RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
August 11, 2014

CALL TO ORDER
Elizabeth Caliendo called the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Committee meeting to order at 4:06 p.m.

ROLL CALL
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner, called the roll as follows:
Present: Elizabeth Caliendo, Sarah David (arrived 4:27), Miranda Downer
Alternate Present: Fred Belledin
Excused Absence: Scott Shackleton
Staff Present: Tania Tully, Martha Lauer

Approval of the July 7, 2014 Minutes
Mr. Belledin moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing and to adopt the minutes as submitted. Ms. Downer seconded the motion; passed 3/0.

Minor Works
There were no questions regarding the Minor Work report.

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

Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address	Affirmed
Franklin Roberts, 3409 Huckabey Circle 27612	Yes
Barbara Doll, 512 Oakwood Ave 27601	No
Bill Brideson, 612 N Blount Street	Yes
Matt Griffith, 111 Longview Lake Dr 27610	Yes
Corey Mason, 163 Oak Chase Lake 27604	Yes
Randy Scott, 218 N East Street 27601	Yes
Heather Scott, 218 N East Street 27601	Yes
Justin Boner, 504 E Jones Street 27601	Yes
Dave Nicolay, 312 Mulberry Street 27604	?
Patrick Nerz, 506 N Greensboro St 27510	Yes
Jason Queen, 207 Fayetteville St 27601	Yes
Laurie Jackson, 115 W Hargett St 27601	No
Gail Wiesner, 515 Euclid Street 27604	No
Patti Brideson, 612 N Blount Street	Yes
Rodney Axtman. 7104 Tyndall Ct 27612	Yes

REVIEW OF SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Downer moved to approve the agenda as printed. Mr. Belledin seconded the motion; passed 3/0.

SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS

There were no objections to the approval of the Summary Proceedings without a public hearing. The committee reviewed and approved the following cases 102-14-CA and 103-14-CA for which the Summary Proceeding is made part of these minutes.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – SUMMARY PROCEEDING

102-14-CA 512 OAKWOOD AVE
Applicant: BARBARA DOLL
Received: 6/25/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/23/2014 1) 8/11/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Remove dangerous 12" dbh magnolia tree; remove diseased 14" dbh maple tree; remove dangerous 33" dbh willow oak tree; remove dangerous 10" dbh maple tree.
Amendments: Additional photos were provided July 29 and are attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Remove dangerous 12" dbh magnolia tree; remove diseased 14" dbh maple tree; remove dangerous 33" dbh willow oak tree; remove dangerous 10" dbh maple tree.

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Removal of 4 trees is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.3, 2.3.5, and the following findings. (Raleigh City Code Section 10.2.15.E.1. states that "An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure or site within any Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark may not be denied…However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of issuance…If the Commission finds that the building, structure or site has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark, it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal.")

1* The trees proposed for removal are maples, a willow oak and a magnolia tree and are located in the rear yard and side yards.

2* The application does not include a report from an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA).

3* The magnolia tree is 12" dbh and located close to and leaning towards the house. The application states that it is poorly formed and expresses concern regarding future growth.

4* The 14″ dbh maple tree is located between houses and is stated to be diseased; a photograph of the bark of the tree is included; no other evidence is provided to support this assertion.
5* The willow oak is 33″ dbh and has roots extending under the house; the amended application includes photographs of the tree roots.
6* The 10″ dbh maple is between two houses and close to the foundation; the application expresses concern about future impact to the foundation.
7* The application proposes not to replace the removed trees because the existing locations are too close to the house and the lot is heavily wooded including a large mature willow oak and pecan tree. The amended application includes a photo of the rear of the lot.
8* Per guideline 2.3.5, the commission requires either replacement of trees removed or, when there is no suitable location for planting a replacement tree, a donation to the NeighborWoods tree planting program.

Staff recommends that the committee approve the application, waiving the 365-day demolition delay and with the following condition:

1. That prior to the removal of the trees and issuance of the blue placard form of the COA the applicant donate the monetary value of four 3″ caliper medium maturing trees (as defined by the NeighborWoods program) to the City of Raleigh's NeighborWoods tree planting program.

Decision on the Application

There were no objections to approval without a public hearing.

Ms. Downer moved to approve the application, adopting the staff comments as the written record of the summary proceeding on 102-14-CA. Mr. Belledin seconded the motion; passed 3/0.

Committee members voting: Belledin, Caliendo, Downer.

Certificate expiration date: 2/11/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – SUMMARY PROCEEDING

103-14-CA 514 OAKWOOD AVE
Applicant: HALE W. HODGDON
Received: 6/25/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/23/2014 1) 8/11/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Remove dead sycamore tree; remove dangerous 14.5" dbh maple tree; remove 18" triple trunk volunteer hackberry tree
Amendments: A photo of the rear yard was provided July 29 and is attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Remove dead sycamore tree; remove dangerous 14.5" dbh maple tree; remove 18" triple trunk volunteer hackberry tree

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Removal of 3 trees is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.3, 2.3.5, and the following findings. (Raleigh City Code Section 10.2.15.E.1. states that "An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure or site within any Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark may not be denied…However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of issuance…If the Commission finds that the building, structure or site has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark, it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal.")

1* The trees proposed for removal are a maple, a sycamore and a hackberry tree and are located in the rear yard.

2* The application does not include a report from an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA).

3* The sycamore tree has already fallen and is clearly a hazard.

4* The application states that the maple and hackberry trees are too close to the wooden fence along the property line, are volunteers, and are poorly formed. The maple tree is too close to the house and the hackberry is in the shade of another larger hackberry tree.
5* The application does not include replacement trees. The amended application includes a photo of the rear of the lot showing trees not proposed for removal.
6* Per guideline 2.3.5, the commission requires either replacement of trees removed or, when there is no suitable location for planting a replacement tree, a donation to the NeighborWoods tree planting program.

Staff recommends that the committee approve the amended application, waiving the 365-day demolition delay and with the following condition:

1. That prior to the removal of the trees and issuance of the blue placard form of the COA the applicant donate the monetary value of three 3" caliper medium maturing trees (as defined by the NeighborWoods program) to the City of Raleigh's NeighborWoods tree planting program.

Decision on the Application

There were no objections to approval without a public hearing.

Ms. Downer moved to approve the application, adopting the staff comments as the written record of the summary proceeding on 103-14-CA. Mr. Belledin seconded the motion; passed 3/0.

Committee members voting: Belledin, Caliendo, Downer.

Certificate expiration date: 2/11/15.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Ms. Caliendo introduced the public hearing portion of the meeting. The committee heard the following cases in the following order for which the Certified Records are made part of these minutes: 078-14-CA, 081-14-CA, 104-14-CA, 105-14-CA, 106-14-CA, 107-14-CA, and 108-14-CA.

Mr. Belledin was recused from COAs 106-14-CA and 107-14-CA because of a potential future business relationship with the applicant. Ms. David moved to allow him to leave the room. Ms. Downer seconded; motion passed 4/0. Mr. Belledin did not return to the meeting and did not hear COA 108-14-CA.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

078-14-CA 136 E MORGAN ST
Applicant: ERIN STERLING LEWIS
Received: 6/17/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/15/2014 1) 7/7/2014 2) 8/11/2014 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: DOD, BUS
Nature of Project: Remove non-historic false façades and site walls; install new landscaping, site walls and metal fence; construct new entry addition on S Blount St, construct new stair addition on E Morgan St; parge concrete block walls; install new canopies; replace non-historic storefronts; change exterior paint colors.
Amendments: Clearer drawings were provided by the applicant 7/3/14 and were distributed at the July hearing. Additional information and revised drawings as requested by the committee were provided by the applicant and mailed with the commission packets.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- Sanborn Fire Insurance maps are available for review.
- COA cases referenced in the facts are available for review.
- Staff comments include facts presented at the July public hearing.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

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

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Removal of non-historic false façades and site walls; installation of new landscaping, site walls and metal fence is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.4.1, 2.4.8; however the use of board-formed concrete for the site walls is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.4.8, the planting area in front of the storefront is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, and the recessed gap between the sidewalk and courtyard surface **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, 2.3.11 and the following findings:

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

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

3* There is a 1 to 2 foot change in grade along Morgan Street.

4* According to the presentation at the July hearing, the existing site walls are 56″ tall minimum and the false wall is a little taller than that. The proposed new walls are 48″ tall except that they will be 62″ at the Blount/Morgan intersection due to the elevation change at the corner.

5* The new fence will be 14″ below the height of the wall with the maximum height of 42″ at Morgan Street. The steel pickets are mounted in a continuous foundation and are spaced at 6" on center.

6* The new site walls are at the property line rather than inset as they are now. The site walls and edges are held back from sidewalk a bit to allow landscaping/planting room. Historically, buildings were set at the property line in the commercial districts. The new site walls will somewhat bring the street wall closer to the sidewalk.

7* The applicants stated that the picket edge proposed is transparent and will allow one to see into the site; however the use of flat pickets will result in a more solid look when viewed from down the street.

8* The amended application included several photographic examples of metal picket fences in downtown historic overlay districts including in the 200 block of S Blount Street.

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

10* The amended application included photographic examples of board formed concrete walls. None of the examples are in a historic overlay district.

11* The presentation stated that the primary reading of the landscape will be planted material. The wall is more in keeping with the surfaces of the courtyard.

12* The amended application is proposing to remove the sign which is original to the warehouse potion, but did not have same wording as it does today.
13* The existing hardscape and plantings will be replaced with new hardscape and plantings; detailed drawings were included in the amended application.
14* The courtyard will have 3 new sycamore trees and other landscaping. The surfaces of the courtyard will be concrete and gravel with landscaped surfaces interspersed. Detailed landscape drawings were provided with the amended application.
15* According to Sanborn Fire Insurance maps, since 1888 the buildings at the corner of S Blount and E Morgan were set back from the street farther than the rest of the block; in fact, from 1903 to 1914 the building at 134 E Morgan Street was a dwelling.
16* The amended application included additional work items include address numbers and recessed up-lights.
17* Along Blount Street there is an approximate 1' grade difference between the existing public sidewalk and the courtyard surface. This is resulting in a recessed gap area between the public sidewalk and courtyard that is proposed for planting.
18* The landscape includes a planting area in front of the historic 2-story building along Morgan Street. This atypical and would have been concrete.

B. Changing of exterior paint colors; parging of concrete block walls; installation of new canopies; replacement non-historic storefronts is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.4.3, 3.6.1, 3.6.10, 3.7.1, 3.7.4, 3.7.7, 3.9.1, 3.9.6, 3.9.7, and the following findings:
1* Paint samples were not included in the application.
2* There are existing skylights on the historic warehouse that will be retained.
3* The concrete block walls proposed for removal or parging are non-contributing to the character of the buildings and district. Parging is a traditional method of coating masonry units and has a stucco-like appearance. The amended application states that it will have a smooth surface. Specifications of the parging material were not included in the application.
4* Excepting on the addition discussed in comment C., no new exterior openings are proposed; all new windows and doors are in existing or previously infilled openings.
5* The windows in the storefront of the warehouse building will fit within the existing openings.
6* A continuous new metal canopy is proposed to wrap 108 S Blount Street; detailed drawings were included in the amended application. A metal canopy was approved wrapping the non-contributing building at the corner of S. Wilmington Street and E. Martin Street in 2010 (COA 042-10-CA).
7* One solid wood pivot door is proposed along E Morgan Street.
8* A portion of the north wall of 108 S Blount Street will be glass accordion doors; the pattern is similar to the storefront windows used elsewhere in the project.
9* Details and specifications for the new doors and windows were not included in the application.
10* The new storefront in the contributing building at 134 E Morgan Street will have a traditional bulkhead.

C. Construction of new entry addition on S Blount Street; construction of new stair addition on E Morgan Street is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.6, 4.2.7 and the following findings:

1* The proposed entry addition is connected to the side of the contributing building at 110 S Blount Street and in front of 108 S Blount Street. It does not damage historic fabric.

2* The addition is in the location of an existing parking area.

3* The entry addition is sheathed in glass, has a flat roof and is lower than the historic buildings; detailed drawings were included in the amended application.

4* The proposed stair addition sits atop the non-contributing garage and is appended to the rear side of the contributing 2-story commercial block. It is several feet shorter than the historic building and also has a flat roof.

5* The stair addition is proposed to be clad in painted cementitious siding with the east wall being a large glass opening. Details and colors were not included in the application.

Pending the committee's determination regarding the gap between the public sidewalk and the courtyard, staff recommends that the committee approve the amended application, with the following conditions:

1. That there not be a planting area in front of the historic building on Morgan Street.
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
    a. Paint chips;
    b. wood doors;
    c. Parging material.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
    a. Windows;
    b. Storefront systems;
    c. Stair addition.
4. That the site walls not be board-formed concrete, with the new material to be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.
5. That the fence be a traditional square picket design, with the new fence to be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support:
Matthew Griffith of in situ [affirmed], Franklin Roberts [affirmed] with Edenton Street Methodist Church, and Corey Mason [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Griffith gave a visual presentation which mostly matched the amended application. He made the following points and comments.

- The amended application addressed the requests for additional information made by the committee.
- The elevations no longer change the opening sizes on the historic warehouse.
- 18″ sills are added to the 2-story walk up.
- They were not able to find any historic photos of the original warehouse, so they are not changing openings.
- They do have non-historic storefront systems in them now and are changing them out only because they are old.
- For the fence precedents they spent an hour or so walking around downtown and found numerous examples of open fence systems; of most significance, every single church in downtown Raleigh has some sort of yard with an open system of fence or wall.
- A photograph of the aesthetic of a canopy that they are after. Would have exposed steel channel at edge. Entry vestibule under canopy is entirely a storefront.
- In the packet they included details and noted materials and a planting plan.
- Disagree with staff's characterization of the board formed walls as utilitarian. Showed the precedents for concrete walls.
- He thinks texture of board formed wall creates more visual interest.
- There will be plantings along the wall.
- Marbles has concrete and masonry walls directly analogous to what they are doing.
- They eliminated two large windows on the façade; not going to be builder beige, but a darker gray on whole thing.
- They are no longer cladding new stair with stained wood, but with hardipanel that will be painted.

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

Mr. Belledin asked the applicant which of concrete wall examples provided are in a local historic. Mr. Griffith said that the only one is in front of the old church on the east side of Moore Square and Marbles. Tania Tully [affirmed] stated that the wall at the church is not in the historic overlay district.

Mr. Belledin asked which metal fences are in the district. Mr. Griffith said that the one in the lower right corner with the open picket without horizontals is. Also right next to the site, there's a metal fence enclosing First Baptist. There is a fence around the entire yard at Christ Church and the cathedral property is also surrounded by a metal fence.

Mr. Griffith said that he is happy to move to 2X2 picket. Mr. Belledin noted that all the fence examples provided are delicate. MG—oblique problem you're correct about

Ms. Tully said that in staff's opinion, the proposed square picket meets the guidelines. They are already doing more contemporary design changes and it's in front of noncontributing structure. Going to a square picket, even if it's larger, will look appropriate.

Mr. Belledin asked if it will be painted. Mr. Griffith said that it would be a dark color like the examples, and the canopy too. It would not be black-black, but dark bronze.

Ms. Tully made a comment about churches in the local district. Although this will be used as church, this is not aesthetically a church-form building, but rather a garage/commercial building.

Mr. Griffith clarified that the steel frame will be painted.

Mr. Belledin noted that the architectural plans and landscape plans don't quite match. On Blount St there's a floating material. What is that proposed to be? Mr. Mason said that it would be concrete. Ms. Tully noted the indication of a grate. Mr. Griffith said that as they continued to move through the project some things have changed. It is planned to be concrete at this point, not a grate. That may be an error in the drawing. Mr. Belledin said that it is shown as ramp in one place and a step on L.1.2. Mr. Griffith said that it would be an accessible entrance, not step. Mr. Mason clarified that it is an existing condition they're just re-laying.

Mr. Belledin asked for a response on staff's comment about the gap on Blount Street. Mr. Mason said that the intent for that gap is to act as a low holding of moisture and anything above that would go into stormwater system. It is similar to what is seen in Portland, OR. The depth of the gap is dictated by the sloping of the sidewalk. It is drawn it at its deepest point of 14". The sidewalk is sloping up, so closer to the main larger of the spaces it's only 3". The planter would be flat. The drawing is at the corner of Morgan and Blount. The drain comes from roof, dumps into planter, and then into the overflow drain. The sidewalk changes too it is 1'10" above the patio - not very significant. Ms. Caliendo asked if it is eleven inches from the concrete. Mr. Mason responded no, the sidewalk. The bed would remain constant and the sidewalk slopes. Ms. Tully reminded the applicant that stormwater handling is nice, but not in the committee's purview. Mr. Mason said that there is roughly a 22" change from corner to corner and that the bioswale treatment is only along Blount Street.

Mr. Griffith noted that the fence pickets are a maximum of 42" as measured from the public sidewalk.

Ms. Caliendo asked for staff to expand upon why board formed concrete is not appropriate. Ms. Tully said that it simply has not been seen anywhere in the historic overlay district. Typically in Moore Square you have masonry units, usually brick. She did note that they went with brick it wouldn't necessarily have to be red. Mr. Griffith said that walls that are parged are seen more often than board formed. They have already talked about moving away from the board formed concrete to a parged concrete block wall. The issue with parging is that it requires more maintenance and isn't as long lasting.

Ms. Caliendo asked for the applicant's thoughts on staff's recommendation about getting rid of landscaping in front of 2 story walk up. Mr. Griffith said that they were trying to do something

other than hardscape. They would want to do something like gravel if they can't have landscapings. Mr. Belledin stated that the challenge is that what happens between the storefront and sidewalk is character-defining. Mr. Griffith said that they are going to want to change the grade of it regardless so as to match the sidewalk.

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

Committee Discussion

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

They addressed the issues we asked them to: the board formed concrete wall, the planting area, the recessed gap, and the picket railing detail. [Caliendo]
Staff was spot-on with the review. A lot of it is unusual because it's in front of a non-historic building, but it's still in historic right-of-way. The comments staff made about transitions through the historic district are critical. I am good with comments generally, but there is still the issue of the gap relative to the guidelines. [Belledin]
I agree. [Caliendo]
2.3.8, 2.3.11 [Belledin]
2.3.11 feels like what they've done doesn't meet that. [Caliendo]
What they are doing on the private side is okay, but what they're proposing on the sidewalk, public side I am having a hard time with. There is a question with the interface with the sidewalk. [Belledin]
It's hard for me to get a good mental picture of really how it's going to look and read on the street, but I am okay with a fence since they are seen downtown already. It seems to me that it reads as a unit - the gap and the fence. [David]
One can't exist without the other. [Downer]
The planting area in front of the storefront is clearly incongruous. [David]
The window on the public sidewalk is the fundamental detail in a historic district. [Belledin]
Can't they change the gap detail so it doesn't step in? On the existing sidewalk? [Caliendo]
Sure, the difference would be that the planted area would be the height of the sidewalk. [Belledin]
I agree with staff on the planting, wall, storefront, fence. Any discussion about the fence detailing or are we okay with suggestion? [Caliendo]
Okay with suggestion. [Belledin]
Ready for a motion? [Caliendo]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Ms. David and seconded by Mr. Belledin 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 1-18), B. (inclusive

of facts 1-10), and C. (inclusive of facts 1-5) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and amendments as stated below:

A. Removal of non-historic false façades and site walls; installation of new landscaping, site walls and metal fence is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.4.1, 2.4.8; however the use of board-formed concrete for the site walls is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.4.8, the planting area in front of the storefront is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, and the recessed gap between the sidewalk and courtyard surface is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, 2.3.11 and the following findings:

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

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

3* There is a 1 to 2 foot change in grade along Morgan Street.

4* According to the presentation at the July hearing, the existing site walls are 56″ tall minimum and the false wall is a little taller than that. The proposed new walls are 48″ tall except that they will be 62″ at the Blount/Morgan intersection due to the elevation change at the corner.

5* The new fence will be 14″ below the height of the wall with the maximum height of 42″ at Morgan Street. The steel pickets are mounted in a continuous foundation and are spaced at 6" on center.

6* The new site walls are at the property line rather than inset as they are now. The site walls and edges are held back from sidewalk a bit to allow landscaping/planting room. Historically, buildings were set at the property line in the commercial districts. The new site walls will somewhat bring the street wall closer to the sidewalk.

7* The applicants stated that the picket edge proposed is transparent and will allow one to see into the site; however the use of flat pickets will result in a more solid look when viewed from down the street.

8* The amended application included several photographic examples of metal picket fences in downtown historic overlay districts including in the 200 block of S Blount Street.

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

10* The amended application included photographic examples of board formed concrete walls. None of the examples are in a historic overlay district. Testimony was provided that Marbles has a concrete seat wall in front of a larger brick wall.

11* The presentation stated that the primary reading of the landscape will be planted material. The wall is more in keeping with the surfaces of the courtyard.

12* The amended application is proposing to remove the sign which is original to the warehouse potion, but did not have same wording as it does today.
13* The existing hardscape and plantings will be replaced with new hardscape and plantings; detailed drawings were included in the amended application.
14* The courtyard will have 3 new sycamore trees and other landscaping. The surfaces of the courtyard will be concrete and gravel with landscaped surfaces interspersed. Detailed landscape drawings were provided with the amended application.
15* According to Sanborn Fire Insurance maps, since 1888 the buildings at the corner of S Blount and E Morgan were set back from the street farther than the rest of the block; in fact, from 1903 to 1914 the building at 134 E Morgan Street was a dwelling.
16* The amended application included additional work items include address numbers and recessed up-lights.
17* Along Blount Street there is an approximate 1′ grade difference between the existing public sidewalk and the courtyard surface. This is resulting in a recessed gap area between the public sidewalk and courtyard that is proposed for planting. Testimony stated that the maximum gap depth would be 10 inches.
18* The landscape includes a planting area in front of the historic 2-story building along Morgan Street. This atypical and would have been concrete.
19* The fence examples provided by the application are all visually transparent even from oblique views. The First Baptist pickets are heavier than the other examples.
20* The recessed gap area between the public sidewalk and courtyard and the fence read as a unit.

B. Changing of exterior paint colors; parging of concrete block walls; installation of new canopies; replacement non-historic storefronts is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.4.3, 3.6.1, 3.6.10, 3.7.1, 3.7.4, 3.7.7, 3.9.1, 3.9.6, 3.9.7, and the following findings:
1* Paint samples were not included in the application.
2* There are existing skylights on the historic warehouse that will be retained.
3* The concrete block walls proposed for removal or parging are non-contributing to the character of the buildings and district. Parging is a traditional method of coating masonry units and has a stucco-like appearance. The amended application states that it will have a smooth surface. Specifications of the parging material were not included in the application.
4* Excepting on the addition discussed in comment C., no new exterior openings are proposed; all new windows and doors are in existing or previously infilled openings.
5* The windows in the storefront of the warehouse building will fit within the existing openings.
6* A continuous new painted metal canopy is proposed to wrap 108 S Blount Street; detailed drawings were included in the amended application. A metal canopy was approved wrapping the non-contributing building at the corner of S. Wilmington Street and E. Martin Street in 2010 (COA 042-10-CA).
7* One solid wood pivot door is proposed along E Morgan Street.
8* A portion of the north wall of 108 S Blount Street will be glass accordion doors; the pattern is similar to the storefront windows used elsewhere in the project.

9* Details and specifications for the new doors and windows were not included in the application.
10* The new storefront in the contributing building at 134 E Morgan Street will have a traditional bulkhead.

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

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That there not be a planting area in front of the historic building on Morgan Street.
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
    a. Paint chips;
    b. wood doors;
    c. Parging material;
    d. Pivot door;
    e. Ramp railings (if any).
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
    a. Windows, including accordion windows;
    b. Storefront systems;
    c. Stair addition.
4. That the site walls not be board-formed concrete, with the new material including address numbers to be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

5. That the fence be a dark painted square picket design that allows transparency or visibility from an oblique view, with the new fence to be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 2/11/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

081-14-CA 323 PACE STREET
Applicant: HEATHER SCOTT
Received: 6/17/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/15/2014 1) 7/7/2014 2) 8/11/2014 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Demolish one contributing portion of building; construct new 30'x41' 1-story rear addition with 18'x16' rear porch with chimney; construct new 22'x26' 1-1/2 story 2-bay garage; install 20'x30' rear brick patio with outdoor fireplace; install rear stone patios; remove 3 trees; plant 2 new trees; remove porch posts; install new porch posts and railing replicating another house; replace front concrete walk with brick; alter existing driveway; add parking area by garage; construct brick wall at rear of yard
Amendments: Revised drawings were provided by the applicant July 1 and 7 and were distributed at the July hearing. Additional information and revised drawings as requested by the committee were provided by the applicant and mailed with the commission packets.
DRAC: This application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee (DRAC) on June 25, 2014. Present were Jerry Traub, Curtis Kasefang, and Dean Ruedrich. Also present were Heather and Randy Scott, David Maurer, and Tania Tully.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- Staff photos are available for review.
- COA files for 323 Pace Street are available for review.
- Sanborn Fire Insurance maps are available for review.
- COA files referenced in the comments are available for review.
- Staff comments include facts presented at the July public hearing.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	construct new 30'x41' 1-story rear addition with 16'x20' rear porch with chimney; construct new 22'x26' 1-1/2 story 2-bay garage; install 20'x30' rear brick patio with outdoor fireplace; install rear stone patios; remove 3 trees; plant 2 new trees; replace front concrete walk with brick; alter existing driveway; add parking area by garage; construct brick wall at rear of yard
2.4	Fences and Walls	construct brick wall at rear of yard

2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	replace front concrete walk with brick; alter existing driveway; add parking area by garage
2.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	construct new 22'x26' 1-1/2 story 2-bay garage
3.6	Exterior Walls	demolish one contributing portion of building
3.7	Windows and Doors	demolish one contributing portion of building
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	remove porch posts; install new porch posts and railing replicating another house;
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	construct new 30'x41' 1-story rear addition with 16'x20' rear porch with chimney

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

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

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

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

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

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

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

6* At the July public hearing the applicants stated that they are fine about re-doing that section and that the window is being restored. The amended application does not yet address this revision.

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

1* At the July public hearing the applicant stated that Jeff Adolphsen from the State Historic Preservation Office looked at house and noted that the railings don't seem to be original and that the columns seem to be from before the 1920s. The applicant also stated that the siding and flooring were likely redone within the last 15-20 years

2* The applicant stated that Matthew Brown researched the house and determined that house was a Julius Lewis & Co. home. The house at 312 E Jones Street with chamfered posts was provided as an example and would not be replicated.

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

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

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

1* At the public hearing the applicant stated that no trees are proposed for removal because of the location of the addition. The landscape plan only shows the site with the addition in place; a tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture was provided in the amended application for the 40″ dbh American Elm tree at the front left corner of the property.

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

3* The proposed addition is located on the rear of the house; it is inset from the historic house and gets wider towards the rear; a proposed front elevation drawing is not included in the application. Height is 1′2″ lower than the historic house.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

10* The fiber cement siding will abut the historic house at a corner and not be in the same plane; the reveal of the historic siding and new siding are not included in the application.
11* The proposed rear porch is larger than is typical in the historic district, especially in conjunction with the large addition. The roof of the porch is lower than the main house, typical of porches within the district.
12* Having one solid wall on a rear porch is atypical; the landscape plan notes the possible screened enclosure of porch; addition drawings do not indicate a screened enclosure. In the amended application it appears as though the solid wall has been eliminated.
13* While unusual to have an exterior fireplace, its location on a solid wall makes it appear as though it is within the interior of the house. In the amended application it appears as though the solid wall has been eliminated.
14* Detailed drawings of the proposed addition and porch were not included in the application.
15* There was testimony at the public hearing regarding the additions at 315 N Boundary Street. Mr. Andy Penry stated that a 2nd level addition was approved in 2103. He stated that there was a discussion on whether the addition overpowered house. It was argued that there wasn't a change in the roofline, so nothing was looming over the historic portion of the house. The committee asked for the minutes from the hearing.
16* The committee requested examples of long additions in Oakwood either approved by the commission or historically added or a revised proposal that reduces the scale of the addition; neither was provided to staff.

D. Construction of new 22'x26' 1-1/2 story 2-bay garage is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.6.5, 2.6.6, 2.6.9 and the following findings.
1* The proposed garage will sit on the critical root zone of a large tree; the application states that garage will have a slab foundation that sits on a stalite expanded slate lightweight aggregate foundation to ensure the health of the tree; at the public hearing the applicant stated that that he has worked a lot with the Stalite material. Mr. Penry, the owner of 315 N Boundary Street testified that the same material was used at his property when his garage was constructed in 2005. He said that the product maintains air and water flow to the roots of trees and that the trees on his property are still in good condition.
2* The lot size is 10,454 SF. The proposed addition with porches and remaining house and porch has a total proposed footprint of 3,268 SF for lot coverage of 31%. The proposed garage is 572 SF for new total lot coverage of 37%.
3* The location of the proposed garage in the rear corner of the lot and at the end of the driveway is consistent with the traditional placement of accessory structures in the district.
4* There is not a tradition of 2-story garages/carriage houses in Oakwood. Staff is aware of one historic 1-1/2-story horse barn accessory building at the architecturally-elaborate Heck-Pool House at 218 N. East Street.
5* There have been committee-approved exceptions of taller and 2-bay garages. After an initial denial due to lack of evidence, in 2006 a 1½-story, 15' x 17' storage building with loggia and exterior stair was approved at 715 N. Bloodworth Street (COA 166-06-CA). Examples provided in that case include 218 N East Street, 403 E Edenton Street, 121 N Bloodworth Street, and in the 300 block of Polk Street (behind 425 N Bloodworth Street) – except for 121

N Bloodworth Street all of the houses associated with the garages are 2-stories or taller. 121 N Bloodworth Street is one-story, but the approved garage was a 2-bay 1-story structure (COA 135-97-CA).

6* In 2008, based in part on the 2006 decision referenced in fact 4*, the commission approved a 1½-story, 22′x27′ garage at 608 Oakwood Avenue (COA 212-07-CA). That garage was 21′6.5″ tall, compared to the 28′2″ height of the historic house.

7* The garage at 315 N Boundary Street (COA 090-03-CA) was approved to be 18′ in height and 24′x22′8″ in footprint; the committee required a reduction in the height be reduced to at least 10% less than the main house 1-story addition height from the proposed 20′.

8* In the amended application the new garage is proposed to be 22′ wide by 26′ deep. The garage at 608 Oakwood Avenue was approved with a width of 22′3″.

9* The historic house at 323 Pace Street is approximately 19′ tall; in the amended application the proposed garage is 18′ tall which is the same height as the new addition on the rear of the main house.

10* Accessory buildings are characteristically subservient to the main dwelling.

11* The proposed materials are lap siding fiber cement lap siding; hardie trim; asphalt shingles; and garage doors. Specifications for the garage doors were not included in the application.

12* Sanborn maps were distributed at the hearing by the applicant. The 1914 map shows an accessory building on the lot, the 1950 map shows a garage on the lot, and the maps indicate that the lot reached its current size between 1909 and 1914.

E. Installation of a 20'x30' rear brick patio; installation of rear stone patios; removal of 3 trees; planting of 2 new trees; replacement of front concrete walk with brick; alteration of existing driveway; addition of parking area by garage; construction of brick wall at rear of yard; installation of front yard fence and driveway gate is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section 2.3.5, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.5 and the following findings.
(Raleigh City Code Section 10.2.15.E.1. states that "An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure or site within any Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark may not be denied…However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of issuance…If the Commission finds that the building, structure or site has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark, it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal.")

1* The lot size is 10,454 SF. The proposed house and addition with porches and garage has a total proposed footprint of 3,840 SF for lot coverage of 37%. The proposed new patios and driveway is approximately 1,930 SF for new total lot coverage of 55%.

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

3* A photograph of the front fence design was included in the amended application; the 3′ tall fence is a traditional picket fence design found throughout Oakwood.

4* The arched driveway gate is metal pickets whereas the front fence is wood pickets.

5* Trees at the rear of the lot in the location of the proposed patio were also evaluated by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture, but no recommendations were made with regard to the patio. The discussion was only about a future pool.
6* A tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture was provided in the amended application for the 40" dbh American Elm tree at the front left corner of the property, but did not include a discussion of impacts alterations to and extensions of the driveway.
7* The *Guidelines* say that "Typically, driveways were made of gravel or compacted soil. Often a grass median separated two gravel or aggregate textured concrete runners. Occasionally, more decorative brick or stone pavers were used."
8* The proposal is for a solid brick and/or concrete driveway.
9* The landscape plan shows walls around the proposed patio; an outdoor fireplace; a kitchen/grill area; brick wall; no drawings of the proposed changes were included in the application. The amended application included photograph of proposed materials. There is insufficient information to make a determination regarding these items

Staff recommends that the committee approve in part and defer in part in part the amended application:

Defer approval of the walls around the proposed patio; the outdoor fireplace; the kitchen/grill area; and the brick wall with the request that additional drawings and information be provided regarding the proposed changes.

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

1. That the remaining 1909 wall be rebuilt in the same location with wood siding and reusing the historic window.
2. That the new front porch details be simpler than the sample provided in the application.
3. That the scale of the addition and rear porch be reduced with the revised drawings to be reviewed by the committee as an administrative review of conditions.
4. That the siding on the addition be painted.
5. That the driveway be driving strips for a majority of its length.
6. That details and specifications of the addition for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits for the addition:
   a. Location of the tree and associated fencing in drawing form to accompany the written tree protection plan provided;
   b. New windows;
   c. Eave construction detail;
   d. Revised drawings.
7. That details and specifications of the addition for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits for the garage:
   a. Eave construction detail;

b. Garage doors;
c. Windows.

8. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Doors;
   b. Siding reveal;
   c. Roofing material;
   d. Brick foundation sample;
   e. New front porch posts and railing;
   f. Paint colors;
   g. Light fixtures and locations;
   h. Ramp;
   i. Driveway;
   j. Outdoor porch fireplace.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Tania Tully [affirmed] noted that everywhere the garage says 24 feet, it should say 22 feet and that staff comments were based on the 22′.
Mr. Scott distributed a document with examples of houses with long additions. He walked through the examples they found making the following points:

- The depth of the houses are heated space and do not count porches. He used the sketch provided in tax records for dimensions.
- With each example he was comparing pitches of roofs, the fact that additions were done over time, and tendency to go straight back.
- These other houses are longer than what they are trying to do in terms of heated space. Pace Street is 72′.
- 412 N East Street: A triple-gable house like Pace Street. Longer than proposal at 74′. Appears as multiple additions.
- 508 N Bloodworth Street: A triple-gable house like Pace Street. 80′ long. Appears as multiple additions.
- 608 Polk Street: He suspects rear roof is higher. He thinks there may be some sort of deck and structure that makes it longer than 88 feet. 1½ stories means the house has to go up. There is a lower connector. He thought that for this project a half story was too much even with a dormer. Appears as multiple additions.
- 321 E. Lane: A triple-gable house like Pace Street. Has almost the same size deck on back as they are proposing; same tri-gable, overall size of home, jutted out to side of 8′. This project looking to just out only a few feet on right. Almost mirror images of each other. Shrunk the gable on rear down a lot based on DRAC's concerns so they are within 10%;

can see that that house has three different roof lines. The roofline has almost same height. Can lower the roofline as connector. Shed roof off gable is similar to the other side of the proposed addition.

- 526 N East Street is a shotgun with a camel back addition. It is long and narrow – a common theme in Oakwood.

Ms. Tully interjected that 526 N. East Street, originally approved in 1998 and renewed in 2003, was approved under old Design Guidelines. This is a camel-back addition, which is a standard treatment for shotguns.

- 520 N Person: addition is on top of an existing 1st story addition.
- There are several examples of houses that are 2 or 2½ times deep as they are wide like their proposal. (324, 326 and 314 Pell Street)
- 515 and 517 Oakwood are triple gable houses that are 74' long.
- 315 N Boundary St: 2003 demolition and new addition; 2013 2nd level addition.
- A sketch page compared 323 Pace, 321 E Lane and 515 Oakwood as having similar form.
- They are trying to make the house as livable as can be and not have to add on later.

Mr. Belledin asked if any of these examples have a covered rear porch. Mr. Scott said that he wasn't sure but that not that he knows of. Ms. Tully noted that rear covered porches have been approved. Mr. Belledin clarified that he was looking for long narrow houses with a rear covered porch as well. Everything presented was heated area only.

Ms. Downer noted that 526 N East has a covered 2 story porch. Mr. Scott said that 520 N. Person has 2 story covered porch as well.

Ms. Scott stated that the last few pages are pictures of garages that are a story and a half. Mr. Scott said that their revision to the garage removed the proposed dormers, but after finding this example, they'd like to consider having them put back on. Ms. Tully said that they would need to revise the drawing for review. Mr. Scott said that the only reason they took it off was that they were told they had to shrink it. Then they found 608 Oakwood.

Ms. Tully provided the COA file for the approval of the garage at 608 Oakwood Avenue to Mr. Belledin. There was discussion among staff, commission and the applicants about the garage at 608 Oakwood. Ms. Tully noted that the garage is 6 feet shorter than the house and clarified Ms. Scott said that ridge of the garage is only 13" lower than the ridge of the house. Ms. Tully clarified that it is the eave that is 13" lower, not the ridge.

Mr. Scott said that the house without the addition is the same size and goes back. They are proposing 2' shorter garage than they have at 608 Oakwood Avenue, and narrower and deeper, so were hoping to put dormers back in there. Ms. Scott said that she didn't want to get hung up on that.

Mr. Belledin asked how big the house is. Ms. Scott said 1,411 SF.

Ms. Caliendo asked if there is anything else to add. Mr. Scott said that there is a note in staff comments about not seeing the solid wall at the back of the porch. They are not planning on taking it out. Ms. Tully noted the drawing error.

Mr. Scott added that they were shooting grade out there today and noted that with the lowered roofline on garage, they are over a foot lower than the existing roofline and taking into consideration that the grade drops off 12-14" depending on where I shot my level. That's the low side of the house. On the 608 Oakwood garage example the height must be must be taken from the back yard where it slopes dramatically. Ms. Tully said that looking at fact 9-- the garage is at 18' tall, with a 2' grade reduction it would effectively be even lower.

Ms. Scott is fine with strips for most of the driveway.

Mr. Scott is said that their lot is much deeper than most others. They are not pressed up against the property line.

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

Mr. Belledin addressed staff noting that in the file for 608 Oakwood Avenue it looks like the garage is a replacement of a structure that was there. He asked if she was aware of any other types like this that were not replacements. Ms. Scott said that there was a carriage house on the property before and can show Sanborn maps. Ms. Tully added that the garage at 608 Oakwood is bigger than the one that was torn down. Mr. Belledin said that the original was little.

Mr. Belledin referenced the examples of one story additions and asked if they knew of any that have covered porches. Mr. Scott said no, and if that's the hang up, let's remove that. He noted that they can always come back later with more evidence. He added that if you include the covered porch, it is still only 6-8' longer than the other examples. Ms. Scott noted that they didn't differentiate with the covered porch as a conservative reading of guidelines. It is a bit gray.

Mr. Belledin noted that the garage will read substantially lower.
Ms. David told the applicants that they did a lot of homework.

At Ms. Caliendo's suggestion Ms. David 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]:
There are two issues: scale of garage; scale of addition. Didn't get any more details on porch. [Caliendo]

They did a good job illustrating the depth that some of the houses in Oakwood go to. Betsy Buford's is very similar, but the rest of the examples are subservient. At 508 Bloodworth the stuff that's going on in the back is constantly going down and pops up for what was a detached kitchen in the back. It is a very common form to drop down and pop back up. The concern I have is that the proposal doesn't have the variation of roof lines and wall planes. The house on 608 Polk Street has a 1994 addition and even though it may be tall, the connection is so low it reads as two separate rooflines. Their examples support the need to have more variation in roof lines and wall planes on the way back, and helped me think scale is not so much about scale or square footage, but the one-ness of it. [David]
Would lowering the middle help? [Downer]
And with the rear porch roof, it just makes it much longer, but if they're willing to give that up, I'm fine with it. With the comment about the slope, the garage would actually be 2'lower than house and taking 2' off width helps. [Caliendo]
And with dormers? [Belledin]
That reinforces the heft of it. [David]
If that other garage is not 6' lower, then it's not what they represented. The slope helps, but the question is how much lower does it have to be to make it subservient? [Belledin]
We could reopen the public hearing. [Caliendo]
Are there any other points we want to raise so we can open it just once. [Belledin]
Look at fact 7 on page 6 regarding garage height. [Tully]

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Ms. Scott asked the committee to look at page 40, which is the series of additions directly across the street at 315 N Boundary. The noted that this white section is what they left, and the top picture is the 2003 addition. Last year they had another approved addition which really doubled the size of the historic section and continues that same roofline back.

Regarding the garage Mr. Belledin suggested that they should go lower and add dormers, or keep the height and have no dormers. Mr. Scott noted that as far as scale goes, it will look much smaller because it's so far back.
Ms. Scott said that the volume of structure at 608 Oakwood is much larger to their house than this house. Ms. Tully noted that the commission is trying to balance numbers and perception of how it looks from street. She said that if the dormers didn't go all the way up to the peak of the roof but were midway on roof, it wouldn't be perceived as so big. Roofs of dormers shouldn't be at the ridge of the house.

Mr. Belledin said that procedurally we can't really…Ms. Tully interjected that they could kick it to staff, and if it looks to staff like it's a question, it would be brought back for administrative approval.

Ms. Tully also noted that the challenge you have with this house is that it did not get added on to over time as the other houses did. The existing additions on these examples are small. The addition you're looking at is new to old. The committee has to decide if it's okay to add all this new when nothing was added over time.

Ms. Scott added that the house sat empty for decades so it's unusual. If they had brought the Boundary at one time it never would have been approved. They want to do the right thing for the house and if the committee thinks that lowering the connector will help, they will. Mr. Scott pointed out that 621 Lane looks like 1′ or 1½′ lower.

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

Committee Discussion (2)

I'm not sure how to go about doing it. 321 E Lane has a lot of in and out over there. [David]
So you're advocating lowering the roof of the addition in deference to the house. [Belledin]
Yes, would make it condition. [Caliendo]
I agree with lowering the connector piece. I don't feel as strongly about the covered porch. There is a lot of reach back there, but it is a lot lower. I think it would come closer to the guidelines without the porch [David]
What does that do to the chimney? [Tully]
That's part of the discussion; the wall with chimney extends back and reads as a mass [Belledin]
Chimney also? [Caliendo]
The outdoor fireplace can be lower. Other than one extreme example, which I feel was a mistake on the part of the committee, the extra makes it too long. [Belledin]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Mr. Belledin and seconded by Ms. David, Mr. Belledin moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comments A. (inclusive of facts 1-6), B. (inclusive of facts 1-4), C. (inclusive of facts 1-16), D. (inclusive of facts 1-12), and E. (inclusive of facts 1-9) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as stated below:

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

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

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

3* The roof above the wall is not likely original; due to severe water infiltration affecting structural members, the wall would have to be removed and rebuilt.
4* The application proposes a new wall inset from the corner of the house and sheathed in fiber cement siding.
5* Removal of the wall also eliminates an existing wood window.
6* At the July public hearing the applicants stated that they are fine about re-doing that section and that the window is being restored. The amended application does not yet address this revision.

B. Removal of porch posts; installation of new porch posts and railing replicating another house is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.8.1, 3.8.4, 3.8.5; however replicating details from another house is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.8.10 and the following findings:
1* At the July public hearing the applicant stated that Jeff Adolphsen from the State Historic Preservation Office looked at house and noted that the railings don't seem to be original and that the columns seem to be from before the 1920s. The applicant also stated that the siding and flooring were likely redone within the last 15-20 years
2* The applicant stated that Matthew Brown researched the house and determined that house was a Julius Lewis & Co. home. The house at 312 E Jones Street with chamfered posts was provided as an example and would not be replicated.
3* The proposed new porch details are not based on historic evidence and are too elaborate for the historic house.
4* The roof of the porch is proposed to be metal, a traditional porch roof material; details, specifications and color chip were not included in the application.

C. Construction of a new 30'x41' 1-story rear addition with 18'x16' rear porch with chimney is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.6, 2.3.8, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9; however, the scale of the addition with rear covered porch and wall is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 4.2.6 and the following findings:
1* At the public hearing the applicant stated that no trees are proposed for removal because of the location of the addition. The landscape plan only shows the site with the addition in place; a tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture was provided in the amended application for the 40" dbh American Elm tree at the front left corner of the property.
2* The lot size is 10,454 SF. The footprint of the existing house (including porch) is 1,500 SF; current lot coverage is 14%. The proposed addition with porches is approximately 2,487 SF; with the remaining house and porch, the total proposed footprint is 3,268 SF with a lot coverage of 31%.
3* The proposed addition is located on the rear of the house; it is inset from the historic house and gets wider towards the rear; a proposed front elevation drawing is not included in the application. Height is 1'2" lower than the historic house.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

12* Having one solid wall on a rear porch is atypical; the landscape plan notes the possible screened enclosure of porch; addition drawings do not indicate a screened enclosure.

13* While unusual to have an exterior fireplace, its location on a solid wall makes it appear as though it is within the interior of the house.

14* Detailed drawings of the proposed addition and porch were not included in the application.

15* There was testimony at the public hearing regarding the additions at 315 N Boundary Street. Mr. Andy Penry stated that a 2nd level addition was approved in 2103. He stated that there was a discussion on whether the addition overpowered house. It was argued that there wasn't a change in the roofline, so nothing was looming over the historic portion of the house. The committee asked for the minutes from the hearing.

16* The committee requested examples of long additions in Oakwood either approved by the commission or historically added or a revised proposal that reduces the scale of the addition; neither was provided to staff. Numerous examples of 1-story long additions were provided at the hearing; the additions shown were generally subservient. The examples were primarily multiple additions over time and to the best of the applicants' knowledge did not included covered porches.

D. Construction of new 22'x26' 1-1/2 story 2-bay garage is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.6.5, 2.6.6, 2.6.9 and the following findings.

1* The proposed garage will sit on the critical root zone of a large tree; the application states that garage will have a slab foundation that sits on a stalite expanded slate lightweight aggregate foundation to ensure the health of the tree; at the public hearing the applicant stated that that he has worked a lot with the Stalite material. Mr. Penry, the owner of 315 N Boundary Street testified that the same material was used at his property when his garage was constructed in 2005. He said that the product maintains air and water flow to the roots of trees and that the trees on his property are still in good condition.

2* The lot size is 10,454 SF. The proposed addition with porches and remaining house and porch has a total proposed footprint of 3,268 SF for lot coverage of 31%. The proposed garage is 572 SF for new total lot coverage of 37%.

3* The location of the proposed garage in the rear corner of the lot and at the end of the driveway is consistent with the traditional placement of accessory structures in the district.

4* There is not a tradition of 2-story garages/carriage houses in Oakwood. Staff is aware of one historic 1-1/2-story horse barn accessory building at the architecturally-elaborate Heck-Pool House at 218 N. East Street.

5* There have been committee-approved exceptions of taller and 2-bay garages. After an initial denial due to lack of evidence, in 2006 a 1½-story, 15′ x 17′ storage building with loggia and exterior stair was approved at 715 N. Bloodworth Street (COA 166-06-CA). Examples provided in that case include 218 N East Street, 403 E Edenton Street, 121 N Bloodworth Street, and in the 300 block of Polk Street (behind 425 N Bloodworth Street) – except for 121 N Bloodworth Street all of the houses associated with the garages are 2-stories or taller. 121 N Bloodworth Street is one-story, but the approved garage was a 2-bay 1-story structure (COA 135-97-CA).

6* In 2008, based in part on the 2006 decision referenced in fact 4*, the commission approved a 1½-story, 22′x27′ garage at 608 Oakwood Avenue (COA 212-07-CA). That garage was 21′6.5″ tall, compared to the 28′2″ height of the historic house.

7* The garage at 315 N Boundary Street (COA 090-03-CA) was approved to be 18′ in height and 24′x22′8″ in footprint; the committee required a reduction in the height be reduced to at least 10% less than the main house 1-story addition height from the proposed 20′.

8* In the amended application the new garage is proposed to be 22′ wide by 26′ deep. The garage at 608 Oakwood Avenue was approved with a width of 22′3″.

9* The historic house at 323 Pace Street is approximately 19′ tall; in the amended application the proposed garage is 18′ tall which is the same height as the new addition on the rear of the main house. The applicant stated at the public hearing that lot slopes to the rear and with the slope of the site, the ridge of the garage would be approximately two feet lower than that of the house.

10* Accessory buildings are characteristically subservient to the main dwelling.

11* The proposed materials are lap siding fiber cement lap siding; hardie trim; asphalt shingles; and garage doors. Specifications for the garage doors were not included in the application.

12* Sanborn maps were distributed at the hearing by the applicant. The 1914 map shows an accessory building on the lot, the 1950 map shows a garage on the lot, and the maps indicate that the lot reached its current size between 1909 and 1914.

E. Installation of a 20'x30' rear brick patio; installation of rear stone patios; removal of 3 trees; planting of 2 new trees; replacement of front concrete walk with brick; alteration of existing driveway; addition of parking area by garage; construction of brick wall at rear of yard; installation of front yard fence and driveway gate is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section 2.3.5, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.5 and the following findings.
(Raleigh City Code Section 10.2.15.E.1. states that "An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure or site within any Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark may not be denied…However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of issuance…If the Commission finds that the building, structure or site has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark, it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal.")

1* The lot size is 10,454 SF. The proposed house and addition with porches and garage has a total proposed footprint of 3,840 SF for lot coverage of 37%. The proposed new patios and driveway is approximately 1,930 SF for new total lot coverage of 55%.

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

3* A photograph of the front fence design was included in the amended application; the 3' tall fence is a traditional picket fence design found throughout Oakwood.

4* The arched driveway gate is metal pickets whereas the front fence is wood pickets.

5* Trees at the rear of the lot in the location of the proposed patio were also evaluated by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture, but no recommendations were made with regard to the patio. The discussion was only about a future pool.

6* A tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture was provided in the amended application for the 40" dbh American Elm tree at the front left corner of the property, but did not include a discussion of impacts alterations to and extensions of the driveway.

7* The *Guidelines* say that "Typically, driveways were made of gravel or compacted soil. Often a grass median separated two gravel or aggregate textured concrete runners. Occasionally, more decorative brick or stone pavers were used."

8* The proposal is for a solid brick and/or concrete driveway.

9* The landscape plan shows walls around the proposed patio; an outdoor fireplace; a kitchen/grill area; brick wall; no drawings of the proposed changes were included in the application. The amended application included photograph of proposed materials. There is insufficient information to make a determination regarding these items

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

Decision on the Application

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Mr. Belledin and seconded by Ms. David, Mr. Belledin made an amended motion that the application be approved in part and deferred in part:

Defer approval of the walls around the proposed patio; the outdoor fireplace; the kitchen/grill area; and the brick wall with the request that additional drawings and information be provided regarding the proposed changes.

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

1. That the remaining 1909 wall be rebuilt in the same location with wood siding and reusing the historic window.
2. That the new front porch details be simpler than the sample provided in the application.
3. That the scale of the addition and rear porch be reduced with the revised drawings to be reviewed by the committee as an administrative review of conditions.
4. That the roof and wall of the rear porch be removed with the revised design for the fireplace and any low wall be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction.
5. That the siding on the addition be painted.
6. That the driveway be driving strips for a majority of its length.
7. That details and specifications of the addition for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits for the addition:
    a. Location of the tree and associated fencing in drawing form to accompany the written tree protection plan provided;
    b. New windows;
    c. Eave construction detail;
    d. Revised drawings.
8. That details and specifications of the addition for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits for the garage:
    a. Eave construction detail;
    b. Garage doors;
    c. Windows;
    d. Revisions to the design including introduction of dormers.
9. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
    a. Doors;
    b. Siding reveal;
    c. Roofing material;
    d. Brick foundation sample;
    e. New front porch posts and railing;
    f. Paint colors;

g. Light fixtures and locations;
h. Ramp;
i. Driveway;
j. Outdoor porch fireplace.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 2/11/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

104-14-CA 106 S WILMINGTON ST
Applicant: IN SITU STUDIO
Received: 7/10/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 10/8/2014 1) 8/11/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: DOD, BUS
Nature of Project: Add elevated wood-framed deck to rear of existing building; change window to a door on rear of building.
Amendment: Per emails from August 7 and 8, 2014 the application is amended to include a change to previously approved COA 096-14-MW regarding replacement of non-historic windows. Revised drawings are attached to these comments.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
3.7	Windows and Doors	Change window to a door on rear of building; change sill height of windows.
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Add elevated wood-framed deck to rear of existing building

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Addition of elevated wood-framed deck to rear of existing building; alteration of windows is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.7.9, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, and the following findings:
1* There is an existing 1-story kitchen CMU addition on which the deck will sit.
2* One rear window is proposed to be converted to a door to allow access to the deck; specifications for the new door were not included in the application.
3* Three windows on the rear and rear side are proposed to have raised sills; the lower window opening will be filled with brick similar in color to the existing brick. This change is approvable staff as a Minor Work, but is included here for administrative efficiency.
4* The wood deck will be flanked by parged CMU walls and topped by a stainless steel cable trellis. The new walls are several feet below the height of the historic building.
5* The stainless steel cable trellis is shown to run between the new walls and not attached to the historic building.
6* There is a window-sized access door on the south wall.

7* The floor of the new deck will be at the existing 2nd floor level and not sit directly on the roof of the existing kitchen. It will be supported by new CMU walls.
8* The rear of the building is at the edge of the district and is not character defining. The building is flanked by two approximately 6.5′ wide alleys.
9* Exterior lights are proposed on the inward facing walls; specifications were not included in the application.

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

1. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
    a. Rear door;
    b. Steel cable trellis;
    c. Light fixtures.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support:
Matt Griffith [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. He noted that the deck is not visible and is above a non-historic addition. He also noted that the change in the window sill heights is due to a requirement of Wake County Environmental. He added that the brick removed for installation of the new door would be used to patch the shortened sills.

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

At Mr. Shackleton's suggestion Ms. David moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Mr. Belledin 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 1-9) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following addition as stated below:

A. Addition of elevated wood-framed deck to rear of existing building; alteration of windows is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.7.9, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, and the following findings:
1* There is an existing 1-story kitchen CMU addition on which the deck will sit.

2* One rear window is proposed to be converted to a door to allow access to the deck; specifications for the new door were not included in the application.
3* Three windows on the rear and rear side are proposed to have raised sills; the lower window opening will be filled with brick similar in color to the existing brick. This change is approvable staff as a Minor Work, but is included here for administrative efficiency.
4* The wood deck will be flanked by parged CMU walls and topped by a stainless steel cable trellis. The new walls are several feet below the height of the historic building.
5* The stainless steel cable trellis is shown to run between the new walls and not attached to the historic building.
6* There is a window-sized access door on the south wall.
7* The floor of the new deck will be at the existing 2nd floor level and not sit directly on the roof of the existing kitchen. It will be supported by new CMU walls.
8* The rear of the building is at the edge of the district and is not character defining. The building is flanked by two approximately 6.5′ wide alleys.
9* Exterior lights are proposed on the inward facing walls; specifications were not included in the application.
10* The brick from the new door opening will be reused to infill the shortened windows.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
    a. Rear door;
    b. Steel cable trellis;
    c. Light fixtures.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 2/11/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

105-14-CA 504 E JONES ST (CAMERON-MAYNARD-GATLING HOUSE)
Applicant: JUSTIN BONER AND KIERNAN MCGORTY
Received: 7/15/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 10/13/2014 1) 8/11/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT & RALEIGH HISTORIC LANDMARK
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Reconstruct original front porch
Amendments: In reviewing the application staff found the following additional proposed change: replace front concrete walk with brick.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Setting	Reconstruct original front porch
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	Replace front concrete walk with brick
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	Reconstruct original front porch

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Reconstruction of original front porch is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.5.1, 3.8.1, 3.8.6, 3.8.10, and the following findings:

1* A tree protection plan is included for preservation of the magnolia tree on the property.
2* The application states that the original front porch was removed in the 1940s.
3* The c. 1870 house is a one-story, wood frame house with a hip roof. As seen in the 1872 Bird's Eye View of Raleigh map, the house originally had a nearly full-width front porch with a hipped roof supported by pairs of slender square-section posts.
4* A c. 1919 photograph shows a corner of the front porch in the background.
5* Sanborn Fire Insurance maps included in the application also show evidence of a former full-width front porch.
6* Drawings of the proposed porch design are included in the application; section drawings of the railing and posts that clearly delineate details were not included.
7* The proposed porch will be 33' wide by 7' deep. Physical evidence of the size of the original porch was discovered when the house was scraped and repainted (photos included). At that time the original end piers were dug up and sit 7 feet out from the front of the house.

8* The new porch and brick foundation will be painted to match the existing house.
9* To construct the porch, the existing brick stoop, azalea and holly bushes, and circular concrete path leading to the brick stoop will be removed.

B. Replacement of front concrete walk with brick is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section 2.5.1, 2.5.5, and the following findings:
1* To construct the porch, the existing circular concrete path will be removed.
2* The existing concrete front walk is proposed to be replaced with brick.
3* Numerous brick sidewalks, both historic and recent, exist in the historic district. Historic brick walks can be found at 525 E. Jones Street, among many others.
4* No brick paver sample or pattern is included in the application

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

1. That the following specifications and details be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Large scale section drawings of the porch posts and railing that illustrate the construction.
   b. Brick sample and paver pattern.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Justin Boner [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. He said that the recommendations seem legitimate.

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

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
I just want to be clear with staff that the difference in this case is that we have photographic evidence and Sanborn maps to justify the enhanced porch. [Belledin]

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 1-9) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-4) to be acceptable as findings of fact as listed below:

A. Reconstruction of original front porch is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.5.1, 3.8.1, 3.8.6, 3.8.10, and the following findings:

1* A tree protection plan is included for preservation of the magnolia tree on the property.
2* The application states that the original front porch was removed in the 1940s.
3* The c. 1870 house is a one-story, wood frame house with a hip roof. As seen in the 1872 Bird's Eye View of Raleigh map, the house originally had a nearly full-width front porch with a hipped roof supported by pairs of slender square-section posts.
4* A c. 1919 photograph shows a corner of the front porch in the background.
5* Sanborn Fire Insurance maps included in the application also show evidence of a former full-width front porch.
6* Drawings of the proposed porch design are included in the application; section drawings of the railing and posts that clearly delineate details were not included.
7* The proposed porch will be 33' wide by 7' deep. Physical evidence of the size of the original porch was discovered when the house was scraped and repainted (photos included). At that time the original end piers were dug up and sit 7 feet out from the front of the house.
8* The new porch and brick foundation will be painted to match the existing house.
9* To construct the porch, the existing brick stoop, azalea and holly bushes, and circular concrete path leading to the brick stoop will be removed.

B. Replacement of front concrete walk with brick is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section 2.5.1, 2.5.5, and the following findings:

1* To construct the porch, the existing circular concrete path will be removed.
2* The existing concrete front walk is proposed to be replaced with brick.
3* Numerous brick sidewalks, both historic and recent, exist in the historic district. Historic brick walks can be found at 525 E. Jones Street, among many others.
4* No brick paver sample or pattern is included in the application

The motion was seconded by Mr. Belledin; passed 4/0.

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

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

1. That the following specifications and details be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Large scale section drawings of the porch posts and railing that illustrate the construction.
   b. Brick sample and paver pattern.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Belledin; passed 4/0.

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

<u>Certificate expiration date</u>: 2/11/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

106-14-CA 217 E SOUTH ST
Applicant: TELEGRAPH ROAD PROPERTIES LLC
Received: 7/23/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 10/21/2014 1) 8/11/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: PRINCE HALL HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: DOD, RB
Nature of Project: Build addition on rear of existing home; add new windows and doors; add new front porch railing
Amendments: Revised drawings and photos of the proposed windows were provided August 5 and 11 and are attached to these comments. Based on further review of the application staff found the following additional proposed changes: replacement of windows and doors on historic structure.
DRAC: This application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee (DRAC) on August 4, 2014. Present were Erin Sterling, Curtis Kasefang, Dan Becker and David Maurer. Also present were Jason Queen, Rodney Axtman, and Tania Tully.
Conflict of Interest: Mr. Belledin said he must recuse himself from this application because of a potential future business relationship with the applicant. Ms. David moved to allow him to leave the room. Ms. Downer seconded; motion passed 4/0.
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 Setting	Construct rear addition
3.6	Exterior Walls	Remove non-historic siding
3.7	Windows and Doors	Replace windows
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	Replace front porch railing
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Construct rear addition

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Construction of rear addition; removal of non-historic siding is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.8, 4.2.1, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9 and the following findings:
1* There are no trees on this or the adjacent properties that may be impacted by construction of the addition.

2* The lot size is 2, 568 SF. The footprint of the existing house (including porch) is 777 SF; current lot coverage is 30%. Including the proposed addition and porch the total proposed footprint is approximately 1,166 SF for lot coverage of 45%.
3* The existing house is a 1-story, three-bay three room Victorian shotgun-form frame house with synthetic siding, an asphalt-shingled front-gable roof with a diamond-shaped vent, and a front porch. It is a contributing resource to the historic district.
4* The rear room and a non-historic shed addition is proposed to be removed to accommodate the new addition. No evidence was included in the application stating why the east wall of the rear room needs to be removed to accommodate the new addition.
5* The proposed addition is at the rear and rear-side of the house. The rear portion is an extrusion of the existing roof and the side portion is a lower shed roof addition. Shed roofed side additions and rear extrusions are common ways to add onto narrow houses.
6* The side portion of the addition is set back approximately half way from the front of the house and includes a front porch which visually lessens the impact of the addition.
7* A corner board is shown to remain on the east side but seems to be in the wrong location to delineate the new addition.
8* The non-historic siding is proposed for removal with the historic wood siding underneath to be restored. The amended application removes all references to fiber cement siding.
9* The siding of the addition will match the historic wood siding on the existing house. The entire house will be re-roofed with asphalt shingles and the foundations will be parged. The eave detail and roof specifications are included in the application.
10* Paint colors were included in the application; paint chips were not.
11* The current foundation is a mix of brick piers infilled with concrete.

B. Addition of new railing; replacement of windows; replace front door in house is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.6.10, 3.7.1, 3.7.6, 3.8.1, 3.8.6, and the following findings:
1* Photos of all of the windows proposed for removal were not included in the application.
2* Staff inspection of the property revealed that there is not a single window on the house that is intact. Most of the windows have rebuilt muntins with atypical numbers and sizes of lites. One window has what appears to be a 6-lite sash installed sideways.
3* The new windows are proposed to be 2/2 wood sash, which is what the windows appear to have once been.
4* Except for the muntin profile, specifications for the new windows were provided.
5* The railing proposed for replacement is not historic. The new wood railing is of a traditional inset picket design. A section drawing is included in the application.
6* The proposed new doors are traditional wood single lite doors.

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

1. That only the walls being enveloped by the addition be removed and that the east wall remain.

2. That the parging of the foundation use a formulation that is softer than standard concrete so as to avoid damage to the historic brick.
3. That documentation of the existing windows and evidence that they are not historic be provided to and approved by staff prior to removal.
4. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard form of the COA:
   a. Window muntin profile.
5. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Retained corner board location
   b. Paint chips.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tania Tully [affirmed] stated that the staff comments have the incorrect lot size and lot coverage. She provided the correct numbers and noted that the only revision in the amended drawings is that they remove any reference to using fiber cement siding.

Support:
Jason Queen [affirmed] and Rodney Axtman [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Queen asked about staff recommended condition 3 and the documentation to staff that the windows are not historic. He asked for clarification on what is needed. Ms. Tully said that staff is comfortable that they aren't salvageable, but need pictures for the record. She stated that she visited the site and observed every window. The committee could change it to say that they provide a photo of every window.

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

Ms. David asked for clarification on which wall staff was talking about. Ms. Tully said it was the east wall, on the right.

At Ms. Caliendo's suggestion Ms. Downer moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Ms. David seconded; motion carried 3/0.

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
This seems pretty straightforward. [Caliendo]
A nice little project. [Downer]

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 comments A. (inclusive of facts 1-11), B. (inclusive of facts 1-6) and C. (inclusive of facts 1-6) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications as listed below:

A. Construction of rear addition; removal of non-historic siding is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.8, 4.2.1, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9 and the following findings:

1* There are no trees on this or the adjacent properties that may be impacted by construction of the addition.

2* The lot size is 3.529 SF. The footprint of the existing house (including porch) is 777 SF; current lot coverage is 22%. Including the proposed addition and porch the total proposed footprint is approximately 1,166 SF for lot coverage of 33%.

3* The existing house is a 1-story, three-bay three room Victorian shotgun-form frame house with synthetic siding, an asphalt-shingled front-gable roof with a diamond-shaped vent, and a front porch. It is a contributing resource to the historic district.

4* The rear room and a non-historic shed addition is proposed to be removed to accommodate the new addition. No evidence was included in the application stating why the east wall of the rear room needs to be removed to accommodate the new addition.

5* The proposed addition is at the rear and rear-side of the house. The rear portion is an extrusion of the existing roof and the side portion is a lower shed roof addition. Shed roofed side additions and rear extrusions are common ways to add onto narrow houses.

6* The side portion of the addition is set back approximately half way from the front of the house and includes a front porch which visually lessens the impact of the addition.

7* A corner board is shown to remain on the east side but seems to be in the wrong location to delineate the new addition.

8* The non-historic siding is proposed for removal with the historic wood siding underneath to be restored. The amended application removes all references to fiber cement siding.

9* The siding of the addition will match the historic wood siding on the existing house. The entire house will be re-roofed with asphalt shingles and the foundations will be parged. The eave detail and roof specifications are included in the application.

10* Paint colors were included in the application; paint chips were not.

11* The current foundation is a mix of brick piers infilled with concrete.

B. Addition of new railing; replacement of windows; replace front door in house is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.6.10, 3.7.1, 3.7.6, 3.8.1, 3.8.6, and the following findings:

1* Photos of all of the windows proposed for removal were not included in the application.

2* Staff inspection of the property revealed that there is not a single window on the house that is intact. Most of the windows have rebuilt muntins with atypical numbers and sizes of lites. One window has what appears to be a 6-lite sash installed sideways.

3* The new windows are proposed to be 2/2 wood sash, which is what the windows appear to have once been.
4* Except for the muntin profile, specifications for the new windows were provided.
5* The railing proposed for replacement is not historic. The new wood railing is of a traditional inset picket design. A section drawing is included in the application.
6* The proposed new doors are traditional wood single lite doors.

The motion was seconded by Ms. David; passed 3/0.

Decision on the Application

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

1. That only the walls being enveloped by the addition be removed and that the east wall remain.
2. That the parging of the foundation use a formulation that is softer than standard concrete so as to avoid damage to the historic brick.
3. That photographic documentation of the existing windows be provided to and approved by staff prior to removal.
4. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard form of the COA:
   a. Window muntin profile.
5. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Retained corner board location
   b. Paint chips.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Davis; passed 3/0.

Committee members voting: Caliendo, David, Downer.

Certificate expiration date: 2/11/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

107-14-CA 324 E. DAVIE ST
Applicant: TELEGRAPH ROAD PROPERTIES
Received: 7/23/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 10/21/2014 1) 8/11/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: PRINCE HALL HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: DOD, RB
Nature of Project: Construct new two-story single family house
Amendments: Revised drawings were provided August 7, 2014 and are attached to these comments.
DRAC: This application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee (DRAC) on August 4, 2014. Present were Erin Sterling, Curtis Kasefang, Dan Becker and David Maurer. Also present were Jason Queen, Rodney Axtman, and Tania Tully.
Conflict of Interest: Mr. Belledin said he must recuse himself from this application because of a potential future business relationship with the applicant. Ms. David moved to allow him to leave the room. Ms. Downer seconded; motion passed 4/0.
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 Setting	Construct new two-story single family house
4.3	New Construction	

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

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

1* There are trees on the property to the east that may be impacted by construction activities. A tree protection plan is not included in the application.

2* The lot is 2,568 SF; the footprint of the proposed house (including porch) is approximately 824 SF for lot coverage of 32%, which is within the norm for Prince Hall.

3* The application documents that the house will be set back 20 feet and align with the house to the west. The house is set toward the east side of the lot to allow for the introduction of a previously approved joint driveway on the east.

4* The proposed house is 15′8″-foot-wide, 47′4″-foot-deep shotgun form with a two-story camelback addition; it includes a full-width front porch. The front portion of the house has a gable front roof and the 2nd level at the rear has a hipped roof to reduce its apparent height.
5* Heights of nearby properties are not in included in the application; the house immediately to the west is one story, the house to the south is two stories.
6* The lot sits several feet above the sidewalk and is accessed via existing concrete steps similar to other houses on the block.
7* The application does not include any landscaping; houses typically have a walkway that runs from the public sidewalk to the front of the house.
8* Camel back shotgun form houses are a traditional form seen, although rarely, in Raleigh.
9* The front façade of the house has symmetrically placed windows. Windows on the sides of the house appear to have some logic as is traditional and are of typical vertical proportion.
10* The proposed 2/1 wood windows are seen throughout the district on houses from the period of significance.
11* Proposed materials are painted 5″ reveal fiber cement siding, wood windows, wood doors, and parged foundation. Details and specifications were included in the application. It was not specified that the fiber cement siding would be smooth. Paint colors were included with the application, but paint chips were not.
12* Painted smooth faced fiber cement siding and synthetic trim are regularly approved for detached new construction in the historic districts; most recently at 219 E Lenoir Street.
13* The committee has not yet approved the use of fiber cement shingles; a decorative vent would be a more traditional detail.
14* Detail drawings were included in the application.

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

1. That the fiber cement siding have a smooth surface and be painted.
2. That the gable end have horizontal siding to match the rest of the house.
3. That there be a concrete walk extending from the existing steps to the front of the house.
4. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Front walk;
   b. Paint chips.
5. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard form of the COA:
   a. Location of trees on the property to the east;
   b. A tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan if applicable.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support:
Jason Queen [affirmed] and Rodney Axtman [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Queen said he had nothing to add.

Ms. David asked for clarification. The drawing shows 2/2 windows, but staff comments say 2/1. Mr. Queen said they should be 2/2.

Ms. David asked the applicants reaction to the siding being plain in the gable end. Mr. Queen said that wood shakes were cost prohibitive. Tania Tully [affirmed] noted that no one has provided evidence yet requesting to approve fiber cement shakes.

Ms. Caliendo asked about a note on the drawing regarding decorative brackets painted white. Mr. Queen said that was an error that should be removed.

Ms. David asked if any kind of porch lighting shown. Ms. Tully said that there was nothing on the drawings.

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

At Ms. Caliendo's suggestion Ms. David moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Ms. Downer seconded; motion carried 3/0.

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
Again, a straight-forward application. [Caliendo]
A complete application. [David]
Staff hit the points. [Caliendo]

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 1-14) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following modifications as stated below:

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

1* There are trees on the property to the east that may be impacted by construction activities. A tree protection plan is not included in the application.

2* The lot is 2,568 SF; the footprint of the proposed house (including porch) is approximately 824 SF for lot coverage of 32%, which is within the norm for Prince Hall.
3* The application documents that the house will be set back 20 feet and align with the house to the west. The house is set toward the east side of the lot to allow for the introduction of a previously approved joint driveway on the east.
4* The proposed house is 15'8"-foot-wide, 47'4"-foot-deep shotgun form with a two-story camelback addition; it includes a full-width front porch. The front portion of the house has a gable front roof and the 2nd level at the rear has a hipped roof to reduce its apparent height.
5* Heights of nearby properties are not in included in the application; the house immediately to the west is one story, the house to the south is two stories.
6* The lot sits several feet above the sidewalk and is accessed via existing concrete steps similar to other houses on the block.
7* The application does not include any landscaping; houses typically have a walkway that runs from the public sidewalk to the front of the house.
8* Camel back shotgun form houses are a traditional form seen, although rarely, in Raleigh.
9* The front façade of the house has symmetrically placed windows. Windows on the sides of the house appear to have some logic as is traditional and are of typical vertical proportion.
10* The proposed 2/2 wood windows are seen throughout the district on houses from the period of significance.
11* Proposed materials are painted 5" reveal fiber cement siding, wood windows, wood doors, and parged foundation. Details and specifications were included in the application. It was not specified that the fiber cement siding would be smooth. Paint colors were included with the application, but paint chips were not.
12* Painted smooth faced fiber cement siding and synthetic trim are regularly approved for detached new construction in the historic districts; most recently at 219 E Lenoir Street.
13* The committee has not yet approved the use of fiber cement shingles; a decorative vent would be a more traditional detail.
14* Detail drawings were included in the application.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Downer; passed 3/0.

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

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

1. That the fiber cement siding have a smooth surface and be painted.
2. That the gable end have horizontal siding or cedar shakes.
3. That there be a concrete walk extending from the existing steps to the front of the house.
4. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Front walk;

   b. Paint chips;
   c. Lighting fixtures.
5. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard form of the COA:
   a. Location of trees on the property to the east;
   b. A tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan if applicable.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Downer; passed 3/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 2/11/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

108-14-CA 612 N BLOUNT ST
Applicant: BILL AND PATTI BRIDESON
Received: 7/23/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 10/21/2014 1) 8/11/2014 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BLOUNT STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: O&I-1
Nature of Project: Rebuild garage wall; replace garage roof; add garage door; remove pole-mounted outdoor light and add recessed soffit lights to garage, connector, and rear main house; remove chain link fence and replace with black aluminum fence; add wooden privacy fence with gate; add gate to existing brick wall; install wrought-iron railing on rear porch.
Amendments: Based on further review of the application staff found the following addition proposed changes: remove windows on garage. Additional information, photos and clarification of the proposal was provided August 7, 2014 and is attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes: Sanborn Fire Insurance maps and COA 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	remove chain link fence and replace with black aluminum fence; add wooden privacy fence with gate; add gate to existing brick wall
2.4	Fences and Walls	remove chain link fence and replace with black aluminum fence; add wooden privacy fence with gate; add gate to existing brick wall
2.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	rebuild garage wall; replace garage roof; add garage door; remove windows on garage
2.7	Lighting	remove pole-mounted outdoor light and add recessed soffit lights to garage, connector, and rear main house
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	install wrought-iron railing on rear porch

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Removal of chain link fence and replacement with black aluminum fence; addition of wooden privacy fence with gate; addition of gate to existing brick wall is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 2.4.1, 2.4.8, 2.4.10, and the following findings:

1* There are trees along the fence lines that may be impacted by installation of a fence; the amended application illustrates that existing chain link fence is mounted to a continuous concrete strip, but did not include information on how/where post holes will go. The amended application states that most of the roots along the fence line are bamboo.

2* Chain link fencing is a prohibited item.

3* There is an existing section of wrought iron fence that is historic, but not original to the house. The proposed new fence is black aluminum of a simpler design and 4′ tall, which is slightly lower than the existing metal fence. A dimensioned drawing was included in the application.

4* A 6′ tall wood privacy fence is proposed along the rear lot line. It will contain a car width gate of the same design as the fence. A photograph of the proposed solid vertical board fence design was included in the application; the construction is such that the fence looks the same both sides.

5* A 3′ tall new metal gate is proposed to complete the brick wall enclosure along the south property line; the design is the same as the new fence proposed on the north side of the property.

B. Rebuilding of garage wall; replacement of garage roof; addition of garage door; removal of windows is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.6.1, 2.6.4, 2.6.10 and the following findings:

1* The garage was not built at the same time as the historic house. The application states that "The garage is not original to the property, and to the best of our knowledge it was built between 1935 and 1940. Documentation of the construction date, though, has proved elusive."

2* The garage does not appear on the 1914 Sanborn Fire Insurance map, but does in 1950. The reveal of the siding of the garage is wider than the reveal on the main house.

3* The application includes photographs and a written description of the condition of the garage roof. Only the north and west roof slopes have extant tile. The roof has not been fully tiled since at least the 1990s and perhaps as long ago as 1978.

4* Standing seam metal roofing is a traditional material for historic garages; there is metal roofing already on portions of the historic house. The application proposes a metal roof close in color to the existing tile roof so as to not draw attention to the accessory structure. Specifications for the metal roof are not included in the application.

5* The primary reason for proposing to replace the tile is its weight. The application states that "the south wall of the garage must be replaced due to termite and water damage. The contractor won't guarantee that his work will support tile without a design from a structural

engineer, and current structural requirements to support tile are extremely substantial. The garage walls supported the tile roof for over 50 years, but that doesn't factor into current engineering requirements."

6* The commission has approved the replacement of slate with another material when it was deteriorated beyond repair and when structurally infeasible to replace with new slate; one example is 14-16 N East Street (COA 105-06-CA).

7* The south wall is proposed to be rebuilt without windows. The amended application states that neither of the existing windows appears to be original because they look hacked-in, as though they were salvaged from somewhere else and installed casually and because their location and height don't make any sense; they certainly don't look like part of a design.

8* The application proposes to eliminate two non-original windows from the east wall. The amended application states it will weave in new siding with the existing so as to avoid the appearance of matching vertical seams.

9* On the west elevation one garage bay is proposed to be returned to a garage door. A photograph of the proposed door design was included in the application; specifications and details were not. Information on how the new door will be framed into the opening was also not included. The amended application indicated a preference to trim the opening with plain flat trim that's 4.5 inches wide.

C. Removal of pole-mounted outdoor light and addition of recessed soffit lights to garage, connector, and rear main house; installation of wrought-iron railing on rear porch is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.7.5, 2.7.6, 2.7.7, 2.7.8, 2.7.10, 3.8.6, and the following findings:

1* The removal and addition of lighting is approvable as a minor work by staff and is included here for administrative efficiency. Specifications for the new lights were included in the application.

2* The amended application states that there will likely be two or three lights along the three sides of the garage and about every 6-10 feet along the connector with the intent to install no more than the amount needed. Specific locations were not included in the application.

3* The existing north side porch has no railing and is unsafe. The new railing is proposed to be wrought iron. A dimensioned sketch of the proposed railing is included in the application.

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

1. That fence post holes be located and dug so as to avoid damage to large tree roots.
2. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of the blue placard for of the COA:
   a. Garage door;
   b. Metal roof.
3. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Light fixture locations;

b. Garage door trim.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support:
Bill [affirmed] and Patti Brideson [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Brideson noted that in fact A.4* it says that the gate would be the width of the car. He wanted it to be wide enough for a truck to get through. Tania Tully [affirmed] apologized for the error and noted that the exact width isn't important to staff since it's going to be the same design as the fence. Mr. Brideson was ok with it changing to be up to 12' wide.

Mr. Brideson pointed that in fact B.4* it is talking about standing seam metal roofing. He said that he was planning on using copper and doesn't quite know what to specify in copper. Ms. Tully said that for metal roofs the details needed are how wide apart the pans are, how tall the standing seam is, and that it be a flat pan without striations. She added that it should also have as low a ridge cap as possible for the hip and upper ridge.

Ms. Brideson commented that she was worried that the copper might get ripped off of a one story roof and can't think of any solid copper roofs. Ms. Tully said that she has seen flat seam copper on really low sloped roofs on bump out additions. Mr. Brideson said that he thinks of copper as a bright metal and it has weathered to be darker. Ms. David said that this hasn't been used historically on roofs, but this is 1940s garage. Tile would have been great because the house has a wonderful character defining roof. She was just wondering if copper would have been on an outbuilding and didn't think so.

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

At Ms. Caliendo's suggestion Ms. David moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Ms. Downer seconded; motion carried 3/0.

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
In terms of the Design Guidelines, I have concerns about going from tile to metal. If you have to replace it, it says to replace it with same thing. 3.5.5 gives the out if not feasible, but we need to address that the Design Guidelines say that you need to go back with the tile. If not technically feasible, is what the applicants are telling us enough? We need to address that they are skirting Design Guidelines, taking into account a technical issue. [David]
It is for you to decide. Look at what the builder said, the slate decision etc. In this case, fact 3 talks about only two of the slopes having the tile. [Tully]
Facts 5 and 6 are the most important if going with a material besides tile. The builder has given us enough information. [David]

(Asked if there was there documentation on the East Street house from a structural engineer)
The application was from Greg Paul Builders, a builder. They also engaged rooftop systems engineers to evaluate the condition of roof. In the minutes, one of the facts was that 50% of the slate needed to be replaced. [Tully]
So do we feel like what their builder said was enough? [David]
Yes, unless you want them to replace it in kind. I would be more concerned if it was a carriage house that was from the same time. If we were talking about the house or even a garage from the same era this would be a different discussion. [Caliendo]
It's old but not as old as the house. The rest of the building has been pretty altered; not a pristine example of a garage. [David]
Can we ask for the applicant to provide a letter that says that the walls won't support a tile roof. [Downer]
I don't want them to have to go out and get a structural engineer. [David]
So would you be okay with a copper roof? [Caliendo]
That's just something you wouldn't see on a residential structure. [David]
I think they could find a color match with a turn-coated or baked enamel metal roof [Downer]

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

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Ms. David and seconded by Ms. Downer, 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 1-5), B. (inclusive of facts 1-9), and C. (inclusive of facts 1-3) to be acceptable as findings of fact as modified and amended below:

A. Removal of chain link fence and replacement with black aluminum fence; addition of wooden privacy fence with gate; addition of gate to existing brick wall is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 2.4.1, 2.4.8, 2.4.10, and the following findings:

1* There are trees along the fence lines that may be impacted by installation of a fence; the amended application illustrates that existing chain link fence is mounted to a continuous concrete strip, but did not include information on how/where post holes will go. The amended application states that most of the roots along the fence line are bamboo.

2* Chain link fencing is a prohibited item.

3* There is an existing section of wrought iron fence that is historic, but not original to the house. The proposed new fence is black aluminum of a simpler design and 4' tall, which is slightly lower than the existing metal fence. A dimensioned drawing was included in the application.

4* A 6' tall wood privacy fence is proposed along the rear lot line. It will contain a an up to 12' wide gate of the same design as the fence. A photograph of the proposed solid vertical board fence design was included in the application; the construction is such that the fence looks the same both sides.

5* A 3' tall new metal gate is proposed to complete the brick wall enclosure along the south property line; the design is the same as the new fence proposed on the north side of the property.

B. Rebuilding of garage wall; replacement of garage roof; addition of garage door; removal of windows is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.6.1, 2.6.4, 2.6.10, 3.5.5 and the following findings:

1* The garage was not built at the same time as the historic house. The application states that "The garage is not original to the property, and to the best of our knowledge it was built between 1935 and 1940. Documentation of the construction date, though, has proved elusive."

2* The garage does not appear on the 1914 Sanborn Fire Insurance map, but does in 1950. The reveal of the siding of the garage is wider than the reveal on the main house.

3* The application includes photographs and a written description of the condition of the garage roof. Only the north and west roof slopes have extant tile. The roof has not been fully tiled since at least the 1990s and perhaps as long ago as 1978.

4* Standing seam metal roofing is a traditional material for historic garages; there is metal roofing already on portions of the historic house. The application amended proposes a copper metal roof close in color to the existing tile roof so as to not draw attention to the accessory structure. Specifications for the metal roof are not included in the application.

5* The primary reason for proposing to replace the tile is its weight. The application states that "the south wall of the garage must be replaced due to termite and water damage. The contractor won't guarantee that his work will support tile without a design from a structural engineer, and current structural requirements to support tile are extremely substantial. The garage walls supported the tile roof for over 50 years, but that doesn't factor into current engineering requirements."

6* The commission has approved the replacement of slate with another material when it was deteriorated beyond repair and when structurally infeasible to replace with new slate; one example is 14-16 N East Street (COA 105-06-CA).

7* The south wall is proposed to be rebuilt without windows. The amended application states that neither of the existing windows appears to be original because they look hacked-in, as though they were salvaged from somewhere else and installed casually and because their location and height don't make any sense; they certainly don't look like part of a design.

8* The application proposes to eliminate two non-original windows from the east wall. The amended application states it will weave in new siding with the existing so as to avoid the appearance of matching vertical seams.

9* On the west elevation one garage bay is proposed to be returned to a garage door. A photograph of the proposed door design was included in the application; specifications and details were not. Information on how the new door will be framed into the opening was also not included. The amended application indicated a preference to trim the opening with plain flat trim that's 4.5 inches wide.

10* Copper is not commonly used for an entire residential building roof.

11* The garage is already altered architecturally.

C. Removal of pole-mounted outdoor light and addition of recessed soffit lights to garage, connector, and rear main house; installation of wrought-iron railing on rear porch is not

incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.7.5, 2.7.6, 2.7.7, 2.7.8, 2.7.10, 3.8.6, and the following findings:

1* The removal and addition of lighting is approvable as a minor work by staff and is included here for administrative efficiency. Specifications for the new lights were included in the application.

2* The amended application states that there will likely be two or three lights along the three sides of the garage and about every 6-10 feet along the connector with the intent to install no more than the amount needed. Specific locations were not included in the application.

3* The existing north side porch has no railing and is unsafe. The new railing is proposed to be wrought iron. A dimensioned sketch of the proposed railing is included in the application.

Ms. Downer agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 3/0.

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

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

1. That fence post holes be located and dug so as to avoid damage to large tree roots.
2. That the metal roof not be copper, but be terne coated or have a bake enamel finish.
3. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of the blue placard for of the COA:
   a. Garage door;
   b. Metal roof.
4. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Light fixture sizes and locations;
   b. Garage door trim.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Downer; passed 3/0.

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

<u>Certificate expiration date</u>: 2/11/15.

OTHER BUSINESS

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

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Elizabeth Caliendo
Certificate of Appropriateness Committee,
Raleigh Historic Development Commission

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner