RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
September 2, 2014

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Scott Shackleton called the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Committee meeting to order at 4:01 p.m.

ROLL CALL

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

Approval of the August 11, 2014 Minutes

Ms. David moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing and moved to adopt the minutes as submitted. Ms. Jackson seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

Minor Works

There were no questions regarding the Minor Work report.

The following is a list indicating persons in attendance and whether they were affirmed. Ms. Martha Lauer, Notary Public, administered the affirmation.

Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address	Affirmed
Stefan Bray, 1029 W South St 27603	Yes
Catherine P. Bray, 1029 W South St 27603	Yes
John B. Kerr, 1027 W South St 27603	Yes
Bain Jones, 5809-102 Departure Dr 27616	Yes
Susan Bray, 207 Linden Ave 27601	No
Jimmy Thiem, 634 N Blount St 27604	Yes
Mike Kennon, 222 W Hargett St 27601	No
Gil Johnson, 8716 Silver Thorne 27612	No
Greg Hatem, 230 Fayetteville St 27601	Yes
Patrick Nerz, 506 N Greensboro #39 27510	Yes
Charlotte Mitchell, 1117 Hillsborough St 27605	Yes
David Nicolay, 312 Mulberry St 27604	Yes
Bill Brideson, 312 N Blount St 27604	Yes
Jackie Merlano, 1029 W South St 27603	Yes
Mary Page, 218 Pace St 27604	No
Bret Page, 218 Pace St 27604	Yes
Gail Wiesner, 515 Euclid St 27604	Yes

Sarah Rex, 210 Pace St 27604	No
Randall Scott, 218 N East St 27601	Yes
Jason Queen, 207 Fayetteville St 27601	Yes
Emily Brinker, 1008 W South St 27603	Yes
Rob Allen, 1108 W Lenoir St 27603	No
Mon Peng Yueh, 726 Hadrian Dr 27529	Yes
Steve Schuster, 311-200 W Martin 27601	Yes
Jane Barabash, 910 W South 27603	Yes
Igor Barabash, 910 W South 27603	Yes
Don Becom, 308 N East St 27601	No
Terri Becom, 308 N East St 27601	No
Rebecca Morris, 219 E South St 27601	Yes
Jeffrey Sharp, 2000 Chichester Ct 27615	Yes

REVIEW OF SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. David moved to approve the agenda as printed. Ms. Jackson seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS

There were no objections to the approval of the Summary Proceedings without a public hearing. The committee reviewed and approved the following case 116-14-CA for which the Summary Proceeding is made part of these minutes.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – SUMMARY PROCEEDING

116-14-CA 541 E JONES STREET - R.O.W.
Applicant: CITY OF RALEIGH URBAN FORESTRY DIVISION
Received: 8/7/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 11/5/2014 1) 9/2/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Remove declining beech tree in right-of-way
Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Remove declining beech tree in right-of-way

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Removal of declining beech tree in right-of-way is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.5; 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 a 60′ tall American Beech, *Fagus grandifoliais* with a diameter at breast height (DBH) of 23.5 inches.

2* An inspection by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) revealed that: the tree is in decline and the top has broken out during a recent storm. The arborist states that as the tree continues to die, it will become more hazardous to pedestrians, motorists, and to the residents at 541 E Jones St.

3* According to the North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service housed at NC State University in the Department of Horticultural Science, American beech trees are deciduous and range from 50 feet to 80 feet in height. It is a large tree with very dense shade and shallow roots.

4* From November 30, 2007 to November 4, 2013 the Urban Forester has requested removal of thirty-eight (38) trees, all of which were determined by staff arborists to be dying, in decline, or hazardous. Of these, twenty- eight (28) were in the Oakwood Historic District.

5* The budget for tree planting in the City of Raleigh has been eliminated. The Urban Forestry Division of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Resources Department will replace public trees in residential areas through its NeighborWoods program or a Tree Planting Permit (citizen purchase).

6* In 2008 and 2009 the NeighborWoods program received two COAs (207-08-MW and 017-09-MW) for the planting of sixty-seven (67) new trees in the public right-of-way.

7* Since 2009 donations for the value of 35 trees have been made to NeighborWoods through the COA process.

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

1. That a large maturing tree as defined by the Urban Forester's "Suggested Street Trees for the City of Raleigh" be planted in Oakwood during the next NeighborWoods planting season.

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 on 116-14-CA. Ms. Jackson seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

Committee members voting: Belledin, David, Jackson, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 3/2/15.

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: 119-14-CA, 121-14-MW, 122-14-CA, 123-14-CA, 125-14-CA, 126-14-CA, 124-14-CA, and 127-14-CA.

Mr. Belledin is a principal in the architecture firm designing the project on case 123-14-CA. Ms. David moved to recuse Mr. Belledin from the case. Ms. Jackson seconded; motion carried 4/0. Mr. Belledin left the room. After the conclusion of the case Ms. David moved to allow Mr. Belledin back. Ms. Jackson seconded; motion carried 3/0.

Due to a joint public hearing with City Council on another matter and at Mr. Shackleton's suggestion, at 6:45 pm Ms. David moved that the meeting be temporarily adjourned. Ms. Jackson seconded; motion carried 4/0. Mr. Shackleton reopened the meeting at 7:30 pm.

Ms. Jackson works for the design firm on the application for case 124-14-CA. Ms. David moved to recuse Ms. Jackson from the case. Mr. Belledin seconded; motion carried 4/0.
Ms. Jackson left the room. After the conclusion of the case Ms. David moved to allow Ms. Jackson back. Mr. Belledin seconded; motion carried 3/0.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

119-14-CA 119 E HARGETT STREET
Applicant: EMPIRE PROPERTIES (JOHN MARTIN & PATRICK NERZ)
Received: 8/12/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 11/10/2014 1) 9/2/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT
Raleigh Historic Landmark: RALEIGH FURNITURE BUILDING
Zoning: DOD, BUS
Nature of Project: Install 36" wide by 61" tall by 6" deep projecting sign.
Amendments: Photos of historic signs were provided August 26, 2014.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- Ordinarily, review of a sign installation is eligible for minor work approval by staff. However, the sign scale in staff's judgment may not meet the guidelines. According to the commission's Bylaws and Rules of Procedure, Article XV, "Staff will refer Minor Work projects to the COA Committee for review if in staff's judgment the change involves alterations, additions, or removals that are substantial, do not meet the guidelines, or are of a precedent-setting nature."
- From the *Design Guidelines* "Signs in commercial districts can reflect the era and the character of the building and the historic district. Early photographs of Raleigh's commercial districts show a great variety of commercial signs, some of which may serve as prototypes for new commercial signage."
- The Raleigh Furniture Building was designated a Raleigh Historic Landmark in 2011. The report is available for review.
- The Report and Recommendation for the Designation of the Moore Square Area as a Historic Overlay District is available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.7	Lighting	Light projecting sign.
2.8	Signage	Install 36" wide by 61" tall by 6" deep projecting sign.

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Installation of a projecting sign is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.7.6, 2.7.7, 2.7.11, 2.8.2, 2.8.3, 2.8.4, 2.8.7, 2.8.10; however, the scale of the proposed sign **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.8.2 and 2.8.11 and the following findings:

1* From the National Register nomination (which also served as the local district designation report): "Although there was some further commercialization after World War I and II this was controlled and defined by the existing fabric. The significant visual characteristics of this area, therefore, are derived from late 19th and early 20th century building, and the surviving appurtenant features such as dressed granite curbstones, and the mature trees of Moore Square." and "It achieved its present significant character between ca. 1900-1930." Looking at the inventory list there is a c. 1940 building (131 E Hargett Street) listed as contributing.

2* One of the photos provided by the applicant in the amended application is from outside the period of significance (c.1945). In the other two photos (c. 1926 and c. 1911) the signs in the pictures are deep, but not tall.

3* There is an existing COA approved (146-08-MW, 30" deep x 18" tall) projecting sign on the building as well as signs on the fire escape that were installed without a COA.

4* Since 2008 there have been several projecting signs approved in the Moore Square Historic District: 225 S Wilmington Street (012-11-MW, 70" deep x 31.5" tall); 237 S Wilmington Street (042-10-CA, 19" deep x 84" tall); 131 S Wilmington Street (046-14-MW, 14" deep x 16"tall); 200 E Martin Street (050-11-MW, 36" deep x 21" tall); 117 E Hargett Street (058-08-MW, 36" deep x 12" tall); 223 S Wilmington Street (098-13-MW, 24" deep x 36" tall); 221 S Wilmington Street (143-12-MW, 27" deep x 102" tall)

5* A projecting sign at 108 1/2 E Hargett Street (025-12-MW; 42" deep x 120" tall) was denied because of its size and location.

6* The proposed sign is 36" deep x 61" tall.

Pending the committee's determination regarding the scale of the sign, staff recommends that the committee approve the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support:

Patrick Nerz [affirmed], Greg Hatem [affirmed], Empire Properties were present to speak in support of the application. Handouts of historic photographs, sizes of recently approved signs, and photos of current signs in the Moore Square Historic District were distributed. Mr. Nerz said that in thinking about the size of the sign, he was thinking from both a historical and contemporary perspective. He found pictures from the period of significance that show projecting signs on same block, and from just after 1943. From the contemporary perspective, he

was looking at other signs that have been approved through the COA process including Moore Square Transit Station, Joule, Chucks, and Marbles. The Proposed sign fits in this sort of context. The square footage of the sign is slightly smaller than the sign at Marbles and Moore Square Transit Station and smaller than the Busy Bee sign. He also looked at the ratio of the sign square footage noting that of the buildings he looked at, this one has the smallest sign ratio. It is within the range of what's been accepted in the past.

Tania Tully [affirmed] noted that the staff comments mention by address in fact #4 are the signs for which they provided photos. Staff Comments do not include the Marbles sign, but the other 4 on Wilmington street are included in her staff comments. She also added that as she pulled previous decisions, she did change initial judgment. This is why she left it as a "may."
Mr. Belledin asked staff if comments were before or after handouts. Ms. Tully said before, once she'd pulled the sign cases.

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. Jackson seconded; motion carried 4/0.

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
Add fact that additional info was provided about size and ratio at the meeting. [Belledin]
The proposed is the smallest number in terms of ratio. [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 comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-6) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following additional facts and modifications as stated below:

A. Installation of a projecting sign is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.7.6, 2.7.7, 2.7.11, 2.8.2, 2.8.3, 2.8.4, 2.8.7, 2.8.10, 2.8.11, and the following findings:

1* From the National Register nomination (which also served as the local district designation report): "Although there was some further commercialization after World War I and II this was controlled and defined by the existing fabric. The significant visual characteristics of this area, therefore, are derived from late 19th and early 20th century building, and the surviving appurtenant features such as dressed granite curbstones, and the mature trees of Moore Square." and "It achieved its present significant character between ca. 1900-1930." Looking at the inventory list there is a c. 1940 building (131 E Hargett Street) listed as contributing.

2* One of the photos provided by the applicant in the amended application is from outside the period of significance (c.1945). In the other two photos (c. 1926 and c. 1911) the signs in the pictures are deep, but not tall.
3* There is an existing COA approved (146-08-MW, 30″ deep x 18″ tall) projecting sign on the building as well as signs on the fire escape that were installed without a COA.
4* Since 2008 there have been several projecting signs approved in the Moore Square Historic District: 225 S Wilmington Street (012-11-MW, 70″ deep x 31.5″ tall); 237 S Wilmington Street (042-10-CA, 19″ deep x 84″ tall); 131 S Wilmington Street (046-14-MW, 14" deep x 16"tall); 200 E Martin Street (050-11-MW, 36″ deep x 21″ tall); 117 E Hargett Street (058-08-MW, 36″ deep x 12″ tall); 223 S Wilmington Street (098-13-MW, 24″ deep x 36″ tall); 221 S Wilmington Street (143-12-MW, 27″ deep x 102″ tall)
5* A projecting sign at 108 1/2 E Hargett Street (025-12-MW; 42″ deep x 120″ tall) was denied because of its size and location.
6* The proposed sign is 36″ deep x 61″ tall.
7* New information was provided by the applicant at the public hearing regarding the scale and size of other recently approved signs.
8* The proposed sign has the smallest size in terms of ratio.

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

Decision on the Application

Ms. David made a motion that the application be approved as amended.

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

Committee members voting: Belledin, David, Jackson, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 3/2/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

121-14-MW 115 E HARGETT STREET
Applicant: NORTH CAROLINA BOARD OF BARBER EXAMINERS
Received: 8/8/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 11/6/2014 1) 9/2/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT
Raleigh Historic Landmark: GRAND UNITED ORDER OF ODD FELLOWS BUILDING
Zoning: DOD, BUS
Nature of Project: Remove barber pole
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- Ordinarily, review of a sign removal is eligible for minor work approval by staff. According to the commission's Bylaws and Rules of Procedure, Article XV, "Staff will refer Minor Work projects to the COA Committee for review if in staff's judgment the change involves alterations, additions, or removals that are substantial, do not meet the guidelines, or are of a precedent-setting nature."
- The Grand United Order of Odd Fellows Building was designated a Raleigh Historic Landmark in 2011. The report and ordinance are available for review.
- The Report and Recommendation for the Designation of the Moore Square Area as a Historic Overlay District is available for review.
- The application is requesting removal due to a violation of North Carolina General Statute 86A-2.
- Ownership is a civil matter not under the jurisdiction of the commission.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.8	Signage	Remove barber pole.

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Removal of barber pole **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.8.1 and the following findings:

1* From the National Register nomination (which also served as the local district designation report): "Although there was some further commercialization after World War I and II this was controlled and defined by the existing fabric. The significant visual characteristics of

this area, therefore, are derived from late 19th and early 20th century building, and the surviving appurtenant features such as dressed granite curbstones, and the mature trees of Moore Square." and "It achieved its present significant character between ca. 1900-1930." Looking at the inventory list there is a c. 1940 building (131 E Hargett Street) listed as contributing.

2* The Grand United Order of Odd Fellows (GUOOF) Building is architecturally and historically significant as the oldest and one of only two remaining buildings associated with African-American Secret/Benevolent Societies in Raleigh.

3* According to the landmark designation report the building housed a barber as early as 1917 and Capitol Barber Shop, once known as Capital City Barber Shop, was at this location from 1932 to at least 2011.

4* The barber pole is not mentioned in the landmark designation report. No information regarding the age of the pole is included in the application.

5* The application states that "while the building is a historic property, the pole in question has nothing to do with the integrity of the building…" but does not include documentation to support the assertion.

Staff makes no recommendation **pending the commission's determination regarding the significance of the barber pole.**

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support:
Bain Jones [affirmed], representing Barber Examiners was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Jones distributed handouts that included some items from the application plus correspondence between the tenant and the NC Board of Barber Examiners. He recognizes the fact that were not clear which building we were talking about initially. They thought they were applying for Heilig Levine building because of a misplaced plaque. He said that they are actually dealing with the Grand United Order of Odd Fellows Building. Mr. Jones said that the problem is that the business with the barber pole is advertising as if they are approved by the Board of Examiners as a barber, and they are not. He pointed out the letters showing that this business is misrepresenting himself as a barber to various governmental entities. The greater issue is what it is being used for in present. He said that he is requesting that the commission temporarily remove the barber pole while there is a tenant that is not a barber renting the space.

Opposition:
Greg Hatem [affirmed], the building owner spoke in opposition to the application. He said that there is a misunderstanding here about the request, noting that the sign that actually exists on the building has been on the building since the twenties. Mr. Hatem said that when they purchased the building in 2001, they restored the sign. He noted that there had been barbers in there previously and has seen documents from city licensing going back to 1927, which is within the period of significance. Mr. Hatem distributed several illustrations from historic

catalogs, including one from 1929. He noted that example #6 on the Kochs' document is the pole on his building. There is also Paidar #373 as an example of the same type of barber pole from the 20s and 30s. He stated that the misconception here is that the barber pole exists for the tenant. It doesn't, it exists for the building. Mr. Hatem explained that when they renovated the building they used the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, which includes restoration of signs. They used the tax credits not just for the barber shop but also for the sign itself. Mr. Hatem pointed out that in the rehabilitation manual from the National Park Service (distributed), they cite this building and restoration as an example of how these things should be done. In addition to that a spring 2010 Heritage Matters brochure (also distributed) illustrates the barbershop as what the NPS sees as being appropriate. It benefits the history and the historic district in Raleigh.

Ms. David asked the applicant if he knew how long the pole had been on building. Mr. Jones said no, but we know it was there during the time period. He said that he understands the history, but the problem has to do with the fact that it is impossible to distinguish the tenant from the barber shop industry. The shop is holding itself out to be a barber shop.

Mr. Belledin asked staff to clarify that this review is limited only to the facts and that they can only rule on whether or not the barber pole is part of the historic significance of the district and building. Tania Tully [affirmed] said yes, she had consulted city attorney but not yet received definitive guidance. Her suggestion was that they hear all evidence today, but that they might not want to rule today until they've gotten guidance from the City Attorney. There might be a conflict in the City Code. Ms. Tully said yes, from the Design Guidelines standpoint all the committee is looking at is whether or not this is a significant feature. She requested they please state out loud what was submitted.

Mr. Shackleton said they received from Mr. Hatem a 1929 Kotch's revolving barbers pole catalogue, a Paidar Barbershop Catalogue, photographs of existing building prior to renovation 2002, the restored barber poll fall 2007, and the tax incentives document with barber poles.

Mr. Shackleton asked staff about the process. He asked if they can we make a decision and make it administrative. Ms. Tully said that they could go ahead and make a decision, and let staff deal with it if there's a legal issue.

Mr. Shackleton asked Mr. Jones if there would be a problem if it was a non-hair-related business. Mr. Jones said no, that this particular tenant is trying to represent himself as barber.

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

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
From the historic building perspective it looks a lot like #6. [David]
It does contribute to the historic character of the building. [Jackson]
It has been a barber shop since the 1920s. We have no picture of the building without a barber pole. If there is a conflict about what's happening inside the building, if it's a barber shop or not, is outside our purview. [David]
How do you feel about temporary? [Shackleton]
How do you regulate that? [Belledin]
Once it's down, where is it? In an antique store, somebody's garage? [David]
Absent any evidence that it didn't exist in the 1920s, it is appropriate. [Belledin]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Mr. Belledin moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-5) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following additional facts and modifications as stated below:

A. Removal of barber pole is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.8.1 and the following findings:

1* From the National Register nomination (which also served as the local district designation report): "Although there was some further commercialization after World War I and II this was controlled and defined by the existing fabric. The significant visual characteristics of this area, therefore, are derived from late 19th and early 20th century building, and the surviving appurtenant features such as dressed granite curbstones, and the mature trees of Moore Square." and "It achieved its present significant character between ca. 1900-1930." Looking at the inventory list there is a c. 1940 building (131 E Hargett Street) listed as contributing.

2* The Grand United Order of Odd Fellows (GUOOF) Building is architecturally and historically significant as the oldest and one of only two remaining buildings associated with African-American Secret/Benevolent Societies in Raleigh.

3* According to the landmark designation report the building housed a barber as early as 1917 and Capitol Barber Shop, once known as Capital City Barber Shop, was at this location from 1932 to at least 2011.

4* The barber pole is not mentioned in the landmark designation report. No information regarding the age of the pole is included in the application.

5* The application states that "while the building is a historic property, the pole in question has nothing to do with the integrity of the building…" but does not include documentation to support the assertion.

6* Evidence was submitted by the building owner that the barber pole has been on the building since the 1920s.

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

Decision on the Application

Mr. Belledin made a motion that the application be denied.

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

Committee members voting: Belledin, David, Jackson, Shackleton.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

122-14-CA 630 N BLOUNT STREET
Applicant: THOMAS BYRNE HUDDLESTON
Received: 8/11/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 11/9/2014 1) 9/2/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BLOUNT STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: O&I-1
Nature of Project: Remove 5 trees in rear yard [after-the-fact]; plant 36 new trees
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- It is the practice of the commission to treat After-the-Fact applications as though the work has not yet been completed.
- COA files 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	Remove 5 trees in rear yard [after-the-fact]; plant 36 new trees

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Removal of 5 trees in rear yard; planting of new trees is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.5; however removal of healthy trees 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 trees proposed for removal in the application are two 18" trees of unstated species; one 15" maple; and twin mulberry's of unknown diameter. Based on the limited information provided the trees appear to be deciduous overstory trees.

2* Staff visited the site on August 4, 2014 and observed the trunks and stumps remaining from removed trees. There appears to be a tree near the bend in the lot line missing from the survey that has been removed.

3* The trees proposed for replanting are 25 Little Gem Magnolias with a mature height of 20 feet, 4 Southern Magnolias with a mature height of 60-80 feet; 5 Cryptomeria with a mature height of 50-80 feet and 2 Gold Rider Cypress with a mature height of 35 feet. Their planting calipers are unknown:

4* Of the 36 trees 4 are already counted towards replacement of trees approved with COA 061-14-CA.

5* According to the North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service housed at NC State University in the Department of Horticultural Science, Little Gem magnolia trees are evergreen and range from 15 feet to 20 feet in height. It has an upright dense form and a width of 8-10 ft.

6* According to the North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service housed at NC State University in the Department of Horticultural Science, Southern Magnolia trees are evergreen and range from 40 feet to 80 feet in height. It has a dense, conical shape and symmetrical form and a width of 30-40 ft.

7* According to the North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service housed at NC State University in the Department of Horticultural Science, Japanese cryptomeria trees are evergreen and range from 50 feet to 60 feet in height. It has a pyramidal; semiformal form and a width of 25-30 ft. This may not be the exact species proposed.

8* According to the Washington State University Clark County Extension, Gold Rider Leyland Cypress trees are evergreen; over time this tree can grow to a height of 35 feet and a width of 15 feet. After 10 years it may attain a height of 10′. It has a columnar to pyramidal form. This may not be the exact species proposed.

9* The new trees are proposed to be planted along the perimeter of the rear yard and will likely have a screening effect.

10* The trees proposed to be planted are evergreen and of a different character than the trees removed.

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

1. That an equal number of replacement trees of similar or identical species to the trees removed be planted on the property during the next tree planting season with the location and species to be provided to and approved by staff prior to planting.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support:

Charlotte Mitchell [affirmed], attorney, was present to speak on behalf of the Huddlestons. She stated that the Huddlestons removed 5 trees before receiving a COA. Ms. Mitchell added that the staff approved the tree protection plan with 36 replacement trees in August and it looks like staff is recommending a few more trees be planted for replacement.

Questions:
Jimmy Thiem [affirmed], a neighbor spoke not to the case, but to the process and the COA case from 2 months ago. He stated the need for clarification for both applicants and neighbors. Mr. Thiem noted that the site plan did not indicate any changes to the rear of the property, tree removals etc. He reminded the committee that he testified two months ago that no other trees were shown on application, but that Dr. Dewitt, at the time she was working on their 2012 COA application, was asked to show protection of the one tree on an adjacent property. There was no tree protection plan submitted this time, and staff was told approve the submittal. Mr. Thiem thinks that the plans for the new house were approved without enough information. He objected to the responsibility of the tree protection plan being deferred to staff, because it took away the opportunity for folks to review it. The approval also did not clarify what activity would happen on rest of site, therefore it was unclear in application as to what was the degree of impact at the rear of the site would be. Finally, he noted that it's important to clarify what the policies are for saving trees on adjacent properties. If the Dewitts had to protect the tree on the adjacent property, shouldn't this applicant have to do the same. Mr. Thiem urged the committee to be clear whose trees are we saving.

Opposition:
Bret Page [affirmed], neighbor spoke in opposition to the application. Mr. Page said that he recently reviewed the tree protection plan that Huddlestons submitted. After doing so, he noticed three trees directly behind his house were not on the plan but were removed and likely to have been regulated. Mr. Page distributed photographs of the trees and stumps noting that the last page shows a map of the approximate locations of trees. His goal was to bring these trees to everyone's attention in the event that this may impact the future development of this site.

Sarah Rex [affirmed], adjacent property owner, spoke in opposition to the application. Ms. Rex Said that neighbors were surprised by what happened. Many of these trees were right at the fence line and didn't need to be cut down. She noted that now they have a direct view of the commercial side of the block with Krispy Kreme, etc. She asked the committee to consider requesting a certain caliper of tree so that they get coverage as soon as the committee deems reasonable.

Bill Brideson [affirmed], neighbor; his lot is just south pf this property. Mr. Brideson pointed out that in the pencil sketch in the application he has at least one mulberry that was measured by him at 27" and a holly whose critical root zones are in the area of the project. He submits that this application is incomplete, because it doesn't show his trees. In addition, he states that his trees are already being impacted by the project. Mr. Brideson said that there are two dumptruck loads of dirt and a bobcat sitting near these trees. He asked that the committee require that the trees on adjacent properties be considered in applications. He also stated that he is concerned that the trees being replanted will be large which means large holes which might affect existing trees. Tania Tully [affirmed] clarified where his trees are located.

Michael Osborne [affirmed], adjacent property owner, spoke in opposition to the application. He noted that he agreed with Bret's photos. He stated that the lack of communication has been biggest upsetting thing. There was nothing that could be seen that was approved, miscommunication with contractor who said they wouldn't be cut down but then were gone the next day, and being unsure what contractor did above and beyond what was ordered. Mr. Osborne suggested that the new plan needs to have requirements on how large the trees are. Bright lights and a dumpster are now visible for his property. To the extent of committee's ability, he would like to see an effort made to replace the tree canopy as soon as possible.

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

Ms. David noted that in the previous hearing, there was very little information about what was going to happen on the site. She commented that they heard from Mr. Thiem about what trees were there. She asked staff what was submitted for a tree protection plan.

Ms. Tully said that as required, a tree survey was submitted and a tree protection plan that included language about tree fencing, watering of trees, and an associated drawing that referenced the large willow tree plus a pecan tree being kept in front yard as well as one tree along the south property line and adjacent trees near the house. What it didn't do, was completely block off entire rest of the lot. Ms. Tully explained that in the original approval, there was a condition that should trees be recommended for removal in order to construct the house, that the committee didn't know about, that those would be replaced. When the applicant submitted the tree survey with tees noted for removal, staff only approved removal of trees that needed to be removed at the site of the house. She told the applicants that the other trees would have needed to come back. Unfortunately, that was after the fact, they had already taken down the trees in back.

Ms. Tully commented on the concept of planting larger caliper trees, saying that it that has been required in the past. She also said that there have also been situations where the committee required an equal number of caliper of trees be replaced as dbh removed, but that was for a much larger space.

Ms. David asked Ms. Mitchell if she knew about the trees. Ms. Mitchell said that they were removed because they were along the fence line and didn't have information about the health of the trees.

Ms. Tully noted that the trees are not coming back. She said that it was similar to when windows removed are taken to the dump and unrecoverable. The key is to be thoughtful about what is to be put back. Urgency is not here, if you need to think about what needs to go back. She said that she walked the site in addition to what was provided in the application. In her photos she is unable to be certain which tree is which stump.

Mr. Shackleton said that it sounds like two things. Many times what the commission is looking at is the historic character of the canopy. In this case, it's not just the canopy but the visual block between the residential and commercial areas. He wanted to bring this up so they can think about a solution to replacing them. He suggested that it may not be best to go with staff's recommendation; it may be better to put different species in to be screening plants. Ms. Tully commented that it looked to her like what was proposed to go back wasn't canopy.

Mr. Shackleton asked if the application included the caliper or size of what they are going to plant. Ms. Tully said that it looked like they provided height; B&B she thinks is bulb and burlapped. She reminded the committee that there is also a concern that new big trees being planted would hurt existing trees and that the folks that have conflict with the application are speaking about two different areas of the site.

Ms. Mitchell said that she was not clear about what the committee was talking about. She asked if they had gone beyond the five trees in the staff report. She asked why and what is the jurisdiction of RHDC. Mr. Belledin said that the proposed five replacement trees are to replace the canopy that has been lost and noted that the planting plan begins to address the screening issue, which is separate. Mr. Shackleton said that the planting plan may cover the screening, or not. The issue is the historic character is from both the canopy and the screening, which has been lost.

Ms. Tully suggested that they could request additional information such as caliper and height. The committee may want to see some visual representation as to what is being proposed such as the height of new trees at planting. Also the growth rate of the plants of the screening that has already been approved would be useful to see if that is already taking care of screening issue.

Ms. Mitchell asked if trees are regulated. Ms. Tully said yes, trees of 8" dbh or greater.

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

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

Decision on the Application

Mr. Belledin made a motion that the application be deferred pending receipt of additional information regarding proposed replacement trees.

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

Committee members voting: Belledin, David, Jackson, Shackleton.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

123-14-CA 233 S WILMINGTON STREET
Applicant: MON PENG YUEH FOR THE CITY OF RALEIGH
Received: 8/12/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 11/10/2014 1) 9/2/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: DOD, BUS
Nature of Project: Alter existing non-historic Moore Square transit station including: modify curb cuts; remove hargett street "wall"; remove stair and elevator tower, ticket booth, restrooms, and elevated walkway; construct new stair and elevator tower, ticket booth, and restroom in interior of parking deck; remove and replace existing hardscape and landscape in courtyard; replace bus shelters.
Conflict of Interest: Mr. Belledin is a principal in the architecture firm designing the project. Ms. David moved to recuse Mr. Belledin from the case. Ms. Jackson seconded; motion carried 4/0. Mr. Belledin left the room.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.1	Public Rights-of-Way and Alleys	modify curb cuts
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	remove and replace existing hardscape and landscape in courtyard; replace bus shelters; remove hargett street "wall"
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	modify curb cuts
3.11	Accessibility, Health, and Safety Considerations	remove and replace existing hardscape and landscape in courtyard
4.2	Additions	construct new stair and elevator towers, ticket booth, and restroom in interior of parking deck
5.2	Demolition	remove stair and elevator tower, ticket booth, restrooms, and elevated walkway; remove hargett street "wall"

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Removal of stair and elevator tower, ticket booth, restrooms, and elevated walkway; construction of new stair and elevator tower, ticket booth, and restroom is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines*, 4.2.1, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.8, 4.2.9 and the following findings; however there is not enough information to determine congruity of the specifics of the new work.:

1* The existing Moore Square Transit Station was constructed in 1986. None of the features being removed are historic.

2* All new architectural elements are located in the middle of the block and the rear of the historic buildings.

3* The form and scale of the new elements are similar to the elements being removed. The new elevator/stair towers are lower in height than the existing tower and are approximately 15 feet taller the garage.

4* The existing facility is brick. The new buildings, including the elevator shaft, will have metal panel exterior wall finish. The new stair tower will have steel frame structure with perforated metal panel exterior. Details, material samples, and colors were not included in the application.

5* Elevation and 3-D drawings which illustrate the scale of the proposed new architectural features are included in the application.

B. Removal and replacement of existing hardscape and landscape in courtyard; replacement of bus shelters; modification of curb cuts; removal of hargett street "wall" is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section 2.1.1, 2.1.8, 2.1.9, 2.1.12, 2.3.1, 2.3.9, 2.5.8, 2.5.11, 3.11.2; however there is not enough information to determine congruity of the specifics of the new work.

1* The existing Moore Square Transit Station was constructed in 1986. Note of the features being removed are historic and no additional lot coverage is proposed.

2* There is no historic granite curbing at the location of the curb cut alterations. It is unclear from the application if the continuity of the sidewalk will be maintained.

3* The existing planter walls, trellis, elevated walkway and landscaping will be removed. Trees are being removed and replanted; specifics regarding species and locations of trees and plantings were not included.

4* The topography of the courtyard will be modified for greater safety for disabled access.

5* The new bus shelter canopies will have steel posts and beams with tension cables to support roof panels that may be translucent or opaque. Seating areas will be protected with clear back panels. The bush shelter design reduces the need for a lot of posts. The application includes larger scale drawings of the proposed canopies, but no details regarding materials and colors.

6* Perforated panels are proposed to screen the bus shelter areas from the lower level parking. Detailed information regarding the appearance, materials, and colors was not included in the application.
7* Materials proposed for the new hardscaping are concrete and concrete pavers; details pattern and colors were not included in the application.
8* New exterior wall panels with bold graphics and signage are proposed on the northeast corner of the garage; information regarding materials and colors were not included in the application.
9* New lighting and signage, including digital bus schedules are shown in the application; however there is not enough information to make a determination regarding appropriateness.

Staff recommends that the committee approve the application as follows and with the following conditions:

1. That the footprint, location, height and form, of the new architectural elements be approved.
2. That the proposed demolition and removal of existing non-historic features be approved.
3. That the general layout of the proposed new landscaping and hardscaping be approved.
4. That a new Major Work COA application(s) be filed for the new landscape and hardscape features; design and materials of the new architectural elements; new lighting, signage, and bus shelters.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support:
Steve Schuster [affirmed] and Mon Peng Yueh [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Schuster said that he was pleased with the staff recommendations. He noted that with such a large project, gaps will be filled once basic lines are approved. Community input through the initial phases has more than doubled the size of the project. Mr. Schuster explained that they just finished the schematic design and are beginning discussion of materials and pattern/design. He acknowledged that that they will need to take a few trees down but will bring that information back.

Tania Tully [affirmed] explained that the wording of the recommendation is very specific due to the City Attorney's determination that conceptual COAs cannot be approved. This was used for the Blount Street Commons project and Marbles and is nothing the committee hasn't seen before, process-wise.

Mr. Schuster said that they are trying to focus on the pedestrian experience by taking down and relocating stairs, removing shelters, etc. The paving material and canopies are critical, and will bring it forward further in the design process. The transit authority has reviewed and approved the proposal and City Council gave positive feedback.

Questions:
Gail Wiesner [affirmed] said that from things she's read in other cities where they have used transparent panels and metal, it's been a huge maintenance nightmare. Mr. Schuster responded that it was a very appropriate comment. He said they have the obligation to look at long term maintenance considerations as well as construction costs.

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. Jackson seconded; motion carried 3/0.

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
The staff comments will help us make good decisions making forward. Not incongruous at this point with staff's recommendations. [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 1-5) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-9) to be acceptable as findings of fact as stated below:

A. Removal of stair and elevator tower, ticket booth, restrooms, and elevated walkway; construction of new stair and elevator tower, ticket booth, and restroom is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines*, 4.2.1, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.8, 4.2.9 and the following findings; however there is not enough information to determine congruity of the specifics of the new work.

1* The existing Moore Square Transit Station was constructed in 1986. None of the features being removed are historic.

2* All new architectural elements are located in the middle of the block and the rear of the historic buildings.

3* The form and scale of the new elements are similar to the elements being removed. The new elevator/stair towers are lower in height than the existing tower and are approximately 15 feet taller the garage.

4* The existing facility is brick. The new buildings, including the elevator shaft, will have metal panel exterior wall finish. The new stair tower will have steel frame structure with perforated metal panel exterior. Details, material samples, and colors were not included in the application.

5* Elevation and 3-D drawings which illustrate the scale of the proposed new architectural features are included in the application.

B. Removal and replacement of existing hardscape and landscape in courtyard; replacement of bus shelters; modification of curb cuts; removal of hargett street "wall" is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section 2.1.1, 2.1.8, 2.1.9, 2.1.12, 2.3.1, 2.3.9, 2.5.8, 2.5.11, 3.11.2; however there is not enough information to determine congruity of the specifics of the new work.

1* The existing Moore Square Transit Station was constructed in 1986. Note of the features being removed are historic and no additional lot coverage is proposed.

2* There is no historic granite curbing at the location of the curb cut alterations. It is unclear from the application if the continuity of the sidewalk will be maintained.

3* The existing planter walls, trellis, elevated walkway and landscaping will be removed. Trees are being removed and replanted; specifics regarding species and locations of trees and plantings were not included.

4* The topography of the courtyard will be modified for greater safety for disabled access.

5* The new bus shelter canopies will have steel posts and beams with tension cables to support roof panels that may be translucent or opaque. Seating areas will be protected with clear back panels. The bush shelter design reduces the need for a lot of posts. The application includes larger scale drawings of the proposed canopies, but no details regarding materials and colors.

6* Perforated panels are proposed to screen the bus shelter areas from the lower level parking. Detailed information regarding the appearance, materials, and colors was not included in the application.

7* Materials proposed for the new hardscaping are concrete and concrete pavers; details pattern and colors were not included in the application.

8* New exterior wall panels with bold graphics and signage are proposed on the northeast corner of the garage; information regarding materials and colors were not included in the application.

9* New lighting and signage, including digital bus schedules are shown in the application; however there is not enough information to make a determination regarding appropriateness.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the footprint, location, height and form, of the new architectural elements be approved.
2. That the proposed demolition and removal of existing non-historic features be approved.
3. That the general layout of the proposed new landscaping and hardscaping be approved.
4. That a new Major Work COA application(s) be filed for the new landscape and hardscape features; design and materials of the new architectural elements; new lighting, signage, and bus shelters.

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

Committee members voting: David, Jackson, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 3/2/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

125-14-CA 910 W SOUTH STREET
Applicant: IGOR AND JANE BARABASH
Received: 8/13/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 11/11/2014 1) 9/2/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Remove non-historic rear deck; alter non-historic shed addition; construct new 1-story rear addition.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Setting	Alter non-historic shed addition; construct new 1-story rear addition.
3.7	Windows and Doors	Remove one window.
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Remove non-historic rear deck; alter non-historic shed addition; construct new 1-story rear addition.

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Removal of non-historic rear deck; alteration of non-historic shed addition; construction of new 1-story rear addition is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 3.7.1, 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* There are trees on the property that may be impacted by construction of the addition. One tree is very near the existing shed roofed addition.

2* The change to the rear shed moves construction farther from the existing large tree. A tree protection plan is included in the application but it is unclear how adjacent trees, if any, will be protected, where the proposed mulch is to go, and was not prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA).

3* According to Wake County tax records the lot size is 21,351 SF. The footprint of the existing house (including porches and decks) is 2,998 SF; the existing garage is 400 SF; current lot coverage is 16%. The existing deck is 232 SF and the non-historic rear shed is 78 SF; the new addition including the re-worked rear shed is 320 SF. The proposed footprint of the house is approximately 1,591 SF for new lot coverage of 27%.

4* The existing house is a circa 1923 one-story hip roofed brick bungalow with attached off-center one-story porch with gable facing the street and deep eaves resting on brackets. It is a contributing resource to the historic district.
5* The existing non historic deck will be replaced with the sunroom addition.
6* The roof of the rear addition is lower than the historic house and the historic porch gable; a roof plan was included in the application. The addition is inset from the historic house and does not overwhelm the existing house.
7* The roof of the shed will be changed to metal and remain a shed; the rear addition is to have the appearance of a sunroom and will have a hipped roof and deep eaves similar to the historic house. A detailed drawing of the trim and eave was included in the application.
8* The windows in the addition are wood 1/1 and very tall in proportion so as to give the appearance of an enclosed porch. Specifications and details for the new windows and door are included in the application.
9* The shed has German siding; the new addition will have siding to match and the siding and window on the shed will be reused.
10* One window in the brick will remain and one will be removed; there is no indication of what will happen with the removed window.

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

1. That the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Revised tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the ISA.
2. That the window on the rear wall being removed either be stored on site or made available for salvage.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support:
Emily Brinker [affirmed] and Igor and Jane Barabash [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Brinker stated that they were adding on a family room, removing a deck, adding an addition and keeping the existing window on the addition, and the original window will actually be used inside the house dividing the old and new.

In response to a question Tania Tully [affirmed] explained that sometimes staff recommends an arborist prepared protection plan, and sometimes not. It depends on proximity of tree. Ms. Barabash said that the addition will be further away from the tree.

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

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
Good application, a lot of detail. [Shackleton]
I agree with staff. [Belledin]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

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

A. Removal of non-historic rear deck; alteration of non-historic shed addition; construction of new 1-story rear addition is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 3.7.1, 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* There are trees on the property that may be impacted by construction of the addition. One tree is very near the existing shed roofed addition.

2* The change to the rear shed moves construction farther from the existing large tree. A tree protection plan is included in the application but it is unclear how adjacent trees, if any, will be protected, where the proposed mulch is to go, and was not prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA).

3* According to Wake County tax records the lot size is 21,351 SF. The footprint of the existing house (including porches and decks) is 2,998 SF; the existing garage is 400 SF; current lot coverage is 16%. The existing deck is 232 SF and the non-historic rear shed is 78 SF; the new addition including the re-worked rear shed is 320 SF. The proposed footprint of the house is approximately 1,591 SF for new lot coverage of 27%.

4* The existing house is a circa 1923 one-story hip roofed brick bungalow with attached off-center one-story porch with gable facing the street and deep eaves resting on brackets. It is a contributing resource to the historic district.

5* The existing non historic deck will be replaced with the sunroom addition.

6* The roof of the rear addition is lower than the historic house and the historic porch gable; a roof plan was included in the application. The addition is inset from the historic house and does not overwhelm the existing house.

7* The roof of the shed will be changed to metal and remain a shed; the rear addition is to have the appearance of a sunroom and will have a hipped roof and deep eaves similar to the historic house. A detailed drawing of the trim and eave was included in the application.

8* The windows in the addition are wood 1/1 and very tall in proportion so as to give the appearance of an enclosed porch. Specifications and details for the new windows and door are included in the application.

9* The shed has German siding; the new addition will have siding to match and the siding and window on the shed will be reused.

10* One window in the brick will remain and one will be removed; there is no indication of what will happen with the removed window.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Revised tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the ISA.
2. That the window on the rear wall being removed either be stored on site or made available for salvage.
3. That specifications for the metal roof be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

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

Committee members voting: Belledin, David, Jackson, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 3/2/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

126-14-CA 511 E JONES STREET
Applicant: GREGORY P. HATEM
Received: 8/13/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 11/11/2014 1) 9/2/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Raleigh Historic Landmark: THE HECK-WYNNE HOUSE
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Relocate kitchen building; construct new 2-story rear addition; construct rear porch with 2nd level roof deck
Amendments: Existing condition drawings, revised drawings, revised written description and additional documentation were provided by the applicant and are attached to these comments.
DRAC: This application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee (DRAC) on August 25, 2014. Present were Erin Sterling, Curtis Kasefang, Dan Becker and David Maurer. Also present were Greg Hatem, David Nicolay, Patrick Nerz, Andrew Stewart, and Tania Tully.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- The Heck-Wynne House was designated a Raleigh Historic Landmark in 1979. The report is available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Setting	Relocate kitchen building; construct new 2-story rear addition; construct rear porch with 2nd level roof deck
3.4	Paint and Paint Color	Paint new addition
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Construct new 2-story rear addition; construct rear porch with 2nd level roof deck
5.1	Relocation	Relocate kitchen building

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Relocation of kitchen building is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 5.1.1, 5.1.5, 5.1.8 and the following findings:

1* The application states that the kitchen is from 1874 when the house was built. As seen by the Sanborn Fire Insurance maps dating from 1909, 1914 and 1950 the kitchen was once connected by a 1-story open porch which was enclosed and 2-stories by 1950. The Sanborn Maps do not include the property any earlier than 1909.

2* There are trees on the adjacent property near the new location of the kitchen; a hand dug pier and curtain wall system will be constructed for the new foundation. A tree protection plan was not included in the application.

3* It was not uncommon for detached kitchens to be relocated, usually closer to houses as they became attached. Across the street, the Cameron-Maynard-Gatling House at 504 E Jones Street has a kitchen that was moved closer to and attached to the house. There is no evidence that this kitchen has been moved.

4* The kitchen is being relocated to the rear of the house and rotated 90 degrees to allow for construction of a new addition to the house in its place. No information regarding the contractor performing the move was included in the application.

5* The kitchen will be moved intact except for the foundation, which will be rebuilt using as much salvaged brick as is feasible; the amended application included a photo of the historic exterior wall that is currently inside the house. The original doors and windows are to be restored.

6* The application states that the standing seam metal roof of the kitchen will be replicated if beyond repair. No evidence of its condition is included in the application.

B. Construction of new 2-story rear addition; construction of rear porch with 2nd level roof deck is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 3.4.3, 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* There are trees on this and adjacent properties that will be impacted by construction of the additions. One tree is very near the west side addition. A tree protection plan was not included in the application.

2* According to Wake County tax records the lot size is 21,351 SF. The footprint of the existing house (including porches and decks) is 2,998 SF; the existing garage is 400 SF; current lot coverage is 16%. The footprint of the new addition with rear porch is about 2,191 SF. The total proposed new footprint of the house with relocated kitchen and existing garage is approximately 5,589 SF for new lot coverage of 26%.

3* From the landmark designation the Heck-Wynne is a one-and-one-half story L-shaped frame structure set on a common bond brick foundation with a wrap-around porch, a full-height mansard roof, and a two-and-half-story corner mansard tower. It has a rear free-standing kitchen, now joined to the main block and partially obscured by frame additions.

4* The historic kitchen is being relocated to accommodate the addition.

5* The new addition consists of several parts: a two-story extrusion of the historic form; a 2-story ell (rearmost addition), a 1-story west side addition, a small 1-story east side addition, and a two level rear porch.

6* The two story extrusion matches the height and roof form of the historic addition and retains a cornerboard of the historic portion. Original double hung windows from the north (rear) façade will be reused in this portion. Additionally, it will have a slightly tapered, flat, rubber roof that is not visible from the ground. The roof will have an 8″overhang and a dark bronze drip edge to match the existing condition. A photograph of the existing condition was included in the amended application.

7* The rearmost addition is a rectangular flat roofed addition that is perpendicular to the existing addition. It consists of multiple windows to give the appearance of a sunroom or sleeping porch. The amended application contains photographs of rear additions in Oakwood that have walls of windows.

8* The roof of the rearmost addition has a rubber membrane roof with an 8″ wood soffit and 6″ tall wood fascia; a detailed drawing is included in the amended application. The addition will have new ganged one–over-one wood double hung windows with transoms and new full light wood doors.

9* There is no elevation drawing of the south side of the rearmost addition or east side 1-story addition.

10* The roofs of the 1-story additions will be the same as the rearmost addition so as to reduce their visual impact. The windows will be wood double hung windows with the dimensions and details of the trim matching the existing rear addition.

11* The addition on the west side sits back approximately 60 feet from the front most wall of the house. Except for a portion of its porch it does not wrap historic fabric.

12* The existing east side screened porch and deck are removed and replaced with a mudroom and new decks.

13* The two level rear porch is described as a wood covered back porch with an uncovered deck on the second floor. A painted steel guardrail with a wood cap will be installed around the perimeter of the upper deck. A detailed drawing of the railing is included.

14* All of the new additions have painted wood horizontal German siding with 6″ exposure, trim and water table to match the existing rear addition and a hand dug pier and curtain wall systems using salvaged bricks as available. Detailed drawings of the trim and water table were not included in the application.

15* Details and specifications for the windows and doors were not included in the application.

16* The extruded addition will have the same paint scheme as the historic house; paint samples were included. The rearmost addition will be painted in the accent trim color of the existing house; paint samples were included. Except for the steel rails, porch floor, and porch ceiling the rear porch will be painted the same color as the trim of the existing house. The rear porch railing will be black.

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

1. That details and specifications for the following will be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction/installation:
   a. New foundation bricks;
   b. Elevation drawing of the south side of the rearmost addition;
   c. New decks;
   d. Doors;
   e. Trim and water table.
2. That details and specifications for the following will be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Kitchen relocation plan;
   b. A tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture;
   c. Windows.
3. That should anything other than repair be proposed for the kitchen roof the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to commencing work:
   a. The condition of the existing roof; and if agreed upon by staff that it is deteriorated beyond repair;
   b. Specifications and details for the new roof.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support:
Greg Hatem [affirmed], David Nicolay [affirmed], Andrew Stewart [affirmed], Patrick Nerz [affirmed], and Rob Allen [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Hatem provided a bit of background stating that he purchased the house a year and a half ago. The design challenges were that he wanted to maintain the original house in its original state, restoration, and modernity. He noted that it was the desire of the addition that led him to consider taking the historic kitchen building off of the house and moving it into the back corner. Mr. Hatem said that in doing that, it allows them to put up a more open addition on the back for the kids and so forth. He pointed out the plan of the house with the color coding for the dates. He explained that they do not yet have a tree protection plan; they are on their fourth arborist—they just haven't' shown up. Mr. Hatem pointed out that the application included a number of photographs that show the existing building and the Sanborn maps for reference. He also said that they went through DRAC and integrated comments from them into the revisions. He is not trying to make any statements with this house.

Comments:
Randy Scott [affirmed] made middle of the road comments. He is on the neighboring property. He said that he discussed moving the kitchen into kind of the back corner a long time ago with the applicant. He gives good graces on moving the kitchen. In looking through the plans, what he sees as a question is the height of the addition's roof. He said that the open sunroom look of

the addition seemed ok and that there are no trees on his property affected by the proposed work.

Opposition:
Gail Wiesner [affirmed], 515 Euclid Street, spoke in opposition to the application. She stated that this is an addition and typically additions are subservient. This proposal nearly doubles the house. Ms. Wiesner said that the addition is highly visible. She noted the roof line and referenced a recently denied property that was long and stretched out saying that the roofline needs to be broken up. Ms. Wiesner noted that the glass porch is not something you don't see, but that they're typically small and added on at the back of properties and not highly visible. She stated that this one if it was all that was being added and the amount of glass it's extremely visible. She said that even some of the porches and additions have had similar fenestration. Ms. Wiesner referenced National Park Service Brief #14 saying that glass is a material that calls a lot of attention to itself. She asserted that when the proportion of glass to solids is high as in this particular example, and if there's lighting inside in the evening, and proportion of glass to solids is much higher than is typical. Ms. Wiesner also commented that she can't tell from this what the metal railings are going to be or how prominent they're going to be. She noted that the metal railings are not unheard of but need to be demure to the property and need to be in a configuration that is not going to call attention to them. She ended by restating that the addition will overwhelm the historic house.

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

Mr. Belledin asked the applicant what led to the change of the window pattern on the rear addition. Mr. hatem said it was DRAC comments. It is an addition, simplify it. Also, it's a separation from a previous addition to the house. Mr. Nicolay said that the biggest thing they heard from DRAC was that they were basically proposing an enclosed porch. The thought was to keep it looking like that. Mr. Stewart noted the ample examples of glass on the rear of building provided in the application. Mr. Hatem pointed out that the sightlines of the house as you're walking down the street, show how prominent these views are. Mr. Nicolay pointed out the page that shows a study of the approach available in the application.

Mr. Hatem noted that they are proposing a pretty straightforward safety railing. Ms. David asked if the pickets are they just plain square. Mr. Hatem confirmed.

Mr. Allen addressed the breaking up of the side façade. He said they did talk about the extruded form specifically and the application that Ms. Wiesner was speaking to and we were trying to avoid a situation like that. He said they are adding on only a minor addition directly to the house and the larger part is rotated 90% to break that up. He explained that the height is barely bumped up a foot as a way to distinguish it as slightly different, slightly disengaged, but that the detailing is very similar to the existing addition.

Mr. Nerz pointed out the original 1875 portion of house. He noted an early renovation where the original first floor and then 2nd floor was added, which created existing extruded 1920s addition. He noted that the addition they've added is towards the back. They are trying to stay with that same extrusion to keep it from having shotgun linear effect. Mr. Nicolay noted that if you look at south façade, they've kept everything tucked in to the width of the original house with the exception of the one bedroom. Mr. Shackleton said that it was helpful to look at it from the side.

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
It is on the least visible façade and the sightlines mean that it will be pretty tough to get the full impact from the street. [Jackson]
The house is extruding anyway. The ratio or scale of the addition to the rest of the house is not overwhelming and is demarcated with corner board. I do think the back porch exaggerates it even more. My main concern is moving the kitchen because there are two other very similar houses to this that still have kitchens on the back. That's a really common characteristic in Oakwood, a kitchen attached to the house, and they usually didn't get into that position by being moved, but being built to. With Guideline 5.1.5 —what is the effect of the house and the district, and on the three Heck Houses there to have one that's had its kitchen detached and put in a place it wouldn't have been? That has a negative impact on the building's historic character. If there wasn't a kitchen there and this was just an addition, I generally think the addition meets the guidelines. I have concerns about moving kitchen. [David]
What if this were an application for the kitchen to be demolished? [Shackleton]
That is not then request. [Tully]
It's very characteristic of these three houses in particular and Oakwood in general to have the house meet the kitchen. That's a defining characteristic of the house, and you're taking it away. [David]
The kitchen itself? [Belledin]
The form that is created by where the kitchen is. [David]
The guidelines don't specifically talk about moving a part of a building. It's like it's going to become an accessory structure. [Shackleton]
Moving it is preferable to demolishing it. Is orientation a problem? [Jackson]
Once you move it out of its context to the building, the orientation is less of a concern. [David]
Do you not have enough information? [Tully]
How does changing the location of kitchen change the character of the house? Is it character defining? My argument is that it is. That is the character of a 19th century house to have a detached kitchen that was attached with a breezeway, then as people get more comfortable the breezeway is closed in in some way, then perhaps other additions, and you can see that progression. Here there are three buildings total and all three of them have this feature. Is that

part of their character that they matched and all changed in the same way during the same time? Does that matter? [David]
Going back to the additions part of the guidelines, and this might help frame another question. 4.2.8 talks about not requiring the removal of a significant building element. Is this a significant building element? [Shackleton]
Yes, because it speaks to the history of the house. That said, you see it on other houses in the neighborhood. Are we satisfied that other houses speak to it as well? The kitchen is not going away entirely. [David]
Are there any other examples of kitchens that have been moved away from house? [Jackson]
No. I'm trying to speak towards your points and not add evidence. [Tully]
If it's a specific building element, I'd look at the other building elements of the house and try to rank it. [Shackleton]
So if they chopped off the tower and moved it that would be significant? [David]
The porch, the detail. The reason I hadn't thought about this before this meeting, walking by this site, I never specifically noticed there was a kitchen attached to the back. [Shackleton]
At one point in time the kitchen would have been more noticeable. [Jackson]
You can also use landmark designation report for guidance. [Tully]
Fact B.3* says the kitchen is partially obscured which reduces its significance. [Shackleton]
The fact that it is detached again and put it in new location almost reinstates its significance [Jackson]
No. [David]
Even though it's in a new location, it's still detached from the house on some level. [Jackson]
Actually it's been attached to the house for a long time, since 1909. [David]
Fred, any thoughts on this? [Shackleton]
Still looking through the guidelines. [Belledin]
Is there any other information we could have that would help us make a better decision than the information we have now? [Shackleton]
Taking off the kitchen is a problem with the guidelines. Overall the addition itself meets the guidelines so that's where my conflict lies. [David]
Is this threatening its integrity? [Jackson]
Is there a different place it could go that would still retain the significance of it that would be different than that corner? [Shackleton]
No. [David]

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY(2)

Speaking to the kitchen, Mr. Hatem said that they too struggled with this. They went to staff for guidance. Their impression was that moving the kitchen wasn't a significant issue because it was so far in the back. In one period it was detached. Having it detached in a different orientation is not that different. He noted that if it remained in its location it would be opened

up and lose the character of the kitchen anyway. They chose to move and restore rather than losing it entirely. Mr. Stewart added that the kitchen was originally detached.

Mr. Belledin asked if they were going for tax credits. Mr. Allen asked if it would be better to relocate it somewhere else, noting that it took them into the tree zone with the geometry of the building. Is that really better, it's just repurposing. The rear of property isn't where it was located either.

Ms. Tully pointed out that the questions have to do with Guidelines 5.1.5 - is it damaging? and 4.2.8 - do you think it's significant?

Ms. David said that it was attached; initially with a breezeway. Mr. Belledin noted that by its nature it was constructed to be freestanding.

Mr. Hatem added that another way they developed the proposal, was noticing that from looking at the front of the house, as one comes back it gets simpler and less significant. That's what led them down that path. They did think about coming in here with demolition because of its condition, but felt like they could save it.

Ms. Jackson said that she would be interested to know what someone from the State Historic Preservation Office had to say about the degree of significance of the kitchen.

Ms. Tully reminded the committee that there were other comments need to be addressed such as the height.

Mr. Belledin asked the applicant about the timing of the project with regards to the tax credits. Mr. Hatem said that if they don't start fairly quickly, there's no option. Ms. Jackson said that even an informal discussion with a restoration specialist would be helpful.

Mr. Belledin asked if the landmark designation based on the National Register nomination. Ms. Tully said yes. Mr. Belledin commented that it would be fair to say that the tax credits will rest on similar significance. Ms. David noted that the local landmark designation and NR nomination (for all three houses together) cites the front fancy parts. The nomination was completed in the 70s, when all that was looked at was the fancy parts.

Due to a joint public hearing with City Council on another matter and at Mr. Shackleton's suggestion, at 6:45 pm Ms. David moved that the meeting be temporarily adjourned. Ms. Jackson seconded; motion carried 4/0.

Mr. Shackleton reopened the meeting at 7:30 pm.

Mr. Hatem said that he was able to reach Tim Simmons with the State Historic Preservation Office, but that he was unable to give a determination. He did say unofficially that he was confident it wouldn't cause a delisting.

Mr. Stewart said that in looking at guideline 4.2.8, this is not removing a feature. To him, removing a feature is getting rid of, making it go away. They are talking about relocating on the site, so he would argue that 4.2.8 doesn't apply in this case.

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

Committee Discussion(2)

I'm not sure that anyone thought of moving a kitchen when writing the guidelines. One thing that comes to mind is that we could add a condition of feedback from SHPO. [Belledin]
To what end? If you want feedback, you are allowed to do that through bylaws or code, if your decision is going to hinge on that information. [Tully]
Another issue brought up was the issue of height of the addition and it not seeming subservient. Are there any thoughts on that? [Shackleton]
It is slightly greater than the rest of the building. We generally ask that the roofline be lower. [David]
Read the guidelines. [Tully]
I don't think it overpowers the rest of the building. [Jackson]
It would look more unusual if it were lower. [Belledin]
It serves the purpose of breaking up the roofline the same way the roof does. You do see roofs that go down to the hyphen where the kitchen then pops up. With the tower this is not overpowering. [David]
Especially when looked at from the sightline photos. Are there any other points that came up from other neighbors? [Shackleton]
Gail brought up the glass, but the applicants covered that with the photos they submitted [David]
And the metal railings. I think that the applicant addressed that as well. [Shackleton]
The really big back porch is a point of concern. [David]
It was the roof on the other one. The other one had a pitched roof and had mass. [Belledin]
I had the same thought, Fred. Any other issues? [Shackleton]
Back to the original attached kitchen, I would treat this as a dependency. The house grew to it, but it is still a dependency if it's moved [Belledin]
I still think removal is removal from the house. To look at significance it is not the tower, it is not what makes these houses what they are as Second Empire houses, but it is significant in social history; the house developing over its time. It's part of how people look at buildings in a different way than we used to. But I do think keeping it on the property mitigates some of the damage done by removing it and you could make the case that there are other houses in the neighborhood that will still illustrate that aspect of history. For me it's just two really conflicting

pieces of the application with an addition that meets the guidelines. [David]
It is not unreasonable for the four of you to come up with different viewpoints having heard the same bit of information. [Tully]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Mr. Belledin moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comments A. (inclusive of facts 1-6) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-16) to be acceptable as findings of fact with the following additional facts and modifications as stated below:

A. Relocation of kitchen building is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 5.1.1, 5.1.3, 5.1.5, 5.1.8 and the following findings:

1* The application states that the kitchen is from 1874 when the house was built. As seen by the Sanborn Fire Insurance maps dating from 1909, 1914 and 1950 the kitchen was once connected by a 1-story open porch which was enclosed and 2-stories by 1950. The Sanborn Maps do not include the property any earlier than 1909.

2* There are trees on the adjacent property near the new location of the kitchen; a hand dug pier and curtain wall system will be constructed for the new foundation. A tree protection plan was not included in the application.

3* It was not uncommon for detached kitchens to be relocated, usually closer to houses as they became attached. Across the street, the Cameron-Maynard-Gatling House at 504 E Jones Street has a kitchen that was moved closer to and attached to the house. There is no evidence that this kitchen has been moved.

4* The kitchen is being relocated to the rear of the house and rotated 90 degrees to allow for construction of a new addition to the house in its place. No information regarding the contractor performing the move was included in the application.

5* The kitchen will be moved intact except for the foundation, which will be rebuilt using as much salvaged brick as is feasible; the amended application included a photo of the historic exterior wall that is currently inside the house. The original doors and windows are to be restored.

6* The application states that the standing seam metal roof of the kitchen will be replicated if beyond repair. No evidence of its condition is included in the application.

B. Construction of new 2-story rear addition; construction of rear porch with 2nd level roof deck is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 3.4.3, 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* There are trees on this and adjacent properties that will be impacted by construction of the additions. One tree is very near the west side addition. A tree protection plan was not included in the application.

2* According to Wake County tax records the lot size is 21,351 SF. The footprint of the existing house (including porches and decks) is 2,998 SF; the existing garage is 400 SF; current lot coverage is 16%. The footprint of the new addition with rear porch is about 2,191 SF. The

total proposed new footprint of the house with relocated kitchen and existing garage is approximately 5,589 SF for new lot coverage of 26%.

3* From the landmark designation the Heck-Wynne is a one-and-one-half story L-shaped frame structure set on a common bond brick foundation with a wrap-around porch, a full-height mansard roof, and a two-and-half-story corner mansard tower. It has a rear free-standing kitchen, now joined to the main block and partially obscured by frame additions.

4* The historic kitchen is being relocated to accommodate the addition.

5* The new addition consists of several parts: a two-story extrusion of the historic form; a 2-story ell (rearmost addition), a 1-story west side addition, a small 1-story east side addition, and a two level rear porch.

6* The two story extrusion matches the height and roof form of the historic addition and retains a cornerboard of the historic portion. Original double hung windows from the north (rear) façade will be reused in this portion. Additionally, it will have a slightly tapered, flat, rubber roof that is not visible from the ground. The roof will have an 8″overhang and a dark bronze drip edge to match the existing condition. A photograph of the existing condition was included in the amended application.

7* The rearmost addition is a rectangular flat roofed addition that is perpendicular to the existing addition. It consists of multiple windows to give the appearance of a sunroom or sleeping porch. The amended application contains photographs of rear additions in Oakwood that have walls of windows.

8* The roof of the rearmost addition has a rubber membrane roof with an 8″ wood soffit and 6″ tall wood fascia; a detailed drawing is included in the amended application. The addition will have new ganged one–over-one wood double hung windows with transoms and new full light wood doors.

9* There is no elevation drawing of the south side of the rearmost addition or east side 1-story addition.

10* The roofs of the 1-story additions will be the same as the rearmost addition so as to reduce their visual impact. The windows will be wood double hung windows with the dimensions and details of the trim matching the existing rear addition.

11* The addition on the west side sits back approximately 60 feet from the front most wall of the house. Except for a portion of its porch it does not wrap historic fabric.

12* The existing east side screened porch and deck are removed and replaced with a mudroom and new decks.

13* The two level rear porch is described as a wood covered back porch with an uncovered deck on the second floor. As it is unroofed it is clearly secondary to the house. A painted steel guardrail with a wood cap will be installed around the perimeter of the upper deck. A detailed drawing of the railing is included.

14* All of the new additions have painted wood horizontal German siding with 6″ exposure, trim and water table to match the existing rear addition and a hand dug pier and curtain wall systems using salvaged bricks as available. Detailed drawings of the trim and water table were not included in the application.

15* Details and specifications for the windows and doors were not included in the application.

16* The extruded addition will have the same paint scheme as the historic house; paint samples were included. The rearmost addition will be painted in the accent trim color of the existing house; paint samples were included. Except for the steel rails, porch floor, and porch ceiling the rear porch will be painted the same color as the trim of the existing house. The rear porch railing will be black.
17* The two story extrusion and new addition are roughly equal in length to the existing two story addition.
18* The height of the rearmost addition breaks up the visual line of the extrusion and does not overwhelm the historic house.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Jackson; passed 3/1 (Ms. David opposed).

Decision on the Application

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

1. That details and specifications for the following will be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction/installation:
   a. New foundation bricks;
   b. Elevation drawing of the south side of the rearmost addition;
   c. New decks;
   d. Doors;
   e. Trim and water table;
   f. New columns.
2. That details and specifications for the following will be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Kitchen relocation plan;
   b. A tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture;
   c. Windows.
3. That should anything other than repair be proposed for the kitchen roof the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to commencing work:
   a. The condition of the existing roof; and if agreed upon by staff that it is deteriorated beyond repair;
   b. Specifications and details for the new roof.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Jackson; passed 3/1 (Ms. David opposed).

Committee members voting: Belledin, David, Jackson, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 3/2/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

124-14-CA 219 E SOUTH STREET
Applicant: SHARP PROPERTIES NC
Received: 8/13/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 11/11/2014 1) 9/2/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: PRINCE HALL HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: DOD, RB
Nature of Project: Remove non-historic rear addition; construct new 300 SF rear addition and porch; alter existing doors and windows; replace existing windows; remove utility chimney; construct new front porch on existing porch foundation; change exterior paint colors.
Conflict of Interest: Ms. Jackson works for the design firm on the application. Ms. David moved to recuse Ms. Jackson from the room. Mr. Belledin seconded; motion carried 4/0.
Staff Notes: Photos of porches mentioned in the comments are attached.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Setting	Remove non-historic rear addition; construct new 300 SF rear addition and porch
3.4	Paint and Paint Color	change exterior paint colors
3.5	Roofs	remove utility chimney; alter roof form of rear addition
3.7	Windows and Doors	alter existing doors and windows; replace existing windows
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	construct new front porch on existing porch foundation
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Remove non-historic rear addition; construct new 300 SF rear addition and porch

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Remove non-historic rear addition; construct new 300 SF rear addition and porch is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 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* There are no trees on this or the adjacent properties that may be impacted by construction of the addition.

2* According to Wake County tax records the lot size is 4,356 SF. The footprint of the existing house (including porch) is 1,313 SF; the existing garage slab is 340 SF; current lot coverage is 38%. Addition being removed is 84 SF; new addition with porch is 368 SF. With the proposed addition and porch the proposed footprint of the house is approximately 1,597 SF; including the existing garage slab the lot coverage is 44%.

3* The existing house is a circa late 19th century one-story frame house with weatherboard siding, an asphalt-shingled hip roof, the brick foundation of a porch with upside down picket fence railing. It is a contributing resource to the historic district. The rear addition has a flat roof.

4* A non-historic shed addition is proposed to be removed to accommodate the new addition. It does not appear on any of the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps.

5* The proposed addition is at the rear of the house and will be delineated from the historic house by being inset on the east side and with retention of a corner board on the west.

6* The form of the addition is rectangular and has a hipped roof.

7* The roof of the existing historic addition is proposed to be replaced with a hip roof; this roof is lower than the historic hipped roof and the new addition will be lower than that. The new roof on the rear addition also raises the eave of the historic rear addition to match that of the front portion of the house.

8* Rear small porches are common features historically. This one is under the new roof of the existing addition which makes it appear as though it may have been original. It is more traditional to have a separate roof for a small rear porch such as what is proposed.

9* The siding of the addition will match the historic wood siding on the existing house. The roof will be asphalt shingles and the foundation will be parged. Specifications on the roofing material were not included in the application.

10* Trim and eave details are to match the existing; detailed drawings are not included in the application.

11* The current foundation is a mix of brick piers infilled with concrete blocks that are proposed to be parged along with the new addition foundation. Specifications for the parging are not included in the application; it's important that the material be specified so as to not damage the historic brick piers.

B. Alteration of existing doors and windows; replacement of existing windows is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.7.1, 3.7.6, 3.7.7 and the following findings:

1* The front door is not original.

2* The application states that none of the existing windows appear to be original. No detailed photos or evidence regarding the existing windows were included in the application. It is clear from photos in the application that several of the windows are replacements.

3* The new windows are proposed to be wood sash. The new windows are drawn as 4/4 but noted as 2/2. In 2011 the windows were 6/6 and 9/9. There is no evidence of when the windows were removed.

4* The drawings show traditionally sized and proportioned window trim; looking at the photos there may be existing trim of a different size that may or may not be historic fabric.

5* Specifications for the new window sashes, including muntin profiles, were provided.

6* The proposed new doors are traditional wood single lite doors; specifications were included in the application.
7* On the east elevation a door is proposed for removal; its removal leaves no opening in the historic rear addition. There is no evidence that there was not historically a window in that location. On the west elevation a similarly located door is proposed for removal; a window will remain.

C. Construction of new front porch on existing porch foundation is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.8.6, 3.8.10 and the following findings:
1* The railing proposed for replacement is not historic. The new wood railing is of a traditional inset picket design. A section drawing is included in the application.
2* Except for the foundation, the historic porch is missing.
3* The front steps are being relocated to the other side of the porch to be entirely on the property; detailed drawings of the steps are not included in the application.
4* The new porch roof is supported by square simple paired posts on single piers; detailed drawings are not included in the application.
5* The new porch roof is proposed to have a hipped roof with a gable front. There is no evidence to support the proposed look of the front porch. A simple low pitched porch roof that sits below the eaves is more appropriate for the historic house.
6* There are at least four other houses in the district that are also one-story tall, one-bay deep, and with side gable hipped roofs (212 E Lenoir Street, 218 E Lenoir Street, 514 S Person Street, and 412 S Bloodworth Street); none have gable front porches and all are constructed with porch roofs that remain below the eave of the historic house. There are other one-story hipped roofed houses in the district; of those most of the porches remain below the eave; of those only one has a porch with a gable. Of the other porches with gables in the district (215 E Cabarrus, 312 E Cabarrus, 313 E Cabarrus) all are two-stories.
7* The 2011 photo of the house shows a painted brick pier porch foundation infilled with brick; the photos included in the application are not clear enough to see the materials; the drawing indicates concrete block. It is not appropriate to parge a brick foundation.

D. Changing of exterior paint colors; removal of utility chimney, removal of awnings is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.4.3, 3.5.7.
1* Changing of exterior paint colors and removal of chimney are approvable by staff as a Minor Work and is included here for administrative efficiency.
2* Paint colors and chips were included in the application.
3* Chimney being removed is in the historic rear addition and is a service chimney.
4* There are existing non-historic metal awnings on the building that based on the drawings are proposed for removal. This is approvable by staff as a Minor Work and is included here for administrative efficiency.

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

1. That the east wall of the historic addition have a window.

2. That the front porch not have a gable and that it remain below the eave of the house.
3. That the small rear porch have separate roof.
4. That should the front porch foundation be brick and that it not be parged.
5. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction/installation/removal:
    a. Clarification on window lite divisions;
    b. Window trim;
    c. Porch posts and piers;
    d. Revised rear porch roof design;
    e. Proportions and size of the new window on the east wall.
    f. Parging material;
    g. Roofing material;
6. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
    a. Revised front porch roof design;
    b. Documentation of existing windows;
    c. Addition eaves.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support:
Rebecca Morris [affirmed], design team and Jeff Sharp [affirmed], owner were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Sharp said that the main goal is to improve the overall property. The project is very similar to the Matt Flynn/Jason Queen property next door. Regarding staff suggested condition #3 about having a separate roof he thinks he would prefer it be a patio anyway.

Ms. Davis asked if the windows were to be 2/2 or 4/4. Ms. Morris said they were supposed to be 2/2. Tania Tully [affirmed] noted that it looks like sometime between when designation report was done and Mr. Sharp bought the house, the windows were ripped out.

Ms. David asked the applicant id the low hipped roof was acceptable. Mr. Sharp said yes, but has a comment on the suggested window on the east elevation. Ms. Tully clarified that she is talking about where door was removed. Ms. Morris said okay. Ms. Tully added that typically if a window had still been there, what has been is that could be one sash instead of two sash. Some sort of fenestration on that bay would be typical.

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

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
The porch was my main concern, the front porch. I wanted to get the porch roof tucked under the eaves. [David]
Its good there. [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 1-11), B. (inclusive of facts 1-7), C. (inclusive of facts 1-7) and D. (inclusive of facts 1-4) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following modifications as stated below:

A. Remove non-historic rear addition; construct new 300 SF rear addition and porch or patio is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 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* There are no trees on this or the adjacent properties that may be impacted by construction of the addition.

2* According to Wake County tax records the lot size is 4,356 SF. The footprint of the existing house (including porch) is 1,313 SF; the existing garage slab is 340 SF; current lot coverage is 38%. Addition being removed is 84 SF; new addition with porch is 368 SF. With the proposed addition and porch the proposed footprint of the house is approximately 1,597 SF; including the existing garage slab the lot coverage is 44%.

3* The existing house is a circa late 19th century one-story frame house with weatherboard siding, an asphalt-shingled hip roof, the brick foundation of a porch with upside down picket fence railing. It is a contributing resource to the historic district. The rear addition has a flat roof.

4* A non-historic shed addition is proposed to be removed to accommodate the new addition. It does not appear on any of the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps.

5* The proposed addition is at the rear of the house and will be delineated from the historic house by being inset on the east side and with retention of a corner board on the west.

6* The form of the addition is rectangular and has a hipped roof.

7* The roof of the existing historic addition is proposed to be replaced with a hip roof; this roof is lower than the historic hipped roof and the new addition will be lower than that. The new roof on the rear addition also raises the eave of the historic rear addition to match that of the front portion of the house.

8* Rear small porches are common features historically. This one is under the new roof of the existing addition which makes it appear as though it may have been original. It is more traditional to have a separate roof for a small rear porch such as what is proposed.

9* The siding of the addition will match the historic wood siding on the existing house. The roof will be asphalt shingles and the foundation will be parged. Specifications on the roofing material were not included in the application.

10* Trim and eave details are to match the existing; detailed drawings are not included in the application.
11* The current foundation is a mix of brick piers infilled with concrete blocks that are proposed to be parged along with the new addition foundation. Specifications for the parging are not included in the application; it's important that the material be specified so as to not damage the historic brick piers.

B. Alteration of existing doors and windows; replacement of existing windows is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.7.1, 3.7.6, 3.7.7 and the following findings:
1* The front door is not original.
2* The application states that none of the existing windows appear to be original. No detailed photos or evidence regarding the existing windows were included in the application. It is clear from photos in the application that several of the windows are replacements.
3* The new windows are proposed to be wood sash. The new windows are drawn as 4/4 but noted as 2/2. In 2011 the windows were 6/6 and 9/9. There is no evidence of when the windows were removed.
4* The drawings show traditionally sized and proportioned window trim; looking at the photos there may be existing trim of a different size that may or may not be historic fabric.
5* Specifications for the new window sashes, including muntin profiles, were provided.
6* The proposed new doors are traditional wood single lite doors; specifications were included in the application.
7* On the east elevation a door is proposed for removal; its removal leaves no opening in the historic rear addition. There is no evidence that there was not historically a window in that location. On the west elevation a similarly located door is proposed for removal; a window will remain.

C. Construction of new front porch on existing porch foundation is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.8.6, 3.8.10 and the following findings:
1* The railing proposed for replacement is not historic. The new wood railing is of a traditional inset picket design. A section drawing is included in the application.
2* Except for the foundation, the historic porch is missing.
3* The front steps are being relocated to the other side of the porch to be entirely on the property; detailed drawings of the steps are not included in the application.
4* The new porch roof is supported by square simple paired posts on single piers; detailed drawings are not included in the application.
5* The new porch roof is proposed to have a hipped roof with a gable front. There is no evidence to support the proposed look of the front porch. A simple low pitched porch roof that sits below the eaves is more appropriate for the historic house.
6* There are at least four other houses in the district that are also one-story tall, one-bay deep, and with side gable hipped roofs (212 E Lenoir Street, 218 E Lenoir Street, 514 S Person Street, and 412 S Bloodworth Street); none have gable front porches and all are constructed with porch roofs that remain below the eave of the historic house. There are other one-story hipped roofed houses in the district; of those most of the porches remain below the eave; of

those only one has a porch with a gable. Of the other porches with gables in the district (215 E Cabarrus, 312 E Cabarrus, 313 E Cabarrus) all are two-stories.

7* The 2011 photo of the house shows a painted brick pier porch foundation infilled with brick; the photos included in the application are not clear enough to see the materials; the drawing indicates concrete block. It is not appropriate to parge a brick foundation.

D. Changing of exterior paint colors; removal of utility chimney, removal of awnings is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.4.3, 3.5.7.

1* Changing of exterior paint colors and removal of chimney are approvable by staff as a Minor Work and is included here for administrative efficiency.

2* Paint colors and chips were included in the application.

3* Chimney being removed is in the historic rear addition and is a service chimney.

4* There are existing non-historic metal awnings on the building that based on the drawings are proposed for removal. This is approvable by staff as a Minor Work and is included here for administrative efficiency.

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

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

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

1. That the front porch not have a gable and that it remain below the eave of the house.
2. That the small rear porch have separate roof or no roof.
3. That should the front porch foundation be brick and that it not be parged.
4. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction/installation/removal:
   a. Clarification on window lite divisions;
   b. Window trim;
   c. Porch posts and piers;
   d. Revised rear porch roof design;
   e. Parging material;
   f. Roofing material;
5. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Revised front porch roof design;
   b. Documentation of existing windows;
   c. Addition eaves.

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

Committee members voting: Belledin, David, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 3/2/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

127-14-CA 1029 W SOUTH STREET
Applicant: JBK CONSTRUCTION, LLC
Received: 8/13/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 11/11/2014 1) 9/2/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Demolish existing 1-story rear addition; construct new 1-story rear addition with screened porch, deck, and side entry.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Setting	Demolish existing 1-story rear addition; construct new 1-story rear addition with screened porch, deck, and side entry.
4.1	Decks	construct new deck
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Demolish existing 1-story rear addition; construct new 1-story rear addition with screened porch, deck, and side entry

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Demoliton of existing 1-story rear addition; construction of new 1-story rear addition with screened porch, deck, and side entry is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.7, 4.1.8, 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* No information regarding trees on this or adjacent lots are included in the application.

2* According to Wake County tax records the lot size is 8,628 SF. The footprint of the existing house (including porch) is 1,518 SF; current lot coverage is 18%. The footprint of the new addition is 640 SF; the new porches and deck are about 300 SF; the addition being removed is 230 SF. The proposed new footprint of the house is approximately 2,228 SF for new lot coverage of 26%.

3* The house is a c. 1922 two-story frame hipped roof colonial box with bungalow elements and an attached one-story full façade porch with gable end to street.

4* The application indicates that a new window is proposed on the left elevation; there are no drawings or photos of that side of the house as existing. Window alterations such as this are typically approvable by staff.
5* The addition proposed for removal is 1-story, non-historic, and covered in masonite siding.
6* The new addition is also 1-story and the width of the house; it extends an additional 10 feet into the yard. The addition has a rectangular form and a gable roof the same pitch as the roof of the front porch.
7* The application states that the new addition will have dutch lap siding and wood windows to match the existing and a standing seam metal roof. Details and specifications of the siding, trim and windows were not included in the application.
8* There is a door but no window proposed on the left side of the addition. The lack of window on the addition creates an unusual expanse without a window.
9* Detailed drawings of the roof eave are not included in the application.
10* The foundation is proposed to be brick.
11* The rear deck and screened porch are shown as sitting on brick piers with fixed louver screens between the piers. The deck and porch are not inset.
12* A photograph of an unfinished screened porch and deck is included in the application to supplement the drawings.
13* A 4'x4' side entry is proposed on the left side of the addition. Side entries are not uncommon.

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

1. That should there be a tree within the footprint of the proposed addition, deck or screened porch that the application return to the committee for review in a new public hearing.
2. That a window be provided on the left elevation of the addition.
3. That the deck be inset from the corners of the addition.
4. That details and specifications for the following will be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction/installation:
   a. Doors;
   b. Siding;
   c. Trim;
   d. Window and door trim;
   e. New window on left elevation of historic house.
   f. Railings and deck stairs;
   g. Deck screening.
5. That details and specifications for the following will be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. A tree survey locating the trees on this and adjacent properties.
   b. A tree protection plan (staff is to determine whether the plan is to be prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture based on the proximity of trees to the new work);
   c. Revised drawing showing location and size of window on left elevation;

d. Windows;
e. Addition eave detail.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support:
Jackie Merlano [affirmed], designer, John Kerr [affirmed], applicant, Stefan and Catherine Bray [affirmed], owners, were present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Kerr made comments regarding staff's suggested conditions. Regarding 4.e. that's six over six to be replaces with 2/2. He will email it to staff. As to adding the window on the left side, he said that they are putting in cabinets because it's a laundry room. He said that if they need to do it they can do it between perhaps. Mr. Kerr noted that there's a crepe myrtle in the back yard that will be saved. The only other tree is a 100-yr oak already on a tree protection plan. Making the deck inset on the corners is no problem as is providing more detail on the side porch. One question he had is what is needed on the eave detail. Tania Tully [affirmed] said that they needed a larger scale drawing of how it's constructed. Mr. Kerr said that it would not be boxed, and will get the detail on that and the deck screening. He asked if the committee cared what size the window is, Is it ok to do a more square window like in the kitchen so they could still do storage inside?

Ms. Bray asked someone to explain why they need that window. Ms. David said that typically long stretches of wall without a window is not seen in the historic district. Ms. Bray said she understood the need for natural light.

Mr. Shackleton said that the application seems pretty complete with the exception of what we've talked about.

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. Jackson seconded; motion carried 4/0.

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
Because the house would dead ends into a blank wall he agrees with staff on this window. [Belledin]
Agrees. [David]

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 comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-13) to be acceptable as findings of fact as stated below:

A. Demoliton of existing 1-story rear addition; construction of new 1-story rear addition with screened porch, deck, and side entry is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.7, 4.1.8, 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* No information regarding trees on this or adjacent lots are included in the application.

2* According to Wake County tax records the lot size is 8,628 SF. The footprint of the existing house (including porch) is 1,518 SF; current lot coverage is 18%. The footprint of the new addition is 640 SF; the new porches and deck are about 300 SF; the addition being removed is 230 SF. The proposed new footprint of the house is approximately 2,228 SF for new lot coverage of 26%.

3* The house is a c. 1922 two-story frame hipped roof colonial box with bungalow elements and an attached one-story full façade porch with gable end to street.

4* The application indicates that a new window is proposed on the left elevation; there are no drawings or photos of that side of the house as existing. Window alterations such as this are typically approvable by staff.

5* The addition proposed for removal is 1-story, non-historic, and covered in masonite siding.

6* The new addition is also 1-story and the width of the house; it extends an additional 10 feet into the yard. The addition has a rectangular form and a gable roof the same pitch as the roof of the front porch.

7* The application states that the new addition will have dutch lap siding and wood windows to match the existing and a standing seam metal roof. Details and specifications of the siding, trim and windows were not included in the application.

8* There is a door but no window proposed on the left side of the addition. The lack of window on the addition creates an unusual expanse without a window.

9* Detailed drawings of the roof eave are not included in the application.

10* The foundation is proposed to be brick.

11* The rear deck and screened porch are shown as sitting on brick piers with fixed louver screens between the piers. The deck and porch are not inset.

12* A photograph of an unfinished screened porch and deck is included in the application to supplement the drawings.

13* A 4′x4′ side entry is proposed on the left side of the addition. Side entries are not uncommon.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That should there be a tree within the footprint of the proposed addition, deck or screened porch that the application return to the committee for review in a new public hearing.
2. That a window be provided on the left elevation of the addition.
3. That the deck be inset from the corners of the addition.
4. That details and specifications for the following will be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction/installation:
   a. Doors;
   b. Siding;
   c. Trim;
   d. Window and door trim;
   e. New window on left elevation of historic house.
   f. Railings and deck stairs;
   g. Deck screening.
5. That details and specifications for the following will be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. A tree survey locating the trees on this and adjacent properties.
   b. A tree protection plan (staff is to determine whether the plan is to be prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture based on the proximity of trees to the new work);
   c. Revised drawing showing location and size of window on left elevation;
   d. Windows;
   e. Addition eave detail.

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

Committee members voting: Belledin, David, Jackson, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 3/2/15.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Design Guidelines Update
2. CAMP Follow-up
3. Committee Discussion
    1. Application Completeness
    2. Meeting Post-Mortem

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner