RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
July 7, 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: Elizabeth Caliendo, Sarah David (4:03), Miranda Downer, Scott Shackleton
Alternate Present: Fred Belledin
Staff Present: Tania Tully, Martha Lauer, Vivian Ekstrom

Approval of the June 2, 2014 Minutes

Ms. Caliendo moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing and to adopt the minutes as amended. Ms. Downer seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

Minor Works

There were no questions regarding the Minor Work report.

The following is a list indicating persons in attendance and whether they were affirmed. Ms. Martha Lauer 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
Cynthia Seal, 324 Cutler Street 27603	No
John Martin, 133 Fayetteville Street, 6th Floor 27601	Yes
Erin Sterling Lewis, 704 N Person Street 27604	Yes
Corey Mason, 2009 Fairview Road #6082 27628	Yes
Matthew Griffith, 704 N Person Street 27604	Yes
Franklin Roberts, 3409 Huckabay Circle 27612	Yes
Susan Gilbert, 219 E Lenoir Street 27601	Yes
Heather Scott, 218 N East Street 27601	Yes
Randall Scott, 218 N East Street 27601	Yes
Louis Stamm, 308 Pace Street 27604	No
Leslie Foster, 308 Pace Street 27604	No
Andy Penry, 315 N Boundary Street 27604	Yes

REVIEW OF SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS

There were no objections to the approval of the Summary Proceedings without a public hearing. The committee reviewed and approved the following case 079-14-CA for which the Summary Proceeding is made part of these minutes.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – SUMMARY PROCEEDING

079-14-CA 324 CUTLER STREET
Applicant: CYNTHIA SEAL
Received: 6/17/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/15/2014 1) 7/7/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Install 48" tall wood picket fence in rear yard; expand existing rear deck
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- COA 174-07-CA is available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.4	Fences and Walls	install 48" tall wood picket fence in rear yard
4.1	Decks	expand existing rear deck

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Installation of 48" tall wood picket fence in rear yard; expansion of existing rear deck is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.4.8, 2.4.11, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.1.5, and the following findings:

1* The house sits at the corner of Cutler Street and McCulloch Street and is visible from McCulloch.

2* Rear yard wood fences are regularly approved in Boylan Heights. A photograph of the proposed picket design was included in the application.

3* The proposed fence runs along the south and west property lines with the garage forming the corner. From McCulloch Street the fence turns to meet the house several feet beyond the side bay of the house.

4* No information regarding gates was included in the application.

5* The application does not indicate if the fence will be installed with the structural members facing inward towards the yard as is the commission's policy.

6* The application proposed to expand the existing rear deck from 8' x 8' to 11.5' x 12'.

7* The current deck replaced a smaller deck and was approved in 2007 under COA 174-07-CA. The existing deck is not an original feature of the house, is located on the rear façade, and its

removal will not compromise the main structure. The replacement deck is positioned in the same location as the existing deck, but is larger.

8* The existing deck is built of treated wood framing and flooring supported by 4″x4″ treated posts with wood railings. The railings will be built with 4″x4″ posts, 2″x4″ handrails, and 2″x2″ pickets – materials that have been approved in the historic districts for exterior decks. The posts and rails will have beveled edges.

9* The existing deck is approximately 9′ above grade which will allow the deck to align with the first floor of the house. Lattice panels are installed between the support posts of the deck and stairs.

10* The materials, design, and lattice screening of the expanded deck will be the same as the existing. The stairs will remain in the same location. Several photos of the existing deck were included in the application. Drawings from the 2007 approval were sent to the applicant by staff.

11* It is hard to tell from the site plan if the deck is inset from the north corner of the house as stated in the *Guidelines*.

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

1. That the deck be inset 6″ from the corner of the house.
2. That the fence be installed with the structural members facing inward towards the yard.
3. That should the gates be of a different design than the fence panels, they be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

There were no objections to approval without a public hearing.

Ms. Caliendo moved to approve the application, adopting the staff comments as the written record of the summary proceeding on 079-14-CA. Ms. David seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

<u>Committee members voting</u>: Belledin, Caliendo, David, Downer, Shackleton.

<u>Certificate expiration date</u>: 1/7/15.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chair Shackleton introduced the public hearing portion of the meeting. The committee heard the following cases in the following order for which the Certified Records are made part of these minutes: 077-14-MW, 078-14-CA, 080-14-CA, and 081-14-CA.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

077-14-MW 19 W HARGETT STREET (ODD FELLOWS BUILDING)
Applicant: JOHN MARTIN - ODD FELLOWS LANDLORD, LLC
Received: 6/17/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/15/2014 1) 7/7/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: RALEIGH HISTORIC LANDMARK
Zoning: DOD, BUS
Nature of Project: Install 10 colored uplights at top pilasters.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- Installation of lighting is typically approvable by staff as a Minor Work application. Per the RHDC By-laws, staff forwarded this item to the committee as the use of colored lights does not clearly meet the *Guidelines* and may set a precedent.
- The landmark designation report is available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.7	Lighting	Install 10 colored uplights at top pilasters.
3.2	Masonry	

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Installation of 10 uplights is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.7.10, 3.2.2; however the use of colored lights **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.7.10 and the following findings.

1* The landmark designation report describes the building as "Raleigh's first 1920s tall office building. It is a ten-story, brick and steel skyscraper which adheres to the classic or Chicago school approach to design in that the base, shaft, and capital formula are exhibited…***Ochre-colored facade brick serves to heighten the whiteness of the terra cotta and limestone ornamental elements***...There is an abundance of decoration on the north and west street elevations." The area proposed to be lit is described as "The capital stage [which] includes the ninth and tenth floors and is the most embellished of the three stages. Similar to the rhythm of pilasters and glass planes in the base stage, this section has two-story tall Corinthian order columnettes and pilasters which alternate with vertical ranks of windows." [*emphasis added*]

2* The proposed lighting fixtures are 10-1/8" wide and 14-7/8" tall and grey in color. The bulbs are LED solid color lights in red, green, blue and yellow. They will not flash or blink.
3* Page 20 of the *Guidelines* states "The light cast by these early fixtures was described as a soft yellow-toned glow rather than the harsher bluishtone light cast by contemporary mercury vapor streetlights."
4* A photograph illustrates that the lights will be mounted in front of the columnettes on the entablature between the eighth and ninth floors. No dimensions are provided, however it appears that the brackets will bolt directly into the historic masonry unless some kind of mounting plate is used.
5* Photographic examples of other older building in other cities are provided to show the desired effect of the lighting.

Pending the committee's determination regarding the use of colored lighting staff recommends that the committee approve the application, with the following conditions:

1. That mounting plates be used so as to allow for bolting into existing joints with the exact method to be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits.
2. That that the lighting be natural (yellow-toned, not blue-toned).

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: John Martin [affirmed], Empire Properties was present to speak in support of the application. He made the following initial statements. The lights would enhance and highlight the historic character. They will not be visible from the ground and would not detract from overall historic character. The lighting is for a tall, downtown commercial building, in the heart of the city, and always has been in the heart of the city. The lighting is true to the city and very appropriate.

Ms. Caliendo asked if the adjacent building was commercial or residential. Mr. Martin said was commercial.

Mr. Belledin asked if the light would change over the course of the year. Mr. Martin said it would be similar to the Empire State Building and will change with the season and holidays. Otherwise it will remain white during most of the year. He said it will highlight the features and historical character of building. The colored lights will be classy and appropriate to highlight holidays and special events. Tania Tully said that there is no mention of white lights in the application. Mr. Belledin stated that a RGBW fixture will provide white light. Noting that he is familiar with this type of product it looks like from the light pattern it is a large, not medium. Mr. Martin said it was the size recommended to light the capital of the building. Mr. Belledin noted that it will hinge out from bottom, so the fixtures will be visible from the street. Mr. Martin said that the coping will cover it. Ms. Tully said that from the application information there is no coping. Mr. Martin said it is a narrow coping, but you would not likely

be able to see the lights. Mr. Belledin said that these are fairly large and would be visible from a distance. He asked if there is another standard of fixture color such as tan or buff he could use. Mr. Martin said that these are the only ones they have looked at.

Mr. Belledin asked about the installation of the wiring. Mr. Martin said the wiring will be flush with the coping closer to the edge of the building wall. The intention is to keep this as clean as possible and not show conduit or light fixtures if possible. Mr. Belledin asked about the location of the wiring boxes. Mr. Martin said they would be on the interior of the space.

Mr. Belledin asked staff if there was any precedent to conditioning things to time of use. Ms. Tully said that there was not that she knew of. Mr. Belledin asked about the possibility of doing so. Ms. Tully said that it may fall out of the commission's jurisdiction because of the temporary nature, but that she wasn't aware of anyone else ever asking the question. She stated that there is nothing that says the committee can or can't make that a condition. It is also an enforcement issue. Mr. Belledin asked the applicant if he is amenable to conditioning the times of use of color. Mr. Martin said he was perhaps amenable noting a few of the limited number of holidays and events such as the 4th of July, the Komen Race, and Christmas.

Mr. Belledin asked if the applicant understood the suggested mounting plate condition. Mr. Martin said he did, but that a contractor advised against this method because drilling into mortar on a horizontal surface would lead to water damage. That's why they proposed what's in the application. Ms. Tully said that she didn't understand how drilling into mortar would create any more potential for water damage than into the building. Mr. Martin passed around an exhibit from the contractor about the drilling proposal that illustrated the granular mortar. Mr. Belledin asked if there were terra cotta blocks up there and Mr. Martin confirmed.

Mr. Shackleton asked if there were other questions while passing the exhibit around.

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. David seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Committee Discussion

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

I have reservations about the proposed damage to the building, but no opinion on the color of the lights. She said that she is not an expert on which was less damaging to terra cotta, drilling into the mortar or the stone.[David]
I see two issues: the colored lights and the technical issue of connecting to the terra cotta. A workaround could be to condition that the drilling is to be into the mortar unless they have an

opinion from a terra cotta expert stating otherwise, especially regarding the freeze-thaw cycle [Belledin].
We could limit colored lights to a certain percentage of year. [Shackleton]
I was thinking that 10% of the year would be fair if it is only for holidays and special events. It is also in the spirit of the *Guidelines*. The LED bulb is a new option not readily available when the Guidelines were written [Belledin].
10% seems fair [Caliendo]
We need cut sheet, but it seems like you could get true white out of the proposed lights.[Belledin]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Ms. Caliendo and seconded by Ms. David, Ms. Caliendo 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 1-5) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following modification and additional facts as listed below:

A. Installation of 10 uplights is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.7.10, 3.2.2 and the following findings.

1* The landmark designation report describes the building as "Raleigh's first 1920s tall office building. It is a ten-story, brick and steel skyscraper which adheres to the classic or Chicago school approach to design in that the base, shaft, and capital formula are exhibited…***Ochre-colored facade brick serves to heighten the whiteness of the terra cotta and limestone ornamental elements***...There is an abundance of decoration on the north and west street elevations." The area proposed to be lit is described as "The capital stage [which] includes the ninth and tenth floors and is the most embellished of the three stages. Similar to the rhythm of pilasters and glass planes in the base stage, this section has two-story tall Corinthian order columnettes and pilasters which alternate with vertical ranks of windows." [*emphasis added*]

2* The proposed lighting fixtures are 10-1/8" wide and 14-7/8" tall and grey in color. The bulbs are LED solid color lights in red, green, blue and yellow. They will not flash or blink.

3* Page 20 of the *Guidelines* states "The light cast by these early fixtures was described as a soft yellow-toned glow rather than the harsher bluishtone light cast by contemporary mercury vapor streetlights."

4* A photograph illustrates that the lights will be mounted in front of the columnettes on the entablature between the eighth and ninth floors. No dimensions are provided, however it appears that the brackets will bolt directly into the historic masonry unless some kind of mounting plate is used.

5* Photographic examples of other older building in other cities are provided to show the desired effect of the lighting.

6* The applicant stated that the wiring for the fixtures will be flush with existing coping and the junction and circuit boxes will be mounted on the interior of the building.
7* The applicant stated that except for special events and holidays the lights would be white in color.
8* The coping of the building is terra cotta.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the mounting plates and brackets be used for the light fixtures and conduit so as to allow for bolting into existing joints unless information to the contrary is provided by a contractor with specialized expertise in terra cotta with the exact method to be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits.
2. That that the lighting be natural (yellow-toned, not blue-toned).
3. That cut sheets for the light fixtures that demonstrate the ability to produce white light be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits.
4. That the colored lights be used only for known special events and holidays and for a maximum of 15% of the year.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 1/7/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

078-14-CA 136 E MORGAN ST
Applicant: ERIN STERLING LEWIS
Received: 6/17/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/15/2014 1) 7/7/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: DOD, BUS
Nature of Project: Remove non-historic false façades and site walls; install new landscaping, site walls and metal fence; construct new entry addition on S Blount St, construct new stair addition on E Morgan St; parge concrete block walls; install new canopies; replace non-historic storefronts; change exterior paint colors.
Amendments: Clearer drawings were provided by the applicant 7/3/14 and are attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- Sanborn Fire Insurance maps are available for review.
- COA cases reference in the facts are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Remove non-historic false façades and site walls; install new landscaping, site walls and metal fence
2.4	Fences and Walls	install new site walls and metal fence
3.4	Paint and Paint Color	change exterior paint colors
3.6	Exterior Walls	parge concrete block walls
3.9	Storefronts	install new canopies; replace non-historic storefronts
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	construct new entry addition on S Blount St, construct new stair addition on E Morgan St

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Removal of non-historic false façades and site walls; installation of new landscaping, site walls and metal fence is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.4.1, 2.4.8; however the use of board-formed concrete for the site walls and a fence is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.4.8 and the following findings:

1* The Moore Square National Register nomination, on which the local district designation was based, describes 136 E Morgan/108 S Blount as a c. 1920 1-story commercial block and attached garage. The commercial block (now 110 S Blount Street) is listed as contributing and the attached garage as non-contributing (now 108 S Blount Street). 134 E Morgan Street is a contributing 2-story commercial block.

2* The site walls and arches/faux storefronts being removed are non-historic.

3* Existing site walls are approximately 42" tall. The proposed new walls and fence are 48" tall. The new site walls are at the property line rather than inset as they are now. Historically, buildings were set at the property line in the commercial districts. The new site walls will somewhat bring the street wall closer to the sidewalk.

4* Staff is unaware of any fences in the Moore Square Historic District; fences are not a traditional feature in commercial areas.

5* The new site wall is proposed to be board-formed concrete; the proposed texture was not included in the application. Board formed concrete has been approved by the committee in the Blount Street Historic District on a rear addition (COA 043-14-CA). It is a utilitarian treatment seen more often on foundations; staff is unaware of its use in a prominent site wall.

6* The existing hardscape and plantings will be replaced with new hardscape and plantings; detailed drawings were not included in the application.

7* According to Sanborn Fire Insurance maps, since 1888 the buildings at the corner of S Blount and E Morgan were set back from the street farther than the rest of the block; in fact, from 1903 to 1914 the building at 134 E Morgan Street was a dwelling.

B. Changing of exterior paint colors; parging of concrete block walls; installation of new canopies; replacement non-historic storefronts is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.4.3, 3.6.1, 3.6.10, 3.7.1, 3.7.4, 3.7.7, 3.9.1, 3.9.6, 3.9.7; however, the lack of a bulkhead on the historic building at 134 E Morgan Street is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.9.6 and the following findings:

1* Paint samples were not included in the application.

2* The concrete block walls proposed for removal or parging are non-contributing to the character of the buildings and district. Parging is a traditional method of coating masonry units and has a stucco-like appearance. The amended application states that it will have a smooth surface. Specifications of the parging material were not included in the application.

3* Excepting on the addition discussed in comment C., no new exterior openings are proposed; all new windows and doors are in existing or previously infilled openings.

4* A continuous new metal canopy is proposed to wrap 108 S Blount Street; detailed drawings were not included in the application. A metal canopy was approved wrapping the non-contributing building at the corner of S. Wilmington Street and E. Martin Street in 2010 (COA 042-10-CA).
5* One solid wood door is proposed along E Morgan Street.
6* A portion of the north wall of 108 S Blount Street will be glass accordion doors; the pattern is similar to the storefront windows used elsewhere in the project.
7* Details and specifications for the new doors and windows were not included in the application.
8* The new storefront in the contributing building at 134 E Morgan Street is shown without a bulkhead. Traditionally storefronts in 2-story commercial blocks sat on some form of bulkhead.

C. Construction of new entry addition on S Blount Street; construction of new stair addition on E Morgan Street is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.6, 4.2.7 and the following findings:
1* The proposed entry addition is connected to the side of the contributing building at 110 S Blount Street and in front of 108 S Blount Street. It does not damage historic fabric.
2* The entry addition is sheathed in glass, has a flat roof and is lower than the historic buildings; detailed drawings were not included in the application.
3* The proposed stair addition sits atop the non-contributing garage and is appended to the rear side of the contributing 2-story commercial block. It is several feet shorter than the historic building and also has a flat roof.
4* The stair addition is proposed to be clad in wood with the east wall being a large glass opening. Details and colors were not included in the application.

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

1. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
    a. Paint colors;
    b. Parging material;
    c. Canopies;
    d. Lighting fixtures and locations;
    e. Landscape plan;
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
    a. Windows;
    b. Storefront systems;
    c. Entry addition;
    d. Stair addition.

3. That the new storefront at 134 E Morgan Street have a bulkhead with the revised design to be proved to and approved by staff prior to installation.
4. Specifications for doors and windows.
5. That the site walls not be board-formed concrete, with the new material to be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.
6. That there not be a fence, with the new site enclosure material to be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support:
Franklin Roberts [affirmed], representative of the property owner, Edenton St UMC, was present to speak in support of the application as were Matthew Griffith [affirmed], in situ and Corey Mason, Landscape Architect.

Mr. Roberts spoke to the intent of the project saying that it is a great time to establish satellite churches and reach out to new downtown residents. This church is separate from Edenton Street UMC, but also a part of it.

Mr. Griffith walked through a presentation (provided in PDF format to staff) that in large part mirrored the amended application. He made the following comments:

- The colored plan illustrated the dates of construction of the various buildings. There is a historic warehouse, a 1920s-30s 2-story walk-up, a non-historic 1-story garage and a 1980s addition and appendages with site walls and decorative metalwork.
- The older wood windows on the 2-story walk-up and the glass tile/block appear to be historic.
- The existing site walls are 56" tall minimum and the false wall is a little taller than that.
- The buildings are set back from the corner and are they are proposing new landscape (larger images of the existing buildings were in the presentation than included in the application).
- The proposed site walls come out more and redefine urban edge of city.
- They are proposing to remove the sign which is original to the warehouse potion, but did not have same wording as is today.
- There are existing skylights on the historic warehouse that will be retained.
- The garage openings will be filled in; one will become a window into interior, one will be open completely.
- There will not be just landscaping, but chairs/tables, etc. to activate corner.
- They are adding a small entry to the east of that space. Two walls will be completely glass so as to see the garage interior.
- Along the entire garden edge, windows will be replaced with a new storefront.
- The concrete site walls will be 62" at the Blount/Morgan intersection due to the elevation change at the corner.

- The courtyard will have 3 new trees and other landscaping.
- They are proposing the addition of a stair above the roof of the garage; it will be visible.
- New windows in the warehouse façade are proposed.
- The picket edge proposed is transparent and will allow one to see into the site.
- The awning proposed wraps around the edge of the building making the heights of the Morgan St. facades more similar.
- There is a 1 to 2 foot change in grade along Morgan Street.
- The courtyard will be an active space. Om the far left corner at Morgan and Blount, the proposed site wall is the same height as is there today: 4′ 8″.
- The surfaces of the courtyard will be concrete and gravel with landscaped surfaces interspersed.
- The intent of the color scheme is to identify the warehouse and historic 2-story building as being separate from the garage. The palette will be warm grays; corner complex will be lighter in color, two historic facades darker in color. The stair addition will be clear finish wood.
- The main door on Morgan will likely be solid wood.
- The site walls and edges are held back from sidewalk a bit to allow landscaping/planting room. The proposed trees will match existing trees.

Mr. Belledin commented on the statement that the stacked bond and CMU are inappropriate in scale and asked how it is different from the concrete they are proposing. Mr. Griffith said that the board-formed wall is low and the primary reading of the landscape will be planted material. The wall is more in keeping with the surfaces of the courtyard. He is not aware that it is incongruous to have enclosures/walls.

Mr. Belledin noted that originally there was a lintel all the way across two openings on the warehouse and asked if they are maintaining two separate openings. Mr. Griffith said that both are correct. They are using color to visually connect the two buildings/openings.

Mr. Belledin asked about changing the historic character of the façade. Mr. Griffith said that he understands that the opening went to the ground, but has no evidence.

Ms. Caliendo asked how the steel pickets are mounted. Mr. Mason said that they will be in a continuous foundation and we would not see that connection.

Mr. Belledin asked staff how the commission has typically dealt with additions to non-contributing buildings. Tania Tully [affirmed] said that the recent addition to Marbles and a house in Oakwood on Boundary Street are examples. Most of the additions the commission sees are in residential districts and mainly in the rear. She said that she is unaware of a request similar to this before, on the front of a building and a commercial site.

Ms. Tully said that with non-contributing buildings there is less of a focus on changes to the building and more on how it fits in with the district character.

Mr. Griffith said that the color is tying the new openings together on the warehouse. Keeping the whole masonry portion of façade the same color would be fine with them.

As for the fence, Mr. Griffith noted that the picket edge seems more in keeping with what you would see in and around the downtown area, though maybe not typical for a commercial building. Ms. Tully noted that in the Capitol Square district Christ Church does have metal picket fence. Mr. Shackleton said that in the way of fencing aren't there gates around Marbles? Ms. Tully said that it is not really a fence, but there are metal openings/gates just down the street on Marbles. Mr. Belledin asked if they could you accomplish same thing with landscaping instead of a fence. Mr. Mason said no, not in the same way. He stated that in front of the new addition, they feel the advantage would be more transparency with a fence rather than landscaping. It is keeping with the new mission of church – share with the community but still have security and sense of enclosure. Yes and no would be the answer. Ms. Lewis and Mr. Griffith noted that kids will be using the space, so the fence will help with safety (40-60 kids). The edge will be useful. It will create an edge while also making it porous and maintain a similarity to what exists now.

Mr. Shackleton asked how high the Blount St fence will be. Mr. Mason said that it will be 14" below the height of the wall. Mr. Griffith added that the maximum height will be 42" at Morgan Street and will dip below that.

Ms. Caliendo asked staff to explain the comment regarding the lack of a bulkhead. Ms. Tully said that usually on a storefront it would have wood or metal panels underneath, like a sill. Mr. Griffith said that they are open to doing that. They are trying to make a connection outside to inside and want to make sure you can see through. Ms. Tully noted that there is variation in height in historic buildings for this element and they could make it different to what is there now. Mr. Belledin stated that there is some indication that has been changed before, so makes it hard to respond. We have to look purely contextual.

Ms. Tully spoke up regarding the siding of the stair addition. The use of clear wood is new information. The committee has approved clear wood before, but in this case recommends that it should be painted so as not to stand out. Mr. Griffith asked if it could be a different material other than wood. Ms. Tully said yes and noted the stair tower at the Busy Bee as an example.

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

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

There is not a lot of detail on certain elements such as the canopy, the glass addition, and the overhangs. There is no landscape plan. I'd like more detail on the fence material and spacing. [Belledin]
Do you want to defer or provide more information for staff decision later? [Shackleton]
Personally, would like more detail to make decision. This proposal seems to be at the edge of what is meeting with the Guidelines. [Belledin]
I agreed. Actual details such as the material of canopy are needed. [Caliendo]
Any more comments, discussion? If we are deferring we should be specific as to what we are looking for. [Shackleton]
I want to see any evidence of what existed on Blount St. A clearer elevation and fence precedents in downtown Raleigh historic districts and downtown Raleigh in general as well as the details on the addition (glass wall and canopy – material, overhang) are needed. They should submit a landscape plan and concrete wall precedent as well as any revisions to the elevations based on our comments. [Belledin]
Profile details are needed. [Caliendo]
Plug and play is not the way to go. [Belledin]
Balance what is big picture versus what can wait to be approved at the staff level. [Tully]
Showing examples of board-formed concrete – the texture – may be helpful. [Caliendo]

Decision on the Application

Mr. Belledin made a motion that the application be deferred with the following additional information requested:

1. Any evidence of what existed on Blount St. elevation;
2. Fence precedents in downtown Raleigh historic districts and downtown Raleigh in general;
3. Larger scale details on the addition and canopies;
4. A landscape plan;
5. Concrete wall precedents;
6. Any revisions to elevations based on staff comments.

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

080-14-CA 5 W HARGETT STREET (RALEIGH BANKING & AND TRUST COMPANY BUILDING/THE RALEIGH BUILDING)
Applicant: AT&T MOBILITY
Received: 6/18/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/16/2014 1) 7/7/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: RALEIGH HISTORIC LANDMARK
Zoning: DOD, BUS
Nature of Project: Install 12 antennas, equipment platform, and 11'x16' equipment shelter on rooftop of building.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes: Staff photos are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	Install 11'x16' equipment shelter on rooftop of building
3.5	Roofs	Install 12 antennas, equipment platform, and 11'x16' equipment shelter on rooftop of building.
3.10	Utilities and Energy Retrofit	
4.1	Decks	Install equipment platform on rooftop of building

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Installation of 12 antennas, equipment platform, and 11'x16' equipment shelter on rooftop of building is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.6.7, 2.6.9, 3.5.10, 3.5.11, 3.10.11, 3.10.12, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.6, 4.1.7; however the location of the antennas and shelter **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.5.11, 3.10.11, 3.10.12 and the following findings:

1* The Landmark designation ordinance describes the building as an "eleven-story commercial building erected in two distinct phases, the first three floors of which were constructed in 1913 (originally in the Neo-Classical Revival style), the upper eight floors were constructed in 1928, with a substantial renovation in 1935-36 which resulted in the only Raleigh example of the transition from the NeoClassical Revival to the Moderne style."

2* The landmark designation report states "The location of the Raleigh Building, one block south of the Capitol on the southwest corner of the busy Fayetteville and Hargett streets, is one of the premier focal points in the central business district of Raleigh."

3* The prefabricated utility enclosure will be located centered between the north (Hargett Street) and south walls and set back from the east wall (Fayetteville Street) by about 16 feet.
4* The 11′ tall utility enclosure will sit on a 4′ high platform and for a total height of 15′. The existing brick penthouse is 14′ tall. It is proposed to be a metal clad building; the color and sheen are not indicated.
5* The height of the parapet on the building is unknown; scaling from the drawings it appears as though the antenna array and utility structure will extend above the parapet by approximately 10.5 feet.
6* The antennas mounted on the penthouse will be painted to match the existing brick and will be on the west non-character defining side.
7* All of the proposed changes are on the roof of the building and not attached to character defining architectural masonry.
8* Photo renderings were included in the application. Based on these and staff photos it is likely that antennas and shelter will be not be visible from the immediately adjacent streets, but will be visible from approximately a half-block away.
9* The application includes a letter from an engineer stating that the roof is structurally able to support the proposed changes.
10* The elevation drawings of the building do not reflect the actual look of the building; they appear to be the building as it looked prior to the 1930s design changes and before the conversion of the bottom floor to a CVS; additionally it is the east elevation that faces Fayetteville Street. The west elevation now abuts the 1923 Odd Fellows Building.
11* One of the antenna arrays is proposed to be mounted immediately adjacent the character defining north elevation.
12* Based on the elevation drawings, the antenna arrays will be nearly as tall as the utility structure.
13* The existing penthouse is not visible from the north. The proposed arrays and equipment will be the only items visible above the parapet excepting the flagpole.
14* There are existing mechanical units and smaller antennas on the rooftop.

Pending the committee's determination regarding the prominence of the changes, Staff recommends that the committee approve the application, with the following conditions:

1. That the antenna array near the northeast corner of the roof be pulled back from the north wall by a few feet with the location to be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits.
2. That the mounting brackets on the penthouse be bolted into mortar joints.
3. That the utility structure be painted to match the penthouse brick.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Mr. Shackleton asked if there are questions or comments for staff since no applicant is present. Ms. Tully said that they could defer if they had questions for the applicant. She noted that communicating with the applicant had been difficult.

Mr. Belledin asked why staff highlighted the northern versus the southern array. Tania Tully [affirmed] said that the southern wall is plain brick, not as character-defining which is why she is only suggesting the northern array be moved back. Ms. David pointed out that the entire building is contributing and Ms. Tully agreed. Ms. David noted that the northeast corner antenna is prominent from Fayetteville Street. Ms. Tully said yes and read part of Guideline 3.5.11 which states that antennas are not appropriate in locations that compromise character defining roofs or on roof slopes prominently visible from the street. Looking south at the building, she said that all you would see would be array. She said that she has photos that she took right around base of building, if they wish to see.

Mr. Shackleton asked how far it would need to be moved back, as referenced in the condition. Ms. Tully said that she isn't sure because she can't tell how tall the parapet is. Her guess is at least halfway closer to shelter building and that she would need to consult more with property owner on that. Mr. Belledin suggested that it be pushed back the length of the array perhaps. Make it equidistant from cornice.

Ms. David stated that the antennas interrupt the crenellated cornice of the building. The array needs to be where you don't see it. Ms. Caliendo agreed stating that it seems too prominent.

Mr. Shackleton asked if they need to say where you couldn't see it from. Mr. Belledin said that it depends on the parapet height. Ms. David said that it is important not to interrupt the decorative cornice. She is not sure where that would be, but the applicant needs to figure that out. Mr. Belledin said that they need a location from where to reference. Ms. David said that she is most concerned with the view from the East and North. Mr. Belledin asked again how far back in terms of viewline. Ms. David said that she didn't want to see it interrupt the top of the cornice – everywhere. Ms. Caliendo said that it would also include view from the south. Ms. Tully asked why since it doesn't have a cornice. Ms. Caliendo said it was because of the context. We don't see equipment on any of those buildings, and thinks it is important from any direction not to see equipment.

Mr. Belledin suggested that they use the State Capitol grounds from the North and use that distance as defining for the other directions. Ms. Tully agreed especially since the farther away you are, the less you can tell that the cornice is crenellated. Mr. Shackleton agreed that the antenna array can't be visible from State Capitol and a radius from there.

Ms. Tully noted that since the applicant is not here, they can request reconsideration without the extra step. She asked the committee if for the visibility they are talking about just the array or also the equipment shelter.

Ms. Caliendo and Ms. David said both.

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Ms. David moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1, 3-6) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following modifications and additional fact as stated below:

A. Installation of 12 antennas, equipment platform, and 11'x16' equipment shelter on rooftop of building is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.6.7, 2.6.9, 3.5.10, 3.5.11, 3.10.11, 3.10.12, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.6, 4.1.7; however the location of the antennas and shelter **are** incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.5.11, 3.10.11, 3.10.12 and the following findings:

1* The Landmark designation ordinance describes the building as an "eleven-story commercial building erected in two distinct phases, the first three floors of which were constructed in 1913 (originally in the Neo-Classical Revival style), the upper eight floors were constructed in 1928, with a substantial renovation in 1935-36 which resulted in the only Raleigh example of the transition from the NeoClassical Revival to the Moderne style."

2* The landmark designation report states "The location of the Raleigh Building, one block south of the Capitol on the southwest corner of the busy Fayetteville and Hargett streets, is one of the premier focal points in the central business district of Raleigh."

3* The prefabricated utility enclosure will be located centered between the north (Hargett Street) and south walls and set back from the east wall (Fayetteville Street) by about 16 feet.

4* The 11′ tall utility enclosure will sit on a 4′ high platform and for a total height of 15′. The existing brick penthouse is 14′ tall. It is proposed to be a metal clad building; the color and sheen are not indicated.

5* The height of the parapet on the building is unknown; scaling from the drawings it appears as though the antenna array and utility structure will extend above the parapet by approximately 10.5 feet.

6* The antennas mounted on the penthouse will be painted to match the existing brick and will be on the west non-character defining side.

7* All of the proposed changes are on the roof of the building and not attached to character defining architectural masonry.

8* Photo renderings were included in the application. Based on these and staff photos it is likely that antennas and shelter will be not be visible from the immediately adjacent streets, but will be visible from approximately a half-block away.
9* The application includes a letter from an engineer stating that the roof is structurally able to support the proposed changes.
10* The elevation drawings of the building do not reflect the actual look of the building; they appear to be the building as it looked prior to the 1930s design changes and before the conversion of the bottom floor to a CVS; additionally it is the east elevation that faces Fayetteville Street. The west elevation now abuts the 1923 Odd Fellows Building.
11* One of the antenna arrays is proposed to be mounted immediately adjacent the character defining north elevation.
12* Based on the elevation drawings, the antenna arrays will be nearly as tall as the utility structure.
13* The existing penthouse is not visible from the north. The proposed arrays and equipment will be the only items visible above the parapet excepting the flagpole.
14* There are existing mechanical units and smaller antennas on the rooftop.
15* One of the building's most character defining features is its crenellated cornice.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the antenna arrays and equipment shelter not be visible as viewed from a radius around the building established by the distance to the Capitol Building with the locations to be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits.
2. That the mounting brackets on the penthouse be bolted into mortar joints.
3. That the utility structure be painted to match the penthouse brick.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 1/7/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

081-14-CA 323 PACE STREET
Applicant: HEATHER SCOTT
Received: 6/17/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/15/2014 1) 7/7/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Demolish one contributing portion of building; construct new 30'x41' 1-story rear addition with 18'x16' rear porch with chimney; construct new 24'x26' 1-1/2 story 2-bay garage; install 20'x30' rear brick patio with outdoor fireplace; install rear stone patios; remove 3 trees; plant 2 new trees; remove porch posts; install new porch posts and railing replicating another house; replace front concrete walk with brick; alter existing driveway; add parking area by garage; construct brick wall at rear of yard
Amendments: Revised drawings were provided by the applicant July 1 and 7 and are attached to these comments.
DRAC: This application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee (DRAC) on June 25, 2014. Present were Jerry Traub, Curtis Kasefang, and Dean Ruedrich. Also present were Heather and Randy Scott, David Maurer, and Tania Tully.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- Staff photos are available for review.
- COA files for 323 Pace Street are available for review.
- Sanborn Fire Insurance maps are available for review.
- COA files referenced in the comments are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	construct new 30'x41' 1-story rear addition with 16'x20' rear porch with chimney; construct new 24'x26' 1-1/2 story 2-bay garage; install 20'x30' rear brick patio with outdoor fireplace; install rear stone patios; remove 3 trees; plant 2 new trees; replace front concrete walk with brick; alter existing driveway; add parking area by garage; construct brick wall at rear of yard
2.4	Fences and Walls	construct brick wall at rear of yard
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	replace front concrete walk with brick; alter existing driveway; add parking area by garage

2.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	construct new 24'x26' 1-1/2 story 2-bay garage
3.6	Exterior Walls	demolish one contributing portion of building
3.7	Windows and Doors	demolish one contributing portion of building
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	remove porch posts; install new porch posts and railing replicating another house;
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	construct new 30'x41' 1-story rear addition with 16'x20' rear porch with chimney

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Demolition of one contributing portion of building is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.6.6 and the following findings:

1* COA 072-14-MW approved the removal of the altered and deteriorated non-historic additions.

2* Based on physical inspection and Sanborn Fire Insurance maps, the wall proposed for removal was constructed by 1909.

3* The roof above the wall is not likely original; due to severe water infiltration affecting structural members, the wall would have to be removed and rebuilt.

4* The application proposes a new wall inset from the corner of the house and sheathed in fiber cement siding.

5* Removal of the wall also eliminates an existing wood window.

B. Removal of porch posts; installation of new porch posts and railing replicating another house is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.8.1, 3.8.4, 3.8.5; however replicating details from another house is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.8.10 and the following findings:

1* The application does not included evidence that the porch posts proposed for removal are not historic.

2* The proposed new porch details are not based on historic evidence and are too elaborate for the historic house.

3* The roof of the porch is proposed to be metal, a traditional porch roof material; details, specifications and color chip were not included in the application.

C. Construction of a new 30'x41' 1-story rear addition with 18'x16' rear porch with chimney is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.6, 2.3.8, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9; however, the scale of the addition is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 4.2.6 and the following findings.

1* It is unclear from the application if any trees are proposed for removal because of the location of the addition. The landscape plan only shows the site with the addition in place; a tree protection plan is not included in the application.

2* The lot size is 10,454 SF. The footprint of the existing house (including porch) is 1,500 SF; current lot coverage is 14%. The proposed addition with porches is approximately 2,487 SF; with the remaining house and porch, the total proposed footprint is 3,268 SF with a lot coverage of 31%.

3* The proposed addition is located on the rear of the house; it is inset from the historic house and gets wider towards the rear; a proposed front elevation drawing is not included in the application.

4* Not including porches, the current length of the house is 40′6″; the proposed length of the house is 72′4″; the new addition is about 31.5 feet longer than the house and current additions. The rear porch adds another 16′. The addition is the same height as the historic house.

5* Given the height and length, the scale of the proposed addition diminishes and visually overpowers the historic building.

6* The mass, materials, color, and relationship of solids to voids in the exterior walls of the addition is similar to the historic house and existing additions.

7* The window proportions and locations are traditional and similar to others in the historic district; details and specifications of the wood windows were not included in the application.

8* The roof is proposed to be asphalt shingles or standing seam metal; details and specifications were not included in the application; both materials have been approved routinely in the historic district. The foundation is proposed to be brick; sample was not provided.

9* The proposed siding is smooth faced Artisan HardiePlank, COA 181-13-CA at 610 N Bloodworth Street (a corner lot) approved the use of this material on an addition to a historic house in part based on the following facts applicable to this case:

- The new addition is on the rear elevation;
- The siding is smooth faced and horizontal;
- Artisan siding is 5/8″ thick;
- The horizontal siding is not proposed for use on the main level, but on the rear where it is a second story.

10* The fiber cement siding will abut the historic house at a corner and not be in the same plane; the reveal of the historic siding and new siding are not included in the application.

11* The proposed rear porch is larger than is typical in the historic district, especially in conjunction with the large addition. The roof of the porch is lower than the main house, typical of porches within the district.

12* Having one solid wall on a rear porch is atypical; the landscape plan notes the possible screened enclosure of porch; addition drawings do not indicate a screened enclosure.
13* While unusual to have an exterior fireplace, its location on a solid wall makes it appear as though it is within the interior of the house.
14* Detailed drawings of the proposed addition and porch were not included in the application.

D. Construction of new 24'x26' 1-1/2 story 2-bay garage is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.6.5 and the following findings.
1* The proposed garage will sit on the critical root zone of a large tree; the application states that garage will have a slab foundation that sits on a stalite expanded slate lightweight aggregate foundation to ensure the heath of the tree; no information regarding the efficacy of the proposed foundation is included in the application. The application states that the same material was used at 315 N Boundary Street.
2* The lot size is 10,454 SF. The proposed addition with porches and remaining house and porch has a total proposed footprint of 3,268 SF for lot coverage of 31%. The proposed garage is 624 SF for new total lot coverage of 37%.
3* The location of the proposed garage in the rear corner of the lot and at the end of the driveway is consistent with the traditional placement of accessory structures in the district.
4* There is not a tradition of 2-story garages/carriage houses in Oakwood. Staff is aware of one historic 1-1/2-story horse barn accessory building at the architecturally-elaborate Heck-Pool House at 218 N. East Street.
5* There have been committee-approved exceptions of taller and 2-bay garages. After an initial denial due to lack of evidence, in 2006 a 1½-story, 15′ x 17′ storage building with loggia and exterior stair was approved at 715 N. Bloodworth Street (COA 166-06-CA). Examples provided in that case include 218 N East Street, 403 E Edenton Street, 121 N Bloodworth Street, and in the 300 block of Polk Street (behind 425 N Bloodworth Street) – except for 121 N Bloodworth Street all of the houses associated with the garages are 2-stories or taller. 121 N Bloodworth Street is one-story, but the approved garage was a 2-bay 1-story structure (COA 135-97-CA).
6* In 2008, based in part on the 2006 decision referenced in fact 4*, the commission approved a 1½-story, 22′x27′ garage at 608 Oakwood Avenue (COA 212-07-CA). That garage was 21′6.5″ tall, compared to the 28′2″ height of the historic house.
7* The garage at 315 N Boundary Street (COA 090-03-CA) was approved to be 18′ in height and 24′x22′8″ in footprint; the committee required a reduction in the height be reduced to at least 10% less than the main house 1-story addition height from the proposed 20′.
8* The new garage is proposed to be 24′ wide by 26′ deep. Even for a 2-bay garage, this is wider than is typical. The garage at 608 Oakwood Avenue was approved with a width of 22′3″.
9* The historic house at 323 Pace Street is approximately 19′ tall; the proposed garage is approximately 19′2″ tall; the garage is equal in height to the comparable construction on the rear of the main house.
10* The proposed structure uses dormers to present a 1½ -story appearance.

11* Accessory buildings are characteristically subservient to the main dwelling. The proposed structure is as tall as and not deferential to the main dwelling.

E. Installation of a 20'x30' rear brick patio with outdoor fireplace; installation of rear stone patios; removal of 3 trees; planting of 2 new trees; replacement of front concrete walk with brick; alteration of existing driveway; addition of parking area by garage; construction of brick wall at rear of yard is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section 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 lot size is 10,454 SF. The proposed house and addition with porches and garage has a total proposed footprint of 3,892 SF for lot coverage of 37%. The proposed new patios and driveway is approximately 1,930 SF for new total lot coverage of 56%.

2* The proposed lot coverage does increase substantially, however the overall lot coverage is not unusual for Oakwood.

3* The landscape plan shows walls around the proposed patio; an outdoor fireplace; a kitchen/grill area; a picket fence; wrought iron gates; brick wall; no details or drawings were included in the application.

4* There is not enough information regarding the landscape plan to render a decision.

Staff recommends that the committee approve in part, defer in part, and deny in part the amended application:
Deny construction of the garage at its current height and size allowing for a new revised application to be submitted.

Defer approval of the landscape plan with the request that additional drawings and information be provided regarding the proposed changes.

Approve the remainder of the application waiving the 365-day demolition delay for removal of the trees with the following conditions:

1. That the remaining 1909 wall be rebuilt in the same location with wood siding and reusing the historic window.
2. That evidence be provided that the existing porch details are not historic and that the new porch details be simpler than the sample provided in the application.
3. That the scale of the addition and porch be reduced with the revised drawings to be reviewed by the committee as an administrative review of conditions.

4. That the siding on the addition be painted.
5. That details and specifications of the addition for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture or a Landscape Architected registered with the NCBLA;
   b. New windows;
   c. Revised drawings.
6. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Doors;
   b. Siding reveal;
   c. Roofing material;
   d. Brick foundation sample;
   e. New porch posts and railing;
   f. Paint colors;
   g. Light fixtures and locations;
   h. Ramp;
   i. Outdoor porch fireplace.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Heather and Randall Scott [affirmed], applicants, were present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Shackleton suggested that the applicants respond to staff comments as an efficient way to proceed.

Mr. Scott said that regarding the 1909 section of the house they are fine about re-doing that section. The window is being restored and they several different architectural plans to do that.

Ms. Scott said that Comment B about the porch is more difficult. They had Jeff Adolphsen from the State Historic Preservation Office look at house. He noted that the railings don't seem to be original. Matthew Brown did the research and determined that house was a Julius Lewis & Co. home. The house at 312 E Jones Street with chamfered posts is an example. They would like to get close to the style that would have been on home which mirrors what she heard in the DRAC meeting. Mr. Scott added that the rest of the porch including the siding and flooring had been redone earlier – likely within the last 15-20 years. It is hard to determine the age of the existing columns, though. Mr. Belledin asked if Mr. Adolphsen had an opinion on the existing columns. Ms. Scott said no, but they seem to be before the 1920s. The question is whether to leave in place, which to her looks out of proportion, or to put back what was original. Tania Tully [affirmed] noted that the Guidelines talk about what to do with a non-historic porch and that staff has asked that it be handled at the staff level.

Ms. Scott said that comment C is big one. She said that it is important to them to abide by the guideline of not overpowering the original historic roofline and they did that by having it bump out to one side, but with no increase in stories. They did not want the addition to overpower the existing portion. Mr. Scott said that he heard the DRAC talk about finding examples of houses with multiple additions over time. They tried to take that into account with the design, to make it like other homes in Oakwood that have had several additions over time. Ms. Scott added that it is less overpowering if it is not one straight line back.

Mr. Scott distributed a copy of the 1909 Sanborn map which shows the first addition on the right hand back corner. He also pointed out the original size of the lot and the size of the house in comparison. Ms. Scott said that the house took up ¾ of lot then, approximately. Mr. Scott also noted that the 1914 map, shows an accessory building in back and the acquired lot from N Person St. property adjacent. He explained that is how it grew to be such a long lot.

Mr. Scott said he had a question on #9. Ms. Tully explained that it was a fact from a previous case that was being referenced.

Ms. Scott confirmed that no trees are being removed for construction of the rear addition. She also said that a tree protection plan has been done asking if the tress being removed need to be included on the protection plan. Ms. Tully said no.

Ms. Scott asked what is meant by the request for detailed drawings of porch. Ms. Tully said that they will need larger drawings of details.

Mr. Scott spoke to the garage construction. He said that they have plans in place to protect the roots of the large oak. He said that he has worked a lot with the Stalite material and that there are examples of success in the neighborhood, including at Mr. Penry's house. Ms. Tully advised Mr. Scott that he should have Mr. Penry mention that during his testimony. Ms. Scott said that they want to put Mr. Penry's parents in the home and may need a caretaker. They would like to find space above the garage. Mr. Scott noted that the garage backs up to a 2-story garage on the adjacent property. The garage would be 120' away from lot line of the historic section of the home. This is a very deep lot compared to the size of the house. He is hoping that would help with the concerns. He also said that they would like an interior staircase instead of exterior if possible.

Mr. Scott said they were ok with deferring the landscape portion of the application, but hoped that the ground plan layout could at least be approved.

Mr. Shackleton asked if there were other speakers.

Andy Penry [affirmed], neighbor and prospective buyer, spoke in support of the application. He said that his 82 year old mother may be residing there. He sees two issues: whether the addition is incongruous and overpowers historic part of house and the garage. Mr. Penry said

that he has done this before with his house at 315 N. Boundary. Regarding the first issue he provided context on the approval of the 315 N. Boundary addition. The original 2-room 2-story house was from 1875. There was a 1909 addition and in the 2000s the 1980s additions were removed. He noted that the square footage of the 2000s addition was significantly more than that of the existing structure and then he did a 2-story addition later. That application and meeting had a discussion on whether that addition overpowered house. It was argued that there wasn't a change in the roofline, so nothing was looming over the historic portion. Looking from the Boundary St. elevation one couldn't tell there was an addition. He also noted that materials were important; they should match the historic portion. Also, there was discussion about if someone wanted to remove the addition, could it be done without compromising integrity of historic structure. He said that he is in the process of constructing that approved addition now. Mr. Penry asserted that this seems to stand as a precedent for the case on Pace Street. He argued that a smaller addition than what is proposed would probably not be functional. He also said that the only way to keep the roofline the same, is to go back farther on lot. He stated his need to make sure it is functional for modern living standards and that as it is now, it is not. Mr. Penry said he is buying this house to be functional, but at the same time respecting the historic integrity. He fears that a smaller addition would not retain the functionality of the house.

Mr. Penry also spoke to the garage. He noted that according to Sanborn maps, there was a stable at one time. He also said there was an outbuilding/carriage house on this property at one time when the lot was smaller. He added that there are other 2-story garages in the vicinity. There is precedential value in one on Bloodworth St. and one at 315 Boundary. He explained that it is hard to park on-street on Pace, so it seems that a garage is needed and doesn't think it would be incongruous. Regarding the project in 2005 he said that his garage has the Stalite underslab treatment for the garage and wine cellar construction. The product maintains air and water flow to the roots of trees, so as to protect the trees. He added that the trees on his property are still in good condition.

Opposition: 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. David seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Committee Discussion

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

The scale and size of the addition and garage are very big. [David]
When we look at what was demolished it does not seem as overpowering of an addition. [Caliendo]

The height of the addition is overpowering in scale. The extruded look of the addition seems overpowering. The roof of the addition comes all the way to the peak of the historic house. [David]
A lower roof would result in a weird roofline. [Caliendo]
I think staff is right with the interpretation. [Belledin]
Agreed. I had concerns about changing out the porch. Tuscan columns are not out of the realm for a house like this, but the presence of ghost marks and Mr. Adolphsen's interpretation has allayed some of these concerns. [David]
Does the rear porch affect the overwhelming feeling? [Caliendo]
Removing the rear porch would make the addition appear shorter. [David]
I am in agreement with staff comments as a recommendation for what we should do. [Shackleton]
For the addition and the garage, yes. I have a hard time balancing the proposed size with Guideline 4.2.6. [Belledin]
Comment A. seems to have been addressed by the applicant. Comment B., based on research, the applicant has also addressed. With Comment C. there is concern with guideline 4.2.6 and the scale. The combination of the height and length makes it seem overwhelming. I have no comment on the Boundary case and the evidence provided by Mr. Penry now. I would like to review this case before commenting. [Shackleton]
There may be other examples of additions of similar size they could bring back. [Caliendo]
Other thoughts on C? [Shackleton]
I do not believe addition is that out of scale, for the record. [Caliendo]
For the garage, there was testimony about Fact 1 and about the tree issue, which makes me feel better. I am not bothered by the lot coverage since it is within what happens in Oakwood for lot coverage. I am concerned with the height. [Shackleton]
The width of the garage presents a very suburban façade. [David]
The overall scale and mass could be adjusted to fit with the house. [Belledin]
For Comment E. we don't seem to have all the factors to make a decision. We need to be able to consider the addition and the garage also. [Shackleton]
The applicants have requested that you just look at the ground plane. [Tully]
I need more information before deciding on that and the other members agree. [Shackleton]
I think we need to defer to consider the 315 case; it is new information. [Belledin]
It may make sense to defer the whole thing. [Tully]

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. Scott stated that she provided info on the house and addition at 315 for the hearing today. She mentioned the 1914 Sanborn map which shows the 315 property. She noted that the Penry lot coverage is 87%.

Mr. Penry said it was not just the issue of size whether the addition overpowers historic structure; it is scale. Ms. David agreed.

Ms. Scott said that they are following all the precedents set at 315 N Boundary in this case. The addition is the same height as the historic house. Mr. Belledin stated that they are doubling the size of the house and increasing the scale of the entire structure. Ms. Scott said that she had drawings considered as precedent for this meeting and asked if the committee could offer suggestions for what they think would be approvable in terms of scale. Mr. Scott added that over the years, 6 architects have worked on plans for this house. Some of the proposals went back and up, which they wanted to stay away from. He asked if it would help to get pictures of other homes similar to the style of this structure that have different ways of dealing with additions and articulation. Mr. Shackleton said that approved COA cases with examples of large additions would be helpful. Ms. Tully said that she could not find anything more similar to this case. She suggested that the applicants could show what other previously added additions look like. Not the lot coverage, but it's how it's looking from a sense of scale. Ms. Caliendo asked if the view is what it looks like from the side. Ms. Tully said that the Guidelines do not say "as viewed from the street."

Ms. Scott noted that there doesn't seem to be a number in terms of how large the addition could be. Mr. Scott added that they've made changes based on suggestions and are not trying to skirt the guidelines. He knows that it is hard to combine these two projects into one application, but they are trying to make it easy for the buyer and want to make it functional for the user.

Ms. Tully clarified what she heard that the committee is asking for in terms of further information. She said that they are seeking more examples of additions or a reduction in scale. With the garage she is hearing that it is just think it's too big. But the applicants are welcome to bring other examples as evidence. Mr. Belledin said he would need an example of a garage this large with a historic 1-story house. Otherwise they should reduce the height and/or width to reduce the impact on the scale of the existing building.

Ms. Scott asked if there is an exact number. Should they reduce it by 10%? Ms. Tully said that 10% is usually a good reference for reduction. The old code referenced that new buildings be no taller than 10% of the historic building. Ms. Scott said that they would like garage to be 2-stories for a caretaker. Mr. Belledin asked how they can do this under the UDO. Ms. Tully reminded them that they cannot consider zoning code issues for this review.

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

Mr. Belledin made a motion that the application be deferred with the following additional information requested:

1. Minutes from 2013 addition approval at 315 N Boundary Street;

2. Example of garage this large for a 1-story contributing house or a revised proposal that reduces the height and/or width to reduce the impact on the scale of the existing building;
3. Examples of long additions in Oakwood either approved by the commission or historically added or a revised proposal that reduces the scale of the addition;
4. Landscape details as addressed in staff comments.

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

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

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Administrative Review of Conditions: 062-14-CA, 219 E Lenoir Street. Ms. David moved to approve the updated window design per the condition. Ms. Downer seconded; motion approved 4/0. (Belledin recused)
2. Administrative Review of Conditions: 074-13-CA, 520 S Person Street. Ms. David moved to approve the addition of the canopies as a non-substantial change to the previous approval. Ms. Caliendo seconded; motion approved 4/0. (Belledin recused)
3. Design Guidelines Update
4. Committee Discussion
   a. Application Completeness
   b. Meeting Post-Mortem

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner