RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
February 2, 2015

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Elizabeth Caliendo called the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Committee meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Tania Tully, Preservation Planner, called the roll as follows:
Present: Elizabeth Caliendo, Sarah David, Don Davis, Miranda Downer, Laurie Jackson
Staff Present: Tania Tully, Martha Lauer

Approval of the January 5, 2015 Minutes

Ms. David moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing and to adopt said minutes as submitted. Mr. Davis seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

Minor Works

There were no questions regarding the Minor Work report.

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

Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address	Affirmed
Chad Wilkins, 715 Mountford Avenue 27603	Yes
Parker Shanahan, 520 N Blount Street 27604	Yes
Michael Ruiz, 110 E Hargett Street 27601	Yes
Darren Bridger, 110 E Hargett Street 27601	Yes
John & Nancy Brooks, 516 N Blount Street 27604	Yes
Mackey McDonald, 520 N Blount Street 27604	Yes
Franklin Haignere, 706 Dorothea Drive 27603	Yes
Nathan Romblad, 708 Dorothea Drive 27603	Yes
David Maurer, 511 Cutler Street 27603	Yes

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. David moved to approve the agenda as amended. Mr. Davis seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chair 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: 176-14-CA, 190-14-CA, 194-14-CA, 004-15-CA, 005-15-CA and 006-15-CA.

After case 004-15-CA Ms. David moved to recuse Ms. Jackson from case 005-15-CA. Ms. Downer seconded; motion carried 5/0. Ms. Jackson left the room.

Prior to convening case 006-15-CA, Ms. David moved to allow Ms. Jackson to return. Ms. Downer seconded; motion carried 4/0.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

176-14-CA 520 N BLOUNT STREET
Applicant: MAGGIE MCDONALD & MACKEY MCDONALD
Received: 11/7/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 2/5/2015 1) 12/1/2014 2) 1/5/2015 3) 2/2/2015

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BLOUNT STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: O&I-2, PDD
Nature of Project: The portion of application deferred from the January meeting is: siting for approved new 2-story house.
Amendments: Elevation drawings of the house that show portions of the adjacent houses were provided January 26, 2015 and are attached to these comments. The application was amended January 30, 2015 to center the house between the side lot lines. A site plan was provided February 2, 2015 and is attached to these comments.
DRAC: The application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its November 19 meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker and Erin Sterling; also present were Maggie McDonald, Mackey McDonald, Jon Rufty, and Tania Tully.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- File photos are available for review.
- The exact location of property lines, ownership, and legal access to driveways is a civil matter outside of the jurisdiction of the commission.
- Staff comments include testimony heard at the December and January meetings having to do with the siting of the house.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Construct new 2-story house
4.3	New Construction	Construct new 2-story house

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. The location of the house is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 4.3.1 and the following findings:

1* There are 3 trees located at the north property line. They are a 26" DBH Ash tree, a 13" DBH Sugar Maple, and a 28" DBH Water Oak. The water oak has been approved for removal.

2* A report prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture states that the north foundation of the new house would be located 9 feet away from the root flares of all 3 trees and would be a linear cut parallel with the property line and trees. It was his recommendation that based on a continuous footer and new driveway (no longer proposed) that the Ash and Water Oak be removed prior to construction due to the construction impact. There was no analysis based on pier construction rather than a continuous footer.

3* The applicants are choosing to retain the Ash and Maple trees.

4* The amended application states that the arborist believes that the house can moved 2′ north (to be centered on the lot) and still preserve the Ash tree. The first report did not consider that the front of the house is 3′ less wide than the rear. The arborist states that if the house were closer than 10.8′ to the tree it would not survive.

5* A tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture recommends soil care and fertilization, root pruning, pest management, and root invigoration to better ensure the health of the Ash and Sugar Maple trees during construction. The plan does not address other trees on adjacent properties whose roots may extend onto this property or include a drawing locating tree protection fencing and material storage.

6* The lot appears to slope up slightly from the street and then becomes relatively flat until sloping back down towards the rear; it appears from the application that the house will sit 2 to 2-1/2 feet above the ground on a brick foundation; this is consistent with other houses on the block.

7* The amended application sites house approximately in the center of the lot. This places the house 8′ from the south side lot line and 8′4″ from the north property line. A scaled site plan is included in the amended application.

8* The house fronts onto Blount Street as is typical of the district. The application states that the front yard setback for the house at 630 N. Blount Street is 31′; the adjacent houses are set back 16′ and 40′.

9* The location of the house allows for the structure on the lot to the rear to be visible from the street. It is not uncommon for accessory buildings to be visible when sited at the rear of a lot.

10* There was testimony at the January meeting that placing the house 5′ from the south property line will not allow for screening between the two houses.

11* The amended application includes elevation drawings of the house as placed between the adjacent houses prior to centering the house on the lot. A site plan showing the house centered on the lot in relationship to the adjacent houses is included.

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

1. That the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
    a. A modified tree protection plan for the new house (prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture) that addresses trees on adjacent

properties whose roots may extend onto this property and includes a drawing locating tree protection fencing and material storage.

2. That the conditions from the January 2-015 meeting still stand.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from staff comments. She noted that the application was amended to approximately center the house on the site.

Support:
Mackey McDonald [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. McDonald provided color copies of the amended site plan and a revised elevation drawing of the new house sited between the adjacent buildings. He asked about staff fact number 5 stating that there are no other trees that he's aware of. Ms. Tully stated that from aerials of the property it looked like there may be trees at the rear of the Brooks' lot whose roots extend onto this property. She stated that clarifying the extent of construction on the property would likely address the issue.

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

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
They complied with what the committee had asked them to do. The siting is more appropriate moved the few feet. [Caliendo]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Ms. David and seconded by Ms. Downer, Ms. David made an amended motion that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-10) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications as listed below:

A. The location of the house is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 4.3.1 and the following findings:

1* There are 3 trees located at the north property line. They are a 26" DBH Ash tree, a 13" DBH Sugar Maple, and a 28" DBH Water Oak. The water oak has been approved for removal.

2* A report prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture states that the north foundation of the new house would be located 9 feet away from the

root flares of all 3 trees and would be a linear cut parallel with the property line and trees. It was his recommendation that based on a continuous footer and new driveway (no longer proposed) that the Ash and Water Oak be removed prior to construction due to the construction impact. There was no analysis based on pier construction rather than a continuous footer.

3* The applicants are choosing to retain the Ash and Maple trees.

4* The amended application states that the arborist believes that the house can moved 2′ north (to be centered on the lot) and still preserve the Ash tree. The first report did not consider that the front of the house is 3′ less wide than the rear. The arborist states that if the house were closer than 10.8′ to the tree it would not survive.

5* A tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture recommends soil care and fertilization, root pruning, pest management, and root invigoration to better ensure the health of the Ash and Sugar Maple trees during construction. The plan does not address other trees on adjacent properties whose roots may extend onto this property or include a drawing locating tree protection fencing and material storage.

6* The lot appears to slope up slightly from the street and then becomes relatively flat until sloping back down towards the rear; it appears from the application that the house will sit 2 to 2-1/2 feet above the ground on a brick foundation; this is consistent with other houses on the block.

7* The amended application sites house approximately in the center of the lot. This places the house 8′ from the south side lot line and 8′4″ from the north property line. A scaled site plan is included in the amended application.

8* The house fronts onto Blount Street as is typical of the district. The application states that the front yard setback for the house at 630 N. Blount Street is 31′; the adjacent houses are set back 16′ and 40′.

9* The location of the house allows for the structure on the lot to the rear to be visible from the street. It is not uncommon for accessory buildings to be visible when sited at the rear of a lot.

10* There was testimony at the January meeting that placing the house 5′ from the south property line will not allow for screening between the two houses.

11* At the hearing, an elevation drawing of the house centered on the lot between the adjacent houses was provided. A site plan showing the house centered on the lot in relationship to the adjacent houses was included in the amended application.

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

<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 following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:

a. A modified tree protection plan for the new house (prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture) that addresses trees on adjacent properties whose roots may extend onto this property and includes a drawing locating tree protection fencing and material storage.

2. That the conditions from the January 2015 meeting still stand.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 8/2/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

190-14-CA 708 DOROTHEA DRIVE
Applicant: NATHAN ROMBLAD
Received: 12/12/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 3/12/2015 1) 1/5/2015 2) 2/2/2015 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Portion of application deferred from January meeting is: replace windows and door.
Amendments: A window survey was provided December 22, 2014 and presented at the January meeting. Additional information regarding the windows was provided January 22, 2015 and was included in the commission packets. The applicant has amended the application to only replace the front door and a few of the windows as described in the staff comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- References to the windows in the comments below use the numbering system provided by the applicant.
- Staff comments include testimony heard at the January meeting having to do with the windows and door.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
3.7	Windows and Doors	replace windows and front door

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Replacement of windows and doors that are deteriorated beyond repair is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.7.1, 3.7.4, 3.7.5, 3.7.6, 3.7.7, and the following findings

1* The applicant has not attempted to repair the windows; however, per the amended application the windows were evaluated by professionals experienced in window rehabilitation. Names were not provided.

2* An inspection was made of the windows by the applicant; the following facts are taken from the window survey, window inventory, and the associated photographs:

a. Window B1 is on the east side of the enclosed porch. It is a 6/6 wood double-hung window; based on the pulley system, the bottom sash appears to have been replaced with a newer six lite muntin configuration.
b. Windows B3 and B8 are missing. There are currently only storm windows installed.
c. Window B9 is a 6-lite fixed window that is completely rotted across the bottom of the sash and has begun to fall apart. Several muntins are broken and deteriorating. The bottom rail appears to be splitting and at least one joint has come apart.

3* The amended application proposes to replace only windows B3, B8 and B9 and the bottom sash of B1. The current bottom sash of B1 is proposed to be used to replace the missing B3. For windows B8 and B9, the applicant will salvage 6 lite picture windows that match B3.

4* None of the professionals experienced in window and door rehabilitation would provide a definitive quote regarding repair of the front door. Additional photographs documenting its condition were provided in the amended application.

5* The bulk of the damage to the front door appears to be to the stile where the latches are installed.

6* At the January hearing the applicant stated that the there's plywood over the window part of the door and that the jamb is split.

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

1. That the salvaged wood window sashes be approved by staff prior to installation.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from staff comments. She stated that the application has been amended and that it is now proposing to replace only 4 windows and the front door.

Support:
Nathan Romblad [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. He stated that he was comfortable with staff comments.

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

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
He is saving more windows. The only issue is the front door. [Caliendo]
The existing door appears to be original and the proposed door is extra Craftmany. [David]

The photos show that the damage is pretty substantial. I am glad the applicant did extra the work to provide more information. [David]
Thank you. [Caliendo]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

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

A. Replacement of windows and doors that are deteriorated beyond repair is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.7.1, 3.7.4, 3.7.5, 3.7.6, 3.7.7, and the following findings

1* The applicant has not attempted to repair the windows; however, per the amended application the windows were evaluated by professionals experienced in window rehabilitation. Names were not provided.

2* An inspection was made of the windows by the applicant; the following facts are taken from the window survey, window inventory, and the associated photographs:
   a. Window B1 is on the east side of the enclosed porch. It is a 6/6 wood double-hung window; based on the pulley system, the bottom sash appears to have been replaced with a newer six lite muntin configuration.
   b. Windows B3 and B8 are missing. There are currently only storm windows installed.
   c. Window B9 is a 6-lite fixed window that is completely rotted across the bottom of the sash and has begun to fall apart. Several muntins are broken and deteriorating. The bottom rail appears to be splitting and at least one joint has come apart.

3* The amended application proposes to replace only windows B3, B8 and B9 and the bottom sash of B1. The current bottom sash of B1 is proposed to be used to replace the missing B3. For windows B8 and B9, the applicant will salvage 6 lite picture windows that match B3.

4* None of the professionals experienced in window and door rehabilitation would provide a definitive quote regarding repair of the front door. Additional photographs documenting its condition were provided in the amended application.

5* The bulk of the damage to the front door appears to be to the stile where the latches are installed.

6* At the January hearing the applicant stated that the there's plywood over the window part of the door and that the jamb is split.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the salvaged wood window sashes be approved by staff prior to installation.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 8/2/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

194-14-CA 110 E HARGETT STREET
Applicant: 40 & HOLDING LLC C/O MICHAEL RUIZ & DARREN BRIDGER
Received: 12/12/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 3/12/2015 1) 1/5/2015 2) 2/2/2015 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: BUS, DOD
Nature of Project: [After-the-fact] construct 10'x20' wood sign in rear courtyard.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- It is the practice of the commission to treat after-the-fact applications as though the work has not yet been completed.
- The "Special Character of Moore Square Historic District" description in the *Design Guidelines for Raleigh Historic Districts* states: "Moore Square Station, a mid-1980s city project to provide a parking deck and centralized bus transit transfer facility, has an internal circulation system that accommodates buses, auto parking, and pedestrian traffic. The entire complex is carefully integrated within the historic building fabric, nestled into the center of the block behind the earlier structures that front onto Hargett, Blount, Martin and Wilmington streets."
- The application was deferred from the January meeting without discussion at the applicant's request.
- COAs mentioned 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	
2.4	Fences and Walls	construct 10'x20' wood sign in rear courtyard
2.8	Signage	

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Construction of 10'x20' wood sign in rear courtyard **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.9, 2.4.8, 2.8.2, 2.8.3, and the following findings:

1* All work is at the rear of the property, behind a privacy fence; it is visible from the rear public right-of-way, but not Hargett Street, the character defining façade of the building.

2* The location of the proposed sign is near, but not attached to, the adjacent building.

3* The sign is a 10' tall by 20' wide wood wall painted with a red, white, and blue flag background, brown cut out letters, and a bluish cityscape along the bottom.
4* The location and size of the sign is such that it has the appearance of a mural.
5* An after-the-fact mural was approved by the commission at the rear of the same building in October 2012 (COA 086-12-MW). That mural is set back in a nook between buildings and behind a second privacy fence. It is visible in the last photograph of the application.
6* There are historic examples of painted wall signs in the Moore Square district at 119 E Hargett Street (Raleigh Furniture) and 137 S Wilmington Street (Heilig-Levine).

Pending the committee's determination of whether this is a sign or a mural, staff recommends that the committee approve the application

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from staff comments. Ms. Tully stated that the application was deferred from last month prior to being heard at applicant's request. The proposal is for a 10X20 sign in the rear courtyard of the building. It her judgment it really came down to determining whether or not it is a sign or a mural.

Support:
Michael Ruiz [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. He noted that the picture shown on screen was taken in the winter and that any other time the trees are full and so the area is opaque, not visible from elsewhere.

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

Responses and Questions:
Ms. David asked the applicant if he thinks it's a sign, a fence, a wall, or a mural. Mr. Ruiz said that it's supposed to be a mural. The bottom of it is a painting of the city skyline. Ms. Tully noted that they would not have this question if it were painted on the building. The challenge in this case is that he does not own the adjacent wall.

Ms. David asked how it is attached. Mr. Ruiz said that it is supported by posts cemented in the ground, 18" from building. He tried to get approval from building owner to paint a mural, but couldn't get any response.

Ms. Jackson asked if there was any lighting other than what is seen in photos. Mr. Ruiz said no.

Ms. David asked staff why she suggested they determine what it is. Is it to find out which guidelines to use? Ms. Tully said, yes, to determine what guidelines apply. She noted that the section on signs seems to apply more to signs on the public face of a building.

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
I agree with staff that that the guidelines were really addressing the most public face of a building. [Caliendo]
It's not a sign in the traditional sense, you can only see it if you're back there. [Downer]
It reads like a mural from inside the space, but is constructed like a wall or a fence. [David]
It's a decorative item. I hesitate to call it a mural because someone down the line might want to construct something like it and call it a mural. [David]
Can we call it furniture? [David]
It is not obscuring or damaging architectural features, is not a permanent feature. [Jackson]
It's like a sculpture; a free standing decoration. [David]
Especially given its location. [Caliendo]
With that in mind, you can decide to not name it and approve it using comments. If you say it's not a sign, eliminate references to the sign section of the Guidelines. [Tully]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

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

A. Construction of 10'x20' wood structure in rear courtyard is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.9 and the following findings:

1* All work is at the rear of the property, behind a privacy fence; it is visible from the rear public right-of-way, but not Hargett Street, the character defining façade of the building.

2* The location of the proposed structure is 18" away from and not attached to the adjacent building.

3* The structure is a 10' tall by 20' wide wood wall painted with a red, white, and blue flag background, brown cut out letters, and a bluish cityscape along the bottom.

4* The location and size of the structure is such that it has the appearance of rear yard art.

5* It is not obscuring or damaging architectural features, is not a permanent feature.

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

Decision on the Application

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

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 8/2/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

004-15-CA 706 DOROTHEA DRIVE
Applicant: FRANKLIN HAIGNERE
Received: 1/13/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 4/13/2015 1) 2/2/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Extend 6' tall wood rear yard fence; alter driveway surface; replace front retaining wall
Amendments: Application clarifications were provided by the applicant January 29, 2015 and are attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- COAs mentioned 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	Extend 6' tall wood rear yard fence; alter driveway surface; replace front retaining wall
2.4	Fences and Walls	Extend 6' tall wood rear yard fence; replace front retaining wall
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	alter driveway surface

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Extension of 6' tall wood rear yard fence; replacement of front retaining wall; alteration of driveway surface; is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 2.4.6, 2.4.8, 2.5.3, and the following findings:

1* Trees were noted on the site plan. The post holes may encounter roots of an adjacent tree behind the garage. The amended application states that that post holes will be dug manually so as to avoid damage to tree roots.

2* The existing fence was constructed per COA 062-09-CA. The proposal is an extension of that fence and remains at the rear of the house. Detailed drawings of the fence and gates as well as gate hardware specifications were provided.

3* The proposed wood fence is located along the property lines as is characteristic of the district. The amended application states that the fence will be constructed using neighbor-friendly design with the structural members facing towards the subject yard.
4* A file photograph from 1994 shows that the retaining wall once had a smoother surface than it has today.
5* Concrete is a material often used historically in the district.
6* The amended application includes photographs of a wall at 603 E Lane Street with the proposed new surface texture. The new wall will have the same dimensions and design as the existing wall.
7* The driveway surface is currently a mix of concrete, asphalt and dirt. The proposal is to retain the concrete and replace the asphalt and dirt with gravel.
8* Gravel is a historic driveway material.

Staff recommends that the committee approve the amended application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from staff comments.

Support:
Franklin Haignere [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. He stated that he is looking forward to getting rid of the asphalt and stucco.

Nathan Romblad [affirmed] stated that he is an adjacent neighbor and is ok with the proposal.

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

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
It is clear from the file photograph that that the stucco has not been there, at least prior to 1994, so the proposed material is appropriate and found throughout the district. The wall will be the same size. [Jackson]
The application has a pretty big swing gate across the driveway. I don't see any operational equipment. [David]

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Ms. David asked the applicant if the gate would be mechanized,. Mr. Haignere said no, that it would be manually operated.

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

Committee Discussion (2)

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
The driveway is appropriate. [Jackson]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Mr. Davis and seconded by Ms. David, Mr. David made an amended motion that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1, 3-6) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Extension of 6' tall wood rear yard fence; replacement of front retaining wall; alteration of driveway surface; is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 2.4.6, 2.4.8, 2.5.3, and the following findings:

1* Trees were noted on the site plan. The post holes may encounter roots of an adjacent tree behind the garage. The amended application states that that post holes will be dug manually so as to avoid damage to tree roots.

2* The existing fence was constructed per COA 062-09-CA. The proposal is an extension of that fence and remains at the rear of the house. Detailed drawings of the fence and gates as well as gate hardware specifications were provided. The applicant testified that the gate will not be mechanized.

3* The proposed wood fence is located along the property lines as is characteristic of the district. The amended application states that the fence will be constructed using neighbor-friendly design with the structural members facing towards the subject yard.

4* A file photograph from 1994 shows that the retaining wall once had a smoother surface than it has today.

5* Concrete is a material often used historically in the district.

6* The amended application includes photographs of a wall at 603 E Lane Street with the proposed new surface texture. The new wall will have the same dimensions and design as the existing wall.

7* The driveway surface is currently a mix of concrete, asphalt and dirt. The proposal is to retain the concrete and replace the asphalt and dirt with gravel.
8* Gravel is a historic driveway material.

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

Decision on the Application

Mr. Davis made a motion that the application be approved.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 8/2/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

005-15-CA 511 CUTLER STREET
Applicant: DAVID MAURER & ALLISON GRAY
Received: 1/13/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 4/13/2015 1) 2/2/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Remove rear 2-story porch; construct new 2-story rear addition; replace brick patio
Amendments: Additional information regarding the proposed addition was provided January 28, 2015 and is attached to these comments.
DRAC: The application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its January 21 meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker, Jerry Traub and Curtis Kasefang; also present were David Maurer, Allison Gray, and Tania Tully.
Conflict of Interest: Ms. Jackson works for Mr. Maurer. She recused herself and left the room.
Staff Notes:

- COAs mentioned 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 rear 2-story porch; construct new 2-story rear addition; replace brick patio
3.5	Roofs	Re-roof historic house.
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Remove rear 2-story porch; construct new 2-story rear addition

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Removal of rear 2-story porch; construction of new 2-story rear addition; replacement of brick patio is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 3.5.5, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.9, and the following findings:

1* There is an existing dogwood tree that will be pruned and protected from construction impacts. A tree protection plan that also addresses other trees on the site was included in the application.

2* The existing brick patio was installed per COA 001-93-MW. It will be reconfigured to accommodate the new addition.

3* Based on the application drawings and Wake County Real Estate Data the lot is 6,098 SF. The existing built area including house, porches, port cochere, and patio is about 1,843 SF for 30% lot coverage. The proposed built area including house, porch, new addition with porches, and reconfigured patio is about 2,066 SF for 34% lot coverage.

4* The proposal removes the existing 2-story porch and adds a larger new 2-story rear addition with lower integrated porch and uncovered rear balcony.

5* The rear porch has been altered as follows:
- Screening and plywood enclosing the lower portion of the porch was removed per COA MWD-93-054.
- The upper part of the rear porch was enclosed per COA CAD-93-042.
- Existing rear porch columns were added per COA 091-04-MW.

6* The new addition is at the rear of and inset from walls of the historic house. The addition begins approximately 60 feet back from the front property line.

7* The gable and hip roofed addition attaches to the hip roofed historic house at the eave and is several feet lower than the ridge of the historic house.

8* The new porch column will match the design of the columns being removed. Detailed drawings are in the file for COA 091-04-MW.

9* The addition is proposed to be clad primarily in smooth faced Hardie Artisan siding with exposure to match that on the historic house and smooth faced Miratec trim sized to match all cornerboards, jamb and head trim, skirt boards, beam trim, and under soffit trim. A portion of the addition will have vertical V-groove wood tongue and groove siding. The addition will be painted to match the historic house.

10* The upper portion of the hipped bay is proposed to be clad in smooth Hardie-panel. Hardie-panel has not been approved for use on additions to historic buildings except in conjunction with battens. The dimensions of the area proposed for its use are between 6″ and 1 foot and it will not have exposed seams.

11* The existing house will be re-roofed with new asphalt shingles which the addition will match. Specifications were included in the application.

12* The existing rear door will be salvaged and reused.

13* Most of the windows at the rear of the house and on the porch being removed will be salvaged and reused in the addition. The two double hung windows being removed will be salvaged and used to replace missing and damaged sashes in the historic house. The application proposes wood windows for new windows in the addition. Section drawings were provided.

14* Detailed drawings of the brackets, balcony railing, windows, door, and window and door trim were included in the application.

15* Based on the application drawings and Wake County Real Estate Data the lot is 6,098 SF. The existing built mass including house, porches, and port cochere is about 1,464 SF for 24% built mass coverage. The proposed built mass including house, porch, and new addition with porches is about 1,771 SF for 29% built mass coverage.

Staff recommends that the committee approve the amended application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from staff comments. Ms. Tully noted that attached to staff comments are additional details and a rear elevation that shows that the rear hardi panels will not have exposed seams.

Support:
David Maurer [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application.

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

Ms. Caliendo noted that it was an extremely complete application.

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

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

Ms. Downer asked staff if facts 3 and 15 were different. Ms. Tully explained that she was clarifying her analysis by separating out the built area as referenced in Section 2.3 from the built mass referenced in Section 4.2. Fact 3 includes the footprints of all ground covering items from patios to houses to porches and Fact 15 only includes items with a roof.

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 1-15) to be acceptable as findings of fact as listed below:

A. Removal of rear 2-story porch; construction of new 2-story rear addition; replacement of brick patio is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 3.5.5, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.9, and the following findings:

1* There is an existing dogwood tree that will be pruned and protected from construction impacts. A tree protection plan that also addresses other trees on the site was included in the application.

2* The existing brick patio was installed per COA 001-93-MW. It will be reconfigured to accommodate the new addition.

3* Based on the application drawings and Wake County Real Estate Data the lot is 6,098 SF. The existing built area including house, porches, port cochere, and patio is about 1,843 SF for 30% lot coverage. The proposed built area including house, porch, new addition with porches, and reconfigured patio is about 2,066 SF for 34% lot coverage.

4* The proposal removes the existing 2-story porch and adds a larger new 2-story rear addition with lower integrated porch and uncovered rear balcony.

5* The rear porch has been altered as follows:
- Screening and plywood enclosing the lower portion of the porch was removed per COA MWD-93-054.
- The upper part of the rear porch was enclosed per COA CAD-93-042.
- Existing rear porch columns were added per COA 091-04-MW.

6* The new addition is at the rear of and inset from walls of the historic house. The addition begins approximately 60 feet back from the front property line.

7* The gable and hip roofed addition attaches to the hip roofed historic house at the eave and is several feet lower than the ridge of the historic house.

8* The new porch column will match the design of the columns being removed. Detailed drawings are in the file for COA 091-04-MW.

9* The addition is proposed to be clad primarily in smooth faced Hardie Artisan siding with exposure to match that on the historic house and smooth faced Miratec trim sized to match all cornerboards, jamb and head trim, skirt boards, beam trim, and under soffit trim. A portion of the addition will have vertical V-groove wood tongue and groove siding. The addition will be painted to match the historic house.

10* The upper portion of the hipped bay is proposed to be clad in smooth Hardie-panel. Hardie-panel has not been approved for use on additions to historic buildings except in conjunction with battens. The dimensions of the area proposed for its use are between 6" and 1 foot and it will not have exposed seams.

11* The existing house will be re-roofed with new asphalt shingles which the addition will match. Specifications were included in the application.

12* The existing rear door will be salvaged and reused.

13* Most of the windows at the rear of the house and on the porch being removed will be salvaged and reused in the addition. The two double hung windows being removed will be salvaged and used to replace missing and damaged sashes in the historic house. The application proposes wood windows for new windows in the addition. Section drawings were provided.

14* Detailed drawings of the brackets, balcony railing, windows, door, and window and door trim were included in the application.

15* Based on the application drawings and Wake County Real Estate Data the lot is 6,098 SF. The existing built mass including house, porches, and port cochere is about 1,464 SF for 24% built mass coverage. The proposed built mass including house, porch, and new addition with porches is about 1,771 SF for 29% built mass coverage.

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

Decision on the Application

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

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 8/2/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

006-15-CA 715 MOUNTFORD STREET
Applicant: CHARLES WILKINS, JR
Received: 1/13/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 4/13/2015 1) 2/2/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Replace 2nd level front porch rails and columns
Amendments: [After-the-fact] Install railing on first floor porch. Additional photographs of the existing posts and railings and a section drawing of the proposed railing were provided January 30 and February 2, 2015 and are attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- COAs mentioned in the comments are available for review.
- No COA was located for installation of a railing on the 1st level porch.
- After-the-fact applications are treated as though the work has not been completed.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	Replace 2nd level front porch rails and columns; install railing on first floor porch.

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Replacement of 2nd level front porch rails and columns is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.8.1, 3.8.5, 3.8.6, and the following findings:

1* The porch floor is being replaced in kind except that the extreme slope is being adjusted. Porch floors are typically installed with the boards running perpendicular to the wall of the house with no end cap. Detailed drawings were not included.

2* A COA was approved in 2003 (024-03-MW) to reduce the height of the 2nd floor railings from 41″ to 36″, decrease the spacing of the pickets, and add a piece of trim.

3* The application shows a railing height of about 40 inches. Historically, porch railings were 24″ to 30″ in height. For upper railings the commission has approved 36″ tall railings to accommodate modern building code safety issues.

4* The 1st level railing is installed at a height matching the existing brick bases and has a traditional inset picket design with eased railings. The application includes a close-up photo of the 1st floor railing.
5* Per a February 2nd phone conversation, except for height the 2nd level railing will match the 1st floor railing.
6* The existing 4x4 posts are not historic. The application leaves the existing pilasters in place. The pilasters sit on half bases in a similar fashion to the lower level bases, but appear to be narrower in width. The exact dimensions and details of the proposed columns and bases are unclear.
7* It is historically appropriate for upper porch columns to be of smaller width than lower porch columns.
8* There historic design of the upper porch posts is unknown. The application intends to mimic the downstairs design, citing 603 Cutler Street and 728 W Cabarrus Street as examples of houses with first and second floor porches. The amended application includes photographs.

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

1. That the new porch column bases be the same width as the existing half bases and that the columns have the same design as the existing 2nd level pilasters.
2. That the new porch railing be no higher than 36 inches.
3. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Detailed drawing of the porch floor installation.
   b. Detailed drawing of the new columns and bases.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from staff comments. She stated that staff recommends that the dimensions of the upper bases be the same as what's upstairs rather than match the bottom bases, and that the upper railing only be 36" high.

Support:
Charles Wilkins, Jr. [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. He stated his agreement with staff conditions.

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

Responses and Questions:
Ms. Caliendo asked if the pickets of the second story railing will also match the first. Mr. Wilkins said yes.

Mr. Davis asked about the current height of the railing. Mr. Wilkins said that he was not sure, but agrees that 36″ works. Ms. Jackson stated her concern about a code mandatory height of 42 inches. Ms. Tully said that she isn't sure what the rehab code says, but if that if it needs to be taller from a safety issue, it can be approved at the staff level.

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
The amendments really work out the details. It seems appropriate. [Jackson]
I agree. [Davis]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

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

A. Replacement of 2nd level front porch rails and columns is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.8.1, 3.8.5, 3.8.6, and the following findings:

1* The porch floor is being replaced in kind except that the extreme slope is being adjusted. Porch floors are typically installed with the boards running perpendicular to the wall of the house with no end cap. Detailed drawings were not included.

2* A COA was approved in 2003 (024-03-MW) to reduce the height of the 2nd floor railings from 41″ to 36″, decrease the spacing of the pickets, and add a piece of trim.

3* The application shows a railing height of about 40 inches. Historically, porch railings were 24″ to 30″ in height. For upper railings the commission has approved 36″ tall railings to accommodate modern building code safety issues.

4* The 1st level railing is installed at a height matching the existing brick bases and has a traditional inset picket design with eased railings. The application includes a close-up photo of the 1st floor railing.

5* Per a February 2nd phone conversation, except for height the 2nd level railing will match the 1st floor railing.

6* The existing 4x4 posts are not historic. The application leaves the existing pilasters in place. The pilasters sit on half bases in a similar fashion to the lower level bases, but appear to be narrower in width. The exact dimensions and details of the proposed columns and bases are unclear.

7* It is historically appropriate for upper porch columns to be of smaller width than lower porch columns.

8* There historic design of the upper porch posts is unknown. The application intends to mimic the downstairs design, citing 603 Cutler Street and 728 W Cabarrus Street as

examples of houses with first and second floor porches. The amended application includes photographs.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the new porch column bases be the same width as the existing half bases and that the columns have the same design as the existing 2nd level pilasters.
2. That the new porch railing be no higher than 36 inches unless required by the building code and that any revision (height and/or design) be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.
3. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Detailed drawing of the porch floor installation.
   b. Detailed drawing of the new columns and bases.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 8/2/15.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Staff Report: Appeal of 008-14-MW officially withdrawn.
2. Design Guidelines Update: Staff working on City Attorney comments.
3. Committee Discussion
    a. Application Completeness
    b. Meeting Post-Mortem

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:16 p.m.

Elizabeth Caliendo, Chair
Certificate of Appropriateness Committee,
Raleigh Historic Development Commission

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner