RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
February 3, 2014

CALL TO ORDER
Elizabeth Caliendo 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, Sarah David
Alternate Present: Kiernan McGorty
Excused Absence: Miranda Downer, Scott Shackleton
Staff Present: Tania Tully, Martha Lauer

Approval of the January 6, 2014 Minutes
Ms. David moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing and adopt the minutes as submitted. Mr. Alphin seconded the motion; passed 3/0.

Minor Works
There were no questions regarding the Minor Work report.

The following is a list indicating persons in attendance and whether they were affirmed. Ms. Martha Lauer and Ms. Tania Tully, Notary Publics, administered the affirmations.

Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address	Affirmed
Brad Thorne. 9217 Shallcross Way 27617	Yes
Joel New, 702 Lake Boone Trail 27607	No
Julie New, 702 Lake Boone Trail 27607	No
Mary Lovelock, 314 Polk Street 27604	Yes
Barbara Church, 820 Runnymede Road 27607	No
Jimbo McIver, 820 Runnymede Road 27607	Yes
Gail Wiesner, 515 Euclid Street 27604	Yes
Dr. Davis Wiesner, 515 Euclid Street 27604	Yes
Huston Paschal, 821 Runnymede Road 27607	Yes
Manny Aretakis, 309 Transylvania Avenue 27609	Yes
Terry Thayer, 8521 Waterchase Ct 27613	Yes
Todd Barlow, 606 N Boundary Street 27604	Yes
Tyson Warren, 2717 Anderson Street 27608	Yes
Heather Scott, 218 N East Street 27601	No
Darcia Black, 225 Elm Street 27601	Yes
Louis Cherry, 421 N Bloodworth Street 27604	Yes
Marsha Gordon, 421 N Bloodworth Street 27604	Yes

Teresa Becom, 308 N East Street 27601	No
Don Becom, 308 N East Street 27601	No
Jackie Twisdale, 318 Oakwood Avenue 27601	No
Joy Weeber, 530 N East Street 27604	Yes
David Nightingale, 407 E Jones Street 27601	No
Peggy Federson, 401 Elm Street 27604	Yes
Peter Rumsey, 515 N Bloodworth Street 27604	Yes

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. David moved to approve the agenda as revising the order of cases. Mr. Alphin seconded the motion; passed 3/0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Ms. Caliendo 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: 003-14-CA, 006-14-CA, 005-14-CA and 195-13-CA.

Due to the receipt of a Notice of Intent to Appeal, transcribed minutes for case 004-14-CA will be reviewed and approved at a special meeting at the conclusion of the RHDC Business meeting on Tuesday, March 18.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

003-14-CA 821 RUNNYMEDE ROAD (MATSUMOTO HOUSE)
Applicant: HUSTON PASCHAL
Received: 1/14/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 4/14/2014 1) 2/3/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: RALEIGH HISTORIC LANDMARK
Zoning: R-4
Nature of Project: Change concrete patio, sidewalk & steps to brick; change block planter to brick; add handrails to ramp; replace wood on ramp with ipe; replace screened door; extend driveway; add drainage trough; alter landscaping.
Amendments: In a phone conversation 1/29/14 staff learned that the existing patio steps were added by the current property owner prior to designation and the wood deck is currently unpainted. Additional information was received via email 1/30/14 and is attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- The application includes a request to add curb and gutter; this is outside of the landmark boundary and not subject to a COA.
- The landmark boundary does not include the entirety of the patio entry or most of the off-street parking area. A map is attached to these comments.
- Excerpt from Landmark Designation Ordinance:
    - "Exterior of the modular plan, flat-roofed, steel and wood-frame residence cantilevered over a concrete base, designed by George Matsumoto and built in 1954 as an innovative modernist building, as described in the designation report, including all of the parcel described in Section 1."
- The landmark designation report and ordinance are available for review.
- Excerpts from Landmark Designation report:
    - "A paved and landscaped forecourt at the road's edge provides a transition between the street and a short bridge that leads up to the central doorway of the symmetrical, paneled façade…" (Section 7, page 1)
    - "The principal approach to the house is by way of a sunken, landscaped entry forecourt located just off the street. Several concrete steps lead down into this court between a hedge-like row of lagustrum shrubs on the south and a perpendicular, raised planter on the north which contains hollies and a small juniper tree. The forecourt is paved with exposed aggregate concrete divided into panels by wood strips. At the south end of the forecourt is a concrete block retaining wall which supports the near end of a steel-string wooden ramp that bridges up to a wooden platform before the recessed front entrance to the house. A steeply-sloped driveway, shared with the adjacent Koontz House, also leads

from the street down to a carport under the east end of the building. " (Section 7, page 2)

- "The house is…the work of a master and as possessing high artistic values. Built on a modular plan, the post and beam, steel and wood-frame residence demonstrates Matsumoto's skill in integrating site, structure, economy of labor and materials, and space planning to create an environment of warmth and quiet grace." (Section 8, page 1)
- "An exterior entry court just off the street prepares the visitor to cross a small bridge that spans up to the carefully-composed, paneled front elevation" (Section 8, page 2)
- "Matsumoto was quoted as saying, 'This [forecourt] is necessary to prepare one to enter the home; a part of the planning. There should be a pause point.'" (Section 8, page 2)

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	change concrete patio, sidewalk & steps to brick; change block planter to brick; install concrete curb and gutter; extend driveway; add drainage trough; alter landscaping
2.4	Fences and Walls	change block planter to brick
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	extend driveway
3.7	Windows and Doors	replace screened door
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	replace wood on ramp with ipe; add handrails to ramp
3.11	Accessibility, Health, and Safety Considerations	add handrails to ramp

STAFF COMMENTS

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

A. Changing of concrete patio, sidewalk & steps to brick; changing of block planter to brick; extending of driveway; addition of drainage trough; alteration of landscaping is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.1, 2.3.3, 2.3.4, 2.3.8, 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.5.1, 2.5.5, 2.5.7.

1* The application includes Matsumoto's sketch of the floor and site plan; the patio, planting walls and driveway are all part of the original design. Only a portion of the patio is within the boundary of the landmark.

2* The landmark designation ordinance specifies that the house is of primary significance.

3* New landscaping and mulched path is proposed for the front of the house; a planting plan is included in the application. Plantings proposed include black bamboo, ferns, azaleas, and other plants.
4* The proposed driveway extension will require removal and replanting of existing camellias.
5* The driveway extension is at the end of the driveway, a common and typical driveway location.
6* The application states that the washed-aggregate concrete sidewalk and steps have suffered settling over the years, resulting in sloped and uneven surfaces. The proposal replaces the concrete with a commercial brown brick; material sample and brick layout were not included in the application. The trim on the house is brown.
7* An obsolete 500-gallon fuel-oil tank located beneath the patio is slated to be removed.
8* The application states that the concrete block planters are settling and disintegrating, and damaged by overgrown plantings. The proposal replaces the concrete block with a commercial brown brick; material sample and elevations were not included in the application.
9* The application proposes a three-and-a-half-foot shift in the non-historic steps from the patio down to the side yard.
10* The application states that the east section of the wing wall has the most severe settling in the retaining wall and has separated from the main wall. The east section of the wing wall is proposed to be removed and relocated to allow for a new planter.
11* The concrete block wing wall parallel to the house is part of the original plan and is the same material as the foundation of the house.

B. Addition of handrails to ramp; replace wood on ramp with ipe; replacement of screened door is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.7.11, 3.8.1, 3.8.2, 3.8.5, 3.8.10, 3.11.1, 3.11.3.
1* The existing screen door is proposed to be replaced with a custom-built, mahogany frame door repainted eggplant, with a stainless steel door handle and lockset and a copper screen wire panel which will reintroduce some of the original natural wood at the entry. A detailed drawing is included in the application.
2* A light-weight steel frame handrail with stainless steel cables is proposed for safety; a photographic example of the proposed rail is included; details and specifications were not included.
3* The amended application states that the handrail will attach only to the ramp and not the house.
4* The treated two-by-six unpainted wood decking will be replaced with unpainted ipe wood decking; the amended application states that the boards will have precisely the same layout as the existing boards.

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

1. That the historic wing wall not be relocated and not be replaced with brick.
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits.
   a. new steps;
   b. brick sample(s);
   c. patio layout;
   d. planter walls;
   e. location and installation of the new railing.
3. That the surface texture of the new section of driveway match that of the existing driveway.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Huston Paschal [affirmed], owner and Manny Aretakis [affirmed], builder and architect spoke in support of the application. Mr. Aretakis said that he lives in and grew up in 309 Transylvania Avenue, another Matsumoto House. He handed out photographs of the existing condition of the wing wall and steps, photos of brick samples with three different mortars, and a detailed drawing of the ramp railing.
Ms. Caliendo asked if the applicant had any response to staff comments. Ms. Paschal talked about the historic wing wall noting that on the drawing in the application it shows the area where the retaining wall has suffered the most. The current plan is to take it down and put a planter there and reconfigure steps slightly moving them closer to street. She said that staff suggested that the retaining wall be retained exactly as it is, parallel to the foundation of the house. Ms. Paschal stated that the other aspect of the retaining wall is that they propose that it be faced with brick so it will blend in with the patio and planters they are planning.

Mr. Aretakis said that the wing wall captures the end of the stairs which aren't original. There is pretty severe settling so the whole thing [wall] would need to be removed to be rebuilt even if kept in the same location. He stated that new concrete block compared to the 60 year old concrete block wouldn't look good together. If they used brick then it doesn't look like a patch job. Mr. Aretakis also pointed out that the original house was naturally varnished and over the years it's all been painted a dark brown color. He stated that the house itself has changed over time and the brick proposed will mirror the trim of the house. He explained that there is a similar situation at his mom's house, the Matsumoto House [at 309 Transylvania Avenue], and the caps on her retaining wall which were like pavers. He'd been trying to figure out how to repair and ultimately did a brick rowlock to match that driveway.

Mr. Aretakis also discussed the patio noting that the exposed aggregate is a bit slippery and slopes so much that it's treacherous. He noted that they would consider doing a stained concrete to avoid new white concrete. It could have the wood trim the way George [Matsumoto] did his patios: that would be plan B. They still would want brick planters.

Ms. Paschal commented that if the patio was replaced with brick, where the wood dividers are now, that same pattern or design could be replicated with the darker brown brick of the wall turned on its side to outline the area.

Ms. Caliendo clarified that the application under review is proposing brick for the patio material.

Ms. Paschal asked about suggested staff condition number 3 and the surface texture. Mr. Aretakis said that the new section of driveway would be stained concrete. Ms. Paschal confirmed that the intent is for it to look like what there now. Ms. Caliendo said that that is what staff is recommending.

Mr. Alphin stated that the big sticking point is not the patio.

Gail Wiesner [affirmed] asked if this is an individually designated landmark and if the yard is part of the landmark. Ms. Davis said that it is part of the yard. Tania Tully [affirmed] pointed out that the staff comments explain that the original construction of the front yard goes into the public right of way. She notes that with landmark designations it is only the parcel that is landmarked, so the regulated portion is only Ms. Paschal's private property.

Ms. Wiesner asked if the current materials were no longer available. Mr. Aretakis said that they would be then using new concrete block on the wing wall. Ms. Wiesner sad that it wouldn't stay new looking very long. Mr. Aretakis said that the foundation has 60 years of aging and it will take a long time for new block to age.

Ms. Caliendo asked for confirmation that the stone out there is not original. Mr. Aretakis said that the stone around the base was added because the tar paper was exposed, and the cantilevers exposed dirt. Ms. Tully noted that it was approved with a minor work COA a couple of months ago. Mr. Aretakis stated that George [Matsumoto] had a large bed of river stone, same material as along the foundation wall now, loosely put along under porch along bottom of porch. Ms. Paschal said they were "extending [the existing] pebble beach." Mr. Aretakis said that he had the same issue at his Matsumoto House; the planting beds have river stone because nothing grows underneath.

Mr. Alphin brought the conversation back to the retaining wall stating that it's going to be hard to change the concrete wing wall with brick because the designation names the material specifically. He also commented that the reshaping of that wall seems questionable to me. It's two planes and you're breaking the planes of the entrance designed by the architect. Mr. Aretakis asked how to rebuild it without making it look patched. Mr. Alphin suggested that he try to reclaim concrete block from the planters. He also noted that a good mason could go a long way to getting close. He understands the dilemma but part of this is that a concrete block retaining wall is specifically named in the designation report. That's above the commission's

rank, if you will. Ms. Paschal commented that if that's the case, and the retaining wall is retained as it is, then reconfiguring steps in that area in front of the retaining wall would make sense. Ms. Tully noted that they could still have the planter shown on the plans. Ms. Paschal said that keeping the wall in the same location makes the planter less essential. Ms. Caliendo stated that attaching a planter would be negative impact as it attaches to the wall.

Ms. Wiesner asked if the proposal is to be the same with wood strips as well. Ms. Caliendo said that it was not in this application. That the applicants were just throwing out ideas.

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

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
The retaining wall is part of original plan. The fact that the forecourt is paved in concrete divided by wood strips is in the report too. It seems like a switch over to brick pavers is a big change. [David]
I suggest a discussion on where the boundary line fits with regard to the patio and also looking at language of the ordinance which is included at the top of the staff comments. It could go either way on this but it needs to be clear what is significant. The difficulty is the boundary cutting through the forecourt. Is it the material or the fact that the forecourt exists that is important? It was staff's interpretation that it is the fact that the forecourt exists. [Tully]
With the boundary if we have oversight of part of the patio, it seems to be we have to consider the whole patio. [David]
Technically you only have jurisdiction over the part that is within the landmark boundary. You are just assuming that people will not make radical changes to part of it. [Tully]
These applicants are clearly interested in preserving this landmark. I am okay with brick planting walls on other side of the property line, especially since it will allow them to harvest some concrete block that could be reused with the wall retained. [Alphin]
The forecourt itself is important to the entry sequence. [Caliendo]
You mean rather than if it is brick or concrete? [David]
Yes. [Caliendo]
Visually in terms of design it is a bog change. Changing from concrete block to brick is less of a change because it is more of a change in unit size. To me going from concrete with an aggregate in it to brick is a big change. The question is how important is it to the landmark significance. [David]

There were a few moments of silence as the commissioners read through the landmark designation application.

There's something to be said for aggregated concrete. Brick will have a different look. Exposed aggregate blends. Brick is more of a departure. The flat surface connects the regulated and non-regulated parts. The exposed aggregate will get old looking fairly quickly. [Alphin]
The applicant mentioned a stained concrete. How different would that be from aggregate? [David]
In my mind is not that difference and it is a safety issue with the slippery aggregate. [Alphin]
The wall should stay straight. It can't jog. It must stay concrete block whether reused or new. [David]
I'd rather see reused. [Alphin]
What about applying brick to planters? [David]
They are mostly outside the landmark boundary and I thinks it's an appropriate choice. [Alphin]
In staying true to the original, concrete with aggregate or a broom finish is closer than brick. [David]
I agree. [Caliendo]
With divider strips. [Alphin]
The brick patio is just one more material, and it's a different color. It should keep the same design intent. [Caliendo]

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Mr. Aretakis asked about the material of the planters. Mr. Alphin said that they haven't voted but they seem to be in agreement that the planter walls could be brick, the retaining/wing wall needs to remain concrete block, and the patio be either exposed aggregate or other concrete. Mr. Aretakis noted that the only problem with exposed aggregate is the slippery nature of it. Ms. Paschal agreed. He asked if her if she was okay with stained concrete instead and she said yes. Mr. Aretakis also noted that he is not aware of another Matsumoto house with exposed aggregate concrete.

Mr. Alphin asked if they are planning to weld the handrails. Mr. Aretakis said it is a 7" steel channel would be either a weld or a bolt and would be painted black. Mr. Alphin said that with old buildings the commission is very concerned about a connection to a house and the ability to bring is back if desired. Mr. Aretakis said he can't imagine anyone going back to no handrails. Ms. Paschal said that they take the point that it should be reversible. Mr. Aretakis noted that the problem with bolting it is that there is a wood cleat inside, so you'd have to go through that which is technically tricky.

Committee Discussion (2)

Any thoughts on making the railing reversible? [Alphin]

Bolting sounds as irreversible as welding. [David]
Bolts would take away from the design simplicity. [Caliendo]

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 comments A. (inclusive of facts 1, 3-11) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-4) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following modifications:

Changing Comment A to read as follows:

A. Changing of sidewalk & steps to brick; changing of block planter to brick; extending of driveway; addition of drainage trough; alteration of landscaping is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.1, 2.3.3, 2.3.4, 2.3.8, 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.5.1, 2.5.5, 2.5.7; however changing of concrete patio and retaining wall to brick is incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.1, 2.3.3, 2.3.4.

Adding the following fact:
A.12* The landmark designation ordinance states that the forecourt is paved with exposed aggregate concrete.

Modifying the following fact to read as follows:

5* B.2* A light-weight steel frame handrail with stainless steel cables is proposed for safety; a photographic example of the proposed rail is included; details and specifications were provided at the public hearing.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the historic wing wall not be relocated and not be replaced with brick.
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits.
   a. new steps;
   b. brick sample(s);
   c. patio layout and new concrete surface texture;
   d. planter walls.
3. That the surface texture of the new section of driveway match that of the existing driveway.
4. That the forecourt not be replaced with brick.

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

Committee members voting: Alphin, Caliendo, David.

Certificate expiration date: 8/3/14.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

006-14-CA 525 EUCLID STREET
Applicant: BRADLEY THORNE DESIGNS, LLC
Received: 1/16/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 4/16/2014 1) 2/3/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Construct dormer on east side of house; change exterior paint colors; replace existing rear deck.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes: Google street view photos are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	construct dormer; replace deck
3.4	Paint and Paint Color	change exterior paint colors
3.5	Roofs	construct dormer on east side of house
4.1	Decks	replace existing rear deck
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	construct dormer on east side of house

STAFF COMMENTS

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

A. Changing of exterior paint colors; replacement of existing rear deck is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.7, 3.4.3, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.5.

1* There are trees on the property that may be impacted by construction activity; a tree protection plan was not included in the application.

2* Changing exterior paint colors is typically approved as a Minor Work and is included here for administrative efficiency. Color samples were included with the application.

3* The existing rear deck is proposed to be removed and rebuilt on the same footprint with the addition of stairs to the rear yard; detailed drawings were not included in the application. There is no COA on file for the existing deck.

4* The existing deck railing does not have traditional details; the proposed drawings suggest a railing with an inset picket. Details and specifications were not included in the application.

5* The deck sits at the first floor level of the house, but is not screened; the *Guidelines* suggest that decks be screened.

6* The deck is shown as drawn to the edge of the west wall; the *Guidelines* suggest that decks are inset from the corner.

B. Construction of dormer on east side of house is not incongruous in concept according to Guidelines sections 3.5.10, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8.

1* There are no historic chimneys or other roof features on the existing roof where the dormer is proposed.

2* Dormers are a historical method of adding onto houses and are not uncommon features on bungalows. A side roof dormer was approved at 319 S Boylan Avenue (COA 007-12-CA).

3* The proposed dormer is located on the east side of the house and is set back several feet from the front and rear walls of the house.

4* It appears as though the dormer bracket detail will match the existing historic house.

5* Details and specifications of the new dormer are proposed to match the existing finishes, trim, and details; specifications are not included in the application.

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

1. That there either be no brackets on the dormer or be a simplified version of the historic brackets so as to differentiate from the historic house.
2. That the deck be screened and inset from the west wall by at least the width of the corner board.
3. That details and specifications for the following items be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan;
   b. Deck construction drawing;
   c. Dormer window specifications (cut sheets/section drawings).
4. That details and specifications for the following items be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Dormer brackets;
   b. Window trim details (either close-up photos of existing or detailed drawing);
   c. Dormer finishes, trim, and details;
   d. Deck screening.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Terry Thayer [affirmed] and Bradley Thorne [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Thorne stated that everything in the staff comments looks very doable. They will move deck over six inches and add screening. For the dormer windows they will create additional drawings with details. He stated that what they are considering doing is matching the trim details that are there and may not put brackets on the dormer at all.

Dr. David Wiesner [affirmed] stated his support of the project noting that it matches the existing nicely including the siding, trim, color and roof. He pointed out a guideline not listed in staff comments: 3.7.10 about the introduction of dormers that will not compromise roof design.

Dr. Joy Weeber [affirmed] stated her support of the application because the details such as the window fenestration honor the nature of the street.

Tania Tully [affirmed] noted that guideline 3.7.10 is not about dormers, but that 3.5.10, which does, is included in the staff comments.

Mr. Alphin asked about guideline 4.2.7 which states "Design an addition to be compatible with the historic building in mass, materials, color, and relationship of solids to voids in the exterior walls, yet make the addition discernible from the original." He questioned the discernibility of this addition. Ms. Tully said that staff suggested simplified dormer brackets in the staff comments as a way to make the addition discernible. She noted that there are many ways to make things discernible, from subtle to not too subtle. Often times in additions like this when they use windows with simulated divided lights it is another subtle way to note what is new.

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

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
The guidelines call for decks to be screened around the base. [Alphin]

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) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-4) to be acceptable as findings of fact.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That there either be no brackets on the dormer or be a simplified version of the historic brackets so as to differentiate from the historic house.
2. That the deck be screened and inset from the west wall by at least the width of the corner board.
3. That details and specifications for the following items be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan;
   b. Deck construction drawing;
   c. Dormer window specifications (cut sheets/section drawings).
4. That details and specifications for the following items be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Dormer brackets;
   b. Window trim details (either close-up photos of existing or detailed drawing);
   c. Dormer finishes, trim, and details;
   d. Deck screening;
   e. Exterior light fixtures.

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

Committee members voting: Alphin, Caliendo, David.

Certificate expiration date: 8/3/14.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

005-14-CA 606 N BOUNDARY STREET
Applicant: TODD BARLOW
Received: 1/16/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 4/16/2014 1) 2/3/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Change to previously approved COA 008-13-CA: install smooth faced fiber cement siding with a bead profile [partial after-the-fact]
Amendments: Additional information was provided by the applicant January 27, 2014 and is attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted. Ms. Caliendo did disclose that the applicant does work for a company that her firm consults with at times. She is not currently working on a project with him and stated that she can be impartial in her decision making.
Staff Notes:

- After-the-fact applications are reviewed as though the work has not been completed.
- Because of the extensive nature of the proposed alterations to this non-contributing resource, staff is treating the proposed work as new construction rather than an addition.
- COA 008-13-CA approved in part construction of 1-story rear addition with screened porch & deck; construction of new 2-car garage; siding of existing brick house with fiber cement siding.
- The file for COA 008-13-CA is available for review.
- The 1979 COA file for 602 N Boundary Street is available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
4.3	New Construction	install smooth faced fiber cement siding with a bead profile

STAFF COMMENTS

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

A. Installation of smooth faced fiber cement siding with a bead profile **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* section 4.3.10.

1* The house at 606 N Boundary Street, constructed in the 1950s, is a non-contributing resource in the Oakwood Historic District. The approved changes (COA 008-13-CA) gave the house a semi-traditional bungalow appearance.
2* COA 008-13-CA approved the use of smooth finish fiber cement siding; a bead was not discussed in the hearing.
3* The application states that beaded siding has been used in construction as an architectural detail well before the 1900s throughout the US and across NC (no citation). Historically, horizontal siding with a bead was more commonly found on houses constructed in the late 1700s and early 1800s. (The Visual Dictionary of American Domestic Architecture, by Rachel Carley, 1994)
4* The application contained photographs of houses in Oakwood with beaded siding at 602 N Boundary Street and 516 Elm Street. The installation of "masonite beaded clapboard siding over existing siding" at 602 N Boundary Street was approved with a COA in June 1979 under an earlier set of design guidelines. There is no record of the discussion, simply the decision. There is no COA on file for a siding change at 516 Elm Street.
5* Beaded siding is seen in the historic district, but is not common. The amended application states that the beaded siding helps distinguish the new construction from the historic buildings per *Guidelines* 4.3.11.
6* The amended application states that decorative beaded details are evident throughout Historic Oakwood – whether it is beaded siding, beaded mortar in a home's foundation or beaded boards on porch ceilings.
7* The amended application references various sections of the *Guidelines* and includes arguments for use of the beaded siding.
8* A close-up photo of the proposed beaded siding is included in the amended application; a close-up photo of a historic beaded siding is provided by staff (ca. 1820 house, photo by Calder Loth) and is attached to these comments. The beaded fiber cement siding is clearly not duplicative of historic beaded siding.

Pending the committee's determination of the use of beaded siding, staff suggests that the committee approve the amended application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Todd Barlow [affirmed] and Tyson Warren [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application.

Gail Wiesner [affirmed] asked why the application was limited to smooth faced originally and if there were samples of the material put in the application. Tania Tully [affirmed] stated that the option other than smooth faced is faux wood grain and smooth faced is what the commission typically approves. She also noted that because smooth faced fiber cement siding is a commonly approved material a sample was not requested or provided. Ms. Wiesner clarified that the approval was not with a bead. Ms. Tully concurred.

In response to a question from Mr. Alphin Ms. Tully stated that the review of the application was this was treated as new detached new construction. She also commented that when staff originally reviewed the application, because it was a major change to a noncontributing structure, she also treated the review as detached construction. This application is being treated same way as original approval.

Mr. Warren noted that 516 has same bead on it. Ms. Tully said that fact 4 included that information. Mr. Warren stated that through his research it was done in 1978 after the historic department was created.

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

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
As an architectural historian I would say this is a small brick box as post-war recovery. To turn it into a bungalow was false history. Then to add a bead from earlier history was further false history. In 1978 the country was in a bicentennial fervor. Beads are best left to the 18th century. [David]
This is new construction. I think someone could put a bead on a new siding and we wouldn't think about it. [Alphin]
It's very particular to the 18th century. [David]
Leonidas, for new construction those would count. Not sure if there's beaded siding there.
I'm not sure, but I would have been opposed to it. [David]
I have no problem with it. It's looked at as new construction. [Caliendo]
It's a really character defining treatment from the 18th century. It doesn't have a place anywhere else. [David]
It conforms with 4.3.11. [Alphin]

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 1-8) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following additional facts:

8* Staff treated the COA as new construction for review purposes.
9* Beaded siding was a signature treatment that is distinctively1from the 18th century.

The motion was seconded by Ms. David; passed 2/1 (David Opposed).

Decision on the Application

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

The motion was seconded by Ms. David; passed 2/1 (David Opposed).

Committee members voting: Alphin, Caliendo, David.

Certificate expiration date: 8/3/14.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

195-13-CA 529 EUCLID STREET
Applicant: LOUIS AND SARA PASCUCCI
Received: 12/13/2013 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 3/13/2014 1) 1/6/2014 2) 2/3/2014 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Replace window
Amendments: Remove general request to replace windows; revised to replace one non-historic window.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes: Replacement of non-historic front door and enclosure of rear deck was approved with conditions at the January 6, 2014 COA meeting.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
3.7	Windows and Doors	Replace window

STAFF COMMENTS

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

A. Replacement of window is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.7.1, 3.7.6; however installation of aluminum clad wood windows is incongruous according to *Guidelines* section 3.7.6.
1* The application states that the window proposed for removal is a non-historic swinging window above the kitchen sink that has dry-rot and close to coming apart.
2* A photo of the window to be replaced was not included in the application.
3* The application states that the replacement window looks nearly identical and is made of wood. Details and specifications for the proposed new window were provided; the proposed window is an aluminum clad wood window.
4* Aluminum clad wood windows have only been approved by the commission for detached new construction.

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

1. That a photograph of the window proposed for replacement be provided prior to removal.

2. That the new window be wood with a wood exterior.
3. That details and specifications for the new window be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

There was one question from the audience. Dr. David Wiesner [affirmed] asked if the approval would be for the Pella 450 proposed in original application. Tania Tully [affirmed] stated that it was staff's suggestion that the proposed window spec not be approved and that the approval be for an all wood window to be approved by staff.

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

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

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 1-4) to be acceptable as findings of fact.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That a photograph of the window proposed for replacement be provided prior to removal.
2. That the new window be wood with a wood exterior.
3. That details and specifications for the new window be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits.

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

Committee members voting: Alphin, Caliendo, David.

Certificate expiration date: 8/3/14.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Committee Discussion
2. Design Guidelines Update

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Caliendo adjourned the meeting at 8:08 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner