RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
December 1, 2014

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Scott Shackleton called the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Committee meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Tania Tully, Preservation Planner, called the roll as follows:
Present: Elizabeth Caliendo, Sarah David, Miranda Downer, Laurie Jackson, Scott Shackleton
Alternate Present: Don Davis
Staff Present: Tania Tully, Martha Lauer

Approval of the November 3, 2014 Minutes

Ms. Caliendo moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing and adopt the minutes as submitted. Ms. David seconded the motion; passed 6/0.

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
Carole Baxter, 411 Elm Street 27604	Yes
John Baxter, 411 Elm Street 27604	Yes
Estridge Hatlety, 1139 Evans Road 27513	Yes
Ludelle Hatlety, 1139 Evans Road 27513	Yes
Elizabeth Dunbar, 422 Cutler Street 27603	unknown
Nathan Romblad, 1405 Cameron Street 27605	No
David Maurer, 115.5 E Hargett Street 27601	Yes
Maggie & Mackey McDonald, 710 Independence Pl, Unit 509 27603	Yes
Parker Shannon, 2601 Cornerstone Drive 27518	Yes
Michiel Doorn, 403 Elm Street 27604	Yes
Louis Cherry, 516 Euclid Street 27604	Yes
John Lunsford, 1905 Freewood Court 27606	Yes
Matthew Brown, 601 E Lane Street 27601	Yes
Jill Furgurson, 1100 W Cabarrus Street 27603	Yes
Chris Gotwalt, 401 E Jones Street 27601	Yes
Bill Brideson, 612 N Blount Street 27904	No
Dan Furgurson, 1100 W Cabarrus Street 27603	Yes
Anna Bigelow, 1003 W South Street 27603	Yes

Rob Allen, 1008 W Lenoir Street 27603 Yes

REVIEW OF SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Caliendo moved to approve the agenda as printed. Ms. Davis seconded the motion; passed 6/0.

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 173-14-CA for which the Summary Proceeding is made part of these minutes.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – SUMMARY PROCEEDING

173-14-CA 420 CUTLER STREET
Applicant: DAVID MAURER AIA, MAURER ARCHITECTURE PA
Received: 11/6/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 2/4/2015 1) 12/1/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Install new curb cut and driveway; remove cedar tree; construct rear deck and side steps; install new gutters and downspouts; alter porch roofs; relocate window; remove section of fence.
Amendments: Additional information was provided November 26 and is attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: Ms. Jackson did not receive the staff comments and abstained voting as she works at Maurer Architecture.
Staff Notes:

- COA 165-14-MW approved the following: enclose rear screened porches; remove side wall window and relocate; remove side steps; remove rear window; change exterior paint color; install new doors. File is available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	install new curb cut and driveway; remove cedar tree; construct rear deck and side steps; remove section of fence
2.4	Fences and Walls	remove section of fence
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	install new curb cut and driveway
3.5	Roofs	install new gutters and downspouts; alter porch roofs
3.7	Windows and Doors	relocate window
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	alter porch roofs
4.1	Decks	construct rear deck and side steps

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Installation of new curb cut and driveway; removal of cedar tree; removal of section of fence is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.3, 2.3.7, 2.4.1, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.8, 2.5.9; however, not replacing the tree is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.5 and the following findings:
(Raleigh City Code Section 10.2.15.E.1. states that "An 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 not be denied…However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of issuance…If the Commission finds that the 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 such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal.")

1* The tree proposed for removal is growing at an angle under the canopy of a larger oak and has grown to a size that now damages the house from debris. The roots of the cedar are also competing for water with the larger oak.

2* The removal of the tree will not significantly impact the tree canopy; a replacement tree is not proposed.

3* The section of fence being removed is not historic.

4* The new driveway, curb cut, and apron are likely in the critical root zone of a large tree. The application does not state how the driveway installation may impact the roots of the tree or how the construction will occur so as to minimize damage. The amended application states that the contractor will layout the exact location of the strips and will consult with an arborist or landscape architect to ensure no damage to tree roots.

5* There is a dumpster sitting in the location of the proposed driveway and on the roots of the adjacent tree. The amended application states that there are OSB boards under the dumpster to protect the roots, the contractors are doing all they can to get it out as soon as possible, and the tree will be going dormant now.

6* Photos of the existing curb were not included. Google streetview shows a concrete curb.

7* The new curb cut and apron will be concrete. The driveway is proposed to be 2' wide concrete strips. Detailed drawings of the curb cut and concrete finish were not included in the application. The commission typically requires that concrete have a water-washed finish to match the existing concrete sidewalk.

8* The proposed driveway is in a typical location and configuration for driveways in the historic district. There are similar driveways on the block.

B. Installation of new gutters and downspouts; alteration of porch roofs; relocation of window is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.5.1, 3.5.5, 3.5.8, 3.7.9, and the following findings:

1* Asphalt shingles on the rear porch are proposed to be replaced with a white rubber membrane. Page 34 of the *Guidelines* states that "Historic roofing materials were usually dark in color."

2* Due to the height of the roof and the low slope, the rear porch roof is not visible from the street. Membrane roofs are common on low pitched roofs.

3* The application proposes half round gutters and round downspouts; the material, locations, and installation information were not included in the application.
4* The window being relocated is inside the approved enclosed porch.

C. Construction of rear deck and side steps is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.1.5, 4.1.8 and the following findings
1* There appear to be trees in the rear yard on this and adjacent properties not located on the plan that may be impacted by construction activities. A tree protection plan was not provided.
2* Rear decks are commonly approved when inset from the historic house; this deck is greatly inset on the south, but not on the north side.
3* Detailed drawings and a photo of the proposed deck railing were provided in the application. The railing is a simple, yet elegant formal design.
4* The new side steps are in the location of steps approved for removal with COA 165-14-MW.
5* Under deck screening was not included in the application.
6* According to the online Wake County Real Estate Data, the lot is 6,534 SF. The footprint of the house and porches is 1,505 SF; for current lot coverage of 23%; the new deck and side steps are approximately 200 SF for an increase of about 152 SF for new lot coverage of about 25%.

Staff recommends that the committee approve the amended application, waiving the 365-day demolition delay for the removal of the tree with the following conditions:

1. That the driveway and apron have a water-wash finish.
2. That either a new tree be planted on the property or a donation be made to the NeighborWoods tree planting program prior to removal of the tree.
3. That the deck be inset on the north side by at least the width of a corner board.
4. That specifications and details for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation/construction:
   a. material, locations, and installation information for the gutters;
   b. under deck lattice screening;
   c. close up photo of existing window trim being matched.
5. That specifications and details for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits for the deck and side steps:
   a. Tree protection plan similar to the sample RHDC plan;
   b. New dumpster location.
6. That specifications and details for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits for the driveway, curb cut and apron:
   a. Tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture;
   b. Curb cut and apron.

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

There were no objections to approval without a public hearing.

Ms. Downer moved to approve the application, adopting the staff comments as the written record of the summary proceeding on 173-14-CA. Ms. David seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

Committee members voting: Caliendo, David, Davis, Downer, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 6/1/15.

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: 163-14-CA, 172-14-CA, 174-14-CA, 175-14-CA and 176-14-CA.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

163-14-CA 403 ELM STREET
Applicant: MICHAEL DOORN & MARY BOONE
Received: 10/15/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 1/13/2015 1) 11/3/2014 2) 12/1/2014 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Deferred portion of application: remove portion of existing low concrete block wall; construct new low wall. (Remove existing fencing in rear yard; construct low brick wall with fence in rear yard; install new 70" tall rear yard privacy fence - approved at the November 3, 2014 meeting)
Amendments: Additional information was provided December 1, 2014 and is attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- After-the-fact applications are treated as though the work has not been completed.
- The exact location of the property line and ownership of the concrete block wall is in dispute. Ownership is a civil matter outside of the jurisdiction of the commission.
- Staff photos are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.4	Fences and Walls	removal of a portion of an existing low concrete block wall; construction of new low wall

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

D. Removal of a portion of an existing low concrete block wall; construction of new low wall **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.4.2, 2.4.5, and the following findings:
5* Masonry or stone retaining walls were occasionally employed to accommodate a significant shift in grade.
6* Based on the material and configuration, the concrete block wall was likely constructed in the 1920s or 30s. There are no photographs of the removed wall that indicate its condition. There are photographs of the remaining portion of the wall.
7* The portion of the block wall removed starts beyond the front face of the house.

8* The application indicates construction of a low brick wall to replace the removed wall. The amended application mentions the possibility of cladding the remaining concrete block wall with stone.
9* The amended application states that on the "north side of the house there was a two cinder-blocks-high wall that was partially removed to install a French drain and grade the soil. There was not enough space to install a functioning drainage system with the cinder blocks in place. The cinder block wall was overgrown and in poor shape. Moreover, this wall was not functional to retain water nor silt, as cinderblocks have large holes in them…"
10* The application states that a solid wall is necessary to help with drainage and prevention water damaging the house.
11* The amended application includes a section drawing of the proposed new low brick wall.
12* The amended application includes photographs of portions of an unearthed brick wall, some with decorative concrete caps.

Pending the committee's determination regarding the significance of the block wall, staff recommends that the committee approve the amended application, with the following condition:

7. That the existing concrete block wall not be clad in stone.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from staff comments. She noted that the only real question is the committee's determination of the significance of the cinder block wall.

Support:
Michael Doorn [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. He made the following comments:

- The house is at lower end of a large block.
- There was very serious soil erosion and the crawlspace was inaccessible.
- They removed part of an old cinder block wall in order to put in a French drain.
- The cinder block wall does not function.
- The drain has been working and they have found evidence of part of an older brick wall.
- The proposal is to rebuild a brick wall to about 18" above grade.
- Cinderblocks leave a different picture than the granite that was preserved. He would like to extend the brick to veneer the remainder of the concrete block wall.

Opposition:
Carole Baxter [affirmed], property owner of the adjacent 411 Elm Street and her son John Baxter [affirmed], were present to speak in opposition. Photographs were distributed and the following comments were made:

- In the amended application there are several discrepancies.

    - The remove wall was three cinderblocks high, not two.
    - The wall was overgrown, but not in poor shape.
    - Disagrees that it was not functioning as retaining wall. It was intended to have vegetation as part of it and it functioned for 80-90 years. The photo of the wall in a straight line was noted.
- The old cinderblocks were attractive and were historic. Cladding the front wall in river stone is not appropriate. The other part of the wall is a Niece Belgian stone.
- The application says that the sixth picture shows the stake of the correct property line, but really only ½ inch of the wall is on his property. He speculates the wall has shifted downhill.
- The visual differences between the old and new concrete blocks were noted in a photograph.
- The wall is not an eyesore. It's on their property and we think it's pretty and contributes to the character of the district.

The Baxters requested that the wall be repaired with matching materials according to guidelines 2.3.6. Additionally, in regards to the low brick wall, they feel it should be considered an archaeological feature. They are notifying RHDC that an archaeological feature has been uncovered.

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

Responses and Questions:
Mr. Doorn said that Mr. Baxter showed him that at some point that the cinderblocks from the street were 50/50 along the property line. A lot of this could well be on his property.

Mr. Shackleton interjected to note that the commission discussion has nothing to do with property lines or property rights issues.

Mr. Doorn pointed out that the wooden fence has already been approved and will only come to the end of his house. The only thing between the Baxter property and his property will be this low wall. Mr. Shackleton asked if the fence that's already been approved was disturbing the newly discovered brick wall at all. Mr. Doorn said that it was originally to be atop the wall, but that it can be moved to be beside it.

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

Committee Discussion

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

There are some pretty old cinderblocks that are historic, and you do have evidence of a brick retaining wall. I understands wanting to have a more solid retaining wall. [David]
Our job is to decide if the application meets the guidelines. Then the property owner needs to decide where the wall is going to go. [Shackleton]
In the application now—there is a portion of the wall already gone. The question is does what goes back need to be a replication or does it meet the guidelines to be brick? Regarding the front portion, the applicant mentioned wanted to make that brick, but the application has not been amended to request that. [Tully]
So you're saying that wasn't part of the application. [Shackleton]
Yes. Last time in the amended application it was to be in stone. That part of the application is nebulous. [Tully]
So we have the two different parts. What are your thoughts on the parts that are missing now? As a practical matter, it is a bit complicated, because the owner could approve building a wall entirely on his property, but then there is still a missing section. We need to approach it as is a concrete block wall, is a brick wall okay? This is an after-the-fact application. My understanding was that a brick wall was under there, so it was used historically. Within the period of significance. [Shackleton]
They can't use new cinderblock. It doesn't match. In the absence of matching concrete block, brick is a compatible substitute. [Jackson]
Some of the hang up is that the concrete block is not very pretty, which is not either appropriate or inappropriate. It has been there 80 years. Even the functionality is not our area. We have to treat the application as though the wall were still there. [David]
How does that fit with what should go back. Would you go back with currently available concrete block? [Shackleton]
Do we know that block like this is not available? [David]
Not likely. [Shackleton]
You have in the past used the concept of something being technically feasible as a fact. Look at guideline 2.4.5; tie it back to that language. [Tully]
I am coming down on the side that it should be concrete block. If old concrete block is not available, it should be the closest concrete block you can find [Shackleton]
Yes. [David]
We have an application for the wall that's there already. Then there is the replacement wall. We could decide that that wall would need to stay and that would not preclude the applicant from applying for a low wall adjacent. [Shackleton]
Yes, and a low wall like that would be a minor work. [Tully]
I see that the evidence of the brick wall is towards the back, not the front. [Shackleton]
We should talk about using modern cinderblock for the part that needs to be replaced. [Davis]
I agree. I hesitate using new cinderblocks to repair the wall, because of the material. I would try to check to see if it's possible to find the old cinderblock. [Downer]
The applicant should propose something. [David]
This could be an administrative review of conditions, or put it to staff [Tully]
A new low brick wall is not incompatible with the guidelines but the existing historic wall should stay. [Jackson]

Guideline 2.4.2 is pretty clear that the wall should remain. It seems we all agree on the existing wall. [Caliendo]
The existing wall should stay. Brick is an acceptable alternative to modern concrete blocks. [Davis]
Do we need to address brick wall in back where the fence is to go on top of? [David]
It's not really part of this application. [Shackleton]
I can deal with this as an administrative change to the application. It's not what's been advertised for this application. [Tully]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Ms. Caliendo and seconded by Ms. Jackson, Ms. Caliendo 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) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Removal of a portion of an existing low concrete block wall is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.4.5; and construction of new low wall is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.4.5, and the following findings:

1* Masonry or stone retaining walls were occasionally employed to accommodate a significant shift in grade.

2* Based on the material and configuration, the concrete block wall was likely constructed in the 1920s or 30s. There are no photographs of the removed wall that indicate its condition. There are photographs of the remaining portion of the wall.

3* The portion of the block wall removed starts beyond the front face of the house.

4* The application indicates construction of a low brick wall to replace the removed wall. The amended application mentions the possibility of cladding the remaining concrete block wall with stone.

5* The amended application states that on the "north side of the house there was a two cinder-blocks-high wall that was partially removed to install a French drain and grade the soil. There was not enough space to install a functioning drainage system with the cinder blocks in place. The cinder block wall was overgrown and in poor shape. Moreover, this wall was not functional to retain water nor silt, as cinderblocks have large holes in them…"

6* The application states that a solid wall is necessary to help with drainage and prevention water damaging the house.

7* The amended application includes a section drawing of the proposed new low brick wall.

8* The amended application includes photographs of portions of an unearthed brick wall, some with decorative concrete caps.

9* Additional photographs of the wall were provided by the adjacent property owner/joint owner of the wall at the hearing.

10* Testimony was received by the adjacent property owner/joint owner of the wall that the portion of the wall removed as 3 blocks tall.

Ms. Jackson agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 6/0.

Decision on the Application

Ms. Caliendo made a motion that the amended application be denied in part and approved in part as listed below:

That the removal of concrete block wall be denied.

That the construction of the new low masonry wall be approved with the following condition:

1. That the replacement material for the wall be the closest material that can be found commercially available to be provided to and approved by approved by staff prior to issuance of permits.

The motion was seconded by Ms. David; passed 6/0.

Committee members voting: Caliendo, David, Davis, Downer, Jackson, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 6/1/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

172-14-CA 546 E JONES STREET
Applicant: LUDELLE R HATLEY
Received: 11/5/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 2/3/2015 1) 12/1/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: [Partial after-the-fact] replace windows with wood windows; replace porch columns; change exterior paint colors; replace door
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- After-the-fact applications are treated as though the work has not been completed.
- Staff photos are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
3.4	Paint and Paint Color	change exterior paint colors
3.7	Windows and Doors	replace windows with wood windows; replace door
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	replace porch columns

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Changing of exterior paint colors is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.4.3 and the following findings:
1* Changing exterior paint colors is typically approvable by staff as a minor work and is included here for administrative efficiency.
2* Paint samples were included in application.

B. Replacement of windows with wood windows; replacement of door is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.7.1, 3.7.2, 3.7.6, and the following findings:
1* Replacement of doors is typically approvable by staff as a minor work and is included here for administrative efficiency.

2* From a 2008 staff photo the front door appears to have been a non-historic wood paneled door with no windows. The new door is proposed to be a ½ light wood paneled door.
3* The windows were removed and replaced with vinyl prior to issuance of a COA. This proposal is to replace the vinyl windows with new wood windows.
4* There is no information regarding the condition of the window sashes proposed for removal. Only the sashes are to be replaced; the trim and mullions will remain.
5* In 1989 (CAD-89-048), under a previous set of design guidelines, the windows were approved to be replaced with wood 2/2 windows though the work was never completed. The change was approved in part because the existing window configurations: 1/1, 2/2, 4/4, 6/6 were the result of numerous window alterations over the years.
6* A pair of 6/6 wood windows are not proposed for replacement.
7* Based on conversations with the applicant, at least some of the replaced wood windows were original historic fabric. In all file photos the windows have storms so it is difficult to see the muntin pattern. The application is proposing 1/1 wood windows.
8* Details and specifications for the new windows were not provided in the application.

C. Replacement of porch columns is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.8.1, 3.8.6, , and the following findings:
1* In 2008 (CAD-88-105) the front porch columns were approved to be replaced though the work was never completed.
2* The existing columns are decorative metal likely installed in the 1950s or 60s.
3* Proposed columns are 5" diameter wood columns with a turned appearance. It is unclear how they will be installed.

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

1. That within 90-days of this decision, the vinyl replacement windows will be removed and replaced with double hung 1/1 wood windows, with the specifications for the wood windows to be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard.
2. That specifications for the installation of the porch posts be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map.

Support:
Ludelle Hatley [affirmed], co-owns house with elderly mother and was present to speak in support of the application. She requested that the time frame be increased to 120 days from the decision instead of 90 days.

Mr. Shackleton asked if there was anyone else to speak in support or opposed. There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Mr. Shackleton asked for questions from committee.

Ms. Tully pointed out that the Hatleys have been very cooperative. She is comfortable giving them the additional time and trusts that they will follow through.

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

Committee Discussion

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

The proposed work meets the design guidelines. [David]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Ms. Jackson moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comments A. (inclusive of facts 1-2), B. (inclusive of facts 1-8), and C. (inclusive of facts 1-3) to be acceptable as findings of fact as listed below:

A. Changing of exterior paint colors is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.4.3 and the following findings:
1* Changing exterior paint colors is typically approvable by staff as a minor work and is included here for administrative efficiency.
2* Paint samples were included in application.

B. Replacement of windows with wood windows; replacement of door is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.7.1, 3.7.2, 3.7.6, and the following findings:
1* Replacement of doors is typically approvable by staff as a minor work and is included here for administrative efficiency.
2* From a 2008 staff photo the front door appears to have been a non-historic wood paneled door with no windows. The new door is proposed to be a ½ light wood paneled door.
3* The windows were removed and replaced with vinyl prior to issuance of a COA. This proposal is to replace the vinyl windows with new wood windows.
4* There is no information regarding the condition of the window sashes proposed for removal. Only the sashes are to be replaced; the trim and mullions will remain.
5* In 1989 (CAD-89-048), under a previous set of design guidelines, the windows were approved to be replaced with wood 2/2 windows though the work was never completed. The change was approved in part because the existing window configurations: 1/1, 2/2, 4/4, 6/6 were the result of numerous window alterations over the years.

6* A pair of 6/6 wood windows are not proposed for replacement.
7* Based on conversations with the applicant, at least some of the replaced wood windows were original historic fabric. In all file photos the windows have storms so it is difficult to see the muntin pattern. The application is proposing 1/1 wood windows.
8* Details and specifications for the new windows were not provided in the application.

C. Replacement of porch columns is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.8.1, 3.8.6, , and the following findings:
1* In 2008 (CAD-88-105) the front porch columns were approved to be replaced though the work was never completed.
2* The existing columns are decorative metal likely installed in the 1950s or 60s.
3* Proposed columns are 5" diameter wood columns with a turned appearance. It is unclear how they will be installed.

The motion was seconded by Ms.David; passed 6/0.

Decision on the Application

Ms. Jackson made a motion that the application be approved, with the following conditions:

1. That within 120-days of this decision, the vinyl replacement windows will be removed and replaced with double hung 1/1 wood windows, with the specifications for the wood windows to be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard.
2. That specifications for the installation of the porch posts be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Caliendo; passed 6/0.

Committee members voting: Caliendo, David, Davis, Downer, Jackson, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 6/1/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

174-14-CA 401 E JONES STREET
Applicant: JESSICA GOTWALT
Received: 11/7/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 2/5/2015 1) 12/1/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Rear and side yard master landscape plan to include: remove wood picket fence; install wrought iron fence; remove tall wood fence; construct brick wall; lower grade of side yard; remove concrete block wall; add planting beds; remove pond; remove concrete sidewalk; remove slate tiles; install new brick patio; remove rear deck; construct rear porch.
Amendments: Amended drawings were received and are attached to these comments. The depth of the porch and roof form are modified, the grade changes are clarified, and the tree protection plan is modified.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- Files for COAs mentioned in the staff comments are available for review.
- File and staff photos are available for review

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Rear and side yard master landscape plan to include: remove wood picket fence; install wrought iron fence; remove tall wood fence; construct brick wall; lower grade of side yard; remove concrete block wall; add planting beds; remove pond; remove concrete sidewalk; remove slate tiles; install new brick patio; remove rear deck; construct rear porch
2.4	Fences and Walls	remove concrete block wall; remove wood picket fence; install wrought iron fence; remove tall wood fence; construct brick wall
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	remove concrete sidewalk
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Remove rear deck; construct rear porch

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Removal of rear deck; construction of rear porch is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9 and the following findings:

1* A tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan is included in the application; the footprint of the new porch is the same as existing deck.

2* The lot at 401 E Jones Street is at the corner of N Bloodworth Street.

3* The rear deck and stairs being removed were constructed per a 1996 COA (118-96-CA) under an older set of *Guidelines*. The new covered porch will sit in the same location and not increase the amount of built area.

4* The new covered porch will attach to a rear addition that has been modified multiple times over the years per approved COAs (1980, CAD-92-064, 145-09-MW, 190-13-MW).

5* The new covered porch is located at the rear of the house. It is inset from the corners of the house and is farther back from Bloodworth Street than the front wall of the house at 212 N Bloodworth Street.

6* The porch will sit on a brick foundation and have a low pitched hipped roof similar to the historic house. The roof form reduces the apparent mass of the porch. A photograph of the proposed brick was included in the amended application; a sample was not provided.

7* The materials and colors will match that of the house.

8* Details for the metal roof were not included in the application, but will likely match that approved in COA 190-13-MW.

9* Detailed drawings of the porch construction were not included in the application.

B. Removal of concrete block wall; removal of wood picket fence; installation of wrought iron fence; removal of tall wood fence; construction of brick wall is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.7, 2.4.8,and the following findings:

1* A portion of the brick wall is within the critical root zone of a large tree. The application does not provide information on the impact of the wall construction on the future health of the tree.

2* The fences and walls being removed are not historic and were constructed per approved COAs (069-95-MW, 062-99-CA).

3* Brick walls are not uncommon in the Oakwood Historic District; the application includes several examples. The location along the rear and side property lines is a traditional location for fences and walls. A brick sample was not provided.

4* The section of picket fence will be replaced with a wrought iron fence similar to what is in place; the specific design was not provided. It is unclear from the application where the fence replacement is located. The proposed site plan shows a wood fence with gate in front of an existing low retaining wall at the southeast corner of the house. This is likely the fence section being replaced.

5* A new wrought iron gate is proposed at the Bloodworth Street brick walk; the specific designs were not provided

C. Implementation of rear and side yard master landscape plan to include: altering grade of side yard; addition of planting beds; removal of pond; removal of concrete sidewalk; removal of slate tiles; installation of new brick patio is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.3.11, and the following findings:

1* A tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan is included in the application; the concrete pad under the tree will be removed without heavy equipment.

2* The patios being removed are not historic and were constructed per approved COAs (069-95-MW, 062-99-CA). No historic fabric is being altered.

3* The amount of built space is not being altered. Existing patios and walks are being replaced with a dry laid brick patio. A brick sample was not provided.

4* The grade changes are minimal; the grade of the rear yard was altered under prior COAs.

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

1. That the metal roof specifications be those approved with COA 190-13-MW.
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Porch construction including eaves; porch floor; railing; brick sample.
   b. A tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture Arborist on the wall construction including a recommendation on the need for a different construction method.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction/installation:
   a. New wrought iron fence section;
   b. New wrought iron gates;
   c. Brick sample for patio;
   d. Brick sample for site wall;
   e. Brick sample for porch foundation;
   f. Clarification of the location of the picket fence being replaced.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from staff comments. She specified the amendments to the application including that the depth of porch has been reduced to the depth of the existing deck, the roof has been changed to hip, and the grades of land have been added. Additionally a modified tree protection plan was provided. She suggested that except for some details that need clarification there were not major issues with the application.

Support:
Chris Gotwalt [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. He stated his concurrence with staff recommend conditions.

There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.
At Mr. Shackleton's suggestion Ms. David moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Ms. Caliendo seconded; motion carried 6/0.

Committee Discussion

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

The amended application is great. Moving the porch back worked. [Caliendo]
The roof is low; subservient to the house. [Shackleton]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Ms. David moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comments A. (inclusive of facts 1-9), B. (inclusive of facts 1-5), and C. (inclusive of facts 1-4) to be acceptable as findings of fact as listed below:

A. Removal of rear deck; construction of rear porch is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9 and the following findings:

1* A tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan is included in the application; the footprint of the new porch is the same as existing deck.
2* The lot at 401 E Jones Street is at the corner of N Bloodworth Street.
3* The rear deck and stairs being removed were constructed per a 1996 COA (118-96-CA) under an older set of *Guidelines*. The new covered porch will sit in the same location and not increase the amount of built area.
4* The new covered porch will attach to a rear addition that has been modified multiple times over the years per approved COAs (1980, CAD-92-064, 145-09-MW, 190-13-MW).
5* The new covered porch is located at the rear of the house. It is inset from the corners of the house and is farther back from Bloodworth Street than the front wall of the house at 212 N Bloodworth Street.
6* The porch will sit on a brick foundation and have a low pitched hipped roof similar to the historic house. The roof form reduces the apparent mass of the porch. A photograph of the proposed brick was included in the amended application; a sample was not provided.
7* The materials and colors will match that of the house.
8* Details for the metal roof were not included in the application, but will likely match that approved in COA 190-13-MW.
9* Detailed drawings of the porch construction were not included in the application.

B. Removal of concrete block wall; removal of wood picket fence; installation of wrought iron fence; removal of tall wood fence; construction of brick wall is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.7, 2.4.8,and the following findings:

1* A portion of the brick wall is within the critical root zone of a large tree. The application does not provide information on the impact of the wall construction on the future health of the tree.

2* The fences and walls being removed are not historic and were constructed per approved COAs (069-95-MW, 062-99-CA).

3* Brick walls are not uncommon in the Oakwood Historic District; the application includes several examples. The location along the rear and side property lines is a traditional location for fences and walls. A brick sample was not provided.

4* The section of picket fence will be replaced with a wrought iron fence similar to what is in place; the specific design was not provided. It is unclear from the application where the fence replacement is located. The proposed site plan shows a wood fence with gate in front of an existing low retaining wall at the southeast corner of the house. This is likely the fence section being replaced.

5* A new wrought iron gate is proposed at the Bloodworth Street brick walk; the specific designs were not provided

C. Implementation of rear and side yard master landscape plan to include: altering grade of side yard; addition of planting beds; removal of pond; removal of concrete sidewalk; removal of slate tiles; installation of new brick patio is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.3.11, and the following findings:

1* A tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan is included in the application; the concrete pad under the tree will be removed without heavy equipment.

2* The patios being removed are not historic and were constructed per approved COAs (069-95-MW, 062-99-CA). No historic fabric is being altered.

3* The amount of built space is not being altered. Existing patios and walks are being replaced with a dry laid brick patio. A brick sample was not provided.

4* The grade changes are minimal; the grade of the rear yard was altered under prior COAs.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Jackson; passed 6/0.

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

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

1. That the metal roof specifications be those approved with COA 190-13-MW.
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Porch construction including eaves; porch floor; railing; brick sample.

b. A tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture Arborist on the wall construction including a recommendation on the need for a different construction method.

3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction/installation:
   a. New wrought iron fence section;
   b. New wrought iron gates;
   c. Brick sample for patio;
   d. Brick sample for site wall;
   e. Brick sample for porch foundation;
   f. Clarification of the location of the picket fence being replaced.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Jackson; passed 6/0.

Committee members voting: Caliendo, David, Davis, Downer, Jackson, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 6/1/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

175-14-CA 1100 W CABARRUS STREET
Applicant: DAN & JILL FURGUSON
Received: 11/7/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 2/5/2015 1) 12/1/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Remove rear deck and addition; construct new 2-story rear addition; remove crape myrtle tree; plant new tree; remove portion of gravel patio; install new concrete pads patio.
Amendments: Amended drawings were received November 24, 2014 and are attached to these comments. Revisions include a material change, material clarification and retaining wall notation.
DRAC: The application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its November 19 meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker and Erin Sterling; also present were Louis Cherry, Dan and Jill Furguson, and Tania Tully.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes: COA mentioned in the comments is available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Remove rear deck and addition; construct new 2-story rear addition; remove crape myrtle tree; plant new tree; remove portion of gravel patio; install new concrete pads patio
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Remove rear deck and addition; construct new 2-story rear addition

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Removal of rear deck and addition; construction of new 2-story rear addition is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 4.2.1, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9, and the following findings:

1* Except for one tree proposed for removal (see comment B.) there are no trees directly impacted by the construction. There appear to be trees on adjacent properties whose roots may be impacted by construction activity. No tree protection plan was provided.
2* The lot size is 6,534 SF; the house is 920 SF including the front porch for lot coverage of 14%. The portion of the house being removed is 128 SF; the new addition is about 523 SF for new lot coverage of about 20%. This appears similar to that of the other houses on the 1000 block of E Cabarrus Street.
3* The house is a 1928 house is a one-story Bungalow with a hip roof with gable dormer, and a full façade engaged porch. There is a 1-story hipped roof bump-out and small rear deck.
4* Based on the 1950 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map a portion of the bump out used to be an open porch. The proposal removes this to accommodate the new addition. The commission commonly approves removal of rear bump-outs.
5* The existing elevation drawing shows a corner board and roof delineation at the bump-out. Photographs indicate continuous siding and no roof delineation.
6* The proposed addition is two stories, but due to the slope of the yard it reads as 1-½ stories.
7* Due to the slope of the yard the foundation height varies. From the first floor, the house is 17′ 2″ tall. The new addition rises 3′ 6″ above the historic house.
8* There are a few examples in Boylan Heights of additions that are taller than the historic house including at 1022 W South Street (COA 101-07-CA). That addition is about 6′ taller than the historic house.
9* The addition is at the rear of the house. It is inset on the west side and extends beyond the historic house by about 1′ on the east.
10* The roof of the addition is a simple hipped form with a deep eave and exposed rafters similar to the historic house.
11* Four windows on the existing house are proposed for removal to accommodate the addition. There is no indication as to what will be done with them. It is customary to reuse historic windows on additions.
12* On the east side of the house there is no physical delineation between the old and new.
13* The siding used on the addition will be fiber cement siding that matches the dimensions of the existing wood siding. The siding is specified as 6″ lap siding, 5/8″ thick painted to match. The use of smooth faced fiber cement siding has been approved on additions to historic houses, but not when the new siding is in the same plane as the historic siding.
14* Details and specifications for the windows are not included in the application.
15* Windows on the addition are inconsistently shown with traditional casing, sill and drop cap. Details and specifications for the trim are not included in the application.
16* On the east side three of the windows on the addition have the same proportion as the windows on the historic house but with no muntins and asymmetrically sized sashes.
17* There are three horizontally-oriented windows proposed on the addition. There is one horizontal window existing on the west elevation.
18* The lower level of the addition on the west side has the appearance of an enclosed porch with wide eaves; the windows above follow the same proportion as the lower level doors.
19* There is a second-story covered porch on the upper level of the rear addition on the west side.

B. Removal of crape myrtle tree; planting of new tree; removal of portion of gravel patio; installation of new concrete pads patio is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.4, 2.3.5, and the following findings: (Raleigh City Code Section 10.2.15.E.1. states that "An 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 not be denied…However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of issuance…If the Commission finds that the 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 such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal.")

1* The crape myrtle proposed to be removed is medium sized, in the rear yard, and will be replaced. The species of the tree was not specified.

2* The new concrete pads are in the location of an existing gravel patio and adjacent to a concrete pad at the base of the west and south sides of the addition.

3* Concrete is a common material in the Boylan Heights historic district.

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

1. That either the addition be sided in wood or that the east elevation be modified so that the historic wood siding and fiber cement siding not be in the same plane.
2. That the windows being removed either be stored on site or made available for salvage.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Revised drawings to reflect condition 1;
   b. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan;
   c. Windows.
4. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the construction/installation:
   a. Doors;
   b. Window and door trim.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from staff comments. She specified the amendments to the application including that the cladding has been to be all horizontal siding and there is clarity on the retaining wall that's being proposed. She noted that with staff's comments the only item that may come up for discussion is the siding. As proposed, there is new fiber cement siding abutting historic siding. It is staff's suggestion is that there should be a change in plane.

Support:
Louis Cherry [affirmed], and Dan and Jill Ferguson [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Cherry said that they had nothing to add. The application stepped through the the guidelines and remunerated their response

Anna Bigelow, 1003 W South Street [affirmed], neighbor said that she thinks it looks great.

Rob Allen, 1008 W Lenoir Street [affirmed], neighbor also spoke in support. He noted that the application shows there are other examples of taller additions. He added that because the first floor plan is dropping down, the impact won't be great in terms of the neighborhood.

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

Questions:
Mr. Shackleton asked if there were any questions about the fiber cement being used in the same plane.

Mr. Davis asked the applicant if there were any plans to make a distinction between the two. Mr. Cherry said that there was a jog in the plane in the drawings presented to DRAC and fiber cement panels. After that discussion went to all horizontal siding. He added that it would be very easy to create a jog in the plane and differentiate.

Ms. Caliendo asked about aluminum clad windows. Ms. Tully said that aluminum clad windows have not been approved on an addition. She said that they know what they're looking for with detached new construction in aluminum windows. Ms. Tully noted that these are not replicative historic windows. She noted that so far the committee has seen that Herd and Jeld-Wen each have clad wood products with profiles that look enough like a wood window that they've approved them for detached new construction.

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

Committee Discussion

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

There are definitely precedents in Boylan Heights of additions of this nature. This is generally appropriate and does not detract. [Jackson]
Are we on same page for requiring a jog? (commissioners nodding) Yes. What about the windows? [Shackleton]
I know from previous evidence in prior cases that aluminum clad wood can look exactly like painted wood. The only thing we want the applicant to avoid is the diagonal seam. [David]

Staff commented that these windows are not intended to replicate historic windows. That's relevant in terms of that material being appropriate, since it's a modern addition. [Jackson]
This will be a game changer. If we approve, we are now going to see all aluminum clad windows in most of our applications. That may even lead to revised COA applications. We need to be cognizant of that. [David]
Is there anything that would make it appropriate for this style of addition where it would not be appropriate for another style of addition? [Shackleton]
I am currently inclined to approve the windows since we've seen in person that they look like wood windows, and as far as we know, there's no reason they will harm the historic resource. The style doesn't matter. They can look exactly like wood windows. [David]
They are replacing the tree. The height issue has been addressed, including neighbors stating that it would not be overwhelming. [Shackleton]

<u>Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law</u>

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Ms. Jackson and seconded by Ms. David, Ms. Jackson made an amended motion that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comments A. (inclusive of facts 1-19) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-3) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Removal of rear deck and addition; construction of new 2-story rear addition is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 4.2.1, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9, and the following findings:

1* Except for one tree proposed for removal (see comment B.) there are no trees directly impacted by the construction. There appear to be trees on adjacent properties whose roots may be impacted by construction activity. No tree protection plan was provided.

2* The lot size is 6,534 SF; the house is 920 SF including the front porch for lot coverage of 14%. The portion of the house being removed is 128 SF; the new addition is about 523 SF for new lot coverage of about 20%. This appears similar to that of the other houses on the 1000 block of E Cabarrus Street.

3* The house is a 1928 house is a one-story Bungalow with a hip roof with gable dormer, and a full façade engaged porch. There is a 1-story hipped roof bump-out and small rear deck.

4* Based on the 1950 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map a portion of the bump out used to be an open porch. The proposal removes this to accommodate the new addition. The commission commonly approves removal of rear bump-outs.

5* The existing elevation drawing shows a corner board and roof delineation at the bump-out. Photographs indicate continuous siding and no roof delineation.

6* The proposed addition is two stories, but due to the slope of the yard it reads as 1-½ stories.

7* Due to the slope of the yard the foundation height varies. From the first floor, the house is 17′ 2″ tall. The new addition rises 3′ 6″ above the historic house.

8* There are a few examples in Boylan Heights of additions that are taller than the historic house including at 1022 W South Street (COA 101-07-CA). That addition is about 6′ taller than the historic house.

9* The addition is at the rear of the house. It is inset on the west side and extends beyond the historic house by about 1′ on the east.

10* The roof of the addition is a simple hipped form with a deep eave and exposed rafters similar to the historic house.

11* Four windows on the existing house are proposed for removal to accommodate the addition. There is no indication as to what will be done with them. It is customary to reuse historic windows on additions.

12* On the east side of the house there is no physical delineation between the old and new.

13* The siding used on the addition will be fiber cement siding that matches the dimensions of the existing wood siding. The siding is specified as 6″ lap siding, 5/8″ thick painted to match. The use of smooth faced fiber cement siding has been approved on additions to historic houses, but not when the new siding is in the same plane as the historic siding.

14* Details and specifications for the aluminum clad windows are not included in the application.

15* Windows on the addition are inconsistently shown with traditional casing, sill and drop cap. Details and specifications for the trim are not included in the application.

16* On the east side three of the windows on the addition have the same proportion as the windows on the historic house but with no muntins and asymmetrically sized sashes.

17* There are three horizontally-oriented windows proposed on the addition. There is one horizontal window existing on the west elevation.

18* The lower level of the addition on the west side has the appearance of an enclosed porch with wide eaves; the windows above follow the same proportion as the lower level doors.

19* There is a second-story covered porch on the upper level of the rear addition on the west side.

20* The committee has heard testimony and seen samples of aluminum clad wood windows for previous applications and determined that with specific details they look the same as new wood windows.

B. Removal of crape myrtle tree; planting of new tree; removal of portion of gravel patio; installation of new concrete pads patio is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.4, 2.3.5, and the following findings: (Raleigh City Code Section 10.2.15.E.1. states that "An 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 not be denied…However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of issuance…If the Commission finds that the 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 such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal.")

1* The crape myrtle proposed to be removed is medium sized, in the rear yard, and will be replaced. The species of the tree was not specified.

2* The new concrete pads are in the location of an existing gravel patio and adjacent to a concrete pad at the base of the west and south sides of the addition.
3* Concrete is a common material in the Boylan Heights historic district.

Ms. David agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 6/0.

Decision on the Application

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

1. That either the addition be sided in wood or that the east elevation be modified so that the historic wood siding and fiber cement siding not be in the same plane.
2. That the windows being removed either be stored on site or made available for salvage.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Revised drawings to reflect condition 1;
   b. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan;
   c. Windows.
4. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the construction/installation:
   a. Doors;
   b. Window and door trim.

The motion was seconded by Ms. David; passed 6/0.

Committee members voting: Caliendo, David, Davis, Downer, Jackson, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 6/1/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

176-14-CA 520 N BLOUNT STREET
Applicant: MAGGIE MCDONALD & MACKEY MCDONALD
Received: 11/7/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 2/5/2015 1) 12/1/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BLOUNT STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: O&I-2, PDD
Nature of Project: Construct new 2-story house; ~~construct new driveway and curb cut~~; remove water oak tree; plant 2 ~~dogwood~~ trees; install plantings at foundation; construct new rear retaining wall and rear fence; install walkways; install rear patio
Amendments: Additional information was received November 24, 2014 and is attached to these comments. The driveway is no longer proposed. Revised drawings include a new site plan.
DRAC: The application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its November 19 meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker and Erin Sterling; also present were Maggie McDonald, Mackey McDonald, Jon Rufty, and Tania Tully.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes: File photos are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Construct new 2-story house; remove water oak tree; plant 2 dogwood trees; install plantings at foundation; construct new rear retaining wall and rear fence; install walkways; install rear patio
2.4	Fences and Walls	construct new rear retaining wall and rear fence
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	install walkways
4.3	New Construction	construct new 2-story house

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Construction of new 2-story house is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 4.3.1, 4.3.4, 4.3.5, 4.3.6, 4.3.7, 4.3.8, 4.3.9, 4.3.10, 4.3.11; however the use of cellular PVC windows is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 4.3.9, 4.3.10 and the following findings:

1* There are 3 trees located directly inside the north property line. They are a 26" DBH Ash tree, a 13" DBH Sugar Maple, and a 28" DBH Water Oak. The water oak is proposed for removal (See comment B).

2* A report prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture states that the north foundation would be located 9 feet away from the root flares of all 3 trees and would be a linear cut parallel with the property line and trees. It was his recommendation that based on a continuous footer and new driveway (no longer proposed) that the Ash and Water Oak be removed prior to construction due to the construction impact. There was no analysis based on pier construction rather than a continuous footer.

3* The applicants are choosing to retain the Ash and the Maple. A tree protection plan was not included in the application.

4* According to the online Wake County Real Estate Data, the lot is 11,326 SF. The footprint of the proposed house is 1,900 SF; porches are about 741 SF for a total footprint of approximately 2,641 SF for lot coverage of 23%, within the norm for Blount Street.

5* The lot appears to slope up slightly from the street and then becomes relatively flat until sloping back down towards the rear; it appears from the application that the house will sit 2 to 2-1/2 feet above the ground on a brick foundation; this is consistent with other houses on the block.

6* The house sits towards the right of the lot to be father away from the trees and to allow for a possible future driveway.

7* The house fronts onto Blount Street as is typical of the district. The application states that the front yard setback for the house at 630 N. Blount Street is 31'; the adjacent houses are set back 16' and 40'. A scaled site plan is not included.

8* The proposed height of the two-and-one-half story house is 35'8". As seen in the application photos, houses many houses in the district are 2 to 2 ½ stories in height. Actual heights of the immediately adjacent buildings were not included; the amended application includes a list of the heights of the historic buildings in the Blount Street Commons master plan. The new house is within the range of heights.

9* The proposed house is 2-stories with a moderately pitched hipped roof. It has a wide symmetrically balanced front façade with a central pediment and two-story porch.

10* The hipped-roof form of the house is not uncommon in the Blount Street district; examples of houses with double porches in both the Blount Street and Oakwood districts were included in the application.

11* Details of the house include exterior cove crown molding with a piece of inverted base cap, 10" freeze board with a heavy molded base cap, and large columns. The materials of and detailed drawings of the architectural were not included except for the columns.

12* The locations of windows are deliberate, have a sense of rhythm, and are in locations typical of other houses in the district. The windows are traditionally proportioned.

13* The front doors are solid wood with true divided lights. Details and specifications were not included in the application.

14* Shutters on the front façade are proposed to be operational and sized so that they could be closed.

15* The windows are simulated divided light double hung with 7/8″ muntins; the casing is 5/4″x4″ with a traditional window sill. Windows are proposed to be vinyl (cellular PVC) with simulated divided lights. The amended application includes some details and specifications. A sample is window is expected to be provided at the hearing.
16* The proposed windows are an extruded product that can be painted.
17* The commission has only approved either wood windows or aluminum clad wood windows in detached new construction. Cellular PCV has not been approved except for sills.
18* The application states that materials include cementitious lap siding with an 8" lap; wood doors; dimensional asphalt shingles on the house; metal roof on the porches; and a brick foundation. Photographs of materials were provided; samples and details were not. The material of the corner boards and trim is not stated.
19* Painted smooth faced fiber cement siding is regularly approved for detached new construction in the historic districts; most recently at 630 N Blount Street (061-14-CA). The application does specify that the house will be painted and colors were shown, but samples were not provided.

B. Removal of water oak tree; planting of 2 trees; installation of plantings at foundation; construction of new rear retaining wall and rear fence; installation of walkways is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.4, 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.4.8, 2.5.5, and the following findings: (Raleigh City Code Section 10.2.15.E.1. states that "An 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 not be denied…However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of issuance…If the Commission finds that the 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 such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal.")
1* The arborist report states that the 28″ DBH Water Oak cannot withstand construction of the new house. The removed tree is proposed to be replaced with either a Crimson Spice Oak or Blackjack Oak. A dogwood is also proposed.
2* Vegetation and small trees on the right side of the property are also proposed for removal.
3* The low retaining wall and new wood fence with gates are along the rear and side rear property lines as is typical. The new fence will abut the fencing that is currently in place on the right side of the property and will allow access to the garage located in the carriage house on the adjacent property.
4* The fence and gate designs were not included.
5* The front walkway goes directly from the sidewalk to the front of the house as is traditional in the historic district. Exact dimensions were not provided.
6* The finish of the concrete walkways and concrete paver patio are not provided. The commission typically requires a water-washed finish similar to historic concrete sidewalks in the district.

Staff recommends that the committee approve the amended application, waiving the 365-day demolition delay for the removal of the tree with the following conditions:

1. That the new windows either be wood or aluminum clad wood.
2. That the siding have a smooth finish.
3. That new concrete have a water-washed finish.
4. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan for the new house and general construction activity prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture that includes an analysis of a pier foundation and trees on adjacent properties whose roots may extend onto this property;
   b. Windows;
   c. Section drawings of eave, fascia and water table.
5. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction/installation:
   a. Doors;
   b. Window and door trim;
   c. Railings;
   d. Metal roofing;
   e. Trim material;
   f. Front steps;
   g. Concrete paver patio;
   h. Fence and gates designs;
   i. Front walkway.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from staff comments. She specified the amendments to the application for a new house removes the request for a driveway. It adds windows on the sides of the front portion of the house and the detail on upper level on rear balcony is lightened up a little bit. Information on the heights of other houses was provided as well as information on the proposed cellular PVC windows.

Support:
Maggie and Mackey McDonald [affirmed] were present to support the application. John Rufty [affirmed] and Parker Shanahan [affirmed] were also present to speak in support of the application. A full size sample of the proposed window was brought to the hearing and placed in view of the committee.

Mr. Shanahan immediately addressed the proposed windows. He noted that it looks like wood when it's painted and that they would choose the color shade very carefully. It is a PVC molded

material with several casing designs. They are proposing a putty glaze profile. Mr. Rufty added that it is a window that will never be structurally damaged with rot. It looks like a traditional wood product.

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

Questions:
Mr. Shackleton asked if the window was PVC construction or clad. Mr. Shanahan said that the jambs were wood. Anything exposed to the weather is PVC. It's assembled like a wood window.

Mr. Shackleton asked Ms. Tully if she remembered in the discussion regarding aluminum clad windows there a discussion that metal was a historic product. Ms. Tully said that she didn't remember that, but that there was testimony that the metal cladding acted like a really, really thick paint. She added that the committee required that the aluminum be painted, not a metallic finish. The other difference is that they had a wood window that you were looking at and comparing it to. Ms. Tully noted that if all else looks good other than the windows, they can make a decision on the bulk of the application, and then make a decision about the windows once you have more information. Additionally, the the proposed window type wasn't called out in the advertising of the application. The deferral would allow for the public to have an opportunity to see and be heard on a plastic window product. Ms. Tully said that she could provide the committee with the minutes from the aluminum clad discussions to read ahead of time if they so choose.

Support:
Matthew Brown [affirmed] asked to speak in support of application, especially compared to the atrocious applications for houses on Blount Street received a year ago. He said that this is much nicer, and he is very happy to see a home built here. He added though, that he agrees with staff recommended conditions that the windows should be wood or aluminum clad because of precedential danger of approving plastic.

Mr. Rufty agreed that there are multiple brands out there that don't have the historic look. This is not about all plastic windows. They use this particular product because of its details.

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

Committee Discussion

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

It would help to have wood window next to it. There is an extra line around the sash. I am inclined not to approve. [Caliendo]
I would like something to compare it to, for a greater knowledge. I wasn't part of the prior decision and would like to read the minutes. We may not want to tackle this tonight. [Jackson]

Are there any issues that anyone sees other than the windows? [Shackleton]
The width of the house, while compared to the one to the south, is really broad and appears to draw on Deep South rural architecture versus the urban scale that we tend to see in the historic districts generally. Blount Street in particular has some wider houses, but generally the houses have a bit of different scale. Even the really big ones are more narrow. The width of the double porches and the hip roof exaggerate that. The gable on the front roof exaggerates the width. [David]
In the examples presented on Blount Street, none of them had a full two story porch the width of the house. [Caliendo]
There are comparable monumental porches, but none that that go all the way across the house. [David]
Guideline 4.3.7 says to design the proportions…surrounding buildings. [Caliendo]
The Brooks' house is an outlier for Blount Street and not to be taken precedence from. [David]
It might be helpful to have some evidence about the width compared with other Blount Street houses. [Shackleton]
Info on the height of the houses was really helpful, for example. [Jackson]
We could defer for wood window sample, pull minutes for the window discussion, and request information from applicant on the width of the houses on Blount Street. [Shackleton]

At Mr. Shackleton's suggestion Ms. Caliendo moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be re-opened. Ms. David seconded; motion carried 6/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY(2)

One of the applicants asked when the commission is talking about the character of the district, if they are talking about just the street.

Ms. Tully said that Blount Street is the name of the district. There's a map (shows the one in the back of the Guidelines). It is mostly on Blount Street, but does extend onto Pace Street also. She also pointed out the special character essay that they should read.

Ms. Tully added that she was concerned with the comment about the Brooks' house being an outlier. It is a contributing resource to the district and either it is its contributing or it isn't. Ms. David noted that the scale was different. Ms. Tully agreed that it is less monumental. Ms. David said that her concern is its presence on the street regardless of how deep or shallow it is. This is a very rural characteristic.

Ms. Tully noted in the examples most of the double porches are in Oakwood, and I don't think the width pertains there. Ms. David said that the portico on Lane Street is monumental, but not wide. The Oakwood examples have spindly columns.

Ms. Tully said that what she was hearing is that a combination of the width of the house with the width of the porch, which makes it seem incongruous in the district.

Ms. Jackson said that it does go a long way towards compatibility in the district.

Mr. Rufty commented that accurate historic detail was very important to the owners, so they contracted with Michael Booth, who has been very involved in historic architecture down east. They looked for someone familiar with true architecture, and he spent time here before designing.

Mr. Brown added that it won't look as wide as the elevation because the wings are set back.

Ms. David suggested they could narrow the porch.

Ms. McDonald said that they specifically didn't copy the house across the street as they were told not to. She wanted it to be identified on its own. Ms. David suggested they come back with more information on the width of other porches and make the case. She is just sharing where in her mind she is on this. Ms. Jackson added that the examples should be specific to the Blount Street district, not Oakwood.

At Mr. Shackleton's suggestion Ms. Caliendo moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be re-closed. Ms. David seconded; motion carried 6/0.

Decision on the Application

Ms. Caliendo moved that the application be deferred for further information on the cellular PVC windows, including a wood window comparison and for more information about the width of other houses on Blount Street.

Committee members voting: Caliendo, David, Davis, Downer, Jackson, Shackleton.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Design Guidelines Update
2. Committee Discussion
    a. Application Completeness
    b. Meeting Post-Mortem

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner