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

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

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

Approval of the May 5, 2014 Minutes

Ms. Caliendo moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing and to adopt the minutes as amended. Mr. Alphin seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

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, Notaries Public, administered the affirmations.

Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address	Affirmed
Andy Gilbert, 219 E Lenoir Street 27601	Yes
Stuart Cullinan, 219 E Lenoir Street 27601	Yes
Jimmy Thiem, 634 N Blount Street 27604	Yes
Mark Kirby, 2412 Beechridge Road 27608	Yes
Yvonne Blair-Burnette, 524 Sherrybrook Dr 27610	Yes
Sonja McKay, 518 N Bloodworth Street 27604	Yes
Ashley Morrison, 306 Pell Street 27604	Yes
Jason Queen, 207 Fayetteville Street 27601	Yes
Susan Gilbert, 219 E Lenoir Street 27601	Yes
Charlotte Mitchell, 1117 Hufbranch 27603	Yes
Sarah Rex, 210 Pace Street 27604	Yes

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Caliendo moved to approve the agenda as printed. Mr. Alphin seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

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: 059-14-CA, 060-14-CA, 061-14-CA, 062-14-CA, and 063-14-CA.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

059-14-CA 507 S PERSON STREET
Applicant: BEGINNING & BEYOND CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER INC
Received: 5/13/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 8/11/2014 1) 6/2/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: PRINCE HALL HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: DOD, RB
Nature of Project: Install handicap ramp; remove and replant crepe myrtle tree; revise previously approved coa 016-14-CA - construct new rear addition; install 6' tall wood privacy gate
Amendments: Revised drawings and additional information regarding windows were provided and are attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- City of Raleigh Pictometry and Google Streetview images of the property provided by staff are available for review.
- The drawings include notes of work conditionally approved in COA application 016-14-CA. The only work under review is that listed in the nature of project above. The COA file is available for review. Amended drawings removed notes referencing items from prior COAs.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	install handicap ramp; remove and replant crepe myrtle tree; construct new rear addition; install 6' tall wood privacy gate
2.4	Fences and Walls	install 6' tall wood privacy gate
3.11	Accessibility, Health, and Safety Considerations	install handicap ramp
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	construct new rear addition

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Installation of handicap ramp; removal of and replanting of crepe myrtle tree; installation of 6' tall wood privacy gate is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.5, 2.4.8, 3.11.1, 3.11.2, 3.11.5 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* There is an existing crepe myrtle tree proposed to be removed to allow for construction of a ramp. A new crepe myrtle tree is proposed to be replanted adjacent the new ramp.
2* The proposed section of fence will be wood and match the adjacent wood fence. It is proposed to be located at the rear of the driveway; drawings were provided.
3* The new ramp is proposed to come off of the front of the porch. Typically, front porch ramps are desired to connect to the side of the porch. The location of the property line does not allow for that configuration in this case.
4* There are no railings on the porch, thus no railings being removed to accommodate the ramp.
5* Elevation and detail drawings of the ramp are included in the application; the amended application includes a detailed drawing showing that the ramp will be attached by a ledger board at the band board of the porch.
6* To accommodate the small space the proposed ramp is steeper than is typically required.

B. Removal of rear screened porch; construction of new rear addition is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.6, 2.3.8, 4.2.1, 4,2.2, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9, and the following findings:

1* According to Wake County Real Estate data the lot is about 3,485 SF. The existing house and deck is 1,554 SF for lot coverage of 45%. The porches being removed are 182 SF. The proposed addition has an approximate 308 SF footprint for an increase of 126 SF and new lot coverage of 48%.
2* COA 016-14-CA conditionally approved removal of rear screened porch and construction of new rear screened porch as well as the notes regarding step repairs, windows and doors.
3* According to the City of Raleigh iMaps 2013 aerial photo, there are no trees on this or adjacent properties that may be impacted by the construction.
4* A rear ell shaped enclosed porch is proposed to be removed and replaced with a one story addition.

5* Removal of rear enclosed porches has been previously approved by the commission including at 520 Polk Street (COA 135-09-CA) and 522 N Person Street (COA 040-10-CA).
6* Architectural drawings of the existing house and proposed changes were included with the application.
7* Except for the rear stair the proposed addition fits within the ell of the rear of the house.
8* The roof of the addition remains lower than the eave of the historic house and does not overpower it.
9* The application states that the windows in the addition will be wood, details and specifications were included in the amended application except for the muntin profile.
10* The drawings show windows with "picture frame" trim rather than a sill, which is not typical in the historic districts.
11* The amended application includes a section detail of the eave; it is a simplified version of the eave of the historic house.

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

1. That the replacement tree be planted within 6 months after installation of the ramp.
2. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Window muntin profile.
3. That the windows in the addition have sills matching the historic windows rather than the picture frame trim shown in the drawing.

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 5/0.

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
I agree with staff. The staff conditions address the sill and the tree issue. The amended application thoroughly addressed the ramp. It meets the guidelines. [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 1-6) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-11) to be acceptable as findings of fact as listed below:

A. Installation of handicap ramp; removal of and replanting of crepe myrtle tree; installation of 6' tall wood privacy gate is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.5, 2.4.8, 3.11.1, 3.11.2, 3.11.5 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* There is an existing crepe myrtle tree proposed to be removed to allow for construction of a ramp. A new crepe myrtle tree is proposed to be replanted adjacent the new ramp.
2* The proposed section of fence will be wood and match the adjacent wood fence. It is proposed to be located at the rear of the driveway; drawings were provided.
3* The new ramp is proposed to come off of the front of the porch. Typically, front porch ramps are desired to connect to the side of the porch. The location of the property line does not allow for that configuration in this case.
4* There are no railings on the porch, thus no railings being removed to accommodate the ramp.
5* Elevation and detail drawings of the ramp are included in the application; the amended application includes a detailed drawing showing that the ramp will be attached by a ledger board at the band board of the porch.
6* To accommodate the small space the proposed ramp is steeper than is typically required.

B. Removal of rear screened porch; construction of new rear addition is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.6, 2.3.8, 4.2.1, 4,2.2, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9, and the following findings:

1* According to Wake County Real Estate data the lot is about 3,485 SF. The existing house and deck is 1,554 SF for lot coverage of 45%. The porches being removed are 182 SF. The proposed addition has an approximate 308 SF footprint for an increase of 126 SF and new lot coverage of 48%.
2* COA 016-14-CA conditionally approved removal of rear screened porch and construction of new rear screened porch as well as the notes regarding step repairs, windows and doors.
3* According to the City of Raleigh iMaps 2013 aerial photo, there are no trees on this or adjacent properties that may be impacted by the construction.
4* A rear ell shaped enclosed porch is proposed to be removed and replaced with a one story addition.
5* Removal of rear enclosed porches has been previously approved by the commission including at 520 Polk Street (COA 135-09-CA) and 522 N Person Street (COA 040-10-CA).
6* Architectural drawings of the existing house and proposed changes were included with the application.
7* Except for the rear stair the proposed addition fits within the ell of the rear of the house.

8* The roof of the addition remains lower than the eave of the historic house and does not overpower it.
9* The application states that the windows in the addition will be wood, details and specifications were included in the amended application except for the muntin profile.
10* The drawings show windows with "picture frame" trim rather than a sill, which is not typical in the historic districts.
11* The amended application includes a section detail of the eave; it is a simplified version of the eave of the historic house.

The motion was seconded by Ms. David; passed 5/0.

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the replacement tree be planted within 6 months after installation of the ramp.
2. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Window muntin profile.
3. That the windows in the addition have sills matching the historic windows rather than the picture frame trim shown in the drawing.

The motion was seconded by Ms. David; passed 5/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 12/2/14.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

060-14-CA 518 N BLOODWORTH STREET
Applicant: SONJA & FRANK MCKAY
Received: 5/13/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 8/11/2014 1) 6/2/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Alter existing rear addition; construct new rear addition; alter rear roof form; alter windows
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- City of Raleigh Pictometry and Google Streetview images of the property provided by staff are available for review.
- COA file for 518 N Bloodworth Street is available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Alter existing rear addition; construct new rear addition
3.5	Roofs	alter rear roof form
3.7	Windows and Doors	alter windows
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Alter existing rear addition; construct new rear addition

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Alteration of existing rear addition; construction of new rear addition; alteration of rear roof form; alteration of windows is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 3.5.1, 3.5.7, 3.7.1, 3.7.13, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9 and the following findings:

1* There are no trees in the footprint of the rear addition; however there are trees on the property that may be impacted by construction activity. A tree protection plan was not included in the application.

2* The proposed addition stays within the ell of the existing rear additions and will sit on an existing flagstone patio. There is no increase in build to open space.

3* The brick driving strip driveway, brick walk, and stone patio were installed per COA 100-09-MW.
4* Rear roof forms have been approved to be modified for water leakage issues including at 604 Oakwood Avenue (042-14-CA). Existing and proposed roof plans were included in the application.
5* The window proposed for alteration is at the rear side of the house and will retain the upper sash. This type of alteration is typically approved as a Minor Work.
6* The form of the house with a side gable roof, front cross gable and two rear ells connected by a hog valley is found throughout Oakwood including at 526 and 530 Oakwood Avenue.
7* The existing house is a frame ell form house constructed circa 1900. According to Sanborn Fire Insurance maps (in application) the current footprint of the house has not changed significantly since 1914. A 14'x17' rear addition was approved with a COA in 1980. A color coded history of the house was included in the application.
8* The application states that the addition "will match existing in material, aesthetic, dimensions and color." The proposed materials are wood siding with 4.5" exposure, wood trim, asphalt shingles and rubber membrane. Details and specifications were not included in the application. The addition roof will match the roofing material of the 1980s addition.
9* The rear addition matches the roof pitch of the existing house and follows the tradition of adding ells as a means of adding more space. The new roof is lower than the historic ell.
10* Windows and door are proposed to be wood. Details and specifications were included in the application.

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 issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample tree protection plan.
2. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Eave construction
   b. Window trim

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Sonja McKay [affirmed], owner and Ashley Morris [affirmed], architect were present to speak in support of the application. They had no additional comments.

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

Mr. Shackleton thanked them for a very complete application.

At Mr. Shackleton's suggestion Mr. Alphin moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Ms. Caliendo seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

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 1-10) to be acceptable as findings of fact as listed below:

A. Alteration of existing rear addition; construction of new rear addition; alteration of rear roof form; alteration of windows is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 3.5.1, 3.5.7, 3.7.1, 3.7.13, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9 and the following findings:

1* There are no trees in the footprint of the rear addition; however there are trees on the property that may be impacted by construction activity. A tree protection plan was not included in the application.

2* The proposed addition stays within the ell of the existing rear additions and will sit on an existing flagstone patio. There is no increase in built to open space.

3* The brick driving strip driveway, brick walk, and stone patio were installed per COA 100-09-MW.

4* Rear roof forms have been approved to be modified for water leakage issues including at 604 Oakwood Avenue (042-14-CA). Existing and proposed roof plans were included in the application.

5* The window proposed for alteration is at the rear side of the house and will retain the upper sash. This type of alteration is typically approved as a Minor Work.

6* The form of the house with a side gable roof, front cross gable and two rear ells connected by a hog valley is found throughout Oakwood including at 526 and 530 Oakwood Avenue.

7* The existing house is a frame ell form house constructed circa 1900. According to Sanborn Fire Insurance maps (in application) the current footprint of the house has not changed significantly since 1914. A 14'x17' rear addition was approved with a COA in 1980. A color coded history of the house was included in the application.

8* The application states that the addition "will match existing in material, aesthetic, dimensions and color." The proposed materials are wood siding with 4.5" exposure, wood trim, asphalt shingles and rubber membrane. Details and specifications were not included in the application. The addition roof will match the roofing material of the 1980s addition.

9* The rear addition matches the roof pitch of the existing house and follows the tradition of adding ells as a means of adding more space. The new roof is lower than the historic ell.

10* Windows and door are proposed to be wood. Details and specifications were included in the application.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Caliendo; passed 5/0.

Decision on the Application

Mr. Alphin 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 issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample tree protection plan.
2. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Eave construction
   b. Window trim.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Caliendo; passed 5/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 12/2/14.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

061-14-CA 630 N BLOUNT STREET
Applicant: THOMAS BYRNE AND SARA PARIS HUDDLESTON
Received: 5/13/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 8/11/2014 1) 6/2/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BLOUNT STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: O&I-1
Nature of Project: Construct new 2-story house with attached garage; install new driveway; remove tree; construct fence
Amendments: Information regarding the tree proposed for removal was provided by the applicant and is attached to these comments.
DRAC: This application was reviewed as a pre-application by the Design Review Advisory Committee (DRAC) on April 23, 2014. Present were Jerry Traub, Dan Becker, and Erin Lewis. Also present were Thomas and Sara Huddleston, Mark Kirby, and Tania Tully.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- City of Raleigh Pictometry and Google Streetview images of the property provided by staff are available for review

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.1	Public Rights-of-Way and Alleys	install new driveway
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	construct new 2-story house with attached garage; install new driveway; remove tree; construct fence
2.4	Fences and Walls	construct fence
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	install new driveway
2.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	construct new 2-story attached garage
4.3	New Construction	construct new 2-story house with attached garage

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Construction of new 2-story house is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.5, 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.4, 4.3.5, 4.3.6, 4.3.7, 4.3.8, 4.3.9, 4.3.10, 4.3.11, and the following findings:

1* In addition to the willow oak mentioned in the application, there are trees along the south property line that may be impacted by the construction of the new house; a tree protection plan was not provided.
2* According to the online Wake County Real Estate Data, the lot 17,860 SF. The footprint of the proposed house (including porches and garage) is approximately 2,400 SF for a lot coverage of 13%, well within the norm for Blount Street.
3* The lot appears to slope up slightly from the street and then become relatively flat; it appears from the application that the house will sit 3 steps above the ground; adjacent houses sit 4 to 5 steps above grade.
4* The application states that the front yard setback for the house at 630 N. Blount Street is 30'; and illustrates that other houses on the block have approximate setbacks ranging from 24' to 29' and shows the approximate line of adjacent houses on the plot plan.
5* The house fronts onto Blount Street as is typical of the district.
6* The proposed height of the house is 34'; two-stories. As seen in application photos the houses on the block are all 2-storied; actual heights were not included.
7* The front porch on the new house is inset and aligns with the front wall of the house. The porch steps are not as grand as the remainder of the house and seem out of place.
8* The hipped-roof form of the house is not uncommon in Blount Street; design details imitate those found in the Italianate style which is seen in the district; examples were included in the application.
9* The application states that "The finish floor elevation of 630 N. Blount Street will approximate the finish floor elevation of the neighboring existing single-family dwellings;" however there is no clear evidence to support the statement.
10* As drawn, the chimney is the same height as the roof of the house; chimneys are typically taller than the roof.
11* The locations of windows appear to be deliberate and have some sense of rhythm. Details and specifications were not included in the application.
12* The application states that materials include cementitious lap siding with a 4" lap; wood corner boards and window trim; wood doors; dimensional asphalt shingles and a brick foundation. The narrow 4" reveal is not uncommon in the historic district.
13* Painted smooth faced fiber cement siding is regularly approved for detached new construction in the historic districts; most recently at 501 Oakwood Avenue. The application does not specify that the house will be painted and colors were not provided.
14* The application states that "The house is also discernible from historic buildings in the district by the application of modern day materials such as cementitious lap siding and by

the inclusion of an attached garage, which has been carefully placed in relation to the house such that it is subservient to the main house."

15* A mitered glass hallway enclosure is proposed on the rear of the house; this is a unique feature.

16* Detail drawings were not included in the application.

B. Construction of new 2-story attached garage; installation of new driveway; removal of tree; construction of fence is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.3.1, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.4.7, 2.4.8, 2.4.10, 2.4.11, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.8, 2.5.9 ; 2.6.6 however an attached garage **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.6.6 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 Pecan tree. A letter prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture states that the Pecan tree may not survive construction activity. A replacement tree is not proposed.

2* Other than a parking-strip driveway and front sidewalk, no information regarding landscaping was included in the application.

3* Concrete runner driveways are appropriate for the district.

4* There is an existing curb cut; there appears to be granite curbing on the location of the new driveway; the *Guidelines* state that granite curbing should not be removed.

5* Specifications for the curb cut, driveway, and apron were not included in the application.

6* The application states that the location of the house and garage was determined in part due to "a large mature, canopy contributing willow oak in the rear of the yard".

7* A 6' tall rear yard fence is proposed; tall fences are commonly approved; no details are included in the application.

8* An accessory structure with living space and two lower level garage bays is proposed to be constructed. It is set back from the front elevation by about 50' and from the front property line by about 80'. It is attached to the house via a 2-story corridor.

9* The proposed garage is lower than the main house and the trim details on the accessory structure are less ornate than details on the main house. A large trellis is planned on the connecting structure between the main house and the accessory structure.

10* Staff is unaware of any examples of front facing 2-story 2-car garages that are attached to the main house.

11* The application included photos of two 1-story garages in Blount Street as examples of houses with attached garages. However, at 302 N Blount Street, the historic 2-car garage is not attached to the main house. Its location near the main house is typical of garages on

corner lots. It appears as though the garage connection at 213 E. Lane Street is not historic. Additionally, the garage is at the rear of the house not facing the street.

Pending the committee's determination regarding the attached garage, staff recommends that the committee approve the amended application, with the following conditions:

1. That the garage either not be attached, or be reoriented so that it is fully behind the main house.
2. That a replacement tree be planted within 6 month after issuance of a certificate of occupancy on the house with the species and location to be provided to and approved by staff prior to planting.
3. That the tree protection plan be in place prior to commencement of construction.
4. That the chimney be taller than the roof.
5. That the front steps be wider.
6. That the granite curb be retained or relocated.
7. That the house and trim be painted.
8. That the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture or a landscape architect certified by the NCBLA.
   b. Window specifications and details;
   c. Eave construction;
   d. Revised garage location.
9. That details and specifications the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Doors;
   b. New fence location and materials;
   c. Front steps;
   d. Window and door trim;
   e. Porch posts;
   f. Mitered glass hallway enclosure;
   g. Lighting;
   h. Paint colors;
   i. Roofing.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support:
Byrne Huddleston [affirmed], owner, Sarah Huddleston [affirmed], owner, and Mark Kirby [affirmed], design-builder were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Kirby noted that the staff recommended conditions were all fairly easy with the exception of the garage and then made the following initial comments:

- The garage was a big question when they began planning.

- This is a from-scratch design suited to both the Huddlestons and the district.
- They looked at the possibility of a detached garage and the reduced utility of it.
- He noted that they found two single family houses with attached garages, both closer to the right-of-way than the proposed.
- They garage is clearly based on the location of the driveway.
- It's bending around the pecan tree.
- The one real specimen tree on the property is a white oak, behind the garage. The garage is outside of the dripline so they are able to do grading around the project.
- They tried to site the garage so it could be viewed as a detached garage that was attached at some point. There is only a hyphen connecting the two together.
- Any detaching of the garage or moving it behind the house would mean losing the tree.
- There are 80 feet from the setback and 90 feet from the actual curb to front face of the garage.
- The Blount Street rowhouses have front-facing garage doors.
- They intentionally made the details of the garage less ornate denoting its subservience to the main structure.
- They are all very happy with the result.

Ms. Huddleston said that they are interested in historic preservation and hope to fit into the neighborhood and build a house that will fit their family for years to come.

<u>Opposition</u>:

Jimmy Thiem [affirmed], at 634 N. Blount Street, has some concerns about the project. He distributed photographs of the site and made the following comments:

- He is very excited about having a neighbor.
- He has lived in his house since 1990.
- He had the (mis)fortune to watch original house be torn down by Peace College.
- The siting for the house is very appropriate, and he appreciates the style borrowing from the neighborhood.
- Regarding the applicant's statement that the "Side yards are heavily vegetated" he commented that most of the vegetation on his side is his, not the applicant's.
- He walked the lot and looked at the trees. He counted 8 trees that are 8 inch caliper or more. They vary in condition.
- Considering the fact that the original house was located in that same place roots will be impacted no matter what.

Tania Tully [affirmed] suggested that he provided information regarding his expertise with regard to trees.

Mr. Thiem stated that he is a landscape architect who has been practicing for over 35 years and then continued with his comments:

- It is inevitable that trees will be impacted here, and there is consideration for allowing impact. Sometimes in efforts to save the trees, you're impacting the roots.

- Some of the trees should probably be taken out.
- The original location of the driveway was along south property line, and there is evidence of this.

Mr. Thiem distributed photographs of the garage examples included in the application and an iMaps site plan. The following comments related to the precedent of the character of houses.

- He asked what examples have been cited and how this might be interpreted later.
- He has taken time to look at both houses with garages provided in the application.
- The garage at 302 Blount Street is not connected. The other example appears to have been a garage but was converted to living space.
- Both examples given as precedent are one story and both examples do not face the street, unlike the proposed.
- The garage at 612 Blount faces the same direction of the street, but is not connected.
- The proposal is two-stories and is not connected on one level but on both. The connection is a 10 foot heated space.
- He's not clear why it's not just a house with garage.
- He encouraged the committee as part of the consideration to look at how these precedents are matching up to the proposal.
- Clearly many of these houses did not originally to have garages.
- It is not atypical for garages to be added, but the combination, to have the two connected is a garage inside the house. This is not a separate garage.
- If there is some possibility that there is some flexibility to look at location of garage, he suggested maybe flipping it to other side.

Questions:

Ms. Caliendo asked how far back the connector is inset. Mr. Kirby said it was about 3 feet.

Ms. David had no questions, noting that overall it hits the guidelines. She does have some concern with the garage.

Ms. Caliendo asked if the tree canopy shown on the plot plan is accurate. Mr. Kirby said that he has not had a tree survey done. Mr. Alphin said that it looks like the plot plan shows the connector as 2 feet.

Mr. Shackleton asked if the applicant had considered Mr. Thiem's idea. Have they considered reversing the house and garage? Mr. Kirby said that they did, but the garage being on that side blocks all the afternoon sun. The vegetation is heavier on the south side of the property and makes a better barrier. He also noted that there are two curb cuts on the property and is not sure which one was first.

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. Mr. Alphin seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Committee Discussion

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

The guidelines, 2.6.6, are pretty clear about locating a new garage in a traditional relationship. [David]
The guidelines are confusing to me because 2.6.6 seems like it is adding garage not new construction. [Alphin]
I don't know how you do it. I'm not an architect, but it just seems like it needs to be back more, somewhere, somehow [David]
They made moves to try to make it appear detached, set the connector back. It may be not set back far enough. Maybe the garage could be farther away and moves can be more pronounced. There's a trellis which I presume would have plantings, which would give it effect of being detached. [Caliendo]
The garage facing the street seems pretty suburban. [David]
I agree with all of that. It has doors facing the street, but to me it feels like it's very far from the street. [Downer]
If the main house existed and this was just a COA about building a garage, I would probably think about it. [Alphin]
I would not look to see it attached to house if it was already there. It would be detached and pushed back. If the tree wasn't there, the problem would be solved. [Shackleton]
If we are to believe this is an Italianate, second empire house, the story would be that there was no garage originally and that this would be an addition. In that storyline, how do you feel about the garage? [Alphin]
The guidelines are fairly clear about adding a garage to the lot. It needs to be similar to garages in other areas. [David]
Look at guidelines 4.3.7 and 4.3.8. Does this help in thinking about it as one building? The guideline is about the front façade and door and window openings. In their application they talk about the attached garage being one way of differentiating. You need to decide whether you agree with that. [Tully]
[To the applicant] Did your presentation have any information that wasn't in application, specifically about garage issue? [Shackleton]
Only with respect of separate elements of tree and shadows, elements leading us here. [Mr. Kirby]
Looking at 4.3.11 I question if it is discernable. Is the building an 1800s house? Is a 2014 house referencing the mid-1800s appropriate? There are clearly two types, fake historicism. [Alphin]
The design is clearly streamlined. It is less frilly than a real Italianate house would have been. I wouldn't mistake it, but that's my job. [David]
I don't think I would either. [Shackleton]
The scale fits the neighborhood, but something about its scale makes it read as a different building. The details clearly reference Italianate elements but in a more streamlined way. Combined with cementitious siding, it's been addressed. [David]

The applicant also, in addressing that particular guideline, 4.3.11, listed a few facts to address that. The use of modern day materials and the issue of garage itself. Differentiation is on a scale, modern at one end and traditional additions such as at Kiernan McGorty's house at the other. This isn't an addition, but it's an addition to the neighborhood on the traditional end. [Shackleton]
I agree. The simplified detailing makes it differentiated though it's certainly on a lower scale. [Caliendo]
We are still on the garage. Are there any new thoughts about that? [Shackleton]
This is a case where I like it but I am not sure the garage part meets the guidelines. I see the argument that it differentiates it. I see that it's subservient and there's a hyphen to lessen its attachment. It's just orientation to the street. You wouldn't see it on an old house anyway. [David]
It is so far back. That helps with the orientation. [Caliendo]
Another option is to ask for more research on the garage. If there is anything helpful. They could get us a few examples. [Shackleton]
I can think of two story garages off the top of my head, but they are behind the street and face the cross street. I don't know that more research would help. [David]
Would having more information on how this would fit into the streetscape help? [Tully]
Yes. [Caliendo]
No, it's simply the orientation. [David]
Would you feel differently if you had more information about the landscaping? [Downer]
No. [David]
The fact that the garage is 90' back helps and this is not an addition to a historic house. If it were an accessory building being put onto an existing house it would clearly violate 2.6.6. and if we go over to 4.3, the proportion is not problematic itself. The window and door openings, if I have a problem, that's where it is - the garage door openings being compatible with the surrounding historic district. I personally think that 4.3 should carry weight because this is new construction. [Shackleton]
Is the garage, since it's so far back, part of the front façade? [Caliendo]
Not because it's so far back. [Alphin]
I can buy that. [Shackleton]
The other thing is the chimney being taller than the roof. This is not a problem with applicant. [David]
Should we talk about how wide front steps should be? Tania, do you have a width in mind? [Shackleton]
What I can say is that typically alteration of steps is a matter that can be dealt with at staff level. Did you want to talk about the possibility of other trees needing to be removed? Nothing in staff comments speaks to that. [Tully]
Does one of the photos that Mr. Thiem passed out show the trees? [Shackleton]

At Mr. Shackleton's suggestion Ms. Caliendo moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be re-opened. Ms. David seconded; motion carried 5/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Ms. Tully said that clearly they are not trying to clear-cut the yard. The committee has approved trees to come down for new construction.

Mr. Huddleston said that he didn't understand the context. They are not talking about taking out a lot of stuff on Jimmy's side. Mr. Theim said no, he's a landscape architect who doesn't think every tree should be saved. His concern is that there are trees there – for example the two right at the northwest corner of lot, one hidden and one pecan tree – that if you follow the strategy as with oak tree, that pecan tree is going to be significant impacted by its root system. His concern is that you're saving it for trunk value and 2 years later it's dead. The original house sat where you're siting the new house. You shouldn't have burden of being constrained by this tree. There is a balance there. Some of the trees don't deserve to be saved.

Sarah Rex [affirmed] stated that the commission has made recommendations on how they could be kind to that oak tree on her projects. The oak tree is important to several people. She thinks the pecan tree is beautiful and looks healthy and adds to canopy. She said to save it if you can.

Mr. Shackleton said that if the commission procedurally approves for a tree to come down, they are not insisting it come down. It gives owners flexibility as they proceed with construction. Ms. Tully said that the committee probably wants to do the typical thing with the trees—either have trees they are taking out by replaced by replanting on the property or require a donation to NeighborWoods.

Mr. Kirby noted that it is clear there's a conflict between the good of the tree and the new house. Without a complete reboot they were comfortable enough to bring this forward. He also noted that the Blount Street row houses have attached front-facing garages. There is also precedent there with the garages. They have pushed this so far back. He noted on the elevation drawing that is doesn't read how far back the garage is. There is also an issue on how much they want to spend. Mr. Kirby made a final point that there are a lot of empty lots in Blount Street. This lot is zoned as industrial/office, which opens the lot to less sensitive development. They are not trying to specifically copycat any particular style, they just wanted to take cues and respect history without being a slave to it, knowing there will be others who will come to see new construction in addition.

Ms. David noted that the row houses are not in the historic district. Also, the concept is that the carriage houses face an alley, not a street. Ms. Tully added that the carriage houses are essentially the back houses behind grand houses. Finally, the commission must consider what's proposed here, not what could be.

At Mr. Shackleton's suggestion Ms. Caliendo moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Ms. David seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Ms. David and seconded by Ms. Caliendo, Ms. David made an amended motion that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comments A. (inclusive of facts 1-16) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-11) to be acceptable as findings of fact with modifications and additional facts as listed below:

A. Construction of new 2-story house is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.5, 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.4, 4.3.5, 4.3.6, 4.3.7, 4.3.8, 4.3.9, 4.3.10, 4.3.11, and the following findings:

1* In addition to the willow oak mentioned in the application, there are trees along the south property line that may be impacted by the construction of the new house; a tree protection plan was not provided.

2* According to the online Wake County Real Estate Data, the lot 17,860 SF. The footprint of the proposed house (including porches and garage) is approximately 2,400 SF for a lot coverage of 13%, well within the norm for Blount Street.

3* The lot appears to slope up slightly from the street and then become relatively flat; it appears from the application that the house will sit 3 steps above the ground; adjacent houses sit 4 to 5 steps above grade.

4* The application states that the front yard setback for the house at 630 N. Blount Street is 30′; and illustrates that other houses on the block have approximate setbacks ranging from 24′ to 29′ and shows the approximate line of adjacent houses on the plot plan.

5* The house fronts onto Blount Street as is typical of the district.

6* The proposed height of the house is 34'; two-stories. As seen in application photos the houses on the block are all 2-storied; actual heights were not included.

7* The front porch on the new house is inset and aligns with the front wall of the house. The porch steps are not as grand as the remainder of the house and seem out of place.

8* The hipped-roof form of the house is not uncommon in Blount Street; design details imitate those found in the Italianate style which is seen in the district; examples were included in the application.

9* The application states that "The finish floor elevation of 630 N. Blount Street will approximate the finish floor elevation of the neighboring existing single-family dwellings;" however there is no clear evidence to support the statement.

10* As drawn, the chimney is the same height as the roof of the house; chimneys are typically taller than the roof.

11* The locations of windows appear to be deliberate and have some sense of rhythm. Details and specifications were not included in the application.

12* The application states that materials include cementitious lap siding with a 4" lap; wood corner boards and window trim; wood doors; dimensional asphalt shingles and a brick foundation. The narrow 4" reveal is not uncommon in the historic district.

13* Painted smooth faced fiber cement siding is regularly approved for detached new construction in the historic districts; most recently at 501 Oakwood Avenue. The application does not specify that the house will be painted and colors were not provided.
14* The application states that "The house is also discernible from historic buildings in the district by the application of modern day materials such as cementitious lap siding and by the inclusion of an attached garage, which has been carefully placed in relation to the house such that it is subservient to the main house."
15* A mitered glass hallway enclosure is proposed on the rear of the house; this is a unique feature.
16* Detail drawings were not included in the application.

B. Construction of new 2-story attached garage; installation of new driveway; removal of tree; construction of fence is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.3.1, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.4.7, 2.4.8, 2.4.10, 2.4.11, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.8, 2.5.9, 2.6.6, 4.3.7, 4.3.8 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 Pecan tree. A letter prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture states that the Pecan tree may not survive construction activity. A replacement tree is not proposed.
2* Other than a parking-strip driveway and front sidewalk, no information regarding landscaping was included in the application.
3* Concrete runner driveways are appropriate for the district.
4* There is an existing curb cut; there appears to be granite curbing on the location of the new driveway; the *Guidelines* state that granite curbing should not be removed.
5* Specifications for the curb cut, driveway, and apron were not included in the application.
6* The application states that the location of the house and garage was determined in part due to "a large mature, canopy contributing willow oak in the rear of the yard".
7* A 6′ tall rear yard fence is proposed; tall fences are commonly approved; no details are included in the application.
8* An accessory structure with living space and two lower level garage bays is proposed to be constructed. It is set back from the front elevation by about 50' and from the front property line by about 80'. It is attached to the house via a 2-story corridor. The garage is set back from the curb by about 90′.
9* The proposed garage is lower than the main house and the trim details on the accessory structure are less ornate than details on the main house. A large trellis is planned on the connecting structure between the main house and the accessory structure.

10* Staff is unaware of any examples of front facing 2-story 2-car garages that are attached to the main house.
11* The application included photos of two 1-story garages in Blount Street as examples of houses with attached garages. However, at 302 N Blount Street, the historic 2-car garage is not attached to the main house. Its location near the main house is typical of garages on corner lots. It appears as though the garage connection at 213 E. Lane Street is not historic. Additionally, the garage is at the rear of the house not facing the street.
12* There are several trees on the lot and no formal tree survey has been undertaken.
13* Design methods have been taken to make the garage appear detached including a setback hyphen made to appear as a trellis.

Ms. Caliendo agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 4/1 (Alphin opposed).

Decision on the Application

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

1. That a replacement tree be planted within 6 month after issuance of a certificate of occupancy on the house with the species and location to be provided to and approved by staff prior to planting.
2. That the tree protection plan be in place prior to commencement of construction.
3. That the chimney be taller than the roof.
4. That the front steps be wider.
5. That the granite curb be retained or relocated.
6. That the house and trim be painted.
7. That the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan based on a tree survey prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture or a landscape architect certified by the NCBLA.
   b. Window specifications and details;
   c. Eave construction;
8. That details and specifications the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Doors;
   b. New fence location and materials;
   c. Front steps;
   d. Window and door trim;
   e. Porch posts;
   f. Mitered glass hallway enclosure;
   g. Lighting;
   h. Paint colors;
   i. Roofing.

9. That should trees be recommended for removal based on the tree protection plan that the trees either be replaced or a donation be made to the NeighborWoods Tree planting program with replacement tree species and locations to be provided to and approved by staff.

Ms. Caliendo agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 4/1 (Alphin opposed).

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

Certificate expiration date: 12/2/14.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

062-14-CA 219 E LENOIR STREET
Applicant: ROBERT ANDREW & SUSAN REYNOLDS GILBERT
Received: 5/13/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 8/11/2014 1) 6/2/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: PRINCE HALL HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: DOD, RB
Nature of Project: Construct new 2-story house; install new driveway; relocate curb cut; remove chain link fence; install new fence
Amendments: Revised drawings were provided by the applicant and are attached to these comments.
DRAC: This application was reviewed as a pre-application by the Design Review Advisory Committee (DRAC) on April 23, 2014. Present were Jerry Traub, Dan Becker, and Erin Lewis. Also present were Robert and Susan Gilbert, Stuart Cullinan, and Tania Tully.
Conflict of Interest: Mr. Shackleton noted that he has a business relationship with Mr. Cullinan, doing accounting work. He was unaware of Mr. Cullinan's involvement with this application until the meeting and is able to be unbiased in his decision making.
Staff Notes:

- City of Raleigh Pictometry and Google Streetview images of the property provided by staff are available for review.
- Portions of the chain link fence may straddle the lot line; the ownership of property and locations of lot lines is outside of the commission's jurisdiction and is a civil matter.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.1	Public Rights-of-Way and Alleys	relocate curb cut
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Construct new 2-story house; install new driveway; relocate curb cut; remove chain link fence; install new fence
2.4	Fences and Walls	remove chain link fence; install new fence
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	install new driveway
4.3	New Construction	Construct new 2-story house

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Construction of new 2-story house is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.5, 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.4, 4.3.5, 4.3.6, 4.3.7, 4.3.8, 4.3.9, 4.3.10, 4.3.11; however the window placement and proportions on the front façade is incongruous according to *Guideline* 4.3.8 and the following findings:

1* There are trees on the adjacent properties and the public right-of-way that may be impacted by construction activities; a tree protection plan was not included.

2* According to the application, the lot is 10,918 SF; the footprint of the proposed house (including porches) is approximately 1,404 SF for a lot coverage of 13%, which is within the norm for Prince Hall. With the proposed patio and driveway the lot coverage is approximately 19%.

3* The application documents that the house will be set back 18 feet and align with the house to the east. The house is set toward the west side of the lot to allow for the introduction of a driveway on the east.

4* The application states that the house is flanked by a house built in 1950 and a historic Queen Anne House. According to the *Report and Recommendation for the Designation of the South Person/South Blount Historic Overlay District* the house to the west is a c. 1909 two-story, three-bay Foursquare-form frame house and the house to the east is a late 19th century one-story, three-bay Queen Anne frame house.

5* Looking at the 1914 and 1950 Sanborn Fire Insurance maps (available for review), there was once a 2-story house on the lot.

6* The proposed house is a two-story, 28-foot-wide, 35-foot deep house patterned after the American Foursquare design of the early 1900s and includes a full-width front porch, hip roof with attic dormer window, right-side entry stoop, and rear screened porch.

7* The lot slopes up slightly from the street and is then relatively flat; the house is proposed to sit at about 2′ above grade which is similar to other houses on the block.

8* The locations of windows on the façade do not appear to be deliberate and do not have a sense of rhythm as is typical of foursquare houses. Windows on 1st and 2nd levels are typically centered over one another. The 1st level also has three different proportions which is atypical.

9* The proposed 2/1 windows are seen on foursquare houses from the period of significance.

10* Proposed materials are smooth faced cement-board siding, wood windows, and wooden doors. Details and specifications were not included in the application.

11* Painted smooth faced fiber cement siding and synthetic trim are regularly approved for detached new construction in the historic districts; most recently at 501 Oakwood Avenue. The application does not specify that the house will be painted and colors were not provided.

12* As scaled off of the drawing, the siding will have a 6″ reveal and the window trim will be just over 2″. A window trim of 4″ or 5″ is more typical for historic house being emulated.

13* The application states both that the window trim will be wood and that it will be Miratech a paintable composite trim that has been approved for use on detached new construction
14* Detail drawings of the construction were not provided.

B. Installation of new driveway; relocation of curb cut; removal of chain link fence; installation of new fence is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.3.1, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.4.7, 2.4.8, 2.4.10, 2.4.11, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.8, 2.5.9 and the following findings:
1* There appears to be granite curbing on the location of the new driveway; the *Guidelines* state that granite curbing should not be removed.
2* Other than a parking-strip driveway and rear concrete patio, no information regarding landscaping was included in the application. Houses typically have a walkway that runs from the public sidewalk to the front of the house.
3* The fence proposed for removal is chain-link; a prohibited item. Details of the proposed new fence were not included in the application.
4* The current curb cut and driveway are in the center of the property and not appropriate for the location of a house. The proposed driveway is set to the east side of the new house. The application documents that properties on the street have driveways on the east and west sides. Specifications for the curb cut, driveway, and apron were not included in the application.
5* Concrete runner driveways are appropriate for the district.

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

1. That the granite curb be retained or relocated.
2. That there be a concrete walk that runs from the public sidewalk to the front of the house.
3. That all new landscape concrete have a water washed finish.
4. That the house and trim be painted.
5. That the windows on the front elevation be changed so that there is a clear delineation of "bays" and the windows on 1st and 2nd level are centered on one another.
6. That the window and door trim be between and 4" and 5" in width.
7. That the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample tree protection plan;
   b. Window specifications and details;
   c. Revised front elevation;
   d. Eave construction.
8. That details and specifications the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Doors;
   b. Window and door trim design and materials;
   c. Lighting;
   d. Paint colors;
   e. Curb cut; new curb; driveway apron and driveway;

f. Screened porch construction;
g. New fence location and materials;
h. Front walk.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support:
Susan and Andy Gilbert [both affirmed], applicants, and Stuart Cullinan [affirmed], builder were present to speak in support of the application.

Regarding the staff recommended condition about windows and doors, Mr. Cullinan stated that they will be wood window with a composite sill and the window trim would be 5/4X4 trim. Tania Tully [affirmed] stated that staff will need section drawings and cut sheets. Mr. Cullinan said that they will have a standard sill. The door will be pine stained, 12-light with three light transom above.

For the side door and rear door, Mr. Cullinan wants to propose a fiberglass door. Ms. Tully said that there was not enough information to ask for fiberglass door. She recalled an approval at 501 Oakwood Avenue that approved a fiberglass door, but that she did not have the case. Mr. Alphin remembered the case as having a very unique condition. Ms. David noted that the side door side door is close to the front and visible.

Mr. Shackleton noted that all the conditions proposed in number 8 can be approved by staff. Ms. Tully explained that if the applicant provides something that doesn't meet guidelines, staff will bring that piece back to the committee.

Mr. Cullinan noted that fact 12 asks about siding exposure. If it is six versus five, does the commission need to know which? Ms. Tully said that as long as it's not wider than six inches it can be handled by staff. Not 10 inches however. If it has a narrower reveal it can be handled by staff.

Mr. Cullinan said that the biggest item that concerns them is the second story windows. They have a floor plan. He wants to talk and come up with an idea that they can feel good about. He noted that the second floor windows are all the same. Ms. David said that the second story windows are following a traditional symmetrical layout. It's the first floor asymmetrical layout that is a concern.

As for the other conditions, Mr. Cullinan said that he has no further questions except for the tree protection plan. Ms. Tully explained that the sample RHDC tree protection plan can be done without an arborist and is requested on cases where the major tree impacts are due to construction activity on the site rather than direct impact from the proposal.

Mr. Cullinan said that he is not clear on fence comment. Ms. Tully said that the main point is that the chain link fence on the very front would be removed. The question at staff level is that she needs information on the new fence and materials. If they're wanting a privacy fence in the rear yard they need to amend the application since staff can only approve up to a 42" tall fence.

Mr. Shackleton stated that the issue is the placement of the windows on the front façade. Ms. David added that they have a foursquare look on top, but not the bottom. Ms. Tully said that for staff it was also the different sizes of windows that made it incongruous. Mr. Gilbert said that he saw examples of foursquares with some asymmetrical windows so they didn't put a lot of stake in trying to make sure it was. Ms. David explained that in foursquares you do see paired windows with single windows and you do see a little small window next to a front door lined up with window above. The fenestration on the façade is markedly different than what you see in historic districts.

Ms. Gilbert asked if the main concern is the front. Ms. David said that the side is more like a house in a subdivision with the lack of symmetry, but she has less concern about side elevations. Ms. Tully added that there was a similar discussion regarding the house proposed to be relocated to the district and the issues with windows. Historically one saw a lot more symmetry on sides, but sometimes not, so staff was speaking specifically to front façade.

Mr. Shackleton asked if anyone had an easy fix in mind. Ms. Caliendo said that windows that are the same width give things a sense of balance. Ms. David said that there is a difference between asymmetrical windows that are accidental and those that are purposeful. The asymmetry is so slight it appears to be accidental. Ms. Downer said that the middle window on the second floor looks like it's central but the one below is just ever so slightly off. It would be better of the left edge lined up or if the bottom was less lined up. Ms. Caliendo said it was the same thing with the door. The laundry room window either should match the foyer window or the bigger window. They could shift the double window to line up with upper window, and shift the door to line up with other window.

Ms. Tully stated that what she's hearing is that the windows on the first floor need to have some sense of regularity to them so there aren't three different types of windows and that there needs to be some sort of alignment to them. They do not necessarily need to be centered over one another, aligned. The window on the right should either be the size of the big window or the small window, not new proportion of window.

Mr. Cullinan brought up a sketch mock-up of what he'd like to request. Ms. David said that it is not appropriate to approve a sketch; would we do this in other districts? Ms. Lauer said that it was not appropriate to have a commissioner uncomfortable with approving a sketch. The sketch could end up looking different than the commission thought. If a complaint were to be received it would be revealed that a sketch was approved.

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. Ms. Downer seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Ms. Downer and seconded by Ms. Caliendo, Ms. Downer made an amended that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comments A. (inclusive of facts 1-14) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-5) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following modifications additional facts as listed below:

A. Construction of new 2-story house is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.5, 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.4, 4.3.5, 4.3.6, 4.3.7, 4.3.8, 4.3.9, 4.3.10, 4.3.11; however the window placement and proportions on the front façade is incongruous according to *Guideline* 4.3.8 and the following findings:

1* There are trees on the adjacent properties and the public right-of-way that may be impacted by construction activities; a tree protection plan was not included.

2* According to the application, the lot is 10,918 SF; the footprint of the proposed house (including porches) is approximately 1,404 SF for a lot coverage of 13%, which is within the norm for Prince Hall. With the proposed patio and driveway the lot coverage is approximately 19%.

3* The application documents that the house will be set back 18 feet and align with the house to the east. The house is set toward the west side of the lot to allow for the introduction of a driveway on the east.

4* The application states that the house is flanked by a house built in 1950 and a historic Queen Anne House. According to the *Report and Recommendation for the Designation of the South Person/South Blount Historic Overlay District* the house to the west is a c. 1909 two-story, three-bay Foursquare-form frame house and the house to the east is a late 19th century one-story, three-bay Queen Anne frame house.

5* Looking at the 1914 and 1950 Sanborn Fire Insurance maps (available for review), there was once a 2-story house on the lot.

6* The proposed house is a two-story, 28-foot-wide, 35-foot deep house patterned after the American Foursquare design of the early 1900s and includes a full-width front porch, hip roof with attic dormer window, right-side entry stoop, and rear screened porch.

7* The lot slopes up slightly from the street and is then relatively flat; the house is proposed to sit at about 2' above grade which is similar to other houses on the block.

8* The locations of windows on the façade do not appear to be deliberate and do not have a sense of rhythm as is typical of foursquare houses. Windows on 1st and 2nd levels are

typically centered over one another. The 1st level also has three different proportions which is atypical.

9* The proposed 2/1 windows are seen on foursquare houses from the period of significance.

10* Proposed materials are smooth faced cement-board siding, wood windows, and wooden doors. Details and specifications were not included in the application.

11* Painted smooth faced fiber cement siding and synthetic trim are regularly approved for detached new construction in the historic districts; most recently at 501 Oakwood Avenue. The application does not specify that the house will be painted and colors were not provided.

12* As scaled off of the drawing, the siding will have a 6″ reveal and the window trim will be just over 2″. The window trim of will be 4″.

13* The application states both that the window trim will be wood and that it will be Miratech a paintable composite trim that has been approved for use on detached new construction

14* Detail drawings of the construction were not provided.

B. Installation of new driveway; relocation of curb cut; removal of chain link fence; installation of new fence is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.3.1, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.4.7, 2.4.8, 2.4.10, 2.4.11, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.8, 2.5.9 and the following findings:

1* There appears to be granite curbing on the location of the new driveway; the *Guidelines* state that granite curbing should not be removed.

2* Other than a parking-strip driveway and rear concrete patio, no information regarding landscaping was included in the application. Houses typically have a walkway that runs from the public sidewalk to the front of the house.

3* The fence proposed for removal is chain-link; a prohibited item. Details of the proposed new fence were not included in the application.

4* The current curb cut and driveway are in the center of the property and not appropriate for the location of a house. The proposed driveway is set to the east side of the new house. The application documents that properties on the street have driveways on the east and west sides. Specifications for the curb cut, driveway, and apron were not included in the application.

5* Concrete runner driveways are appropriate for the district.

Ms. Caliendo agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 4/1 (Mr. Alphin opposed).

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

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

1. That the granite curb be retained or relocated.
2. That there be a concrete walk that runs from the public sidewalk to the front of the house.
3. That all new landscape concrete have a water washed finish.
4. That the house and trim be painted.

5. That the windows on the front elevation be changed so that there is more regularity in size and alignment.
6. That the window and door trim be between and 4" and 5" in width.
7. That the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample tree protection plan;
   b. Window specifications and details;
   c. Eave construction.
8. That details and specifications the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Doors;
   b. Window and door trim design and materials;
   c. Lighting;
   d. Paint colors;
   e. Curb cut; new curb; driveway apron and driveway;
   f. Screened porch construction;
   g. New fence location and materials;
   h. Front walk.
9. That all the doors be wood.
10. That a rear yard fence up to 6' tall is approved subject to condition 8 above.
11. That the revised front elevation be brought back to the committee for review and approval.

The motion was seconded by Ms. David; passed 4/1(Mr. Alphin opposed).

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

Certificate expiration date: 12/2/14.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

063-14-CA 322 E DAVIE STREET
Applicant: TELEGRAPH ROAD PROPERTIES LLC
Received: 5/13/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 8/11/2014 1) 6/2/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: PRINCE HALL HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: DOD, RB
Nature of Project: Remove tree; construct new driveway & curb cut.
Amendments:
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- City of Raleigh Pictometry and Google Streetview images of the property provided by staff are available for review.
- The proposed driveway straddles the lot line with the adjacent property; the ownership of property and locations of lot lines is outside of the commission's jurisdiction and is a civil matter.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.1	Public Rights-of-Way and Alleys	Remove tree; construct new driveway & curb cut.
2. 3	Site Features and Plantings	
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Removal of tree; construction of new driveway & curb cut is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.3.5, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.8 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* There is a granite curb in the location of the proposed curb cut; the granite is proposed to be lowered in place. Specifications for the curb cut and driveway apron were not included in the application.
2* The proposed curb cut is shown with a traditional rounded curb rather than a dropped granite curb.
3* The tree proposed for removal is intended to allow for the construction of the driveway; two trees are proposed to replace the removed tree; location and species were not included in the application.
4* It appears from the drawing that driveway apron maintains the continuity of the sidewalk; detailed drawings were not included.
5* The proposed driveway is intended to serve the adjacent vacant lot as well as the subject house.
6* Concrete ribbon driving strip driveways are typical for early Raleigh historic districts; the finish of the concrete is not specified.

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

1. That all new concrete have a water-washed finish.
2. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Curb cut;
   b. Driveway apron;
   c. Retaining wall.
3. That the replacement trees be planted within 6 months after installation of the driveway with the locations and species provided to and approved by staff prior to planting.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support:
Jason Queen [affirmed], partner the in development of this property was available to speak in support of the application. He handed out additional information regarding the condition of the existing curb and other driveways in the district. The noted that staff comments seemed pretty straightforward. He said he was not sure if they will need a retaining wall.

There was no one else 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 5/0.

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

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 comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-6) to be acceptable as findings of fact, as listed below:

A. Removal of tree; construction of new driveway & curb cut is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.3.5, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.8 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* There is a granite curb in the location of the proposed curb cut; the granite is proposed to be lowered in place. Specifications for the curb cut and driveway apron were not included in the application.
2* The proposed curb cut is shown with a traditional rounded curb rather than a dropped granite curb.
3* The tree proposed for removal is intended to allow for the construction of the driveway; two trees are proposed to replace the removed tree; location and species were not included in the application.
4* It appears from the drawing that driveway apron maintains the continuity of the sidewalk; detailed drawings were not included.
5* The proposed driveway is intended to serve the adjacent vacant lot as well as the subject house.
6* Concrete ribbon driving strip driveways are typical for early Raleigh historic districts; the finish of the concrete is not specified.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Alphin; passed 5/0.

Decision on the Application

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

1. That all new concrete have a water-washed finish.
2. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Curb cut;
   b. Driveway apron;
   c. Retaining wall.
3. That the replacement trees be planted within 6 months after installation of the driveway with the locations and species provided to and approved by staff prior to planting.

The motion was seconded by Ms. David; passed 5/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 12/2/14.

OTHER BUSINESS

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

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner