

RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
March 5, 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, Kiernan McGorty, Scott Shackleton

Excused Absence: Miranda Downer

Staff Present: Tania Tully, Martha Lauer

Approval of the February 2012 Minutes

Ms. McGorty moved to adopt the minutes as submitted. Mr. Alphin seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

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
Bob Metz, 3103 Plantation 27609	No
Linda Metz, 3103 Plantation 27609	No
Ken Redfoot, Peace University	No
Russ Davis, 219 E Washington 29601	Yes
Michael Walters, 411-A2 Gooseneck Dr 27513	No
Lelanda Cottle, 3100 Hillmer Dr 27609	No
Jackie Cottle, 3100 Hillmer Dr 27609	No
Molly Urquhart, 3104 Hillmer Dr 27609	Yes
Marie S Brown, 3216 Plantation Rd 27609	No
Erika A Swain, 3211 Plantation Rd 27609	No
David Justice, 5401 Worthington Ln 27604	No
Stuart Cullinan, 310 Heck St 27601	Yes
Emily Brinker, 323 S Boylan Ave 27603	Yes
Richard Smith, 323 S Boylan Ave 27603	Yes
Anna Maria Taylor, 302 N Blount St	Yes
Bubba Watts, 302 N Blount St	Yes
Berta Hammerstein, 3215 Plantation Rd 27609	No
Lawrence Hammerstein, 3215 Plantation Rd 27609	No

Yijie Zhao, 1241 University Ct, Apt 201 27606	No
Lacy Reaves, 150 Fayetteville St 27601	Yes
Xiao Chen Shi, 1351 University Ct, Apt 101 27606	No
Mansour Ali, 3016 Hillmer Dr 27609	No
Will Parry-Hill, 6508 Bush St 27609	No
Unien, 1241 University Ct 27606	No
Gui Li, 1331-103 Crab Orchard Dr 101 27606	No
Chris Pope, 6310 Chapel Hill Rd #250 27606	Yes
Myrick Howard, Fayetteville St 27601	No

REVIEW OF SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Alphin moved to approve the agenda as printed. Mr. Belledin seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

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 016-12-CA for which the Summary Proceeding is made part of these minutes.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – SUMMARY PROCEEDING

016-12-CA 15 E PEACE STREET
Applicant: JOHN CRANHAM FOR WILLIAM PEACE UNIVERSITY
Received: 2/20/2012 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 5/20/2012 1) 3/5/2012 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BLOUNT STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: O&I-1

Nature of Project: Construct addition to athletic center; alter windows, doors and HVAC of athletic center; implement associated landscaping alterations; remove two trees.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- The elevation drawings are incorrectly labeled (north & south and east & west are reversed); staff comments use the correct directions.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	implement landscaping alterations; remove two trees
2.5	Walkways and Driveways	implement associated landscaping alterations
3.7	Windows and Doors	alter windows and doors of athletic center
3.10	Utilities and Energy Retrofit	alter HVAC of athletic center
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	construct addition to athletic center

STAFF COMMENTS

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

- A. Implementation of landscaping alterations; removal of two trees is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.5, 2.3.7, 2.5.1, 2.5.5, 2.5.9. Raleigh City Code Section 10-2052(a)(2)c.5.i states that "An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure, or site within the district may not be denied... However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to three-hundred sixty-five (365) days from the date of approval... If the Commission finds that the building, structure, or site has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Overlay District, it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal."
- 1* Two regulated trees (12" and 15" dbh) are in the location of the proposed addition and will be removed; based on their location and size, their contribution to the overall tree canopy of the district is limited.

- 2* Other adjacent trees will be protected during construction; a tree protection plan was included in the application.
- 3* New HVAC equipment will be screened with vegetation or fencing; details were not included in the application.
- 4* An existing brick walkway will be removed and reconfigured around the new addition.

- B. Construction of addition to athletic center; alteration of windows, doors and HVAC of athletic center is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.7.1, 3.10.3, 3.10.8, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6.
- 1* The athletic center, constructed in 1964, is non-contributing to the historic district.
- 2* The addition increases the square footage very little (1,400 to the 19,000 SF building) and is in the same style as the existing building; the application includes small scale drawings.
- 3* Materials and details will match the existing; specifications and details for the windows and doors were not included in the application.
- 4* New windows and doors will be installed in existing openings.
- 5* The new ramp is being installed on the east elevation.
- 6* The north elevation will have a significant amount of external ductwork; the color and finish are not included in the application; this elevation is away from the historic Main Building.

Staff suggests that the committee approve the application, waiving the 365-day demolition delay for the tree removals, with the following conditions:

- 1. That larger scale drawings of the addition, bay window, and ramp be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits;
- 2. That specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
 - a. Windows;
 - b. Doors;
 - c. HVAC screening;
- 3. That external ductwork have a matte finish and be colored to blend with the brick building.

Decision on the Application

There were no objections to approval without a public hearing.

Mr. Belledin moved to approve the application, adopting the staff comments as the written record of the summary proceeding on 016-12-CA. Mr. Alphin seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 9/5/12.

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: 134-11-CA, 010-12-CA, 012-12-CA, and 014-12-CA.

Mr. Belledin requested recusal on case 010-12-CA because of prior conversations regarding pertinent matters. Mr. Alphin moved recusal; Ms. McGorty seconded; passed 4/0. After the hearing Mr. Alphin moved to readmit Mr. Belledin to the meeting; Ms. McGorty seconded; passed 3/0.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

134-11-CA 501 OAKWOOD AVENUE

Applicant: STUART CULLINAN

Received: 12/21/2011

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 3/20/2012

1) 1/9/2012 2) 3/5/2012 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: Construct new 2.5 story house with screened porch, driveway, and walkway (as amended)

Amendments: Revised drawings and new information was provided by the applicant via email January 6, 2012 and is attached to these comments. The amended application removes the garage, new curb cut, patio, and fence from the proposal.

DRAC: The application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its January 4, 2012 meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker, Curtis Kasefang, and David Maurer; also in attendance were Stuart Cullinan, Hardik Parekh, Tania Tully, and Martha Lauer.

Conflict of Interest:

Staff Notes:

- File photographs are available for review.
- These comments are based upon the revised drawings and 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 driveway; install walkways
4.3	New Construction	construct new 2.5 story house with attached screened porch

STAFF COMMENTS

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

- A. Construction of new 2.5 story house with screened porch, driveway, and walkway is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.2, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.4, 4.3.5, 4.3.6, 4.3.7, 4.3.8, 4.3.9, 4.3.10, 4.3.11.
- 1* Other than a parking-strip driveway and front sidewalk, no information regarding landscaping was included in the application.
- 2* There are no trees on the property.

- 3* According to a 1988 survey, the lot is 4,050 SF (.09 acre); according to the online Wake County Real Estate Data, the lot is .10 acre (4,356 SF). The footprint of the proposed house (including porches) is approximately 1,417 SF for a lot coverage of either 35% or 33%, within the norm for corner lots in Oakwood.
- 4* A two-story building was on the property until 1999 when it burned during a rehabilitation; this house (including porches) had a footprint of approximately 2,292 SF for a lot coverage of either 57% or 53%.
- 5* There is a slight slope to the lot; it is unclear from the application where the floor level of the house will sit in relationship to the ground and adjacent houses.
- 6* The amended application documents that the front wall of the house will generally align with that of adjacent properties; the documentation also illustrates that the setbacks are within the range found on nearby corner lots.
- 7* The amended application documents that the other three corner houses at the intersection of N. East Street and Oakwood Avenue are also 2.5 stories tall; it also notes that the topography of those lots is similar.
- 8* The new house, like the prior house on the lot, will be taller than the adjacent 1 story house on N. East Street.
- 9* The gable form of the house is not uncommon in Oakwood; design details do not imitate any particular style and do not seem out of character.
- 10* The front porch on the new house is inset and aligns with the front wall of the house; the slight flare of the siding between the upper and lower windows gives the illusion of a wider porch.
- 11* The front façade of the house is less dimensionally articulated than other houses along Oakwood Avenue; the inset porch visually increases the mass.
- 12* The design of the house is reminiscent of traditional designs found in Oakwood; fireplaces traditionally had chimneys.
- 13* The locations of windows on the south and west elevations appear to be deliberate and have some sense of rhythm; window placement on the other two elevations does not have the same aesthetic. Details and specifications were not included in the application.
- 14* The design of the foundation vents appears to match the porch railings; staff isn't aware of similar situations.
- 15* The visible screened porch is treated in the same architectural manner as the house.
- 16* Materials and finishes were described in the application; details and specifications were not.
- 17* Smooth faced fiber cement siding is regularly approved by the committee on new detached construction.
- 18* The curb cut on Oakwood Avenue was approved with a COA in 1999; the curb cut was approved with a driveway that included retaining walls.
- 19* The previous house was 4.8' from the porch to the property line.
- 20* The following additional facts were provided by the applicant at the January hearing:
- House is consistent in that it faces Oakwood, the heights of the houses on the other corners, and the setback.
 - Prior structure was a duplex which burned down.

- The applicant will defer designing landscaping etc. until they are further along, either working with a future buyer or realtor to make decisions.
- Regarding exposure of the siding and the material of the mansard portion, Mr. Kenoyer states that it is all horizontal siding and that the exposure changes between the upper floors and lower.
- The design is not trying to be replica of a historic house, but a modern interpretation of a traditional form.
- The right-of-way is extremely wide on East Street (11'2" or 11'6"), plus there is the sidewalk to the house. It is close to almost 10 feet from the house to the street.
- North of the property is an 8' strip of land that is owned by another Oakwood Ave owner that is used for parking. He says that it adds an additional 8 feet between the two structures.
- There is street parking on East Street.

21* The following additional facts were provided by the Oakwood residents at the January hearing:

- GIS is misleading and doesn't match what he sees on the site plan.
- There is no street parking on Oakwood at that very busy intersection.
- The existing curb cut is steep.

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

1. That the fireplace have the appearance of a chimney.
2. That the following specifications and details be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
 - a. screened porch construction
 - b. grading plan.
3. That should the committee require physical articulation of a front porch that the specifications and details be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits.
4. That the following specifications, details, and/or samples be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
 - a. materials
 - b. windows and doors
 - c. window and door trim
 - d. chimney design
 - e. light fixtures
 - f. master landscape plan.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Stuart Cullinan [affirmed], owner, was representing project. Mr. Cullinan began by describing part of the discussion from the prior hearing. He noted that the last time the main issue was the driveway and whether cars could be seen from other neighbors porches and how consistent that would be with the neighborhood. He stated that he was asked to complete a driveway study of similar cases. Mr. Cullinan handed out a document from which he made the following observations regarding driveways on Oakwood Avenue from Person Street to Linden Avenue:

- 50% of driveways had no screening; many were shared driveways; it was easy to see vehicles.
- 50% of the time there was screening, whether it be bush, bushes, street trees, hedge plantings, but limited.
- He found was that there really is no standard—there is a split between houses with rear alleys, deep lots, shared driveways, single loaded shallow driveways, and varied screenings.

He came up with what he thinks is a best case scenario. He proposed to rather than have a shallow driveway as shown in the last application, he would do a strip driveway that went back to the rear of the property. This would mean that a car would be screened by either the house or a neighboring house. He stated that by providing deeper driveway it would be more likely that they'd park further back and be less visible. He also added screening in case cars park near the street. He thinks this is an adequate compromise to concerns brought up at the last meeting.

Mr. Alphin asked if he counted the rear alleys as ones being screened? Mr. Cullinan said no.

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

Mr. Belledin asked staff about fact 20 and the source of the numbers. Tania Tully [affirmed] stated that her recollection is that the numbers came up in response to how close the proposed house is to the property line. She stated that the point was point was that even though the house is close to property line, it was still far from the street because of wide right-of-way. Mr. Cullinan noted that the property line is over six feet from the back of the sidewalk and that because it is a very small lot they have scootched the house up to the property line to be consistent with houses along Oakwood Avenue.

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

Committee Discussion

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

As a point of clarification: I still would like to see chimney go to the ground. [Shackleton]
It is listed as approvable by staff. [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 1-21) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following modifications and additional facts 2:

Modifying fact 20 to remove reference to specific dimensions.

Adding fact 22*

22* The applicant provided additional facts in the form of a driveway study.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Belledin; passed 4/0.

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the fireplace have the appearance of an attached shed.
2. That the following specifications and details be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
 - a. screened porch construction
 - b. grading plan.
3. That the following specifications, details, and/or samples be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
 - a. materials
 - b. windows and doors
 - c. window and door trim
 - d. chimney design
 - e. light fixtures
 - f. master landscape plan.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Belledin; passed 4/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 9/5/12.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

010-12-CA 3015 WAKE FOREST ROAD (CRABTREE JONES HOUSE)
Applicant: DAVIS PROPERTY GROUP C/O LACY H REAVES
Received: 2/15/2012 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 5/15/2012 1) 3/5/2012 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: RALEIGH HISTORIC LANDMARK

Zoning: CUD O&I-2

Nature of Project: Demolish house and accessory buildings; redevelop the site.

Amendments: The application was amended per “Bylaws and Rules of Procedure of the Raleigh Historic Districts Commission, Incorporated” Article XIII, Section 1.b. via email February 22, 2012. Information regarding the proposed redevelopment was provided March 1, 2012. These comments are based on the amended application as stated in the nature of Work above.

Conflict of Interest: Mr. Belledin requested recusal because of prior conversations regarding pertinent matters. Mr. Alphin moved recusal; Ms. McGorty seconded; passed 4/0.

Staff Notes:

- The Raleigh Historic Landmark designation ordinance and National Register nomination are available for review.
- The COA application only includes 1 acre of the proposed redevelopment project.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
5.1	Relocation	Demolish house and accessory buildings Redevelop the site
5.2	Demolition	

STAFF COMMENTS

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

- A. The proposed demolition of the Crabtree Jones House is incongruous according to *Guidelines* section 5.2, which states “Demolition of significant buildings, structures, sites, objects, or trees within Raleigh Historic Districts is discouraged.” Raleigh City Code Section 10-2052(a)(2)c.5.i states that “An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure, or site within the district may not be denied... However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to three-hundred sixty-five (365) days from the date of approval. The maximum period of delay authorized by this section shall be reduced by the Commission where it

finds that the owner would suffer extreme hardship or be permanently deprived of all beneficial use of or return from such property by virtue of the delay. During such period of delay the Commission may negotiate with the owner and with any other parties in an effort to find a means of preserving the building, structure, or site. If the Commission finds that the building, structure, or site has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Overlay District, it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal."

- 1* No information is contained in the application stating whether "the owner would suffer extreme hardship or be permanently deprived of all beneficial use of or return from such property by virtue of the delay."
- 2* Little information regarding the architectural and historical significance of the Crabtree Jones House has been submitted with the application; the Crabtree Jones House, and approximately one acre around it, was designated a Raleigh Historic Site on June 16, 1969. The entire property was listed in the National Register of Historic Places on June 4, 1973.
- 3* The Statement of Significance included in the May 1, 1973 National Register nomination form for the property states that "The Crabtree Jones House is one of the few early Federal plantation houses remaining in Wake County. It is distinguished by its handsome proportions and the well-executed exterior and interior detail, particularly the modillion cornice and the marbleized baseboard and unusual painting on the Federal mantel. The house is of considerable local historical significance as the home of an important branch of the Jones family who played a vital role in the early history of Wake County." The architectural description is limited to the main 2-story house and its 1-story wings. [Current designation standards would include a description of the entire house as well as evaluation of the accessory buildings and site.]
- 4* A site plan has been submitted with the application for development of the site following demolition. The written description states the intent to "develop a multi-family residential community on the property which will consist of 250 residential units."
- 5* Development of the site would also include demolition of numerous trees.
- 6* The commission has in the past required measured drawings and archival-quality black-and-white photographs for the commission's files.

Staff suggests that the committee issue a certificate of appropriateness imposing a 365-day demolition delay period with an effective date of March 5, 2013, including conditions 1-5 as noted:

1. That during the demolition delay period, the applicant work cooperatively with staff and all interested parties in seeking an outcome to the situation that would preserve the building from demolition;
2. That the following items be submitted to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of a demolition permit:
 - a. Documentation of the Crabtree Jones House, its accessory buildings and environs through measured drawings and photographs, meeting the guidelines of the Heritage Documentation Programs of the National Park Service [www.cr.nps.gov/hdp/standards/standards.htm];

- b. Identification of and a plan for salvaging usable architectural materials and features;
3. That no removal of any exterior feature or element of the buildings be undertaken prior to the issuance of demolition permits, except as may be provided for by any current or future Certificates of Appropriateness issued by the Certificate of Appropriateness Committee;
4. That after demolition the site be cleared promptly and thoroughly;
5. That after demolition the site be planted or developed promptly as approved in the proposed site plan.

Prior to opening the public hearing Mr. Shackleton made the following comments:

- This is an application for the demolition of the structure and is the range of the question the commission can decide
- The structure can be approved for demolition now, or with a delay of up to 365 days.
- Any other issues surrounding this proposed project, they don't have the authority to address today.
- Please don't repeat comments, as this is evidentiary not a poll;
- In this setting, they can consider evidence, not hearsay. If your comment isn't of factual basis that isn't first hand knowledge it can't be considered.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Lacy Reaves [affirmed], 150 Fayetteville Street and Russ Davis [affirmed], Greenville, SC were present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Reaves began with the following comments:

- The application for demolition was filed in the alternative. The primary goal is to relocate this house in accordance with a plan that is in the process of being formulated. Alternatively, they want to demolish; but because of the process, they had to choose one or the other in the application.
- They are working under contractual obligations in the sale of the property. They had to elect the remedy of demolition in order to get the clock started on process.
- This application is before you in the context of the proposal of Mr. Davis to develop slightly more than 50 acres of the Gaddy property at Wake Forest Road and Wake Town Drive.
- You have seen the plat of the property and an aerial maybe, what they are concerned with is the Crabtree Jones House. The property has to be assessed in the context of the 15 acres that Mr. Davis proposes to develop. This property was zoned in a series of cases back in the 1980s and 1990s. The first one was a general use case that was accompanied by a declaration of restrictive covenants that reflected a series of agreements between Mr. Gaddy and neighbors. That case was duplicated and replaced by a conditional use zoning case approved by City Council in 1995.

- We have handed out an illustration of the zoning conditions applicable to 15 acres plus 6 acres to the west. What you see is that the conditions of the zoning case created a complicated set of buffers that reflected an earlier agreement and conditions adopted by rezoning. The very significant is the buffer illustrated in green. At most points it is 100 feet wide. The buffer must be maintained in a natural condition. The other colored areas are similar buffers that restrict height and use. It is very significant that you recognize the developable portions of property are quite limited and on the north side of the property.
- The Crabtree Jones House is right in the middle of the developable piece. It needs to be demolished or moved.

Mr. Davis made the following additional comments:

- This is an exceptional piece of property. It is in a desirable location and expensive. It is a bifurcated site with complicated topography.
- During the planning process they decided to put as many units on it as possible without going to midrise and came up with a 215-240 unit project. The property is intended to be held long-term as luxury rental apartments. The market for this product is strong. There is an institutional pension fund partner so it is intended to be a high quality product.

Mr. Reaves stated his desire to make clear the limitations in developing site. He noted the proposed relocation proposal in the application. He noted the opportunity to move the Jones house to the west on Wake Towne Drive which would still be part of original Jones property. Mr. Davis has entered into negotiations with a mover. Mr. Davis said that Blake House Moving has looked at the house. He believes it can be moved to the potential site for about \$200,000 noting that it is part of the budget. He is also acquiring property for the house and all would be donated to a preservation organization. They studied initially keeping the house on the site and using it, but it was not going to work. Mr. Reaves stated that the primary goal is to relocate the house to another spot on Jones property.

Mr. Reaves asked that the commission approve the COA to demolish the house with time to work on the options for relocating the house.

Ms. McGorty asked to see the site plan for the Jones House again.

Mr. Reaves noted that Mr. Davis has the contractual right to purchase the lot under consideration for relocation for the house. Mr. Davis reassured the committee that he anticipates that they would get the appropriate amount of property and site the house properly.

Mr. Shackleton asks for speakers in support. Given no response he asks for speakers in opposition.

Opposition: Molly Urquart [affirmed], lives in Crabtree Heights, the development behind the house. She stated that she is not clear on whether this is an application to demolish or relocate

house. Mr. Shackleton stated that they are applying to demolish it to start the clock, but looking the relocate.

Ms. Urquart asks if the commission can make a determination of statewide significance. Mr. Shackleton responds that it is a possibility that the commission as a whole can do, but is not a deciding factor for today's decision.

Ms. Urquart stated that she and 8 others from neighborhood also in attendance do not want to see house demolished.

Mr. Shackleton explained that if it is approved for demolition with 365 days, and no relocation plan agreed upon, it could come down. The 365 days will be used to cooperate. Tania Tully [affirmed] stated that from staff's perspective, looking at the RHDC bylaws, what will happen next procedurally is that applicants can submit new application when they identify a new location. Mr. Davis stated that he is highly motivated to move house. Mr. Reaves said that given the way that city code and state statute is written, they have to apply to demolish. The commission similarly does not have any option but to place the delay. This is a step to relocation.

Mr. Alphin asked if it was reasonable to the applicant that they would pay for the documentation required to be submitted prior to obtaining a demolition permit. Mr. Davis agreed.

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. Alphin seconded; motion carried 3/0.

Committee Discussion

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

The most we can do is impose the 365-day delay. The applicant is motivated. We will have done the most we can do by creating the opportunity for them to come up with a plan to preserve the structure. [Alphin]

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, with the following modification:

Change fact 6* to read:

- 6* The commission has in the past required measured drawings and archival-quality black-and-white photographs for the commission's files *to be provided by applicant*.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Alphin; passed 3/0.

Decision on the Application

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Ms. McGorty and seconded by Mr. Alphin, Ms. McGorty made an amended motion that the application be approved as amended, imposing a 365-day demolition delay period with an effective date of March 5, 2013 and with the following conditions:

1. That during the demolition delay period, the applicant work cooperatively with staff and all interested parties in seeking an outcome to the situation that would preserve the building from demolition;
2. That the applicant pay for and have the following items be submitted to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of a demolition permit:
 - a. Documentation of the Crabtree Jones House, its accessory buildings and environs through measured drawings and photographs, meeting the guidelines of the Heritage Documentation Programs of the National Park Service [www.cr.nps.gov/hdp/standards/standards.htm];
 - b. Identification of and a plan for salvaging usable architectural materials and features;
3. That no removal of any exterior feature or element of the buildings be undertaken prior to the issuance of demolition permits, except as may be provided for by any current or future Certificates of Appropriateness issued by the Certificate of Appropriateness Committee;
4. That after demolition the site be cleared promptly and thoroughly;
5. That after demolition the site be planted or developed promptly as approved in the proposed site plan.

Mr. Alphin agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 3/0.

Committee members voting: Alphin, McGorty, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 9/5/13.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

012-12-CA 323 S BOYLAN AVENUE
Applicant: THE NORTHGATE GROUP, LLC BY EMILY BRINKER
Received: 2/20/2012 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 5/20/2012 1) 3/5/2012 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: Remove existing rear deck; construct new rear addition and deck.

Amendments: The following work items were noted during preparation of the staff comments:
paint brick house; remove chimney.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- This structure is classified as non-contributing to the historic district, having been constructed after the historic district's period of significance. In evaluating the proposal, staff has conceptually taken the point of view that it can be treated as one might treat new construction in the historic district.
- The following items are available for review:
 - files for COAs 009-98-CA; 212-97-CA; 094-08-CA;
 - streetscape photographs;
 - photographs of 805 W Lenoir Street.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	construct new rear addition and deck
3.4	Paint and Paint Color	paint brick house and addition
4.1	Decks	remove existing rear deck; construct new rear deck
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	construct new rear addition

STAFF COMMENTS

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

- A. Removal of existing rear deck; construction of new rear addition and deck is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 3.4.3, 3.4.4, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.5, 4.1.8, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9.
- 1* The application states that a tree protection plan will be prepared for a nearby tree; this was not included in the application.

- 2* The footprint of the existing house and porches is 1,992 SF and the lot 10,890 SF; the existing lot coverage is 18%. The proposed addition is approximately 320 SF, the proposed deck approximately 192 SF; the porch and deck being removed are approximately 192 SF; the total proposed footprint is 2,312 SF for an approximate lot coverage of 21%.
- 3* The application states the intent to paint the entire house including "brick, siding and trim" with the main color to be "Antique White."
- 4* In 2008, the non-contributing brick house at 805 W Lenoir St was approved (094-08-CA) to be painted a color that would "blend in better with the district" and that "white would be worse, not better."
- 5* The adjacent house to the north (319 S Boylan Ave) is a contributing unpainted brick building and the one to the south (4012 S Boylan Ave) has medium gray-green wood siding.
- 6* The Boylan Heights National Register nomination describes the c. 1954 house as a non-contributing "Contemporary Brick Box with hip roof."
- 7* The existing rear addition was approved in 1998 (009-98-CA) under an earlier set of design guidelines. Hardie plank siding was approved; the finish was not specified and it is not known whether "smooth faced" was available at the time of construction.
- 8* A previously proposed addition (212-97-CA) was denied by the commission in part because "The roof is extruded and uses existing materials, while the walls are of a different material." It is unclear from the application how the new addition will connect to the existing house.
- 9* The commission has more recently approved additions that are extrusions of the roof.
- 10* The design of the addition is simple and angular, not unlike the existing house.

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

- 1. That the main paint color of the house be one that does not stand out in the district and that the colors be provided to and approved by staff prior to painting.
- 2. That details and specifications for the following 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;
 - b. Elevation drawings of the addition;
 - c. Elevation drawings of the deck.
- 3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. Windows;
 - b. Doors;
 - c. Skylights.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Emily Brinker [affirmed] and Rick Smith [affirmed] owner were present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Brinker said that the house is a modern structure and they are adding a contemporary addition with lots of glass to overlook downtown. One won't see much from street. They've already started on tree protection plan. They are finalizing elevations as far as exactly how it will connect with the glass details.

Mr. Smith notes that he was not aware of the request to paint the house. Mr. Shackleton asks if they are asking that they change the application to remove painting. Ms. Brinker replies no.

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 4/0.

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

Findings of Fact

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

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the main paint color of the house be one that does not stand out in the district and that the colors be provided to and approved by staff prior to painting.
2. That details and specifications for the following 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;
 - b. Elevation drawings of the addition;
 - c. Elevation drawings of the deck.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. Windows;
 - b. Doors;
 - c. Skylights.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 9/5/12.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

014-12-CA 302 N BLOUNT STREET
Applicant: ANNA MARIA TAYLOR; TAYLOR DESIGN STUDIO
Received: 2/20/2012 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 5/20/2012 1) 3/5/2012 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BLOUNT STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-30

Nature of Project: Remove non-historic garage roof; construct new garage roof; install new garage doors onto existing hardware.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	remove non-historic garage roof; construct new garage roof; install new garage doors onto existing hardware
3.5	Roofs	remove non-historic garage roof; construct new garage roof
3.7	Windows and Doors	install new garage doors onto existing hardware

STAFF COMMENTS

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

- A. Removal of non-historic garage roof; construction of new garage roof; installation of new garage doors onto existing hardware is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.5, 3.5.6, 3.7.7.
- 1* The application includes photographs indicating that the garage once had a flat roof.
- 2* Details of the roof construction are not included in the application.
- 3* Hardware and tracks for sliding garage doors remain on the garage.
- 4* The proposed design of the new wood doors is a historic style; although none remain in Blount Street, there is a frame garage at 224 N East Street with similar doors. Construction details/specifications for the new garage doors were not included in the application.

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

- 1. That specifications and details for the garage roof be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of building permits;
- 2. That specifications and details, including color, for the garage doors be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Anna Maria Taylor [affirmed] and Bubba Watts [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Taylor stated that the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC) wants to put a roof on the garage that is more in keeping. They didn't add more details about how the roof would be put on because they'd like to see what's under the existing roof before they make final plans. They also would like to add garage doors. She noted that there is not a lot of evidence of what they looked like. They looked for some and submitted a picture of something similar to what likely had been there. They will have to have doors built because they're not standard, but they would paint them. They will be repainting the whole house and will submit a paint schedule at that time.

Mr. Belledin noted the need to put in a comment that they want to demolish the current roof in order to study what's there before they design new roof. Tania Tully [affirmed] also noted that although they will be putting new roof on, some sort of deadline would be good.

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. Alphin seconded; motion carried 4/0.

Committee Discussion

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

We should add that staff approve the cap to the parapet wall. [Alphin]

Findings of Fact

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

5* The roof will be removed to verify the condition prior to designing the new roof.

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

Decision on the Application

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

6. That specifications and details for the garage roof and parapet cap or coping be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of building permits;
7. That specifications and details, including color, for the garage doors be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Alphin; passed 4/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 9/5/12.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Committee Discussion – Meeting Post-Mortem
2. *Design Guidelines* Update

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner