RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
April 7, 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: Will Alphin, Elizabeth Caliendo, Miranda Downer, Scott Shackleton
Excused Absence: Sarah David
Staff Present: Tania Tully, Martha Lauer

Approval of the March 3, 2014 and March 18, 2014 Minutes

Ms. Caliendo moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the meetings and adopt the minutes as submitted. Mr. Alphin seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

Minor Works

There were no questions regarding the Minor Work report.

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

Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address	Affirmed
Yvonne Blair-Burnette, 524 Sherrybrook Dr 27610	Yes
Jennifer Simmons, 620 W Cabarrus St 27603	Yes
Matthew Staton, 620 W Cabarrus St 27603	Yes
DJ Carryon, Raleigh NC	Yes
Karen Fiorini	Yes

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Caliendo moved to approve the agenda as changed. Mr. Alphin seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

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: 016-14-CA, 028-14-MW, and 029-14-CA.

At the applicant's request Ms. Caliendo moved to defer the application for case 130-13-CA for 90 days. Mr. Alphin seconded; motion passed 4/0.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

016-14-CA 507 S PERSON STREET
Applicant: BEGINNING & BEYOND CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER INC.
Received: 2/12/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 5/13/2014 1) 3/3/2014 2) 4/7/2014 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: PRINCE HALL HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: DOD, RB
Nature of Project: Deferred from March meeting: Add front gate; install gate lights; replace front door; replace windows. [Removal of windows is after-the-fact.]
Amendments: Additional information was provided 3/31/14 and is attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- The Prince Hall Historic District rezoning took effect May 1, 2012.
- The bulk of the application was approved at the March meeting. Items under discussion at this meeting were deferred with a request for additional information regarding the condition of the existing windows and door and a prior approval of a front gate and lights.
- Staff comments from COA 147-13-CA were included in the commissioner packets.
- Staff photos are available for review.
- COA file for 096-07-CA is available for review.
- It is the practice of the commission to review after-the-fact applications as though the work has not yet been completed.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	add front gate; install gate lights
2.4	Fences and Walls	add front gate
2.7	Lighting	install gate lights
3.7	Windows and Doors	replace front door; replace windows

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Addition of front gate; installation of gate lights is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.10, 2.4.1, 2.4.5, 2.4.8, 2.7.5, 3.2.1 however, the proposed light fixtures are incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.7.11 and the following findings:

1* The 2011 Report and Recommendation for The Designation of The South Person/South Blount [now named Prince Hall] Historic Overlay District describes the pre-1914 house at 507 S Person Street as a "One-story, three-bay frame house with weatherboard siding, an asphalt-shingled hip roof with a hipped dormer with a 6/6 window, a front hipped porch with decorative pediment and replacement square wood columns, and boarded up 1/1 windows." The house has very little ornamentation.

2* The Special Character Essay states that "Fences are uncommon, although a few wrought iron fences encircle front yards or vacant parcels and some chain-link fencing is present."

3* COA 147-13-CA at 500 N Blount Street (the Merrimon-Wynne House) approved the installation of new wrought iron gate and brick support piers with lights in part because the house is among the more ornate and high-style residences in the [Blount Street] district and the similarity to similar features in the district.

4* A black metal fence exists in the historic district at 121 and 125 E South Street.

5* The proposed gate is a 48" tall bronze finish metal powder coated aluminum fence gate with an arched top that will extend 2" above the existing brick columns.

6* The application includes photographs of two existing painted brick columns where the front walk meets the public sidewalk. There do not appear to be any existing connections for electricity. The application does not included specification on how electricity will be added to accommodate lights.

7* Page 20 of the *Design Guidelines* for Raleigh Historic Districts discusses the historic lighting in Raleigh and provides general guidance for adding new lighting including: "Additional lighting may be desirable on a particular site because of concerns for safety or security…Adequate lighting can often be introduced through lights on residential-scale posts…." and "Contemporary fixtures that are inconspicuous or that complement the style and the character of the building may be selected for historic buildings. Simple, discreet styles and materials are usually successful."

8* The Special Character Essay states "Houses are one and two stories and are generally modest…[but] not necessarily without style."

9* The proposed cast aluminum light fixture is approximately 17" in height and 7" in width sitting atop a 3" base both with an oil rubbed bronze finish. The style is described as traditional.

10* Plan and elevation drawings of the proposed new gate and light fixtures are included in the application.

B. Replacement of front door; replacement of windows is not incongruous in concept according to Guidelines section 3.7.1, 3.7.2, 3.7.5, 3.7.6; however, replacement of windows that are not deteriorated beyond repair is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.7.6 and replacement of 1/1 and 2/2 windows with 3/1 windows is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.7.6 and the following findings:

1* A photograph of the 20-lite front door is included in the application and shows that some of the lower muntins are damaged and/or missing.

2* The amended application includes a report by David Hoggard Double Hung, LLC based on photographs regarding the condition of the front door. It states that the "unit has been severely abused; several muntins are either missing or severely damaged; finishes have failed requiring complete finish removal and recoating; door lockset mortise has been compromised, weakening the locket and security; most of the glass is missing; and door does not seem to be 'square' in its opening." It further states that "Although few doors we run across are unrepairable to a level that will make them secure and structurally sound, this one comes as close as any. The door in question would require disassembly of major elements, fabrication of new elements and reassembly. Much of the historic fabric of the door would likely be lost in the process. Can it be repaired? Yes. Should it be repaired instead of replaced in kind? Tough call, but probably not worth the investment."

3* The new front door is proposed to be a 9-lite over 2-panel wood door; specifications are included in the application. The design guidelines state that "If replacement of a deteriorated window or door unit is necessary, replace the unit in kind, matching the design and the dimension of the original sash or panels, pane configuration, architectural trim, detailing, and materials."

4* The application for the removal of wood windows is submitted after-the-fact.

5* The amended application states that the dormer window and two front and right side window sashes were removed prior to the effective date of the HOD and that the other 6 windows were removed after the HOD went into effect. No evidence is included in the application that the windows removed were deteriorated beyond repair.

6* According to the 1990 National Register of Historic Places Registration Form for the East Raleigh-South Park Historic District the house at 507 S Person Street contributes to the district, is 1-1/2 stories tall, was constructed pre-1914 and is described as having 1-over-l double hung-sash windows, original door, and a hipped dormer with 6-over-6 double hung-sash windows.

7* According to the 2011 Report and Recommendation for The Designation of The South Person/South Blount [now named Prince Hall] Historic Overlay District the house at 507 S Person Street contributes to the district and is described as a having a hipped dormer with a 6/6 window and boarded up 1/1 windows.

8* The amended application includes photographs of removed 2/2 double hung sash (DHS) and 1/1 windows and proposes replacement with 2/2 and 1/1 wood sashes. The locations of the windows were not included.

9* Partial specifications of the new windows are included in the amended application. This does not include section drawings, but does include a statement regarding the dimensions of the exterior casing.

10* No evidence regarding the condition of the exterior casing and trim was included in the application. The amended application states that the "exterior of the windows were not affected all."
11* The amended application states that the "sash windows were removed from the inside of the house." The sashes are part of the windows and considered exterior features.
12* Testimony at the 3/3/14 provided no new evidence, but reiterated and supported facts regarding the historic windows and lack of proof of deterioration.

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

1. That the light fixtures be smaller and of a more simple design.
2. That the new front door match the design, materials and details of the historic door.
3. That the sashes removed be replaced with wood sashes matching the historic sashes.
4. That the exterior casing, frames and sills remain.
5. That the following be specifications and details provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or commencement of work:
   a. Light fixtures on gate;
   b. How electricity will be provided to the gate lights;
   c. Light fixtures on house, if proposed;
   d. Front door;
   e. New window sashes;
   f. Clarification of where new window sashes will be installed.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
I'm good with staff's recommendations. [Alphin, Shackleton]
Do we want to say something that's clear about the gate not having a fence. Last time they discussed that it didn't need to be beyond 42" and it is still at 48". [Shackleton]
What are the measurement on the posts? [Alphin]
It only says that the fence will extend two inches above the brick columns.
It seems okay [Alphin]
Ms. Caliendo showed the elevation drawings.
I'm okay with it with smaller lights because the columns are already there. [Shackleton]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Ms. Caliendo moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comments A. (inclusive of facts 1-10) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-12) to be acceptable as findings of fact as stated below:

A. Addition of front gate; installation of gate lights is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.10, 2.4.1, 2.4.5, 2.4.8, 2.7.5, 3.2.1 however, the proposed light fixtures are incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.7.11 and the following findings:

1* The 2011 Report and Recommendation for The Designation of The South Person/South Blount [now named Prince Hall] Historic Overlay District describes the pre-1914 house at 507 S Person Street as a "One-story, three-bay frame house with weatherboard siding, an asphalt-shingled hip roof with a hipped dormer with a 6/6 window, a front hipped porch with decorative pediment and replacement square wood columns, and boarded up 1/1 windows." The house has very little ornamentation.

2* The Special Character Essay states that "Fences are uncommon, although a few wrought iron fences encircle front yards or vacant parcels and some chain-link fencing is present."

3* COA 147-13-CA at 500 N Blount Street (the Merrimon-Wynne House) approved the installation of new wrought iron gate and brick support piers with lights in part because the house is among the more ornate and high-style residences in the [Blount Street] district and the similarity to similar features in the district.

4* A black metal fence exists in the historic district at 121 and 125 E South Street.

5* The proposed gate is a 48" tall bronze finish metal powder coated aluminum fence gate with an arched top that will extend 2" above the existing brick columns.

6* The application includes photographs of two existing painted brick columns where the front walk meets the public sidewalk. There do not appear to be any existing connections for electricity. The application does not included specification on how electricity will be added to accommodate lights.

7* Page 20 of the *Design Guidelines* for Raleigh Historic Districts discusses the historic lighting in Raleigh and provides general guidance for adding new lighting including: "Additional lighting may be desirable on a particular site because of concerns for safety or security…Adequate lighting can often be introduced through lights on residential-scale posts…." and "Contemporary fixtures that are inconspicuous or that complement the style and the character of the building may be selected for historic buildings. Simple, discreet styles and materials are usually successful."

8* The Special Character Essay states "Houses are one and two stories and are generally modest…[but] not necessarily without style."

9* The proposed cast aluminum light fixture is approximately 17" in height and 7" in width sitting atop a 3" base both with an oil rubbed bronze finish. The style is described as traditional.

10* Plan and elevation drawings of the proposed new gate and light fixtures are included in the application.

B. Replacement of front door; replacement of windows is not incongruous in concept according to Guidelines section 3.7.1, 3.7.2, 3.7.5, 3.7.6; however, replacement of windows that are not deteriorated beyond repair is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.7.6 and replacement of 1/1 and 2/2 windows with 3/1 windows is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.7.6 and the following findings:

1* A photograph of the 20-lite front door is included in the application and shows that some of the lower muntins are damaged and/or missing.

2* The amended application includes a report by David Hoggard Double Hung, LLC based on photographs regarding the condition of the front door. It states that the "unit has been severely abused; several muntins are either missing or severely damaged; finishes have failed requiring complete finish removal and recoating; door lockset mortise has been compromised, weakening the locket and security; most of the glass is missing; and door does not seem to be 'square' in its opening." It further states that "Although few doors we run across are unrepairable to a level that will make them secure and structurally sound, this one comes as close as any. The door in question would require disassembly of major elements, fabrication of new elements and reassembly. Much of the historic fabric of the door would likely be lost in the process. Can it be repaired? Yes. Should it be repaired instead of replaced in kind? Tough call, but probably not worth the investment."

3* The new front door is proposed to be a 9-lite over 2-panel wood door; specifications are included in the application. The design guidelines state that "If replacement of a deteriorated window or door unit is necessary, replace the unit in kind, matching the design and the dimension of the original sash or panels, pane configuration, architectural trim, detailing, and materials."

4* The application for the removal of wood windows is submitted after-the-fact.

5* The amended application states that the dormer window and two front and right side window sashes were removed prior to the effective date of the HOD and that the other 6 windows were removed after the HOD went into effect. No evidence is included in the application that the windows removed were deteriorated beyond repair.

6* According to the 1990 National Register of Historic Places Registration Form for the East Raleigh-South Park Historic District the house at 507 S Person Street contributes to the district, is 1-1/2 stories tall, was constructed pre-1914 and is described as having 1-over-l double hung-sash windows, original door, and a hipped dormer with 6-over-6 double hung-sash windows.

7* According to the 2011 Report and Recommendation for The Designation of The South Person/South Blount [now named Prince Hall] Historic Overlay District the house at 507 S Person Street contributes to the district and is described as a having a hipped dormer with a 6/6 window and boarded up 1/1 windows.

8* The amended application includes photographs of removed 2/2 double hung sash (DHS) and 1/1 windows and proposes replacement with 2/2 and 1/1 wood sashes. The locations of the windows were not included.

9* Partial specifications of the new windows are included in the amended application. This does not include section drawings, but does include a statement regarding the dimensions of the exterior casing.

10* No evidence regarding the condition of the exterior casing and trim was included in the application. The amended application states that the "exterior of the windows were not affected all."
11* The amended application states that the "sash windows were removed from the inside of the house." The sashes are part of the windows and considered exterior features.
12* Testimony at the 3/3/14 provided no new evidence, but reiterated and supported facts regarding the historic windows and lack of proof of deterioration.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the light fixtures be smaller and of a more simple design.
2. That the new front door match the design, materials and details of the historic door.
3. That the sashes removed be replaced with wood sashes matching the historic sashes.
4. That the exterior casing, frames and sills remain.
5. That the following be specifications and details provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or commencement of work:
   a. Light fixtures on gate;
   b. How electricity will be provided to the gate lights;
   c. Light fixtures on house, if proposed;
   d. Front door;
   e. New window sashes;
   f. Clarification of where new window sashes will be installed.

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

Committee members voting: Alphin, Caliendo, Downer, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 10/7/14.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

028-14-MW 620 W CABARRUS STREET
Applicant: MATTHEW STATON
Received: 3/20/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 6/18/2014 1) 4/7/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Grade around rear deck; install associated steps and plantings
Amendments: Additional information was provided 3/28/14 and is attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- Grading is sometimes approvable at the staff level; Per Article XV of the Bylaws and Rules of Procedure of the Raleigh Historic Development Commission, Incorporated, staff referred this Minor Work projects to the COA Committee for review because in staff's judgment the change involves an alteration that may not meet the guidelines and is of a precedent-setting nature.
- COA files for 620 W Cabarrus Street are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Grade around rear deck; install associated steps and plantings

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Installation of associated steps and plantings is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.4; however, grading around rear deck **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, 2.3.11 and the following findings:

1* The subject lot is relatively flat, 50'x125', and contains a residence and storage shed. The rear yard is contained by 3' and 4' high fencing, installed per COA 030-03-CA.

2* Concrete patio, rear deck, low fence, wall, remove railings, seat wall, gravel, and some plantings were approved per COA 034-14-MW.

3* The amended application includes photographs of other retaining walls and sloped earth in the Boylan Heights district.

4* Staff is unaware of any examples where earth is mounded around a rear porch in an otherwise flat yard.

5* The proposed work is located behind an existing fence; from the front yard, the slope will also be behind a 36″ tall wall.
6* The retaining wall will keep the earth away from the foundation.
7* The area of grading is approximately 272 SF in area and will rise from the natural grade of the yard to about 36″ in depth; plan and elevation drawings are included in the application.
8* Two sets of 4' x 1' - 6" wide concrete steps and 3 3' boulders are proposed to be installed on the slope.
9* River birch trees and meadow grasses are proposed to be planted on the slope.

Pending the committee's determination regarding the grading around the rear deck, staff recommends that the committee approve the amended application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Matthew Staton [affirmed] and Jennifer Simmons [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Staton pointed out that the storage shed referenced in staff comments was demolished some time ago. He also stated that they'd like to highlight that they want to create the deck and remove the rails and steps in order to minimize the effect on the house. He provided examples of raised beds and mounded earth along with the application.

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

Mr. Alphin asked how high the deck is off the grade. Ms. Staton said that the deck is 36″ off the ground and that there would be 30″ of mound.

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
The building code rarely regulates anything 30″ or down. It doesn't affect the house. [Alphin]
The work is hidden from view. [Shackleton]
The mounded earth is configured much like a planter. [Caliendo]
If there was a retaining wall around it, it would have been approved by staff. [Shackleton]
It is not in the front yard. The dirt will not be up against the house. [Shackleton]
Looking at guideline 2.3.11, I don't think the proposal alters the topography substantially. [Caliendo]
It's only 30″ [Shackleton]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Mr. Alphin moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 2-9) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with a change to fact 1 as stated below:

A. Installation of associated steps and plantings is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.4; and grading around rear deck is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, 2.3.11 and the following findings:

1* The subject lot is relatively flat, 50'x125', and contains a residence. The rear yard is contained by 3' and 4' high fencing, installed per COA 030-03-CA.

2* Concrete patio, rear deck, low fence, wall, remove railings, seat wall, gravel, and some plantings were approved per COA 034-14-MW.

3* The amended application includes photographs of other retaining walls and sloped earth in the Boylan Heights district.

4* Staff is unaware of any examples where earth is mounded around a rear porch in an otherwise flat yard.

5* The proposed work is located behind an existing fence; from the front yard, the slope will also be behind a 36" tall wall.

6* The retaining wall will keep the earth away from the foundation.

7* The area of grading is approximately 272 SF in area and will rise from the natural grade of the yard to about 36" in depth; plan and elevation drawings are included in the application.

8* Two sets of 4' x 1' - 6" wide concrete steps and 3 3' boulders are proposed to be installed on the slope.

9* River birch trees and meadow grasses are proposed to be planted on the slope.

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

Decision on the Application

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

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

Committee members voting: Alphin, Caliendo, Downer, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 10/7/14.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

029-14-CA 523 N BLOODWORTH STREET
Applicant: KAREN FIORINI WITH BACKYARD OASIS POOLS
Received: 3/19/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 6/17/2014 1) 4/7/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Remove two trees; remove koi pond; install rear yard pool
Amendments: Additional information was provided 3/28/14 and 4/6/14 and is attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- Files for COA 012-08-CA and COA 073-13-CA are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Remove two trees; remove koi pond; install rear yard pool
2.4	Fences and Walls	Remove fence.

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Remove two trees; remove koi pond; install rear yard pool; remove fence is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.5, 2.3.8, 2.3.9, 2.4.1, 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* Two trees inside the fence are proposed for removal and replacement in order to accommodate construction of the pool. The trees proposed for removal are multi-stemmed trees, one of which may be a crape myrtle. Location and tree species for replacement trees were not included in the application.

2* The lot size is 8,276 SF; the existing house has a footprint of 2,800 SF inclusive of porches and decks; the koi pond is approximately 84 SF; the proposed pool is about 209 SF; total proposed footprint is 2,925 SF. An existing concrete pad will remain. The current lot coverage is roughly 34%; the proposed lot coverage is 35%
3* There is no COA on file for the koi pond being removed.
4* Rear yard pools have been approved in Oakwood including at 520 N Person Street (COA 012-08-CA) and 225 Elm Street (COA 073-13-CA).
5* The subject lot is relatively flat, 54'x150', and contains a residence and storage shed. The rear yard is contained by a 6' high fence, installed per COA CAD-90-015. The proposed pool will be sited immediately behind the house adjacent an existing wood deck and behind the fence.
6* The freeform-shaped pool will have a 12' section of 18" tall raised stone veneer wall with waterfall; the back side of the wall is proposed to be stucco; a photographic example of the stone wall was included in the amended application; material samples were not included in the application.
7* Walls typically are the same material on both sides, unless retaining earth.
8* Pool equipment is proposed to be located next to the existing storage building; it will sit on a concrete pad and be screened by plantings. Planting specifications are not included in the application.
9* The existing non-historic low fence in the rear yard will be removed.

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

1. That the stone veneer be applied to both sides of the wall.
2. That the details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. pool equipment screening;
   b. species and location of the replacement trees;
   c. stone veneer sample.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Karen Fiorini [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application.

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

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
The trees proposed for removal do not appear to be historic canopy producing trees. The area is not visible from the street and they won't be running the risk of killing other trees. I am good with staff comments. [Shackleton]
I am good with staff comments. [Caliendo, Alphin]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Ms. Downer moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-9) to be acceptable as findings of fact as stated below:

A. Remove two trees; remove koi pond; install rear yard pool; remove fence is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.5, 2.3.8, 2.3.9, 2.4.1, 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* Two trees inside the fence are proposed for removal and replacement in order to accommodate construction of the pool. The trees proposed for removal are multi-stemmed trees, one of which may be a crape myrtle. Location and tree species for replacement trees were not included in the application.

2* The lot size is 8,276 SF; the existing house has a footprint of 2,800 SF inclusive of porches and decks; the koi pond is approximately 84 SF; the proposed pool is about 209 SF; total proposed footprint is 2,925 SF. An existing concrete pad will remain. The current lot coverage is roughly 34%; the proposed lot coverage is 35%

3* There is no COA on file for the koi pond being removed.

4* Rear yard pools have been approved in Oakwood including at 520 N Person Street (COA 012-08-CA) and 225 Elm Street (COA 073-13-CA).

5* The subject lot is relatively flat, 54'x150', and contains a residence and storage shed. The rear yard is contained by a 6' high fence, installed per COA CAD-90-015. The proposed pool will be sited immediately behind the house adjacent an existing wood deck and behind the fence.

6* The freeform-shaped pool will have a 12' section of 18" tall raised stone veneer wall with waterfall; the back side of the wall is proposed to be stucco; a photographic example of the stone wall was included in the amended application; material samples were not included in the application.

7* Walls typically are the same material on both sides, unless retaining earth.
8* Pool equipment is proposed to be located next to the existing storage building; it will sit on a concrete pad and be screened by plantings. Planting specifications are not included in the application.
9* The existing non-historic low fence in the rear yard will be removed.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the stone veneer be applied to both sides of the wall.
2. That the details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. pool equipment screening;
   b. species and location of the replacement trees;
   c. stone veneer sample.

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

Committee members voting: Alphin, Caliendo, Downer, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 10/7/14.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Design Guidelines Update
2. Appeal Update

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Alphin moved that the meeting be adjourned. Ms. Caliendo seconded the motion; passed 4/0. The meeting was adjourned at 4:39 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner