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

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Scott Shackleton called the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Committee meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Tania Tully, Preservation Planner, called the roll as follows:
Present: Elizabeth Caliendo, Sarah David, Miranda Downer, Laurie Jackson, Scott Shackleton
Alternate Present: Fred Belledin, Kiernan McGorty
Excused Absence:
Staff Present: Tania Tully, Martha Lauer

Approval of the September 2, 2014; October 6, 2014 Minutes

Ms. Caliendo moved to waive the reading of and adopt the minutes for the hearings. Ms. David seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

Minor Works

There were no questions regarding the Minor Work report.

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

Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address	Affirmed
Byrne Huddleston, 630 N Blount Street 27604	Yes
Jonathan Janis, 315 Oakwood Avenue 27601	Yes
John Baxter, 411 Elm Street 27604	Yes
Ashley Morris, 306 Pell Street 27604	Yes
Christian Olmstead, 2205 Dungiven Court 27529	Yes
Will Jeffers, 27601	Yes
Nate Mullins, 325 Axum Road 27592	Yes
Bill Brideson, 612 N Blount Street 27604	No

REVIEW OF SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Case 163-14-CA was moved to the public hearing portion of the agenda. Ms. Caliendo moved to approve the agenda as amended. Ms. Jackson seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chair Shackleton introduced the public hearing portion of the meeting. The committee heard the following cases in the following order for which the Certified Records are made part of these minutes: 163-14-CA, 146-14-CA, 161-14-CA and 162-14-CA.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

163-14-CA 403 ELM STREET
Applicant: MICHAEL DOORN & MARY BOONE
Received: 10/15/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 1/13/2015 1) 11/3/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Remove existing fencing in rear yard; construct low brick wall with fence in rear yard; install new 70" tall rear yard privacy fence.
Amendments: After-the-fact removal of a portion of an existing low concrete block wall. Additional photographs were provided and are attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- After-the-fact applications are treated as though the work has not been completed.
- The exact location of the property line and ownership of the concrete block wall is in dispute. Ownership is a civil matter outside of the jurisdiction of the commission; however given the question both possible owners should be given the opportunity to comment on the application.
- Staff photos are available for review

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Remove existing fencing in rear yard; construct low brick wall with fence in rear yard; install new 70" tall rear yard privacy fence; remove portion of an existing low concrete block wall.
2.4	Fences and Walls	

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Removal of existing fencing in rear yard; construction of low brick wall with fence in rear yard; installation of new 70" tall rear yard privacy fence is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, 2.4.8, 2.4.11, and the following findings:

1* The historic relationship between buildings and landscape features is not being changed.

2* The fencing being removed does not contribute to the overall historic character of the site. The new fence will be installed in approximately the same locations which are traditional locations for new fences.

3* Wood rear yard privacy fences are common new features in the historic district.
4* The amended application states that the design of the new fence is such that both sides should be very similar. Traditionally fences were constructed using neighbor-friendly design with the structural members facing the interior of the yard.
5* The gates will be of the same design as the sections of adjacent fencing; elevation drawings of the fence and wall are included in the application.
6* The fence and gate on the south side of the house are proposed to be moved closer to the front of the house. The new location is behind the front walls of the subject house and the house on the adjacent property, keeping it out of the front yard.
7* There is a grade change on the north side of the property. It is traditional to have low masonry walls between properties to address grade changes.
8* The amended application includes photographs of a recently discovered previous brick wall.

B. Removal of a portion of an existing low concrete block wall; construction of new low wall **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.4.2, 2.4.5, and the following findings:
1* Masonry or stone retaining walls were occasionally employed to accommodate a significant shift in grade.
2* Based on the material and configuration, the concrete block wall was likely constructed in the 1920s or 30s. There are no photographs of the removed wall that indicate its condition. There are photographs of the remaining portion of the wall.
3* The portion of the block wall removed starts beyond the front face of the house.
4* The application indicates construction of a low brick wall to replace the removed wall. The amended application mentions the possibility of cladding the remaining concrete block wall with stone.
5* The amended application states that on the "north side of the house there was a two cinder-blocks-high wall that was partially removed to install a French drain and grade the soil. There was not enough space to install a functioning drainage system with the cinder blocks in place. The cinder block wall was overgrown and in poor shape. Moreover, this wall was not functional to retain water nor silt, as cinderblocks have large holes in them…"

Pending the committee's determination regarding the significance of the block wall, staff recommends that the committee approve the amended application, with the following condition:

1. That the fence be constructed using neighbor-friendly design with the structural members facing the interior of the yard.
2. That the existing concrete block wall not be clad in stone.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tania Tully [affirmed] stated that from a public notice standpoint, if there's a possibility that the applicant is not the owner, then there should be an opportunity for comment. According to the city attorney, the architect cannot answer for the property owner, only to the design.

Support: The applicants were not present. Ashley Morris [affirmed], architect was present to speak in support of the application.

Opposition: Johnny Baxter [affirmed], 411 Elm Street requested that the discussion about the low wall be deferred until his mother (the owner of 411 Elm Street) can represent herself and comment on the application.

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

Ms. David asked about the location of the brick wall that had been hidden. Ms. Tully said that it is at the back by the shed. Mr. Baxter added that there may be more, but it's not exposed.

Mr. Shackleton asked if the committee had any questions about the fence. There were none. He also asked if there was anything about the wall that would lead to deferring the request or not. There was nothing.

Mr. Baxter noted that his only concern is with the low wall on the north property line.

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

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Ms. Caliendo moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-8) to be acceptable as findings of fact as listed below:

A. Removal of existing fencing in rear yard; construction of low brick wall with fence in rear yard; installation of new 70" tall rear yard privacy fence is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, 2.4.8, 2.4.11, and the following findings:

1* The historic relationship between buildings and landscape features is not being changed.

2* The fencing being removed does not contribute to the overall historic character of the site. The new fence will be installed in approximately the same locations which are traditional locations for new fences.

3* Wood rear yard privacy fences are common new features in the historic district.
4* The amended application states that the design of the new fence is such that both sides should be very similar. Traditionally fences were constructed using neighbor-friendly design with the structural members facing the interior of the yard.
5* The gates will be of the same design as the sections of adjacent fencing; elevation drawings of the fence and wall are included in the application.
6* The fence and gate on the south side of the house are proposed to be moved closer to the front of the house. The new location is behind the front walls of the subject house and the house on the adjacent property, keeping it out of the front yard.
7* There is a grade change on the north side of the property. It is traditional to have low masonry walls between properties to address grade changes.
8* The amended application includes photographs of a recently discovered previous brick wall.

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

Decision on the Application

Ms. Caliendo made a motion that the application be approved in part and deferred in part.

That the items described in comment A (Removal of existing fencing in rear yard; construction of low brick wall with fence in rear yard; installation of new 70" tall rear yard privacy fence) be approved with the following condition:

1. That the fence be constructed using neighbor-friendly design with the structural members facing the interior of the yard.

That the reminder of the application be deferred.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 5/3/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

146-14-CA 316 E CABARRUS STREET
Applicant: WILL JEFFERS
Received: 9/17/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 12/16/2014 1) 10/6/2014 2) 11/3/2014 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: PRINCE HALL HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: DOD, RB
Nature of Project: Remove rear porches; construct 1-story rear addition.
Amendments: The application has been amended to reduce the footprint of the proposed addition; remove chain link fence; construct new fence. Revised drawings were provided October 29, 2014 and are attached to these comments.
DRAC: The application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its September 24 meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker, Jerry Traub, and David Maurer; also present were Will Jeffers and Tania Tully.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- Staff photos are available for review.
- The amended drawings show a proposed rear deck. This is a substantial enough changes that a new application is required so that the proposal can be properly noticed.
- Removal of the rear porches and non-historic addition and proposed footprint of the addition were approved at the October meeting.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Construct 1-story rear addition; remove chain link fence; construct new fence
	Fences and Walls	Remove chain link fence; construct new fence
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Construct 1-story rear addition

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Construction of 1-story rear addition is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.9, and the following findings:

1* The current house is 1,200 SF and the lot is .12 acres (5,227 SF) for lot coverage of approximately 23%. The new addition is approximately 1,091 SF; the 1950s addition is 221

SF; the increase in SF is approximately 870 SF for new lot coverage of 40%. This is not an uncommon lot coverage in the Prince Hall Historic District.

2* The amended application includes a site plan showing the locations of trees on this and the adjoining properties. The large trees are behind an existing chain link fence. The trees near the foundation are not regulated since they are 6 and 7 inches DBH.

3* The addition is located at the rear of and inset 4 feet from the historic house on the east side and in the location of the non-historic addition on the west. The roof of the addition is approximately 2 feet below the ridge of the historic house; the amended application includes a revised roof plan.

4* The proposed addition is comprised of intersecting rectangular forms with gable roofs similar to the historic house. The drawings indicate that the eaves and trim details will be similar to the historic house; detailed drawings are not included.

5* The windows are proposed to be wood 4/4 windows to match the existing; a section drawing was included in the application; width of the muntins is not included. The roofing is proposed to be asphalt shingles to match what is on historic house. The siding on the historic house is clapboard with 4-½ to 5-½ inch reveal; the thickness is not stated in the application.

6* The application proposes fiber cement siding with a reveal to match the existing; trim material is not indicated. The commission has approved the use of smooth-faced fiber cement siding on additions to historic houses when it is not in line with historic siding and when the thickness matches. This has typically required the use of Artisan Hardie-plank siding which is thicker and more similar to historic wood siding. Typical fiber cement siding is 5/16″ thick. Artisan is 5/8″ thick.

B. Removal of chain link fence; construction of new fence is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 2.4.8, 2.4.10, and the following findings:

1* Chain link fences are a prohibited item.

2* There are trees along the property line that may be impacted by installation of a fence.

3* The proposed fence is a 6′ tall wood privacy fence located along the property line in the rear yard; a traditional location for rear yard fences.

4* The application does not include the fence design or any information about locations and design of gates. Historically fences were constructed using neighbor-friendly design with the structural members facing the interior of the yard.

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

1. That the siding either be the thicker 5/8″ thick Artisan fiber cement or be wood.
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Window muntins;
   b. Eave construction details.

3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Doors;
   b. Window and door trim;
   c. Foundation brick sample.
4. That the chain link fence not be removed until after construction on the addition has been completed.
5. That the fence be constructed using neighbor-friendly design with the structural members facing the interior of the yard.
6. That fence holes be dug by hand and located to avoid damage to tree roots and that roots larger than 1″ caliper will be cut cleanly using proper tools such as loppers.
7. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Fence design;
   b. Gate location(s) and design.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tania Tully [affirmed] stated that staff comments do reflect the alteration of the footprint of the addition that the committee already approved. She explained why amending the application to include the fence could be included and why the proposed deck needed to be a new application. The fence is a tall fence being replaced by a tall fence. The new deck, however, is a substantial enough change that proper notification needs to be provided and so a new application is required. She added that since the footprint was previously approved all they are really looking at today is the architecture and that most of her comments have to do with the details.

The committee acknowledged that they had all visited the site.

Support:
Will Jeffers [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. He said that the staff comments look good. He asked staff if the sections of the windows from the initial application had been received. Ms. Tully said yes, that all that was missing was the dimensions of the muntins.

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

Ms. Caliendo noted that there was no longer a railing on the east side. Mr. Jeffers commented that once he had removed the existing addition he realized the proposed new addition was too large. When redrawing he decided that the railing looked bad and removed the proposed side porch.

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]:
With the amendment there is a lot coverage of 40% with is within the normal range. [Shackleton]
The eaves are unbroken on the east elevation where on the previous design it was much more broken up. [David]
So on the roofline? [Shackleton]
The commission has been concerned with this before on recent additions. It may be drawn wrong. [David]
The higher pitch of roof will overlap a little bit on the long elevation. [Downer]
Do we want clarification? [Shackleton]

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY(2)

Mr. Jeffers said that the redesign allowed us to do one long simple roof in transition between the old and the new.
Ms. Tully commented that yes, the roof is continuous but it is lower and the wall is broken up.
Ms. David noted that it doesn't have the inset that it used to have and is straight down the side.
Mr. Jeffers added that the front section, the new addition, will be about two feet lower. Ms. Caliendo said that Ms. David is right, that the elevation makes it look like it's broken down into three components but it's really one long wall with one continuous roof slope. Mr. Jeffers confirmed that it would be one long plane.

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

Committee Discussion(2)

The issue of artisan hardie is addressed in staff comments. The fence, as staff indicated, is a tall fence, 6', in the same location as an existing prohibited fence. The trees are not regulated that are near the foundation. So on the roofline and wall plane, are you okay with that or not? [Shackleton]
It's just a lot of roof and a lot of plane, and that always to me magnifies the scale of the addition. I want to get it scaled down a bit. It is lower. [David]
While it would be nice if it were broken up more, I don't see any specific guideline it violates. [Caliendo]

It would be related to 4.2.7 in terms of mass and 4.2.6 in size and scale. It's the exact same size as what came in the earlier packet but the expanse of roof makes it look a lot more extruded. [David]
I agree with Elizabeth. Also, the vertical trim corner boards break it up and make it more pedestrian. [Downer]
Are those are original cornerboards that are being kept? [Jackson]
On the right side yes; on the left side no. [Tully]
With a cornerboard and being lower it's compatible [Jackson]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Ms. Jackson moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comments A. (inclusive of facts 1-6) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-4) to be acceptable as findings of fact as listed below:

A. Construction of 1-story rear addition is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.9, and the following findings:

1* The current house is 1,200 SF and the lot is .12 acres (5,227 SF) for lot coverage of approximately 23%. The new addition is approximately 1,091 SF; the 1950s addition is 221 SF; the increase in SF is approximately 870 SF for new lot coverage of 40%. This is not an uncommon lot coverage in the Prince Hall Historic District.

2* The amended application includes a site plan showing the locations of trees on this and the adjoining properties. The large trees are behind an existing chain link fence. The trees near the foundation are not regulated since they are 6 and 7 inches DBH.

3* The addition is located at the rear of and inset 4 feet from the historic house on the east side and in the location of the non-historic addition on the west. The roof of the addition is approximately 2 feet below the ridge of the historic house; the amended application includes a revised roof plan.

4* The proposed addition is comprised of intersecting rectangular forms with gable roofs similar to the historic house. The drawings indicate that the eaves and trim details will be similar to the historic house; detailed drawings are not included.

5* The windows are proposed to be wood 4/4 windows to match the existing; a section drawing was included in the application; width of the muntins is not included. The roofing is proposed to be asphalt shingles to match what is on historic house. The siding on the historic house is clapboard with 4-½ to 5-½ inch reveal; the thickness is not stated in the application.

6* The application proposes fiber cement siding with a reveal to match the existing; trim material is not indicated. The commission has approved the use of smooth-faced fiber cement siding on additions to historic houses when it is not in line with historic siding and when the thickness matches. This has typically required the use of Artisan Hardie-plank siding which is thicker and more similar to historic wood siding. Typical fiber cement siding is 5/16" thick. Artisan is 5/8" thick.

B. Removal of chain link fence; construction of new fence is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 2.4.8, 2.4.10, and the following findings:

1* Chain link fences are a prohibited item.

2* There are trees along the property line that may be impacted by installation of a fence.

3* The proposed fence is a 6′ tall wood privacy fence located along the property line in the rear yard; a traditional location for rear yard fences.

4* The application does not include the fence design or any information about locations and design of gates. Historically fences were constructed using neighbor-friendly design with the structural members facing the interior of the yard.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the siding either be the thicker 5/8″ thick Artisan fiber cement or be wood.
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Window muntins;
   b. Eave construction details.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Doors;
   b. Window and door trim;
   c. Foundation brick sample;
   d. Stair railings.
4. That the chain link fence not be removed until after construction on the addition has been completed.
5. That the fence be constructed using neighbor-friendly design with the structural members facing the interior of the yard.
6. That fence holes be dug by hand and located to avoid damage to tree roots and that roots larger than 1″ caliper will be cut cleanly using proper tools such as loppers.
7. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Fence design;
   b. Gate location(s) and design.

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

Committee members voting: Caliendo, David, Downer, Jackson, Shackleton.
Certificate expiration date: 5/3/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

161-14-CA 707 FLORENCE STREET
Applicant: CHRISTIAN OLMSTEAD, OLMSTEAD HOMESTEADS, INC.
Received: 10/15/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 1/13/2015 1) 11/3/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Remove tree; remove rear stoop and steps; construct new 1-story rear addition; construct new rear screened porch with roof deck.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- Closer review of the application and a site visit revealed the following additional proposed changes: Install concrete walk; change exterior paint color; remove brick front steps; install concrete steps; remove metal awning.
- Additional photographs provided by the applicant are available for review.
- Staff photos 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; remove rear stoop and steps; construct new 1-story rear addition; construct new rear screened porch with roof deck
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	Install concrete walk
3.4	Paint and Paint Color	Change exterior paint color
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	Remove brick front steps [after-the-fact]; install concrete steps; [after-the-fact] remove awning.
4.1	Decks	construct new rear screened porch with roof deck
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	construct new rear screened porch with roof deck

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Installation of concrete walk; removal of brick front steps; installation of concrete steps; changing of exterior paint color, removal of awning is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.5.4, 3.4.3, 3.8.1 3.8.4, and the following findings:

1* The finish texture of the new concrete walk is not specified; historically concrete walks had a water washed finish.
2* Paint chips of the new paint color scheme were not provided.
3* Detailed drawings of the front steps are not included; concrete steps are common in the historic district.
4* The awning removed was not historic.

B. Removal of tree; removal of rear stoop and steps; construction of new 1-story rear addition; construction of new rear screened porch with roof deck is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.5, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.7, 4.2.1, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.9; however, not replacing the tree is incongruous with *Guidelines* 2.3.5 and however, the upper deck **may be** incongruous with *Guidelines* 4.1.2, 4.1.5, the following findings: (Raleigh City Code Section 10.2.15.E.1. states that "An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure or site within any Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark may not be denied…However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of issuance…If the Commission finds that the building, structure or site has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark, it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal.")
1* The tree proposed for removal is located at the rear corner of the house immediately adjacent the foundation. The application states that that the tree is split and dangerous. A replacement tree is not proposed.
2* There are trees on this and adjacent properties that may be impacted by construction of the addition; they are noted to be saved, but a tree protection plan is not included.
3* The current house is 1,291 SF including the porch and rear stoop; the lot is 3,485 for a lot coverage of approximately 37%. The new additions are approximately 360 SF; the stoop being removed is 16 SF; the increase in SF is approximately 344 SF for new lot coverage of 47%. This is a not an unusual lot coverage for Boylan Heights.
4* The c. 1925 historic house is a one story hip roofed bungalow with engaged front porch. The rear of the house where the addition will be attached was constructed after 1950 according to the Sanborn Fire Insurance maps.
5* The additions are located on the rear of the house; the screened porch is proposed to be inset from the historic house.
6* The proposed deck will be screened and is proposed to have an open deck on top; staff is unaware of any examples of this in the historic district. There is no evidence in the application that the roof deck will not be visible from the street.
7* Detailed drawings of the screened porch are not provided; typically the railings are on the outside of the screening. No screening is shown under the porch.
8* The 1-story addition is proposed to have a hipped roof and is lower than the historic house. A corner board will be retained at the location of the new addition.
9* The application states that the siding and window trim will match the existing on the house; details and specifications were not included. Details and specifications of the new windows

were not included; only wood windows have been approved in rear additions to historic houses.

10* The proportions of the new windows appear to match the existing, but exiting condition drawings were not included and the photographs do not accurately show the proportions.

Pending the committee's determination regarding the roof deck on the screened porch, staff recommends that the committee approve the application, waiving the 365-day demolition delay for the removal of the tree with the following conditions:

1. That the screened porch not have a roof deck.
2. That the finish of the new concrete walkway have a water washed finish.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Paint chips/samples;
   b. Detailed drawings of the front steps.
4. That the windows in the addition have the same proportion as the existing windows with evidence to be provided to and approved by staff.
5. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan;
   b. Windows;
   c. Eave construction details;
   d. Screened porch construction.
6. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Doors;
   b. Window and door trim;
   c. Screening under the screened porch.
7. That a tree of similar species be planted on the property during the next tree planting period following completion of construction with the location and species to be provided to and approved by staff prior to planting.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tania Tully [affirmed] explained that the amendments to the application made by staff were after closer review of the application and the site visit. She noted that the drawings provided by the applicant distributed with staff comments reflect staff B*10 where she talks about the proportions of the windows and the whole house as opposed to the addition. The biggest question is the appropriateness of a roof deck on the screened porch.

Support: .

Christian Olsmstead [affirmed] and Nick Mullens [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Olmstead noted that in the drawings just distributed the right side

elevation has a missing window but that they are not planning to take it out. He references the original drawing with the cornerboard shown and the window shown not removed. He also noted that he visited the lot again and that he saw no trees canopying onto this property other than way in the back corner of lot, nowhere near the house.

Speaking to the second story deck Mr. Olsmstead noted that on the new front elevation, it shows a 36" wall that was architect and engineer's method of hiding the deck railing. He noted that you don't see it from the road because the house is up a little bit. It is a parapet wall that they are proposing to clad with the same kind of siding that is on the original house. He also pointed out the cricket behind it on the south elevation to shed water to the left. Additionally, the entire screened porch and deck is inset about 4", the width of the cornerboard.

Ms. Tully commented that staff was less concerned about the view straight on but that it would be visible from an oblique view. She said that in her judgment one should either see a railing or not and a parapet wall with siding would definitely be incongruous. Ms. Tully noted that the commission could decide how to reference the proposal – as an addition or a deck. She poi ted out guideline 4.1.2.that says decks should not be visible, but that 4.1.4 acknowledges rare occasions where one might be visible. The two guidelines may compete.

Mr. Mullins stated that from the street, you wouldn't be able to see it. For it to be visible a person would have to elevate himself. There's a tree at the corner of the house that also acts as a blockade. Mr. Olmstead said that they are open to a railing or wall there on roof deck or screened porch itself.

Referencing staff's comment, Mr. Olmstead said that the certified arborist who came to the site said that the condition of the tree was obvious without a report and should not necessary based on the pictures.

Ms. Caliendo asked about the material of the spiral stair. Mr. Olmstead it would probably be wrought iron.

Mr. Shackleton asked if they were able to find any other houses in Boylan Heights or other districts that had a similar rooftop deck. Mr. Olmstead said that he did not take time to look, but noted that there's a trend of rooftop decks. He noted a commercial one around the corner on Davie Street.

Ms. Tully asked about the dimensions are from the front of the house back to the addition. Mr. Olmstead said that the house was 25 feet wide which would make the house with porch approximately 56 feet long.

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]:
First, the roof deck. Thoughts? [Shackleton]
It is minimized. If you're going to see it from street, it would be looking back at an angle. In the Guidelines section on decks under Things to Consider (p. 52), it says to take into consideration locations that would have an impact on the whole district, not just one building. This feels like this could be a Pandora's box of little roof decks. [David]
My concern about it is that 4.1.5 says to align decks generally with the first floor level. [Shackleton]
Looking at it as a roof to a screened porch, the flat roof would not be consistent with the rest of the district. [Caliendo]
It's pretty incompatible [David]
There was a case in a different district where someone had a flat roof and wanted to add a railing. [Shackleton]
That was ultimately approved it but it was moved back so it would not be visible. [Tully]
The tree. It seems pretty clear to me from the pictures of the tree that it does need to come out. I am okay with that as long as it's replaced somewhere. I agree with staff that a wall on the roof of the porch would make it worse. [Shackleton]
Regarding the roof deck. Is the deck you were referencing at the September meeting - on the Heck-Wynne House at 511 E. Jones? [Jackson]
No 516 E Jones. [Shackleton]
So my thought was in concept even though that house is strikingly different and the Historic District is different I want to note for the record there has been roof a deck approved. [Jackson]
That was fronting a wall at the back of the house. This one is perched up. There's more house on that one. [David]
The only reason it was approved was that it was not visible from the street, from either side, or across the street. [Shackleton]
It is a roof deck, but it has a full whole story adjacent to it. This one is actually at the roof, the final height. [David]
Yes there are other houses with second story porches or decks but they are second stories on the houses, subservient to the house. [Shackleton]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Ms. David and seconded by Ms. Caliendo, Ms. David made an amended motion that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comments A. (inclusive of facts 1-4) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-8) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Installation of concrete walk; removal of brick front steps; installation of concrete steps; changing of exterior paint color, removal of awning is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.5.4, 3.4.3, 3.8.1 3.8.4, and the following findings:

1* The finish texture of the new concrete walk is not specified; historically concrete walks had a water washed finish.

2* Paint chips of the new paint color scheme were not provided.

3* Detailed drawings of the front steps are not included; concrete steps are common in the historic district.

4* The awning removed was not historic.

B. Removal of tree; removal of rear stoop and steps; construction of new 1-story rear addition; construction of new rear screened porch is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.5, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.7, 4.2.1, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.9; however, not replacing the tree is incongruous with *Guidelines* 2.3.5 and however, the upper deck is incongruous with *Guidelines* 4.1.2, 4.1.5, the following findings: (Raleigh City Code Section 10.2.15.E.1. states that "An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure or site within any Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark may not be denied…However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of issuance…If the Commission finds that the building, structure or site has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark, it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal.")

1* The tree proposed for removal is located at the rear corner of the house immediately adjacent the foundation. The application states that that the tree is split and dangerous. A replacement tree is not proposed.

2* There are trees on this and adjacent properties that may be impacted by construction of the addition; they are noted to be saved, but a tree protection plan is not included.

3* The current house is 1,291 SF including the porch and rear stoop; the lot is 3,485 for a lot coverage of approximately 37%. The new additions are approximately 360 SF; the stoop being removed is 16 SF; the increase in SF is approximately 344 SF for new lot coverage of 47%. This is a not an unusual lot coverage for Boylan Heights.

4* The c. 1925 historic house is a one story hip roofed bungalow with engaged front porch. The rear of the house where the addition will be attached was constructed after 1950 according to the Sanborn Fire Insurance maps.

5* The additions are located on the rear of the house; the screened porch is proposed to be inset from the historic house.

6* The proposed deck will be screened and is proposed to have an open deck on top; staff is unaware of any examples of this in the historic district. There is no evidence in the application that the roof deck will not be visible from the street.

7* Detailed drawings of the screened porch are not provided; typically the railings are on the outside of the screening. No screening is shown under the porch.

8* The 1-story addition is proposed to have a hipped roof and is lower than the historic house. A corner board will be retained at the location of the new addition.
9* The application states that the siding and window trim will match the existing on the house; details and specifications were not included. Details and specifications of the new windows were not included; only wood windows have been approved in rear additions to historic houses. Wood windows are proposed in the application.
10* The proportions of the new windows appear to match the existing per the exiting condition drawings included at the hearing.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the screened porch not have a roof deck.
2. That the finish of the new concrete walkway have a water washed finish.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   c. Paint chips/samples;
   d. Detailed drawings of the front steps.
4. That the screened porch roof be sloped with revised drawings to be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits.
5. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   e. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan;
   f. Windows;
   g. Eave construction details;
   h. Screened porch construction.
6. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   d. Doors;
   e. Window and door trim;
   f. Screening under the screened porch.
7. That a tree of similar species be planted on the property during the next tree planting period following completion of construction with the location and species to be provided to and approved by staff prior to planting.

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

Committee members voting: Caliendo, David, Downer, Jackson, Shackleton.
Certificate expiration date: 5/3/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

162-14-CA 315 OAKWOOD AVENUE
Applicant: JONATHAN JANIS & MARY SHAVER
Received: 10/15/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 1/13/2015 1) 11/3/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Remove aluminum windows; install wood windows; remove aluminum siding from rear addition; install fiber cement siding; remove utility chimney; alter rear walkways; alter rear elevation; expand existing addition.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	alter rear walkways; expand existing addition.
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	alter rear elevation
3.5	Roofs	remove utility chimney
3.6	Exterior Walls	remove aluminum siding from rear addition; install fiber cement siding
3.7	Windows and Doors	Remove aluminum windows; install wood windows; alter rear elevation
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	expand existing addition

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Removal of aluminum windows; installation of wood windows; removal of aluminum siding from rear addition; installation of fiber cement siding; removal of utility chimney; alteration of rear walkways; alteration of rear elevation; expand existing addition are not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, 2.3.7, 2.5.5, 3.5.1, 3.6.1, 3.6.7, 3.7.7, 3.7.9, 4.2.1, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7 and the following findings:

1* A tree protection plan is included in the application.

2* Replacement of the aluminum windows, removal of the utility chimney, alteration of the rear elevation, and alteration to the rear walkway is all approval by staff as Minor Works

and are included here for administrative efficiency. Details and specifications were included in the application.

3* The aluminum siding on the rear bump-out is proposed to be removed and replaced with smooth faced Artisan Hardie plank siding with a 4-½" reveal.

4* The rear addition is proposed to be expanded to the rear by just over 2 feet (approximately 25 SF); upper deck will be expanded as well. Except for the siding materials will match the existing.

Staff recommends that the committee approve the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tania Tully [affirmed] noted that the application was excellent and that the only reason it was a Major Work is because of the small increase in square footage.

Support: Ashley Morris [affirmed], architect and Jonathan Janis [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application.

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

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

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Ms. Downer moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-4) to be acceptable as findings of fact as listed below:

A. Removal of aluminum windows; installation of wood windows; removal of aluminum siding from rear addition; installation of fiber cement siding; removal of utility chimney; alteration of rear walkways; alteration of rear elevation; expand existing addition are not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, 2.3.7, 2.5.5, 3.5.1, 3.6.1, 3.6.7, 3.7.7, 3.7.9, 4.2.1, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7 and the following findings:

1* A tree protection plan is included in the application.

2* Replacement of the aluminum windows, removal of the utility chimney, alteration of the rear elevation, and alteration to the rear walkway is all approval by staff as Minor Works and are included here for administrative efficiency. Details and specifications were included in the application.

3* The aluminum siding on the rear bump-out is proposed to be removed and replaced with smooth faced Artisan Hardie plank siding with a 4-½" reveal.
4* The rear addition is proposed to be expanded to the rear by just over 2 feet (approximately 25 SF); upper deck will be expanded as well. Except for the siding materials will match the existing.

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

Decision on the Application

Ms. Downer made a motion that the application be approved.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 5/3/15.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Administrative Review of Conditions: 122-14-CA; 630 N Blount Street. Ms. Caliendo moved that the proposed tree locations and species meet the condition noting that the holes must be dug by hand and located to avoid damage to tree roots and that roots larger than 1" caliper be cut cleanly using proper tools such as loppers. Ms. David seconded; motion approved 5/0.
2. Design Guidelines Update
3. Committee Discussion

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner