RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
December 2, 2013

CALL TO ORDER

Elizabeth Caliendo called the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Committee meeting to order at 4:07 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Tania Tully, Preservation Planner, called the roll as follows:
Present: Will Alphin, Elizabeth Caliendo, Sarah David
Excused Absence: Miranda Downer, Scott Shackleton
Staff Present: Tania Tully, Martha Lauer

Approval of the November 4, 2013 Minutes

Mr. Alphin moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing. Ms. David seconded the motion; passed 3/0. Mr. Alphin moved to adopt the minutes as submitted. Ms. David seconded the motion; passed 3/0.

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. Martha Lauer, Notary Public, administered the affirmation.

Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address	Affirmed
Ann Robertson, 516 E Jones Street 27601	Yes
John C. Brooks, 516 N Blount Street 27604	Yes
Jamey Glueck, 5935 Hourglass Court 27612	Yes
John Cranham, 15 E peace Street 27604	No
Mary Hart-Paul, 306 E Forest Drive 27605	Yes
John Sibert, 3230 Glen Royal Drive 27607	Yes
Ken Bowers, 704 N East Street 27604	No
Chad Wilkins, 919 W South Street 27603	No

REVIEW OF SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. David moved to approve the agenda as printed. Mr. Alphin seconded the motion; passed 3/0.

SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS

There were no objections to the approval of the Summary Proceedings without a public hearing. The committee reviewed and approved the following cases 180-13-CA and 183-13-CA for which the Summary Proceedings are made part of these minutes.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS . SUMMARY PROCEEDING

180-13-CA 704 N EAST STREET
Applicant: KENNETH BOWERS
Received: 11/12/2013 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 2/10/2014 1) 12/2/2013 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Remove three trees; remove shrubs
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes: Only trees with a combined stem girth of 8 inches and greater in diameter, measured 4-1/2 feet above ground level are regulated.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Remove three trees; remove shrubs

STAFF COMMENTS

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

A. Removal of three trees; removal of shrubs is not incongruous in concept according to Guidelines œ Ž Œ • ' ˜ — œ 1 X ï Y ï W ð 1 X ï Y ï Y ð 1 X ï Y ï [ò 1 Š • Ž ' • ' 1 ' • ¢ 1 ˜ • Ž 1 Ž Œ • ' ˜ –
application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure or site within any Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark may
— ˜ • 1 ‹ Ž 1 • Ž — ' Ž • ó ˜ Ž Ÿ Ž › ð 1 • ' Ž 1 Š ž • ' ˜ › ' £ Š • ' ˜ — 1 • Š • Ž 1 ˜ • 1 œ ž Œ ' 1 Š 1 Œ Ž › • '
™ Ž › ' ˜ • 1 ˜ • 1 ž ™ 1 • ˜ 1 Y \ [1 • Š ¢ œ 1 • › ˜ – 1 • ' Ž 1 • Š • Ž 1 ˜ • 1 ' œ œ ž Š — Œ Ž ó • 1 • ' Ž 1 ˜
building, structure or site has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark, it shall waive all or part of
œ ž Œ ' 1 ™ Ž › ' ˜ • 1 Š — • 1 Š ž • ' ˜ › ' £ Ž 1 Ž Š › • ' Ž › 1 • Ž – ˜ • ' • ' ˜ — 1 ˜ › 1 › Ž – ˜ Ÿ Š • ï

1* All trees proposed for removal are in the side yard.

2* ˜ 1 ˜ • 1 • ' Ž 1 • › Ž Ž œ 1 ™ › ˜ ™ ˜ œ Ž • 1 • ˜ › 1 › Ž – ˜ Ÿ Š • 1 Š › Ž 1 Y [1 • Š • • 1 ž • ‹ Ž › › ¢ 1 • › Ž
three feet from the brick foundation.

3* ' Ž 1 • ' ' › • 1 • › Ž Ž 1 ™ › ˜ ™ ˜ œ Ž • 1 • ˜ › 1 › Ž – ˜ Ÿ Š • 1 ' œ 1 Š 1 Y [1 • Š • • 1 ' • ž œ • › ž – 1 ' —
from foundation as the Mulberry trees.

4* An inspection by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) revealed that: The roots of the Mulberry trees will continue to grow and expand, eventually beginning to crack the foundation, causing structural damage and that the Ligustrum is damaging the shingles.

5* The application states that due to existing trees and the small size of the lot there is not a good location to plant new trees; also the yard is so shady that it is difficult to maintain any grass during the summer.
6* The application proposes to donate to NeighborWoods in lieu of replacement trees.
7* The application states that the property will still have significant tree canopy following the removal of the three large trees; current photos of the house and yard are included in the application.

Staff suggests that the committee approve the application, waiving the 365-day demolition delay with the following condition:

1. That prior to the removal of the trees the applicant donate the monetary Ÿ Š • ž Ž 1 ˜ • 1 • ‘ › Ž Ž 1 Y 1 caliper medium maturing trees (as defined by the NeighborWoods program) to the City of Š • Ž ’ • ‘ œ 1 Ž ’ • ‘ ‹ ˜ › ˜ ˜ • œ 1 • › Ž Ž 1 ™ • Š — • ’ — • 1 ™ › ˜ • › Š – ï

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

There were no objections to approval without a public hearing.

Ms. David moved to approve the application, adopting the staff comments as the written record of the summary proceeding on 180-13-CA. Mr. Alphin seconded the motion; passed 3/0.

<u>Committee members voting</u>: Alphin, Caliendo, David.

<u>Certificate expiration date</u>: 6/2/14.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS . SUMMARY PROCEEDING

183-13-CA 919 W SOUTH STREET
Applicant: CHARLES WILKINS, JR
Received: 11/12/2013 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 2/10/2014 1) 12/2/2013 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Front yard master landscape plan to include: new plantings; new stepping stone path
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes: When posting the sign, staff observed that the work has been partially completed. After-the-fact applications are reviewed as though the work has not been completed.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Front yard master landscape plan to include: new plantings; new stepping stone path
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	

STAFF COMMENTS

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

A. Implementation of front yard master landscape plan to include: new plantings; new stepping stone path is not incongruous according to Guidelines sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.4, 2.5.5.
1* The front yard is currently fairly bare, mostly dirt with a couple of small trees.
2* The bulk of the yard is proposed to be planting beds; there are examples of front yards in the district that have minimal lawn and have been fully landscaped with plant materials including 315 S Boylan Avenue and 435 Cutler Street.
3* Walkways from the side yard to the front walk are most often narrow stepping stone paths or concrete sidewalks.
4* The right of way is proposed to be planted with ground cover, a treatment seen throughout the district.

Staff suggests that the committee approve the application.

Decision on the Application

There were no objections to approval without a public hearing.

Ms. David moved to approve the application, adopting the staff comments as the written record of the summary proceeding (fixing one typo) on 183-13-CA. Mr. Alphin seconded the motion; passed 3/0.

Committee members voting: Alphin, Caliendo, David.

Certificate expiration date: 6/2/14.

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: 164-13-CA, 177-13-CA, 181-13-CA, and 182-13-CA.

The applicant for case 130-13-CA requested continued deferral. Ms. Alphin moved to approve the deferral. Ms. David seconded; passed 3/0.

The applicant for case 179-13-CA was not present. Ms. Alphin moved to defer. Ms. David seconded; passed 3/0.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS . CERTIFIED RECORD

164-13-CA 501 N BLOUNT STREET
Applicant: MARY HART-PAUL FOR ROBERTSON LAW FIRM LLC
Received: 10/16/2013 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 1/14/2014 1) 12/2/2013 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BLOUNT STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: PDD, O&I-2
Nature of Project: Install hanging painted wood sign on porch; install painted wood ground sign in front yard
Amendments: Additional information was provided in the commissioner packet.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- There is existing wall mounted signage installed without a COA on the north side of the house and small door mounted signage also installed without a COA.
- Ordinarily, review of a sign installation is eligible for minor work approval by staff. ~ Ž Ÿ Ž › ð 1 • ‘ Ž 1 œ ’ £ Ž 1 Š — • 1 • ˜ Œ Š • ’ ˜ — 1 ˜ • 1 • ‘ Ž 1 ™ › ˜ ™ ˜ œ Ž • 1 œ ’ • — œ ð 1 ’ — precedent and does not meet the Guidelinesï 1 Œ Œ ˜ › • ’ — • 1 • ˜ 1 • ‘ Ž 1 Œ ˜ – – hœ œ ’ ˜ — œ 1 ž • Ž œ 1 ˜ • 1 › ˜ Œ Ž • ž › Ž ð 1 › • ’ Œ • Ž 1 ð 1 • Š • • 1 ’ • • 1 › Ž • Ž › 1 ’ — ˜ › 1 ˜ › ” 1 ™ • ˜ › 1 › Ž Ÿ ’ Ž 1 ’ • 1 ’ — 1 œ • Š • • œ 1 “ ž • • – Ž — • 1 • ‘ Ž 1 Œ ‘ Š — • Ž 1 ’ — Ÿ ˜ • Ÿ Ž œ 1 Š • • that are substantial, do not meet the guidelines, or are of a precedent-se • • ’ — • 1 — Š • ž › Ž ï
- The Blount Street Historic District was locally designated in 1976.
- In 1998 the COA committee provided staff with specific guidance regarding signage on residential buildings (A copy is attached to these comments); this was prior to the current DesignGuidelineswhich were adopted in 2001.
- Section 2.8 of the Guidelines ž — • Ž › 1 ‘ ’ — • œ 1 • ˜ 1 ˜ — œ ’ • Ž › 1 œ 1 ˜ ž 1 • Š — 1 ’ • 1 œ • commercial adaptive uses in a historic district with residential character, small simple signs constructed of traditional sign materials and affixed flush to the body of the building near the front door are considered appropriate. Alternatively, the sign might be applied to the glazing of a storm or front door, as is seen along North Blount Street. For historic institutional uses within predominantly residential districts, simple signs constructed of traditional sign materials should be discreetly located. Small historic plaques and markers are usually mounted near the entrance on the exterior wall in a location where no archite Œ • ž › Š • 1 • Ž • Š ’ • 1 ’ œ 1 • Š – Š • Ž • 1 ˜ › 1 Œ ˜ — Œ Ž Š • Ž • ï
- Staff is seeking clear guidance regarding signage in the historic overlay districts and Blount Street in particular.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.7	Lighting	Install lighting for the ground sign
2.8	Signage	Install hanging painted wood sign on porch; install painted wood ground sign in front yard

STAFF COMMENTS

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

A. Installation of painted wood sign on porch is not incongruous in concept according to Guidelines sections 2.8.2, 2.8.4, 2.8.5, 2.8.6, 2.8.7, 2.8.9; however, installation of a ground sign in front yard is incongruous according to Guidelines sections 2.8.2, 2.8.6, 2.8.9 and installation of a hanging porch sign **may be** incongruous according to Guidelines sections 2.8.2, 2.8.6.

1* Although the property is currently being used as a law office, the Blount Street Historic District is residential in character.

2* In 2008 (213-07-CA) 13 low voltage uplights were denied for installation at 540 N Blount Street because of the residential character of the district.

3* ‘Ž 1 • Š Œ Ž œ 1 ˜ • 1 • ‘ Ž 1 œ ’ • — œ 1 Š › Ž 1 ™ › ˜ ™ ˜ œ Ž • 1 • ˜ 1 ‹ Ž 1 W _ ¡ Z \ ò 1 • ‘ Ž 1 • › ˜ ž maximum ‘ Ž ’ • ‘ • 1 ˜ • 1 Y \ ò 1 • ˜ 1 ™ ˜ œ œ ’ ‹ • Ž 1 ™ ˜ œ • 1 œ • ¢ • Ž œ 1 Š › Ž 1 ™ › ˜ ™ ˜ œ Ž • ï

4* Illustrative photos showing each of the signs mounted are provided in the application, a photo showing them both mounted is not included.

5* The approved Master Plan for the North Blount Street Revitalization Planned Development ’ œ • › ’ Œ • 1 œ • Š • Ž œ 1 • ‘ Š • 1 • › ˜ ž — • 1 œ ’ • — œ 1 Š › Ž 1 ™ Ž › – ’ • • Ž • 1 ’ • ‘ ’ — 1 • ‘ Ž 1 Section 2.8.9 and shall be permitted within the Development pursuant to this Master Plan regardless of setbacks and parcel size; provided that all other applicable Code provisions Š › Ž 1 – Ž • ð 1 Š — • 1 œ ž ‹ “ Ž Œ • 1 • ˜ 1 Š ™ ™ › ˜ Ÿ Š • 1 ‹ ¢ 1 • ‘ Ž 1 Š • Ž ’ • ‘ 1 ’ œ • ˜ › ’ Œ 1 ’ œ

6* Wood is a traditional material used for signs.

7* The text of the sign is simple and easy to read and will be painted to match the colors of the logo which coordinate with the colors of the house. No specific color chips or manufacturer color names/numbers are provided in the application.

8* In 2008 a wooden ground mounted sign was approved at the corner of N. Blount Street and E. Peace Street (234-08-CA, 540 N Blount Street) with a condition that the sign will be temporary and subject to an annual review by the RHDC. Part of the decision was also due to the fact that the sign was not lit.

9* The application includes a photograph of the site as seen from a vehicle to illustrate limited visibility of the house.

10* The amended application lists reasons why a wall or door mounted sign is not adequate including that the entry door is recessed in a deep porch, there is a shutter to the right of the door and a bay protruding to the left, the available space for a wall-mounted sign is not visible at all when approached from the south or Polk Street, N Blount Street is a major

traffic artery, and there are trees in the public right-of-way. The Guidelines do not address visibility of signage or use of the building.

11* The amended application includes examples of existing in-ground signs at 310 and 424 N Blount Street, 411 N Bloodworth Street, 418 N Person Street, and the Dodd-Hinsdale House; 310 and 424 N Blount Street are state owned and have no COAs on file for the signage; the sign at 411 N Bloodworth Street appears to have been installed between 1983 and 2000 without a COA; no COA is on file for the sign at 418 N Person Street; the sign at the Dodd-Hinsdale House appears to have been installed between 2001 and 2004 without a COA.

12* The amended application includes examples of hanging signs at 422 and 530 N Blount Street; 422 N Blount Street is state owned and has no COA on file for the signage.

13* A wood sign was approved to be installed on the porch of 530 N Blount Street at the November 2008 meeting (217-08-CA) based in part because of the specific architectural features of the house, the prior existence of hanging signs on the porch, that Blount Street is one-way south bound, and the location of the property close to the intersection of Blount Street and Peace Street.

14* NC Session Law 2007- Z ^ X 1 œ • Š • Ž œ 1 • ' Š • 1 ó ˜ • ' • ' œ • Š — • ' — • 1 Š — ¢ 1 ˜ • ' Ž › 1 ™ › ˜ ˜ local zoning ordinance shall apply to any State owned building built or to be built on any State-owned land within six blocks of the State Capitol without the consent of the Council of • Š • Ž ï

15* ' Ž 1 Š – Ž — • Ž • 1 Š ™ ™ • ' Œ Š • ' ˜ — 1 œ ž • • Ž œ • œ 1 • ' Š • 1 • ' Ž 1 W d _ _ ^ 1 ' • — 1 ž ' • Ž Properties Located in the Blount Street His • ˜ › ' Œ 1 ' œ • › ' Œ • 1 ' œ 1 Š ™ ™ › ˜ ™ › ' Š • Ž 1 • ˜ › 1 • ' district.

16* The amended application posits that the character of the Blount Street Historic District is unique and warrants interpretation of the design Guidelines relevant to that uniqueness. The following points are made:

a. Though the Blount Street Historic District is made up largely of historic houses, it is • ' • • Ž › Ž — • 1 ' — 1 Œ ' Š › Š Œ • Ž › ð 1 Œ ˜ — • Ž ¡ • 1 Š — • 1 ž œ Ž 1 • › ˜ – 1 Š " ˜ ˜ • 1 Š — • historic residential districts;
b. North Blount and North Person streets are presently major traffic arteries forming a north/south one-way pair serving the state government center and the east side of downtown;
c. The density is notably greater in Oakwood and Boylan Heights, where lots are smaller and houses closer together;
d. The lower Blount Street District is distinctly different from its adjoining residential areas and nearby downtown;
e. The streets in Oakwood and Boylan Heights are narrower and slower than those in the Blount Street District;
f. Oakwood and Boylan Heights are, by far, predominantly residential; most of the Blount Street District mansions are no longer used as residences;
g. The architecture in the Blount Street District, especially the houses along North Blount Street, is of a larger and grander scale than that in Oakwood and Boylan Heights;
h. The architectural fabric of the district remains strong, suggesting that the existing larger, in-ground signs have not compromised that fabric;

i. The Blount Street District has a decidedly more urban context, edged with large-scaled stone office buildings;
j. Signage in the Blount Street District serves fast-flowing vehicular traffic, rather than pedestrians, and visitors are likely to be unfamiliar with the area;

17* The historic overlay district does not regulate use, but manages the changes to the physical character of the buildings and districts.

18* ‘ Ž 1 Š – Ž — • Ž • 1 Š ™ ™ • ’ Œ Š • ’ ˜ — 1 ’ — Œ • ž • Ž œ 1 ™ ‘ ˜ • ˜ • › Š ™ ‘ œ 1 ˜ • 1 ž › ‹ Š — 1 Ž • contrasting scale in what was originally a residential district, all taken within two blocks of 501 ˜ › • ‘ 1 • ˜ ž — • 1 • › Ž Ž • ï 1 ‘ Ž 1 ’ — • Ž — • 1 ˜ • 1 • ‘ Ž 1 ‘ ’ œ • ˜ › ’ Œ 1 • ’ œ • › ’ Œ • 1 • Ž œ ’ character of the districts in spite of and from the adjacent changing context. The highly contrasting scale is outside of the historic district.

Staff suggests that the committee deny the installation of the ground sign and **pending the committee’s determination regarding the location**, approve the installation of the porch sign, with the following conditions:

1. That the existing signage be removed within 30 days of this decision.
2. That color chips or manufacturer color names/numbers be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits.
3. That the sign not be lit.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support:

Mary Hart-Paul [affirmed], architect; and Ann Robertson [affirmed], owner were present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Hart-Paul stated that between the 1998 Guidelines and the 2001 Guidelines and the master plan for the N Blount Street revitalization project she hopes that these signs do conform to Guidelines as a whole. Ms. Hart-Paul submitted a photograph of a wall sign that staff said was preferred for the district. She said that a sign like that did not meet the needs of this location. She pointed out how difficult it is to see that sign when driving and that ’ • œ 1 › Ž Š • • ¢ 1 ‘ Š › • 1 • ˜ 1 œ Ž Ž 1 • › ˜ – 1 • ‘ Ž 1 œ • › Ž Ž • ï 1 ‘ Ž 1 œ ’ • — œ 1 Š › Ž 1 • Ž œ historic residential context as viewed from the sidewalk. The size and distance from the street Š — • 1 • ‘ Ž 1 œ ’ £ Ž 1 ˜ • 1 • ‘ Ž 1 • Ž • • Ž › ’ — • 1 ’ œ 1 Š 1 ™ › ˜ ‹ • ž • ‘ 1 • Ž 1 Š œ Ž • œ 1 • ‘ Š • 1 ’ • ‘ Ž › Ž œ 1 Š 1 ‹ Š ¢ 1 • ˜ 1 • ‘ Ž 1 • Ž • • 1 ˜ • 1 • ‘ Ž 1 • ˜ ˜ › 1 Š — • Paul said that the porch at 501 is deep and dark at times and there are visibility issues with locating it on the door. It is difficult to spot when passing on the thoroughfare and not walking. This district is quite different from Oakwood; the needs are different. She stated that she hopes we can find answers in Design Guidelines to approve these signs.

Ms. Robertson stated that her firm was founded 1991 and she has a good idea of what her clients need. She stated that her clients are coming from South Carolina and North Carolina. ‘ Ž 1 Œ Š — • 1 ’ – Š • ’ — Ž 1 Œ • ’ Ž — • œ 1 • ’ — • ’ — • 1 ‘ Ž › 1 ˜ • • ’ Œ Ž 1 ’ — 1 • ‘ Š • 1 • › Š • • ’ Œ ò • ˜ — • 1 • Ž Ž • 1 Œ ˜ – cities. She also stated that there is an issue of it being a one-way street. It is important for people to see the house from that location and as seen the photographs, the

trees are completely blocking the house. The added that the State of NC had the right idea with their ground signs, which are the only way it will be visible. Something on the house simply ˜ — • 1 ‹ Ž 1 Ÿ ' œ ' ‹ • Ž ï 1 ' Ž 1 Šomething that fits [illegible] She has lived in Oakwood since 1989.

Ms. Hart-Paul stated that she hopes that they have shown that the proposed signs meet the Guidelines. Referencing the photograph she states that the sign at 549 N Blount Street conforms to the Guidelines. That the assumption is that every house could have a sign like the sign at 549 and not compromise the character of the district, but that it is a sign that is not practical in this situation. It is hard to spot quickly especially if new to Raleigh and unfamiliar with the convention in the historic district; the print size is hard to read; and there is not a similar location for a wall sign on the porch. Ms. Hart-Paul asks that if the wall sign is the standard for all the districts could there be another standard that works for the distinct needs of this district and still maintains the special character of the district. If the Guidelines allowed hanging porch signs and in-ground signs with specific carefully regulated characteristics, would seeing them in repetition detract from the architecture and the fabric of the district any more than the conventional sign at 549 N Blount? Or the existing signs at the state properties. She stated that she is open to questions.

<u>Opposition</u>:
John Brooks [affirmed], 516 N. Blount Street stated that he lives diagonally across from the house in question and that he is here to support the staff recommendations with one possible modification. Mr. Brooks said that he is here to support approval of a sign attached to the porch not unlike what the private colleges has at its location, but that he is opposed to any kind of ground sign.

Mr. Brooks said that he is only speaking to placement of the hanging sign. He noted that the only thing in the staff recommendation that he would not oppose is that the signage attached to the house not be lit. He is not opposed to lighting the sign, noting that even on a gray day such as this the signs are hard to see.

As to placement, they have a mess. Mr. Brooks then spoke to signage in the Blount Street district generically and with regard to stated owned properties. The Capitol Planning Commission holds title to all of the State property in the county. Three or 4 persons are appointed by House and similarly by Senate and the Mayor of Raleigh is a statutory member. The Capitol Planning C ˜ – – ' œ œ ' ˜ — 1 ' Š œ 1 — ˜ 1 œ • Š • • 1 Š — • 1 ' Š œ — • 1 Ž Ÿ Ž › 1 ' Š • 1 œ • responsibilities including oversight of all state owned property in Wake County. Statutorily it is to meet every 3 months, but ' • 1 ' Š œ — • 1 – Ž • 1 [illegible] • Ž œ 1 Š › Ž — • 1 " Ž ™ • ï 1 — guidelines for state owned properties on Blount Street was voted upon unanimously by the Capitol Planning Commission. He cannot attest whether this was precisely adopted, mostly reads as he recalls. Mr. Brooks said that much discussion on ground signs was had and it was agreed that there would be none. However, there are many ground signs anyway. The OSHA œ ' • — 1 Š œ 1 " ž œ • 1 ' — œ • Š • • Ž • ï 1 • • 1 ' — œ • Š • • Ž • 1 ' — 1 Ÿ ' ˜ • Š • ' ˜ — 1 ˜ • 1 • ' Ž 1 • Š

staff for enforcement; the legislature does not fund their statutory responsibilities by the dozen, œ ˜ 1 • ‘ Ž 1 “ ˜ ‹ 1 • ˜ Ž œ — • 1 • Ž • 1 • ˜ — Ž ï 1 ‘ Ž › Ž 1 ’ œ 1 — ˜ 1 ˜ — Ž 1 • ˜ 1 Œ Š › › ¢ 1 Š 1 • › ’ Ž Ÿ Š • ‘ Ž 1 ‘ Ž Š • 1 ˜ • 1 • ‘ Ž 1 ˜ – – ’ œ œ ’ ˜ — ï 1 • 1 Š ™ ™ Ž Š › œ 1 • ‘ Š • 1 • ˜ Ž › œ 1 Š › Ž — • 1 [illegible]

Mr. Brooks continues by saying that before the State can sell any property in Wake County, the Capitol Planning Commission has to vote to release the land. They have the title to Dix for example, not the Council of State. They can in Durham and Catawba, but not in Wake County. Because there was no staff to the Capitol Planning Commission it is his view that this committee Š — • 1 œ ’ – ’ • Š › 1 • › ˜ ž ™ œ 1 ‘ Š Ÿ Ž 1 — ˜ • 1 ‹ Ž Ž — 1 • Š – ’ Mr. Brooks hands out [illegible] • ‘ Ž 1 • Š • Ž œ 1 copies of the Blount Street Revitalization Plan noting that he shares it with the commission today as there may be opportunities to refer to it in future Blount Street cases. He notes that this ˜ ž • • 1 ‘ Š Ÿ Ž 1 Œ ˜ – Ž 1 ’ — • ˜ 1 ™ • Š ¢ 1 ’ • ‘ 1 • ‘ Ž 1 • ˜ 1 Œ Š œ Ž œ 1 • ‘ Š • 1 Ž › Ž 1 ’ • ‘ • › Š —

Mr. Brooks finishes by stating that he supports staff recommendations about nipping in the bud in-ground signs. He states that these signs are not compatible with Blount Street Historic District character. He also notes that he is in favor of the sign attached to the structure.

Mr. Alphin asks Mr. Brooks to explain again what the Blount Street Revitalization Plan is. Mr. Brooks says that it is what was produced when the revitalization of Blount Street was first considered. It was originally intended that Blount Street be single family residences and that the back side on Wilmington would be apartments.

<u>Support</u>:
Ms. Hart-Paul states that considering those comments and staff recommendations, they hope that both signs would be approved, and asks the commission to consider a temporary in-ground sign until the trees grow higher so you can see building sign.

Ms. David asked about the existing sign that is to be removed and if they considered filing a COA for that. Ms. Robertson states that at the present time the trees simply block signs on the building. She said that they may come back and ask to keep the one they have there now.

Tania Tully [affirmed] made a comment about the mention of temporary signage. There is nothing in the Design Guidelines that speaks to signage being temporary. In the COA list of work there is an allowance for temporary signage for emergencies. She notes that the commission has made an exception; that being the Blount Street Commons sign at Blount and Peace streets. That approval came back for an annual review and was to assist with the sale of the historic homes needing rehabilitation. These houses have now all been sold and the sign will be removed. She noted that when making a decision the assumption is that you are approving things for all time.

Ms. Hart-Paul distributed a photograph of a sign at 540 N Blount Street and noted that it is larger than the one they are requesting. Their proposed sign is smaller and the ground is lower, if that helps.

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

At Ms. Caliendo's suggestion, Mr. Alphin moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Ms. David seconded; motion carried 3/0.

<u>Committee Discussion</u>

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
Ž • œ 1 • ' › œ • 1 • Š • " 1 Š ‹ ˜ ž • 1 • ' Ž 1 • › ˜ ž — • 1 œ ' • — ï 1 ý Š • ' Ž — • ˜ þ
The overarching character of district is residential, and even though many of the houses are being used or will ‹ Ž 1 ž œ Ž • 1 Š œ 1 ˜ • • ' Œ Ž œ ð 1 ' • œ 1 œ • ' • • 1 › Ž œ ' • Ž — • ' Š • 1 Œ ' Š › Š Œ •
ž ' • Ž • ' — Ž 1 X ï ^ 1 ï X 1 œ Š ¢ œ 1 introduce new signage that is compatible in material, size, color, scale, and character with the building or the district. Design signage to enhance the architectural character of a building. 1 ž ' • Ž • ' — Ž 1 X ï ^ 1 ï X 1 œ Š ¢ œ 1 If desired, install small identification signs and bronze historic plaques for residential buildings so that no architectural features or details are obscured or damaged. 1 ý Š • ' Ž — • ˜ þ
ž ' • Ž • ' — Ž 1 X ï ^ 1 ï X 1 œ Š ¢ œ 1 Install freestanding signs in appropriate locations on low standards or ground bases. Consider screening the base of ground signs with plantings to enhance its appearance. 1 ý • ™ ' ' — þ
The question in 2.8.9 is the appropriateness of the location. [Caliendo]
Because ' • œ 1 ‹ Ž Œ ˜ – ' — • 1 œ ˜ 1 ˜ • 1 Œ Ž located on the street, it is likely that there will be requests for more and more and more signs. [David]
The question is what is the wayfinding standard. It is a sign or an address number, which is pretty universal and usually part of the way people find their way somewhere. A sign is more • ' " Ž 1 ' — 1 Œ Š œ Ž 1 ¢ ˜ ž 1 • ' • — • 1 " — ˜ ð 1 • ' ' œ 1 ' œ 1 ' Ž › Ž ï 1 1 • 1 ' œ 1 Š • Ÿ Ž › • ' œ ' —
then everyone will want to advertise their location. [Alphin]
I also have a reservation with the request for 2 signs, which is even less in keeping with the › Ž œ ' • Ž — • ' Š • 1 Œ ' Š › Š Œ • Ž › ï 1 ' Š • œ 1 ™ › ˜ • Ž Œ • Ž • 1 ' Ž › Ž 1 ' œ 1 • ' Ž 1 › Ž œ ' • Ž — • ' Š
Fact 18 speaks to this. [Caliendo]
' œ • ˜ › ' Œ Š • • ¢ 1 ' • 1 Š œ — • 1 ž — Œ ˜ – – ˜ — 1 • ˜ › 1 œ ˜ – Ž ˜ — ž 1 • ˜ 1 ' Š Ÿ ž 1 Š — 1 ˜ • • ' Œ
and maybe a small sign, but again more advertising and less wayfinding. [Alphin]
Just because the State is violating its own guidelines is no reason to approve. [David]
What about installation of a hanging porch sign? Staff referred to 2.8.2 (read it for record) and 2.8.6 (read it for record) [Caliendo]
I feel like the hanging sign conforms to the guidelines. [Alphin]
I agree, it becomes part of the architecture [Caliendo]
Yes. It is closer to the wall-mounted version, which is the least intrusive. I wish they had filed a COA for the existing sign, because in my mind it is pretty low impact on the architecture and pretty visible. [David]
I never noticed that sign. Is there any issue with the size or location of the hanging sign? [Caliendo]
Did application talk about offset versus centering it between the posts? [David]

1 • ˜ — • 1 ‘ Š Ÿ Ž 1 Š 1 ™ › ˜ ‹ • Ž – 1 ‘ • 1 ˜ Lighting was mentioned. The guidelines are pretty clear there. [Caliendo]
I concur. [Alphin]
Which guideline are you referencing when you say i • œ 1 Œ • Ž Š › 1 ˜ — 1 — ˜ 1 • ’ • ‘ • ’ — • õ 1 X ï ^ ï W V • ’ • ‘ • ’ — • 1 œ ’ • — Š • Ž ï 1 • 1 ¢ ˜ ž › Ž 1 œ Š ¢ ’ — • 1 • ‘ Š • 1 ’ • œ 1 ‹ Ž Œ Š ž œ Ž 1 ˜ • 1 • ‘ Ž 1 › Ž œ appropriate to light the sign. [Tully]
Is the sign at 530 approved with lighting? [David]
No. [Tully]
There is probably a clever way to light sign to achieve visibility. [Alphin]
Before you move forward, I request that you discuss whether you need to continue to refer to • ‘ Ž 1 • ž ’ • Š — Œ Ž 1 • › ˜ – 1 W _ _ ^ ï 1 • œ ˜ ð 1 ™ • Ž Š œ Ž 1 ‹ Ž 1 Œ • Ž Š › 1 Š ‹ ˜ ž • 1 ‘ Ž • ‘ Ž › 1 ¢ just Blount Street, and whether or not the 2001 Design Guidelines supersede the 1998 policy. [Tully]
This is a case-by-case basis review. I am not prepared to address this to other districts. As a point of reference it was useful to hear the past thinking on this topic, whether or not this should supersede the Design Guidelines. [Alphin]
• 1 ‘ Š œ — • 1 ‹ Ž Ž — 1 Œ • Ž Š › ð 1 ‘ Ž — 1 ’ • 1 Œ Š – Ž 1 • ˜ 1 • ˜ ž — • 1 • › Ž Ž • ð 1 œ ˜ 1 • ‘ ’ œ 1 that in the future or do you feel that the current Design Guidelines cover it? [Tully]
Anyone can submit supporting evidence, but the Design Guidelines are central. We go with Design Guidelines but are open to being influenced by other documents. [Alphin]

Findings of Fact

Ms. David moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-8) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following modifications:

Modify comment A. by striking the following:
and installation of a hanging porch sign **may be** incongruous according to Guidelines sections 2.8.2, 2.8.6

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

Decision on the Application

Ms. David made a motion that the ground sign be denied and that the remainder of the application be approved as amended, with the following conditions:

1. That the existing signage be removed within 30 days of this decision.
2. That color chips or manufacturer color names/numbers be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits.
3. That the sign not be lit.

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

Committee members voting: Alphin, Caliendo, David.

Certificate expiration date: 6/2/13.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS . CERTIFIED RECORD

177-13-CA 15 E PEACE STREET
Applicant: JOHN CRANHAM, WILLIAM PEACE UNIVERSITY
Received: 11/5/2013 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 2/3/2014 1) 12/2/2013 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BLOUNT STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: O&I-1
Nature of Project: Change approved COA (069-13-CA) to use tan colored aluminum clad wood windows in detached new construction.
Amendments: Additional information regarding the simulated divided lights and the manufacturers wood windows were provided to staff and are attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
4.3	New Construction	use tan colored aluminum clad wood windows in detached new construction

STAFF COMMENTS

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

A. Use of aluminum clad wood windows in detached new construction is not incongruous according to Guidelines sections 4.3.9, 4.3.10; however the tan color **may be** incongruous according to Guidelines section 4.3.9, 4.3.10.

1* Demolition of the majority of the Laundry and Boiler Building and construction of a new 2-story building around the remaining portion of building was approved in June 2013 (069-13-CA) with wood windows.

2* Aluminum clad wood windows were approved in new construction with COAs 135-13-CA and 145-13-CA based on the following facts: the windows have a smooth painted finish, not an anodized finish; the window color is black, a traditional window sash color; the seams of the aluminum clad wood window are flush, not pronounced, and not significantly more visible than the seams on the all wood window ò 1 ‹ Š œ Ž • 1 ˜ — 1 • ‘ Ž 1 – Š — ž • Š Œ • ž › Ž › œ 1 Œ components of the cased window are almost identical to the uncased window components

3* The proposed windows are not intended to replicate historic windows on the same building, but to match historic and non-historic wood windows used throughout the campus.

4* The application proposes the use of aluminum clad wood by Hurd Windows and Doors; the amended application includes section drawings of both wood and aluminum clad wood products.
5* The Hurd aluminum clad wood windows have a vinyl nail fin that is not visible once installed.
6* The drawings show that the windows are constructed of wood and have a thin layer of aluminum cladding with a jamb extension in lieu of exterior casing.
7* The only major difference discerned by staff is that the mull between banked windows of the aluminum clad wood windows will have a vertical seam, whereas the wood windows have a solid piece.
8* The windows will be installed in a masonry building.
9* The application states that actual physical samples of the proposed aluminum clad wood window and a wood window shall be presented in the public meeting. The visibility of the seams is not discernible from the drawings.
10* [illegible] to simulated true divided lights; details of the proposed aluminum simulated divided lights (grilles) and wood versions were included in the amended application. The only difference discerned by staff is that the wood grilles are .260 in height and the aluminum grilles are .290 in height. The taller dimension will create a shadow line more akin to historic muntins.

Pending the committee's determination regarding the color of the windows and the specific manufacturer details, staff suggests that the committee approve the amended application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support:
Jamey Glueck, the architect representing William Peace University spoke in support of the application. The applicant, Mr. John Cranham was in the audience, but did not speak. Mr. Glueck explained that this is a change to the book store project. Between the time when the COA was granted and now, there was discussion of using aluminum clad windows, which staff said needed to be approved by the commission.

Mr. Glueck pointed out the full size wood and aluminum clad window samples that were placed in front of the commissioners. For the color of the wood sample he noted that he was at [illegible] approved, but that trim information is in the packet. The color of the aluminum window matches the trim on the adjacent buildings, noting that there is in fact a lot of variation of [illegible] but that [illegible]

Ms. David pointed out that the brick mold is type F in the section detail. Mr. Alphin said that it looks like its 4 ¼ inches. Mr. Glueck said that the trim is a polyurethane material covering the edges.

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

At Ms ï 1 Š • ' Ž — • ˜ œ 1 œ ž • • Ž œ • ' ˜ — 1 œ ï 1 Š Ÿ ' • 1 – ˜ Ÿ Ž • 1 • ' Š • 1 • ' Ž 1 ™ ž ‹ • ' Œ 1 • Ž œ
be closed. Mr. Alphin seconded; motion carried 3/0.

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
The issue is the color. As far as the material, they are visually the same. [Caliendo]
Yes [David]
As it says in the staff comments one of the reasons the aluminum clad windows were approved the other time was that they were dark, because that was a traditional sash color. In this case they are proposing a light color because it matches the other windows on campus. [Tully]
Remind me of the previous application . the color of the trim? [Alphin]

Ms. David moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be re-opened. Mr. Alphin seconded; motion carried 3/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY(2)

Tania Tully [affirmed] stated that in the previous cases, there was no trim on the windows. The commission has approved dark colored sash aluminum clad wood windows based on the precedent setting case. One of the reasons for the approvals was that they were dark colored sashes historically appropriate to the residential districts they were in and they were visually diminished by dark color. There are probably enough facts to approve it.

Ms. Tully confirmed for Mr. Alphin that the only change on this case from the original application is the material of the windows. Had they condition submittal been for aluminum clad wood windows with dark colored sashes, staff would have approved them. She confirmed for Ms. David that the original windows in this case were approved to be wood with the tan color. Ms. David commented that since they approved light colored wood windows, they would approve light colored aluminum clad.

Ms. Tully pointed out features of the sample windows including the lack of visible horizontal seam made by the cladding. There is not then diagonally overlapping seam found in some aluminum clad wood window products.

Mr. Alphin stated that it was not a restoration. Ms. Tully said that essentially it is new construction, that there is a core of an old bu8lding within the building, but that the initial COA was reviewed as though it was new construction.

At Ms ï 1 Š • ' Ž — • ˜ œ 1 œ ž • • Ž œ • ' ˜ — 1 œ ï 1 Š Ÿ ' • 1 – ˜ Ÿ Ž • 1 • ' Š • 1 • ' Ž 1 ™ ž ‹ • ' Œ 1 • Ž œ
be closed. Mr. Alphin seconded; motion carried 3/0.

Findings of Fact

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Mr. Alphin and seconded by Ms. David, 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 1-8, 10) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following modifications:

In comment A. striking the following:

- however the tan color **may be** incongruous according to Guidelines section 4.3.9, 4.3.10.

Modifying fact 9* to read as follows:

9* Physical samples of the proposed aluminum clad wood window and a wood window were presented in the public meeting. The visibility of the seams is not discernible from the drawings.

Adding the following new facts:

11* There is no discernible visible difference in the wood and aluminum samples provided; the visibility of the aluminum seams is not discernible from the wood seams in the samples presented

12* The paint color samples closely resemble the existing paint color on windows of adjacent buildings.

Ms. David agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 3/0.

Decision on the Application

Mr. Alphin made a motion that the amended application be approved.

The motion was seconded by Ms. David; passed 3/0.

Committee members voting: Alphin, Caliendo, David.

Certificate expiration date: 6/2/13.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS . CERTIFIED RECORD

181-13-CA 610 N BLOODWORTH STREET
Applicant: MEG MCLAURIN
Received: 11/12/2013 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 2/10/2014 1) 12/2/2013 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Change approved COA (070-13-CA) to use artisan hardiepanel siding on addition to historic house
Amendments: Additional information was provided and is attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- Conditions of approval for 070-13-CA have not yet been submitted. Should this application be approved, conditions of approval for 070-13-CA must still be met prior to issuance of permits.
- Note that the application references case 170-13-CA. The case number of the approved addition is actually 070-13-CA.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	use artisan hardiepanel siding on addition to historic house

STAFF COMMENTS

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

A. Use of artisan hardiepanel siding on addition to historic house **may be** incongruous according to Guidelines sections 4.3.9, 4.3.10.

1* The application proposes to use smooth faced horizontal fiber cement siding on the main body of the addition and board and batten fiber cement panels on the basement level

2* The rear addition was conditionally approved with wood siding in June 2013 (070-13-CA). The public hearing included discussion of using hardiplank siding, but the committee determined that there was not enough information provided to render a decision.

3* Facts from the 070-13-CA hearing that may be relevant to this case include the following:
   a. The new addition is on the rear elevation
   b. The existing house is a frame c.1920 low-sloped side gable Craftsman bungalow

c. The subject property is at the corner of N Bloodworth Street and Pace Street; the lot slopes down significantly from the front towards the rear such that a full walk-out basement will be under the main level of the addition; there is an existing privacy fence along Pace Street.
d. The new porch on the addition wraps around the northeast corner of the historic house; the new porch protrudes beyond the side of the house, but not as far as the historic front porch.
e. The proposed horizontal fiber cement siding will be in close proximity to and potentially abut existing historic wood siding at the new porch.
f. Horizontal smooth faced fiber cement siding was approved on a rear addition of a frame historic house at 512 E Lane Street in 2012 (COA 079-12-CA); the decision included discussion of currently available wood siding and the qualties of fiber cement siding. The decision was also based in part on the fact that the addition is not readily visible from the street and not sited on a corner lot.
g. The proposed fiber cement board and batten treatment of the basement will be adjacent to the existing brick foundation, not historic wood.

4* The application proposes to use James Hardie Artisan Premier Lap Siding on the prominent side of the approved addition and regular Hardie siding on the remainder of the main floor ˜•1•‘Ž1Š••’•’˜—ï11 ‘Ž1 ›•’œŠ—1œ’•’—•1’œ1[&^ 1•‘’Œ”1Š—•1 ’••1‘ŠŸ exposure similar to the siding on the historic house. The thickness of the remainder of the proposed fiber cement siding is not included in the application.

5* Based on the amended application neither the siding of the historic house nor the proposed fiber cemen•1’œ1‹ŽŸŽ•Ž•ò1‘˜žœŽ œ1œ’•’—•1’œ1Š‹˜ž•1™ •‘’Œ”ï

6* The boards of the proposed Artisan Premier Lap Siding have tongue and grooved joints at the ends for minimally visible horizontal joints.

7* Details of how the new siding will look and physically abut the adjacent historic siding are not included in the application.

Staff has no suggested decision.

Should the application be approved, staff suggests the following condition:

1. That the siding on the addition be painted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support:

Meg McLaurin [affirmed], architect spoke in support of the application. Ms. McLaurin explained that in the original application they requested using hardiplank throughout the upper level and got the impression that if she were able to show that there is a good shadow-line with the hardiplank we might be able to get approval. She said that she is requesting on the visible side to use the Artisan series, which has deep shadow-line. She is hoping to still use the

normal hardiplank on the back. She stated that she realized ' • œ 1 œ ˜ – the commission has reservations about, but thought œ ' Žtry.1

Tania Tully [affirmed] brought up a couple of items. She stated that she d ' • — • 1 ' — Œ • ž • Ž 1 Š 1 • ˜ • 1 ˜ info on previous approvals of fiber cement siding because the question was not about the material, but about the location of the material. She pointed out fact 3*f. which states that the commission has approved it on a rear addition on the back, so really it is coming back to you ‹ Ž Œ Š ž œ Ž 1 ' • œ 1 Š 1 Œ ˜ possibly abutting existing siding. A new fact that comes out in the amended application is the existing thickness of the siding on the house. She also said her suggestion would be to approve one product rather than two products changing across the building.

Ms. David asked for clarity on the Artisan product. Ms. McLaurin stated that the only place it abuts the existing wood siding is right at the inside corner and on the other side too. Mr. Alphin asked if the material comes in a narrower board. Ms. McLaurin said that because of the Ž ¡ ™ ˜ œ ž › Ž ð 1 ' • 1 • ' Ž ¢ 1 Œ Š — 1 ž œ Ž 1 — Š › › ˜ Ž › 1 ‹ ˜ Š › The next size down is 1 • ' Ž ¢ • • 1 Œ short for recommended overlap.

Mr. Alphin asked if the owner objects to wood that much. Ms. McLaurin said it is a maintenance issue. Ms. Alphin noted that you can buy pressure treated wood for the outside that would be comparable to Artisan, but it would need painting more often.

Mr. Alphin asked staff if the commission previously approved hardi on the board and batten portion. Ms. Tully said no; one of the conditions was that hardi not be used for any of the siding. She noted that the way she wrote the staff comments for this case assumed that the applicant was asking for hardi on the board and batten as well; all siding on the addition. Ms. David stated that the board and batten was approved, just not the material. Mr. Alphin asked the applicant if hardi was approved for board and batten, what would the batten be made out of. Ms. McLaurin said that they would be treated 1X2s. Mr. Asked about ¼ in hardi. Ms. McLaurin said no, that they would have some thickness to them . either 3/4" or 5/8 battens.

Mr. Alphin asked the applicant about her thoughts that the hardiplank is thicker than the boards on the original house. Ms. McLaurin said that the Artisan only comes in one thickness and the fact that it is thicker might play into • ' Ž distinct from the original 1 • ž ' • Ž • ' — Ž ï 1 › ï 1 Alphin noted that normal hardiplank is half the thickness ð 1 [& W \

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

• 1 œ ï 1 Š • ' Ž — • ˜ œ 1 œ ž • • Ž œ • ' ˜ — 1 › ï 1 • ™ ' ' — 1 – ˜ Ÿ Ž • 1 • ' Š • 1 • ' Ž 1 ™ ž ‹ • ' Œ 1 • hearing be closed. Ms. David seconded; motion carried 3/0.

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
There are sort of three 3 things to talk about / the foundation - board and batten, the 2nd story addition, and the two proposed materials. One thought about hardipanel for board and batten, ' — 1 " ž œ • 1 Š ‹ ˜ ž • 1 Ž Ÿ Ž › ¢ 1 Š ™ ™ • ' Œ Š • ' ˜ — 1 " — ˜ ' — • 1 ' ˜ 1 • ' ' Œ " 1 • ' Ž 1 ‹ ˜ Š › • 1 ' œ ‹ Š • • Ž — 1 ¢ ˜ ž 1 Œ Š — 1 • Ž • • 1 • ' Ž 1 • ' ' Œ " — Ž œ œ 1 ˜ • ï 1 › Ž Š • 1 • Ž Œ ' — ' Œ Š • 1 ž œ Ž 1 ˜ painted, seems like it works in that application. [Alphin]
I agree as long as the applicant uses a thicker batten. The horizontal siding is abutting historic siding, but also not in the same plane, so to me it makes it more acceptable. [Caliendo]

Ms. David moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be re-opened. Mr. Alphin seconded; motion carried 3/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY(2)

Ms. Tully stated that the commission has approved hardi on rear additions, but all of them were not corner properties and not visible from street. Two of the approvals were on non-historic existing additions being rebuilt and there was another case where aluminum or Masonite siding was already there. The way the yard slopes, the first floor is at a second floor situation. It is not at sidewalk level and it is recessed.

Ms. David moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Mr. Alphin seconded; motion carried 3/0

Committee Discussion(2)

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
It does feel • ' " Ž 1 ' • œ 1 — ˜ • 1 › Ž Š • ' • ¢ 1 Ÿ ' œ ' ‹ • [Caliendo] Ž 1 Ž Œ Š ž œ Ž 1 ˜ • 1 • ' Ž 1 œ • ˜ ™ Ž ï
What do you think of the mix of hardis? That would make it three thicknesses on the house. [Alphin]
The existing siding is between the width of the Artisan and regular hardi. [David]
not comfortable going thinner. It needs to be Artisan. [Caliendo]
' Ž — 1 Ž › Ž ˜ 1 › ¢ ˜ ' • 1 • 1 • ' Š • 1 ' • œ ? 1 [Alphin] ž • 1 ˜ • 1 œ ' • ' •
The Guidelines do not mention visibility although it often comes into play. [David]
What is making it specific to this case is that it is on the second story level. [Caliendo]

Mr. Alphin moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be re-opened. Ms. David seconded; motion carried 3/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY(3)

Ms. McLaurin pointed out that Artisan is not just expensive but very heavy. She asked if there could be consideration that they use regular wood on the street side and regular hardi on the

invisible sides. Ms. David said that would still yield two different thicknesses of siding instead of three.

Ms. David moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Mr. Alphin seconded; motion carried 3/0

Committee Discussion(3)

What about the suggestion of wood on visible side and hardi on invisible side? [Caliendo]
Why should we [illegible] [Alphin]
I still think at the end of the day, regular hardi is thinner than regular siding. If [illegible] going to approve hardiplank the applicant needs to use Artisan all around. [Caliendo]
The compelling reason to approve that is that it looks more like wood. [Alphin]
The wood that is on the house already [Caliendo]

Findings of Fact

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

Modifying Comment A. to read as follows:

A. Use of artisan hardiepanel siding on addition to historic house **is not** incongruous according to Guidelines sections 4.3.9, 4.3.10

Modifying fact 1* to read as follows:

1* The application proposes to use [illegible] smooth faced horizontal fiber cement siding on the main body of the addition and board and batten fiber cement panels on the basement level

Adding the following new facts:

8* The batten [illegible] thick

9* The horizontal siding is proposed for use on the main level, but on the rear where it is a second story.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the siding on the addition be painted.
2. That all of the horizontal siding be the Artisan premier lap siding with the [& ^ 1 • ‘ ’ Œ ” — Ž œ œ
3. That for the board and batten siding the hardie panels be installed with no horizontal seams and that the battens be between 5/8 and 3/4 inch thick.

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

Committee members voting: Alphin, Caliendo, David.

Certificate expiration date: 6/2/14.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS . CERTIFIED RECORD

182-13-CA 525 E LANE STREET
Applicant: JOHN SIBERT
Received: 11/12/2013 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 2/10/2014 1) 12/2/2013 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Remove 5 trees to accommodate previously approved rear addition
Amendments: Additional information provided to staff is attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- Conditions required for COA 56-13-CA were submitted to staff. Relevant pages are attached to these comments.
- Review of the application revealed that a new driveway was approved in COA 56-13-CA, but a new curb cut was not. Staff is amending the application to include installation of new curb cut.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.1	Public Rights-of-Way and Alleys	Installation of new curb cut and driveway apron
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Remove 5 trees
2.5	Walkways, Driveways And Offstreet Parking	Installation of new curb cut and driveway apron

STAFF COMMENTS

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

A. Removal of 5 trees; installation of new curb cut and driveway apron is not incongruous in concept according to Guidelines section 2.1.2, 2.1.13, 2.3.1, 2.3.5, 2.5.5, 2.5.8; however not replacing trees is incongruous according to Guidelines section 2.3.5; Raleigh City Code Ž Œ • ' ˜ — 1 W V ï X ï W [ï ï W ï 1 œ • Š • Ž œ 1 • ' Š • 1 — 1 Š ™ ™ • ' Œ Š • ' ˜ — 1 • ˜ › 1 Š 1 Œ Ž authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure or site within any Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark may — ˜ • 1 ‹ Ž 1 • Ž — ' Ž • ó ˜ Ž Ÿ Ž › ð 1 • ' Ž 1 Š ž • ' ˜ › ' £ Š • of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of ' œ œ ž Š — Œ Ž ó • 1 • ' Ž 1 ˜ – – ' œ œ ' ˜ — 1 • ' — • œ 1 • ' Š • 1 • ' Ž 1 ‹ ž ' • • ' — • ð 1 œ • › ž Œ • ž significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Historic Overlay District or

Historic Landmark, it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition
˜ › 1 › Ž – ˜ Ÿ Š • ï

1* The addition and driveway were conditionally approved in May 2013 under COA 56-13-CA.

2* The trees are proposed for removal to accommodate the previously approved rear addition and driveway. The required tree protection plan revealed that there are trees in the footprint of the proposed new work.

3* No replacement treeas are proposed; the amended application states that the owners may be willing to plant replacement trees.

4* Photos taken by staff indicate that there is one tree in the right-of-way along Elm Street and that nearly all of the trees on the property along Elm Street are proposed for removal. The tree canopy may be negatively affected by the removals.

5* ˜ 1 ˜ • 1 • ‘ Ž 1 • › Ž Ž œ ð 1 Š • “ Š Œ Ž — • 1 • ‘ Ž 1 Ž ¡ ’ œ • ’ — • 1 • ˜ ž — • Š • ’ ˜ — ð 1 • ˜ 1 — ˜ • ð 1
the way of the addition.

6* The amended application states that the back quarter of the house along Elm Street is being torn down and reconstructed because the house is collapsing unto itself due to water damage and rot; the trees are in the way of performing that work.

7* One tree proposed for removal is in the location of the new curb cut. The amended application did not include evidence that a new curb cut was required, just that a new driveway was proposed.

8* Details and specifications for the new curb cut and driveway apron were not included in the application.

9* It is not known if there is existing granite curbing at the proposed curb cut; it is not appropriate to remove granite curbing; the commission typically requires that existing granite curbs be lowered and retained in place.

Staff suggests that the committee approve the amended application, waiving the 365-day delay with the following conditions:

1. That at least one replacement tree be planted along the Elm Street side of the house with other removals ameliorated either with replacement trees or donations to the NeighborWoods Tree Planting program. Locations, species, and/or donations are to be provided to and approved by staff prior to tree removals.
2. That any existing granite curbing be retained.
3. That the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
    a. Curb cut and driveway apron specifications.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support:
John Sibert [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. He noted that the addition may be constructed later than anticipated and that the proposed new curb cut may or may not happen.

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

•1 œï1 Š•'Ž—•˜ œ1œž••Žœ•'˜—1 œï1 ŠŸ'•1–˜ŸŽ•1•'Š•1•'Ž1™ž‹•'Œ1•Ž
be closed. Mr. Alphin seconded; motion carried 3/0.

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
The question is really about those two trees. [Caliendo]
I concur. [David]

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 1-9) to be acceptable as findings of fact.

The motion was seconded by Ms. David; passed 3/0.

Decision on the Application

Mr. Alphin made a motion that the application be approved as amended, waiving the 365-day demolition delay for the tree removal, with the following conditions:

1. That at least one replacement tree be planted along the Elm Street side of the house with other removals ameliorated either with replacement trees or donations to the NeighborWoods Tree Planting program. Locations, species, and/or donations are to be provided to and approved by staff prior to tree removals.
2. That any existing granite curbing be retained.
3. That the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
    a. Curb cut and driveway apron specifications.

Committee members voting: Alphin, Caliendo, David.

Certificate expiration date: 6/2/14.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Demolition by Neglect: Oakwood
   a. 409 Polk Street: Ms. David, Ms. Caliendo, and Mr. Alphin volunteered to do the inspection.
2. Design Guidelines Update
3. Committee Discussion
   a. Application Completeness
   b. Meeting Post-Mortem

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:42 p.m.

Elizabeth Caliendo
Certificate of Appropriateness Committee,
Raleigh Historic Development Commission

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner