

RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
August 6, 2012

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Scott Shackleton called the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Committee meeting to order at 4:07 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Tania Tully, Preservation Planner, called the roll as follows:

Present: Elizabeth Caliendo, Miranda Downer, Kiernan McGorty, Scott Shackleton

Excused Absence: Will Alphin

Staff Present: Tania Tully, Martha Lauer

Approval of the July 2, 2012 Minutes

Ms. McGorty moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing and adopt said minutes. Ms. Downer seconded the motion; failed 2/0 due to lack of quorum for the vote. Mr. Shackleton and Ms. Caliendo abstained from the vote having not been at the meeting. The item will return at the September meeting.

Minor Works

There were no questions regarding the Minor Work report.

The following is a list indicating persons in attendance and whether they were affirmed. Ms. Kiernan McGorty, Notary Public, administered the affirmation.

<u>Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address</u>	<u>Affirmed</u>
Rob Allen, 1108 W Lenoir Street 27603	Yes
Chuck Dopler, 3508 Bush Street 27609	Yes
Will Parry-Hill, 3508 Bush Street 27609	Yes
Bob Kucab, 3508 Bush Street 27609	Yes
Emily Brinker, 319 S Boylan Ave 27603	Yes
Ethan Hyman, 319 S Boylan Ave 27603	Yes
Agnes Stevens, 512 E Lane St 27601	Yes
Gene Davis, 2204 Byrd St 27608	Yes
Will Jeffers, 318 E Cabarrus St 27601	Yes
David Maurer, 119 E Hargett St 27601	Yes

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Downer moved to approve the agenda as printed. Ms. McGorty seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chair Shackleton introduced the public hearing portion of the meeting. The committee heard the following cases in the following order for which the Certified Records are made part of these minutes: 073-12-MW, 078-12-CA, 079-12-CA, 080-12-CA, 081-12-CA, 082-12-CA and 025-12-MW.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

073-12-MW 319 S BOYLAN AVENUE

Applicant: THE NORTHGATE GROUP, LLC BY EMILY BRINKER

Received: 7/13/2012

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 10/11/2012

1) 8/6/2012 2)

3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: Change previously approved COA 007-12-CA - deck railing configuration;
install storm windows

Conflict of Interest: None noted

Staff Notes:

- A rear deck was approved for construction in February 2012 (007-12-CA)

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3.7	Windows and Doors	install storm windows
4.1	Decks	alter deck railing configuration

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application, in staff's judgment:

- A. Installation of storm windows is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section 3.7.10.
- 1* Installation of narrow profile storm windows is encouraged.
 - 2* Specifications, details, and proposed locations for the storm windows were not included in the application.
- B. The proposed deck railing configuration is incongruous according to *Guidelines* section 4.1.3.
- 1* The deck is located at the rear of the house.
 - 2* The Boylan Heights National Register nomination describes the c. 1921 house as a contributing "one-story Bungalow; gable faces street; projecting bay with gable facing street, right side of front. Attached one-story porch with hip roof and one-story roof over drive (porte cochere) left side."
 - 3* There is no precedent for a horizontal cable railing on a contributing building in Boylan Heights.
 - 4* At the April 5, 2010 meeting, the committee approved a railing with vertical metal inset pickets on a rear deck at 405 Kinsey Street (031-10-CA). The committee found that the

railing is located on a modern deck, on a secondary elevation, on a non-contributing building, and is relatively hidden from view. The file is available for review.

5* In May 2012, staff approved the proposed railing on a rear deck at 323 S Boylan Ave (044-12-MW) – a non-contributing property. The file is available for review.

Staff suggests that the committee approve in part and deny in part the application.

Approve the installation of storm windows with the following condition:

Specifications, details, and proposed locations for the storm windows be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

Deny the proposed horizontal cable railing.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Emily Brinker [affirmed], consultant and Ethan Hyman [affirmed], owner were present to speak in support of the application.

Ms. Brinker made the following points:

- aware that there is no precedent;
- it is a good look;
- the deck is non-historic;
- the deck is not attached to the house per committee decision;
- trex is a new product approved by the commission;
- the deck is not visible from the street;
- the railing is a neat look
- the proposed railing is obviously not historic, but neither are decks;
- storm windows which are not historic are approved;

Mr. Hyman distributed photographs of the next door deck which shows what the finished product will look like and pictures of his deck under construction. He made the following points:

- there won't be great disparity of views;
- the cable railing allows better view of actual house from yard and vice versa.

Ms. Brinker made the following additional points:

- the cute kitchen windows will not be visible from yard at all if a traditional railing is used;
- the deck and railing are constructed of wood posts, not metal, traditional two by fours on top and bottom; you can use that to make this non-precedent setting.

Tania Tully [affirmed] clarified for the record that in some instances storm windows are historic.

Ms. Caliendo asked if the proposed railing is the same as the railing is next door. Mr. Shackleton said yes, but that house is noncontributing.

Ms. Brinker noted that hardieplank was approved on second story addition.

There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

At Mr. Shackleton's suggestion Ms. McGorty moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Ms. Downer seconded; motion carried 4/0.

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:

There's no precedent. This is a big decision to allow this new material. [McGorty]

We need to make decision based on guidelines, not whether we think it looks cool. Guideline 4.1.3 is the issue—do cables reflect the materials of the building? [Shackleton]

The building, not the deck? [McGorty]

The building. [Shackleton]

The building is brick and wood. [McGorty]

Are we interpreting the guidelines as not allowing it based on materials of the building? [Downer]

That's where I am. [Shackleton]

Hardie and wood are different and we allowed those. [Downer]

The wood frame of the deck makes the difference. [Caliendo]

It is important to note that the use of hardiplank on this house was extremely prescriptive. [McGorty]

The other point is they don't feel deck is historic; the testimony is that since the commission allowed a new material on a new addition, the deck is in effect an addition that is not attached and so it should be considered the same way. [Shackleton]

Ms. Tully The committee approved the use of fiber cement siding on the addition to this house because of the following:

- it is an addition;
- it is a second story addition;
- the fiber cement siding replicates wood siding;
- there is no existing wood siding on the building, so there is no side-by-side issue.

Cable is not the same look. Cables don't look like wood pickets. [Shackleton]

We are tied to guidelines, not innovation. [McGorty]

I think it looks cool, but from where I sit it doesn't meet guidelines. Other thoughts? [Shackleton]

It's hard to discount that deck is new, hardieplank is new, metal is new. [Downer]

How is deck not attached to the house? I don't remember. [McGorty]

The applicants are considering it a little noncontributing element. [Shackleton]

Ms. Tully A house is a contributing resource or not. The deck would be considered a non character-defining feature.

Findings of Fact (1)

Ms. McGorty moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-2) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-5) to be acceptable as findings of fact.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Downer; failed 2/2 [Downer and Caliendo opposed].

Ms. McGorty moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be reopened. Ms. Downer seconded; motion carried 4/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Ms. Brinker: the wood elements make the deck railing not that nontraditional; it's on a brick house, not a wood house.

Mr. Hyman: it is not viewable.

Ms. Downer: The materials should reflect what is on the house; she interprets this that if there is wood on the house, the deck would need to be wood. Mr. Shackleton: The house does have wood trim. Are you saying that the cabling is equivalent to the walls and the trim is wood. Ms. Downer: yes.

Ms. Tully: Can you put that in a fact? Ms. Downer: Visually the deck appears be trimmed in wood as is the house.

Ms. McGorty: We can incorporate points made as facts.

Mr. Shackleton: The wood posts, top and bottom rails, stairs and decking are all wood. This is a totally detached deck, self-supporting.

Ms. McGorty: An important distinction is that the house is brick.

Ms. Tully: Is the concern that it is a cable railing or that it is a horizontal cable railing? There are 2 cases of atypical railings on noncontributing resources; is that the way they have to stay?

Ms. McGorty: The deck is in an inconspicuous location.

Mr. Shackleton: I might feel differently if this was a corner lot or if the deck extended past the plane of the house. Seeing the horizontal cable rails as a wall of the deck makes a difference.

Ms. Downer: When you look at it you will see the wood trim.

Ms. McGorty: We are opening ourselves up to saying it is okay to do on a brick house. The commission has leaned towards allowing more modern elements to distinguish additions rather than to add to the existing historic resources.

Mr. Shackleton: There is specific language for decks and additions.

Ms. Tully: The guideline doesn't say the material has to be the same as the house, but to reflect that of house.

Findings of Fact (2)

Ms. McGorty moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-2) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-5) to be acceptable as findings of fact with the following modifications and additional facts:

Modify comment B. to read:

- B. The proposed deck railing configuration is **not** incongruous according to *Guidelines* section 4.1.3.

Add the following to fact B. 1*:

- 1* ...in an inconspicuous location and does not project beyond the side of the house.

Add the following new facts under comment B.:

- 6* The house is brick with a hardieplank sided addition
- 7* The deck is completely detached from the house so that it could be removed and is self-supporting.
- 8* The deck is visually trimmed in wood with upper and lower trim and posts similar to the house which is trimmed in wood

The motion was seconded by Ms. Downer; passed 4/0.

Decision on the Application

Ms. McGorty made a motion that the application be approved, with the following conditions:

1. Specifications, details, and proposed locations for the storm windows be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Downer; passed 4/0.

Committee members voting: Caliendo, Downer, McGorty, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 2/6/13.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

078-12-CA 1108 W LENOIR STREET

Applicant: ROB ALLEN

Received: 7/20/2012

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 10/18/2012

1) 8/6/2012 2)

3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: Construct new rear yard accessory building; rear yard grading to include parking area and low retaining wall; plant new trees and shrubs; door and window alterations; construct new privacy fencing; alter roofing material; construct rear deck; change exterior paint color; install ceiling fan, alter existing side-addition

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	construct new rear yard accessory building; rear yard grading to include parking area and low retaining wall; plant new trees and shrubs; construct new privacy fencing; construct rear deck
2.4	Fences and Walls	construct low retaining wall; construct new privacy fencing
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	install parking area
2.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	construct new rear yard accessory building
3.4	Paint and Paint Color	change exterior paint color
3.5	Roofs	alter roofing material
3.6	Exterior Walls	alter existing side-addition
3.7	Windows and Doors	door and window alterations
4.1	Decks	construct rear deck
4.3	New Construction	Construct new rear yard accessory building

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application, in staff's judgment:

- A. Construction of new rear yard accessory building; rear yard grading to include parking area and low retaining wall; planting of new trees and shrubs; door and window alterations;

construction of new privacy fencing; alter roofing material; construct rear deck; change exterior paint color; install ceiling fan, alter existing side-addition is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.7, 2.3.11, 2.4.1, 2.4.6, 2.4.8, 2.4.10, 2.5, 2.6, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 4.1, 4.3; however relocation of widows **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* section 3.7.13.

- 1* Tree protection plan was not included in application.
- 2* The application was extremely complete and detailed.
- 3* Downspout and security light locations were not included in the application.
- 4* The application proposed to relocate a window on the north side of the historic house so as to create a group of three.

Pending the committee's determination regarding the window relocation, staff suggests that the committee approve the application, with the following conditions:

- 1. That the following items be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
 - a. Tree protection plan
- 2. That the following items be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
 - a. downspout locations
 - b. security lights

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Rob Allen [affirmed], homeowner spoke in support of the application.

Mr. Shackleton requested that because the application is so thorough, the applicant just address staff comments.

Mr. Allen said that he is happy to provide tree protection plan; downspout and light locations noting that he has usually be determined this with the contractor in the field. He will work with staff at that point. He noted that to understand the window on the north elevation it would help to look at the before and after plans. He stated that it would help the kitchen a lot to move windows. He noted that is would be similar to the three windows on front.

Ms. McGorty asked if the window he is considering moving is in its original location. Mr. Allen said that to his knowledge where it is currently shown is where it's always been. Ms. McGorty asked if the group of three windows on the front is original also. Mr. Allen said yes, noting that the neighbor across the street is almost a mirror configuration with three across.

There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. At Mr. Shackleton's suggestion Ms. McGorty moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Ms. Downer seconded; motion carried 4/0.

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:

It may be incongruous because it's not appropriate to remove them, but it may be appropriate to move. Is that the interpretation? [McGorty]
Yes plus it will mirror the front with a repeating look. [Shackleton]
In my mind removing and relocating are different. [Downer]
And mirroring the front. With motion, add facts we discussed about the windows. This was a very thorough application. [Shackleton]

Findings of Fact

Ms. Downer moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-4) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following modification and additional facts:

Change comment A.

Strike the following: “; however relocation of widows **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* section 3.7.13”

Add facts:

5* The window proposed for relocation will remain on same character defining façade, mirroring an architectural element already on the house.

The motion was seconded by Ms. McGorty; passed 4/0.

Decision on the Application

Ms. Downer made a motion that the application be approved, with the following conditions:

1. That the following items be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
 - a. Tree protection plan
2. That the following items be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
 - a. downspout locations
 - b. security lights.

The motion was seconded by Ms. McGorty; passed 4/0.

Committee members voting: Caliendo, Downer, McGorty, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 2/6/13.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

079-12-CA 512 E LANE STREET

Applicant: AGNES STEVENS

Received: 7/23/2012

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 10/21/2012

1) 8/6/2012 2)

3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: Remove enclosed rear porch; construct 1-story addition; change exterior paint color; alter driveway surface; install rear parking area; alter storm door.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	construct 1-story addition; alter driveway surface; install rear parking area
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	alter driveway surface; install rear parking area
3.4	Paint and Paint Color	change exterior paint color;
3.7	Windows and Doors	alter storm door
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	remove enclosed rear porch; construct 1-story addition

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application, in staff's judgment:

- A. Alteration of driveway surface; installation of rear parking area; alter roof covering; removal of enclosed rear porch; construction of 1-story addition; changing of exterior paint color; alteration of storm door is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.7, 2.3.11, 2.5.1, 2.5.5, 2.5.7, 3.4, 3.7.10, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9; however the proposed materials are incongruous according to *Guidelines* section 4.2.7.
- 1* No information is included in the application regarding the location of trees on or adjacent to the property.
- 2* The committee frequently approves removal of non-character defining enclosed rear porches.
- 3* The new addition is located inconspicuously at the rear; is lower than the historic house and has a similar gable roof form.

- 4* The proposed gravel and pavers are a traditional paving material in the district; dimensioned drawings and material samples were not included with the application.
- 5* Changing of paint color and alteration of storm doors is typically approvable as a minor work and is included here for administrative efficiency; paint colors were included with the application.
- 6* The lot size 5,663 SF; the footprint of the house and partial driveway is approximately 1,421 SF; current lot coverage is 25%. The proposed footprint of the addition is 330 SF and the driveway is about 917 SF; proposed lot coverage is 43%.
- 7* The committee approved a similarly sized rear yard parking area at 518 E Lane Street (169-08-CA).
- 8* The house is a c. 1920s bungalow; standing seam metal roofing is traditional and has been approved by the committee; however the the proposed RIBLOC material has not been approved for main houses.
- 9* Except for the reuse of the wood rear door, materials proposed for the addition are non-historic and include faux wood grain fiber cement siding; PCV trim, fiberglass doors, and vinyl windows.

Staff suggests that the committee approve the application, with the following conditions:

1. That details and specifications for the following items be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
 - Landscape Alterations
 - a. Plot plan locating trees on and adjacent to the property;
 - b. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan.
 - House Alterations
 - c. Side elevation drawings.
2. That the materials for the addition be traditional wood products.
3. That the metal roof be a standing seam metal roof.
4. That details and specifications for the following items be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
 - House Alterations
 - a. Roofing material;
 - b. Doors and windows;
 - c. Trim including for new doors, windows and eaves;
 - d. Siding;
 - Landscape Alterations
 - e. Driveway and parking area drawings
 - f. Paver samples.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Agnes Stevens [affirmed] made the following comments in response to staff comments:

1. Happy to provide
2. Happy to hear
3. Good
4. Will have to work out with next door neighbor since they own it together.
5. OK
6. OK
7. OK
8. Metal roof is a preference; standing seam is more expensive so she will withdraw and reroof with what she has. No problem with not doing riblock, but that's fine.
9. That was for durability; current wood products are not as durable. Rear addition, proposed non-historic material would look like wood, you do not see it from the street. If you won't approve that stuff, it's not what she'll use.

At the request of Ms. McGorty Tania Tully [affirmed] explained the commission's history with regard to the approval and denial of fiber cement siding. Referencing guideline 4.2.7, Ms. Tully made the following points:

- The committee has approved fiber cement siding for new construction;
- Regarding the use of synthetic siding on an addition, the issue is having the substitute material immediately adjacent the historic material.
- The few times it's been approved on additions it's been for very specific reasons.
- Hardie is approved with smooth face because when painted it looks like wood.
- There is also the question of its shadow line. Wood sign tends to be thicker than typical fiber cement siding
- In Boylan Heights the commission did approve Artisan Hardie with a thicker profile
- The commission has approved composite window sills and column bases because that is what is more prone to rot.
- One possible idea to consider along these lines would be the use of wood on the main body, but on the lower part where you're most likely to get rot, you allow substitute materials. This does end up with substitute materials right next to historic.

Ms. Stevens states that the addition is intentionally not woven into the existing house. It is distinct in its footprint and design.

Ms. Tully notes that the questions is if the fiber cement siding is compatible as a material on an addition. She states that if the commission thinks there is more info out there that would help in making a decision they can ask for it.

Ms. McGorty asks for the expected life span of wood. Mr. Shackleton says that it's hard to determine because it depends on how much moisture, sun exposure there is and that things like gutters can make it more durable.

Ms. McGorty asks for other examples of approving totally different materials. Ms. Tully states that the commission decided that vinyl sign lettering on windows is the modern day equivalent of painting and that regularly Masonite is replaced with fiber cement siding because it is fairly equivalent.

Ms. Tully noted that if the applicant is willing to defer, she could defer, gather facts, and then the committee could set up a policy. At the next meeting staff would propose a policy to the COA Committee based on decisions leading up to this, before you hear this case. She will bring it up at the business meeting. Ms. Downer noted that it would be a policy that is interpretive of guidelines, not guidelines revision.

Mr. Shackleton stated that he is not inclined to vote for riblock. He noted that it is pretty thin and you can tell a difference between that and traditional standing seam metal. He also reminded the committee of the very recent case with 5V which was denied - they made them take off.

Ms. Caliendo asked if the standing seam was approvable because it is a 1930s bungalow and what if she wanted to do slate. Ms. Tully responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Shackleton suggested that the synthetic trim be considered in a similar manner to the fiber cement siding. However, the Fiberglas door and vinyl windows are not approvable.

There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Decision on the Application

Ms. McGorty move to defer the application.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Downer; passed 4/0.

Committee members voting: Caliendo, Downer, McGorty, Shackleton.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

080-12-CA 10 N EAST STREET
Applicant: NC HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY; JOHN DOPLER
Received: 7/23/2012 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 10/21/2012 1) 8/6/2012 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: O&I-2, NCOD
Nature of Project: Enlarge paved rear yard parking; replace 21 window sashes
Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	enlarge paved rear yard
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	parking
3.7	Windows and Doors	
3.10	Utilities and Energy Retrofit	replace 21 window sashes

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application, in staff's judgment:

- A. Enlarging of paved rear yard parking is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.7, 2.5.9; however increase in surface paving the proposal **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.5.7, 2.5.9.
- 1* There is a tree in the area proposed to be paved; it is unclear from the application if the tree is proposed to be retained or removed.
- 2* Tree protection was not included in the application.
- 3* The area proposed to be paved is currently gravel.
- 4* The parking area is at the rear of the property and screened from view by the house and fencing.
- 5* According the City of Raleigh Wake County iMaps data the lot size is 6,098.4 SF; the footprint of the house and paved area is approximately 4,015 SF; current lot coverage is 65.8%. The proposed additional paved area is 1,613 SF; proposed lot coverage is 92.3%.
- B. Removing sashes from 21 windows, and installing new sashes is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.7.1, 3.7.5, 3.7.6; however removal of original wood sashes is incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 3.7.1, 3.7.4, 3.7.5, 3.7.6, 3.10.2, 3.10.4.

- 1* Some of the sashes proposed for replacement are not historic wood windows.
- 2* Some of the windows are wood 1/1 double-hung sash and appear to be original historic fabric; the application does not include evidence that the sashes are deteriorated beyond repair.
- 3* Photographs of some of the windows were included in the application.
- 4* The application includes air leakage as a reason for replacement; the *Guidelines* advocate the use of storm windows.
- 5* The proposed replacement windows would be Lincoln brand wood sashes; Lincoln has been approved by the commission; detailed drawings were not included with the application.

Pending the committee's determination regarding the increase in surface paving staff suggests that the committee approve in part and deny in part the application:

Approve the increase in rear yard paving, with the following conditions:

1. That an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) evaluate the health of the tree and the potential impact of additional paving on the tree.
2. That the paving material be selected based upon the arborist report and be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

Approve the replacement of the non-historic wood window sashes, with the following conditions:

3. That a visual inventory of windows keyed to their locations on the house be provided to staff prior to removal.
4. That specifications and details for the new window sashes be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

Deny replacement of the historic wood window sashes.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Bob Kucab [affirmed], Director of the NC Housing Finance Agency, Will Parry-Hill [affirmed], NC Housing Finance Agency, Gene Davis [affirmed], Board Member the NC Housing Finance Agency, Chuck Dopler [affirmed], NC Housing Finance Agency were present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Parry-Hill provided some background information and stated that the Emmauas House was chosen as the NC HFA's 25th Anniversary project because of its long distinguished career in helping homelessness and recovering addicts in community. They chose Raleigh very specifically.

Mr. Davis stated that HFA is set up to work with affordable housing statewide. The agency has committed a lot of money to the help rehabilitate the building. They are not here for the historic preservation of building, but for community service.

Tania Tully [affirmed] noted that the applicants have completed minor works throughout the project.

Mr. Parry-Hill is hopeful that the rehabilitation will also add to the community and neighborhood. With regard to the parking, Mr. Parry-Hill stated that they are trying to do the right thing and encouraging public transportation, but do want to provide parking for the residents who do have cars. The parking is shielded by a privacy fence. The area is tight and will allow for more maneuverability. He is not sure how to address tree protection. Mr. Shackleton said that it can be worked out with staff later on.

Mr. Parry-Hill stated his agreement with staff comments noting that 14 of the windows have been replaced with nonhistoric windows. Some are outlined in photo sheet. He noted that the Lincoln brand custom made sashes will be identical to the historic windows which are 1/1 double hung. Mr. Shackleton asked the applicant if he has any sense of whether some of the historic windows are beyond repair. Mr. Parry-Hill said that a number of the sashes literally held together by duct tape; some have had holes drilled through sash a long time ago for unknown reasons; there is at least one window with water rot; and the remaining are just beat up to smithereens.

Ms. McGorty asked if the zoning of house was residential. You think of these parking lots as businesses. Ms. Tully noted that the zoning is O&I-2, but that; use is not the issue. Ms. Tully stated that the area proposed to be paved is currently gravel. Because gravel could be considered paved area or not depending how you look at it. She stated that her judgment is that Fact 5 should be changed to reflect that that there will be no change because of the gravel.

Mr. Parry-Hill (switching back to the windows) stated that this is a one shot deal for total rehabilitation. The investment is one that they hope will last Emmaus House 30 years so that the neighborhood will be proud of it as well. Mr. Davis stated that he wants all of the windows to look the same rather than some with storms, some without. He also wants consistency and that energy inefficiency is very important.

Mr. Shackleton asked staff if there is anything in the guidelines to address the visual inconsistency if some of the window sashes were replaced and some had storm windows. Ms. Tully recalled one commission decision where it approved partial replacement, partial non-replacement that worked out such that there was consistency wall by wall of the house. With that in mind we're talking about 7 windows, depending on your level of comfort, it could work out that staff looks at 7 windows and if there are any that are still repairable, bring them all together to the front façade or something like that. As to the Guidelines, with windows it is largely about the retention of historic fabric—it's there—more that than how it looks.

Ms. McGorty asked if all of the windows are the same size. Mr. Dopler said no. Mr. Shackleton said that it seems like in some cases you have damage from weather, and some cases you have abuse by users of building. Ms. McGorty noted that with an inventory of all windows, it may come out that there is no way to have consistent looking façade. Ms. Tully stated that there is nothing in guidelines that say anything about consistency.

Ms. McGorty noted that the commission can't consider the funding source. She is sympathetic, but it is not in their purview. Mr. Shackleton noted that the commission's charge is historic preservation. Where the concern of the owner and the funding source matches our concern is that if it's not done now we may be putting the building in a place where the windows are not taken care of now and in future the building will be harmed by this. Ms. Tully asked if committee decided not to allow replacement, would the applicant be willing to repair them or would they just let them rot. Mr. Parry-Hill said that they just want windows to last. Ms. Tully noted that from, a longevity lifespan, storm windows are just as efficient as new windows. Mr. Parry-Hill noted that insulating the weight cavities would help and that of the three houses Emmaus owns, this is the smallest and the one with the highest energy costs. Ms. Tully asked about insulating the attic and crawl space to which Mr. Parry-Hill said they were. Martha Lauer [affirmed] noted that the studies on energy efficiency and windows show that a properly repaired and caulked wood window with a properly caulked and sealed storm window is as energy efficient as a new modern window. Mr. Shackleton said that this was not a pieced together with duct tape repair, but a through rehabilitation by a craftsman.

Ms. McGorty noted that the difference would be the look of the storm window. Mr. Dopler stated that the storms on this house are poor. Mr. Dopler stated that in this case there is more air leakage than what is typical and that he is not sure that they can be fixed for as little as new windows, epically where the window weights are broken. He also stated that it would result in the clients living there have inconsistency from room to room.

Ms. Tully stated the need for details on the seven windows. Mr. Shackleton asked if staff can go out and look ahead of time if deferred. Mr. Parry-Hill noted that all new residents were moving in on Sept 7th. Ms. Tully said that she was comfortable making call on windows that are clearly beyond repair, but that if there are any that are not clearly beyond repair, she would like to get commissioners to meet on site.

Ms. McGorty asked about the case staff referenced where walls of uniform appearance were able to be achieved. Ms. Tully clarified that all repairable windows were required to be repaired, but that because of the window survey and window sizes the applicants were able to relocate repairable windows together on walls and new windows on a separate wall. Mr. Kucab clarified whether or not consistency is a factor to be considered. Mr. Shackleton stated that windows were moved in order to create the consistency. Ms. Tully explained that a survey helped facilitate the consistency and while not a factor in the decision was by the commission, was something the applicant wanted and was able to achieve.

Mr. Shackleton read Guideline 3.7.4 which states “Repair historic windows and doors and their distinctive features through recognized preservation methods for patching, consolidating, splicing, and reinforcing.” If a window is so far gone that this cannot be done, we can approve replacement. He offered that the commission is available to meet on site and make the call for the borderline windows.

Mr. Davis asked the commission to not look at the rules, but to look with the heart. He explained the purpose of the house as part of the addiction recovery program provided. He stated that sometimes people have to make decisions that may not be exactly by the rules. Mr. Davis referenced the musical Les Mis and requested that all 22 windows be approved for replacement, because it is right. Mr. Shackleton stated that he heard Mr. Davis, and that he personally has a lot of involvement with population the applicants are helping, but that the commission has to adhere to its legal oversight and meet the letter of the law. The committee has to consider the ramifications of allow a change that doesn’t meet the Guidelines.

Mr. Shackleton stated that in his opinion the most effective way to get this project done in a quality way (all committee members live in that neighborhood) is to approve replacement of the 14 non-historic window sashes and the and parking, and then make a determination on the remaining windows on can get it scheduled. If there are some that are repairable, they will need to be repaired according to the guidelines.

There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

Findings of Fact

Ms. McGorty moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-5) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-5) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following modifications:

Modify Comment A as follows:

Strike the following text: “...; however increase in surface paving the proposal **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.5.7, 2.5.9”

Change to read:

A. Enlarging of paved rear yard parking is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.7, 2.5.9.

Strike the following text from fact 5*: “...; the footprint of the house and paved area is approximately 4,015 SF; current lot coverage is 65.8%. The proposed additional paved area is 1,613 SF; proposed lot coverage is 92.3%”

Modify Comment B as follows:

Change to read:

- B. Removing sashes that are deteriorated beyond repair from 21 windows, and installing new sashes is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.7.1, 3.7.4, 3.7.5, 3.7.6, 3.10.2, 3.10.4; however removal of original wood sashes that are not deteriorated beyond repair is incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 3.7.1, 3.7.4, 3.7.5, 3.7.6, 3.10.2, 3.10.4.

Change facts to read:

- 1* Fourteen of the sashes proposed for replacement are not historic wood windows.
- 2* Seven of the windows are wood 1/1 double-hung sash and appear to be original historic fabric; the application does not include evidence that the sashes are deteriorated beyond repair.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Downer; passed 4/0.

Decision on the Application

Ms. McGorty made a motion that the application be approved, with the following conditions:

Approve the increase in rear yard paving, with the following conditions:

1. That an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) evaluate the health of the tree and the potential impact of additional paving on the tree.
2. That the paving material be selected based upon the arborist report and be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

Approve the replacement of the non-historic wood window sashes, with the following conditions:

3. That the applicant evaluate the condition of the seven historic wood window sash with staff and two commissioners to determine reparability of the windows.
4. That specifications and details for the new window sashes be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Downer; passed 4/0.

Committee members voting: Caliendo, Downer, McGorty, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 2/6/13.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

081-12-CA 20 E HARGETT STREET

Applicant: DAVID MAURER

Received: 7/23/2012

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 10/21/2012

1) 8/6/2012 2)

3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: BUS, DOD

Nature of Project: Install metal railing on roof of building.

Amendments: Staff noticed a new door opening on the drawing and is adding it to the proposal: add door and door opening

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes: Installation of railings is typically approvable as a Minor Work, however in staff's judgment the change is of a precedent-setting nature and per the by-laws it has been referred to the COA Committee for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3.5	Roofs	Install metal railing on roof of building.
3.7	Windows and Doors	Add door and door opening.
3.9	Storefronts	
3.11	Accessibility, Health, and Safety Considerations	Install metal railing on roof of building.

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application, in staff's judgment:

- A. Installation of metal railing on roof of building; addition of new door and door opening is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.5.10, 3.5.11, 3.7.9, 3.9.14, 3.11.1, 3.11.2, 3.11.3; however; the location of the railing **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 3.11.2, 3.11.3.
- 1* The subject building sits at the south west corner of the intersection of E Hargett and S Wilmington Streets; the Moore Square National Register Nomination form describes the c. 1900 contributing building as "2 story comm. brick, recent 1 shop, cut back corner."
- 2* There is no known precedent for the installation of a railing along the very edge of the roof on the primary street facades of a historic structure.
- 3* The committee approved a rooftop railing at 225 S Wilmington Street (140-08-CA); the railing is on a side elevation at the rear of the building.

- 4* The proposed railing is metal frame with metal wire mesh panels.
- 5* The second-level windows of the building are metal.
- 6* The new door and door opening are located on a side elevation near the rear of the building and in the wall of the adjacent 2-story building; specifications for the new door were not included in the application.

Pending the committee's determination regarding the location of the railing, staff suggests that the committee approve the amended application, with the following condition:

1. That specifications for the new door be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: David Maurer [affirmed] spoke in support of the application and made the following points:

- The is the first application for a rooftop railing in this location.
- There are railings on decks all over town.
- In this particular case, there is nowhere on the roof where it could go that you couldn't see it.
- The deck will literally only be about 4" below parapet height.
- To obtain the historic rehabilitation tax credit, neither the deck nor railing is attached to the parapet. The NC SHPO does not have a problem with this location.

Ms. McGorty asked staff if the issue is visibility. Tania Tully [affirmed] stated that the issue is that staff is not allowed to set precedent.

Mr. Shackleton notes that fact 2 says it's on the edge of the roof. Ms. Tully states that the applicant just stated that the railing is not attached to the parapet and asked if the drawings submitted reflect that. She says it looks like it is on parapet to her. Mr. Maurer states that he would like to submit that the detail in application is not correct and requested a condition of approval be that the railing be attached to the roof deck not the parapet and that correct drawing be submitted to staff.

Mr. Maurer noted that what was submitted was a safe design and that there is a real opportunity to do a creative railing up there - a grid where you can grow vines, or etc. He requested that condition of approve be that the final design of the railing would be approved by staff and that he would be happy to go to DRAC.

There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

Findings of Fact

Ms. Downer moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-6) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following modifications and additional fact:

Modify Comment A as follows:

Strike the following text: "...; however; the location of the railing **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 3.11.2, 3.11.3"

Add fact 7.

7* The proposed railing is not attached to the parapet, but to the new roof deck.

The motion was seconded by Ms. McGorty; passed 4/0.

Decision on the Application

Ms. Downer made a motion that the application be approved as amended, with the following conditions:

1. That specifications for the new door and railing design be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.
2. That an accurate installation detail drawing be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

The motion was seconded by Ms. McGorty; passed 4/0.

Committee members voting: Caliendo, Downer, McGorty, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 2/6/13.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

082-12-CA 318 E CABARRUS STREET

Applicant: WILL JEFFERS

Received: 7/23/2012

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 10/21/2012

1) 8/6/2012 2)

3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: S. PERSON / S BLOUNT HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: RB, DOD

Nature of Project: Remove aluminum siding; alter plantings; regrade for drainage; install patio; construct low retaining wall; remove chain link fence; install new privacy fence; remove top level of non-historic 2-story rear addition; construct new top level of rear addition; alter roof coverings and roof form; alter doors; alter miscellaneous non-historic features; install new HVAC unit; alter storm windows; change exterior paint color.

Amendments: Revised drawings were provided August 1 and 5, 2012 and are attached to these comments. The amended drawings reflect a revised roof for proposal for the rear of the house and the addition.

DRAC: The application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee on August 1, 2012 by Curtis Kasefang and David Maurer. Also in attendance were Will Jeffers and Tania Tully.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- The Nature of Project has been rewritten to reflect the fact that the bottom level of the non-historic addition will not be removed. The proposal has not changed, but staff's understanding of the project has.
- The S Person / S Blount Street HOD took effect May 1, 2012; this is the first COA application from the new district. The district "is historically, architecturally, and culturally significant, possessing a mix of residential, commercial, institutional, and community landmark resources representative of African American life in Raleigh from the late nineteenth century through the beginning of the era of integration." The Special Character Essay is attached to these comments.
- The designation report describes the contributing resource as a "one-story Victorian frame house with aluminum siding, an asphalt-shingled triple-A gable roof, a front porch with replacement square wood columns, 4/4 windows, a one-pane transom over the front entry, and peaked gable vents."
- The contributing status of buildings in the district was evaluated based on "integrity of roofline, trim, windows, exterior wall cladding, and porches." Resources had to possess "integrity for at least three of the five criteria" to be classified as contributing.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	alter plantings; regrade for drainage; install patio; construct low retaining wall; remove chain link fence; install new privacy fence; install new HVAC unit;
2.4	Fences and Walls	remove chain link fence; install new privacy fence; construct low retaining wall
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	install patio
3.4	Paint and Paint Color	change exterior paint color
3.5	Roofs	alter roof coverings and roof form
3.6	Exterior Walls	remove aluminum siding; install fiber cement siding on rear addition
3.7	Windows and Doors	alter storm windows; alter doors
3.10	Utilities and Energy Retrofit	install new HVAC unit
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	remove top level of non-historic 2-story rear addition; construct new top level of rear addition

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application, in staff's judgment:

- A. Alteration of rear yard plantings; regarding of rear yard; installation of patio; construction of low retaining wall; changing of rear yard fencing; installation of HVAC unit is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.7, 2.3.11, 2.4.1, 2.4.6, 2.4.8, 2.4.10, 2.5.1, 2.5.5, 2.5.7; however, the size of the rear yard patio **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* section 2.3.8.
- 1* The applications states that there are drainage issues in the rear yard.
- 2* Grading will lower the ground at the rear of the house below the existing floor level and route water away from the foundation.
- 3* The proposed wood privacy fence will replace existing wood and chain link fencing; specifications and details for the new fence were not included in the application.
- 4* A tree protection plan for the crepe myrtle was not included in the application.
- 5* Scrub and ailing plants and shrubs will be removed and replaced; a detailed planting plan was not included with the application.
- 6* The lot size is 3,485 SF; the footprint of the house and patio is 1,566 SF; current lot coverage is 45%. The proposed footprint of the house and patio is 2,998; proposed lot coverage is 86%.

- B. Changing of exterior paint color; removal of aluminum siding; alteration of storm windows; alteration of doors and windows is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.4, 3.6, 3.7.
- 1* The application states that there is a large amount of termite damage on the east side of the house.
 - 2* Removal of the aluminum siding and awning and changing of paint color is typically approvable as a minor work and is included here for administrative efficiency; paint colors were not included with the application.
 - 3* Several door and window alterations are proposed; details and specifications of the new units are not provided in the application.
 - 4* The application states that 1960s storm windows will be removed and new storms installed; details and specifications were not included in the application.
- C. Removal of top level of non-historic 2-story rear addition; construction of new top level of rear addition; alteration of roof coverings and roof form is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.5.1, 3.5.5, 3.5.6, 3.5.7, , 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9; however the use of fiber cement siding on the rear addition **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 3.6;
- 1* The proposed roofing is proposed to be either architectural shingles or standing seam metal; details and specifications are not provided.
 - 2* The application proposes to construct a new main level on top of the existing 1960s CMU addition foundation. The former flat roof will be replaced with a gable roof.
 - 3* The application proposes to side the main level of the rear addition with fiber cement siding; it is unclear from the application if there was wood siding under aluminum siding of the now-collapsed rear addition.
 - 4* The committee recently approved the use of smooth faced fiber cement to replace masonite on a non-contributing addition to a historic house in Oakwood (129-11-CA; 421 N Bloodworth Street) in part because the masonite addition was constructed in the 1960s and not original to the house.

Pending the committee's determination regarding the size of the rear yard patio and pending the use of fiber cement siding on the rear addition, staff suggests that the committee approve the amended application, with the following conditions:

- 1. That details and specifications for the following items be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
 - House Alterations
 - d. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan.
 - Landscape Alterations
 - e. Retaining wall
 - f.
- 2. That details and specifications for the following items be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:

House Alterations

- a. Roofing material;
- b. Paint colors;
- c. Doors and windows;
- d. Storm windows;
- e. Trim including for new doors, windows and eaves;
- f. Gutters and downspouts;

Landscape Alterations

- g. Fence design;
 - h. Gate and hardware design;
 - i. Planting plan;
 - j. HVAC unit;
 - k. Patio construction including material samples and paving pattern
3. That the fiber cement siding used on the rear addition be installed with the smooth face out.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Will Jeffers [affirmed] spoke in support of the application.

Mr. Shackleton asked about the request to use fiber cement siding. Mr. Jeffers said that he had to tear down the aluminum siding over Masonite siding addition. Tania Tully [affirmed] explained that the only difference from Oakwood addition cited in the facts is that this proposal gets 4 feet wider. The question is this rebuilding current space or a new addition?

Mr. Jeffers agrees that hardieplank does look a little different. He stated that he is not wed to the size of the patio.

Mr. Shackleton stated that for the case in Oakwood, it was already a Masonite addition, all they did was re-side it. The commission could use that as precedent. Ms. Tully stated that if not for the new roof reconfiguration, staff would probably have approved it as minor work.

Mr. Shackleton referenced the fourth bullet under staff notes—needs three criteria to remain contributing. changing roof line but removing aluminum siding is adding one more.

There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

Findings of Fact

Ms. McGorty moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-6), B. (inclusive of facts 1-4),

and C. (inclusive of facts 1-4) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following modifications:

Modify Comment A as follows:

Change "regarding" to "regrading".

Change "...; however, the size of the rear yard patio may be incongruous according to *Guidelines* section 2.3.8" to read "...; however, the size of the rear yard patio **is** incongruous according to *Guidelines* section 2.3.8"

Modify Comment C as follows:

Strike the following text: "...; however the use of fiber cement siding on the rear addition **may** **be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 3.6;"

Change to read:

C. Removal of top level of non-historic 2-story rear addition; construction of new top level of rear addition; alteration of roof coverings and roof form is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.5.1, 3.5.5, 3.5.6, 3.5.7, 3.6, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9.

Change fact 3 to read:

3* The application proposes to side the main level of the rear addition with fiber cement siding; the applicant states that there was Masonite siding under the aluminum siding of the now-collapsed rear addition.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Downer; passed 4/0.

Decision on the Application

Ms. McGorty made a motion that the application be approved, with the following conditions:

1. That details and specifications for the following items be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:

House Alterations

- a. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan.

Landscape Alterations

- b. Retaining wall

2. That the size of the patio be reduced.

3. That details and specifications for the following items be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:

House Alterations

- a. Roofing material;
- b. Paint colors;
- c. Doors and windows;
- d. Storm windows;
- e. Trim including for new doors, windows and eaves;

- f. Gutters and downspouts;
 - Landscape Alterations
 - g. Fence design;
 - h. Gate and hardware design;
 - i. Planting plan;
 - j. HVAC unit;
 - k. Revised patio plan;
 - l. Patio construction including material samples and paving pattern
4. That the fiber cement siding used on the rear addition be installed with the smooth face out.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Downer; passed 4/0.

Committee members voting: Caliendo, Downer, McGorty, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 2/6/13.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

025-12-MW 108 1/2 E HARGETT ST

Applicant: EAST HARGETT ST ENT, JONATHAN SEELBINDER

Received: 3/2/2012

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 5/31/2012

1) 4/2/2012

2) 5/7/2012

3) 6/4/2012

4) 7/2/2012

5) 8/6/2012

6)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: DOD, BUS

Nature of Project: Install externally lit painted wood projecting sign in front of window

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- The Moore Square report describes the c. 1900 building as “1 bay, center entry, 2 story brick Italianate commercial block; 1st floor altered. 2nd floor plain windows with decorative panels, elaborate parapet with arch over entry.”
- The application was not heard at the April, May, or July COA meetings. **The next COA meeting, September 4, 2012 is beyond 180 days.**
- Raleigh City Code section 10-2052(a)2.c.1. states “Applications for certificates of appropriateness shall be acted upon within ninety (90) days after the complete application is filed, otherwise the application shall be deemed to be approved and a certificate of appropriateness shall be issued; provided however, that the Commission may take the matter under advisement for a total period of up to one hundred eighty (180) days to receive additional evidence or memoranda of authority requested by the Commission for its consideration. Nothing herein shall prohibit an extension of time where mutual consent is given. The City staff may advise the applicant and make recommendations in regard to appropriateness.
- Raleigh City Code section 10-2052(a)2.c.4. states “...the burden of producing substantial evidence or testimony is upon the applicant, and if the applicant fails to do so, the Commission shall deny the certificate. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Code, the Historic Districts Commission may require additional evidence or memoranda of authority to be submitted and may take the matter under advisement until such evidence or memoranda have been submitted and considered up to the one hundred eighty (180) day limit established in subsection c.1. above.”

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.8	Signage	Install externally lit painted wood projecting sign
3.9	Storefronts	in front of window

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application, in staff's judgment:

- A. Installation of an externally lit painted wood projecting sign in front of window is incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 2.8.2, 2.8.3, 2.8.4, 2.8.11, 3.9.8.
- 1* An awning with lettering was recently approved as a Minor Work application (021-12-MW).
- 2* The proposed sign is 10 feet tall and mounted in front of the only arched window on the building.
- 3* Specific details regarding the mounting method and sign construction were not included in the application; however it appears as though the sign would mount into the decorative window hood and stone sill.
- 4* The sign would project less than the existing awning by 6 inches.
- 5* The central bay of the building is slightly projecting and is a character defining feature.

Staff suggests that the committee deny the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

Findings of Fact

Ms. Downer moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearings, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-5) to be acceptable as findings of fact.

The motion was seconded by Ms. McGorty; passed 4/0.

Decision on the Application

Ms. Downer made a motion that the application be denied.

The motion was seconded by Ms. McGorty; passed 4/0.

Committee members voting: Caliendo, Downer, McGorty, Shackleton.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Committee Discussion
 - i. Application Completeness
 - ii. Meeting Post-Mortem
2. Design Guidelines Update

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:59 p.m.

Scott Shackleton, Chair
Certificate of Appropriateness Committee,
Raleigh Historic Development Commission

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner