RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
May 5, 2014

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Scott Shackleton called the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Committee meeting to order at 4:04 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Tania Tully, Preservation Planner, called the roll as follows:
Present: Will Alphin (arrived 4:21), Elizabeth Caliendo, Sarah David
Alternate Present: Fred Belledin (arrived 4:07), Kiernan McGorty
Excused Absence: Miranda Downer, Scott Shackleton
Staff Present: Tania Tully, Martha Lauer

Approval of the April 7, 2014 Minutes

Ms. David moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing and adopt the minutes as submitted. Ms. McGorty 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, Notaries Public, administered the affirmation.

Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address	Affirmed
Jay Beaman, 521 N Boundary Street 27604	Yes
Vicki Rees, 604 Oakwood Avenue 27601	Yes
Peter Rees, 604 Oakwood Avenue 27601	Yes
Gail Wiesner, 515 Euclid Street 27604	Yes
George Weller, 4000 Westchase Blvd 27607	Yes
Steve Schuster, 311-200 W Martin St 27601	Yes
Bang Le, 311-200 W Martin St 27601	Yes
Donald Mertrud, 527 Euclid Street 27604	Yes

REVIEW OF SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Tully requested that case 045-14-CA be added to public hearing portion of the meeting. Ms. David moved to approve the agenda as revised. Ms. McGorty seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS

There were no objections to the approval of the Summary Proceeding without a public hearing. The committee reviewed and approved the following case 044-14-CA for which the Summary Proceeding is made part of these minutes.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – SUMMARY PROCEEDING

044-14-CA 504 E FRANKLIN STREET
Applicant: EDDE BURGESS
Received: 4/15/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 7/14/2014 1) 5/5/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Construct screened porch on existing rear deck; remove rear door and window.
Amendments: Additional drawings were provided May 5 and are attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- The COA file for 504 E Franklin Street is available for review.
- 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
3.7	Windows and Doors	remove rear door and window
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	Construct screened porch on existing rear deck
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Construct screened porch on existing rear deck

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Construction of screened porch on existing rear deck; removal of rear door and window is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.7.13, 3.8.1, 3.8.7, 4.2.2, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9 and the following findings:

1* The house at 504 E Franklin Street was constructed in 1998 per the August 1995 approved COA (126-95-CA).

2* No historic fabric is being removed or modified.

3* The door and window proposed for removal are on the rear of the house in the location of the new roof; no information is provided regarding the installation of new siding. The

commission typically requires that new siding match the existing and be woven in with the existing siding so as to avoid the appearance of matching vertical joints.

4* The proposed screen porch will eliminate the existing upper roof deck and sit on the pier foundations of the existing rear deck.

5* The proposed screen porch and roof is approximately 5′ longer than the existing rear deck. No new footings are proposed, the extra length is achieved through a cantilever.

6* The gable roof form of the screened porch is similar to the gable on the house and is lower than the roof of the main part of the house.

7* The proposed screen porch is at the rear of the house and aligns with the house on the west side; it is far inset on the east. The roof overhang will sit several inches proud of the wall of the house.

8* Orthogonal and elevation drawings of the proposed new screen porch were provided; detailed drawings of the eaves and porch construction were not included with the application.

9* The screened porch is proposed to be wood with an asphalt shingle roof to match the existing; it is unclear whether it is to be painted. All other wood on the house is painted.

10* Under the porch, the existing concrete slab is proposed to be covered with a framed wood floor; details and specifications were not provided.

11* No new lot overage is proposed.

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

1. That where the window and doors are removed, new siding to match the existing will be woven in with the existing so as to avoid matching vertical seams.
2. That the wood on the screened porch be painted.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. eave construction;
   b. screened porch construction.
4. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Paint colors;
   b. Framed wood floor over concrete pad.

Decision on the Application

There were no objections to approval without a public hearing.

Mr. Belledin moved to approve the amended application, adopting the staff comments as the written record of the summary proceeding on 044-14-CA. Ms. David seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

Committee members voting: Belledin, Caliendo, David, McGorty.

Certificate expiration date: 11/5/14.

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: 045-14-CA, 042-14-CA, and 043-14-CA.

Mr. Belledin is principal at Clearscapes, the architecture firm on the project. Ms. David moved to recuse Mr. Belledin on case 043-14-CA. Ms. McGorty seconded; motion carried 4/0. Mr. Belledin left for the remainder of the meeting.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

045-14-CA 527 EUCLID STREET
Applicant: DONALD MERTRUD
Received: 4/15/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 7/14/2014 1) 5/5/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Remove rear stoop and steps; construct new wood deck; remove tree; remove rear windows and door; install set of french doors; alter driveway.
Amendments: Additional photographs were provided by the applicant April 21 and are attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- The alteration of the driveway was on the application, but mistakenly not included in the initial "Nature of Project."
- City of Raleigh Pictometry and Google Streetview images of the property provided by staff are available for review.
- 2005 staff photos are available for review.
- The COA file for 527 Euclid Street is available for review.
- The work items remove rear windows and door, install set of french doors, and alter driveway are classified as Minor Work.
- The work items remove rear stoop and steps and construct new wood deck are classified as Major Work because the height of the deck is above 48 inches.
- The work item for tree removal is classified as Major Work because the tree(s) have not been determined dead, diseased, or dangerous by an ISA Certfied Arborist and replacement tree(s) are not proposed.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Remove rear stoop and steps; construct new wood deck; remove tree
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	alter driveway
3.7	Windows and Doors	remove rear windows and door; install set of french doors
4.1	Decks	Remove rear stoop and steps; construct new wood deck

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Removal of tree(s) is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.5 and the following findings:
(Raleigh City Code Section 10.2.15.E.1. states that "An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure or site within any Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark may not be denied…However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of issuance…If the Commission finds that the building, structure or site has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark, it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal.")

1* A quote for removal of two trees from Brafford Tree Service, Inc. was included in the application and includes the following job description: "Extra lg walnut tree & lg maple, both are diseased & dying, dead tips in end of limbs, indicate root damage. Cut down and remove." No tree replacement is proposed.

2* According to the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) Michael Brafford is an ISA Certified Arborist, however the quote in fact 1* was signed by Danny Brafford, who has no record of certification.

3* There is no information in the application clearly noting the location of the proposed tree removal(s); the written description states that one tree is proposed for removal.

4* There are few trees on the property. Removal of the tree(s) may impact the overall canopy of the district.

B. Removal of windows; installation of French doors; removal of rear stoop and steps; construction of new wood deck is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 3.7.1, 3.7.2, 3.7.9, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.5, 4.1.7, 4.1.8 and the following findings:

1* There are no trees in the footprint of the rear deck; 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* According to Wake County Real Estate data the lot is about 5,227 SF. The existing house and stoop is 1,040 SF for a lot coverage of 20%. The proposed deck and stairs have an approximate 240 SF footprint for an increase of 224 SF and new lot coverage of 24%.

3* The rear of the house appears to be an enclosed porch.

4* The windows and door proposed for removal are on the rear of the house and not historic.

5* A photograph of a set of French doors was included in the application; details and specifications were not.

6* Wood French doors are commonly approved on rear elevations in the Oakwood historic district.

7* The stoop and steps being removed are not historic.

8* The proposed new rear deck is at the rear of the house but does not appear to be self-supporting.
9* The application states that the deck does not exceed the sides of the house; the guidelines state that it should be inset.
10* The application states that the deck will be screened with lattice; detailed information was not included.
11* The drawings included in the application provide a general idea of the location and dimensions of the deck, but not its construction or appearance. Detailed drawings for the following were not included: railing, stairs, deck edges.

C. Alteration of driveway is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.5.4, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.9 and the following findings:
1* There is an existing curb cut and driveway apron. The driveway is currently compacted earth/grass.
2* There do not appear to be any trees within the footprint of the driveway except for the one proposed for removal.
3* The application shows driving strips and states that it will be concrete and brick; dimensions and specifications were not included.
4* According to the *Design Guidelines* (p. 16) concrete driving strips are often found in the historic districts with the occasional use of brick or stone pavers.
5* The driveway leads directly to the backyard along the east side of the house. This is a traditional location according to the *Design Guidelines* (p. 16).

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

1. That prior to removal of the tree a report prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture that the tree(s) are dead, diseased, or dangerous be provided to staff.
2. That a new tree(s) of similar mature height be planted during the next planting season after removal with the species and location be provided to and approved by staff prior to planting.
3. That a tree protection plan for the construction similar to the RHDC sample tree protection plan be provided to and approved by staff *prior to the issuance of permits* and that the tree protection be in place prior to construction activity.
4. That the deck be inset from the corners of the house and be self-supporting.
5. That the French doors be wood.
6. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff *prior to issuance of permits*:
   a. Revised deck drawings;
   b. Deck railing;
   c. Deck stairs;
   d. Deck edge.

7. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff *prior to installation*:
   a. French doors;
   b. Lattice screening;
   c. Driveway;
   d. Brick samples.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Donald Mertrud [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Mertrud expressed his concern that some of the staff recommendations mean that he can't do the project. He stated that the socioeconomic rules keep him from fixing up his house. Specifically, he objects to the requirement for wooden doors. Mr. Mertrud bought the house, a former rental, and spent the winter fixing up the inside. He thought he would fix the outside this summer. He stated that he found out about historic district process after he moved in and so he has been saving up money for a deck. He found the doors on Craig's List and was going to fix it up. Mr. Mertrud added that the neighbor next door gave him some brick so he could put in a driveway. The proposed door is aluminum and wood; the picture is not exact, the door that opens is the first one on the right. He explained that right now the back of the house has plywood and old aluminum windows that crank open Three's Company style, and a five and a half foot door that is very short. He is 6' tall and has to duck, which is why he wants to replace the door. He also noted that there is a stoop which bounces. He can't lean against the railing or it will fall off.

Ms. David clarified that the staff report is recommending that the deck proposal is fine, but that he needs to give details on what the rail will look like. Tania Tully [affirmed] stated that she can meet and walk him through it.

Mr. Mertrud stated that he put some rock on the front walkway because he wanted to make it nicer. The house isn't historic, it is a 1930s house. Ms. David stated that the house does contribute to the neighborhood.

Ms. David reiterated that all they're asking for is more information on the deck and that the deck be inset. The door can be discussed. She noted that it seems like he is asking to use an aluminum clad door. We are here to ask these questions. We'll talk about your driveway, but need to address other issues first.

Mr. Mertrud stated that the intent is to use concrete to make the driving strips straight and then herringbone patterned brick on top.

Ms. Caliendo stated that Mr. Mertrud doesn't necessarily have to come back, he can work with staff. Mr. Belledin noted that on the deck and driveway, you can work with staff. He also stated that the tree company should be able to certify the health of the tree. Mr. Mertrud said that he

wouldn't take on the cost of removing the trees, but during heavy winds the branches are flying off and a big one is coming down. Ms. Tully said that whoever he talks to next time needs to be an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture. Ms. David said that he can use the same service, just get a certified arborist on the staff to sign a letter.

Mr. Mertrud said that he didn't propose replanting because to take down the trees is really expensive – about $3,500. His goal is to put up Leyland cypresses to screen between his and the next door property and himself, but between taking trees down and grinding stump, his budget to plant is low. He could agree to do it in six months. Ms. Caliendo said that it could be one tree. Ms. Tully said the replanting could be within a timeframe.

Ms. McGorty asked how long the COA is valid for. Ms. Tully said that the applicant has six months to start work, and then it doesn't expire unless work is stopped for a year. Any new proposed screening would need to be proposed with a new COA.

Ms. Tully asked the commission if they heard that what he's really proposing is two brick driveway runners.

Ms. Caliendo asked if there was anyone present in support of or in opposition to the application.

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

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

<u>Committee Discussion</u>

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
The issue here is the doors being aluminum clad. Thoughts? [Caliendo]
Typically we don't allow aluminum clad on existing structures. This one is interesting because it's a back porch, and infill. [Belledin]
So if this was an open porch right now, and it was proposed to be enclosed, would we be considering aluminum clad doors? Or is that a valid thing to bring up? In my time on the commission we only allowed aluminum clad on new construction. [David]
We can't take financial hardship into consideration. [McGorty]
So we're all in agreement that it has to be wood doors. [Caliendo]

Ms. McGorty moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Ms. David seconded; motion carried 4/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Mertrud stated that on the back right there are some odd shaped windows that don't open. They are aluminum single pane, no storm glass on it, and that's what there now. The door is shorter than he is tall and there is no lock on it. He had to put a latch on it like a gate. That's what there. The current siding on the rear is plywood that was painted over by the previous landlord after it got puffy. That siding wraps around to the other side. He found a guy two blocks away who found a guy that has siding that matches exactly the historic siding on his house. The portion around that French door would be same siding that's on the house and not Hardiplank. The guy will sell him his scraps, and it would be insulated and nicer than what it is now. Mr. Mertrud added that he thinks that all the rules that are in place are probably a good thing but the spirit is probably to improve it in a structured way and these doors would make the house look a hundred times better. That's what they make nowadays, the aluminum. Understands it's a historically contributing house but someone's got to live there. It doesn't make sense to make somebody pay thousands of dollars for a back door for an 800 foot house.

Ms. David noted that there are three people on the COA committee who live in Oakwood and are sympathetic to the expense of owning such a property, but they have just not approved aluminum clad doors and windows on historic structures. Ms. Tully said that she sees a few solutions. She said that they could rule on it as it is now or can defer the rear door item with the opportunity for the applicant to come back with additional information on what the exact proposed doors are.

Mr. Mertrud again said that there is already aluminum on the house, which is not painted. He is just putting doors on there that are the same. Ms. Caliendo said that they have to rule on what's new.

Mr. Belledin asked if they are proposing to put milled siding around sides. Mr. Mertrud said he would be putting as much as he can get. He will be trying to match the house as much as possible. Mr. Belledin asked what he is planning to do where the house meets. Mr. Mertrud said that there is a trim piece there that he wouldn't touch. Ms. Tully suggested that some of the other items that he's mentioned he's planning could be added today so that he doesn't have to come back. If he wanted to replace the door with a larger wood door, that would be an option, as a backup plan.

Mr. Hillebrenner asked if it would be possible to approve wood French doors. Mr. Belledin said that they approve it as is with wood with the condition that if he wants to use something else he has to bring it back. Ms. Tully said to just make it really clear in motion.

Mr. Mertrud added that he put some flagstone down on his walkway this weekend and just found out this morning that's another thing he is supposed to get approval for. Ms. Tully suggested that he not add it to application, noting that he doesn't have photos and that previous applications have been denied.

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

Committee Discussion

It sounds like it needs to be wood. [McGorty]
Just modify the recommendation. [Belledin]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Mr. Belledin moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comments A. (inclusive of facts 1-4), B. (inclusive of facts 1-11), and C. (inclusive of facts 1-5) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following modifications and additional facts as listed below:

A. Removal of tree(s) is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.5 and the following findings:
(Raleigh City Code Section 10.2.15.E.1. states that "An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure or site within any Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark may not be denied…However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of issuance…If the Commission finds that the building, structure or site has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark, it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal.")

1* A quote for removal of two trees from Brafford Tree Service, Inc. was included in the application and includes the following job description: "Extra lg walnut tree & lg maple, both are diseased & dying, dead tips in end of limbs, indicate root damage. Cut down and remove." No tree replacement is proposed.

2* According to the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) Michael Brafford is an ISA Certified Arborist, however the quote in fact 1* was signed by Danny Brafford, who has no record of certification.

3* There is no information in the application clearly noting the location of the proposed tree removal(s); the written description states that one tree is proposed for removal.

4* There are few trees on the property. Removal of the tree(s) may impact the overall canopy of the district.

B. Removal of windows; installation of French doors; removal of rear stoop and steps; construction of new wood deck is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 3.7.1, 3.7.2, 3.7.9, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.5, 4.1.7, 4.1.8 and the following findings:

1* There are no trees in the footprint of the rear deck; 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* According to Wake County Real Estate data the lot is about 5,227 SF. The existing house and stoop is 1,040 SF for a lot coverage of 20%. The proposed deck and stairs have an approximate 240 SF footprint for an increase of 224 SF and new lot coverage of 24%.
3* The rear of the house appears to be an enclosed porch.
4* The windows and door proposed for removal are on the rear of the house and not historic.
5* A photograph of a set of French doors was included in the application; details and specifications were not.
6* Wood French doors are commonly approved on rear elevations in the Oakwood historic district.
7* The stoop and steps being removed are not historic.
8* The proposed new rear deck is at the rear of the house but does not appear to be self-supporting.
9* The application states that the deck does not exceed the sides of the house; the guidelines state that it should be inset.
10* The application states that the deck will be screened with lattice; detailed information was not included.
11* The drawings included in the application provide a general idea of the location and dimensions of the deck, but not its construction or appearance. Detailed drawings for the following were not included: railing, stairs, deck edges.
12* The existing plywood wall may be glad with matching wood horizontal siding.

C. Alteration of driveway is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.5.4, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.9 and the following findings:
1* There is an existing curb cut and driveway apron. The driveway is currently compacted earth/grass.
2* There do not appear to be any trees within the footprint of the driveway except for the one proposed for removal.
3* The applicant stated in the public hearing that the driving strips will have a finished appearance of brick; dimensions and specifications were not included.
4* According to the *Design Guidelines* (p. 16) concrete driving strips are often found in the historic districts with the occasional use of brick or stone pavers.
5* The driveway leads directly to the backyard along the east side of the house. This is a traditional location according to the *Design Guidelines* (p. 16).

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That prior to removal of the tree a report prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture that the tree(s) are dead, diseased, or dangerous be provided to staff.
2. That a new tree(s) of similar mature height be planted during the next planting season after removal with the species and location be provided to and approved by staff prior to planting.
3. That a tree protection plan for the construction similar to the RHDC sample tree protection plan be provided to and approved by staff *prior to the issuance of permits* and that the tree protection be in place prior to construction activity.
4. That the deck be inset from the corners of the house and be self-supporting.
5. That the French doors be wood and if another material is desired a new application with additional information must be filed.
6. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff *prior to issuance of permits*:
   a. Revised deck drawings;
   b. Deck railing;
   c. Deck stairs;
   d. Deck edge.
7. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff *prior to installation*:
   a. French doors;
   b. Lattice screening;
   c. Driveway;
   d. Brick samples;
   e. Infill siding and trim.

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

Committee members voting: Belledin, Caliendo, David, McGorty.

Certificate expiration date: 11/5/14.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

042-14-CA 604 OAKWOOD AVENUE
Applicant: BEAMAN BUILDING AND REALTY
Received: 4/9/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 7/8/2014 1) 5/5/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Remove tree in rear yard; remove rear deck; construct new 2-story rear addition; modify existing rear roof form; replace window sash with glass block; add roof over basement entry; replace roof shingles; master landscape plan
Amendments: Existing condition drawings were provided April 23 and are attached to these comments. Revised drawings of the addition and additional information regarding the driveway and retaining wall were provided April 29, 2014 and are attached to these comments.
DRAC: This application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee (DRAC) on April 23, 2014. Present were Jerry Traub, Erin Lewis, and Dan Becker. Also present were Jay Beaman, Vicki Rees, Peter Rees, and Tania Tully.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- The COA file for 604 Oakwood Avenue is available for review.
- 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
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Remove tree in rear yard; construct new 2-story rear addition; master landscape plan
2.4	Fences and Walls	master landscape plan: relocate retaining wall; install new fence
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	master landscape plan: alter existing driveway; replace front concrete walk with flagstone
3.2	Masonry	Expose portion of chimney
3.5	Roofs	modify existing rear roof form; replace roof shingles
3.7	Windows and Doors	replace window sash with glass block
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	add roof over basement entry
4.2	Additions to Historic	remove rear deck; construct new 2-story rear

Buildings addition; modify existing rear roof form;

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Removal of tree in rear yard; removal of rear deck; construction of new 2-story rear addition; modification of existing rear roof form; replacement of roof shingles is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.5, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 3.2, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9; however alteration of the roof form **may** be incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.5.1 and the use of fibrex windows and perforated fiber cement soffit panels are incongruous according to *Guidelines* 4.2.7 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 Pecan tree proposed for removal is leaning and adjacent to the proposed new addition; several new trees are proposed to be planted as part of the landscape plan.

2* There are no other 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.

3* According to Wake County Real Estate data the lot is about 8,276 SF. The existing house and deck is 2,266 SF for lot coverage of 27%. The proposed addition has an approximate 470 SF footprint for an increase of 286 SF and new lot coverage of 31%.

4* The existing house is a frame Triple-A house constructed circa 1910. According to Sanborn Fire Insurance maps (available for review) the current footprint of the house has not changed significantly since 1914.

5* As seen on the rear elevation drawing in the original submittal, changing the roof form will result in the exposure of more of the chimneys. The as-built drawings do not accurately reflect the amount of chimney currently exposed. No information regarding the treatment of the newly exposed brick was included in the application.

6* The form of the house with a side gable roof and two rear ells connected by a hog valley is found throughout Oakwood including on the same street at 526 and 530 Oakwood Avenue. The historic addition of a flat roof has created a situation where the sloped hog-valley intersects with the flat roof rather than funneling water off of the roof.

7* The roof form of the rear additions is proposed to be altered to eliminate severe roof leaks. The amended application includes a photo of the water damage.

8* In the amended application the proposed change eliminates the two steeply pitched roofs over the ells and associated hog valley and replaces them with a single 5/12 pitched hipped roof culminating in two gable ends.
9* The deck proposed for removal was approved in 1998 (COA 002-98-CA).
10* The altered roof room retains the historic ridge height and the new addition is partially lower than the main house.
11* The rear addition is inset on the east side by 2 feet; on the west side the addition maintains the wall line of the flat roof section of the house. When an addition is extruded, the commission typically requires retention of a corner board to denote the location of the addition. This is not shown.
12* The new addition has windows of a different proportion and has board and batten rear lower level walls. Board and batten is used between the brick piers of the historic house.
13* The slope of the lot allows for a 2nd level to be constructed under the main floor level of the house.
14* Proposed materials are wood horizontal siding; wood and fiber cement panel board and batten; asphalt shingles for the roof; new metal roof for front porch; wood trim and other details; fiber cement perforated soffit panels; Anderson fibrex windows; a detailed written description and photographs of details being matched were included with the application.
15* Wood and fiber cement panel board and batten has been approved by the commission on a rear addition in Oakwood at 610 N Bloodworth Street in 2013 (COA 181-13-CA).
16* Neither fiber cement perforated soffit panels nor fibrex windows have been approved by the committee. No information was included in the application to support the proposal.

B. Replacement of window sash with glass block; addition of roof over basement entry is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.7.13, 3.8.6, 3.8.10 and the following findings:
1* The window proposed for removal is not on a character defining façade and is near the rear of house. The window opening will remain the same size.
2* Installation of a roof over a basement entry is typically approvable by staff as a Minor Work and is included here for administrative efficiency.
3* Shed roof over side and rear entries are common features in the historic district.
4* The shed roof appears to have craftsman-like brackets. The house has more delicate Victorian details.

C. Alter existing driveway; replace front concrete walk with flagstone; replace retaining wall is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section 2.3.2, 2.4.6, 2.5.3, 2.5.5, 2.5.6; however the solid concrete pad is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.5.4 and the flagstone front walk is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.5.1, 2.5.2, and the following findings:
1* It is unclear from the application if the retaining wall is proposed for relocation. The existing wall has been slathered in concrete and is inappropriate. Details and specifications regarding the new wall and location were not included in the application.
2* The existing driveway consists of gravel driving strips.

3* According to the *Design Guidelines* (p. 16) concrete driving strips are often found in the historic districts with the occasional use of brick or stone pavers.
4* The driveway leads directly to the backyard along the east side of the house. This is a traditional location according to the *Design Guidelines* (p. 16).
5* The proposed driveway alterations include a solid concrete parking pad at the front of the driveway. Solid concrete driveways are atypical.
6* A solid concrete driveway was denied by the commission in 2006 in part due to the following facts: "1* As noted in the *Guidelines* appendix essay describing the special character of Oakwood, 'Driveways themselves are most often gravel or concrete ribbon strips, squeezing beside the house to access the rear yard, and pushing the house close to the opposite side-lot line.'
7* No special circumstances are indicated for constructing a solid concrete driveway in this location. The commission has approved the use of brick or stone pavers between concrete driving strips to maintain the appearance of driving strips. A recent approval is 212-07-CA at 608 Oakwood Avenue.
8* A metal fence is proposed in the front yard. No information regarding the design or height was included in the application.
9* Front yard fences are approved at a maximum of 48" in height.
10* Stone front walks are uncommon in Oakwood. A flagstone walkway was denied by the commission in 2009 in part due to the following facts: "1* The commission has not approved the replacement of a concrete front walk with stone. 3* Staff surveyed 323 front walks in Oakwood. Of those front walks 73% are concrete; 21% are brick, 4% are stone, and 1% are some other material."
11* The landscape plan is difficult to read and includes references to items for which no information is provided. There is insufficient information to make a determination regarding appropriateness.

Pending the committee's determination regarding the significance of the rear roof form, staff recommends that the committee approve the amended application, waiving the 365-day demolition delay for removal of the tree, with the following conditions:

1. That there not be a solid concrete section of the driveway.
2. That the front walkway remain concrete.
3. That perforated fiber cement soffit panels not be used.
4. That the windows be all wood.
5. That for the board and batten siding the fiber cement panels be installed with no horizontal seams.
6. That a corner board be retained on the west elevation at the location of the new addition.
7. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff *prior to issuance of permits*:
   a. Windows;
   b. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample tree protection plan.

8. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff *prior to installation*:
   a. New retaining wall;
   b. Revised driveway design;
   c. Shed roof brackets;
   d. Doors;
   e. Front porch metal roof;
   f. Color of asphalt shingles;
   g. Paint colors;
   h. Light fixtures;
   i. Treatment of exposed newly exposed chimney brick.
9. That a new Minor Work COA application be submitted for the landscape master plan and associated elements including the metal fence, plantings, landing for trash, walkways, new trees. This does not include the flagstone front walk or driveway.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Jay Beaman [affirmed] and Vicki and Peter Rees [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Beaman addressed staff comments. As he understands it, they are approving this with the pending information for discussion: #1 driveway, fine; #2 front walkway, needs to be re-poured but will keep concrete.

Ms. McGorty noted that there were more options than concrete. Tania Tully [affirmed] said that most of the other materials were either at big houses or were changed before the district was in place. She noted that it's been a while since the commission had this discussion about driveways in 2007-2008. Ms. Rees said that she was fine with concrete; it just needs to be tilted away from the house.

Mr. Beaman said that the condition regarding soffit panels is fine and asked if they can use continuous soffit vent or if they have to use the typical 8 X 12 rectangular vents. Ms. Tully said that the commission has approved both continuous and rectangular on an addition. No one has asked for soffits to be fiber cement. Mr. Alphin noted that he has taken a piece of molding and left a gap, so you don't see an expressed vent. Mr. Beaman said that he will not do perforated panels and will work with staff.

Mr. Beaman said that he is asking that the fibrex be approved. It is a cladding of a wood window and is paintable. He passed around photographs of the product in a house elsewhere.

Mr. Beaman said that he understands that there will be no horizontal seams with board and batten and that the rest of the conditions are fine. He said that he wants to match the existing stone retaining walls and will work with staff. He will also provide driveway details to staff and work with staff on the design of the shed roof brackets. The doors are fir and glass doors. Mr. Beaman said that the porch roof will be a typical standing seam roof of 24-guage; it will have the seam and not the cap and will submit all of the details. With regard to the treatment of the

newly exposed brick it may have to be repaired or replaced. He is aware that there will be some brick that has never seen the light of day and will take care of that.

He asked about the new minor work COA for landscaping. He understands that you need to see the fence. He will not use flagstone. He asked if the items are staff approvable. Ms. Tully suggested that they could pull out the fence since they are seen in the district, though not often. For the landscape plan she couldn't tell what plantings were going where and it looks like there are trash landings and walks also proposed. She just couldn't tell what was going on. Ms. McGorty said that the minor work would be a separate application.

Mr. Beaman requested approval of the wood window clad in fibrex. A full size sample was brought and placed in full view of the committee. The proposal is a bronze color so that it would look like the same storm windows that are up on the house. The trim would be same wood trim as around the other windows. Ms. David asked if they would be able to see the little diagonal bits on the window. Mr. Alphin asked if there would be storm windows. Mr. Beaman said there would be no storm windows. Ms. Caliendo asked if fibrex is a composite between wood and vinyl. Mr. Beaman said that fibrex is some sort of fiberglass, like vinyl. Mr. Belledin asked if the facing would cover the window. Mr. Beaman said no, it will be adjacent.

Opposition: Gail Wiesner [affirmed] was present to speak in opposition to the application. She stated that the flagstone had been addressed. Ms. Wiesner noted that no one is addressing the replacement of a window with glass block. She commented that recently at 525 Euclid Street, the property owner had to show that a window was deteriorated before they could replace it. She said that there were no details on where or when the glass block was approved to create precedent. The window will be visible in some areas. There are other ways to address privacy. This window is not congruous with anything that has been on an addition so far. Ms. Wiesner also commented on the proposed fibrex windows. She commented on the corners showing and the prominence of the profile and that it was hard to say how much the molding will contribute to that. They are very different windows.

Will Hillebrenner asked if the sill would be wrapped. Mr. Beaman said that there would be no sill, but be picture framed. Ms. Tully said that the sill is shown on the drawings. Mr. Beaman said that in that case the sill would be 2" and added with wrap molding and extend out to look like others in neighborhood.

Ms. Caliendo asked if there were any comments about staff's comment on rear roof form. Ms. Belledin asked about the rationale for the roof form change. Mr. Beaman said that in the original application, DRAC suggested that they change entire back of the house to be a hip. He noted that the backyard slopes behind the house and with a hip roof, the roof detail would disappear and get further behind you. They are also putting small one cantilever to give the look of symmetrical gables on the back and keep the main roof as the hip. He thought it looked nicer than just the large hip going back.

Ms. McGorty asked if staff comments were written with the amended application. Ms. Tully said yes. She said that staff would like the commission to discuss their comfort with the concept of replacing the two ells with one big roof. She noted that the change made the addition fit better with the Guidelines. The change really helps the form. Mr. Belledin asked if anyone has

filled a hogvalley. Ms. Tully said that what she's seen is the addition of dormers. She also commented that most changes were not as long as this one has gotten. This is the first proposal like this she's seen and Dan Becker didn't bring up any examples living in his memory. She also noted that it felt like the addition of the flat roof section made it really long. Mr. Alphin asked when the addition was built. Ms. Tully said that based on the Sanborn Fire Insurance maps it was around that 1914. There was an addition there, but she cannot be sure of the roof form.

Ms. McGorty noted that the glass block window is in the shower and visible from neighbor's deck.

Ms. David asked a question about the fence. She noted that in the application the new fence line comes right off corner of porch and that's not a configuration seen in Oakwood. She said that in her knowledge that is not historic. A fence usually comes off the corner of the house like it does on the other side. Ms. Rees stated that the fence is a psychological barrier from people who walk by and find things on their porch which they want to go home with. Ms. McGorty asked if there was room to shift it back to house. Ms. Tully noted that in the application it is not clear if the wall is being moved. Ms. Rees said that the wall needs to be moved to be level with porch. They are currently parking partially in the neighbor's yard. Ms. David asked if the retaining wall will come off of edge of porch also. That's not what drawing looks like. Ms. Rees said yes, and the fence would be on the wall.

Ms. McGorty asked if the applicant had comments about the objection to the glass block. Ms. David asked if they had considered replacing the window glass with frosted glass. Ms. Caliendo noted that guideline 3.7.16 states that it is inappropriate to replace clear glass with tinted glass. Mr. Belledin noted that they could leave the exterior window, remove interior of it and put piece of frosted glass that meets the tile on the inside. Mr. Beaman commented that if glass block could be approved, it would be better because the shower is a curved glass wall. The request is a design preference from the inside. If allowable they would like to do it.

Mr. Belledin asked again about moving wall. Ms. Rees said that they can't open the car door with wall where it is.

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 5/0.

<u>Committee Discussion</u>

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
Let's discuss the roof first. [McGorty]
Guideline 3.5.1 says to retain character defining roof and roof forms. [Caliendo]
This is such an extreme case with the two ells and the hog valley [Belledin]
This is changing the character of the house. It is proposed to be a 5/12 pitch from the edge all the way up to the ridge. [Alphin]

The proposal does retain the lower ridge height. The irony is that if you kept the 5/12 you would end up with a flat roof that ends up in a hog valley. This is a unique condition. The challenge is that you are impacting historic fabric, but it is behind the main roof of the house and maintaining the character of two gable ells. [Belledin]
If the change is in the flat roof addition, does that make glass block more obtainable? If it's original should we change the roof form? [Alphin]
You see the two ells coming off the back of the house with the hogvalley between them. That is seen fairly often and it makes such a bad leaking problem. If it's not an addition it's certainly an early change. It's probably been leaking since 1914 and the proposed alterations fix that and look to what the original looked like with gables coming off back. [David]
Would the original have had a flat roof in the hogvalley? [Alphin]
It would have had a low slope. To close that up was probably preferable. [David]
This changes the overall roof form with the existing house. The flat roof section of the house is an addition. With the proposal it has been completely wiped out and the two steeper roofs are now getting flattened. Where there were two ridgelines now there will be one. This is a significant change in form. Yes, it blends in, but this house wasn't built like this originally. We are camouflaging recipe in parts, erasing history here. [Alphin]
That is typically done when people pull off porches. [Belledin]
Staff is asking if the two slopping pitched ells with the hogvalley character-defining. What is remaining? [Tully]
The main roof is not being altered as seen from front. The original ridge line remains. The rear elevation retains the appearance of two ells. The addition is located on the rear of the house. The second roof is still secondary. [Belledin]
So the consensus is that the flat roof is an addition for the purposes of the glass block? [Alphin]
There are other treatments that could be used other than glass block. [Belledin]
With the roof forms, the consensus is that they're okay? [Caliendo]
Yes. Let's discuss the glass block next and then the windows. [McGorty]
They chose to create a problem by putting the shower there. It seems like they can find a different way to make the window private from the inside. [Alphin]
The Guideline Elizabeth cited speaks to the opacity of the glass bock. [McGorty]
Fibrex would be new precedent. [McGorty]
I am not comfortable with what it looks like. Especially the corner with the piece of divider. [Caliendo]
If the storm windows were removed… [Alphin]
We haven't introduced new materials even to new additions to historic structures. [David]
It is unusual for the fence to be coming off of the corner of the porch. [David]
We can address that using the minor work. [Alphin]
We were looking to make these conditions, but staff may need guidance on if they think it's appropriate. [McGorty]
There are a number of items shown on the plan, but there is not enough information. [Belledin]

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

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Mr. Alphin and seconded by Ms. McGorty, 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 1-16) and B. (inclusive of facts

1-4) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following modifications and additional facts as listed below:

A. Removal of tree in rear yard; removal of rear deck; construction of new 2-story rear addition; modification of existing rear roof form; replacement of roof shingles is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.5, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 3.2, 3.5.1, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9; however the use of fibrex windows and perforated fiber cement soffit panels are incongruous according to *Guidelines* 4.2.7 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 Pecan tree proposed for removal is leaning and adjacent to the proposed new addition; several new trees are proposed to be planted as part of the landscape plan.

2* There are no other 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.

3* According to Wake County Real Estate data the lot is about 8,276 SF. The existing house and deck is 2,266 SF for lot coverage of 27%. The proposed addition has an approximate 470 SF footprint for an increase of 286 SF and new lot coverage of 31%.

4* The existing house is a frame Triple-A house constructed circa 1910. According to Sanborn Fire Insurance maps (available for review) the current footprint of the house has not changed significantly since 1914.

5* As seen on the rear elevation drawing in the original submittal, changing the roof form will result in the exposure of more of the chimneys. The as-built drawings do not accurately reflect the amount of chimney currently exposed. No information regarding the treatment of the newly exposed brick was included in the application.

6* The form of the house with a side gable roof and two rear ells connected by a hog valley is found throughout Oakwood including on the same street at 526 and 530 Oakwood Avenue. The historic addition of a flat roof has created a situation where the sloped hog-valley intersects with the flat roof rather than funneling water off of the roof.

7* The roof form of the rear additions is proposed to be altered to eliminate severe roof leaks. The amended application includes a photo of the water damage.

8* In the amended application the proposed change eliminates the two steeply pitched roofs over the ells and associated hog valley and replaces them with a single 5/12 pitched hipped roof culminating in two gable ends.

9* The deck proposed for removal was approved in 1998 (COA 002-98-CA).

10* The altered roof room retains the historic ridge height and the new addition is partially lower than the main house. The amended application maintains the appearance of 2 ells at the rear of the house.
11* The rear addition is inset on the east side by 2 feet; on the west side the addition maintains the wall line of the flat roof section of the house. When an addition is extruded, the commission typically requires retention of a corner board to denote the location of the addition. This is not shown.
12* The new addition has windows of a different proportion and has board and batten rear lower level walls. Board and batten is used between the brick piers of the historic house.
13* The slope of the lot allows for a 2nd level to be constructed under the main floor level of the house.
14* Proposed materials are wood horizontal siding; wood and fiber cement panel board and batten; asphalt shingles for the roof; new metal roof for front porch; wood trim and other details; fiber cement perforated soffit panels; Anderson fibrex windows; a detailed written description and photographs of details being matched were included with the application.
15* Wood and fiber cement panel board and batten has been approved by the commission on a rear addition in Oakwood at 610 N Bloodworth Street in 2013 (COA 181-13-CA).
16* Neither fiber cement perforated soffit panels nor fibrex windows have been approved by the committee. No information was included in the application to support the proposal.
17* A sample of a fibrex window was provided and examined. The corners have details atypical of a wood window. The non-wood exterior does not allow for a traditional trim.
18* The fibrex window can be painted.

B. Addition of roof over basement entry is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.7.13, 3.8.6, 3.8.10; however, replacement of window sash with glass block is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.7.16 and the following findings:
1* The window proposed for removal is not on a character defining façade and is near the rear of house. The window opening will remain the same size.
2* Installation of a roof over a basement entry is typically approvable by staff as a Minor Work and is included here for administrative efficiency.
3* Shed roof over side and rear entries are common features in the historic district.
4* The shed roof appears to have craftsman-like brackets. The house has more delicate Victorian details.
5* The existing sash is historic; no evidence of a need for replacement was provided.

Ms. McGorty agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 5/0.

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Mr. Alphin and seconded by Ms. David, Mr. Alphin made an amended motion that all items listed under Staff Comment C be deferred and the remainder of the application be approved as amended, with the following conditions:

1. That perforated fiber cement soffit panels not be used and that the detail be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.
2. That the windows be all wood.
3. That for the board and batten siding the fiber cement panels be installed with no horizontal seams.
4. That a corner board be retained on the west elevation at the location of the new addition.
5. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff *prior to issuance of permits*:
   a. Windows;
   b. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample tree protection plan.
6. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff *prior to installation*:
   a. Shed roof brackets;
   b. Doors;
   c. Front porch metal roof;
   d. Color of asphalt shingles;
   e. Paint colors;
   f. Light fixtures;
   g. Treatment of newly exposed chimney brick.

Ms. David agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 3/2 (Ms. McGorty and Mr. Alphin opposed).

Committee members voting: Alphin, Belledin, Caliendo, David, McGorty.

Certificate expiration date: 11/05/14.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

043-14-CA 515 N BLOUNT STREET
Applicant: STEVEN D SCHUSTER FAIA
Received: 4/15/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 7/14/2014 1) 5/5/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BLOUNT STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: O&I-2, PDD
Nature of Project: Change previously approved COA 006-13-CA: install board formed concrete foundation treatment on rear addition; install steel cable railings on rear addition.
Amendments: Additional information regarding the foundation treatment was provided April 30, 2014 and is attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: Mr. Belledin is principal at Clearscapes, the architecture firm on the project. Ms. David moved to recuse Mr. Belledin. Ms. McGorty seconded; motion carried 4/0. Mr. Belledin left for the remainder of the meeting.
Staff Notes:

- Minor Work COA 052-14-MW approved changes to previously approved COAs 006-13-CA and 039-12-MW: Install new sidewalk; reconfigure handicap parking space; install vertical platform lift; add railing on front porch; change existing house foundation treatments; elimination of rear vertical platform lift and rear addition roof deck. The file is available for review.
- Conditions of approval for 006-13-CA remain to be met. The file is available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	install board formed concrete foundation treatment on rear addition; install steel cable railings on rear addition

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Installation of board formed concrete foundation treatment on rear addition; installation of steel cable railings on rear addition **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* section , and the following findings:

1* Subject to detailed conditions, the rear addition was previously approved in 2013 per COA 006-13-CA.

2* Detailed architectural drawings are included in the application.

3* The details of the revised cornice on the rear addition give the rear addition a lighter and more traditional look and feel. The use of the formed concrete foundation and steel cable railings seem hard and detract from the overall historic character of the principal building.
4* The ameded application included a photograph of the proposed foundation treatment on the Contemporary Art Museum. This building is not in the historic overlay district and is not of residential character.

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

1. That the foundation of the addition have a more traditional residential treatment.
2. That the railing either have vertical pickets or the frosted glass originally approved.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Steve Schuster [affirmed], Bang Le [affirmed], and John Holms [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application.

Tania Tully [affirmed] explained that the addition shown in the application has been approved and that the only thing to discuss for this application is the change of frosted glass railing treatment and the foundation treatment. She also noted that there is no longer going to be a roof deck with glass railing. Some part of the foundation on the house is stone veneer. The applicant has decided to stay with what's there, except for parging the newly exposed cinder block section. She added to the missing comments Guidelines section 4.2.8 and 4.2.7.

Mr. Le explained the changes to the foundation materials that were approved by the Minor Work including the parged concrete block foundation and added plantings. In the rear they want to continue in the tradition of the original building. The older addition used a brick foundation and felt that in this addition, it should be discernible as 21st century addition. They feel like the board formed concrete is used as a commercial product and since Blount Street is a transitional district between residential and commercial, to use something discernible from the parge coat and brick foundation is not incongruous. They want to continue 21st century tradition with a steel rail with cables, to be visually minimal than even the glass would have been.

Mr. Schuster said that clearly the goal is to make the addition appear honest to its period. The glass rails were value engineered out, which happens. It seems like simple aircraft cable is no different from a glass railing; both are new. With stone, then brick, then parged block, the addition having a different treatment is continuing in the tradition of the building.

Opposition:
Gil Wiesner [affirmed] spoke in opposition to application. She stated that this is a significant building. Raleigh is a young city without much constructed before 1900. She argued that the

issue of discernible can be met even with a plaque; it doesn't have to slap you in the face. She stated that being honest of its period is irrelevant to the Design Guidelines and that affordable is also irrelevant to the Design Guidelines. She agreed that the building is already a mishmash, but you can get to a point where it looks trashy. She asserted that this is the case because it's so visible. She stated that it is even truer of the railing. There are a number of alternatives to the railing, and agrees that the glass is a problem; it calls too much attention to itself instead of keeping attention on the historic building. There is no reason to do it.

Questions:
Ms. David asked why the landing comes out so out. Ms. Tully said that she could ask but noted that it's already been approved. Mr. Le noted that it is set on the axis of the main building. On the front it's a porch; in the rear it's an entry to the basement below. Mr. Schuster added that there is a door down there.

Mr. Alphin noted that the approved addition had shown stone veneer. He asked if the proposal wasn't approved if they'd be back to the stone veneer and glass rail. Mr. Schuster said yes.

Ms. Caliendo asked if the foundation is painted. Mr. Le said that the rear quarter is stone and unfortunately very little remained and it's been painted white. Essentially it's been painted all the way around. Mr. Schuster added except for under the porch where it's untreated concrete block.

Mr. Alphin noted that board forming can take on all kinds of character. He asked if the intent is to be more like the photograph. Mr. Schuster said that the intent is not to have lots of texture, but just to be more expressive than smooth concrete. It is to have a little more character than parging since it's visible inside and out.

Ms. Tully asked if they are removing the paint or repainting. Mr. Le said that they would not be repainting. Mr. Schuster said the intent is to leave it natural.

Ms. Caliendo noted that the board formed concrete is used for commercial applications in the warehouse district. Mr. Schuster noted that it is also at Oak View Park secondary agricultural buildings.

Mr. Schuster noted that the proposal is compatible, quiet, and unique to 21st century. He noted the fact that glass has been approved and that they think this is not of greater emphasis than the glass was. He also noted that concrete is a different product than stone, but not greater than previous commission allowed.

Ms. McGorty asked if the commission has approved board formed concrete.

Ms. Caliendo asked if they will be repainting the existing foundation a different color. Mr. Le said that it could be damaged.

Ms. McGorty asked if there are other materials that they could use to make a foundation that would make it discernible but that are more frequently used. Mr. Schuster stated that there is already stone, brick, and parged concrete. He said that adding discernible to a material already there.

Mr. Alphin said that the original findings of fact would have addressed the uniqueness of the addition. The commission can tie it to that and it not so easily becomes precedent.

Mr. Schuster asked if it a texture problem. He noted that concrete can be as smooth as parging, commonly approved in districts. Concrete is far more durable than parging. Parging is used because it's less costly than concrete.

Ms. McGorty stated that the issue she's having is Guideline 4.2.7 that says to design an addition to be compatible in materials, yet make the addition discernible. She noted that they are introducing a new material to be discernible. Mr. Schuster stated that this is a house that has a tradition of every foundation being a different material while the siding remains the same. That's the tradition of this house. Mr. Le added that this house already had a contemporary to its time foundation.

Ms. McGorty said that the material is already on the house in different forms. Ms. Caliendo said that the material is compatible. Ms. David said that it is the texture and the finish. As an architectural historian the first place she always looks is at the foundation. Even if the siding is the same, you can tell a lot. It is very common in NC to have a different foundation for each change. She said that the proposal is highlighting it; the board poured concrete instead of a smooth finish is drawing attention to it. Ms. Caliendo noted they said that the intent is not to have an excessive texture. She added that the elevation drawings are showing lines, but those lines may be indiscernible in reality.

Ms. McGorty noted that the railing may not be in keeping with the Guidelines. Mr. Schuster stated that this commission has approved many times in the historic districts. Ms. Tully said that they have been approved in back yards, slowly over time, when not visible from the street. In one case the railing was approved conditioned on the fence remaining.

Ms. David said they have had the discussion about the character of the district recently. Ms. Tully said that based on the special character essay and the very long meeting regarding signage the commission has come down clearly that Blount Street is residential in character.

Ms. McGorty said that they already set a precedent for modern materials on the addition when they approved the glass. Ms. Tully said that they may need to have a discussion about the visibility of the material. She noted that the original approval had no real visibility.

Ms. McGorty said that glass is a solid, whereas the steel is separated by 4 inches of cable. Mr. Schuster said that the horizontal steel would by definition have more openings. Ms. McGorty said that she thinks glass would have been more visible. She asked if there are any other materials like that on the house. Mr. Schuster said that there are no other horizontal rails on the house except for a horizontal steel rail as an augment to a low historic rail. Ms. McGorty said that the steel wire detracts less from the overall character of the principal building because it's less solid citing guiding 4.2.8. Ms. Caliendo said that they approved the glass rail and she thinks this is as minimal in expression as the glass rail. She would have a hard time not approving the rail.

Ms. David said that she agrees with Ms. Wiesner that it would be better to explore something less modern, but that this is a reasonable exchange for the glass.

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

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. McGorty and seconded by Mr. Alphin, Ms. McGorty made an amended motion that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-4) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following modifications and additional facts as listed below:

A. Installation of board formed concrete foundation treatment on rear addition; installation of steel cable railings on rear addition is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section 4.2.7, 4.2.8 and the following findings:

1* Subject to detailed conditions, the rear addition was previously approved in 2013 per COA 006-13-CA.

2* Detailed architectural drawings are included in the application.

3* The details of the revised cornice on the rear addition give the rear addition a lighter and more traditional look and feel. The use of the formed concrete foundation and steel cable railings seem hard and detract from the overall historic character of the principal building.

4* The amended application included a photograph of the proposed foundation treatment on the Contemporary Art Museum. This building is not in the historic overlay district and is not of residential character.

5* The intent is to not have a rough texture for the concrete.

6* The board formed concrete will be left unpainted.

7* In comparison to the approved glass railing, the steel cable railing detracts less and is less of a solid obstruction.
8* Concrete is a material already seen in foundations. It is typical for foundations to change with new additions.

Mr. Alphin agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 4/0.

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the texture of the board formed concrete be similar to or less than the texture of the Contemporary Art Museum example provided in the photographs.

Ms. David agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 4/0.

Committee members voting: Alphin, Caliendo, David, McGorty.

Certificate expiration date: 11/05/14.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Courtesy Review: Blount Street Condos
   The following items summarize the commission's comments regarding the congruity of the proposal with respect to the Design Guidelines for Raleigh Historic Districts:
   - The property is adjacent to the Oakwood and Blount Street Historic Overlay Districts.
   - The proposal is within the height approved by the Master Plan.
   - The new construction has a suburban feel.
   - Flat roofed row houses would have a more urban feel.
   - Vinyl windows and aluminum clad garage doors are atypical.
   - There are few examples of shingles in the Blount Street Historic District.
   - The building is out of proportion with the applied architectural elements.
   - The boxed eave details are clunky.
   - The proposal should take cues from the adjacent historic districts.
2. Committee Discussion
   a. Application Completeness
   b. Meeting Post-Mortem
3. Design Guidelines Update

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Elizabeth Caliendo
Certificate of Appropriateness Committee,
Raleigh Historic Development Commission

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner