDC 2014-070 – 1700 Heathcliff Street – New Construction.

This application was continued from August for additional design study regarding fenestration and materials. Revised plans include 1) Stucco notes removed, 2) Shutters removed, 3) Window on front removed and replaced with a vent, 4) Fenestration more aligned, 5) Simplified and matching window headers, 6) Adjacent setbacks, 7) Traditional building materials, 8) Height of adjacent homes, 9) Window sections, 10) HVAC units located in the rear, 11) Fireplace removed from site plan, 12) Modified front roof design, 13) Context exhibit, 14) Gable vent on back (as well as the front), 15) All brick foundation, and 16) All dimensions called out.

The site is a triangular vacant lot at the end of a street. The adjacent properties are 1.5 and 2 story single family homes and a two story quadraplex. There are mature trees on the site. There is not an established front setback on the street. The site has an unimproved alley on one side.

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

FOR/AGAINST: Adjacent Property Owner Rachel Ortiz spoke in opposition

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Dr. Corbus made a MOTION to CONTINUE this application for 1) Tongue and Groove for the front porch, and an 2) Accurate site plan to include the percentage of lot coverage, and Driveway and sidewalks, and landscaping, and the discussed guard rail and stairway. Mr. Sullivan seconded.

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED.

APPLICATION: HDC 2014-098– 325 East Tremont Avenue – New Construction.

The application was continued from September for (1) Building materials and, 2) Further design study of the roofline and height along East Tremont Avenue.

The site is located at the corner of Euclid Avenue and East Tremont Avenue and includes several parcels. Existing structures include a single family structure and multi family structure. The 365-Day Stay of Demolition has expired. The surrounding context is multi-family redevelopment and single family homes. The site has mature trees to the rear and within the planting strips along public streets.

The proposal is a 12 unit townhouse development, 9 units will face public streets and 3 will be located to the rear of the site. Parking will be surface under the residential units. The proposed setback along East Tremont Avenue is consistent with the previously approved Dilworth Terrace multi-family project. The setback along Euclid Avenue is approximate to the existing building, approximately 22' from thermal wall to back of curb. The buildings are generally 2.5 to 3 stories in height. Exterior materials include cast stone, brick, wood siding and smooth fiber cement. The units have useable balconies and porches.

Revised Proposal – August 13, 2014

1. Scale – The height of the corner structure at Euclid Ave. and East Tremont has been reduced from 38' from FFE to approx. 33'-5" from FFE. The elevation of the primary structure along Euclid Ave. is approx. 34'-9".
2. Massing – The dormers along Euclid Ave. are centered above the balconies. The roof height has been lowered slightly.
3. Context – A third material, wood shake, has been introduced on the third floor along E. Tremont Ave. along with entry stoops that address the sidewalk.

Revised Proposal – September 10, 2014

1. Scale – The height of the corner structure at Euclid Ave. and East Tremont has been reduced from 38' from FFE to approx. 33'-5" from FFE. The elevation of the primary structure along Euclid Ave. is approx. 34'-9".
2. Massing – The roof line along East Tremont has been changed to a series of hipped roofs.
3. Traditional siding materials are used on primary wall planes.

Revised Proposal – October 8, 2014

1. Massing – The roof line along East Tremont has been lowered.
2. Materials – All traditional.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the project meets the remaining unresolved design guidelines.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood Resident Marcia Rowse spoke in opposition.
Neighborhood Resident John Phares spoke in opposition.

Developer Frank Martin spoke in favor of the project.

.

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** – **New Construction,** Mr. Bender made a MOTION to APPROVE as revised. Mr. Duffy seconded.

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED.

.

MR. RISTAINO DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HIMSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.

2ND VICE CHAIR MS TITUS ASSUMED THE POSITION OF CHAIR FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.

APPLICATION: <u>HDC 2014-168</u> – 425 Rensselaer Avenue – Garage.

This project was continued in September for correct and accurate plans.

The existing home is a small one story cottage style design constructed in 1930. It is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register survey. It is on a very small lot. The house itself encroaches into the rear yard setback. Adjacent homes are similar in size. A one and one half story garage is under construction but not being built as approved. Work was stopped when the problem was identified. This has been continued a of number times.

Proposal - August 13, 2014

The proposal is a 1.5 story detached garage with a height of approximately 19’-5”. Exterior trim, windows and materials will match the house.

Revised Proposal – September 10, 2014

Additional elevations and plan notes have been provided. A revised stair plan with landing was presented at the meeting. Discussion proved that the new stair proposal would not actually work but would potentially block an entry door into the garage.

Revised ProposaL – October 8, 2014

The revised plan includes an expanded wood deck area and new stair plan to access the rear upper level storage area.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the new revised plan meets all applicable ***Policy & Design Guidelines***.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** – **Accessory Buildings - Garages,** Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE as submitted with the comment that he would rather not see the horizontal bar across the windows but just a four-light pattern. Mr. Lenhart seconded.

VOTE: 7/1 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, LENHART, MARSHALL, SULLIVAN, YARBROUGH

NAYS: TITUS

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR GARAGE APPROVED

APPLICATION: <u>HDC 2014-164</u> – 1319 Thomas Avenue – Rear Yard Accessory Building, and Fencing.

This application was continued from September. Revised plans now include 1) Building heights, 2) Notes for trees to remain, 3) Traditional building materials, 4) Plan note for a 4'fence height exception, 5) All architectural details.

The existing house was constructed in 1920. The site is on the edge of the Plaza Midwood Local Historic District and located adjacent to a commercial parking lot on one side. An alley exists for access to multiple properties. A large rear yard garage/accessory building has been in place for many years. In the staff review, some Code issues became obvious regarding setbacks of the proposed rear yard ADU and this application was pulled from a recent HDC agenda to better understand and correct the issues.

Proposal – September 10, 2014

A new two story ADU (Accessory Dwelling Unit) is to be located near the rear property line with access from the alley. The structure will be detailed as a Victorian cottage with a wraparound porch. The existing accessory building will be renovated to become a higher roofed garage for an RV in the middle with auxiliary spaces to each side. Gable end facing street will have a new panelized garage door.

Proposal October 8, 2014

The revised plans reflect the changes from comments in September. Building heights and notes regarding trees, building materials, details and fencing are included in the plans. The new garage height is approximately 13'-4", the ADU is approximately 25'-6" and the existing home is approximately 30'-8".

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the application meets ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** for Garages - Accessory Structures and if an exception is warranted for the height of the front yard fence.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** – **Accessory Buildings - Garages, Fences,** Mr. Sullivan made a MOTION to APPROVE as submitted making an exception regarding 4' front yard fence required by Code as a screen to the adjacent parking lot. Ms. Marshall seconded.

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY BUILDING, GARAGE ADDITION, and FENCE APPROVED.

.

APPLICATION: <u>HDC 2014-170</u> – 1817 Merriman Avenue – Addition

This application was continued from September for scaled, detailed drawings.

This one story brick house is on the edge of the Wilmore Local Historic District. A metal awning has been removed that covered the front terrace and entry. Steps lead down from the terrace parallel to the house.

Proposal - September 10
The plan is to add a shed roof supported by columns over the front terrace. A wooden rail will be added between the columns that is historically appropriate to the neighborhood and adequately detailed.

Proposal – October 8, 2014
Revised plans include details of the porch rail details, column and trim materials, and dimensions. A drawing shows the relationship of the new roof to the existing house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the submitted drawings are explanatory and detailed to the degree that a decision can be made.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** – **Additions,** Mr. Bender made a MOTION to APPROVE as submitted. Ms. Marshall seconded.

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR PORCH ADDITION APPROVED.

APPLICATION: <u>HDC 2014-203</u>– 2120 Dilworth Road E. – Site Features

This application was continued from September for 1) Complete site plan, 2) Context pictures, 3) Further design study regarding materials, and 4) Additional site plan details.

The c. 1927 home is listed as a Contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey..

Proposal – September 10, 2014

The proposal is a new driveway and walkway. The driveway area in the front yard is proposed to have additional space for parking.

Updated Proposal – October 8, 2014

The proposal is a widened driveway, walkway along side new drive, retaining wall parallel to street and turn corner into drive, and benches and water fountain out front. The submittal includes a revised site plan with additional notes (materials, dimensions), streetscape renderings, and examples of single family residential parking in the Dilworth Local Historic District that supports this request that could potentially park a number of cars in the front setback. Paving materials include brick pavers and concrete.
A landscaped strip will be added to the middle of the driveway. Retaining wall is brick.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the site plan meets the ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** and/ whether an exception is warranted.

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

MOTION: Based on no exception warranted to ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** **-** Driveway and Parking, Landscaping, Dr. Corbus made a MOTION to DENY this application as submitted due to this creating front setback parking, material choices, lack of a tree protection plan, undeveloped landscaping plan. Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 8/1 AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: BENDER

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR DRIVEWAY/WALKWAY/RETAINING WALL WITH AMENITIES DENIED AS SUBMITTED.

APPLICATION: <u>HDC 2014-115</u> – 224 N. Poplar Street, Addition/Façade Changes

The existing structure, constructed in 1982, is a six story condominium building with parking underneath and at grade. The brick façade is decorated with punched openings.

Proposal

The proposal is to eliminate the punched openings. It is a solution to prevent further water damage to the structure. This proposal is considered an addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if filling in the openings on the brick façade is appropriate.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines, - Additions,*** Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE with revised plans to be submitted for staff review. The revised plans will show the infill maintaining the pattern language by the choice of a dark contrasting color brick which will be inset a minimum of ¾ inch. The same applies to the zipper joint and wall holes. Mr. Sullivan seconded..

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

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR BRICK INFILL APPROVED WITH STAFF TO REVIEW REVISED PLANS.

MR. SULLIVAN LEFT THE MEETING AT 5:45 PM BUT DID RETURN.

APPLICATION: <u>HDC 2014-193</u> – 424-436 E. Park Avenue– Site Features

The existing structure is a contemporary condominium building constructed in 1981, predating the Dilworth Historic Local District. A new single family home was recently constructed on the right side. The condo building is approximately 2-3 feet lower than the adjacent property. The existing historic retaining wall is concrete and only 18" high.

The proposal is the existing brick garden wall will remain as it is and a new brick screening wall is proposed. The new wall is offset from the garden wall by several feet. Landscape timbers will adjoin the new screening wall to correct water The proposed height from existing grade is approx. 7-8". (See diagram A04 in the presentation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission shall determine if an exception to the ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** is warranted.

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

MOTION: Based on exceptions warranted to ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** – SITE FEATURES, by unusual water problems from the adjacent higher land, Ms. Titus made a MOTION to APPROVE with revised drawings submitted for staff to review. The revised drawings will show 1) six feet high wall on adjacent side, 2) brick wall extension - painted to match what is there now, 3) landscape timbers - 4" from grade maximum. Ms. Yarbrough seconded

VOTE: 7/1 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, LENHART, RISTAINO, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: MARSHALL

DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED.

MS. TITUS DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND REMOVED HERSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.

MR. SULLIVAN RETURNED TO THE MEETING AT 7:15 PM

APPLICATION: <u>HDC 2014-198</u> – 712 East Boulevard - Demolition

The C. 1979 building is listed as a Non Contributing Structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. It is a deteriorating contemporary structure owned by the Greek Cathedral.

The proposal is to demolish the structure. Future plans have not been determined.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if a 365 Day Stay of Demolition should be placed on the structure.

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

MOTION: Based on the style of the building and the condition, Mr. Lenhart made a MOTION to approve DEMOLITION. Mr. Bender seconded.

VOTE: 3/5 AYES: BENDER, LENHART, RISTAINO

NAYS: CORBUS, DUFFY, MARSHALL, SULLIVAN, YARBROUGH

MOTION: Based on ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** – Demolition, Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to IMPOSE a 365 day stay on the demolition. Ms. Marshall seconded. Note: New Construction and/or a Landscape Plan will be considered when submittal meets deadline for upcoming meeting.

VOTE: 6/2 AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN YARBROUGH

NAYS: BENDER, LENHART

DECISION: 365 DAY STAY OF DEMOLITION IMPOSED.

APPLICATION: <u>HDC 2014-210</u> – 525 East Boulevard – New Construction.

The Commission voted that this project has substantially changed and they will hear the project.

The existing site is a vacant parcel at the corner of East Boulevard and Winthrop Avenue. Previously existing was c. 1911 two-story stucco multi-family building. It had a hipped roof and one story porches with Tudor details. The structure was destroyed by fire several years ago. The block currently consists of two story buildings facing East Boulevard and one and one half story homes on Winthrop Avenue. The street is a mix including churches, office spaces, and retail. There are varying heights and setbacks. The setback along the subject East Boulevard block and adjacent Winthrop Avenue is relatively consistent.

Proposal-June 11, 2014

The proposal is a 3.5 story townhouse development with two separate buildings joined by a center courtyard with ground level garages. The exterior materials are stucco, brick and wood. Units facing East Boulevard will have two story porches. The height of the development is approximately 39'-9" from grade. The East Boulevard and Winthrop Avenue facades feature a balanced fenestration pattern, a series of hipped roofs and other design elements from the original building. **The application was denied based on Size, Scale, Massing and Context.**

Revised Proposal-July 9, 2014
The revised application was resubmitted based on substantial redesign from the denied application. A summary of the changes include:
1. Setback increase of 3' along East Blvd.
2. Removal of front porches along East Blvd.
3. Winthrop Ave. setback increased 4'
4. Building height reduced 3'-2.5" matching the height of 501 East Blvd.
5. Height of end units along Winthrop Ave. have been reduced
6. Material changes include additional wood shake siding and brick to compliment adjacent structures
7. Massing of building has been changed through variation between townhouse units and roof design.

The Commission did not agree that these changes amount to a substantial change to the DENIED application and did not review the project.

Revised Proposal – October 8, 2014
The revised application is resubmitted based on substantial redesign from the denied application. A summary of the changes include:
1. Change in design to a single building footprint.
2. Parking will be enclosed under the primary structure.
3. Front setback is in alignment with the adjacent structure.
4. Rear alley will not be used for access.
5. Height to ridge is under 40 feet.
6. Additional buffer at the rear of the structure.
7. Massing and fenestration patterns have been redesigned.
8. Primary materials are cementitous siding and brick.

The Commission agreed that the changes amount to a substantial change to the DENIED application and reviewed it.

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

FOR/AGAINST: Adjacent property owner Allen West spoke in support of the project.
Neighborhood resident John Phares spoke in opposition.
Neighborhood businessman James MacArthur spoke in support ot the project.

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Dr. Corbus made a MOTION to CONTINUE the application for further design study regarding size, scale, lot coverage percentage, fenestration, massing, and materials. Mr. Duffy made a friendly amendment to also further study bringing the 3rd story roofline down.

VOTE: 8/1 AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: BENDER

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED.

MR. LENHART LEFT AT 8:25 PM AND WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.

APPLICATION: <u>HDC 2014-216</u> – 2037 The Plaza – Addition/Site Features

The existing structure is a single family home constructed in 1936, located on a corner lot. The home is single story with Masonite siding.

The proposal is a renovation project that includes removal of deteriorated Masonite, new wood siding, new window details, roof trim details, privacy fence, driveway, and patio.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the proposed improvements meet the applicable ***Policy & Design Guidelines.***

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

MOTION: Based on the need for additional information Dr. Corbus made a MOTION to CONTINUE for further design study. Revised plans will show 1) 1/1 windows, 2) trim detail dimension, 3) pork chops remaining, 4) darker color on foundation, 5) remove bracket notes from plans.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE.

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION/SITE FEATURES CONTINUED.

APPLICATION: <u>HDC 2014-217</u> – 2000 Park Road – Addition/Site Features

The C. 1925 one and one half single family home is listed as a Contributing Structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5 story single family homes.

Proposal – Building Addition

The proposal is a two story addition that extends from about the center of the house to the rear. .Details include a shed dormer on the front, SDL wood windows, wood siding, brick foundation and steps, and wood trim details. The chimney will be raised to accommodate the addition and a new chimney added in the rear. A covered porch is proposed for the rear. An attached two car garage will be underneath and to the rear.

Proposal – Site Features

Proposed site features include a new privacy fence, driveway, walkways, landscaping and patio. The proposal includes the removal of existing trees to be replaced with new trees.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the proposed improvements meet the applicable ***Policy & Design Guidelines***.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines, - Additions/Site Changes,*** Ms. Marshall made a MOTION to APPROVE as submitted with the hinge of new shed dormer to be dropped

below the existing ridge. HVAC will be located on side near rear and tucked into landscaping. Mr. Bender seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN, TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION/SITE FEATURES APPROVED

APPLICATION: HDC 2014-221 – 417 West Kingston Avenue – New Construction

Existing Conditions

A house was relocated to this previously vacant lot from another location within Wilmore. The structure is a two story single family home constructed in 1925. The surrounding context is a variety of 1, 1.5 and 2 story residential structures. The approval for relocation was granted at a special meeting in the summer with details to be reviewed as soon as the owner could get the house moved and determine all the details. Issues for review include 1) Wood siding, 2) Fenestration, 3) Front entry created, 4) Trim and boxing details, 5) Front porch/wall details, 6) Retaining wall, and 7) Tree assessment.

Proposal

The updated drawings show all details to provide final approval for the house to be completed. Exterior materials include cedar shake siding, brick, and wood trim details, 6/1 wooden windows. Section detail of front porch includes wood railing design and wood columns with brick piers. The plan shows the retention of a large maturing tree in the rear yard which must be protected and included in the tree assessment. .

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Commission will determine if the structure meets the ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** for NEW CONSTRUCTION.

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

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines, - New Construction,*** Ms. Titus made a MOTION to APPROVE with revised drawings for staff to review which show: 1) Tongue and Groove porch floor installed perpendicular to the house, 2) a separation of the siding materials between 2nd and 3rd floors - cedar shakes and lapped wood, 3) horizontal trim bands between materials, 4) 3'-6" to grade, 5) change shutters to be Guideline compliant or leave off all together. Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED WITH STAFF TO SIGN OFF ON REVISED DETAILS

APPLICATION: <u>HDC 2014-223</u> – 1615 Dilworth Road West – Addition/Front Porch Renovation

The existing structure is a C. 1919 two story single family home. It is listed as a Contributing Structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. A prominent feature is the porch on the upper front with highly decorative wrought iron railings and supports.

Proposal

The proposal is to remove the wrought iron columns and extend existing balcony in a circular overlook above new firs floor terrace and add wooden columns to support the upper balcony and extend the lower area and add a circular roof element over circular steps.

S**TAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The Commission will determine if the proposed removal of existing features and construction of new ones meets the ***Policy & Design Guidelines***.

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

MOTION: Based on non-compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines, - Additions*** Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to DENY the application. Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION DENIED.

MOTION WAS MADE TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER MINUTES WITH CORRECTIONS FROM MS TITUS. MS YARBROUGH SECONDED. ANY CHANGES OR CORRECTIONS TO THE MINUTES WILL BE SUBMITTED TO MS. KEICH OR MRS. BIRMINGHAM.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: BENDER, CORBUS, DUFFY, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, SULLIVAN. TITUS, YARBROUGH

NAYS: NONE

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