

RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
Tuesday, September 4, 2012

CALL TO ORDER

Acting Chair Kiernan McGorty called the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Committee meeting to order at 4:01 p.m.

ROLL CALL

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

Present: Will Alphin, Elizabeth Caliendo, Miranda Downer, Kiernan McGorty

Alternate Present: Fred Belledin

Excused Absence: Scott Shackleton

Staff Present: Tania Tully, Martha Lauer

Approval of the July and August Minutes

Mr. Alphin moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing. Ms. Downer seconded the motion; passed 4/0. Mr. Alphin moved to adopt the July 2, 2012 minutes as submitted. Ms. Downer seconded the motion; passed 3/0 (Mr. Belledin & Ms. Caliendo abstained). Mr. Alphin moved to adopt the August 6, 2012 minutes as submitted. Ms. Downer seconded the motion; passed 3/0 (Messrs. Belledin & Alphin 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
Greg Olenar, 3401 Atlantic Avenue, Raleigh	Yes
Agnes Stevens, 512 East Lane Street 27601	Yes
Jason Thurston, 511 Oakwood Avenue 27601	Yes
Henry Stevens, 3784 US 117 South 28333	Yes
Mary Hart-Paul 306 E Forest Dr 27605	Yes

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Alphin moved to approve the agenda as printed. Ms. Downer 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: 079-12-CA, 085-12-MW, and 095-12-CA.

Case 086-12-MW was deferred without being heard due to the absence of the applicant.

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) 9/4/2012 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

Amendments: New drawings and new information regarding fiber cement siding was provided August 27, 2012 and was included in the commissioner packets.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes: A spreadsheet of the various synthetic siding and trim products on the market today is available for review.

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 amended 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; at the August 6, 2012 meeting the applicant stated that she was withdrawing the use of RIBLOC and would re-roof with the same material already on the house; specifications were not provided.
- 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.
- 10* The amended application included the following additional information regarding wood siding.
 - The only wood siding (of the appropriate dimension) available from area commercial lumber dealers today is ½" x 6" clear pine grade.
 - According to reputable area suppliers (Capital City Lumber for example), cypress is no longer available, and cedar siding is not available in the ½" x 6" siding form.
 - The clear pine siding available today is inferior to the pine product used on the original structure. Specialty woods are not available in the ½" x 6" dimension required.
 - The original home's circa 1930 wood has a dense grain and is demonstrably resistant to rot. It is hard to project the longevity of the pine wood siding available today, even if thoroughly primed.
 - The front porch flooring of this structure—commercial pine— installed in the last 10 years was primed front, back, and on the tongue-and-groove interior. It has been regularly painted and well maintained, but it has several sections of boards that currently need to be replaced due to rot. Likewise the vertical posts/stiles of the porch handrails were primed and have been regularly painted, but now need to be replaced in under 10 years due to damage from rot. These were all primed and painted wood materials, so it would seem that the longevity of the wood available today, whether it is installed vertically (porch rails) or flat (floor) is certainly limited if the wood is exposed to the weather, and there is no warranty for wood.

- Custom milling of specialty wood (cedar) into the required lap siding dimension would waste a significant quantity of the wood, and so in addition to being cost-prohibitive would be wasteful and contrary to reasonable conservation practices.
- The addition is located at the rear of the structure, which is located on the interior of a block, so it is not readily visible to the public.

11* The amended application included the following additional information regarding fiber cement siding.

- It can it be drilled, cut, shaped, etc like wood.
- It can it be painted.
- It comes in various widths so as to obtain the proper reveal to match the house.
- It comes in various thicknesses.
- It is available with a smooth finish.
- It has a 30 years warranty.
- Fiber cement siding is quite durable as long as any cuts that are made are pre-painted to avoid moisture in (and subsequent freezing and cracking) during winter months. As it is stated by the manufacturer for warranty purposes, the fiber cement siding comes with a smooth finish and various widths to match existing lap depths of the existing house.

12* The amended application included the following additional information regarding MiraTec trim.

- It can it be drilled, cut, shaped, etc like wood.
- It can it be painted.
- It comes in various widths so as to match the house.
- It comes in various thicknesses.
- It is available with a smooth finish.
- It has a 50 years warranty.

13* The commission first approved the use of fiber cement siding on a new house at 601 Leonidas Lane (CAD-93-049) under a previous set of design guidelines. Since that decision, the committee has regularly approved the use of fiber cement siding for detached new construction. Facts utilized for that decision include the following:

- "The proposed lap siding is smooth, not imitation woodgrain"
- The "proposed lap siding is a durable material. It carries a 50-year transferable limited warranty"
- "A Bungalow that is reported to be a Sears house, located at 421 Cutler Street in the Boylan Heights Historic District, has cedar siding that, like the proposed siding, is thinner than the usual yellow pine lap siding."
- "The proposed Hardiplank siding holds paint extremely well."
- "The applicant... will paint the Hardiplank siding."

14* Wood-grain Hardiplank was denied for use on a non-contributing building at 721 Dorothea Drive (191-05-CA) in part because it "creates an imitation grain that is incongruous with the planed wooden clapboards used throughout the district, which do not display such a pronounced grain pattern."

15* The use of fiber cement siding has been denied for use on additions on multiple occasions including 513 Cutler Street (016-06-CA) and 207 Linden Avenue (153-06-CA) in part because

“the committee has only approved the use of Hardiplank on new construction, where it does not come into contact with existing historic materials.”

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:
 - a. Plot plan locating trees on and adjacent to the property;
 - b. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan.
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. Wood 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

Messrs Alphin and Belledin stated for the record that they had reviewed the minutes from the last meeting regarding this application.

Support: Agnes Stevens, owner [affirmed] and Henry Stevens, contractor [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Stevens reviewed the reasons that she wants to add on to the house. She stated that the request is for fiber cement lap siding for the addition as it is compatible with the existing clapboard siding. She stated her reasons being durability, the fact that it is an inconspicuous rear addition, and that it is a greener solution because it will not need continual replacement.

Mr. Stevens stated that his interest is the durability and least amount of maintenance. He noted that Hardieplank can be put on in the same fashion as wood and the resilience and durability is key. He also noted the green factor of using MiraTech, a composite board made primarily of recycled materials that is also extremely durable. Hardieplank is a recyclable product.

Mr. Alphin asked if facts 10 and 11 were evidence provided by applicant. Tania Tully [affirmed] said yes.

Mr. Alphin asked if the applicant had considered using pressure treated wood. Mr. Stevens said that for clapboard siding it is not available in 1X6. he also noted that even though pressure treated wood is durable, it does crack and split which can lead to water infiltration.

Mr. Alphin asked if the siding on the historic house is tapered. Mr. Stevens said yes.

Mr. Alphin asked if they had looked into the Hardieplank product that is thicker. Mr. Stevens said that he typically uses the ¼" board. The lap is neat, even, clean and once joined to the original house, it will have same lap depth as original house. Mr. Alphin noted that the shadowline will be different. Mr. Stevens agreed it would be a little different, but still extremely familiar. Mr. Alphin asked if he would consider using the Hardieplank that is ½ inch thick. Mr. Stevens responded in the affirmative. Mr. Alphin said that it may cost a little more, but was available.

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

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

Committee Discussion

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

There is a product available that is dimensionally the same. We could have a condition that they use that product. [Alphin] Yes. [Caliendo] [McGorty]

We could amend item d of conditions to say Hardieplank siding thickness be no less than ½" reveal. [Alphin] Or match the existing thickness. [Downer]

Should we amend fact 9*? [Belledin]

Can we amend by deleting? [Alphin]

Ms. Tully noted that they could leave it and deal with it in the conditions for clarity's sake since the materials were not formally amended by the applicant.

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 1-15) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following modifications.

Modifying comment A. as follows:

Striking this text: "; however the proposed materials are incongruous according to *Guidelines* section 4.2.7"

Changing fact 3* to read:

- 3* The new addition is located inconspicuously at the rear, **not readily visible from the street**; is lower than the historic house and has a similar gable roof form; **is not sited on a corner lot**.

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

Decision on the Application

Mr. Alphin made a motion that the application be approved as amended, 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:
 - a. Plot plan locating trees on and adjacent to the property;
 - b. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan.
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. Wood doors and windows;
- c. Trim including for new doors, windows and eaves;
- d. Siding (new fiber cement must match the existing wood in thickness);

Landscape Alterations

- e. Driveway and parking area drawings;
- f. Paver samples.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 3/4/13.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

085-12-MW 511 OAKWOOD AVENUE

Applicant: JASON & AMY THURSTON

Received: 8/1/2012

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 10/30/2012

1) 9/4/2012 2)

3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: Install solar panels on roof

Conflict of Interest: None Noted

Staff Notes:

- Installation of solar panels 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 has been referred to the COA Committee for review.
- File photos of the house are available 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 solar panels on roof
3.10	Utilities and Energy Retrofit	

STAFF COMMENTS

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

- A. Installation of solar panels on roof is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.5.11, 3.10.3, 3.10.11; however the size and location of the panels **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 3.5.11, 3.10.11.
- 1* The frame house is 2½ stories tall with an asphalt shingled hip roof. It sits close to the street; the sidewalk is approximately three feet above the street and the house is roughly two feet above the sidewalk.
- 2* A portion of the array will be visible from the street, east of the house.
- 3* The solar array will be flush roof mounted on the east (side) roof face and as far to the rear of the property as feasible. It is unclear from the application how far from the edge of the roof the array will be.
- 4* It appears from the application that the forward most panels will align with or be just behind the rear wall of the chimney.

- 5* The dimensions of a single module are 65" x 39" and the total array dimensions are 33.3 ft x 10.5 ft; there is not information regarding use of a smaller array.
- 6* The solar panels will have black frames, black back sheets, and black mounting clips; the existing roof is dark asphalt.
- 7* The application includes an article entitled "Case study: impact of photovoltaic modules reflection in an urban area;" the article includes information on the components of photovoltaic modules, photovoltaic conversion, and reflection of a photovoltaic module. The conclusion states "Multiple reflections from the front and back surface of the glass are not apparent in solar panels since they are designed to absorb light and convert it into clean, usable energy. At a normal incident solar panels reflect about 4% of incoming light, following Fresnel Equations. Car windows, on the other hand, reflect from the front and back surface of the glass increasing the intensity, causing about 8% percent of the light to be reflected."

Pending the committee's determination of whether or not the roof slope is prominently visible from the street, staff suggests that the committee approve the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Jason Thurston, owner [affirmed] and Greg Olenar, consultant [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Olenar stated that he is one of the principal owners of NC Solar and that three project managers have evaluated the site to minimize the visibility of the proposed solar panels. Referencing one of the application photographs he said "If you look at the chimney on the house in the picture, 95% of that roof will not have panels." He explained that the proposal is for a 20 panel array because that is maximum number one can buy and get the tax credit and progress energy deal—limited time period. Mr. Olenar stated that they are using black panels with black frames and even the clips to aluminum racking will be black. He also stated that there will be no visibility of the inverter because they are using an end-phase micro-inverter on each panel. (Specifications for the inverter were passed around.) Mr. Olenar stated that from the street there is only one vantage point from where you can see the panels. He stated that the front leading edge of the array will be beyond the step down in the roof. The height of the lower roof section from peak of roof to bottom is roughly 22 feet and the panels will be 10-10½ tall. There will be two rows of 10 panels each. He noted that the Google image picture with the panels overlayed is not to scale. Mr. Olenar said that they could eliminate two panels on the far end and make it an 18 panel array, but that would mean locating two on the flat roof. He noted that they will be flush mounted panels so there is no tilting.

Ms. Caliendo asked if the array would be centered on the roof or tight to the roofline. Mr. Olenar said that they would be tight to roofline to have maximum efficiency of panels.

Mr. Alphin asked how high off the roof deck the panels would be. Mr. Olenar said that they would be 2 ¼" off the roof deck to have a gap for airflow. A photograph of an installed panel was passed around to show how close to the roof the panels would be.

Mr. Alphin asked about the panel thickness. Mr. Olenar said that they are not more than 2 inches and that the wires will go through the wall to the panel. He also noted that there will be a bidirectional meter rather than two single directional meters from Progress Energy.

Ms. Caliendo asked for approximate dimensions of the location of the panels. Mr. Olenar said that they would be roughly 10 feet from the change in roof ridge height and perhaps as far back as 15 feet.

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

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

Committee Discussion

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

The panels are better looking than a skylight. [Alphin]

This seems like the perfect solution for a HOD property with a black roof. I do have a little concern over the size of the panels and roof working out. [Alphin]

Should we add a condition that it be no closer than 12-15 feet to the intersection of the roofs? [Caliendo]

I'm fine with 10 feet. [Belledin]

Staff, is it the slope of the roof or the amount of people seeing the panels that is at issue? [McGorty]

Ms. Tully said that the guideline reads "roof slopes prominently visible from the street" so the assumption is that if the roof's not prominently visible, then whatever you put up there isn't.

They are using the part of the roof that is not prominently visible. [McGorty]

I don't think it's a character-defining roof. [Alphin]

Findings of Fact

Mr. Belledin 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 modifications:

Modifying comment A. as follows:

Striking this text: “; however the size and location of the panels **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 3.5.11, 3.10.11”

Changing the following facts to read as stated:

- 2* A portion of the array will be **not be prominently** visible from the street, east of the house.
- 3* The solar array will be flush roof mounted on the **secondary** east (side) roof face.
- 4* **The applicant states that the front edge of the panels will be at least 10 feet behind the change in the roof plane.**
- 5* The dimensions of a single module are 65" x 39" and the total array dimensions are 33.3 ft x 10.5 ft; **the roof on which panel is fitted is 22 feet tall as measured from roof peak to eave with the panels located close to the ridge.**
- 6* The solar panels will have black frames, black back sheets, and black mounting clips; the existing roof is dark asphalt; **the panels will be flush mounted and protrude no more than 4" from the roof deck.**

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

Decision on the Application

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

- 1. No wiring beyond the panel is permitted to be exposed or visible.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 3/4/13.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

095-12-CA 516 E JONES STREET

Applicant: MARY HART-PAUL FOR ANN ROBERTSON

Received: 8/20/2012

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 11/18/2012

1) 9/4/2012 2)

3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: Remove two windows and install one window on front façade

Conflict of Interest: Mr. Alphin moved that Ms. McGorty be recused due to living within 100 feet of the subject property. Mr. Belledin seconded; motion carried 5/0. Ms. McGorty left the room for the duration of the hearing.

Staff Notes:

- Alteration of windows and window openings 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.
- Due to a fire in April 2012, the brick veneer on the 2nd level of the house has been removed and will be reinstalled.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3.6	Exterior Walls	Remove two windows and install one window on
3.7	Windows and Doors	front façade

STAFF COMMENTS

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

- A. Alteration of windows is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.6.8, 3.6.11, 3.7.1, 3.7.7, 3.7.13; however removal of windows on front façade **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* section 3.7.1.
- 1* Photographs provided with the application show exposed structural members that illustrate prior changes to the house.
- 2* The applicant suggests that "in order to accommodate the bathroom, one 3-4 x 7-6 window centered over the front door was replaced by two small windows."
- 3* Details and specification of the new window are not included in the application.
- 4* The application states that the house was originally built in 1861 and that in the 1920s, a two-story block of four major rooms was added to the west side.

Pending the committee's determination regarding the removal of windows on front façade, staff suggests that the committee approve the application, with the following condition:

1. Details and specification of the new window be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Mary Hart-Paul [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Hart-Paul made the following comments. As heartbreaking as the house's fire was, now you can see some of the history of the house such as where windows and doors were removed and installed, lowered, etc. Referencing an illustration in the application, Ms. Hart-Paul points out the original house and the 1920s addition, which is when they think the bathroom at the front was installed. She noted that on the interior they can now they can see the spot where a window was removed and replaced with 2 windows. She would like to put back the larger window noting that they have an existing window that they can use there. Lots of windows were lost but lots were saved and will be rebuilt. The new window will be the same as the other windows on the front.

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

Mr. Alphin asked about the brick. Ms. Hart-Paul stated that the brick was added in the 1920s and will be reinstalled. She also said that the new window will be detailed exactly as the other windows are detailed. The house is very solid; they are trying to leave in place all the 4X4 studs possible; this will not affect that. Ms. Hart-Paul distributed a duplicate photograph of the interior evidence from the application, printed right-side-up.

Mr. Belledin asked staff if the guidelines address changes to fabric that have gained status in period of significance. Tania Tully [affirmed] said no, noting that if there hadn't been the fire, this may be a different discussion. In this house evidence suggests that windows were changed periodically and that is part of its story. These aren't original windows. Mr. Belledin asked if staff was keeping track if the windows knowing that some of the windows are able to be saved. Ms. Tully said yes, that she was working with the applicant through some minor work applications.

Ms. Hart-Paul made a final comment, noting that she wouldn't have even approached the commission with the application if there wasn't evidence that the window was once there, found because of the fire. There is the evidence, but even so, from the outside, the two small windows seem aesthetically awkward.

Mr. Alphin moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Mr. Belledin seconded; motion carried 4/0.

Committee Discussion

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

This is an interesting story. The house has already been radically altered. [Alphin]

OK. [Belledin]

Yes. [Downer]

The brick is already removed due to the fire restoration. The two small windows look “off.”
[Caliendo]

Findings of Fact

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Ms. Caliendo and seconded by Mr. Belledin, Ms. Caliendo 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.

Change fact 3 to read:

3* An existing restored window will be used in the new single opening.

Mr. Belledin agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 4/0.

Decision on the Application

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Ms. Caliendo and seconded by Mr. Alphin, Ms. Caliendo made an amended motion that the application be approved, with the following conditions:

1. Details and specification of the new window be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation if existing historic windows are not used.

Mr. Alphin agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 4/0.

Committee members voting: Alphin, Belledin, Caliendo, Downer.

Certificate expiration date: 3/4/13.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

086-12-MW 108 E HARGETT STREET

Applicant: JASON HOWARD

Received: 8/2/2012

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 10/31/2012

1) 9/4/2012 2)

3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: DOD, BUS

Nature of Project: Change exterior paint color; paint previously unpainted masonry

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- There is no COA on file for the existing mural.
- The proposed logo is a sign and would also require a City of Raleigh sign permit.
- The location of the proposed mural is an adjacent building; ownership of the wall is a civil matter outside of the commission's purview.

Decision on the Application

Mr. Belledin made a motion that the application be deferred.

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

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

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Committee Discussion
 - i. Application Completeness
 - ii. Meeting Post-Mortem
2. *Design Guidelines* Update – Actively being reviewed by City Attorney

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner