RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
January 6, 2014

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Scott Shackleton called the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Committee meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL

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

Approval of the November 19 and December 2, 2013 Minutes

Ms. Caliendo moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the meetings and adopt the minutes as submitted. Ms. David 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, Notary Publics, administered the affirmations.

Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address	Affirmed
Richard Smith, 323 S Boylan Ave	Yes
Lou Pascucci, 529 Euclid Street	Yes
David Wiesner, 515 Euclid Street	Yes
Craig Brown, 902 W South Street	Yes
Jeannine McAuliffe, 605 Bloodworth St	Yes
Gail Wiesner, 515 Euclid Street 27604	Yes
Steve Schuster, 311-200 W Martin Street 27601	Yes
Anna Wirth, 311-200 W Martin Street 27601	Yes
Mike Walters, City Planning	Yes
Stuart Cullinan, 310 Heck Street	Yes
Jason Queen, 529 E Martin Street	Yes

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Caliendo moved to approve the agenda as printed. Ms. Downer seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

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: 179-13-CA, 191-13-CA, 192-13-CA, 193-13-CA, 194-13-CA, and 195-13-CA.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

179-13-CA 323 S BOYLAN AVENUE
Applicant: RICHARD SMITH
Received: 11/12/2013 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 2/10/2014 1) 12/2/2013 2) 1/6/2014 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Front yard landscape master plan to include: removal of holly bushes, two crape myrtle trees, and one japanese maple tree; planting of new low shrubs and perennials and 1 new tree; widening of front walkway; installation of new walkway; ~~installation of new low wall~~; install paver edge along driveway; installation of front yard patio.
Amendments: The amended application included the following changes in the project: installation of new low wall has been changed to a bench; the patio has been altered to be concrete stepping pads; the size of the gravel path from the driveway decreased; bluestone is no longer proposed
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- The application was deferred at the December 2, 2013 meeting because the applicants were not in attendance.
- COA cases referenced in the comments are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.1	Public Rights-of-Way and Alleys	installation of new walkway
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	front yard landscape master plan to include: removal of holly bushes, two crape myrtle trees, and one japanese maple tree; planting of new low shrubs and perennials and 1 new tree; widening of front walkway; installation of new walkway; installation of new bench; install paver edge along driveway; installation of front yard patio
2.4	Fences and Walls	planting of new low shrubs
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	widening of front walkway; installation of new walkway; install paver edge along driveway

STAFF COMMENTS

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

A. Front yard landscape master plan to include: removal of holly bushes, two crape myrtle trees, and one japanese maple tree; planting of new low shrubs and perennials and 1 new tree; widening of front walkway; installation of new walkway; installation of new bench; install paver edge along driveway; installation of front yard patio is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.1.8, 2.3.2, 2.3.4, 2.3.5, 2.3.8, 2.4.11, 2.5.2, 2.5.5; 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 application proposes a new walkway from the street to the sidewalk; typically these walks are narrow or the same width as the sidewalk running from the sidewalk to the house; the proposal is as wide as the front stoop.

2* The c. 1954 house is a non-contributing resource in the historic district; it is described in the Boylan Heights National Register Nomination as a contemporary brick box with hip roof.

3* The amended application states that "…these landscape changes will subtly bring forward the house's individual character through their reflection of the architectural features of the house, and will further tie the house into the character of the neighborhood through its use of typical materials and by virtue of creating user-patterns that are more akin to those of the surrounding homes."

4* The house is currently visually obscured by trees and large shrubs; trees and shrubs proposed for removal are not historic and are being replaced.

5* There are trees in the public right of way that will remain.

6* The bulk of the yard is proposed to be planting beds; there are examples of front yards in the district that have minimal lawn and have been fully landscaped with plant materials including 315 S Boylan Avenue and 435 Cutler Street.

7* Limited use of reclaimed granite is seen in the historic district; a photograph of the existing stones in the yard is included in the application.

8* The amended application includes two photographic examples of front yard patios at 425 S Boylan Avenue and 802 W South Street; no COA is on file for a front yard patio at 802 W South Street.

9* The front yard patio at 425 S Boylan Avenue was approved in 1994 (066-94-CA) under a different set of design guidelines. It was approved based on the following facts: moss is to be planted between the 3 ½" spaced pavers; the red concrete pavers complement the brick veneer of the house; the paver material, concrete, is a material; common throughout the historic district which was initially developed in the 1900s; the area of the pavers was

integrated into an overall landscape plan for the front yard and serves as a visual forecourt for the front porch; the house is set back further from the street than most other houses in the neighborhood. A previous application for a larger front yard patio with different spacing treatment at the same house was denied (CAD-93-020).

10* The patio is proposed to be concrete stepping pads and a gravel path; surface finish of the concrete is not specified; the commission typically requires a water-washed finish to match that of the adjacent sidewalks.

11* "The Special Character of the Boylan Heights Historic District" description in the *Design Guidelines for Raleigh Historic Districts* states that "The paving material of choice and prestige for walks and curbs in the district was concrete, which at the time of the subdivision's development in the early 20th century, had recently been made more readily available and economical by the introduction of nearby concrete plants."

12* Details and specification for the proposed new bench are not provided in the application.

13* The proposed hollies along the south property line will function similar to fencing, which is commonly approved in historic districts; the mature height is not specified; front yard fencing is typically required to be 42" in height or lower.

14* The driveway of the adjacent yard to the south is lined with brick pavers; samples were not provided in the application.

15* The front walk is proposed to be widened with the use of pavers; staff is unaware of any similar sidewalk treatment in the Boylan Heights Historic District that dates from the period of significance or has been approved by the commission.

16* Based on COA 012-12-CA which approved a rear addition, the lot is 10,890 SF and the house and porches are approximately 2,312 SF; based on the site plan provided in this application and City of Raleigh iMaps aerial photos, the existing gravel driveway is about 925 SF and the concrete sidewalk is about 57 SF for an approximate existing lot coverage of 30%. Based on the site plan provided the proposed new gravel walkway, patio, and altered sidewalks are approximately 215 SF. Proposed lot coverage is about 32%.

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

1. That the right-of way walkway be no wider than the sidewalk extending from the front door.
2. That all new concrete have a water washed finished to match the existing concrete sidewalks.
3. That the mature height of the hollies along the south property line be no taller than 42 inches.
4. That paver material samples be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.
5. That details and specification for the proposed new bench be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Richard Smith [affirmed], owner, was present to speak in support of the application. He asked about staff's suggested conditions. He clarified that in the 1st one it is the portion that goes across city's right of way that is referenced. He said that it seems to him that it would be more reasonable that it be the width of the sidewalk.

Tania Tully [affirmed] stated that they are proposing to widen their front sidewalk and that the city sidewalks in Boylan Heights are very narrow. Without measuring she cannot say for certain, but typically they are only 5 feet wide. Mr. Smith stated that the proposal is 7' wide; the walk way now is fairly narrow lined by lariope. Ms. Tully said that in her judgment having the path the same size as the city sidewalk may be too wide. It is atypical to have a walking path in Boylan Heights that is that wide. She noted that there is an atypical example on Florence St. It's either the same with as the front sidewalk or narrower.

Mr. Smith stated that there are lots of homes in the area that have cut-throughs that go through the city's grass. He said that what they are trying to do in that width is to do it in line with the landing of house. He notes that it also lines up exactly with sidewalk across the street. He said that if you stand at his front door and look across McCullough it lines up exactly.

Mr. Smith asked about staff suggested condition number 3 – if the hollies across the property line are the new Hollies. Ms. Tully said yes.

Mr. Smith asked about the condition for the pavers sample since what they have proposed is that everything is concrete. Ms. Tully said that concrete pavers are still pavers and this is a typical condition.

Mr. Smith asked why the committee needed to approve the bench. Ms. Tully stated that the last time they spoke they had discussed a wall and then it was a bench. She said that if it is a built-in bench it needs approval, but if it is furniture, no approval is needed.

Ms. Tully also pointed out that Guideline 2.1.8 is the one she was working with as far as the right-of-way paths being as narrow as possible. The committee has to interpret what this pave over language means, and what the width should be. Ms. Tully based her suggested decision on what she understood that to be but it's the committee who will determine. Mr. Smith said that the width of that right of way isn't that major of a consideration for him, although they discussed that the wider it is the safer it is. He noted that it is for cars pulling up and people stepping out. He explained that he is constantly tries to put rocks and earth on it, because otherwise people will fall. Ms. Tully suggested that the width could be the same as the access ramp portion of the walk across the street.

Ms. Smith pointed out that on the drawings, the sidewalk should be wider and the turf should be narrower. Mr. Shackleton clarified that no matter what happens, the amount of paving will be less than what it looks like on this drawing. Mr. Smith said yes.

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 4/0.

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
That table (referencing the table with the microphone) is five feet wide; if that's what the sidewalk is that seems like a comfortable width. Larger than that seems excessive. I would agree to 5' to match city sidewalk. [Caliendo]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

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

17* The applicant states that the bench may be freestanding or may be a built structure.
18* The drawing of the walk in the right-of-way is not to scale; the amount of paving will be less than it appears on drawing.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the right-of way walkway be no wider than the existing city sidewalk.
2. That all new concrete have a water washed finished to match the existing concrete sidewalks.
3. That the mature height of the hollies along the south property line be no taller than 42 inches.
4. That paver material samples be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.
5. That details and specification for the proposed new bench (if an installed built-in structure) be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 7/6/14.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

191-13-CA 902 W SOUTH STREET
Applicant: CRAIG AND LAURA BROWN
Received: 12/12/2013 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 3/12/2014 1) 1/6/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Enlarge dormer on west side of house
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- Sheet 76 of the 1950 Sanborn Fire insurance map are available for review.
- The RHDC file on the property is available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
3.5	Roofs	Enlarge dormer on west side of house
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	

STAFF COMMENTS

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

A. Enlarging dormer on west side of house is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.5.1, 4.2.1, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.**6**, 4.2.7.

1* Based on the 1950 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map and RHDC files, the dormer being enlarged was likely added between 1950 and 1986.

2* Although there is no new foundation work occurring, there are large trees on the property that may be impacted by construction activity including materials storage; there is an existing rear yard shed and driveway area away from the largest trees.

3* The existing c. 1923 house is described in the Boylan Heights National Register Nomination as: "Two-story Bungalow; gable faces street; dormer on each side; deep eaves rest on brackets. attached one-story porch. full facade gable pediment marks entry."

4* The application proposes to lengthen the existing shed dormer on the west side of the house by 17 feet to create a dormer that is 30 feet long; an existing corner board will remain to delineate the new from the old.

5* The application states that the materials and trim details will match the existing; the written description provides further clarification; photographs of existing trim are also included in the application.

6* One new window is proposed; details and specifications were included in the application.
7* The application includes photographic examples of large dormers in Boylan Heights.

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

1. That no equipment or material storage occurs within the critical root zone of the trees.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Craig Brown [affirmed] spoke in support of the application. He said that he lives at 902 W South Street and essentially they propose to enlarge on the side of the house that is most sheltered, most tucked away. There was the potential to add on to the Cutler Street side which would have been very obvious. This addition will have minimum presentation.

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 4/0.

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 1-7) to be acceptable as findings of fact.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That no equipment or material storage occurs within the critical root zone of the trees.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 7/6/14.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

192-13-CA 605 N BLOODWORTH STREET
Applicant: ALPHIN DESIGN BUILD (JEANNINE MCAULIFFE)
Received: 12/13/2013 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 3/13/2014 1) 1/6/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: In rear yard: construct masonry outdoor fireplace and chimney; replace gravel parking with stone pavers; install security lighting; remove crape myrtle tree; install new patio
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes: COA cases 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 masonry outdoor fireplace and chimney; replace gravel parking with stone pavers; remove crape myrtle tree; install new patio
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	replace gravel parking with stone pavers;
2.7	Lighting	install security lighting

STAFF COMMENTS

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

A. Replacement of gravel parking with stone pavers; installation of security lighting is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section 2.3.1, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.5.1, 2.5.5, 2.5.11, 2.7.4, 2.7.5, 2.7.6, 2.7.7.

1* All proposed work is in the rear yard.

2* There is an existing gravel driveway and parking area; the gravel in the parking area is proposed to be replaced with dry-set stone pavers; paver size, pattern, and samples were not included with the application.

3* Existing light fixtures and parking area were approved in 1988 with COAs CAD-88-117 and CAD-88-099.

4* An existing light fixture on the arbor is being removed; the new light fixture will be a motion detector; details and specifications were not included in the application.

5* A new lamp post is proposed to be installed in the parking area; details and specifications were not included in the application.
6* There are trees in the existing gravel driveway that may be impacted by construction activity; a tree protection plan was included in the application.

B. Construction of rear masonry outdoor fireplace and chimney; removal of crape myrtle tree; installation of new patio is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.2, 2.3.4, 2.3.5, 2.3.7, 2.3.9; 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* All proposed work is in the rear yard.
2* There are trees in the existing gravel driveway that may be impacted by construction activity; a tree protection plan was included in the application.
3* Existing shrubs and a crape myrtle tree with a combined stem girth of 9" will be removed for installation of the outdoor fireplace and chimney; the area around the fireplace will be paved with stone pavers; paver size, pattern, and samples were not included with the application.
4* The crape myrtle proposed for removal is a small specimen part of the landscape plan; its removal will not impact the tree canopy of the district.
5* The proposed outdoor fireplace and chimney will sit adjacent an existing brick wall and be 8'7" tall; only the chimney of the fireplace will be visible above the top of the masonry wall. Not counting the spark arrestor it will extend 3'10" above the wall.
6* The existing brick patio was approved in 1988 with COA CAD-88-099; the existing brick was wall was approved in 1989 with COA CAD-89-012.
7* Plan and elevation sketches of the fireplace were included in the application; materials samples were not included.
8* This type of modern brick fireplace is a removable feature.
9* Two similar fireplaces have been approved in Oakwood at 225 Elm Street (COA 018-13-CA) and 608 Oakwood Avenue (COA 125-13-CA).

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

1. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Stone paver sample;
   b. Brick sample for fireplace;
   c. Stone paver pattern.

2. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Lighting fixtures.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Shackleton noted for the record that of the committee members (Will Alphin) is the business owner of the applicant, but is not present at the hearing.

Support: Jeannine McAuliffe [affirmed] for Alphin Design Build spoke in support of the application. She noted that she filed the application behalf of the Deals, who own the property.

Ms. McAuliffe requested clarification regarding the demolition language in comment B. Tania Tully [affirmed] stated that it was for the tree removal only. Mr. Shackleton said that if this was significant to the tree canopy, there would be a larger discussion.

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 4/0.

Committee Discussion

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

It is pretty straightforward. [David]
It meets guidelines with the conditions. [Shackleton]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Ms. David moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comments A. (inclusive of facts 1-6) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-9) to be acceptable as findings of fact.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:

   a. Stone paver sample;
   b. Brick sample for fireplace;
   c. Stone paver pattern.
2. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Lighting fixtures.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 7/6/14.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

193-13-CA 201 E HARGETT STREET
Applicant: CLEARSCAPES, PA
Received: 2/13/2013 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 5/14/2013 1) 1/6/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: DOD, BUS
Nature of Project: Construct 2nd story addition/terrace enclosure. [partial after-the fact]
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- After-the-fact applications are treated and reviewed as though the work has not been started.
- COA cases referenced in the comments are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Construct 2nd story addition/terrace
4.3	New Construction	enclosure

STAFF COMMENTS

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

A. Construction of 2nd story addition/terrace enclosure is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 4.2.2, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9, 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.6, 4.3.10, 4.3.11; however, use of the multi-colored perforated stainless steel rings **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* section 4.3.10.

1* The building being altered is new construction approved under previous guidelines in 1994 and 1995 with COA 167-94-CA (basic shape and form, roof forms and pitch, scale and size, and orientation) and COA 119-95-CA (construction of new building and courtyard).

2* The proposal is to enclose the existing second floor terrace at the southeast corner of the museum along Hargett Street.

3* The application describes the existing building as "a mix of brick veneer exterior walls, metal storefront and curtainwall, zinc exterior wall panels, wood entrance canopy, zinc finish mechanical louvers, and custom-colored childrens marble sandwich panels."

4* The application states that the proposed addition will install 19'-6" tall curtainwalls to match existing curtainwalls; install a new single membrane roof over a new concrete deck; and install new multi-colored powder-coated, perforated stainless steel rings to provide

solar screening for the newly enclosed space. Details and specifications are included in the application.

5* From the application, the addition will sit approximately 3'-0" above the existing adjacent roof parapets; it will not extend above the tallest portion of the building.

6* The application includes a portion of the Certified Record from the previously approved COA 167-94-CA; excerpts are highlighted and include the following:

a. From public testimony "Mr. Schuster noted that the museum's Blount Street elevations will echo the rhythms and fenestration currently existing along the street, while its Hargett Street facade will be more distinctive."

b. Fact A. 1* "The new construction is contemporary in design, differentiating it from the historic architecture of the district. The architectural character of Moore Square is diverse, featuring several prominent and architecturally distinctive historic and contemporary structures in proximity to this site (Tabernacle Baptist Church, City Market, Montague Building, Moore Square Station, Wilmington St. Station) set in a contextual matrix of vernacular commercial structures. This proposal is consistent with Moore Square's hallmark of architectural diversity for prominent edifices."

c. Fact A. 2* "Most block faces within the historic district establish an urban feeling by having the buildings set right at the sidewalk. The structure is oriented to the street faces by establishing its perimeter along Blount and Hargett streets with a building façade line adjacent to the sidewalks…"

d. Fact A. 5* "The structure's basic shape and form is composed of boxy rectangles, consistent with the forms of the commercial structures located throughout the district."

e. Fact A. 6* "…As the building turns the corner and fronts Moore Square, materials will evolve and take on a more contemporary sense. Other materials will be introduced that are unique and compliment the contemporary form and global mission of the museum, much as the City Market has its unique red tile roof…"

f. Fact A. 7* "Roof forms and pitch are largely flat roof with parapet for the street face facades and the 'black box,' in keeping with the predominant roof form of the historic district…"

g. Fact A. 8* "The entry to the complex will be located on Hargett Street adjacent to the Tabernacle Baptist Church and fronting Moore Square. Its fenestration will be mostly transparent and it will be the most contemporarily and playfully rendered element of the complex to communicate its status as entry and as the terminus of the gradual evolution of complex from the contextualism of the Blount Street street [sic] facade turning the corner to the more contemporary feel of the Hargett Street facade."

7* The application states that "the perforated stainless steel rings continue the circular design motif that is a part of the interior and exterior of the Marbles museum. They recall the circular pattern of the existing exterior marble walls at the north of the building, the 'look-in/look-out' observation window on the south facade, and the circular mechanical louvers on the west facade of the building."

Pending the committee's determination regarding use of the multi-colored perforated stainless steel rings, staff suggests that the committee approve the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Steve Schuster [Affirmed] and Anna Wirth [Affirmed], both with Clearscapes, were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Schuster made the following comments:

- He apologized for the after-the-fact COA, noting that they have received multiple COAs on this property, and this one slipped through the cracks.
- Several current photos were passed around.
- His firm did the initial project in the early 1990s. It was the biggest building built in the HODs to date.
- They went through a series of applications, beginning with massing diagrams (passed around the 1994 massing). At that point there was a 2-story corner with an open terrace with roof on it. During the value engineering phase, the terrace lost the roof.
- This application is asking to do that roof.
- He looked for precedent on the existing building and found it on another corner, not unlike what they're proposing now.
- This is a 900 SF addition that is a storefront system on masonry.
- The energy code and program have changed a bit.
- This addition wants to be a glass box, so the only way to do that is to introduce solar panels. Typically these are vertical and horizontal louvers to block the sun.
- In the original application in the 1990s they looked at the surrounding neighborhood and tried to understand the elements that were in the HOD. They wanted to do something that had a visual conversation with its neighbors. They looked at the Tabernacle Baptist Church's rose windows, and looked at the circle as a motif. They also looked at freestanding corner column at Cafe Luna, and used that. They looked at veneers. They then looked at putting in significant round elements to talk to its neighbors in a cross century conversation.
- He is very pleased with the fact that Marbles has been used as an example by the commission to introduce new buildings in districts.
- With this application they are trying to pick up on the spirit of what they've done previously.
- They are introducing horizontal and vertical louvers—round, in fact. They are needed to shade the glass and celebrate the round elements on the building.
- These are not marbles but are using them to identify the front door.
- One of the design challenges was for the museum store to have storefront presence on the street, to be part of the retail environment of Moore Square, Hargett Street, and Blount Street. The problem is, that is not the front door to the museum. It is around the corner.
- These solar screens will better identify the front door to the museum.
- Finally, we hope that they are fun, recognizable by kids.
- They are using colors that were approved in previous COAs.

Ms. Wirth added that they are an additional way to identify building as a place to play.

Ms. Caliendo asked if the rings are perforated. Mr. Schuster said yes. This ties in with the existing marble wall imbedded in perforated stainless steel. They are using a special coating on the stainless for the color, but stainless won't rust. Being full of holes will reduce the weight of these.

Gail Wiesner [affirmed] asked if the commission was just approving the rings tonight or the rest of it also. Mr. Shackleton said that the application is to approve the enclosure of the space including the solar screens.

Mr. Shackleton stated that in looking at the issue of solar shading rings and guidelines 4.3.10 it says to select materials and finishes found on surrounding buildings found to contribute to the special character of the district. He asked if there are any surrounding buildings that shed light on that. Tania Tully [affirmed] noted that the main reason she referenced 4.3.10 is primarily module and color.

Mr. Schuster said that the Moore Square Historic District does not have a significant number of historic buildings with metals as a primary material. A lot of the infill buildings including Marbles and the parking structures have quite a bit of metals included in them. Right across the street at the parking deck on Blount Street there are a lot of decorative metals. The Montague Building has a cast iron corner on the building. City Market has metal decorative items, but district is largely brick and wood and glass. There is quite a bit of metal on the existing Marbles building including the zinc roof.

Ms. Tully mentioned the structure under the City Market canopy and noted that the special character essay doesn't speak to color.

Ms. Wiesner asked for clarification of the custom colored sandwich panels. Mr. Schuster explained that they exist on the building. They are most visible at night since they're backlit. There are marbles between the panels at the Morgan and Blount Street corner.

Ms. Caliendo noted that Hamlin's has metal screen that sits on front of glazing.

Mr. Schuster stated that where this is different than others is the variety of color. He also noted that the blade sign on the corner has fairly vivid colors, as does the column underneath it, all of the grille work on Blount Street that fills the openings of warehouse shell. The colors exist in previous places. All were approved largely because of the children-ness of this museum.

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 4/0.

Committee Discussion

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

Hamlin Drug building metal screen across façade is clear precedent. [Caliendo]
There is use of color all around the building already. [Downer]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Ms. Caliendo and seconded by Ms. Downer, 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 1-7) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following additional facts:

8* The Hamlin Drug Co. Building on Hargett Street has a similar metal screen on the entire façade with a circle motif.
9* The colors are already seen on the building.

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

Decision on the Application

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

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 7/6/14.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

194-13-CA 322 E DAVIE STREET
Applicant: TELEGRAPH ROAD PROPERTIES (JASON QUEEN)
Received: 12/13/2013 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 3/13/2014 1) 1/6/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: PRINCE HALL HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: DOD, RB
Nature of Project: Demolish existing rear addition; construct new rear addition with 90 SF increase; construct new rear deck; replace front porch railings and columns; window and door alterations; ~~add new windows on side elevations~~ (removed with amendment); remove front yard shrubs and railing (amendment); remove shutters (amendment); parge foundation (amendment); change exterior paint colors.
Amendments: Revised drawings and additional information was provided 12/30/13 and are attached to these comments. Changes include: remove front yard shrubs and railing; remove shutters; parge foundation; eliminate request to add new windows on side elevations
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
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	demolish existing rear addition; construct new rear addition with 90 SF increase; remove front yard shrubs and railing
3.2	Masonry	parge foundation
3.4	Paint and Paint Color	change exterior paint colors
3.6	Exterior Walls	remove siding and install painted cedar shakes in gable end
3.7	Windows and Doors	window and door alterations; add new windows on side elevations; remove shutters
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	replace front porch railings and columns
4.1	Decks	construct new rear deck
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	demolish existing rear addition; construct new rear addition with 90 SF increase

STAFF COMMENTS

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

A. Demolition of existing rear addition; construction of new rear addition with 90 SF increase; construction of new rear deck; removal of front yard shrubs and railing is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.1, 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.5, 4.1.8, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9.

1* A large tree sits on or adjacent to the east property line and another tree appears to be on or near the rear (south) property line that may be impacted by construction activities; a tree protection plan was not included with the application.

2* The amended application proposes to remove front yard shrubs and non-historic site railing.

3* According to Wake County Real Estate data, the lot size is 3,049 SF; the footprint of the house and porch is 1,532 SF; current lot coverage is 50%. Based on Wake County Real Estate data and application drawings, the proposed footprint of the house, porch, addition, and new deck is about 1,767; proposed lot coverage is approximately 58%.

4* The existing contributing c. 1908 house is described in the *Report and Recommendation for the Designation of the South Person/South Blount Historic Overlay District* as a: "One-story frame house with weatherboard siding, an asphalt-shingled triple-A gable roof, a front porch with replacement metal supports, replacement 2/2 windows, and diamond-shaped gable vents."

5* The proposed new rear wood deck is at the level of the first floor, will fit generally within the corner between the east rear and west rear ell of the house, and will have a railing design to match the front porch; wood is a common material for modern decks; rear wood decks are have routinely approved in both Boylan Heights and Oakwood Historic Districts .

6* Extension of an existing rear gable is a traditional way to add on to a house; materials details are proposed to match the existing house; a corner board is proposed to remain to delineate the new addition.

B. Replacement of front porch railings and columns; alterations of windows and doors; removal of shutters; parging of foundation; changing of exterior paint colors is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.2.1, 3.2.6, 3.4.3, 3.6.6, 3.7.1, 3.7.2, 3.7.6, 3.7.8, 3.7.9, 3.8.1, 3.8.4, 3.8.5; however, removal of siding and installation of painted cedar shakes in gable end is incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 3.6.2, 3.6.6, 3.6.11.

1* The existing foundation consists of painted brick piers with concrete block in-fill.

2* Changing of exterior paint colors is typically a minor work approval at the staff level and is included here for administrative efficiency; paint samples were included in the application.

3* The application proposes to remove the weatherboard siding from the front gable end and replace with painted cedar shakes; there is no evidence in the application that the siding is not historic and the shakes are reinstallation of a missing historic feature.

4* The gable end vents and trim are likely original and some of the few remaining architectural details; the application states that vents will be repaired and reused if possible; the Guidelines favor retention of as much historic fabric as possible.

5* Replacement of the existing windows and doors is typically a minor work approval at the staff level and are included here for administrative efficiency. Existing 1950s or 1960s replacement wood windows are being removed; new 2/2 wood windows are proposed to be installed; manufacturer specifications and details are included in the application.
6* Window trim specifications are not included in the application; historic details such as drip caps no longer exist on the house.
7* The shutters proposed for removal were likely installed in the 1950s or 1960s when the windows were replaced.
8* New doors are proposed on the rear reconstructed wall and addition; manufacturer specifications and details are included in the application.
9* The existing railings and columns are non-historic c. 1950s metal replacements; proposed new railings and columns are wood; details and specifications are included in the application.

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

1. That as much of the gable end vents and trim be retained as is technically feasible.
2. That the gable end siding not be replaced with cedar shakes.
3. That the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample tree protection plan.
4. That the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Window trim details.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Jason Queen [affirmed], Raleigh Restoration Group was present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Shackleton asked if the applicant has any questions. Mr. Queen said that we was ok with staff suggested conditions regarding the gable vent and the cedar shakes.

Gail Wiesner [affirmed] stated that she has a concern over code and the railing. She noted that it typically isn't an issue if you are in an HOD. She noted that if you have a very high railing it won't look right. Mr. Queen responded that David Maurer drew them in at 36″ but he will try to get them lower.

Ms. David asked what kind of material is proposed for the parging. Mr. Queen said that the brick is painted right now and the assumption is that if we parge it that the paint would be enough to protect it. Ms. David noted that the old bricks are soft and using hard cement can wear your piers and you wouldn't even know it because it's behind concrete. Mr. Queen asked if she knew of any product. Ms.id said that you can make a cement mixture that is not quite as

hard. Mr. Queen said he will look into it. Ms. David said that Dean Ruedrich comes to mind. Mr. Queen said that there are a couple of masons in the Oakwood listserv he'll look into.

Tania Tully [affirmed] asked if the concrete blocks between the piers are inset or flush. Mr. Queen said flush. Ms. Tully noted that parging between the piers was impractical then.

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 4/0.

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Ms. Downer and seconded by Ms. Caliendo, Ms. Downer 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 1-6) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-9) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following additional fact:

B. 10* Historic brick is softer than modern concrete.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That as much of the gable end vents and trim be retained as is technically feasible.
2. That the gable end siding not be replaced with cedar shakes.
3. That the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample tree protection plan.
4. That the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Window trim details.
5. That the parging of the foundation use a formulation that is softer than standard concrete so as to avoid damage to the historic brick.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 7/6/14.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

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

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Replace windows; replace non-historic front door; enclose rear porch
Amendments: When posting the sign staff observed installation of new house numbers; an email dated 12/30/13 provided clarifying information and is attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- A page from the 1928 *Hill's Raleigh City Directory* is available for review.
- Sheet 68 of the 1914 and 1950 Sanborn Fire insurance maps are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.8	Signage	installation of new house numbers
3.7	Windows and Doors	Replace windows; replace non-historic front door
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	enclose rear porch

STAFF COMMENTS

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

A. Replacement of windows is incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 3.7.1, 3.7.3, 3.7.4, 3.7.5, 3.7.6, 3.7.10, 3.7.13.

1* The majority of the windows are wood 1/1 double-hung sash and appear to be original historic fabric.

2* The current owners have not attempted to repair the windows; evidence of prior inappropriate repairs is seen in the application photographs.

3* The application states that the windows have irreparable deterioration; a window inventory was not included in the application; there is insufficient evidence to support that the windows are deteriorated beyond repair.

4* The replacements window and sashes proposed to be Pella Proline 450 Series Double Hung Wood Windows.

5* Energy efficiency is cited as one of the benefits of the proposed new windows; well-fitting storm windows installed over rehabilitated wood windows will provide similar benefits.

B. Replacement of non-historic front door; installation of house numbers; enclosure of rear deck is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.8.6, 3.7.2, 3.7.7, 3.8.7.

1* The house at 529 Euclid Street is a simple vernacular cross-gable dwelling constructed c. 1927; the address (formerly E Peace Street) first appears in the 1928 *Hill's Raleigh City Directory*.

2* The current front door is a non-historic full light wood door; the proposed front door is a high-style craftsman style wood door.

3* The house numbers are posted on the porch column, a location frequently seen in the district.

4* Enclosing rear porches is a common way of adding onto houses in the Oakwood Historic District; the proposal essentially moves the current rear wall to the opening of the porch.

5* The application states that the same wood siding and same reveal used on the rest of the house will be used for the porch enclosure; an altered photograph is included in the application; the amended application states that there will not be a window on the west wall.

6* The amended applications states that the enclosure of the porch will reuse as much trim and siding as possible.

Staff suggests that the committee deny replacement of the windows and approve the remainder of the amended application, with the following conditions:

1. That the new front door be of a simpler design more in keeping with the vernacular style of the house and be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.
2. That should the applicant choose to install storm windows, the details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Lou Pascucci [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. He stated that he was unclear why it would be denied. He said that if you see the pictures, some of the windows can't be locked. Previous owners carved into the sides and put in a slide lock and the area that the slide lock is in was not done properly. The new windows proposed are the same, just functional. Mr. Pascucci said that he had Jeremy Bradham from Capital Area Preservation look at the windows and he thought that they should be replaced.

Tania Tully [affirmed] said that the main question is that there is not enough information. The fact that Jeremy looked at the windows is good, but there is no information in the application about it. Having him come today would have helped. The other question is also is it both sashes that need to be replaced or just the bottom sash. Ms. Tully explained that the reason that staff recommended denial is that there wasn't enough information in the application to support

replacement. She noted that the applicant can ask for additional time to gather that information together. If the windows are deteriorated beyond repair and it's shown that they're not historic, they could be approved by staff. The committee can choose to kick it back to staff if based on other experts and staff's opinion they are deteriorated beyond repair.

Mr. Shackleton offered the applicant then opportunity to ask to defer application and get someone who is familiar with repairing windows to do a window inventory. They need to provide proof that they're beyond repair. Mr. Pascucci asked if he can he get just this part deferred, but continue with porch part of application. Mr. Shackleton confirmed.

Gail Wiesner [affirmed] asked about the door – if it was denied or would that be staff approval. Ms. Tully said staff suggested the door be of simpler design if committee agrees. She asked Mr. Pascucci if he is requesting that window piece be deferred and the rest be heard. Mr. Pascucci confirmed.

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 4/0.

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

Deferral of Part of Application

Ms. David made a motion to defer the portion of the application dealing with the windows with a recommendation for the applicant to return with expert testimony and a window by window evaluation.

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

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 1-6) to be acceptable as findings of fact.

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

Decision on the Application

Ms. David made a motion that the application (portion not deferred) be approved as amended, with the following conditions:

1. That the new front door be of a simpler design more in keeping with the vernacular style of the house and be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.
2. That should the applicant choose to install storm windows, the details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 7/6/14.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Demolition by Neglect: Oakwood
    a. 409 Polk Street – Ms. David moved to recommend that the commission forward the item to the Inspections Department as a Demolition by Neglect case. Ms. Caliendo seconded the motion; passed 4/0.
2. Subdivision Review: 202 Linden Avenue – Ms. Caliendo moved that the proposed subdivision of 202 Linden Avenue will not result in the creation of lots that would result in the construction of buildings incongruous with the historic district and to recommend that City Council approve the subdivision. Ms. David seconded the motion; passed 4/0.
3. Appeal: 516 Euclid Street – January 13, 2014
4. Committee Discussion
    a. Application Completeness
    b. Meeting Post-Mortem
5. Design Guidelines Update

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:57 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner