

RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
May 7, 2012

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Scott Shackleton called the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Committee meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

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

Present: Will Alphin, Fred Belledin, Miranda Downer, Kiernan McGorty, Scott Shackleton

Staff Present: Tania Tully, Martha Lauer

Approval of the April 2, 2012 Minutes

Mr. Belledin moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing. Mr. Alphin seconded the motion; passed 4/0 (Mr. Shackleton abstained). Mr. Belledin moved to adopt the minutes as submitted. Mr. Alphin seconded the motion; passed 4/0 (Mr. Shackleton abstained).

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.

Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address	Affirmed
Deborah England, 315 Ramblewood 27609	Yes
Emily Brinker, 1008 W South Street 27603	Yes
Eric Brinker, 1008 W South Street 27603	Yes
Michael Knott, 1008 W South Street 27603	Yes
Steve McAllister, 1008 W South Street 27603	Yes
M.B. Hardy, 1020 W South Street 27603	Yes
Ken Thompson, 310 Glenwood Ave 27603	No
Neil Gray, 310 Glenwood Ave 27603	No
Mark Brambrut, Novare Group, 815 W Peachtree Suite 400 30308	No
Gregg Sandreuter 104 Lake Cliff Ct 27513	No

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. McGorty moved to approve the agenda as amended. Mr. Belledin seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

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: 038-12-CA and 040-12-CA.

The applicant for case 025-12-MW was not in attendance. Mr. Belledin moved to defer the case. Ms. McGorty seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

Case 037-12-CA, 602 S Boylan Ave was deferred by the applicant prior to the meeting.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

038-12-CA 1008 W SOUTH STREET

Applicant: EMILY BRINKER

Received: 4/23/2012

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 7/22/2012

1) 5/7/2012 2)

3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: Implement front and rear landscaping and hardscaping to include: front retaining wall; rear retaining wall; rear yard grading; rear and side yard fencing; rear and front yard patios and walkways; tree removals; new plantings in front and rear yard.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- File photographs from September 9, 2005, January 24, 2008, and March 24, 2008 are available for review.
- Excerpts from *Guidelines* page 12: "Site features and plantings not only provide the context for the buildings of the historic districts; they also contribute significantly to the overall character of the districts. The elements of district setting include features that form spaces, including topography, setback and siting of buildings...and tree canopies...and features that articulate or develop a site, such as accessory buildings, fences, walls ...

Landscaping and plantings play a significant role in creating the character of most of the historic districts...and also reflect the regional climate. Mature gardens, grassy lawns, shrubs, climbing vines, ornamental trees, and tree canopies are typical of the residential historic districts. Historically, large shade trees, prudently located, were an important means of providing summer cooling. Today they still contribute shade as well as distinctive character to the historic districts...

Removal of mature, healthy trees should be considered only for absolutely compelling reasons... The planting of a similar replacement tree in its place or nearby helps perpetuate the tree canopy that is so important to the landscape as well as the individual building sites... Whenever construction or site work is undertaken, large trees and other significant site features should be protected from immediate damage during construction or delayed damage resulting from construction work, including compaction of the soil by equipment or loss of root area...

Although the impact of intrusive contemporary site features or equipment can often be diminished through careful siting and screening, in some cases it may be so detrimental to the character of the site or the streetscape that the alteration cannot be accommodated. Such might be the case if the bulk of a residential rear yard were paved for parking or if an addition required the removal of several healthy, mature shade trees."

- Excerpt from *Guidelines* pages 77-78: “The extent to which streets were influenced by the hillside site is shown in West Lenoir and West South streets which are continuations from Raleigh’s original grid. They begin as direct east/west connectors but curve sharply northward around the base of the hill...Large, mature deciduous and evergreen trees fill many lots. Shade trees line the street rights-of-way, which have also been planted with dogwoods or crepe myrtles...Front yards are generally lawns from street sidewalk to house, usually open without an enclosing fence...Because of the gently-sloping hillside location of the district, a few masonry and stone retaining walls can be found within the district adjacent to walks and alleys or between houses. The paving material of choice and prestige for walks and curbs in the district was concrete, which at the time of the subdivision’s development in the early 20th century, had recently been made more readily available and economical by the introduction of nearby concrete plants.”

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	Implement front and rear landscaping and hardscaping to include: front retaining wall; rear retaining wall; rear yard grading; rear and side yard fencing; rear and front yard patios and walkways; tree removals; new plantings in front and rear yard.
2.4	Fences and Walls	front retaining wall; rear retaining wall; rear and side yard fencing
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	rear and front yard patios and walkways

STAFF COMMENTS

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

- A. Implementation of front and rear landscaping and hardscaping is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.4.8, 2.5.1, 2.5.5; however, installation of a front yard patio; the amount of rear yard paving proposed; removal of trees is incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.5, 2.3.8; and the proposed regrading may be incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.7, 2.3.11, 2.3.12, 2.5.6. Raleigh City Code Section 10-2052(a)(2)c.5.i states that “An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure, or site within the district may not be denied... However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to three-hundred sixty-five (365) days from the date of approval. The maximum period of delay authorized by this section shall be reduced by the Commission where it finds that the owner would suffer extreme hardship or be permanently deprived of all beneficial use of or return from such property by virtue of the delay. During such period of delay the Commission may negotiate with the owner and with any other parties in an

effort to find a means of preserving the building, structure, or site. If the Commission finds that the building, structure, or site has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Overlay District, it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal."

- 1* The following COAs (files available for review) at 1008 W South Street have been issued:
 - 104-06-CA "Install French drain around rear (north) side of house; [AFTER-THE-FACT] remove tree root extending underneath southwest corner of the house; alter portion of existing grade in rear yard; install landscaping to include flowers, small shrubs, and a stepping-stone walkway in side and rear yard; alter grade of rear yard; add new gravel in existing rear-yard dirt and gravel parking area."
 - 181-06-CA "Construct accessory building."
 - 132-07-MW "Construct shed in rear yard" Supersedes 181-06-CA.
 - 006-08-MW "Replace failing retaining wall in front yard. Amend COA # 104-06-CA by turning the corners with the patio retaining wall."
 - 075-08-MW "Replace retaining wall in right-of-way; construct brick edged gravel walkway in rear yard; prune trees."
 - 089-10-CA "[AFTER-THE-FACT] Remove dead tree in rear yard; prune large limb on tree in front yard"
- 2* The committee was consistent in its concern with grading and tree health in all of the major work COA applications.
- 3* Due to the closeness of the houses and size of trees along property lines, any extensive digging has the potential to damage root systems and lead to a decline in the trees' health.
- 4* No measurements or graphic details are provided of the grading plan. The entire rear yard slopes towards the structure, so re-grading on a scale to level the yard would be extensive. The proposed rear retaining wall is shown to be as high as 4 feet. Low retaining walls have been approved by the committee in rear yards with similar drainage issues.
- 5* The application states that grading would be between 6 and 10 inches. This appears to be in conflict with a 4 foot tall wall.
- 6* The application does not include information regarding the health of the existing trees and the possible impact further grading may have on their health. The application states that a light duty bobcat will be used; prior COAs have required grading to be completed manually.
- 7* The application does not include information regarding the impact the tree removals would have on the tree canopy.
- 8* The application states the intention to renew a front retaining wall COA; it is unclear which application to which this refers.
- 9* Staff is unaware of any historic or COA approved front yard patios in Boylan Heights.
- 10* The use of bluestone paving has been approved in the district; however, the proposal paves the majority of the yard.

Staff suggests that the committee defer the application in order for the applicant to provide the following information:

- A topographic map or other grading plan that clearly and accurately describes the amount of grading proposed;
- Assessment of the impact of the planned work upon adjacent tree health by an ISA certified arborist in consultation with staff and the amended grading plan;
- Assessment of the impact of the planned tree removals to the tree canopy character of the district;
- Clarification on the retaining wall COA renewal;
- Drawings that show the entire property.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff provided a drawing from the application to the applicant.

Support: Emily and Eric Brinker [affirmed] property owners spoke in support of the application. Ms. Brinker described the project briefly making the following points:

- They have done a lot of COAs because they bought a house that was a rental for many years.
- They have done a lot of work in yard like the patio, never put in French drain.
- They are the drainage source for the alley because there's not a retaining wall. It needs to go behind existing shed at rear of property. One tree is growing up through concrete pad of the shed.
- The alley is 4' above the yard.
- Robert Underwood is doing a tree protection plan (ISA arborist) but didn't get report done in time for this meeting.
- Some of the other stuff is more hardscaping, changing brick to bluestone, and the gravel paths are a mess and need to be replaced with both stones and pervious surface (gator dust or river rock).
- Tania mentioned the lot coverage. They are willing to remove the hardscaping near the alley.
- In front they want to have a surface for Adirondack chairs.

Mr. Brinker followed up noting that in back the retaining wall would require minimal grading in the center area, but more for the foundation of the retaining wall. Digging the footing could be done by hand. Ms. Brinker explained that the reason the retaining wall is so high is that's how high the alley is.

Mr. Belledin asked if they were raising the alley or their property. Mr. Brinker responded that they will be bringing their property up to match height of the alley. Ms. Brinker said that they tried to get the city to regrade the alley to be as deep as it was originally with no success. She said that her tree guy is fine with use of the bobcat.

Mr. Alphin stated that he would like to see the detailed grading plan noting that the drawing of the patio is different than described. Mr. Brinker said no, the plan shows hatching, and the description is exact.

Mr. Shackleton explained that they have a couple of options: they can go ahead and defer. Or they can hear all the evidence as it is. There is a risk in having it heard. He noted that if there were one or two things that could be worked out with staff, that would be one thing, but his concern is that there are several items that are in potential conflict with the guidelines.

Mr. Alphin asked if they have studied a way to do retaining wall near the alley that doesn't require removal of the tree. Ms. Brinker stated that there was no other way.

Ms. McGorty confirmed with staff that no front patios have been approved in Boylan Heights. Ms. Brinker said she tried to find one and didn't. Mr. Shackleton asked if she was willing to withdraw the front patio from the application. Ms. Brinker said yes and amended the application.

Ms. Brinker stated that the existing retaining wall near the street was the COA needing renewal.

Mr. Shackleton asked if they were willing to reduce the paved area in the back near the shed Ms. Brinker said yes and amended the application.

Ms. McGorty asked it works when staff is allowed to work out details based on an arborist's report. Tania Tully [affirmed] said that it was not uncommon for trees to be removed for additions, but she's not sure of the same happening for landscape plans. What needs to be weighed is how much the trees contribute to the tree canopy and what would be the impact of removal. Mr. Shackleton said that approving an application with staff review of plans works if a COA is contingent on following a plan that the arborist is going to develop. In this situation it's a decision based on something that's in report. Ms. Brinker said that she works well with Tania and will do her best.

Ms. McGorty questioned if regrading is the other issue. Ms. Tully said that she cannot tell what's going to happen from this application.

Steve McAllister [affirmed], resident of Boylan Heights spoke in support of the application:

- He knows the Brinkers and the nature of the plan and is familiar with the property.
- The water problems are fairly significant.
- The proposed plan would make the backyard usable.
- The trees in alley where wall would go are not particularly significant to the tree canopy.

Michael Knott [affirmed], Ms. Brinker's father and resident of Boylan Heights spoke in support of the application.

- The backyard without the retaining wall is unusable; it is too wet.

- The retaining wall is essential to making backyard usable.
- Right against the house itself, the patio is covered with inches of silt.
- The slope and the grade is really an issue.
- The impact would be only positive.

Opposition: Marsh Hardy [affirmed], neighbor spoke in opposition to the application making the following points:

- He has a retaining wall and understands the need for a wall noting that his was constructed completely different. For his wall the only footings are for steel fence posts across the back, then cast around the fence posts was the retaining wall of a height of 12" on north side to 15" on south side.
- There was no excavation for his retaining wall and suggested that if they simply continued from his wall they'd start at 15" and run not much higher than that to the other side of their property.
- Behind the retaining wall he filled in with a mix of very coarse gravel and top soil to allow the drainage to go down and reach the tree roots. He would suggest a retaining all solution like that.
- He's concerned about impact on the trees, noting the three 80' tall trees impacted by this project. These three enormous trees contribute to the canopy of the neighborhood One is a 36" DBH oak tree on their shared boundary; one is a 48" DBH Willow Oak; one is an 80' tall pine tree.
- No grading should be allowed. None was used on his backyard and the little retaining wall suffices to keep alley runoff from coming onto his property and provides a parking area off of the alley.

Mr. Hardy requested that he would like the opportunity to review the arborist's plan as part of this process and have his arborist also review.

Ms. Brinker stated that he and his arborist are restrained with a no trespassing order on their property. Mr. Shackleton explained that this is not in the committee's purview.

Mr. Hardy started to bring up a past grading issue. Ms. Tully stated that the Department of Inspections was involved, and it the case has been closed.

Mr. Hardy stated that due to this past grading, no grading should be allowed and made the following additional comments:

- There are so many feeder roots in this neighborhood.
- She wants to remove an oak stump that's part of his fence. The fence is on his property and not hers, and enough of the stump is on his property that it is part of his fence.
- She says that's necessary according to the arborist due to a fungus, but that claim is surprising because the fungus that invades and kills trees is endemic in the soil.
- The tree that died was right next to the outbuilding they built, and any more grading will further remove trees that remain.

- Any filler should be porous like his. Any further pavement should be disallowed. Any further plans should be available for review by him and his arborist before final plans are approved.

Regarding the two large Oaks, Mr. Brinker said that they will follow the arborists plan, but that the pine tree does not contribute to the canopy. Ms. Brinker stated that it is fine to leave the stump.

Mr. Brinker said that he has a Masters in civil engineering and wouldn't use the supports Mr. Hardy used. Ms. Brinker noted that their slope is much more severe than Mr. Hardy's.

Mr. Belledin asked what the height of the brick cap of the wall respective to outbuilding. Ms. Brinker said that the wall will be a little taller than concrete pad to meet area between yard and alley. The shed is up on piers.

At Mr. Shackleton's suggestion Ms. McGorty moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Mr. Alphin seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Committee Discussion

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

Removal of trees and regrading are outstanding. We have no plan to determine whether they are appropriate or not. [McGorty]

Technical point: they amended the application to remove the front patio and the patio in front of the shed and to maintain the tree stump. [Tully]

There is probably a way to resolve this but without a plan we can't make a recommendation.

We need to see the arborist's plan to have good understanding of the retaining wall and how it affects the grade in several areas of site—this would be helpful to the arborist also to make their determination. Part of the committee's charge is to protect trees. [Alphin]

Having seen the site some sort of retaining wall is a reasonable request; this one seems to be too large. I support it in concept but want to make sure the arborist explains what the full impacts would be. [Belledin]

It does need to be put out there for everyone to see it. [Alphin]

I understand the first two bullet points; what about the last bullet? [Belledin] Being able to see the whole property to be able to judge built to open space. [Tully]

Decision on the Application

Mr. Belledin made a motion that the application be deferred in order for the applicant to provide the following information:

- A topographic map or other grading plan that clearly and accurately describes the amount of grading proposed;
- Assessment of the impact of the planned work upon adjacent tree health by an ISA certified arborist in consultation with staff and the amended grading plan;
- Clarification on the retaining wall COA renewal;
- Drawings that show the entire property.

The motion was seconded by Ms. McGorty; passed 5/0.

Committee members voting: Alphin, Belledin, Downer, McGorty, Shackleton.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

040-12-CA 701 E LANE STREET

Applicant: MATTIAS GOULD

Received: 4/29/2012

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 7/28/2012

1) 5/7/2012 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: AFTER-THE-FACT: remove existing metal shingle roofing tiles; install 5v metal roofing

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- File photographs from January 24, April 27, and May 4, 2012 are available for review. Staff visited the site April 27 and observed the condition of metal tiles removed from the roof.
- Excerpt from *Guidelines* page 30: "Patching or replacing deteriorated metal in kind is always preferable to using substitute materials. Corrosion due to galvanic reaction between dissimilar metals limits the options of patching one metal with another. If a detail of a painted metal feature such as a decorative cornice is missing or deteriorated, replacement in kind may not be feasible, and the replication of the detail in fiberglass, wood, or aluminum may be appropriate. Asphalt products such as roofing tar corrode metals and should never be used to patch flashing or other metal surfaces."
- Excerpt from *Guidelines* page 34: "Roofing materials as well contribute to the character of historic buildings. Depending on the age and the style of the building, the original roofing may have been any of a variety of materials, including wood or metal shingles, slates, clay tiles, and standing-seam metal."
- It is the practice of the committee to treat After-the-Fact applications as though the work has not been completed.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3.3	Architectural Metals	remove existing metal shingle roofing tiles; install
3.5	Roofs	5v metal roofing

STAFF COMMENTS

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

- A. Removal of existing metal shingle roofing tiles is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.4, 3.3.5, 3.3.6, 3.5.4, 3.5.5; however, installation of 5v metal roofing is incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 3.3.1, 3.3.5, 3.3.6, 3.5.4, 3.5.5, 3.5.7.
- 1* The National Register nomination form (section 7, page 6) for the Linden Ave. Amendment to Oakwood Historic District states the following regarding 701 E. Lane street:
- It is contributing.
 - It was built ca. 1911 for Millard T. Wilder.
 - It is an L-shaped, one-story frame building at the corner of E. Lane Street and Linden Avenue. The front corner end of the intersecting tin-shingled gable roofs has a partial raised parapet over a shop front with full-length display windows flanking a central door. Extending to the side is a wing originally used as living quarters, but which now has a central door with gabled hood flanked by boarded-up display windows. At the rear of the building are two shed-roofed additions.
- 2* The building is one of three corner grocery stores surviving in Oakwood.
- 3* The removed roofing consists of a mix of intact, partially rusted, and severely rusted metal shingles. Staff photographs are available for review.
- 4* The metal shingle roof has been patched and repaired with other pieces of metal including advertising signage. The shingles have been coated with some sort of metallic coating/paint that partially obscures the pattern of the tiles. This coating would make replacement of individual tiles technically challenging in terms of visual compatibility.
- 5* There is currently at least one U.S. manufacturer of metal shingles matching this pattern.
- 6* The replacement roofing is 5v metal roofing panels; the material was approved for use on the new addition recently approved under COA 132-11-CA.
- 7* The visual characteristic of metal roofing panels is different than metal shingles in terms of pattern and texture.

Staff suggests that the committee approve in part and deny in part the application as follows:

Approve removal of the deteriorated metal shingles with the following condition:

1. That metal shingles matching the dimension and pattern of the existing be reinstalled within 60 days of this decision.

Deny installation of the 5-v metal roofing panels on the historic building.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Tully distributed photographs of the property taken by staff.

Support: Debbie England [affirmed], real estate broker and partner with Matt Gould who owns building spoke in support and provided samples of the removed roofing material. Ms. England stated that the grocery is a family enterprise. Matt works in Washington, D.C. during week and on the building on the weekends. Ms. England's daughter is going to be running the business. Ms. England described how the roof replacement occurred. She said that it started pouring while they were working on roof. The water was running into the building onto the newly refinished wood floors. Mr. Gould decided to get more of the galvanized metal to repair the old roof to match the materials approved for the addition. The new roof is consistent with what was already approved for the addition. They didn't know you could get the squares [metal shingles]. Ms. England stated that the roof had been painted with aluminum paint the month before they closed on the property, so it hadn't been there a long time. She stated that Mr. Gould many materials on the roof including rubber sheets, backs of signs, tar paper, silicone. The spirit of the building is a corner store that was put together piece by piece. It is not an upscale place buying expensive tiles. Ms. England stated that it would be a financial hardship to redo the roof.

Ms. McGorty asked staff to explain the suggested decision. Tania Tully [affirmed] said that the committee has two questions to answer: 1) congruity of removal of the existing metal shingles and 2) if approved, what, can be put back. She stated that she is suggesting approval of the removal, and replacement with metal tiles that match same pattern.

Ms. England said that she thinks that to insist on perfect replacement violates the spirit of the building. It's not like its bad, what she did.

Ms. Tully noted to the committee that the only place she can see where you have flexibility is in timing. Staff suggested 60 days but that doesn't have to be so. One of the facts is that because of the aluminum paint, simply replacing a tile at a time would have resulted in polka dotted look. Mr. Alphin confirmed that the discussion is about the Linden Avenue side.

Mr. Belledin asked how much flexibility the committee has with the timing. Ms. Tully stated that there is nothing in the code that says one way or another. She noted that what has been done in the past with some items is that instead of a specific time frame a deadline is connected to a track-able benchmark. For example within so long from when the CO has been issued.

Mr. Belledin asked if the committee has required replacement in kind with slate. Ms. Tully said that it has happened in at least one case, 516 E Jones Street. That decision was based on the fact that the slate was at the end of its life and perhaps the structure of the building was inadequate. She stated that in this case the difference has to do with texture and noted that typically 5V is only approved on accessory buildings.

Mr. Shackleton said that he's glad they're saving building, but the committee has to take care with setting precedents, and they have an obligation to follow the guidelines.

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

At Mr. Shackleton's suggestion Mr. Alphin moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Ms. McGorty seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Committee Discussion

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

Guideline 3.3.5 is pretty clear. [Belledin]

This is just one section of roof. Maybe compromise between stamped tiles and other types.

[Alphin]

What are thoughts on time? 365 from C.O.? [Shackleton]

Ms. McGorty moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be reopened. Mr. Alphin seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Ms. England said that they kept the squares in the back and asked if they could they reuse them. Mr. Belledin said that from the COA perspective, yes but from structural side it may not be a good idea.

Ms. McGorty moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Ms. Downer seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Findings of Fact

Mr. Alphin moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-7) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following additional fact 2:

The motion was seconded by Mr. Belledin; passed 5/0.

Decision on the Application

Mr. Alphin made a motion that the application be approved, with the following condition:

1. That metal shingles matching the dimension and pattern of the existing be reinstalled within 365 days of issuance of certificate of occupancy.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Belledin; passed 5/0.

Committee members voting: Alphin, Belledin, Downer, McGorty, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 11/7/12.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Courtesy Review –SkyHouse Ken Thompson and Neil Gray with Jay Davis Architects.
Gregg Sandreuter property owner, Mark Brambrut, Novare Group. The committee offered the following comments: The amount of ground floor retail is good; Encourage maximizing the efforts towards pedestrian scaled details; the building looks like one of 17. It is not unique to Raleigh; the materials are a bit cold. There is a lot of old brick nearby. Warmer materials may make a better transition.
2. Committee Discussion – Meeting Post-Mortem
3. *Design Guidelines* Update

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. McGorty moved that the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Alphin seconded the motion; passed 5/0. The meeting was adjourned at 5:54 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner