

RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
Monday, October 1, 2012

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Scott Shackleton called the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Committee meeting to order at 4:03 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Martha Lauer, Executive Director, called the roll as follows:

Present: Will Alphin, Elizabeth Caliendo, Miranda Downer, Kiernan McGorty, Scott Shackleton
Staff Present: Martha Lauer, Janet Saa

Approval of the September Minutes

Ms. McGorty moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing and approve said minutes. Ms. Downer 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
James S. Bailey, Wake County 27602	Yes
Hugh Stohler, 528 N Bloodworth Street 27604	Yes
Brian Waggy, 10 E Hargett Street 27601	Yes
Sarah Rex, 210 Pace Street 27604	Yes
Heidi Walters, 308 Pell Street 27604	Yes
Ashley Morris, 306 Pell Street 27604	Yes
Curtis Kasefang, 519 Polk Street 27604	Yes
Craig Raleigh, 2714 Clark Avenue 27604	No
Chad Wilkins, 919 W South Street 27603	Yes
Chris Mackey, 308 Pell Street 27604	Yes
Mollie Ward, 614 Polk Street 27604	Yes
Rosalind Blair, 524 Sherrybrook Drive 27610	Yes
Jeannine McAuliffe, 4913 Liles Road 27606	Yes

REVIEW OF SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. McGorty moved to approve the agenda as printed; Ms. Caliendo seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS

There were no objections to the approval of the Summary Proceedings without a public hearing. The committee reviewed and approved the following case 100-12-CA for which the Summary Proceedings are made part of these minutes.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – SUMMARY PROCEEDING

100-12-CA 401 E WHITAKER MILL ROAD

Applicant: WAKE COUNTY GSA BY JAMES BAILEY

Received: 9/17/2012

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 12/16/2012

1) 10/1/2012 2)

3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: LANDMARK HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: Remove chain link fence; install 6' tall black metal fence

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	Remove chain link fence; install 6' tall black
2.4	Fences and Walls	metal fence

STAFF COMMENTS

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

- A. Removal of chain link fence; installation of 6' tall black metal fence is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.7, 2.4.8, 2.4.10.
- 1* There are trees within the area of the proposed fence; tree protection is not included with the application.
- 2* There is an existing 48" tall black metal fence elsewhere on the property that was approved with COA 170-09-CA; the new fence would be of the same design.
- 3* The fence will be in the side yard of the building.
- 4* Removal of prohibited features is encouraged.

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

- 1. That the fence not be secured to the building.
- 2. That post holes be dug by hand so as to avoid damage to tree roots.

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: 101-12-MW; 102-12-CA; 103-12-CA; 105-12-CA; 106-12-CA; 096-12-MW; 086-12-MW.

Ms. McGorty moved to move 096-12-MW to the end of the agenda due to the absence of the applicant; Ms. Downer seconded; passed 5/0.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

101-12-MW 528 N BLOODWORTH STREET

Applicant: HUGH STOHLER

Received: 9/14/2012

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 12/13/2012

1) 10/1/2012 2)

3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: Replace a section of rotten wood with fiber cement on non-historic rear addition.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3.1	Wood	Replace a section of rotten wood with fiber
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	cement on non-historic rear addition.

STAFF COMMENTS

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

- A. Replacement of a section of rotten wood with fiber cement on non-historic rear addition is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.7.
- 1* Wholesale replacement of an architectural feature is not the same as replacing a unit of a whole.
- 2* Considering the nature of the industry and general availability of materials it is not technically feasible any longer to expect someone in an ordinary home rehabilitation situation to source wood with a greater expectation of durability.
- 3* The committee recently approved the use of fiber cement siding on a new addition at 512 E Lane Street (079-12-CA) in part because "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."
- 4* The existing addition is at the rear of the house, not readily visible from the street, and is not sited on a corner lot.
- 5* The application proposes only to replace those portions of siding that are near the ground subject to water damage and prone to rot.
- 6* The commission has approved the use of synthetic materials in similar situations including: window sill nosing at 305 Cutler Street (142-08-CA) and column bases and capitals at 302 N Blount Street (130-08-CA).

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

1. That the fiber cement must match the existing wood in thickness.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Mr. Hugh Stohler, owner [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Stohler had no issue with staff comments; he mentioned that he hoped the Committee would approve his request since it is such a minor work.

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

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) to be acceptable as findings of fact.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the fiber cement must match the existing wood in thickness.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 4/1/2013

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

102-12-CA 308 PELL STREET

Applicant: CHRIS MACKEY

Received: 9/14/2012

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 12/13/2012

1) 10/1/2012 2)

3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: Remove rear addition; construct new 1-story rear addition

Amendments: The following additional work items are added based on a closer reading of the application by staff: window alterations; remove rear deck; install driveway; install brick patio; install gravel walkway; side and rear yard landscaping.

Staff Notes:

- There is no COA on file for the existing patio; it should be considered as an after-the-fact part of the application.
- File photos and Sanborn maps are 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	remove rear addition; construct new 1-story rear addition; remove rear deck; install driveway; install patios; install gravel walkway; side and rear yard landscaping
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	install driveway; install gravel walkway
3.7	Windows and Doors	window alterations
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	remove rear addition; construct new 1-story rear addition

STAFF COMMENTS

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

- A. Removal of rear addition; construction of new 1-story rear addition; window alterations; removal of rear deck is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 3.7.1, 3.7.13, 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 relocation of historic windows **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 3.7.1, 3.7.13.

- 1* A tree protection plan was not included in the application.

- 2* The deck being removed is not historic; the rear addition being removed may have been part of the original construction, but has certainly been altered. Sanborn maps indicate that the rear portion of the house once contained an open porch.
 - 3* The lot is 4,792 SF; the footprint of the house is 1,253 SF; the existing concrete pad with shed is 180 SF; current lot coverage is 30%. The proposed footprint of the house with addition is approximately 1,645 SF; proposed lot coverage is 34%.
 - 4* According to Sanborn maps, the house was built between 1914 and 1950. The updated 1914 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (The map was updated through 1950, but individual updates are undated.) shows that 306 and 308 Pell Street (formerly Vance and E. Peace) have building footprints that mirror one another.
 - 5* The mass, form, and proportion of the new addition is similar to the historic house; the addition is at the rear of the house, steps in from the original house on the west and east sides and is lower than the historic house.
 - 6* A portion of the addition will be a screened porch.
 - 7* The application proposes to relocate two windows from the rear addition to the west side of the house and the windows from the west side of the house to a west wall in the addition.
 - 8* The application states that the new windows in the addition will be wood, either simple casements or fixed windows without muntins; the drawings show all windows in the addition except one to be 3/1.
 - 9* The application states that the addition will be clad in wood siding to match the existing house (4.5" exposure); the trim will match existing (4.5" trim for windows and doors, 5" trim for corner boards); the addition will have 1'-0" overhangs with exposed rafter tails and open eaves to match the existing house.
 - 10* The application states that the foundation materials will match the existing; however material samples were not included in the application.
- B. Installation of driveway, brick patio, gravel walkway, and side and rear yard landscaping is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.5.5, 2.5.6.
- 1* There is no COA on file for the existing patio.
 - 2* The lot is 4,792 SF; the footprint of the house is 1,253 SF; the existing concrete pad with shed is 180 SF; current lot coverage is 30%. The proposed footprint of the house with addition is approximately 1,645 SF; measuring off the proposed site plan the footprint of proposed patios and driveway is approximately 566 SF; proposed lot coverage is 46%.
 - 3* Concrete ribbon driveways are traditional and commonly approved in Oakwood; detailed dimensions and material specifications were not included in the application.
 - 4* Detailed dimensions and material specifications for the patios were not included in the application.

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

- 1. That the historic windows not be relocated.

2. That the following specifications, details and/or materials be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
 - a. A tree protection plan;
 - b. New windows;
 - c. Foundation material.
3. That the following specifications, details and/or materials be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
 - a. Doors;
 - b. HVAC units;
 - c. Driveway;
 - d. Patios;
 - e. Landscaping plan.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Chris Mackey, owner [affirmed] and Ashley Morris, architect [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application.

Ms. Morris commented on the requested relocation of the historic windows. In order to make the house livable, a larger kitchen is necessary; several floor plans were tried. This version would require moving the windows in the current kitchen to the future dining room—a reuse rather than removal. The size of the historic windows is not conducive to kitchen design.

Ms. McGorty asked if the windows are of the same width. Ms. Morris replied that all of the windows are standard size.

Ms. McGorty clarified that the windows to be removed from the current kitchen and dining room would be moved to the new kitchen and dining room. Ms. Morris responded in the affirmative and mentioned that the existing dining room windows will have to be repaired because the bottom sash is rotten.

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

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 3.7.1 “Retain and Preserve” could be problematic because the applicant is moving the windows; Guideline 3.7.13 states that it is not appropriate to remove, although in this case the

applicant would be moving, not removing, the windows, and in essence they would still be part of the house. [McGorty]

Findings of Fact

Mr. Alphin moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comments A. (inclusive of facts 1-10) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-4) to be acceptable as findings of fact.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the following specifications, details and/or materials be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
 - a. A tree protection plan;
 - b. New windows;
 - c. Foundation material.
2. That the following specifications, details and/or materials be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
 - a. Doors;
 - b. HVAC units;
 - c. Driveway;
 - d. Patios;
 - e. Landscaping plan.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 4/1/2013

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

103-12-CA 210 PACE STREET
Applicant: SARAH & TED REX
Received: 9/17/2012 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 12/16/2012 1) 10/1/2012 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BLOUNT STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-30

Nature of Project: Construct rear addition and porte cochere; remove concrete pad; relocate exterior stairs to basement; construct rear dormer addition; place HVAC unit on rear roof; window alterations; change exterior paint colors; landscape alterations; construct new curb cut and driveway

Amendments: The following additional work items are added based on a closer reading of the application by staff: replace asphalt shingle roof with standing seam metal; replace existing windows.

DRAC: The application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee on August 1, 2012 by Curtis Kasefang, David Maurer, and Erin Sterling. Also in attendance were Sarah & Ted Rex, Jeanine McAuliffe, and Tania Tully.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.1	Public Rights-of-Way and Alleys	construct new curb cut
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	remove concrete pad; landscape alterations
2.4	Fences and Walls	landscape alterations
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	remove concrete pad; construct new curb cut and driveway
3.4	Paint and Paint Color	change exterior paint colors
3.5	Roofs	replace asphalt shingle roof with standing seam metal
3.6	Exterior Walls	window alterations
3.7	Windows and Doors	
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	construct porte cochere; relocate exterior stairs to basement
3.10	Utilities and Energy Retrofit	place HVAC unit on rear roof
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	construct rear addition and porte cochere; construct rear dormer addition

STAFF COMMENTS

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

- A. Construction of rear addition; construction of porte cochere; removal of concrete pad; construction of new curb cut and driveway; relocation of exterior stairs to basement; installation of brick wall and metal fence and other landscape alterations is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.4.8, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.8, 2.5.9, 3.8.6, 3.8.10, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9.
- 1* The application states that the proposal will preserve the Pecan tree in the side yard; however a tree protection plan is not included in the application for it, the existing dogwood tree or an Oak on the adjacent property.
- 2* It appears as though there may be two trees (smallish) that need to be removed to accommodate the new driveway.
- 3* The application states that there will be "plantings to obscure water collection back corner, and new basement stairwell;" however no information is included.
- 4* The lot is 8,276 SF; the footprint of the house is 1,770 SF; the existing concrete driveway is approximately 928 SF; current lot coverage is 32.6%. The proposed footprint of the addition, brick walk, new driveway & carport is approximately 869 SF; proposed lot coverage is 31.9%.
- 5* The section of wood fence being removed to accommodate the brick wall was approved in 2002 by COA 053-02-CA.
- 6* Construction of the brick wall has the potential to damage an oak tree on the adjacent property; details regarding its construction were not included in the application.
- 7* The application states that the front yard fence will be 39" tall; the site plan says it will be 42"; the lower fence is more characteristic of the historic district.
- 8* The application states that the brick in the wall will match the foundation of the house; samples were not provided in the application.
- 9* Then application states that the curb cut will be the City of Raleigh standard; the existing curb appears to be granite; the commission typically requires that new curb cuts in granite not have the City of Raleigh standard radius and that the existing granite be recessed in place.
- 10* The existing curb cut serves as access to the adjacent property also.
- 11* The new addition is considerably smaller and lower than the historic house and located at the rear.
- 12* New windows in the rear and dormer additions will be wood; specifications and details for the new windows were not included in the application.
- 13* The proposed addition is closer to the west property line than the existing house; the application provides examples of other additions that are similarly situated.
- 14* It is unclear from the application how the new port cochere will be supported.
- B. Construction of rear dormer addition; placement of HVAC unit on rear roof; replacement of asphalt shingle roof with standing seam metal; changing exterior paint color; window alterations; installation of storm windows is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.4.1, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.5.1, 3.5.5, 3.5.10, 3.6.8, 3.7.9, 3.7.10, 3.8.4, 3.10.8, 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 replacing historic windows that are not deteriorated beyond repair is incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 3.7.1, 3.7.4, 3.7.5, 3.7.6.

- 1* Changing the exterior paint colors is approvable by staff and is included here for administrative efficiency.
- 2* Standing seam metal is a common bungalow roofing material and commonly approved in the historic district; specifications and details were not included in the application.
- 3* Expansion of rear dormers is a traditional way of increasing space within a historic bungalow.
- 4* The proposed new window openings are on the second level of the side elevations; the existing window arrangement is not symmetrical and consists of multiple window sizes; specifications and details for the new windows were not included in the application.
- 5* The application states “2nd floor character defining windows (these are being remade to match exactly appearance and materials of existing, but will be more current on insulation capacity). This description makes it sound as though window sashes are being replaced; there is no evidence that windows are beyond repair.
- 6* Regarding windows the application states “No change to street side, but will have exact reproduction made for front 2nd floor (which are not functional and not occlusive currently).” These may be the same windows referenced in fact 5*; there is no evidence that windows are beyond repair.
- 7* Installation of storm windows is encouraged; specifications and details for the new storm windows were not included in the application.
- 8* New windows in the rear and dormer additions will be wood; specifications and details for the new windows were not included in the application.

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

1. That the following specifications, details and/or materials be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
 - a. A tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture;
 - b. New windows;
2. That the following specifications, details and/or materials be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
 - a. Brick wall construction and materials
 - b. Doors;
 - c. Door and window trim;
 - d. Roofing;
 - e. Brick walkway;
 - f. Brick wall;
 - g. New plantings;
 - h. Storm windows;
3. That the existing granite curb not be removed.

4. That no historic windows that can be repaired are replaced.
5. That the following specifications, details and/or materials be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
 - a. Curb cut and driveway apron;
 - b. Driveway;
 - c. Port cochere construction.

Ms. McGorty moved to recuse Ms. Caliendo from the case. Mr. Alphin seconded the motion; motion passed 4/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Sarah Rex, owner [affirmed] and Jeannine McCauliffe [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Ms. McCauliffe began by stating that the port cochere will be built as a free-standing structure adjacent to the structure so that it is removable. She responded to the following staff comments: Fact A.2: The two small trees that need to be removed are actually bushes; Fact A.6: In order to protect the tree, the masonry wall in the back will be hand dug with steel supports in order not to have a continuous footing; applicant is in agreement of the tree protection plan; Fact A.7: applicant agrees to work with staff to approve the height of the front yard fence; Facts B. 5 and B.6: The widows seem to be irreparable so the applicant plans to work with the company that replicated the windows at Pilot Mill. If the windows are salvageable, applicant is willing to salvage but if not they would try to replicate.

Mr. Shackleton requested that the applicant document the condition of the windows under consideration for replacement and provide photographs to staff. Ms. Lauer concurred that staff can determine if the windows are salvageable.

Applicant did not understand Fact A.9: Ms. Lauer explained that in this situation, a curb would be cut, a hole dug, and the granite recessed into the ground. If the driveway is eliminated in the future, the curb could be restored to its original position.

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

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

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 1-14) and staff comment B , removing “; however replacing historic windows that are not deteriorated beyond repair is incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 3.7.1, 3.7.4, 3.7.5, 3.7.6.” (inclusive of facts 1-8), to be acceptable as findings of fact.

Ms. McGorty seconded the motion; motion passed 4/0.

Decision on the Application

Ms. Downer moved that the application be approved, with the following conditions:

1. That the following specifications, details and/or materials be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
 - a. A tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture;
 - b. New windows.
2. That the following specifications, details and/or materials be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
 - a. Brick wall construction and materials;
 - b. Doors;
 - c. Door and window trim;
 - d. Roofing;
 - e. Brick walkway;
 - f. Brick wall;
 - g. New plantings;
 - h. Storm windows;
 - i. Fence height.
3. That the existing granite curb not be removed.
4. That no historic windows that can be repaired are replaced, as determined by staff.
5. That the following specifications, details and/or materials be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
 - a. Curb cut and driveway apron;
 - b. Driveway;
 - c. Port cochere construction.

Ms. McGorty seconded the motion. The amended motion passed 4/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 4/1/2013

Mr. Alphin made a motion to readmit member Ms. Caliendo. Ms. McGorty seconded the motion; motion passed 4/0.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

105-12-CA 919 W SOUTH STREET

Applicant: CHAD WILKINS

Received: 9/17/2012

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 12/16/2012

1) 10/1/2012 2)

3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: Remove asphalt shingle roof; install standing seam metal roof; remove non-historic door; remove non-historic porch floor; install new wood floor.

Amendments: Non-historic door will be replaced with a window; staff error. During the public hearing the applicant withdrew the request to remove chimney.

Staff Notes: Alteration/Construction/Removal of service/utility Chimneys is a Minor Work;
Alteration/Construction/Removal of character-defining Chimneys is a Major Work.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3.2	Masonry	remove chimney
3.5	Roofs	remove asphalt shingle roof; install standing seam metal roof; remove chimney;
3.7	Windows and Doors	remove non-historic door; install new window
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	remove metal egress stairs; remove non-historic porch floor; install new wood floor

STAFF COMMENTS

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

- A. Removal of asphalt shingle roof; installation of standing seam metal roof; removal of metal egress stairs; removal of non-historic door; installation of new window is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.5.6, 3.7.7, 3.8.1.
- 1* Removal of asphalt shingle roof; installation of standing seam metal roof; removal of metal egress stairs; removal of non-historic door; installation of new window are typically approved as minor work and are included here for administrative efficiency.
- 2* Standing seam metal is a traditional, roofing material for bungalows.
- 3* Details and specifications for the roofing and window were not included in the application.

- B. Removal of non-historic porch floor; installation of new wood floor is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.1.5, 3.8.5; however staining the wood floor is incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 3.1.4, 3.1.9, 3.4.1, 3.4.5, 3.8.4.
- 1* Historically porch floors were painted.
 - 2* At 903 W Lenoir Street (024-09-CA) the committee required that the new porch floor have a painted finish.
 - 3* Details regarding the dimensions, orientation and installation of the new flooring were not included in the application.
- C. Removal of chimney **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 3.2.1, 3.5.7.
- 1* There are two brick chimneys on the ca 1922 bungalow; one is fully exposed on the southeast side of the house and connects to a fireplace in the living room; the subject chimney is internal and does not connect to a fireplace. Both chimneys protrude through the front plane of the roof and have brick corbelling.
 - 2* The chimney is an original roof feature of the building. It provides an important vertical accent to the main ridge of the building, and conveys information about the history of heating the structure.
 - 3* Utility chimneys are commonly approved by staff and the commission; chimney removal was denied at 1014 W. Cabarrus Street (086-06-CA); determination of what is a “service/utility” chimney is made on a case-by-case basis.

Pending the committee’s determination regarding the significance of the chimney, staff suggests that the committee approve the amended application, with the following conditions:

- 1. That construction details, specifications, and/or samples be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation for the following items:
 - a) Roofing;
 - b) Replacement window;
 - c) Porch flooring.
- 2. That the porch floor have a painted finish;
- 3. That the exterior portion of the chimney remain.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Mr. Chad Wilkins [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Wilkins responded to staff comments that he has hired a roofer; the replacement window will be identical to the original; the porch flooring will be painted rather than stained.

Mr. Shackleton asked if the applicant would be amenable to removing the chimney on the interior, supporting the exterior portion of the chimney, and keeping the chimney on the

exterior. Mr. Wilkins stated that he was willing to withdraw the request to remove the chimney on the exterior of the building.

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

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

Findings of Fact

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 1-3); and staff comment B., adding "and painting" after "installation" and removing "however staining the wood floor is incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 3.1.4, 3.1.9, 3.4.1, 3.4.5, 3.8.4 ", (inclusive of facts 1-3), to be acceptable as findings of fact, eliminating staff comment C. based on the withdrawal of the request to remove the chimney.

Ms. McGorty seconded the motion; motion passed 5/0.

Decision on the Application

Ms. Caliendo moved that the application be approved, with the following conditions:

1. That construction details, specifications, and/or samples be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation for the following items:
 - a) Roofing;
 - b) Replacement window;
 - c) Porch flooring.
2. That the porch floor have a painted finish;
3. That the exterior portion of the chimney remain.

Ms. McGorty seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 4/1/2013

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

106-12-CA 513 S PERSON STREET

Applicant: ROSALIND BLAIR FOR BEGINNING & BEYOND
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER, INC.

Received: 9/17/2012

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 12/16/2012

1) 10/1/2012 2)

3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: S. PERSON / S BLOUNT HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: DOD, RB

Nature of Project: Construct 1-story modular building in rear yard; alter fence

Amendments: The following items were observed by staff as having been installed without a COA: shed; gazebo. The following item was mentioned by the applicant in conversation with staff: paint existing modular building.

DRAC: The application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee on September 26, 2012 by Curtis Kasefang, David Maurer, and Jerry Traub. Also in attendance were Rosalind Blair, Tania Tully, and Martha Lauer.

Staff Notes:

- It is the practice of the commission to treat “after-the-fact” applications as if the work had not been done.
- The S Person / S Blount Street HOD took effect May 1, 2012; 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.

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 modular building in rear yard
2.4	Fences and Walls	alter fence
3.4	Paint and Paint Color	paint existing modular building
2.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	construct 1-story modular building in rear yard
4.3	New Construction	

STAFF COMMENTS

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

- A. Construction of a 1-story modular building in rear yard, alteration of fence is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.4, 2.6.6, 2.6.7, 2.6.9.
 - 1* No regulated trees will be affected by the proposed work.
 - 2* The existing lot is 16,552.8 SF; current lot coverage is 0%. The proposed building is 1,728 SF; proposed lot coverage is 10%.
 - 3* A section of existing fencing will be replaced with a gate of the same design.
 - 4* The applicant has investment based expectations regarding the installation of the modular building. In a conversation with staff, the applicant stated that the proposed building has been under lease for five years.
 - 5* The applicant acquired the land for the location of the building in 2010; parcels were recombined in 2012.
 - 6* The form of the structure is utilitarian; the application provides photographic examples of other utilitarian structures in the district; there is an existing modular building of similar design on the adjacent lot of common ownership.
 - 7* A wood porch and access ramp is proposed for the north (long) side of the structure; it will be painted the same color as the brick building at 322 E Cabarrus Street.
 - 8* The location of the building on the lot is such that it appears to be an accessory structure to the adjacent house; it is oriented with the gable (narrow) end towards the adjacent house.
 - 9* The location of the building on the lot is such that a street facing (S Person Street) structure compatible with the historic district could be constructed in the future.
 - 10* The application drawing implies that there will be plantings at the base of the building; the application does not include any information regarding the proposed plantings.
 - 11* Information regarding potential signage is not included in the application.
- B. Installation of shed; installation of gazebo, painting of existing modular building is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.9, 2.6.6, 2.6.7, 2.6.9.
 - 1* The application for the shed and gazebo is submitted after-the-fact.
 - 2* The yard is being used as a playground; the playground is screened by a tall fence installed prior to district designation.
 - 3* Neither structure is permanently set in concrete.
 - 4* The metal shed is located at the center of the block near the location of the proposed modular building.
 - 5* The existing modular building is proposed to be painted the same color as the brick building at 322 E Cabarrus Street.

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

1. That detailed information for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.
 - a. Plantings
 - b. signage (if applicable)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Rosalind Blair [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Blair commented that her daycare is in a unique situation. The daycare needed to expand and had leased a modular for this purpose prior to the designation of the HOD, but was delayed because of a recombination of property required prior to the installation of the modular.

Ms. McGorty requested that Ms. Blair provide more information pertaining to the plantings and signage. Ms. Blair responded that the plantings would be evergreen and that the signage would be a single sign for the complex rather than individual signage for each building.

Mr. Alphin requested clarification on the lot lines and information on the zoning of the property. Ms. Blair explained that the site includes an area that runs from Person Street to Bloodworth Street. The lot is rezoned Residential Business.

Mr. Curtis Kasefang, on behalf of DRAC, spoke in favor of the application. In the committee's opinion, mitigating factors include the fact that the area became a HOD after the applicant's lease of the building, and the fact that the building is screened.

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

Ms. McGorty 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]:

The challenge is to ensure that that an approval of this modular building wouldn't open the door to other such modular. Utilitarian structures at the rear are not unusual. [Alphin]

The modular faces the rear of another building. [Downer]

The committee should acknowledge somehow that the modular building is intended for a specific use (classroom). [Alphin]

Amend fact 6? [McGorty]

In fact, the existing modular already serves as a classroom for use as daycare, so both would serve this purpose. [Alphin]

Is there a fact that discusses plantings as screening, may want to add a condition that the plantings serve this purpose. [Shackleton]

The proposed plantings are adequate. [Alphin]

Findings of Fact

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Ms. McGorty and seconded by Mr. Alphin, 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 1-11), with an addition to fact 6 that "both modular units serve as classrooms for daycare", and an addition to fact 4 ", well before the designation of the HOD" and staff comment B. (inclusive of facts 1-5), to be acceptable as findings of fact.

Mr. Alphin seconded the motion. The amended motion passed 5/0.

Decision on the Application

Ms. McGorty moved that the application be approved, with the following conditions:

1. That detailed information for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
 - a. Plantings
 - b. Signage (if applicable).

Ms. Caliendo seconded; motion passed 5/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 4/1/2013

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

096-12-MW 614 POLK STREET

Applicant: MH GREEN JR

Received: 8/20/2012

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 11/18/2012

1) 10/1/2012 2)

3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: Remove 24" historic porch railing; install new 34" porch railing.

Staff Notes:

- It is the practice of the commission to treat “after-the-fact” applications as if the work had not been done.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3.1	Wood	Remove 24" historic porch railing; install new
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	34" porch railing.

STAFF COMMENTS

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

- A. Removal of 24" historic porch railing; installation of new 34" porch railing is incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 3.1.1, 3.1.4, 3.1.5.
- 1* The application for the replacement of wood porch railing is submitted after-the-fact.
- 2* No information is provided to indicate that the porch railing would require replacement rather than repair.
- 3* The 24" tall wood railing was replaced with a 34" tall railing.
- 4* Staff photographs indicating the condition of some railing segments after removal are available for review. Removed railings have been discarded.
- 5* The application states that the railing was increased in height to meet code; current building code is 36"; there is no evidence submitted to support that the change was required by code.

Staff suggests that the committee deny the application and direct that the taller railing be removed and replaced with the original height railing within 90 days of your decision.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Mollie Ward, granddaughter of M.H. Green, Jr., [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Ward mentioned that her grandfather and uncle requested to attend the meeting through electronic means and did not receive confirmation from staff. Ms. Lauer apologized for staff not replying but explained that the City Attorney affirmed that the City cannot accommodate for electronic (conference call or video) participation. The committee suggested to Ms. Ward that the building is handicap-accessible and that she may request to defer the case until November. Ms. Ward elected to continue with the case.

Ms. McGorty asked if the work completed by a professional and if it required a permit. Ms. Ward mentioned that she was not aware of any permit.

Mr. Curtis Kasefang stated that to his understanding repair work of this type does not require a permit.

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

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]:

There doesn't seem to be any way to approve this. [Shackleton]

The number of years of property ownership indicates that the owner would be aware of HOD regulation. [Alphin]

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 1-5) to be acceptable as findings of fact.

Ms. Caliendo seconded the motion; motion passed 5/0.

Decision on the Application

Mr. Alphin made a motion to deny the application.

Ms. McGorty seconded the motion; motion passed 5/0.

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

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) 10/1/2012 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

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.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.8	Signage	paint previously unpainted masonry
3.2	Masonry	change exterior paint color; paint previously
3.4	Paint and Paint Color	unpainted masonry

STAFF COMMENTS

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

- A. Changing exterior paint color; painting previously unpainted masonry is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.8.2, 3.2.10, 3.4.3.
- 1* The application states that the rear mural would have an aged whitewashed effect; there are historic examples of painted wall signs in the Moore Square district at 119 E Hargett Street (Raleigh Furniture) and 137 S Wilmington Street (Heilig-Levine).
- 2* The wall to be painted is on the rear of the building and has an existing unapproved mural; the brick wall has bricked-over windows and patchwork of different colors of bricks.
- 3* The painting is shown to extend to just above the sill of a 2nd level window.
- 4* Traditionally the cornice color on building facades and storefronts is the same color for continuity of the building as a whole; variety is typically seen through window signage and colors of the inset panels and doors.

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

1. That the cornice be the same color across the entire building.
2. That the revised color schedule be provided to and approved by staff.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Mr. Brian Waggle [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Waggle stated that he is attending on behalf of Mr. Jason Howard, who could not be present, and has no objections to staff's conditions.

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

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

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.

Ms. McGorty seconded the motion; motion passed 5/0.

Decision on the Application

Ms. Downer moved that the application be approved, with the following conditions:

1. That the cornice be the same color across the entire building.
2. That the revised color schedule be provided to and approved by staff.

Ms. McGorty seconded the motion; motion passed 5/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 4/1/2013

OTHER BUSINESS

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Martha Lauer, Executive Director