



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
MINUTES

April 8, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dr. Lili Corbus  
Mr. Don Duffy  
Mr. Tom Egan, Chair  
Mr. Rodric Lenhart  
Ms. Mattie Marshall  
Mr. Dominick Ristaino, Vice Chair  
Mr. Damon Rumsch  
Ms. Tamara Titus, Second Vice Chair

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Tim Bender  
Mr. James Haden  
Mr. Michael Sullivan  
Ms. Lisa Yarbrough

OTHERS PRESENT: Mr. John Howard, Administrator  
Historic District Commission  
Ms. Wanda Birmingham, Assistant Administrator  
Historic District Commission  
Ms. Kristina Harpst, Preservation Planner  
Historic District Commission  
Ms. Linda Keich, Clerk to the  
Historic District Commission  
Mr. Thomas Powers, Assistant City Attorney  
Court Reporters

Chairman Egan called to order the Regular April meeting of the Historic District Commission at 1:05 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. Staff will present a description of the proposed project to the Commission. The Commission will first determine if there is sufficient information to proceed with the hearing. If continuing, Commissioners and the applicants will then discuss the project. Audience members signed up to speak FOR or AGAINST will be called to the podium. Presentations by the applicants and audience members must be concise and focused on 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. 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. During discussion and deliberation only the Commission and staff may speak. The Commission may vote to reopen this part of the meeting for

questions, comments, or clarification to the application and audience members. Once the review is completed, a MOTION will be made to Approve, Deny, or Continue the review of the application at a future meeting. The majority vote of the Commission members present is required for a decision to be reached. 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, that should 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. Egan 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. Egan 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 2014-273, 245 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
HDC 2015-268, 1712 Euclid Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2015-030, 316 W. Park Avenue	Wilmore

**NEW APPLICATIONS**

HDC 2015-046, 1114 Linganore Place	Dilworth
HDC 2015-067, 1142 Berkeley Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2015-057, 1623 Dilworth Road W	Dilworth
HDC 2015-061, 220 E. Kingston Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2015-063, 709 E. Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
HDC 2015-064, 2119 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore
HDC 2015-065, 2200 Park Road	Dilworth
HDC 2015-027, Wesley Heights Townhomes	Wesley Heights

---

**MR. RISTAINO DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST BECAUSE HE RECEIVED AN ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNER NOTIFICATION. DUE TO LOSING A QUORUM IF MR. RISTAINO IS RECUSED, MR. POWERS ASKED THE APPLICANT IF HE OBJECTED TO MR. RISTAINO REMAINING ON THE COMMISSION FOR THE APPLICATION. MR. RISTAINO SAID THAT HE DID NOT HAVE A PRECONCEIVED OPINION ABOUT THE NEXT APPLICATION AND COULD BE UNBIASED AND OBJECTIVE. THE APPLICANT INDICATED HE HAD NO OBJECTION TO MR. RISTAINO STAYING ON THE COMMISSION TO HEAR HIS APPLICATION.**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2014-273, 245 W. Kingston Avenue – Fence.**

Existing Conditions

The existing site is located five to six feet above sidewalk level, with a brick retaining wall adjacent to the City sidewalk.

Proposal

The proposal is to install a six foot tall metal fence to enclose the front yard. The guidelines allow fences up to three feet. The fence would be attached to the top of the retaining wall.

Revised Proposal-April 8, 2015

The revised proposal is a five foot tall metal fence located along the sides of the front yard. Staff has approved a three foot tall wrought aluminum fence on top of the retaining wall.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The Commission shall determine if a height exception is warranted.

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

**MOTION:** Based on the need for additional information MR. Lenhart made a MOTION to CONTINUE for further design study re: corner details on both sides and information on grade at front. Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 4/3                      AYES: EGAN, LENHART, RISTAINO, RUMSCH

NAYS: CORBUS, DUFFY, TITUS

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR FIVE FOOT FENCE ON THE SIDES OF THE FRONT YARD CONTINUED.**

---

**MS. MATTIE MARSHALL ARRIVED AT 1:45 PM AND WAS PRESENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2014-268, 1712 Euclid Avenue – Multi Family New Construction.**

Based on the need for additional information this application was continued from March for 1) Landscaping/Parking area screening, 2) Scale of deck and columns, and 3) Roof massing.

Existing Conditions

The existing site is a vacant interior lot located in the block bounded by East Boulevard, Cleveland Avenue, East Kingston Avenue and Euclid Avenue with alleyways on three sides. The site is zoned B-1 (PED). Primary access to the site will be provided through an easement across a parking lot 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. Plan details include the following:

1. Parallel parking will be provided along the alleyways
2. Trees to remain are identified 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 siding
6. Windows are wood.

Revised Proposal – January 14, 2015

1. Building and open space area calculation provided.
2. Building height recalculated.
3. Wall section and fenestration details provided.
4. Shutters removed.
5. Tree replacement/protection plan revised.

Revised Proposal – February 14, 2015

1. Building height revised to be similar to adjacent buildings on East Boulevard.
2. Roof pitch lowered from 12/12 to 10/12.

Revised Proposal – March 11, 2015

1. Roof massing has been modified.
2. Fenestration on southeast elevation has been redesigned.
3. An additional 5' has been added to the rear yard (facing single family) and building size reduced 5'.

Revised Proposal – April 8, 2015

1. The parking areas have additional landscaping at the curbs
2. Roof massing has been modified
3. Ridge height is approximately 30'-6"

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The Commission shall determine if the revised proposal meets the ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** for new construction.

**FOR/AGAINST:** Neighborhood Resident Jill Walker spoke in opposition to the project.  
Adjacent Property Owner Trish Boyd spoke in opposition to the project.  
Neighborhood Resident Howard Barr spoke in opposition to the project.  
Adjacent Property Owner Kemper Boyd spoke in opposition to the project.  
Neighborhood Resident Marcia Rouse spoke in opposition to the project.  
Neighborhood Resident Chris Hudson spoke in opposition to the project.

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

VOTE: 5/3                      AYES: EGAN, LENHART, DUFFY, CORBUS, RUMSCH,  
   NAYS: MARSHALL, RISTAINO, TITUS

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED**

---

MR. RISTAINO DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AS AN OWNER OF AN ADJACENT PROPERTY AND REMOVED HIMSELF FROM THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2015-030, 316 W. Park Avenue – Addition.**

This application was continued from March for further design study regarding: 1) Massing, 2) Fenestration, 3) Rhythm, 4) Context.

*Existing Conditions*

The existing structure is a c. 1931 one story bungalow with traditional details and a full side to side gabled roof. Existing height is approximately 20'-6". Adjacent homes are one and two story bungalows.

*Proposal*

The proposal is a rear second story addition. The front roof slope will be continued to accept the rear addition with a new ridge height of approximately 24'-1". Siding on the new addition will be wood lap. Windows will be wood STDL, vinyl clad with wood trim. The applicant is also requesting a rear secondary

and unused chimney, not visible from the street, to be removed. Exterior features of the original structure will remain.

Revised Proposal – April 8, 2015

1. Ridge height is approximately 23'-5"
2. Roof design has been changed to a hip
3. Addition window on the rear elevation

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the guidelines for additions. The guideline for setback does not apply.

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

**MOTION:** Based on compliance with *Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions*, Ms. Marshall made a MOTION to APPROVE with revised plans for staff approval. Roofline, Massing, Fenestration, Rhythm and Context all meet our guidelines. The revised plans will show trim details on the back and front will wrap and make the smaller windows larger. Dr. Corbus seconded.

VOTE: 7/0                      AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RUMSCH, TITUS,

NAYS: NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH REVISED AND FINAL DRAWINGS TO BE REVIEWED BY STAFF.**

---

**Application: HDC 2015-046, 1114 Linganore Place – Garage.**

Existing Conditions

This c. 1930 house is listed a Contributing Structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. It is a two story painted brick home. It is located on a large lot at the corner of Dilworth Road and Linganore Place.

Proposal

Proposal is a detached garage located in the side yard. Garage doors are wooden carriage style. Exterior material is brick. A new clay tile roof will match the house. Windows will be wood STDL. The newly created garden courtyard will connect garage and home. Garage height is approximately 25'-4", the house height is approximately 35'-6". Grading for the new garage and courtyard is identified on the plans. Courtyard features include pervious materials, new planting beds and metal handrails.

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

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

**MOTION:** Based on the need for change and additional information Mr. Rumsch made a MOTION to CONTINUE for: 1) Elimination of front yard park, 2) Height of the main house, new garage, and adjacent houses. Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 8/0                      AYES: EGAN, CORBUS, DUFFY, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR GARAGE CONTINUED FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND FURTHER STUDY.**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2015-067, 1142 Berkeley Avenue – Addition.**

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1939 two story brick home. It is listed as a Contributing Structure in the Dilworth National Register. The location is a corner lot at Belgrave Place and Berkeley Avenue.

Proposal

The proposal is a two story rear addition that will tie into the existing roof below the ridge. An existing one story room and three windows on the rear will be removed. Exterior will be brick. Trim details, shutters, and windows, will be wood and match existing. The roof material will be slate. The rear covered entrance is re-purposed iron supports and door with a standing seam metal roof.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the *Policy & Design Guidelines* for additions. The guideline for setback does not apply.

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

**MOTION:** Based on compliance of *Policy & Design Guidelines Addition*. Dr. Corbus made a MOTION to APPROVE as submitted. It meets all 9 guidelines. Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 8/0                      AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, MARSHALL, ROSTAINO, RUMSCH, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2015-057, 1623 Dilworth Road West – Addition.**

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a c. 1927 two story brick home. It is listed as a Contributing Structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. The location is mid-block along the street.

Proposal

The proposal is a second story addition located on the side of the house toward the rear and partially visible from the street. The new addition will tuck into the existing gable. Project details include stucco siding and half timbering to match existing with the new addition to include a centered arched window and new half timbering pattern in the gable.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the *Policy & Design Guidelines* for additions.

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

**MOTION:** Based on non-compliance of *Policy & Design Guidelines*, Ms. Titus made a MOTION to DENY this application for 1) Massing – cantilever too heavy, 2) Fenestration – new window shape and size

unwarranted, 3) Rhythm – timbering pattern incorrect, 4)Scale – appears large as drawn. Mr. Ristaino seconded.

VOTE: 8/0                    AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION DENIED AS PRESENTED.**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2015-061 – 220 E. Kingston Avenue – Fenestration Changes.**

Existing Conditions

The existing structure is a C. 1971 one story masonry building. The front has a natural brick façade and deep roof overhangs. The side elevations are painted concrete block with narrow glass block windows. There are two mature trees in the parking lot.

Proposal

The proposal is to accommodate the conversion of the building to a day care facility for the Montessori school. Project details include new gutters, new metal frame windows, new front door, and awnings along the front. The applicant is requesting to paint the brick façade and eliminate the small glass block windows on the east elevation. On the west elevation the windows will be replaced with new metal frame doors. The parking lot will be paved and new landscaping installed which includes removing the planting wells. A mature tree is proposed to be removed and a new tree planted on the site. A dilapidated storage building will be removed. Every classroom is required by Code to have a door and that is the reason for the door/window changes.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood Resident Jason Murphy said the older Knights did not want to sell to a developer and this is a good solution to please all.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the *Policy & Design Guidelines*.

**MOTION:** Based on compliance of *Policy & Design Guidelines Fenestration Changes*, Ms. Titus made a MOTION to APPROVE as submitted with one exception. The brick will not be painted. Ms. Marshall seconded.

VOTE: 8/0                    AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION APPROVED ONE EXCEPTION – BRICK WILL NOT BE PAINTED.**

---

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

---

**Application: HDC 2015-063 – 709 E. Worthington Avenue – Addition**

Existing Conditions

The original structure was a c. 1925 one and one half story bungalow. It is listed as a Contributing Structure in the Dilworth National Register Survey. Substantial changes to the original house occurred prior to establishment of the Historic District. The house was converted to a full two story house with the second story overhanging the front porch. Other modifications were approved by the HDC in 1990.

Proposal

The proposal is an addition and redesign to remove past additions and return the house back to its original form. Details of the project include: removing the second story element on the front, restoring the original porch, add a new shed roof dormer, and a new two story rear addition. The addition will tie into the existing roof at the ridgeline. Materials include brick, fieldstone, and wood.

Applicant Comments: Architect Greg Miller said the goal is to take this house back to its original form. Additions put on over the years are failing and will be removed. Rubble rock added to the foundation will be removed to expose the brick. No height is being added. Materials and details will be maintained or match existing.

FOR/AGAINST: Adjacent Property Owner Tamara Titus had questions about the material choices and the documentation.

**Staff Recommendation:** The Commission will determine if the proposal meets the *Policy & Design Guidelines*. The guideline for setback does not apply.

**MOTION:** Based on the need for additional information, Mr. Rumsch made a MOTION to CONTINUE for additional design study and correct information regarding : 1) Fenestration and massing on the right elevation – , 2) Make all materials notes reflect natural materials, 3) Lot coverage percentage – do the math, 4) Add trim dimensions. Mr. Ristaino seconded.

VOTE: 7/0                      AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, RUMSCH,

NAYS: NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION AND RENOVATION CONTINUED FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND FURTHER DESIGN STUDY.**

---

**Mr. Dominick Ristaino declared a conflict of interest as an owner of an adjacent property and removed herself from the Commission for the next application.**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2015-064, 2119 Wilmore Drive – New Construction**

Existing Conditions

The site is a vacant lot located on a curve along Wilmore Drive. The lot narrows toward the rear forming nearly a triangle. Adjacent properties are primarily one and one-half story ranch and cottage style homes. Setbacks of the adjacent properties are approximately 17-19 feet from back of sidewalk. The building envelope leaves little room for location changes.





rear deck how it will be skirted, 2) Examples of brick if using veneer, 3) Columns with caps match front parapet wall, 4) Rail detail, 5) Lighting plan and details. Mr. Ristaino seconded.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, MARSHALL, RISTAINO, TITUS

NAYS: NONE

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.**

---

**APPLICATION: HDC 2015-027, Wesley Heights Townhomes – New Construction**

The application was continued from February for 1) Scale of buildings 9 and 11, 2) Massing of buildings 9 and 11, 3) Fenestration of the side elevations on buildings 9 and 11, 4) Rhythm of buildings 9 and 11, 5) Materials, and 6) Context of buildings 9, 10 and 11 (corner elevations).

Existing Conditions

The site is mostly vacant with the exception of a contributing two story quadraplex at 131 Grandin Road. The site is relatively flat with the higher elevation on South Summit Avenue. Mature trees exist along the edges of the site. Adjacent land uses include commercial along West Trade Street, multi-family and single family development, and a prominent church building at 201 Grandin Road.

Proposal

The proposal is the construction of 44 townhomes. Design features include:

1. Consistent setbacks with adjacent structures
2. Centralized open spaces
3. Brick façade and walls on the lower levels
4. Non-traditional siding and trim
5. Exposed rafter ends and wood brackets
6. Overall height approximately 39'-10".

Revised Proposal-April 8, 2015

1. Roof design and fenestration patterns have been modified.
2. Corner elevations have been redesigned.
3. Garage doors are carriage style.
4. Siding and trim materials are wood and brick.

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

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

**MOTION:** Based on compliance of *Policy & Design Guidelines New Construction*. Mr. Duffy made a MOTION to APPROVE as submitted that it meets all guidelines. Ms. Titus seconded.

VOTE: 7/1

AYES: CORBUS, DUFFY, EGAN, LENHART, RISTAINO, RUMSCH, TITUS

NAYS: MARSHALL

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION OF TOWNHOMES APPROVED.**

---

A motion was made to approve the March 8, 2015 minutes with revisions from Dr. Corbus and Ms. Titus.

---

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 pm with a meeting length of 6 hours and 20 minutes.

---

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission.

---