

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

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Scott Shackleton called the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Committee meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL

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

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

Alternate Present: Michael Story (arrived 4:04 p.m.)

Staff Present: Tania Tully, Martha Lauer

Approval of the January 9, 2012 Minutes

Mr. Alphin moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing and adopt said minutes.

Mr. Belledin seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

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
Coleen Speaks, 208 Linden Ave 27601	Yes
Mary Dillon, 315 Pell Street 27604	Yes
Ashley Morris, 306 Pell Street 27604	Yes
Ethan Hyman, 319 S Boylan Avenue 27603	Yes
Jarrold Roberson, 1004 Dorothea Drive 27607	Yes
R. Morrell, 101 N Person Street 27601	Yes
Emily Brinker, 319 S Boylan Ave 27603	Yes

REVIEW OF SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Belledin moved to approve the agenda as amended – moving 208 Linden Avenue to the end of the Public Hearings. Ms. Downer seconded the motion; passed 4/0. (Mr. Alphin abstained).

SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS

There were no Summary Proceedings.

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: 122-11-CA, 004-12-CA, 006-12-CA, 007-12-CA, and 121-11-CA.

There was no one available to speak for 134-11-CA. Mr. Belledin moved that the case be deferred. Mr. Alphin seconded; motion carried 6/0.

Prior to distribution of staff comments Mr. Belledin moved that Mr. Alphin, the architect of 121-11-CA, be recused from the meeting. Ms. Downer seconded; motion carried 5/0 (Alphin abstained).

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

122-11-CA 100 N PERSON STREET

Applicant: REUBEN BOWENS

Received: 11/21/2011

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 2/19/2012

1) 1/9/2012 2) 2/6/2012 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: O&I-1

Nature of Project: [After-the-fact] install planter boxes and arbors with built-in benches in front yard/parking area.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- The commission policy has been to treat after the fact applications as though the work has not been completed.
- Excerpt from the 1987 Oakwood South Amendment to the Oakwood Historic District: “The only non-residential property in the district that was constructed as such is the ca. 1937 one-story stuccoed brick Spanish Mission style building set back from the corner at 100 N. Person Street... originally occupied by a produce operation, now converted to a restaurant.” The building is listed as non-contributing.
- The case was not heard at the January hearing.

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	install planter boxes and arbors with built-in
2.4	Fences and Walls	benches in front yard/parking area

STAFF COMMENTS

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

A. Installation of planter boxes is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.1; however installation of arbors with built-in benches in front yard/parking area is incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.2, 2.3.9.

1* The building is non-contributing to the district.

2* The entire front and side yard areas are paved.

3* Historically there would not have been a visual screen between the “storefront” and Person Street.

4* There is no known precedent for the installation of a series of wood screens in front of a building in Oakwood.

- 5* COA 008-09-CA approved a similar structure at the rear of 117 E Hargett Street in the Moore Square district. It was approved by the committee in part because it “is located at the rear of the primary building” and “located in a normally uninhabitable service area on the property.”
- 6* The style of the structures is not similar to the Mission style of the building.

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

- Deny the installation of arbors with built-in benches.
- Approve the installation of planter boxes with the following conditions:
 1. That the arbors with built-in benches be removed within 30 days of this decision.
 2. That the design of the planter boxes change to be more in keeping with the design of the building and for the revised design be provided to and approved by staff prior to implementation.
 3. That the planters be changed as noted above within 45 days of this decision.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tania Tully [affirmed] mentions that the gentleman to be heard is not the owner, so committee needs to be aware that an architect or other profession may be viewed as a person operating without a law license. Russ Morrell [affirmed] said that he has some sort of ownership stake.

Support: Russ Morrell [affirmed], 108 Person Street was present to speak in support of the application. He stated that they want to have outside seating but the sun is too bright, so he designed and built arbors to cordon off area that would be used for outdoor dining; they were unaware they needed COA.

Questions from committee:

Mr. Alphin—are they bolted down until ground? Mr. Morrell—not yet.

Mr. Alphin—how will they be? Mr. Morrell—drilled into the concrete.

Mr. Belledin—do they need to be anchored down? Mr. Morrell—haven’t been so far, so maybe not.

Mr. Alphin—do you think they need to be bolted down to be safe? Mr. Morrell:—in case of tornado type winds, anchors may be appropriate;

Mr. Story—have you given any thought to how you might make it look? Mr. Morrell—it is an old gas station with not much architecture not much to it. Ms. Tully disagrees—the building has some Spanish mission detailing.

Mr. Story—how long has Mr. Owens owned property? Mr. Morrell—he doesn’t, he rents it.

Mr. Shackleton—anyone else here to speak on this case? No.

Ms. Tully notes that this is not the only permit that would need to be obtained to keep the benches.

Mr. Belledin asked if there are any COAs on outdoor furnishings. Ms. Tully says yes: arbors, fences, benches that are bolted to ground. Mr. Belledin—freestanding is more of a gray area? Ms. Tully—yes.

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

At Mr. Shackleton's suggestion Mr. Story moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Mr. Belledin seconded; motion carried 6/0.

Committee Discussion

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

They look impermanent. [Alphin]

I'm trying to decide if this is furniture or not. [Belledin]

If removed they wouldn't leave much of a trace. [Alphin]

Looking at 2.3.2 and 2.3.9—this is the question before us. 2.3.3 is about protecting and maintaining building materials; issue is how it's attached? [McGorty]

2.3.2 gets into the relationship of the building to the street; 2.3.9 is about not introducing contemporary features. [Shackleton]

It's unfortunate that these were built without COA, but what was built there is not congruous with the regulations. This would set a precedent to support after-the-fact work and is a bad policy. [Story]

In reading staff comments it says "if arbors were removed". Is there some other way to provide outdoor seating and shade that wouldn't block the building? [McGorty]

If we were looking at café seating with umbrellas, would that be a different discussion? [Belledin]

That is more like furniture. [Shackleton]

What if it was bolted down? [Alphin]

Café tables do not block the building the same what that these block the building. [Shackleton]

In 2.3.2 this item is not specifically listed. This screens the building. I wonder if they were to alter the arbors to make them shorter if that would make a difference. [Alphin]

From the drive by perspective it's blocking the view, but from the users of the building the building is experienced. They also separate them from the parking. [McGorty]

We need to consider the block, it is a prominent corner. [Shackleton]

This falls into inappropriate site features 2.3.9. [Shackleton]

It also speaks to the historic character of the building. The arbor looks nothing like the building; if the arbor had been constructed where it had appropriate elements, you could maintain the character of the building; it probably could have been done better. Clearly it is not the character of the building. [Story]

I want to make sure that the building isn't faux-historic; [Downer]

Would it make any difference if the bamboo shades weren't on them? [Belledin]

Even without the shades the arbor is still blocking the view. [Shackleton]

Mr. Belledin moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be reopened. Mr. Alphin seconded; motion carried 6/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Mr. Story asked how staff arrived at the recommendation. Ms. Tully said that part of what made her come to the conclusion that it was incongruous, is not just the building but the district itself. When driving along Person Street they stand out. Mr. Shackleton asks for clarification that the staff recommendation is not saying no you can't have outdoor seating? Ms. Tully confirms.

Ms. McGorty asks about the fact about contributing to district. Ms. Tully says that the relationship of what changes are made to building itself is less important than that to the district as a whole.

Mr. Belledin moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Ms. McGorty seconded; motion carried 6/0.

Committee Discussion (2)

I can wrap my mind around seating, but would it be preferable if it was shorter, visually tucked in under the roof in front and that bamboo screens be operable. [Alphin]

When you say shorter, you need piece of wood above bamboo paneling, so are you saying take it down to the level necessary to put up the bamboo screen? [McGorty]

You could take it down further to make it truly seating. You don't get shade but you still get seating. [Story]

Mr. Belledin moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be reopened. Mr. Alphin seconded; motion carried 6/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (3)

Mr. Belledin asked if based on Sanborn maps were there any structures located in the parking lot? He asks Mr. Morrell if there used to be gas pump islands beside the building. Mr. Morrell said yes, on both sides. He also says that the mansard roof on the building is really the only defining characteristic, and this doesn't affect that.

Ms. Tully comments that the committee should keep in mind that although this is a commercial building Oakwood is a residential character district. She said that she would be very concerned with the precedent of putting something like this in a front yard even though this is a commercial property.

Ms. McGorty moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Mr. Story seconded; motion carried 6/0.

Committee Discussion (3)

This is furniture, unless bolted. [Belledin]

Findings of Fact

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Mr. Alphin and seconded by Mr. Belledin, Mr. Alphin made an amended motion that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-6) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following additional facts:

- 7* The building was formerly a grocery and then a gas station.
- 8* During its period as a gas station there were islands that provided some separation between the building and the street.

Mr. Belledin agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 6/0.

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the bamboo screens be operable.
2. That none of the items (planter boxes or arbors with built-in benches) be permanently attached to the pavement.

Ms. McGorty agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 4/1 (Mr. Story opposed).

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

Certificate expiration date: 8/6/12.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

004-12-CA 315 PELL STREET
Applicant: MARY DILLON
Received: 1/23/2012 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 4/22/2012 1) 2/6/2012 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: (amended) Remove existing rear additions; construct new 1.5 story addition; add screened porch on existing side deck; pave gravel driveway; relocate basement door

Amendments: Amended drawings and an amended written description were received February 2, 2012 and are attached to these comments. The revisions reflect comments received from the DRAC.

DRAC: The application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its February 1, 2012 meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker, Curtis Kasefang, Erin Sterling, Jerry Traub, and David Maurer; also in attendance were Mary Dillon, Ashley Morris, and Tania Tully.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes: A few items were added to the project description that were not noted during creation of the agenda.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Construct new 1.5 story addition
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	pave gravel driveway
3.5	Roofs	Construct new 1.5 story addition
3.7	Windows and Doors	relocate basement door
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Remove existing rear additions; add screened porch on existing side deck

STAFF COMMENTS

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

- A. Remove existing rear additions; construct new 2-story addition; add screened porch on existing side deck; relocation of basement door is not incongruous in concept according to

Guidelines sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 3.5.1, 3.5.10, 3.7.1, 3.7.2, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.2.5.

- 1* There are no trees in the areas of new footprint; there are trees in the vicinity that may be impacted by construction activity.
 - 2* The deck being altered was approved with a COA in 1994 (045-94-MW).
 - 3* The lot is 6,259 SF; the footprint of the house is 1,638 SF including the front porch; the existing deck is 288 SF; the driveway is approximately 555 SF; the screened porch addition is 117 SF and sits in the footprint of existing deck; existing square footage being removed is approximately 362 SF; the new addition is approximately 733 SF. Current lot coverage is approximately 39.6%; proposed lot coverage is 45.6%. Total increase in footprint is about 371 SF.
 - 4* The additions being removed are either not historic or heavily altered; the condition of the windows in the additions being removed is unknown.
 - 5* The addition is located on the rear of the house.
 - 6* The addition will match the existing house in terms of the siding material and profile, roofing material, and trim size and material. A vertical trim board will be used on the east elevation to demarcate the location of the addition; new windows will not have muntins.
 - 7* A second floor is added by extending the existing roof line and a dormer on the east elevation; the dormer begins at the rear wall of the historic house – approximately 32 feet from the front wall of the house.
 - 8* The application includes three examples of rear additions:
 - In 2001, the committee approved a COA (092-01-CA) to “Construct addition to rear of property. Reconfigure roof on rear wing of building and add half story” at 221 Elm Street.
 - In 2003, the committee approved a COA (061-03-CA) to “Construct second story on primary structure” at 226 Elm Street, “a non-contributing 1950s-era infill property...”
 - In 1986, the commission approved a COA for “Removal of enclosed porch and addition of gabled section...construction of upstairs deck ‘balcony’...” at 529 N East Street.
- B. Paving of gravel driveway is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.5.3, 2.5.5; however a solid concrete driveway is incongruous with Guideline section 2.5.5.
- 1* The gravel driveway is existing; repaving would not change the configuration or size.
 - 2* In Oakwood “Typically, driveways were made of gravel or compacted soil. Often a grass median separated two gravel or aggregate textured concrete runners. Occasionally, more decorative brick or stone pavers were used.”
 - 3* Approval of driveways is usually approvable as a minor work.

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

1. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
 - a. tree protection plan similar to the RHDC Sample Tree Protection Plan;

2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation/construction:
 - a. Paint colors;
 - b. Screened porch construction;
 - c. Brick sample;
 - d. Skylights;
 - e. Windows and doors;
3. That the driveway not be solid concrete, and that the materials and design be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation;
4. That the removed windows and doors be salvaged and either stored on site or offered to a reputable reuse facility for donation or sale.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Mary Dillon [affirmed], owner and Ashley Morris [affirmed], architect were present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Dillon summarized the proposed work and stated that the exterior of the historic house will not change and that they were ok with staff's suggested conditions. The design changed based on suggestions from the DRAC. She is happy to have a strip driveway. Ms. Morris agreed and said that completing a tree protection plan and getting the other details were not an issue.

Mr. Alphin asked if the applicant had considered rather than just having a cornerboard in the middle of the wall they do more of a three-dimensional thing. Ms. Morris said that they did. She explained that the original plan was a true second story, but DRAC recommended that the second story be a dormer, and then the dimensioning didn't work anymore. It looked odd to have a 2-story with the gasket.

Mr. Belledin noted that he takes staff comments to mean that the precedents that the applicant found for examples are comparable. The projects in 2001 and 2003 were reviewed under the current guidelines.

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

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

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

Findings of Fact

Ms. McGorty moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comments A. (inclusive of facts 1-8) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-3) to be acceptable as findings of fact.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Belledin; 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 following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
 - a. tree protection plan similar to the RHDC Sample Tree Protection Plan;
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation/construction:
 - a. Paint colors;
 - b. Screened porch construction;
 - c. Brick sample;
 - d. Skylights;
 - e. Windows and doors;
3. That the driveway not be solid concrete, and that the materials and design be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation;
4. That the removed windows and doors be salvaged and either stored on site or offered to a reputable reuse facility for donation or sale.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 8/6/12.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

006-12-CA 1004 DOROTHEA DRIVE

Applicant: JARROD ROBERSON

Received: 1/23/2012

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 4/22/2012

1) 2/6/2012 2)

3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: Remove existing rear porches and deck; construct new 1-story addition;
 regrade with retaining wall

Amendments: Revised drawings and photographs of details of the existing house were
 provided by the applicant February 3, 2012 and are attached to these comments.

DRAC: The application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its
 February 1, 2012 meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker, Curtis Kasefang, Erin
 Sterling, and Jerry Traub; also in attendance were Jarrod Roberson and Tania Tully.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	construct new 1-story addition; regrade with retaining wall
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	remove existing rear porches and deck
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	construct new 1-story addition

STAFF COMMENTS

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

- A. Removal of existing rear porches and deck; construction of new 1-story addition; regrading of rear yard with retaining wall is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 3.8.1, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9.
- 1* The existing deck is of relatively new construction; solid concrete patios are not commonly approved in the historic districts.
- 2* Surrounding topography causes water to drain toward the building. This has been a problem for certain other properties with similar orientation in the Boylan Heights Historic District that have a low finish floor height; it is typical for properties in the 1000 block of Dorothea Drive to have rear yard retaining walls; lots slope down from north to south (rear to front).

- 3* Construction and material details of the new wall were not included in the application.
- 4* There are no trees in the footprint of the proposed addition; there are trees along the alley that could be impacted by construction activities; a tree protection plan was not included.
- 5* The existing house has sloped soffits with exposed rafter tails; the addition is proposed to have the same.
- 6* Accurate detailed drawings are not included in the application; however, diagrammatic drawings in conjunction with photographs details on the historic house are used to convey the design.
- 7* The porch addition being removed is not a conditioned space; another small addition is being retained.
- 8* The proposed addition is at the rear of the house, inset from the side of the historic house, lower than the historic house, and has a gable roof form typical of the historic district.
- 9* The application states that the windows will be ply gem wood; door material is not indicated; details and specifications were not provided.
- 10* The addition will sit mostly in the footprint of the porch and deck that are being removed.
- 11* Similar 1-story rear additions have been approved by the committee along Dorothea Drive including 1024 Dorothea (096-07-CA and 090-08-CA) and 1006 Dorothea Drive (109-10-CA).
- 12* The lot size is 4,443 SF; the footprint of the house including front porch is 1,216 SF; the existing rear porch is 72 SF; the deck is 104 SF; the proposed addition is 196 SF. The existing lot coverage is 1,392 SF or 31.3%; proposed lot coverage is 1,412 SF or 31.8%.

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

- 1. That a tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan be provided to and approved by staff prior to grading or the issuance of permits.
- 2. That construction and material details for the new retaining wall be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction.
- 3. That the gable brackets removed to accommodate the addition be reused on the addition if feasible.
- 4. That the following details and specifications regarding the new addition be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
 - a. Window and door manufacturer specifications and drawings;
 - b. Gable vent.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Jarrod Roberson [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Roberson stated that the rear view does look a little funky with the space above window and doors and that he has pictures of some other ones, which he passed around. He showed how he's trying to tie in to the house trying to match original and said that he will try to reuse whatever materials possible.

Mr. Belledin asked staff about fact A.1 and the lack of a condition? Tania Tully [affirmed] said that she has not looked up the specifics, but that in Boylan Heights the patio would likely have not been brick. Mr. Belledin asked if it was a red flag. Ms. Tully said that because of the size it doesn't seem as though it would be precedent.

Mr. Alphin noted that there is a lot of space above the door in the gable, noting that putting a transom in over the windows or doors would bring that up some. Mr. Roberson stated that the drawing may not be accurate and there will not be that much space above the door.

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

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

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

Findings of Fact

Ms. McGorty moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-12) 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 a tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan be provided to and approved by staff prior to grading or the issuance of permits.
2. That construction and material details for the new retaining wall be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction.

3. That the gable brackets removed to accommodate the addition be reused on the addition if feasible.
4. That the following details and specifications regarding the new addition be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
 - a. Window and door manufacturer specifications and drawings;
 - b. Gable vent.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 8/6/12.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

007-12-CA 319 S BOYLAN AVENUE
Applicant: THE NORTHGATE GROUP
Received: 1/23/2012 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 4/22/2012 1) 2/6/2012 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: (amended) Construct 2nd level dormer addition; construct rear deck; alter roofing material; add ridge vent and skylights; remove utility chimney.

Amendments: An amended application was provided by the applicant February 3, 2012 and is attached to these comments. The revisions reflect comments received from the DRAC.

DRAC: The application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its February 1, 2012 meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker, Curtis Kasefang, Erin Sterling, Jerry Traub, and David Maurer; also in attendance were Emily Brinker and Tania Tully.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes: Files from the example COAs 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	construct rear deck
3.5	Roofs	construct 2 nd level dormer addition; alter roofing material; add ridge vent and skylights; remove utility chimney
4.1	Decks	construct rear deck
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	construct 2 nd level dormer addition

STAFF COMMENTS

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

- A. Construction of dormer addition; alteration of roofing material; addition of ridge vent and skylights is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.5.1, 3.5.7, 3.5.10, 4.2.1, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8.
- 1* The main roof is currently gable on the front and hipped in the rear; the dormer addition extends the roofline towards the back, creating another gable end.

- 2* The chimney proposed for removal is not character defining.
 - 3* The application includes three examples of side dormer additions:
 - In 2005, the committee approved a COA (177-05-CA) to “Construct 2-story rear addition with garage in basement level” at 401 S Boylan Avenue.
 - In 1997, the committee approved a COA (186-97-CA) to “Construct rear addition; install roof dormer” at 1005 W South Street.
 - In 2007, the commission approved a COA (101-07-CA) to “Construct rear enclosed and screened porch additions ranging in height from 1 to 2 stories” at 1022 W South Street.
 - 4* The second floor is added by extending the existing roof line to the east and adding a dormer on the south elevation; the dormer begins behind the mid-section of the house, approximately at the 3rd window on the south and beyond the chimney on the north.
 - 5* The dormer sits well below the ridge of the house and back from the wall.
 - 6* Dormers are not uncommon features on bungalows.
 - 7* There appears to be an error in the drawing of the proposed east elevation where the roof hits the wall; it is unclear how the transition between the horizontal siding and brick will be treated.
 - 8* The application is proposing to use fiber-cement siding on the dormer addition; smooth faced fiber cement siding is regularly approved by the committee on new detached construction; it has not been approved on new additions.
 - 9* The application includes details about the trim and siding dimensions; these are all details from wood sided houses and may not be appropriate on a house that is primarily brick.
- B. Construction of rear deck is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.7, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.7, 4.1.8.
- 1* The lot size is 10,454 SF; the footprint of the house including front porch and porte cochere is 2,226 SF; the proposed deck is 240 SF. The existing lot coverage is 21%; proposed lot coverage is 24%.
 - 2* The proposed may be in the critical root zone of a large tree; a tree protection plan was not included in the application.
 - 3* The new deck will be located at the rear of the house; it will be built of treated wood framing and posts as is commonly approved in the district.
 - 4* It is unclear from the application if the deck will be structurally self-supporting; as drawn, the support posts are visually too slender for the weight of the deck.
 - 5* The lot slopes down away from the front of the house.
 - 6* Details of the railing were included in the application; details of the deck edge and stairs were not.
 - 7* It is typical for vegetative or lattice screening to be used at the base of decks. Two rear decks in the 800 block of W South Street were approved without screening in 2004 and 2011.

Pending the committees determination regarding the use of fiber cement siding on the addition, staff suggests that the committee approve the amended application, with the following conditions:

1. That the two windows in the rear gable be ganged similar to those on the 1st level.
2. That the removed window be salvaged and either stored on site or donated to a reputable reuse facility.
3. That details, specifications and/or material samples for the following items be provided to and approved by staff prior installation/construction:
 - a. Transition between the horizontal siding and brick wall;
 - b. Paint color;
 - c. Windows and doors;
 - d. Door and window trim;
 - e. Siding and trim;
 - f. Skylights;
 - g. Gutters;
 - h. Roof venting.
4. That should the committee approve the use of fiber cement siding that it be painted and installed with the smooth side facing out.
5. That the deck be constructed so that it is structurally self-supporting and may be removed in the future without damage to the historic structure.
6. That details, specifications and/or material samples for the following items be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of building permits for the deck:
 - a. Tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) and/or registered Landscape Architect;
 - b. Deck and stair construction;
 - c. Deck edge.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Emily Brinker [affirmed] and Ethan Hyman [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Brinker stated that they propose to draw back the roof and add a dormer to get a little more headroom.

Ms. McGorty asked about the request for hardiplank. Ms. Brinker stated that there is no wood siding on this brick house, and so this seems like a really good case to bring in a good product that stands up as well as brick. She believes that hardiplank is a superior product to wood and that they would use a 6" reveal.

Mr. Alphin noted fact 7 and the apparent error in the drawing.

In answer to Ms. McGorty, Tania Tully [affirmed] stated that fiber cement and hardiplank are the same thing. Fiber cement is the generic material.

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

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

Committee Discussion

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

It seems like the deck is far enough from the tree that they could go with a noncertified tree protection plan. [Alphin]

What about the hardiplank? [McGorty]

I don't see a reason to set a precedent in this case. [Alphin]

Since it is the only siding material I doesn't have problem with hardiplank. [Downer]

What Ms. Downer said does seem to be in keeping with 4.2.7. Synthetic can be compatible with brick. [Shackleton]

Is the point that it's more durable? [McGorty]

Yes. [unknown]

Does it look the same? [Story]

They should measure the reveal of nearby siding and perhaps go narrower than 6". [Belledin]

There is a newer product that is ½" thick and closer to the shadow line of wood siding. A discerning eye could tell the difference. [Alphin]

Does it make a difference if it is paintable? [Story]

We could accept hardi with a fact that this house is not sided. [Alphin]

Is sustainability a big goal? [McGorty]

Ms. Tully noted that the current guidelines do not address sustainability directly.

Ms. McGorty moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be re-opened. Mr. Story seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Ms. Tully stated that one of the reasons the commission has not approved hardi on an addition before was because it was adjacent to wood. She also noted that another consideration is that this will be on second floor.

Ms. Brinker asked that they be allowed to choose between hardie and wood.

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

If we're going to approve fiber cement we should require the thicker taper. [McGorty]

Findings of Fact

Mr. Belledin moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staffs comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-9) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-7) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following additional facts:

A.

10* There is no wood siding on the building.

11* The dormer addition is on the 2nd level and out of reach.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the two windows in the rear gable be ganged similar to those on the 1st level.
2. That the removed window be salvaged and either stored on site or donated to a reputable reuse facility.
3. That details, specifications and/or material samples for the following items be provided to and approved by staff prior installation/construction:
 - a. Transition between the horizontal siding and brick wall;
 - b. Paint color;
 - c. Windows and doors;
 - d. Door and window trim;
 - e. Siding and trim;
 - f. Skylights;
 - g. Gutters;
 - h. Roof venting.
4. That the fiber cement siding be the thickness of Artisan Lap by James Hardie, that it be painted and installed with the smooth side facing out, and that the reveal be the same as the reveal on nearby houses.
5. That the deck be constructed so that it is structurally self-supporting and may be removed in the future without damage to the historic structure.
6. That details, specifications and/or material samples for the following items be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of building permits for the deck:
 - a. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan;
 - b. Deck and stair construction;
 - c. Deck edge.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 8/6/12.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – STAFF COMMENTS

121-11-CA 208 LINDEN AVENUE
Applicant: NICHOLAS AND COLEEN SPEAKS
Received: 11/17/2011 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 2/15/2012 1) 12/5/2011 2) 2/6/2012 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: Remove small rear addition and deck; construct two-story rear addition; construct rear decks; alter 2 existing windows

Amendments: Revised drawings were provided to staff December 2, 2011. Hard copies were provided by the applicant at the hearing. Photographic examples of buildings with similar design features were provided by the applicant January 26, 2012 and were included in the commissioner packets.

DRAC: The Design Review Advisory Committee (DRAC) reviewed the proposal November 30, 2011. Present were Erin Sterling, Jerry Traub, David Maurer, and Dan Becker; also present were Tania Tully, Martha Lauer, Will Alphin, Nicholas Speaks, and Coleen Speaks.

Conflict of Interest: Mr. Alphin is the architect for the application and was recused from the meeting for this case.

Staff Notes:

- These comments are based upon the revised drawings and the December hearing.
- The National Register nomination describes the house as follows: "This one-story, frame, Queen Anne style cottage was constructed ca. 1909 for Wayland G. Matthews of William P. Matthews and Son, Grocers. The cross-gable frame house has a front gable and a gable-roofed ell at the northeast corner. Quatrefoil vents ornament the gables. A hipped-roofed porch with turned columns and simple brackets stretches across the front three bays. The front door has a rectangular transom, and the window sash are two over two. The front porch railings are modern replacements. (Wake County Deeds, City Directories; 1914 Raleigh Sanborn Map)"
- Files from the example COAs 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	construct two-story rear addition and decks
3.7	Windows and Doors	alter 1 existing window; add windows on rear
4.1	Decks	remove existing rear deck; construct rear decks
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	remove small rear addition and deck; construct two-story rear addition; construct rear decks

STAFF COMMENTS

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

- A. Removal of small rear addition and deck; construction of two-story rear addition; construction of rear decks is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 4.1.1, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.7, 4.2.9; however the design of the deck rail is incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 4.1.2, 4.1.4; the size and scale of the addition is incongruous to *Guidelines* section 4.2.6; and the mass and materials is incongruous according to *Guidelines* section 4.2.7.
- 1* The lot is 5,932 SF; the footprint of the house is 1,436 SF including the front porch and existing deck; additional footprint created by the addition is approximately 400 SF; the footprint of the proposed deck is about 276 SF. Current lot coverage is approximately 24%; proposed lot coverage is 35.6%.
- 2* There are trees on adjacent properties that may be impacted by the addition foundation or construction activities; a tree protection plan was not included with the application.
- 3* The yard slopes down from the street towards the rear of the lot.
- 4* The proposed decks are integrated into the design of the addition and are on both levels; except for the railing of the upper deck, the decks do not appear to be adjacent historic fabric.
- 5* The railing on the lower rear porch and deck has horizontal members with few vertical supports; the deck boards and trellis will be cedar, but the railing material was not stated in the application.
- 6* Deck railings with horizontal members and non-wood materials have been approved in Oakwood when the deck was located behind a fence and not visible to the street such as at 516 Polk Street (058-07-CA).
- 7* The proposed location of the addition is the inside of the "L" on the rear and would replace a non-historic deck, altered bump-out, and enclosed porch.
- 8* The addition does not extend closer to the south side property line than the existing house; the deck and trellis extends about 5½ feet beyond the south side of the house.
- 9* At the peak of the shed roof, the addition is about 9 inches taller than the historic house; the clerestory window projection extends about 3½ feet above the historic house.
- 10* Proposed materials for the addition include painted, vertical, corrugated metal panels and clear coated horizontal cedar siding. Neither material exists on the historic house.
- 11* The window units in the addition are the same size as the windows on the historic house; details for the new windows in the addition were not included in the application.
- 12* The amended drawings appear to indicate that the roof covering of the existing house will be changed to standing seam metal; alteration of the roof covering is typically approved by staff as a minor work; details regarding the material specifications were not included in the amended application.
- 13* The addition is actually not higher than the ridgeline of the main house—it is taller than the ridge line of the rear ell; only the clerestory piece is taller than the main ridgeline.

14* Side service entrances are not rare/

15* The following additional facts were provided by the applicant at the January hearing:

- The addition has a small footprint; they are adding 1000 square feet with a 400 square foot footprint.
- The rafter tails at same slope to pay homage to the front porch roof form.
- The windows in the addition are the same size as those of the main house.
- The color of the metal siding is open to discussion, but would be secondary to main house.
- The porch of the house is held off the historic house a few feet to reduce the impact of the addition to the historic fabric. Mr. Alphin notes that in the future this addition could be taken off and the historic house remain intact.
- The stair juts out; it has open risers and visually light materials.
- The addition is in the least conspicuous area of the lot possible, and it touches the fabric of the house only where it had been goofed up already.
- The spirit of design of the addition, like the house, is pragmatic and simple.
- Mr. Alphin states that the railing material is welded steel, painted.

16* The amended application includes examples of tall/visible additions and protruding elements:

- The apparent addition at 541 E Jones Street is original to the house.
- There is no COA file for 420 N East Street.
- A COA is not on file for the screened porch at 517 Oakwood Avenue.
- In 1999, the committee approved a COA (222-98-CA) to “replace existing one-story addition with 2-story addition & porch (rear of house)” at 526 N East Street. The Certified Record states in fact 2* that “the addition creates the form of a “camelback” shotgun dwelling, examples of which are found in the Idlewild neighborhood immediately east of Oakwood.”
- In 2003, the committee approved a COA (176-02-CA) to “Construct addition on rear of house” at 524 N Bloodworth Street.
- In 1996, the committee approved a COA (020-96-CA) to “add steps to existing deck” at 410 Oakwood Avenue.
- In 1995, the committee approved a COA (173-94-CA) to “Construct new 2-story rear at southwest corner of house” at 608 Polk Street.
- In 1987, the committee approved a COA (CAD-87-006) to construct wooden steps leading from deck to yard” at 529 North East Street.
- In 1987, the committee approved a COA (CAD-87-022) for “construction of an exterior stair at the northwest corner of the house” at 213 N Bloodworth Street.

B. Alteration of one existing window and the addition of two are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.7.1, 3.7.9.

1* Installation and removal of windows is typically approved by staff as a minor work; details regarding the window specifications and how the windows will be banked were not included in the application.

- 2* Shortening of windows on side elevations that are near the rear of the house are commonly approved provided that the new siding is woven in with the existing siding.

If the committee chooses to approve the application, staff suggests the following conditions:

1. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
 - a. Tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture or a Landscape Architect licensed by the NCBLA that indicates recommended type of foundation and protection of trees during construction;
 - b. Larger scale drawings that indicate how the addition will be constructed.
2. That the tree protection be in place prior to the start of construction and remain in place until construction has ceased.
3. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
 - a. addition windows;
 - b. historic house windows;
 - c. siding and trim;
 - d. colors;
 - e. metal roofing;
 - f. deck railing.
4. That the new siding under the shortened window is woven in with the existing siding so as to avoid matching vertical seams.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Coleen Speaks [affirmed], homeowner and Will Alphin, designer [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Alphin projects a 3-D computer model of the proposal on the meeting room screen and makes the following comments:

- The idea is to add an addition that is of its time period and very discernible.
- They are removing insignificant pieces of the house
- The addition is tying in to the house with a one story tie-in and is holding off the house on the rear as well.
- The rear view is probably the most overwhelming.
- The rear ell is original.

Mr. Alphin summarized the conclusion of the first meeting on the case which requested that he find examples of stairs that extend off the side of a house, examples of flat low sloping roofs, and examples of two-story additions to one-story houses. Mr. Alphin presents a slide show of the examples provided with the amended application. He argues that having second-story porches on the rear is easily acceptable since it's all over the place on the fronts of houses.

Ms. McGorty asks staff how 4.2.7 and 4.2.6 are different: is mass the proportion? Tania Tully [affirmed] states that mass is sort of the volume, how it feels. She states that you can have something that is physically big but doesn't seem massive...one of the things that staff talks

about is if someone wants to put on a large addition there are architectural tricks that can be done to make it appear less large. Yes, it may be big but perhaps it doesn't feel as massive. Ms. McGorty says that is what she is struggling the most with and that the examples that were shown unless she missed it, really seemed to be making an effort to blend the addition and original house, whereas this is taking the opposite approach. To laypeople in the neighborhood, they may ask how this got through. The contrast makes the mass seem larger.

Mr. Alphin, referencing a previous case in the hearing, says that from a mass perspective with volume, the Pell Street addition had continuous roof and sidewall so in some ways is more massive. He states that they are only plugging into this building where former noncontributing additions have been removed.

Ms. McGorty notes that the materials also make it seem so different and asks him to please speak on it. Mr. Alphin says that he is taking two contrasting styles and by clearly delineating, they each look good by being next to each other. If you look at Pell street house, the addition has diminished original house because it wouldn't have been designed that way. Instead, he's saying we're keeping old house the way it is, it's beautiful, so we're adding on in a separate way. Mr. Alphin notes that the model they tried using traditional addition methods looked really unsatisfying.

Ms. Speaks notes that the landscaping will play a large part in the way the addition is viewed from the street.

Mr. Story asks if he would feel differently if this was the tenth one of these being done in Oakwood - putting novelty aside. Mr. Alphin says there have not been applications pushing this type of addition. Ms. McGorty says she buys into the idea of this being an evolutionary step and asks staff, if neighbors object to future applications what would the power of this objection be? Ms. Tully said that it is entirely possible that after something that is built and the commission decided it didn't meet the Guidelines after all, it could use this to inform future decisions. You will potentially see more attempts at less deliberately compatible additions, but whether we would see someone going this far we don't know.

Mr. Alphin states that in his opinion this does meet guidelines.

Mr. Shackleton says that this fits into the ell space. Mr. Belledin notes the two story examples.

Ms. McGorty says that the size has been talked about, height and jutting off to the side, but the new materials haven't been discussed. Mr. Alphin says they found a lot of examples of side stairs, so that's addressed. Ms. Downer notes that the examples show jutting here, taller here, different materials here, but not on same structure. That being said, she does think it's an example that is a good step forward, and which does have elements that can be traced to other properties.

Mr. Belledin says that the clerestory height is the only problem he sees. He doesn't see a need for the clerestory to be taller, it can hold the roofline. Mr. Story asks how much taller is clerestory. Mr. Alphin says about 2 feet, although construction drawings haven't been done yet. Ms. Speaks notes that it was actually the element she had the most trouble getting used to but now she loves it.

Mr. Belledin says that with the height and mass, there is a legitimate case; same with the material, the natural looking wood isn't heartburn for him, and the projecting stair is okay since it is done delicately.

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

At Mr. Shackleton's suggestion Mr. Story 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]:

The group seems pretty comfortable with it. My biggest concern is defensibility of this. We need to articulate confines clearly. [McGorty]

The case has been worked through to make it defensible. [Story]

Yes. [Shackleton]

Findings of Fact

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Mr. Belledin and seconded by Ms. McGorty, Mr. Belledin made an amended motion that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comments A. (inclusive of facts 1-16) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-2) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following modifications and additional facts:

Modifying fact 9* to read:

9* At the peak of the shed roof, the addition is about 9 inches taller than the historic house; The overall mass of the addition fits vertically within main ridge.

Adding facts 17* to 19*:

17* Examples were provided for the use of roofing used on a vertical surface, additions taller than the main house, and protruding stairs.

18* The house sits in the middle of the block on the edge of the district.

19* The addition is removable.

Ms. McGorty agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 5/0.

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
 - a. Tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture or a Landscape Architect licensed by the NCBLA that indicates recommended type of foundation and protection of trees during construction;
 - b. Larger scale drawings that indicate how the addition will be constructed.
2. That the tree protection be in place prior to the start of construction and remain in place until construction has ceased.
3. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
 - a. addition windows;
 - b. historic house windows;
 - c. siding and trim;
 - d. colors;
 - e. metal roofing;
 - f. deck railing.
4. That the new siding under the shortened window is woven in with the existing siding so as to avoid matching vertical seams.
5. That the clerestory structure be lower than the main ridge of the house.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 8/6/12.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Courtesy Review – Edison Building – Rod Harner of J. Davis
 - Although the site is adjacent to, rather than located in, the Moore Square Historic Overlay District, it is within the Moore Square National Register Historic District. Both Moore Square and much of Fayetteville Street are characterized by storefronts and building entrances on a very human scale.
 - The mid-rise scale of the building is consistent with other buildings in the vicinity.
 - The commission appreciates the alcove stoops which bring residential entrances to the street level.
 - This building's ground level design includes first floor window bays with canopies in order to enhance a pedestrian-scaled ground floor.
 - In keeping with the pedestrian scale and to engage the buildings across Blount Street and activate that elevation, the commission strongly encourages the addition of entrances along the east elevation of the building.
 - The commission also suggests that brick should be used as the exterior material as much as possible as a way to visually connect to the historic district and provide scale.
2. Committee Discussion – Meeting Post-Mortem
3. *Design Guidelines* Update

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner