RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
November 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, Laurie Jackson, Kaye Webb
Staff Present: Tania Tully, Martha Lauer, Teresa Young, Dottie Leapley

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
Mary Ruffin Hanbury, 123 W Park Srive 27605	Yes
Gail Wiesner, 515 Euclid Street 27604	Yes
Carole Baxter, 411 Elm Street 27604	Yes
Lee Ann Gillen, 220 N East Street 27601	Yes
Bob Gillen, 220 N East Street 27601	Yes
John Baxter, 411 Elm Street 27604	Yes
Zach Chrisco, Sasaki Associates	Yes
Lamonn Hutton, Sasaki Associates	Yes
Billy Brewer, 311 E Edenton Street 27601	Yes
Steve Wrinn, 425 S Boylan Avenue 27603	Yes
Grayson Maughan, Raleigh PRCR	Yes
Joy Weeber, 350 N East Street 27604	Yes
John Feddersen, 401 Elm Street 27604	Yes
Peggy Feddersen, 401 Elm Street 27604	Yes
Matt Harper, 312 E Cabarrus Street	Yes
James Buffaloe, 402 Cutler Street 27603	Yes
Will Hayes, 402 Cutler Street 27603	Yes
Jo Ann Sanford, 721 N Bloodworth Strreet 27604	Yes
David Boone, 1621 Waft Ave 27587	Yes
Zach Hoffman, 314 E Cabarrus Street 27604	Yes
M. Doorn, 403 Elm Street 27604	Yes
M. Boone, 403 Elm Street 27604	Yes
Robert Parrott, 250 E Davie Street 27601	Yes

Matt Hobbs, 24 Striding Ridge Ct 27713	Yes
Roz Blair, 322 E Cabarrus Street 27610	Yes
Steve Schuster, 311-200 W Martin Street 27601	Yes
Mon Peng Yueh, 311-200 W Martin Street 27601	Yes
Randy Scott, 218 N East Street 27601	Yes
Heather Scott, 218 N East Street 27601	Yes
Peter Rumsey, 515 N Bloodworth Street 27604	Yes

REVIEW OF SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS

There were no objections to the approval of the Summary Proceedings without a public hearing. The committee reviewed and approved the following case 145-15-CA for which the Summary Proceeding is made part of these minutes.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – SUMMARY PROCEEDING

145-15-CA 312 OAKWOOD AVENUE - ROW
Applicant: CITY OF RALEIGH
Received: 10/6/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 1/4/2016 1) 11/2/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Remove diseased and dangerous red maple tree from right-of-way
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- 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."

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Remove diseased and dangerous red maple tree

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Removal of dangerous red maple tree is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 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* A City of Raleigh Urban Forester inspected the 18.5" DBH red maple tree and determined that it was a hazard.

2* The trunk has decay, a cavity and termite damage on the north and west sides. The canopy is also in decline.
3* A replacement tree is not proposed.
4* According to the City of Raleigh NeighborWoods program webpage, the red maple is categorized as a large tree and described as an attractive tree that reaches 40'-60' in height at maturity and has a medium to fast growth rate.

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

1. That a large maturing tree be planted in Oakwood during the next NeighborWoods planting season.

Decision on the Application

There were no objections to approval without a public hearing.

Mr. Davis moved to approve the application, adopting the staff comments as the written record of the summary proceeding on 145-15-CA. Ms. David seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 5/2/16.

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: 121-15-CA, 128-15-CA, 146-15-CA, 147-15-C, 148-15-CA, 149-15-CA, 150-15-C, 151-15-CA, 152-15-CA, and 153-15-CA.

Prior to the beginning of case 151-15-CA, Ms. David made a motion to recuse Ms. Jackson; Ms. Webb seconded; motion carried.

Prior to the beginning of case 152-15-CA, Mr. Davis made a motion to readmit Ms. Jackson and recuse Ms. Caliendo; Ms. Webb seconded; motion carried 4/0.

After case 152-15-CA, Ms. Jackson made a motion to readmit Ms. Caliendo; Ms. Webb seconded; motion carried 4/0.

Prior to the beginning of case 153-15-CA, Ms. Jackson made a motion to recuse Ms. David; Mr. Davis seconded; motion carried 4/0.

After case 153-15-CA, Mr. Davis made a motion to readmit Ms. David; Ms. Webb seconded; motion carried 4/0.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

121-15-CA 503 CUTLER STREET
Applicant: RIANA SMITH
Received: 8/18/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 11/16/2015 1) 9/8/2015 2) 10/5/2015 3) 11/2/2015

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Construct 1-story garage; install rear driveway; construct rear patio
Amendments: The garage has been moved to within 6-7 feet of the historic wall, the breezeway removed from proposal, and a rear porch added to the house. Additional photos of the wall and minor amendments were provided and are attached to these comments.
DRAC: Pre-application proposals were reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its April 22 and June 24 meetings.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- COAs mentioned in the comments are available for review.
- Sanborn Fire Insurance maps are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Construct 1-story garage; install rear driveway; construct rear patio
2.4	Fences and Walls	Retain brick wall
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	Install rear driveway
2.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	Construct 1-story garage
4.3	New Construction	Construct 1-story garage

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Construction of a 1-story, 2-car garage; installation of a rear driveway is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.4.1, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.9, 2.6.5, 2.6.9, 2.6.10; however, the location of the garage **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.6.6 and the following findings:

1* The amended application clarifies that the driveway from the alley to the garage is proposed to consist of a grass median separated by two concrete runners, pavers, or gravel as is typical in the district. Detailed drawings were not provided.

2* According to the online Wake County Real Estate Data, the lot is 6,970 SF. The footprint of the proposed house with porches is approximately 1,985 SF; the proposed garage is 576 SF for lot coverage of 37%, within the norm for Boylan Heights.

3* According to the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps there was an approximately 15'x20' metal clad garage in the southeast corner of the property adjacent the alley from as early as 1914 and as late as 1962. Based on the National Register Nomination it was gone by 1983 when the district was listed. A building of that size would fit in the same location now.

4* The application states that the location of the garage was determined in part due to an existing brick retaining wall near the rear of the property. According to the survey, the wall extends approximately half-way across the lot.

5* The amended application moves the garage back as close to the retaining wall as believed to be practicable in order to maintain the integrity of the existing retaining wall. This distance is 6 ½ feet from the brick wall and 5 feet from a cinderblock buttress (see photos). The garage was also shifted 5 feet to the south to approximately 3 feet from the side property line.

6* Garages in Boylan Heights are commonly close to side property lines.

7* The amended application states that existing retaining wall is functional and supports the yard of 501 Cutler as well as the alley. Photographs of the retaining wall are included in the amended application.

8* The amended application states that the retaining wall appears to have been constructed over 100 years ago based on a visual inspection of the bricks used, which show them to be handmade and air-dried – a technique that has not been in use since the early 1900s. Photographs of different aged bricks are included in the amended application and were provided for examination at the October hearing.

9* The amended application adds a covered porch to the rear of the new house.

10* The amended application removes the proposed covered breezeway, rendering the garage as detached. The garage is proposed sits approximately 15 feet from the house and 5 feet from the porch.

11* The proposed garage is a 2-car garage with the visual appearance of a 1-car garage with attached shed-roofed bay for a 2nd car. The footprint as a whole is 24'x24'. The proposed garage is lower in height than the main house.

12* Garages in Boylan Heights are typically located at the rear of the lot adjacent to the alley.

13* The amended application includes photographic examples of other properties in Boylan Heights that have two-car garages: 502 Cutler Street, 710 McCullough Street, 916 Dorothea Drive, 1010 W Lenoir Street, 1006 W Lenoir Street.

14* Based on COA files, Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, Wake County Real Estate Data, and construction/design:

   a. The garage at 1006 W Lenoir Street was constructed ca. 1950 outside of the period of significance of the district. It is sited immediately adjacent the alley.

b. The garage at 1010 W Lenoir Street was constructed ca. 1945 outside of the period of significance of the district. It is sited immediately adjacent the alley.
c. The garage at 916 Dorothea Drive was constructed ca. 1960 outside of the period of significance of the district. It is sited immediately adjacent the alley.
d. The garage at 710 McCullough Street was constructed ca. 1950 outside of the period of significance of the district. There is no alley access.
e. The garage at 502 Cutler Street was constructed in 1999 (COA 012-99-CA) under a prior set of Design Guidelines. It is sited immediately adjacent the alley and replaced a ca. 1950 similarly sized outbuilding.

15* A photograph of the attached one-car garage at 602 S Boylan Avenue is provided in the amended application. Based on COA files the garage at 602 S Boylan Avenue was constructed per COA 037-12-CA. The garage was sited at the location of an existing driveway and within a few feet of the property line.

16* The size and scale of the garage is not atypical of garages in the district. The design features are similar to that of the main house which is often seen in accessory buildings.

17* The materials of the garage are proposed to be the same as the house. The garage doors are proposed to be solid-wood with glass panels in the top portion. Specifications were not provided.

Pending the committee's determination regarding the location of the garage, staff recommends that the committee approve the amended application, with the following conditions:

1. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction or installation:
   a. Rear porch on house;
   b. Porch railing section;
   c. Garage doors;
   d. Doors;
   e. Driveway dimensions;
   f. Driveway materials;
   g. Light fixtures;
   h. Electrical panels and other utilities;
   i. Any details that differ from the drawings included in this 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 reminded the committee they were once again looking at the proposed garage and that the garage is now moved closer to the historic wall. Ms. Tully added that a rear porch has been suggested to be added instead of an attached breezeway.

Support:
Ms. Riana Smith [affirmed] and Mr. David Boone [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application.

Ms. Smith stated that based on the comments from last time the garage is now detached and moved three from the south property line and as five feet from the wall. Mr. Boone stated they have tried to do everything that was asked and the garage he believes is now on the best place on the property regarding the elevations and retaining wall. He added that the garage is now detached.

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

At Ms. Caliendo's suggestion Ms. Webb 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]:

What about the location? The breezeway is now gone. [Caliendo]
It's noted that the garage is in a pretty typical location for an accessory garage/structure accessed by a rear alley. Based on all the contributing factors in its location, it meets the requirements that we asked the application to comply with. It meets the Guidelines. [Jackson]
It is a compromise with preserving the wall that is there. [Davis]
It is the width of the garage that prevents it from being closer to the alley, not the retaining wall. [David]
If you look at fact number three a building of that size will fit in the same location. [Caliendo]
Based on the original and amended applications the applicant did establish that the wall is historic and functional. There is a good reason to keep that wall in place. [Jackson]
It is more the fact that it is a two car garage which is you cannot put it closer to the alley. [David]
We saw other evidence of two car garages. [Caliendo]
You did not approve anything with the garage. The staff comments address that but you did not say anything regarding the size. [Tully]
I wanted to clarify it is not the wall's fault. [David]
The wall is a significant site feature. What if they had to rework that portion of the wall to make the garage closer to the alley if that was feasible? [Caliendo]
Too much design work. [David]
It is not necessary that it be in the ideal location on the property, but it is pretty close with all things considered. [Jackson]
Does it meet the guidelines? [Tully]
The location meets the guidelines more than at the beginning of the process. [David]

I just do not think it meets guideline 2.6.6, which says to locate a building with the traditional relationships with the main structure. I have not seen any evidence of free standing structures. In this case they are locating five feet away from the main structure. [Caliendo]

Mr. Davis made a motion to reopen the public testimony portion of the meeting; Ms. Webb seconded; motion carried 5/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Ms. Smith clarified that the garage is actually fifteen feet from the house and five feet from the proposed porch. She added that from the last application the lots that have garages are smaller and the proposed garage is at a similar distance from the house. Ms. Smith added that there are garbage trucks that use the alleyway and moving the garage even closer could limit their access. Ms. Smith believes that the garage meets the guidelines given the restrictions of the lot.

Ms. Caliendo questioned if any plans were included of the houses that were provided for support of the garage as evidence. Mr. Davis stated most of those had the garages on the property lines and the proposed garage is not traditionally in the usual location and are closer to the house. Ms. David said that the location of the garage to the alley is the issue. Mr. Boone stated if you look at the location of the wall the garage cannot be built any closer. He noted that the grade drops 5 feet from the alley to the wall. He added that practically, the garage is 5 feet from the alley because of the wall and 12 feet from the alley proper.

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

Committee Discussion (2)

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

Based on the guidelines the proposed garage is in a historic location as stated by the applicant. It is larger than what was originally on the site according to the Sanborn maps and it is larger than some existing structures that are not garages. There are other two car garages in the district. According to the guidelines sometimes garages are larger if shared by adjourning property owners or a smaller storage shed. In terms of 2.6.6 I think the location meets the guidelines. [Jackson]

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 1-17) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Construction of a 1-story, 2-car garage; installation of a rear driveway is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.4.1, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.9, 2.6.5, 2.6.6, 2.6.9, 2.6.10, and the following findings:

1* The amended application clarifies that the driveway from the alley to the garage is proposed to consist of a grass median separated by two concrete runners, pavers, or gravel as is typical in the district. Detailed drawings were not provided.

2* According to the online Wake County Real Estate Data, the lot is 6,970 SF. The footprint of the proposed house with porches is approximately 1,985 SF; the proposed garage is 576 SF for lot coverage of 37%, within the norm for Boylan Heights.

3* According to the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps there was an approximately 15'x20' metal clad garage in the southeast corner of the property adjacent the alley from as early as 1914 and as late as 1962. Based on the National Register Nomination it was gone by 1983 when the district was listed. A building of that size would fit in the same location now.

4* The application states that the location of the garage was determined in part due to an existing brick retaining wall near the rear of the property. According to the survey, the wall extends approximately half-way across the lot.

5* The amended application moves the garage back as close to the retaining wall as believed to be practicable in order to maintain the integrity of the existing retaining wall. This distance is 6 ½ feet from the brick wall and 5 feet from a cinderblock buttress (see photos). The garage was also shifted 5 feet to the south to approximately 3 feet from the side property line.

6* Garages in Boylan Heights are commonly close to side property lines.

7* The amended application states that existing retaining wall is functional and supports the yard of 501 Cutler as well as the alley. Photographs of the retaining wall are included in the amended application.

8* The amended application states that the retaining wall appears to have been constructed over 100 years ago based on a visual inspection of the bricks used, which show them to be handmade and air-dried – a technique that has not been in use since the early 1900s. Photographs of different aged bricks are included in the amended application and were provided for examination at the October hearing.

9* The amended application adds a covered porch to the rear of the new house.

10* The amended application removes the proposed covered breezeway, rendering the garage as detached. The garage is proposed sits approximately 15 feet from the house and 5 feet from the porch.

11* The proposed garage is a 2-car garage with the visual appearance of a 1-car garage with attached shed-roofed bay for a 2nd car. The footprint as a whole is 24'x24'. The proposed garage is lower in height than the main house.

12* Garages in Boylan Heights are typically located at the rear of the lot adjacent to the alley.

13* The amended application includes photographic examples of other properties in Boylan Heights that have two-car garages: 502 Cutler Street, 710 McCullough Street, 916 Dorothea Drive, 1010 W Lenoir Street, 1006 W Lenoir Street.

14* Based on COA files, Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, Wake County Real Estate Data, and construction/design:

a. The garage at 1006 W Lenoir Street was constructed ca. 1950 outside of the period of significance of the district. It is sited immediately adjacent the alley.
b. The garage at 1010 W Lenoir Street was constructed ca. 1945 outside of the period of significance of the district. It is sited immediately adjacent the alley.
c. The garage at 916 Dorothea Drive was constructed ca. 1960 outside of the period of significance of the district. It is sited immediately adjacent the alley.
d. The garage at 710 McCullough Street was constructed ca. 1950 outside of the period of significance of the district. There is no alley access.
e. The garage at 502 Cutler Street was constructed in 1999 (COA 012-99-CA) under a prior set of Design Guidelines. It is sited immediately adjacent the alley and replaced a ca. 1950 similarly sized outbuilding.

15* A photograph of the attached one-car garage at 602 S Boylan Avenue is provided in the amended application. Based on COA files the garage at 602 S Boylan Avenue was constructed per COA 037-12-CA. The garage was sited at the location of an existing driveway and within a few feet of the property line.

16* The size and scale of the garage is not atypical of garages in the district. The design features are similar to that of the main house which is often seen in accessory buildings.

17* The materials of the garage are proposed to be the same as the house. The garage doors are proposed to be solid-wood with glass panels in the top portion. Specifications were not provided.

18* The grade at the alley drops off five feet towards the wall.

19* The garage will be twelve feet from the alley surface.

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

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

Mr. Davis 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 construction or installation:
   a. Rear porch on house;
   b. Porch railing section;
   c. Garage doors;
   d. Doors;
   e. Driveway dimensions;
   f. Driveway materials;
   g. Light fixtures;
   h. Electrical panels and other utilities;
   i. Any details that differ from the drawings included in this application.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Webb; passed 3/2 (Ms. David and Ms. Caliendo opposed).

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

Certificate expiration date: 5/2/16.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

128-15-CA 307 & 311 E EDENTON STREET
Applicant: CHARLOTTE BREWER, WILLIAM BREWER, & JO ANNE SANFORD
Received: 8/25/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 11/23/2015 1) 10/5/2015 2) 11/2/2015 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: O&I-1
Nature of Project: Remove tall fence; install parking lot lighting [partial after-the-fact]
Amendments:
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- After-the-fact applications are treated as though the work has not been done.
- Use is not reviewed through the COA process.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Install parking lot lighting; Remove tall fence
2.4	Fences and Walls	Remove tall fence;
2.7	Lighting	Install parking lot lighting

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Removal of tall fence is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.4.1, 2.4.8, and the following findings:
1* The wood fence being removed is not historic.
2* The horizontal configuration of the boards is atypical and does not meet the *Guidelines*.

B. Installation of parking lot lighting is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.7.4, 2.7.5, 2.7.6, 2.7.7; however the mounting of streetlight fixtures on standard height poles is incongruous with 2.7.4, 2.7.5, 2.7.8, and the following findings:
1* This application addresses two lots. 307 E Edenton Street has no buildings, and consists of a parking lot. The east side of 311 E Edenton Street is a brick 2-story Neoclassical Revival house with a ca. 1991 rear addition.
2* The Special Character Essay for Oakwood states "A small commercial area at the intersection of Lane and Bloodworth streets continues to provide a touch of contrast to the otherwise uniformly residential character of the district."

3* Except for the non-contributing former filling station at 100 N Person Street, the commercial structures referenced in section B of the application are not within the historic district.

4* Page 20 of the *Guidelines* states "Additional lighting may be desirable on a particular site because of concerns for safety or security. Careful consideration should be given to where supplemental lighting is needed and in what quantity. Adequate lighting can often be introduced through lights on residential-scale posts, recessed lights, footlights, or directional lights mounted in unobtrusive locations. Such solutions are far more in keeping with the historic character of the districts than harsh floodlights and standard security lights mounted on tall utility poles." It also states "To minimize the intrusion of lighting for institutional or commercial buildings and related parking areas in primarily residential neighborhoods, and to save energy, the lighting may be connected to timers that automatically shut it off when it is not needed."

5* There are three utility poles in question. They are all utility company standard height wood poles located at the center and rear of the combined lots. The exact mounting height of the fixtures is unknown.

6* The proposal is for 2 light fixtures on Pole A and 1 each on Poles B and C. The type and position of the proposed fixtures is intended to keep light on the subject properties.

7* The proposed light fixture, "Roadway" is a long flat unit of contemporary design. A photo of the proposed fixture is included.

8* Information from City of Raleigh Public Works staff (attached) compares the current street light fixtures with those to be used, but not yet approved, for streetlights in the district. The new light fixtures are typically mounted at 25, 30 or 35 feet.

9* The fixtures are proposed to have LED bulbs which has been approved provided the light color is of a warm tone.

Staff recommends that the committee deny the proposed light fixtures and approve removal of the fence.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from staff comments. Ms. Tully reminded the committee that this case was on last month's agenda but was deferred. There are two pieces of the application, the fence removal as well as adding parking lot lighting after the fact. Ms. Tully stated she believed that the lighting does not meet the guidelines based on the height and the type of fixture. Ms. Tully added that the proposed lighting fixture will be installed throughout the city, but there has not been a COA application yet.

Support:
Ms. Jo Ann Sanford [affirmed] and Mr. William Brewer [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Brewer gave a history of the properties, stating that even though they are located in a residential historic district they have been commercial properties for a long time. He stated that the lights were installed for safety purposes and that they are the same lighting that will be used by the city, adding that it is a full cut-off fixture.

Ms. Sanford stated that the lights existing on 311 Edenton Street was installed without permission or proper approval process. Ms. Sanford reiterated the concern for security with the lighting and that the proposed lighting will be directed down so there will not be any infiltration onto other properties. Ms. Sanford added that she and Mr. Brewer are amendable to deferring the lighting application until the city lighting is approved.

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

Responses and Questions:
Ms. Tully stated that the adjacent property owners at 312 E Jones Street were unable to come. Ms. Tully added that there is a section on accessibility in the guidelines for health and safety consideration and that the applicants seem to be placing weight on the proposed street lighting which has not received a Certificate of Appropriateness yet. Ms. Tully stated that city staff has a draft and it could be put through so the committee can discuss it since it would be a major work application.

Ms. Brewer stated they would like to move forward and get the fence removed as well as removing the offending light. Ms. Tully reminded the applicants that as long as they are going through the certificate of appropriateness application process there will be no zoning enforcement penalties on their part.

At Ms. Caliendo's suggestion Mr. Davis 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]:
We would like more information on the city lighting plan as well as to go back and look at guidelines 3.11. [Caliendo]
It would make sense that it is congruous with the rest. [David]
Do note that you have the applicants agreeing to deferring. [Tully]

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 1-2) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Removal of tall fence is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.4.1, 2.4.8, and the following findings:

1* The wood fence being removed is not historic.

2* The horizontal configuration of the boards is atypical and does not meet the *Guidelines*.

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

Decision on the Application

Ms. David made a motion that the removal of the fence be approved.
The motion was seconded by Mr. Davis; passed 5/0.

Ms. David made a motion that the remainder of the application be deferred.
The motion was seconded by Mr. Davis; passed 5/0.

Committee members voting: Caliendo, David, Davis, Jackson, Webb

Certificate expiration date: 5/2/16.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

146-15-CA 403 ELM STREET
Applicant: MICHIEL DOORN & MARY BOONE
Received: 10/13/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 1/11/2016 1) 11/2/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Implementation of master landscape plan including: plant trees; rear patio; planting shrubs and other plants; side patio; alter front steps; deck extension; 10'x10' pergola; new and altered walkways
Amendments: Additional information regarding the trees and plants, and color photos are attached to these comments
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- The locations of property lines and ownership issues are a civil matter outside the jurisdiction of the commission.
- Installation of a driveway and widening of the existing curb cut was approved with COA 139-15-MW.
- COAs mentioned in these comments are available for review.
- 403 Elm Street file photos and 1956 photo are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.1	Public Rights-of-Way and Alleys	Stepping stones and brick landing; low plantings
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	implementation of master landscape plan including: plant trees; rear patio; planting shrubs and other plants; side patio; alter front steps; deck extension; 10'x10' pergola; new and altered walkways
2.4	Fences and Walls	new retaining wall; veneer concrete block wall
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	new and altered walkways
4.1	Decks	deck extension

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Implementation of master landscape plan including: plant trees; rear patio; planting shrubs and other plants; side patio; alter front steps; deck extension; 10'x10' pergola; new and altered walkways is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.1.8. 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.4, 2.4.8, 2.5.5, 2.5.6; however the increase in built area **may be incongruous** according to *Guidelines* 2.3.8 and the following findings:

1* Stepping stones and a brick landing are proposed in the parking strip. Small landing areas such as proposed are a common feature in Oakwood. Details and specifications were not provided.

2* Various plants and trees are proposed including:
- 5 Japanese Maples (max 18′ tall) south (side) properly line;
- Boxwood (max 8′ tall);
- Camelia espalier (max 6′ tall) (this will be a wall of plants – it is behind the front wall of the house and in a location similar to privacy fences);
- Gardenia crown jewel (max 4′ tall);
- Christmas Jewel Holly (max 10′ tall);
- Zhuhou (max 8′ tall) (evergreen shrub used for borders);
- Emerald green arborvitae (max 10′ tall) (narrow pyramidal evergreen);
- Zelkova (max 40′ tall) (deciduous shade tree at rear).

3* The two trees on the property will be maintained.

4* Pergolas and ponds are a traditional rear yard features. No information regarding their appearance was provided in the application and the location of the pergola is not provided.

5* Materials to be used throughout the plan include brick, granite, and cobblestones. All three materials are found historically in Oakwood.

6* The patio is proposed to be constructed of bricks unearthed during prior construction. The application includes photos showing bricks, slate stepping stones, under leaves & brick wall, but the quality of the images is poor.

7* The lot is 3,485 square feet. The house, porches, existing walkways, and approved driveway is approximately 1,500 square feet. The proposed new built area (per 2.3.8) is approximately 524 square feet. The original built area is 43%; the proposed is 58%. All of the new surface paving is the side or rear yard.

8* A freestanding water feature is proposed behind the existing fence. It will be screened from view.

9* A short length of 18″ tall stone wall with post is proposed at the steps along the side walkway. Masonry or stone retaining walls were occasionally employed to accommodate a significant shift in grade. Specifications and details were not provided.

10* Decorative iron panels are proposed to be mounted on the interior of a section of fence as a means for growing plants.

11* The HVAC units are proposed to be screened with framed bamboo fencing pieces into notched posts. HVAC screening is usually vegetative or a traditional wood fence.

12* Stepping stones are not uncommon as paths in front yards. Details and specifications were not provided.
13* The existing rear yard brick walkway is proposed to be extended along the side of the house to the driveway and connecting with a landing are at the driveway. This is a common location for and configuration for walkways. Typically the landing area would be the same material as the walkway and drive. Details of the patio are not provided.
14* The rear deck is proposed to be extended just enough to accommodate a grill. It is a low deck with no railings.

B. Veneering of concrete block wall **is incongruous** according to *Guidelines* 2.3.4, 2.4.1, 2.4.9 and the following findings:
1* Masonry or stone retaining walls were occasionally employed to accommodate a significant shift in grade.
2* Based on the material and configuration, the concrete block wall was likely constructed in the 1920s or 30s. There are no photographs of the removed wall that indicate its condition. There are photographs of the remaining portion of the wall.
3* COA 163-14-CA denied removal of a portion of the wall beside the house. The portion proposed for veneering is in the front yard.
4* A 1956 photo of a low granite wall around the front yard was included in the application. That wall was removed per COA CAD-91-043 under an earlier version of the guidelines.
5* The historic relationship between buildings and landscape features is not being changed.

Staff recommends that the committee deny veneering the concrete block wall.

Pending the committee's determination regarding the amount of built area, staff recommends that the committee approve the remainder of the amended application, with the following conditions:

1. That the paved area between the driveway and new walkway be the same material as the walkway.
2. That screening hedges in the rear yard be maintained at a maximum 8' height.
3. That the applicant consult with Urban Forester prior to planting in the right-of-way.
4. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Exact dimensions and location of rear brick patio.
   b. Stepping stones and brick landing in right-of-way;
   c. Front patch stepping stones;
   d. Stone wall at steps;
   e. Paved area between the driveway and new walkway
5. That Minor Work COAs be filed for the following items:
   a. Pergola;
   b. HVAC screening;
   c. Pond.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from staff comments. Ms. Tully added that the additional information regarding the plantings put it in layman's terms and describe the character of them. Ms. Tully added that color photos are also included and amending the brick patio. Ms. Tully stated that veneering the wall as proposed does not meet the guidelines in her judgment.

Support:
Mr. Michiel Doorn [affirmed] and Ms. Mary Boone [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Doorn stated everything looked to be straight forward. Mr. Doorn stated that from the old photographs it looked like there was a granite wall surrounding the property and they wanted to recreate that look. Mr. Doorn added that the committee has the whole package of information and he is mainly looking to put in a yard with small trees as well as a brick patio. Mr. Doorn reminded the committee that all of this will be taking place inside a six foot wooden fence which was already approved. Mr. Doorn clarified that old bricks would be used for part of the application. Mr. Doorn questioned if covering a wall with veneer was allowed.

Opposition:
Mr. John Baxter [affirmed] and Ms. Carol Baxter [affirmed] were present to speak in opposition to the application. Mr. Baxter stated he believed the veneer on the concrete wall should be rejected. Mr. Baxter stated that he remembers when the stone wall was removed and that it lined the entrance way and went to the north corner of the lot and to the south which paralleled the city sidewalk and that adding veneer over the concrete block is not in the historical character of the property. He noted that the wall about 90 years old. Mr. Baxter added that according to section 2.4.9 of the guidelines, it is not appropriate to cover wall with material.

Mr. John and Mrs. Peggy Feddersen [affirmed] questioned if they could object to the driveway. Ms. Tully said that it was not part of trhe application under discussion.

Mr. Feddersen stated his concern about the extensive work that is already going on and that additional work that could go on could aggravate his yard's ground saturation problems. Mr. Feddersen stated that excessive paving could interfere with the water runoff and that the drain pipes on the side of the property haven't been connected to the proper drainage. Mr. Feddersen stated that he believed the application showed a lot of area being completely built over. Mrs. Feddersen stated that the water feature that is being proposed will also need to be silent as it is close to his property and his bedroom. Mr. Feddersen questioned if the applicants intended to park on the grassy area of their property as well. Ms. Caliendo nited that sound is not addressed in the guidelines.

Questions:
Ms. Gail Wiesner [affirmed] spoke about the plantings that were going to be proposed. Ms. Wiesner stated that the plantings will be smaller than what they are stated to be in the application. She expressed her concern that where they are proposed to be planted the roots will extend and grow into the house and property line which will destroy hardscape.

Responses and Questions:
Ms. Tully responded that typically historical walls are not covered as it goes against guidelines and that the decision of the driveway can be appealed.

Ms. Caliendo stated that nothing can be done if the applicants wish to park in the grassy area and that the committee only looks at the visual impact of the features being proposed.

Ms. Leapley stated Ms. Wiesner's experience can be considered as testimony for the committee.

Mr. Doorn stated that they would be glad to withdraw the request to veneer the wall and would like to plant shrubs instead. They are also amendable to changing the plantings as the ones proposed were just the suggestions of the landscape architects. Ms. Tully responded you can change plants and that staff will just need something so it can be able to approve it.

Ms. Tully stated that plantings were looked at for when they become like a wall and that the maximum height typically approved in side and rear yards is six feet.

Ms. David asked about the wall on the south side and how much wider it is. Ms. Boone replied that it is basically the same as the 330 square feet in the back. Ms. Boone stated that the plan is at scale and she measured it exactly. Ms. Boone passed around a plan to scale for the committee.

Mr. Davis asked if there was a patio on the plan or was that feature just there. Mr. Doorn stated there was a brick walkway there and it runs along the house to the patio and that he wishes to use similar bricks. Ms. Boone stated that there was maybe a leftover patio and there were slate stepping stones found.

At Ms. Caliendo's suggestion Ms. David 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 issue seems to be lot coverage. [Caliendo]
There is already a brick walkway and they are adding a little bit from the survey. That was the one I was asking about. [David]
Fact 7 in the comments referenced proposed new built area versus the original. Is this typical for Oakwood? [Jackson]

The built area comes into play in guideline 2.3 because it does bear weight. There is a range of lot coverages and you decide if there is a significant increase. [Tully]
This plan shows a brick walk but this shows more paving. [David]
It is hard to see where it is going to go. [Tully]

Ms. David moved to reopen the public testimony portion of the hearing; Mr. Davis seconded; motion carried 5/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Ms. David questioned what the applicants were proposing. Ms. Boone stated the areas that were highlighted and that the drawings are to scale. The applicants drew on a plan to indicate the location of the patio.

Ms. David moved to close the public testimony portion of the hearing; Mr. Davis seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Committee Discussion (2)

What are your thoughts on lot coverage? [Caliendo]
It is a small space and it is permeable. [David]
It looks more than 58% and goes all the way to the back. [Davis]
There is the front yard and a part on the side. It goes into the back. [David]
Can Tania recalculate? Your calculations were different than what they showed us. [Jackson]
The new coverage is greater than 58% but possibly not significantly. [David]
Do you have enough information here or do you need better drawings? [Tully]

Mr. Davis made a motion to reopen the public testimony portion of the hearing; Ms. Webb seconded; motion carried 5/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (3)

Ms. Boone stated in Oakwood there are various houses with various sized lots where the entire yard was paved and that it is a percentage of the lot per house per neighborhood. Ms. Caliendo stated this information could be brought back to the committee. Mr. Doorn corrected they did not want to pave but make the yard more attractive and his main concern was to get the plantings approved so that trees can be added to the property otherwise they would have to wait another year. Ms. Caliendo stated they could approve the plantings and defer the patio for a later meeting.

Mr. Davis made a motion to close the public testimony portion of the hearing; Ms. Jackson seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Committee Discussion (3)

We can defer for more information needed on the patio portion. [Caliendo]
The guidelines talk about significantly increasing some things there that are already in other houses. This house will be congruous. [Davis]
What constitutes significant because that is only a 15% increase. [Webb]
That is where the evidences of variances in individual lot coverages will help. [Jackson]
We can give Tania time to recalculate. [Caliendo]
What extent of the built area increase are we going to defer? The deck extension, pergola or the side patio? [Jackson]
We can ask for a design and a better drawing as well as a definite percentage of paved area at the perk rate. [David]

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 2, 3, 10, 14) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Implementation of master landscape plan including: plant trees; planting shrubs and other plants; deck extension is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.1.8. 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.4, 2.4.8, 2.5.5, 2.5.6 and the following findings:

1* Various plants and trees are proposed including:
- 5 Japanese Maples (max 18′ tall) south (side) properly line;
- Boxwood (max 8′ tall);
- Camelia espalier (max 6′ tall) (this will be a wall of plants – it is behind the front wall of the house and in a location similar to privacy fences);
- Gardenia crown jewel (max 4′ tall);
- Christmas Jewel Holly (max 10′ tall);
- Zhuhou (max 8′ tall) (evergreen shrub used for borders);
- Emerald green arborvitae (max 10′ tall) (narrow pyramidal evergreen);
- Zelkova (max 40′ tall) (deciduous shade tree at rear).

2* The two trees on the property will be maintained.

3* Decorative iron panels are proposed to be mounted on the interior of a section of fence as a means for growing plants.

4* The rear deck is proposed to be extended just enough to accommodate a grill. It is a low deck with no railings.

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

Decision on the Application

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Ms. Jackson and seconded by Ms. David, Ms. Jackson made an amended motion that a portion of the application (Plantings, tree, shrubs, deck extension) be approved as amended, with the following conditions:

1. That screening hedges in the rear yard be maintained at a maximum 8′ height.
2. That the applicant consults with Urban Forester prior to planting in the right-of-way.
3. That information regarding the new shrubs along the block retaining wall be provided to and approved by staff prior to planting.

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

Ms. Jackson made a motion that the remainder of the application–anything not expressly approved–be deferred.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 5/2/16.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

147-15-CA 402 CUTLER STREET
Applicant: JAMES BUFFALOE FOR DOROTHY C. HELMS
Received: 10/13/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 1/11/2016 1) 11/2/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Replace roof covering (asphalt shingles and slate) with shingles that have a slate-like appearance
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- COAs noted in the staff comments are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
3.5	Roofs	Replace roof covering (asphalt shingles and slate) with shingles that have a slate-like appearance

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Replace roof covering (asphalt shingles and slate) with shingles that have a slate-like appearance is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section , and the following findings:

1* The Boylan Heights designation report described the house as a 1913 Queen Anne Colonial having a hip roof with intersecting gables. The front gable/bay projects and has chamfered corners. There is an attached one-story porch, full façade that wraps around the corner. Above, between the 2 projecting bays, is a small second story porch perhaps a later addition.

2* Slate is a historic roofing treatment distinctive to many properties in the historic district.

3* The current slate roof does not display any patterning other than that inherent to the slate's size and thickness.

4* The roof consists of multiple roof coverings including 3-tab shingles (front porch, roof over the 1st level rear entry, 1st level hip roof, and rear half of the main roof), rubber membrane (2nd level rear entry), and slate (front half of main roof). The slate consisted of about ½ of the entire roof.

5* Will Hayes with Roofwerks states that "The existing Pennsylvania slates are extremely soft and brittle and cannot be salvaged." The application states that two roofing contractors have determined that the slate is not salvageable.

6* The Committee approved the replacement of a deteriorated slate roof of similar shingle color and shape with G.A.F. Slateline roofing material at 710 McCulloch St. (087-04-CA). Slateline is a fiberglass shingle product with a couple of layers and shadow lines that emulate slate.

7* A photo of 710 McCullough (diagonally across the intersection from 402 Cutler) was provided. It shows the installed GAF Slateline shingles. The decorative ridge caps are also visible. Photos of several houses in Boylan Heights with typical architectural shingles were provided.

8* In addition to 710 McCulloch St., replacement of slate roofs with a compatible substitute material has been approved by the commission in the past in cases under an earlier set of guidelines when the slate is irreparably damaged or deteriorating (603 S Boylan Avenue [078-97-CA]; 516 E. Jones St. [001-97-CA); 608 S. Boylan Ave [176-96-CA]; 523 E. Lane St. [CAD-88-094]).

9* The application requests to use either GAF Slateline -Antique Slate or CertainTeed Hatteras - Moire Black.

10* The house does not currently have a ridge vent, both roofers propose one; detailed information as not provided. The ridges on the front of the house have a metal cap typical of slate roofs.

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

1. That the shingles be GAF Slateline with the color to be provided to and approved by staff.
2. That ridge vents not be used on the portions of the roof currently slate, but have a metal ridge cap similar to the existing with the details to be provided to and 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. Ms. Tully added that regarding the slate portion of the application, staff is recommending approval as the entire roof is not already slate.

Support:
Mr. James Buffaloe [affirmed] and Mr. Will Hayes [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Buffaloe stated they are doing a lot of work on the house and there are leaks that need addressing as soon as possible. Mr. Buffaloe stated the house across the street was approved with slate that is all one product and he is looking to make it comparable to the other house in looks.

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. Mr. Davis seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
It seems pretty straight forward. [Caliendo]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Ms. Webb moved 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 and additions as listed below:

A. Replace roof covering (asphalt shingles and slate) with shingles that have a slate-like appearance is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.5.5 , and the following findings:

1* The Boylan Heights designation report described the house as a 1913 Queen Anne Colonial having a hip roof with intersecting gables. The front gable/bay projects and has chamfered corners. There is an attached one-story porch, full façade that wraps around the corner. Above, between the 2 projecting bays, is a small second story porch perhaps a later addition.

2* Slate is a historic roofing treatment distinctive to many properties in the historic district.

3* The current slate roof does not display any patterning other than that inherent to the slate's size and thickness.

4* The roof consists of multiple roof coverings including 3-tab shingles (front porch, roof over the 1st level rear entry, 1st level hip roof, and rear half of the main roof), rubber membrane (2nd level rear entry), and slate (front half of main roof). The slate consisted of about ½ of the entire roof.

5* Will Hayes with Roofwerks states that "The existing Pennsylvania slates are extremely soft and brittle and cannot be salvaged." The application states that two roofing contractors have determined that the slate is not salvageable.

6* The Committee approved the replacement of a deteriorated slate roof of similar shingle color and shape with G.A.F. Slateline roofing material at 710 McCulloch St. (087-04-CA). Slateline is a fiberglass shingle product with a couple of layers and shadow lines that emulate slate.

7* A photo of 710 McCullough (diagonally across the intersection from 402 Cutler) was provided. It shows the installed GAF Slateline shingles. The decorative ridge caps are also visible. Photos of several houses in Boylan Heights with typical architectural shingles were provided.

8* In addition to 710 McCulloch St., replacement of slate roofs with a compatible substitute material has been approved by the commission in the past in cases under an earlier set of guidelines when the slate is irreparably damaged or deteriorating (603 S Boylan Avenue [078-97-CA]; 516 E. Jones St. [001-97-CA); 608 S. Boylan Ave [176-96-CA]; 523 E. Lane St. [CAD-88-094]).

9* The application requests to use either GAF Slateline -Antique Slate or CertainTeed Hatteras - Moire Black.

10* The house does not currently have a ridge vent, both roofers propose one; detailed information as not provided. The ridges on the front of the house have a metal cap typical of slate roofs.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the shingles be GAF Slateline with the color to be provided to and approved by staff.
2. That ridge vents not be used on the portions of the roof currently slate, but have a metal ridge cap similar to the existing with the details to be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 5/2/16.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

148-15-CA 425 S BOYLAN AVENUE
Applicant: STEVE WRINN
Received: 10/13/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 1/11/2016 1) 11/2/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Implementation of master landscape plan including: irrigation system with exposed sprinkler heads; rear raised planting beds; prune tree; new walkway; planting shrubs and groundcovers
Amendments: Additional photos were provided October 26 and 29, 2015 and are attached to these comments. A site plan showing the existing trees and an email with clarifications on some of the other items is also attached.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- Replacing cracked concrete sidewalk in kind and adding gravel to driveway do not need a COA.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.1	Public Rights-of-Way and Alleys	Install plants
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Implementation of master landscape plan including: irrigation system with exposed sprinkler heads; rear raised planting beds; prune tree; new walkway; planting shrubs and groundcovers
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	new walkway

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Implementation of master landscape plan including: irrigation system with exposed sprinkler heads; rear raised planting beds; prune tree; new walkway; planting shrubs and groundcovers is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.1.5, 2.1.8, 2.1.9, 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.4, and the following findings:

1* Ground covers and low shrubs (18″) are proposed for the parking strip. This area in the district is typically lawn. Although low groundcovers are seen in shady sections.

2* The existing trees (42″ DBH Oak, 30″ DBH Maple in front yard and 36″ DBH Oak, 13″ DBH Maple in right-of-way) will be maintained.
3* The existing front sidewalk is made of a sequence of roughly 3′x3′ concrete sections flanked by 12″x12″ pavers. The pavers will be removed and proposed to be used in a small patio area.
4* Most of the proposed irrigation will be subterranean (does not require COA) and the few exposed heads will be pop-up and screened by plantings.
5* The front yard consists of two trees, random plantings and a hedge along the sidewalk. The intent of the plan is to use mostly short plants along the front and sidewalk with the front boxwood hedge being removed and possibly reused in the rear yard.
6* Removal of the hedge will open the front yard which is more in character with the district.
7* Most of the proposed plantings are short ranging from under 1 foot to others in the 2 to 3 foot range. An existing Camellia (3-4 foot currently) and others are proposed along the south side to provide screening. Foundation plants along the front will maintained in the 2 to 3 foot range. The yard is extremely shady which results in slow growth of plants an inability to grow grass.
8* The method of pruning is not indicated; pruning branches should be performed in accordance with ANSI a-300 standards for pruning.
9* The new walkway is proposed to be brownish gray gravel on the left side of the front walk and mulch/wood chips on the right.
10* Raised garden beds are not uncommon features in the historic district; details of construction were not provided.

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

1. That new concrete have a water-washed finish to match the historic concrete.
2. That details and specifications for the raised garden beds are provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.
3. That the trees be pruned in accordance with ANSI a-300 standards for pruning.
4. That the applicant consult with Urban Forester prior to planting in the right-of-way

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from staff comments. Ms. Tully added that there are additional photos provided by the applicant that clarified information on the plan and the four trees that are being maintained.

Support:
Mr. Steve Wrinn [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Wrinn stated the concrete will have a water wash finish but that the City did not do a water wash finish when they installed sidewalks and this seems almost like a double standard.

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

Responses and Questions:
Ms. Tully stated that staff agreed with Mr. Wrinn's comments regarding the water wash.

At Ms. Caliendo's suggestion Mr. Davis 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]:
Staff could work with the applicant? [Jackson]
We request water wash for everyone. [David]

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 1-10) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Implementation of master landscape plan including: irrigation system with exposed sprinkler heads; rear raised planting beds; prune tree; new walkway; planting shrubs and groundcovers is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.1.5, 2.1.8, 2.1.9, 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.4, and the following findings:

1* Ground covers and low shrubs (18") are proposed for the parking strip. This area in the district is typically lawn. Although low groundcovers are seen in shady sections.

2* The existing trees (42" DBH Oak, 30" DBH Maple in front yard and 36" DBH Oak, 13" DBH Maple in right-of-way) will be maintained.

3* The existing front sidewalk is made of a sequence of roughly 3'x3' concrete sections flanked by 12"x12" pavers. The pavers will be removed and proposed to be used in a small patio area.

4* Most of the proposed irrigation will be subterranean (does not require COA) and the few exposed heads will be pop-up and screened by plantings.

5* The front yard consists of two trees, random plantings and a hedge along the sidewalk. The intent of the plan is to use mostly short plants along the front and sidewalk with the front boxwood hedge being removed and possibly reused in the rear yard.

6* Removal of the hedge will open the front yard which is more in character with the district.

7* Most of the proposed plantings are short ranging from under 1 foot to others in the 2 to 3 foot range. An existing Camellia (3-4 foot currently) and others are proposed along the

south side to provide screening. Foundation plants along the front will maintained in the 2 to 3 foot range. The yard is extremely shady which results in slow growth of plants an inability to grow grass.

8* The method of pruning is not indicated; pruning branches should be performed in accordance with ANSI a-300 standards for pruning.

9* The new walkway is proposed to be brownish gray gravel on the left side of the front walk and mulch/wood chips on the right.

10* Raised garden beds are not uncommon features in the historic district; details of construction were not provided.

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

Decision on the Application

Mr. Davis made a motion that the application be approved, with the following conditions:

1. That new concrete have a water-washed finish to match the historic concrete.
2. That details and specifications for the raised garden beds are provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.
3. That the trees be pruned in accordance with ANSI a-300 standards for pruning.
4. That the applicant consult with Urban Forester prior to planting in the right-of-way

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 5/2/16.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

149-15-CA 201 S BLOUNT STREET
Applicant: RALEIGH PARKS RECREATION & CULTURAL RESOURCES DEPT
Received: 10/14/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 1/12/2016 1) 11/2/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: BUS, DOD
Nature of Project: Master plan for alterations to Moore Square including new walkway configuration, new building, new water feature, new plantings; tree preservation; tree removals.
Amendments:
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- 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."

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.1	Public Rights-of-Way and Alleys	Alterations to south parking area; addition of bumpouts
2.2	Archaeology	new building
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Master plan for alterations to Moore Square including new walkway configuration, new building, new water feature, new plantings; tree preservation; benches….remove trees
2.4	Fences and Walls	New site wall
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	new walkway configuration
2.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	new building
3.11	Accessibility, Health, and Safety Considerations	new walkway configuration; New site wall

4.3 New Construction new building

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Implementation of a master plan for alterations to Moore Square including new walkway configuration, new water feature, new plantings; low walls; benches is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.5, 2.1.7, 2.1.10, 2.1.11, 2.1.12, 2.1.13, 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.4, 2.3.5, 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.9, 2.3.10, 2.3.11, 2.3.12, 2.4.1, 2.4.8, 2.5.1, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.9, 2.5.11, and the following findings:

1* Moore Square is one of the original four 4-acre squares of the City. The physical aspects of the square have evolved over time as the specific uses have changed. It has always been a public meeting place, an open green space, and a place for formal and informal activities and recreation.

2* Common Beauty, a study of Moore Square commission by RHDC identifies three key features that should be considered character defining: pedestrian paths, vegetative cover (oak trees at the interior and perimeter), and viewsheds (to and from the square).

3* The amended application includes diagrams illustration the various incarnations of the park over the decades. These will be presented at the hearing.

4* No historic walkway material remains. The trees and general form of the park paths are the major historic characteristics that remain.

5* The topography of the site is being modified minimally for the purpose of accessibility.

6* The new paths have a cross axial pattern which will be installed to reference previous historic patterns without introducing false sense of historicity. These will be presented at the hearing.

7* Changes to the Martin Street parking area and sidewalk, corner and mid-block bump-outs will maintain the historic granite curbs in their current configuration.

8* A comprehensive tree study has been performed on the square; the oak trees that create the historic frame of the square will be maintained; a tree protection plan was not provided.

9* Historic oaks will be protected by appropriately constricted perimeter treatment which will discourage pedestrian and vehicular traffic in the root zones.

10* Approximately 21 trees 8" DBH or larger from the central portion of the square that are incongruous with the character of the oaks will be removed to improve overall flexibility within the square. The amended application includes a plan of all trees including those being removed.

11* All tree pruning and protection will be under the care of the project arborist. New plantings will be limited to deciduous trees including oaks to reinstitute the historic planting patterns. New tree species will maintain the character and traits of the oak trees. Exact species and locations were not provided.

12* Removal of non-historic plantings and planters will restore historic vistas and views.

13* At edges where significant erosion occurs, low seat walls will be introduced to improve health of trees. The new seat wall perimeter bench and interior benches will be low to allow

sightlines through the park. All proposed utilities will be underground. The existing utility panels that exist on site will be relocated underground to improve views and remove clutter from the square.

14* The team will explore options for identifying subterranean resources to include possibly an archaeological assessment or other non-invasive methods.

15* Water feature will be level with the adjacent paving and will be unobtrusive and coordinated with pathway. The play area will be set within tree area and will use natural rock and wooden elements. These elements are in keeping with the historical uses of the square as a gathering space.

16* Photographs and a detailed description of the existing conditions were provided in the application.

17* At the perimeter of the square's planted areas will be a series of seat walls, curbs and low rails which will deter pedestrians from walking through the critical root zone of the canopy trees. Seating, lighting other site furnishings will follow the walkway surrounding the central open space.

18* No details and specifications were provided for any of the proposed alterations.

B. Construction of a new building is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 2.2.5, 2.6.6, 2.6.8, 2.6.9, 2.6.10, 3.11.1, 3.11.2, 3.11.4, 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 4.3.4, 4.3.5, 4.3.6, 4.3.10, 4.3.11, and the following findings:

1* In the early nineteenth century, two small frame buildings were on the square--a church which was moved to the site in 1822, and a school built in 1849.

2* The new building will be in the southeast quadrant of the park, outside of the circular inner path and tucked within the tree area so as to not impede the open central core of the park.

3* New building will be small in scale so as not to detract from the trees and grassy spaces. It will be in scale or smaller than historic buildings once on the square. The amended application states that the chapel was 40' x 50' and the school was 40' x 30'.

4* A design for the building was not provided.

Staff recommends that the committee approve the amended application, waiving the 365-day demolition delay for the removal of the trees with the following conditions:

1. That details and specifications for the following will be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan provided by an ISA certified arborist.
2. That the general footprint and location of the new building be approved.
3. That the proposed demolition and removal of existing non-historic features be approved.
4. That the general layout of the proposed new landscaping and hardscaping be approved.
5. That a new Major Work COA application(s) be filed for the new landscape and hardscape features; design and materials of the new architectural elements including building and fountain; new lighting, signage, playground, and other miscellaneous features.

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 this is the first certificate of appropriateness for this project and the approval will be for very specific basic items. Ms. Tully stated the committee cannot approve concepts but can approve the physical features and the design details will be provided at a later date. Ms. Tully stated her belief that the there were enough details here to approve the basic plan.

Support:
Ms. Mary Ruffin Hanbury [affirmed], Ms. Grayson Maughan [affirmed], and Mr. Zachary Chrisco [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application.

Ms. Maughan gave a brief overview of the project noting that that the master plan was adopted in 2011 and there were extensive tree and soil surveys done in order to preserve the trees and keep them healthy. Ms. Maughan stated that the plan is at fifty percent schematic design and was ready to be brought to the committee.

Ms. Hanbury stated that this was being brought to the committee after the public meetings per suggestion from city staff. Ms. Hanbury stated that using the RHDC's Common Beauty report, the three guiding principles behind the project has been the paths, the oaks and vegetation, and viewsheds. Ms. Hanbury stated that the guidelines behind the project were predicated by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards which can sometimes be problematic with zoning guidelines, but in this case the historic use is being maintained. Ms. Hanbury reiterated that non-historic material will be removed and that the proposed pedestrian path will help keep the health of the trees in the park that are already being threatened. The proposed new paths maintain the historic cross axial configuration. The proposed walls will help protect the trees and keep pedestrians off the roots. Ms. Hanbury stated that the proposed building on the square will be tucked into the east bump-out on the side and the water feature will be at a low grade to provide for interaction with children. The proposed building is no larger than the largest building historically in the site.

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

Responses and Questions:
Ms. Webb inquired about the angled parking on Martin Street and if it would be removed. Ms. Maughan stated there would be fewer parking in that area.

Ms. Caliendo questioned if the trees to be removed have a protection plan. Mr. Chrisco stated that only the trees in red are proposed to be removed.

Mr. Davis asked if the committee will be able to see the proposed building indicated on the designs. It was pointed out to him.

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
This is pretty straightforward. [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 comments A. (inclusive of facts 1,2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12-18) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-4) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Implementation of a master plan for alterations to Moore Square including new walkway configuration, new water feature, new plantings; low walls; benches is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.5, 2.1.7, 2.1.10, 2.1.11, 2.1.12, 2.1.13, 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.4, 2.3.5, 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.9, 2.3.10, 2.3.11, 2.3.12, 2.4.1, 2.4.8, 2.5.1, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.9, 2.5.11, and the following findings:

1* Moore Square is one of the original four 4-acre squares of the City. The physical aspects of the square have evolved over time as the specific uses have changed. It has always been a public meeting place, an open green space, and a place for formal and informal activities and recreation.

2* Common Beauty, a study of Moore Square commission by RHDC identifies three key features that should be considered character defining: pedestrian paths, vegetative cover (oak trees at the interior and perimeter), and viewsheds (to and from the square).

3* The amended application includes diagrams illustration the various incarnations of the park over the decades. The illustrations were presented at the hearing.

4* No historic walkway material remains. The trees and general form of the park paths are the major historic characteristics that remain.

5* The topography of the site is being modified minimally for the purpose of accessibility.

6* The new paths have a cross axial pattern which will be installed to reference previous historic patterns without introducing false sense of historicity. These were presented at the hearing.

7* Changes to the Martin Street parking area and sidewalk, corner and mid-block bump-outs will maintain the historic granite curbs in their current configuration.

8* A comprehensive tree study has been performed on the square; the oak trees that create the historic frame of the square will be maintained; a tree protection plan was not provided.

9* Historic oaks will be protected by appropriately constricted perimeter treatment which will discourage pedestrian and vehicular traffic in the root zones.

10* Approximately 21 trees 8" DBH or larger from the central portion of the square that are incongruous with the character of the oaks will be removed to improve overall flexibility within the square. The amended application includes a plan of all trees including those being removed.
11* All tree pruning and protection will be under the care of the project arborist. New plantings will be limited to deciduous trees including oaks to reinstitute the historic planting patterns. New tree species will maintain the character and traits of the oak trees. Exact species and locations were provided.
12* Removal of non-historic plantings and planters will restore historic vistas and views.
13* At edges where significant erosion occurs, low seat walls will be introduced to improve health of trees. The new seat wall perimeter bench and interior benches will be low to allow sightlines through the park. All proposed utilities will be underground. The existing utility panels that exist on site will be relocated underground to improve views and remove clutter from the square.
14* The team will explore options for identifying subterranean resources to include possibly an archaeological assessment or other non-invasive methods.
15* Water feature will be level with the adjacent paving and will be unobtrusive and coordinated with pathway. The play area will be set within tree area and will use natural rock and wooden elements. These elements are in keeping with the historical uses of the square as a gathering space.
16* Photographs and a detailed description of the existing conditions were provided in the application.
17* At the perimeter of the square's planted areas will be a series of seat walls, curbs and low rails which will deter pedestrians from walking through the critical root zone of the canopy trees. Seating, lighting other site furnishings will follow the walkway surrounding the central open space.
18* No details and specifications were provided for any of the proposed alterations.

B. Construction of a new building is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 2.2.5, 2.6.6, 2.6.8, 2.6.9, 2.6.10, 3.11.1, 3.11.2, 3.11.4, 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 4.3.4, 4.3.5, 4.3.6, 4.3.10, 4.3.11, and the following findings:
1* In the early nineteenth century, two small frame buildings were on the square--a church which was moved to the site in 1822, and a school built in 1849.
2* The new building will be in the southeast quadrant of the park, outside of the circular inner path and tucked within the tree area so as to not impede the open central core of the park.
3* New building will be small in scale so as not to detract from the trees and grassy spaces. It will be in scale or smaller than historic buildings once on the square. The amended application states that the chapel was 40' x 50' and the school was 40' x 30'.
4* A design for the building was not provided.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Davis; passed 5/0.

Decision on the Application

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

1. That details and specifications for the following will be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan provided by an ISA certified arborist.
2. That the general footprint and location of the new building be approved.
3. That the proposed demolition and removal of existing non-historic features be approved.
4. That the general layout of the proposed new landscaping and hardscaping be approved.
5. That a new Major Work COA application(s) be filed for the new landscape and hardscape features; design and materials of the new architectural elements including building and fountain; new lighting, signage, playground, and other miscellaneous features.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 5/2/16.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

150-15-CA 3108 HILLMER DRIVE
Applicant: MATTHEW HOBBS & KATHERINE O'BRIEN
Received: 10/14/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 1/12/2016 1) 11/2/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: LANDMARK HISTORIC DISTRICT
Raleigh Historic Landmark: NATHANIEL "CRABTREE" JONES HOUSE
Zoning: R-4
Nature of Project: Construct 2-story rear addition; enclose side porch; rebuild porch wall with new windows; construct new front porch; alter roof covering; alter garage wall; construct driveway; grade front yard.
Amendments: Amended drawings and additional evidence was provided October 30 and is attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- Color versions of the application photos are available for review.
- COAs mentioned in staff comments are available for review.
- This COA application is for fulfillment of condition 3. of COA 005-13-CA.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	construct 2-story rear addition; construct new front porch; construct driveway; grade front yard; construct retaining walls
2.4	Fences and Walls	construct retaining walls
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	construct driveway; construct retaining walls
2.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	alter garage wall
3.4	Paint and Paint Color	change exterior paint colors
3.5	Roofs	alter roof covering
3.7	Windows and Doors	rebuild porch wall with new windows
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	enclose side porch; rebuild porch wall with new windows; construct new front porch
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	construct 2-story rear addition

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Construction of driveway; grading of front yard; alter roof covering; alteration of garage wall; change of exterior paint colors is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.4, 2.3.7, 2.3.11, 2.4.8, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.9, 2.6.10, 3.4.3, 3.5.5, and the following findings:

1* The house was relocated to this site in 2014 per COA 005-13-CA.

2* A gravel/crush-and-run driveway with new curb cut is proposed on the north side of the house; this is the same side as it was located historically on the old site. A short retaining wall may be required. Specifications and details were not provided.

3* The front yard is proposed to be graded to address drainage issues. A retaining wall may be needed at the south side of the property. Specifications and details were not provided.

4* The south wall of the non-historic garage will be permanently enclosed to match the remainder of the garage. Drawings were provided.

5* The house will be painted white; the garage is to be painted dark green; paint chips were not provided

6* The new roofing on the house and addition will be primarily architectural shingles with a possible metal roofed section. Specifications and details were provided.

B. Enclosure of side porch; rebuilding of porch wall with new windows; construction of new front porch is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.7.1, 3.7.9, 3.7.13, 3.8.1, 3.8.6, 3.8.7, 3.8.10, and the following findings:

1* According to the landmark designation report, the period of significance is ca. 1808-1812 and ca. 1835-1845, the original period of construction and the period of the Greek Revival rear addition.

2* The amended application includes a diagram indicating the various construction periods of the house.

3* The exact date of the two-story enclosed porch wall to be rebuilt is uncertain, but its current condition is outside of the period of significance. The application includes a ca. 1934 photo, excerpted from a recent archaeology report, of the porch prior to installation of windows.

4* The proposed siding for the rebuild wall will match that of the Greek Revival rear addition in material and reveal. The windows are proposed to not have muntins akin to the late 19th-century/20th-century image showing screens only in the second floor, prior to installation of windows in the 20th century. The amended application added windows on the 2nd level to enhance the look of an enclosed porch.

5* Window specifications were provided.

6* Windows being removed will either be stored on site or made available for salvage.

7* The applications states that research suggests the first-period house did not have a front porch as there was substantial water damage below the door. The proposed new porch is to match the first-period Georgian/Federal design. Detailed drawings were not provided.

8* The landmark designation report states: "physical evidence suggests and old photographs document the presence of earlier porches. Pilasters frame the front entrance and ghost

marks indicate the former presence of a covered stoop or small entrance porch. Other ghost marks between the two stories of the center block show that a pedimented roof once sheltered the centermost entrance bay, and another set of marks indicates a full-width front porch at another time."

9* The side porch being enclosed is outside of the period of significance. The fenestration is per the elevations with the siding to match the Greek Revival additions. The cornice is to follow the profile of the existing porch, with the overhang to be similar to the existing rear wing of the house; boxed in with trim boards but without any additional molding. Detailed drawings were not provided.

C. Construction of 2-story rear addition is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9, and the following findings:

1* There are trees at the rear of the property that are not directly impacted by the proposed construction; a tree protection plan was not provided.

2* A shallow two-story addition is proposed for the south side of the ca. 1835-1845 rear addition; it extends to cover a section of uncertain date, but not the ca. 1810-1811 stair hall.

3* The new roof will be a low shed roof that will tie into the ridge of the highest connector gable, but remains lower than the ca. 1835-1845 rear addition.

4* The materials are proposed to be wood siding to match the existing house at the Greek Revival rear wing with all trim to match existing cornice, eaves, soffits, windows, and doors and all overhangs to match the existing rear wing. The foundation for the addition is proposed to match the existing foundation of the house before it was moved, concrete block to be stuccoed and scored. Window specifications were provided.

5* A single skylight is proposed on the addition.

6* A basement access hatch is proposed to be relocated. Details were not provided.

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

1. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan;
   b. Addition construction drawings;
   c. Curb cut.
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction or installation:
   a. Addition foundation treatment;
   b. Window and door trim;
   c. Doors;
   d. Front porch;
   e. Porch enclosure;
   f. Retaining wall(s);
   g. Basement hatch;

h. Paint colors;
i. Light fixtures.

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 house originally sat 300-500 feet away from this site. Ms. Tully stated that amended drawings showed the upper floor made to look more like an enclosed porch, added the missing basement access hatch, and clarified that it is a new curb cut.

Support:
Mr. Matt Hobbs [affirmed] and Mr. Robert Parrot [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Hobbs stated he liked the house and he thanked the commission in preserving it. He expressed his urgency to get this approved so he can buy the house and make it functional.

Mr. Parrot stated that he was speaking as a regional director of Preservation North Carolina, which holds covenants over the house as well as owning it. PNC has approved the work that will be done in the application.

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

Responses and Questions:
None.

At Ms. Caliendo's suggestion Mr. Davis 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]:
This is all pretty straightforward. The windows have been resolved. [Caliendo]
We are very appreciative of the work that is being done. [David]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Ms. Jackson moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comments A. (inclusive of facts 1-6), B. (inclusive of facts 1-9), and C. (inclusive of facts 1-6) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Construction of driveway; grading of front yard; alter roof covering; alteration of garage wall; change of exterior paint colors is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.4, 2.3.7, 2.3.11, 2.4.8, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.9, 2.6.10, 3.4.3, 3.5.5, and the following findings:

1* The house was relocated to this site in 2014 per COA 005-13-CA.

2* A gravel/crush-and-run driveway with new curb cut is proposed on the north side of the house; this is the same side as it was located historically on the old site. A short retaining wall may be required. Specifications and details were not provided.

3* The front yard is proposed to be graded to address drainage issues. A retaining wall may be needed at the south side of the property. Specifications and details were not provided.

4* The south wall of the non-historic garage will be permanently enclosed to match the remainder of the garage. Drawings were provided.

5* The house will be painted white; the garage is to be painted dark green; paint chips were not provided

6* The new roofing on the house and addition will be primarily architectural shingles with a possible metal roofed section. Specifications and details were provided.

B. Enclosure of side porch; rebuilding of porch wall with new windows; construction of new front porch is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.7.1, 3.7.9, 3.7.13, 3.8.1, 3.8.6, 3.8.7, 3.8.10, and the following findings:

1* According to the landmark designation report, the period of significance is ca. 1808-1812 and ca. 1835-1845, the original period of construction and the period of the Greek Revival rear addition.

2* The amended application includes a diagram indicating the various construction periods of the house.

3* The exact date of the two-story enclosed porch wall to be rebuilt is uncertain, but its current condition is outside of the period of significance. The application includes a ca. 1934 photo, excerpted from a recent archaeology report, of the porch prior to installation of windows.

4* The proposed siding for the rebuild wall will match that of the Greek Revival rear addition in material and reveal. The windows are proposed to not have muntins akin to the late 19th-century/20th-century image showing screens only in the second floor, prior to installation of windows in the 20th century. The amended application added windows on the 2nd level to enhance the look of an enclosed porch.

5* Window specifications were provided.

6* Windows being removed will either be stored on site or made available for salvage.

7* The applications states that research suggests the first-period house did not have a front porch as there was substantial water damage below the door. The proposed new porch is to match the first-period Georgian/Federal design. Detailed drawings were not provided.

8* The landmark designation report states: "physical evidence suggests and old photographs document the presence of earlier porches. Pilasters frame the front entrance and ghost marks indicate the former presence of a covered stoop or small entrance porch. Other ghost marks between the two stories of the center block show that a pedimented roof once

sheltered the centermost entrance bay, and another set of marks indicates a full-width front porch at another time."

9* The side porch being enclosed is outside of the period of significance. The fenestration is per the elevations with the siding to match the Greek Revival additions. The cornice is to follow the profile of the existing porch, with the overhang to be similar to the existing rear wing of the house; boxed in with trim boards but without any additional molding. Detailed drawings were not provided.

C. Construction of 2-story rear addition is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9, and the following findings:

1* There are trees at the rear of the property that are not directly impacted by the proposed construction; a tree protection plan was not provided.

2* A shallow two-story addition is proposed for the south side of the ca. 1835-1845 rear addition; it extends to cover a section of uncertain date, but not the ca. 1810-1811 stair hall.

3* The new roof will be a low shed roof that will tie into the ridge of the highest connector gable, but remains lower than the ca. 1835-1845 rear addition.

4* The materials are proposed to be wood siding to match the existing house at the Greek Revival rear wing with all trim to match existing cornice, eaves, soffits, windows, and doors and all overhangs to match the existing rear wing. The foundation for the addition is proposed to match the existing foundation of the house before it was moved, concrete block to be stuccoed and scored. Window specifications were provided.

5* A single skylight is proposed on the addition.

6* A basement access hatch is proposed to be relocated. Details were not provided.

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

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

Ms. Jackson 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 the issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan;
   b. Addition construction drawings;
   c. Curb cut.
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction or installation:
   a. Addition foundation treatment;
   b. Window and door trim;
   c. Doors;
   d. Front porch;
   e. Porch enclosure;

f. Retaining wall(s);
g. Basement hatch;
h. Paint colors;
i. Light fixtures.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 5/2/16.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

151-15-CA 507 S PERSON STREET
Applicant: BEGINNING & BEYOND CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER, INC.
Received: 10/14/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 1/12/2016 1) 11/2/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: PRINCE HALL HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: DOD, RB
Nature of Project: Construct 8'x20' rear deck.
Conflict of Interest: Ms. David made a motion to recuse Ms. Jackson; Ms. Webb seconded; motion passed 5/0.
Staff Notes:

- COAs mentioned in staff comments are available for review.
- When posting the COA sign for this case, staff observed that the railing on the ramp was not constructed as approved in COA 059-14-CA.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Settings	Construct 8'x20' rear deck.
4.1	Decks	

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Construction of a rear deck is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, 2.3.8, 4.1.1, 4.1.2; however, the amount of built area and details **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, 2.3.8, 4.1.3, 4.1.5, 4.1.7, 4.1.8, and the following findings:

1* The foundation of a rear addition approved in June 2014 (COA 059-14-CA) is seen in one of the photos.

2* According to Wake County Real Estate data the lot is about 3,485 SF. The existing house and addition under construction is 1680 SF for built area of 48%. The proposed deck is approximately 182 SF; new built area of 53%.

3* Architectural drawings of the existing house and proposed changes did not contain the deck except for the plan included with the application. Elevation drawings of the deck were not provided.

4* The new deck extends 8 feet into the rear yard and will be 3-1/2 feet from the rear property line and fence.

5* The application states that the size of the lot is unique in the district, no evidence is provided to support this statement.
6* The application provides photos of the rear of 322 E Davie Street which has a low rear deck near the property line.

Staff recommends that the committee defer the application in order to obtain elevation drawings of the proposed deck and documentation of the unique size of the lot.

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 this application is to add a deck to the rear of the house to the addition being constructed. She stated that additional information is required.

Support:
Ms. Rosalind Blair [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Blair stated that there will be a restaurant located near the house that her parents will be moving to and since there will be outside dining and music she wished to have an outdoor space where they will not be disturbed. She stated that the lot was subdivided and originally was one lot and due to the uniqueness of the situation it was easier to add a deck into the back of the property.

Opposition:
Mr. Matt Harper [affirmed] was present to speak in opposition to the application. Mr. Harper stated there was no elevation or material list provided with the application. Mr. Harper also expressed concern that no single family home (of 44) in the district has more than 50% built area on the site and this is a small lot that will have approximately 62% built area. Mr. Harper stated that the property currently has a stoop and adding a deck will have the deck within two to three feet away from the property lines as well as one foot away from a concrete wall on his own property. Mr. Harper recommended the applicant take a look at their property lines and reconfigure where the proposed deck will go.

Responses and Questions:
None

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
We can defer and make them come back with the drawings. [David]
It is a pretty small lot. [Davis]

There is a difference, you can look and discuss with the applicants. [Tully]
We need a plan with elevations and property lines included. [David]

Ms. David made a motion to defer the application requesting additional information; Ms. Webb seconded; motion carried 4/0.
Committee members voting: Caliendo, David, Davis, Webb.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

152-15-CA 233 S WILMINGTON STREET
Applicant: MON PENG YUEH FOR THE CITY OF RALEIGH
Received: 10/14/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 1/12/2016 1) 11/2/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: DOD, BUS
Nature of Project: Follow-up to previously approved COA 123-14-CA regarding alterations to the transit center: implementation of master landscape and hardscape plan; new lighting and signage; new canopies, windbreaks and screen walls; alterations to Wilmington Street storefront.
Amendments: Specifications and photos of the courtyard string lights were provided and are attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: Mr. Davis made a motion to recuse Ms. Caliendo; Ms. Webb seconded; motion carried 4/0.
Staff Notes:

- In September 2014 (123-14-CA) the COA Committee approved demolition and removal of existing non-historic features and the general layout of the proposed new landscaping and hardscaping.
- In September 2015 (125-15-CA) the COA Committee approved the design and materials of the new architectural elements.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	implementation of master landscape and hardscape plan; new canopies, windbreaks and screen walls
2.4	Fences and Walls	hardscape plan
2.7	Lighting	new lighting
2.8	Signage	new signage
3.9	Storefronts	alterations to Wilmington Street storefront
3.11	Accessibility, Health, and Safety Considerations	implementation of master landscape and hardscape plan

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Implementation of master landscape and hardscape plan; is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.4, 2.3.7, 2.3.9, 2.4.8, 3.11.2, and the following findings:

1* The existing trees within the courtyard will be removed in order to allow for accessibility. Some of the trees on the site are not healthy or are at the end of their natural life span. A new specimen quality native canopy tree (Sugar Maple) in a standard City of Raleigh tree grate will replace the existing holly trees in the courtyard,

2* Other planting areas in the courtyard and along the bus lane will include understory trees, shrubs, groundcovers and bulbs. A planting plan was provided.

3* Most of the hardscape changes, canopies, windbreaks and screen walls are located in the middle of the block and the rear of the historic buildings. The existing 1986 Moore Square Transit Station is brick with concrete accents.

4* The topography of the courtyard will be modified for greater safety for disabled access.

5* Proposed site features include retaining walls, wide pedestrian walkways, ramps, planting, and site amenities.

6* Site paving materials consist of concrete in main pedestrian areas and subtly colored concrete in the courtyard and plaza areas. Existing interior courtyard building facades are brick and will remain. New site retaining walls will be concrete. The specific textures and colors were not provided.

7* Different scoring patterns are used for the various areas of the site; a location plan was provided.

8* The site plan indicates that the scoring pattern of the courtyard will be at an angle to the main walking path, 2' x 2' City of Raleigh standard paving.

9* Materials proposed for the new hardscaping are concrete and concrete pavers; details pattern and colors were not included in the application.

10* Low retaining walls of varying heights are proposed to be of smooth finish concrete and have metal railings; a section drawing of the wall was provided, but the railing was not.

B. Installation of new lighting and signage is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.7.4, 2.7.7, 2.7.11, 2.8.2, 2.8.3, 2.8.5, 2.8.7, 2.8.10; however the resin light boxes may be incongruous with *Guidelines* 2.8.10 and the following findings:

1* Five different kinds of lighting are proposed in the site including walkway lights, area lights, uplights, strip lights, cable lights. A color coded lighting plan is provided as well as photos of the proposed fixtures. Areas under the existing parking deck and new bus canopies will be fully lit

2* Simple, discreet pedestrian scale and overhead area lights are provided as required for safety along the streetscape edges of the bus lanes and within the courtyard.

3* The walkway pedestrian light fixture has been chosen for its human scale and compatibility with the new elements of the bus station.

4* The application states that the proposed overhead cable lighting system is consistent with similar lighting used at City Market. Photos and specifications were provided. COA 077-10-CA approved a lighting plan in City Market. However, conditions were never met and an overhead system was not part of the application.

5* Other light fixtures in the courtyard will include recessed uplights as well as indirect strip lighting in the ramp walls along the main pedestrian route through the site. Linear LED fixtures are proposed at each canopy; these fixtures are consistent with existing lighting at the Wilmington Street entrance to the station. Canopy lighting also includes LED fixtures to accent architectural elements and provide a soft, subtle glow.

6* Proposed signage includes an 18" tall stainless steel plate integrated into the new canopy D at the entry to the bus station, on axis to Moore Square. This sits back behind the rear walls of the historic buildings fronting Blount Street. This sign has a simple rectangular shape, with easy-to-read laser cut text and a graphic pattern inspired by the GoRaleigh logo. It is scaled appropriately to the canopy and is lit by a LED floodlight integrated into the canopy structure.

7* At the new bus station building, electronic signage is proposed for the south and east facades of the building; this signage will display up-to-date route times. Electronic display panels will also be located along the bus bays. A signage plan is provided. Photos of similar type displays were provided. Specifications were not provided.

8* New site signage will include directional and wayfinding signs for pedestrians, bus users, and bus traffic at locations to be determined

9* Additional lighting/signage includes 18" tall resin light boxes that are continuous along each bus bay. These light boxes have a matte finish and introduce a soft glow along the bus lanes. Simple vinyl letters will be applied to the face of the light boxes to label the bus bays. These wayfinding elements are internal to the block; they have no relationship to an existing historic facade and are consistent with the lighting and wayfinding requirements of a modern public bus station. A plan of the proposed light box locations as well as elevation drawings were included. Photos of installed Resin Light Boxes were provided.

10* The same material was approved as a back-drop to the large spoon at 135 S Wilmington Street (COA 134-10-MW). The material itself was not illuminated.

C. Installation of new canopies, windbreaks, screen walls, benches, and other miscellaneous site features such as trash & recycling, handrails, security cameras is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.9, 2.3.10, and the following findings:

1* Most of the hardscape changes, canopies, windbreaks and screen walls are located in the middle of the block and the rear of the historic buildings. The existing 1986 Moore Square Transit Station is brick with concrete accents.

2* Site amenities include bus canopy benches as well as solar compaction receptacles that the City of Raleigh has used at other facilities.

3* A few of the bus shelter canopies are along the side of 126 E Hargett Street and highly visible from the street.

4* The new bus shelter canopies will have steel posts and beams with tension cables to support roof panels that may be translucent or opaque. There are four types of canopies which are detailed in the application.
5* Both the canopies and windbreaks are galvanized steel structure with laminated glass; glass at the canopies has a translucent white interlayer while the windbreak glazing is clear with a white silkscreen dot pattern.
6* Screen walls are proposed along the existing parking deck and at the Wilmington Street entrance, internal to the site. These screen walls are constructed of perforated metal panel with a custom powder coated pattern inspired by the GoRaleigh logo. Detailed information regarding the appearance, materials, and colors was not included in the application. There are two types of metal panels with different perforation pattern (1/8″ holes with 3/16″ and 1/4″ staggered centers.
7* The glass windbreaks mimic the metal panels with 1/8″ dots silkscreened with 20% coverage and 40% coverage.
8* The proposed perforated metal panel is consistent with other elements of the project, such as the stair tower, that were approved as part of COA application 125-15-CA. This perforated panel creates an unobtrusive background for graphic patterns that lead into the station and unify the different areas.
9* Detailed drawings with locations provided.
10* Some of the perforated metal screens will attach to existing guardrails on the deck

D. Alterations to Wilmington Street storefront is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.6.2, 3.7.7, 3.9.5, however. the installation of metal screen walls **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.6.10,and the following findings:
1* Two existing cased openings will be modified due to the removal of the parking deck connector on the second floor.
2* A wood door will be added to the existing opening on the Wilmington Street facade. It includes a half-light and bottom panel that are consistent with the character of the street. The door will be painted to match the existing frame, and the bottom portion of the facade will also be repainted to match existing.
3* There is currently no door. The proposed door is typical of a building of that era. The transom signage will be removed.
4* On the building's rear facade, an existing awning will be removed and a wood window added to the existing cased door opening on the second floor. The door opening will be modified by infilling the area below the window sill with wall construction to match existing wall. It is likely that the opening was originally a window.
5* The proposed addition of a metal screen wall along the currently open stairway (north side) and a portion of the painted brick wall currently containing bus art (south side) will be visible from S Wilmington Street.

Pending the committee's determination regarding the proposed resin light boxes and metal screen walls in the Wilmington Street walkway, staff recommends that the committee approve the amended application, with the following conditions:

1. That details and clarifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction or installation:
   a. Concrete textures and colors;
   b. Appearance, materials, and colors of metal screen walls;
   c. Railings;
   d. Light fixtures;
   e. Signs;
   f. Craig building window;
   g. Security cameras.

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 this application is a follow up to previous applications dealing with the master plan for the bus facilities in Moore Square. Ms. Tully added that except for a question regarding the courtyard string lights, resin light boxes and metal screening for the walkway close to Wilmington Street, the application is good as is.

Support:
Ms. Mon Peng Yueh [affirmed], Ms. Susan Hatchell [affirmed], Ms. Jennifer Sea [affirmed], Mr. Steve Schuster [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application.

Ms. Yueh gave a demonstration of the lightbox and showed the committee what it would look like in the pedestrian area. Ms. Yueh stated the client has not decided what will go in the pedestrian area and the lighting will serve as a backdrop for vinyl signage. Ms. Yueh added that the lighting would be internal and not on the historical façades.

Mr. Schuster stated the canopies define the boarding zones throughout the facilities as route changes occur and the type of graphics would allow for a simple change to occur as this was a flexible, non-technical solution.

Ms. Hatchell stated that the main intent is to keep the space flexible as it can be and that the string lights will be mounted on poles.

Ms. Yueh added that the screening part of the parking deck will have a graphic that is inspired by the GoRaleigh logo that would tie into the entrance on Wilmington Street. Samples of the material were passed around. Mr. Schuster added that the stairs that access the Craig Building will no longer be a public stair.

Ms. Hatchell added that the scoring pattern in the walkways will not be 2x2 but will be used in places where it is connecting. Ms. Hatchell also corrected that item A8 the standard 2x2 pattern

will be used but not in the courtyard but the angled part is correct. Ms. Hatchell stated they are only looking at scored concrete and not using concrete pavers.

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

Responses and Questions:
Ms. Tully questioned if the lightboxes would be the same color as the one shown to the committee. Ms. Yueh replied it would be the same. Mr. Schuster stated that the frame would be more modest than the one on the display and will have a colored background. Ms. Tully pointed out that guideline 2.8.10 states that internally illuminated lights are not appropriate was written to address molded plastic signs and it was up to the commission to determine if the proposed lightboxes were applicable. Ms. Tully addressed the committee on the fact that different versions of lighting have been approved such as lit signs with halos around letters and the committee has to decide if the internal location different in this situation. Mr. Schuster replied that if the lights were applied on the outside it would be different but since this on the inside of the transit facility it seems appropriate.

Ms. David pointed out that the metal screen walls could possibly be incongruous. Ms. Tully responded that was concerned only with the location up at Wilmington Street. Mr. Davis inquired as to what was above the canopy on the east sign. Mr. Schuster responded only a pole structure with tension rods.

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
The landscape and hardscape plan, any comments? [David]
No, it falls within the guidelines. [Davis]
The new lighting and signage and the resin lightboxes? Guideline 2.8.10 was originally aimed at molded plastic signs. [David]
It is located on the interior space versus on the street. [Davis]
It does not appear you would see them at all from the exterior. [Jackson]
The way they are set into the building they read as a transit building and it is different from the old commercial building so this is a different situation. [David]
This is a different type of sign. [Jackson]
What about the string lighting? [David]
Is that different? [Davis]
Like this, it is going to be on poles but since it is so small it is very temporary. {David]
Is it indiscriminate area lighting? [Tully]
It does seem to be compatible with the human scale, citing guideline 2.7.4. [Jackson]

You could also cite 2.7.5 low level safety and security. [Davis]
What about the canopies, wind breaks and the screen walls? The alterations to the store front and the screen walls is maybe incongruous. They are in the internal hallway. [David]
I can appreciate that you do see through it but it is incongruous. [Davis]

Mr. Davis made a motion to reopen the public testimony portion of the hearing; Ms. Webb seconded; motion carried 4/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Ms. David inquired about how the screenwall will be attached. Ms. Yueh responded there are steel columns that are not historic that the screen will be attached to and additional steel beams will be added for support. Ms. Jackson questioned about how far back the panels will be set back from the street entrance. Ms. Yueh responded that the panels will be very close and the purpose of the panel was to separate the breezeway from access on the stairs. Mr. Schuster added that the introduction of the material will be all throughout the facility and when looking straight through it will be at the Craig Building. Ms. Jackson questioned how far back the screen sits on the non-stair side. Ms. Yueh responded only about 40-50 feet back and on the non-stair side.

Mr. Davis made a motion to close the public testimony portion of the hearing; Ms. Jackson seconded; motion carried 4/0.

Committee Discussion (2)

So it is not exactly covering historic material. You can see through it. [Davis]
You can interpret the guidelines as a permanent coating or a substitute material. With the visibility inherent it is not completely covering the wall and it would not set it off. It makes more sense in that respect it relates back to the same materials being used throughout. [Jackson]

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 comments A. (inclusive of facts 1-8, 10), B. (inclusive of facts 1-10), C. (inclusive of facts 1-10), and D. (inclusive of facts 1-5) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Implementation of master landscape and hardscape plan; is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.4, 2.3.7, 2.3.9, 2.4.8, 3.11.2, and the following findings:

1* The existing trees within the courtyard will be removed in order to allow for accessibility. Some of the trees on the site are not healthy or are at the end of their natural life span. A new specimen quality native canopy tree (Sugar Maple) in a standard City of Raleigh tree grate will replace the existing holly trees in the courtyard,

2* Other planting areas in the courtyard and along the bus lane will include understory trees, shrubs, groundcovers and bulbs. A planting plan was provided.

3* Most of the hardscape changes, canopies, windbreaks and screen walls are located in the middle of the block and the rear of the historic buildings. The existing 1986 Moore Square Transit Station is brick with concrete accents.
4* The topography of the courtyard will be modified for greater safety for disabled access.
5* Proposed site features include retaining walls, wide pedestrian walkways, ramps, planting, and site amenities.
6* Site paving materials consist of concrete in main pedestrian areas and subtly colored concrete in the courtyard and plaza areas. Existing interior courtyard building facades are brick and will remain. New site retaining walls will be concrete. The specific textures and colors were not provided.
7* Different scoring patterns are used for the various areas of the site; a location plan was provided.
8* The site plan indicates that the scoring pattern of the courtyard will be at an angle to the main walking path.
9* Materials proposed for the new hardscaping are concrete and scored concrete; details pattern and colors were not included in the application.
10* Low retaining walls of varying heights are proposed to be of smooth finish concrete and have metal railings; a section drawing of the wall was provided, but the railing was not.

B. Installation of new lighting and signage is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.7.4, 2.7.7, 2.7.11, 2.8.2, 2.8.3, 2.8.5, 2.8.7, 2.8.10, and the following findings:
1* Five different kinds of lighting are proposed in the site including walkway lights, area lights, uplights, strip lights, cable lights. A color coded lighting plan is provided as well as photos of the proposed fixtures. Areas under the existing parking deck and new bus canopies will be fully lit
2* Simple, discreet pedestrian scale and overhead area lights are provided as required for safety along the streetscape edges of the bus lanes and within the courtyard.
3* The walkway pedestrian light fixture has been chosen for its human scale and compatibility with the new elements of the bus station.
4* The application states that the proposed overhead cable lighting system is consistent with similar lighting used at City Market. Photos and specifications were provided. COA 077-10-CA approved a lighting plan in City Market. However, conditions were never met and an overhead system was not part of the application.
5* Other light fixtures in the courtyard will include recessed uplights as well as indirect strip lighting in the ramp walls along the main pedestrian route through the site. Linear LED fixtures are proposed at each canopy; these fixtures are consistent with existing lighting at the Wilmington Street entrance to the station. Canopy lighting also includes LED fixtures to accent architectural elements and provide a soft, subtle glow.
6* Proposed signage includes an 18" tall stainless steel plate integrated into the new canopy D at the entry to the bus station, on axis to Moore Square. This sits back behind the rear walls of the historic buildings fronting Blount Street. This sign has a simple rectangular shape, with easy-to-read laser cut text and a graphic pattern inspired by the GoRaleigh logo. It is

scaled appropriately to the canopy and is lit by a LED floodlight integrated into the canopy structure.

7* At the new bus station building, electronic signage is proposed for the south and east facades of the building; this signage will display up-to-date route times. Electronic display panels will also be located along the bus bays. A signage plan is provided. Photos of similar type displays were provided. Specifications were not provided.

8* New site signage will include directional and wayfinding signs for pedestrians, bus users, and bus traffic at locations to be determined

9* Additional lighting/signage includes 18" tall resin light boxes that are continuous along each bus bay. These light boxes have a matte finish and introduce a soft glow along the bus lanes. Simple vinyl letters will be applied to the face of the light boxes to label the bus bays. These wayfinding elements are internal to the block; they have no relationship to an existing historic facade and are consistent with the lighting and wayfinding requirements of a modern public bus station. A plan of the proposed light box locations as well as elevation drawings were included. Photos of installed Resin Light Boxes were provided.

10* The same material was approved as a back-drop to the large spoon at 135 S Wilmington Street (COA 134-10-MW). The material itself was not illuminated.

C. Installation of new canopies, windbreaks, screen walls, benches, and other miscellaneous site features such as trash & recycling, handrails, security cameras is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.9, 2.3.10, and the following findings:

1* Most of the hardscape changes, canopies, windbreaks and screen walls are located in the middle of the block and the rear of the historic buildings. The existing 1986 Moore Square Transit Station is brick with concrete accents.

2* Site amenities include bus canopy benches as well as solar compaction receptacles that the City of Raleigh has used at other facilities.

3* A few of the bus shelter canopies are along the side of 126 E Hargett Street and highly visible from the street.

4* The new bus shelter canopies will have steel posts and beams with tension cables to support roof panels that may be translucent or opaque. There are four types of canopies which are detailed in the application.

5* Both the canopies and windbreaks are galvanized steel structure with laminated glass; glass at the canopies has a translucent white interlayer while the windbreak glazing is clear with a white silkscreen dot pattern.

6* Screen walls are proposed along the existing parking deck and at the Wilmington Street entrance, internal to the site. These screen walls are constructed of perforated metal panel with a custom powder coated pattern inspired by the GoRaleigh logo. Detailed information regarding the appearance, materials, and colors was not included in the application. There are two types of metal panels with different perforation pattern (1/8″ holes with 3/16″ and 1/4″ staggered centers.

7* The glass windbreaks mimic the metal panels with 1/8″ dots silkscreened with 20% coverage and 40% coverage.

8* The proposed perforated metal panel is consistent with other elements of the project, such as the stair tower, that were approved as part of COA application 125-15-CA. This perforated panel creates an unobtrusive background for graphic patterns that lead into the station and unify the different areas.
9* Detailed drawings with locations provided.
10* Some of the perforated metal screens will attach to existing guardrails on the deck

D. Alterations to Wilmington Street storefront is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.6.2, 3.6.10, 3.7.7, 3.9.5, and the following findings:
1* Two existing cased openings will be modified due to the removal of the parking deck connector on the second floor.
2* A wood door will be added to the existing opening on the Wilmington Street facade. It includes a half-light and bottom panel that are consistent with the character of the street. The door will be painted to match the existing frame, and the bottom portion of the facade will also be repainted to match existing.
3* There is currently no door. The proposed door is typical of a building of that era. The transom signage will be removed.
4* On the building's rear facade, an existing awning will be removed and a wood window added to the existing cased door opening on the second floor. The door opening will be modified by infilling the area below the window sill with wall construction to match existing wall. It is likely that the opening was originally a window.
5* The proposed addition of a metal screen wall along the currently open stairway (north side) and a portion of the painted brick wall currently containing bus art (south side) will be visible from S Wilmington Street.
6* The screen wall will be mounted to non-historic steel posts.

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

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

Mr. Davis made a motion that the application be approved, with the following conditions:

1. That details and clarifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction or installation:
   a. Concrete textures and colors;
   b. Appearance, materials, and colors of metal screen walls;
   c. Railings;
   d. Light fixtures;
   e. Signs;
   f. Craig building window;
   g. Security cameras.

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

Committee members voting: David, Davis, Jackson, Webb.

Certificate expiration date: 5/2/16.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

153-15-CA 0 E LANE STREET
Applicant: HEATHER AND RANDALL SCOTT
Received: 10/14/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 1/12/2016 1) 11/2/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Pave private alley/driveway with solid concrete; remove 2 trees; plant 2 trees.
Amendments: A letter from the City of Raleigh Stormwater Management Division and Public Works Department was provided and is attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: Ms. Jackson made a motion to recuse Ms. David from the meeting; Mr. Davis seconded; motion carried 3/0.
Staff Notes:

- Locations of property lines, ownership, and access are civil matters outside the jurisdiction of the commission.
- 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."
- COA files mentioned in staff comments are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Pave private alley/driveway with solid concrete; remove 2 trees; plant 2 trees.
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	Pave private alley/driveway with solid concrete

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Removal of 2 trees; planting of 2 trees is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.5, 2.3.7 and the following findings:

1* The application proposes to remove a mature, unhealthy tree (species not specified) at the top of driveway; a referenced arborist report was not provided.

2* A mulberry tree at base of drive between drive and 512 E Lane Street is also requested to be removed because it is blocking full access of the driveway and inhibiting the functionality of the driveway. Two trees will remain.

3* Two trees are proposed to be replanted, one at 512 E Lane Street and one at 218 N East Street. The referenced tree plan was not provided.

4* A November 2014 staff-requested arborist report prepared by Hunter Tree & Landscape Co is attached to these comments. Note that at the time of the report the ownership of the alley was unknown. The following points regarding tree health were made in the report:

- There are 4 trees whose roots systems are significantly in the alley: a mulberry, maple, elm, and locust.
- The trees are likely volunteers, not deliberately planted.
- Excessive gravel, rutting, and exposure of roots have damaged the trees.
- The canopies of the trees and their contribution to the character of the district was not discussed.

B. Paving of private alley/driveway is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section 2.3.2, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.3.11, 2.5.1, 2.5.2; however the use of solid concrete **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.7, 2.5.1, 2.5.3, 2.5.9 and the following findings:

1* Remaining trees are proposed to be protected by adding Stalite rotary kiln expanded slate lightweight aggregate over the roots that extend into the driveway. The application includes an example of Stalite used in Oakwood for the construction of a two-car garage and separate carriage house in 2003 at 315 Boundary Street (COA 090-03-CA). Photos of the trees immediately adjacent the structures were included in the application; the arborist's report regarding root growth along roads and driveways was not.

2* A November 2014 staff requested arborist report prepared by Hunter Tree & Landscape Co. is attached to these comments. Note that at the time of the report the ownership of the alley was unknown. The following points regarding tree health and possible impacts of paving were made in the report:

- Excessive gravel, rutting, and exposure of roots has damaged the trees.
- Paving could cause additional root damage and will interrupt air and water penetration to the roots.
- The use of Stalite was not addressed.

3* It is unclear what will protect the remaining trees more: leaving the alley gravel, or paving.

4* A 1939 photograph of the driveway is included in the application. It appears from the photograph that the surface was either dirt or gravel. Most recently the driveway has been graveled with occasional patches of grass and weeds in the center aisle.
5* Landscape plans for 218 N East Street from 1947 are also included in the application.
6* The driveway has an 18% grade.
7* The proposal is for a solid concrete driveway with a reverse crown. The reverse crown would dip about 1" and allow for water to run down the center of the drive rather than off to adjacent properties. A cross section drawing of the proposed 4" slab is provided.
8* The driveway is currently graveled. Addition of gravel is required frequently to combat rutting and loss of gravel. Loss of gravel has exposed a concrete section likely installed by a prior owner as well as a drain pipe.
9* Gravel frequently washes off the driveway into the public right-of-way.
10* A May 15, 2015 letter from Pete Duffy, Water Quality Technician, City of Raleigh Stormwater Management Division requires the applicants to address the runoff from the driveway to avoid violating the City of Raleigh's Illicit Discharge Ordinance.
11* Engineers have stated that solid concrete is the only solution given the grade of the drive. Randy Wise, PE with Wise Engineering states "Due to the utilities in the area (water and sewer) it would be difficult to install drainage to intercept the runoff plus there are limited places the drainage could be routed without causing other erosion problems." and "Based on the steepness of the drive, the amount of runoff flowing to and down the driveway, I propose that the best solution would be to stabilize the drive by constructing it of concrete with the drive sloped toward the center of the drive to convey the water to Lane St. via a stable (nonerosive channel)."
12* Diagrams of the recommended grade for gravel and earth driveways were provided. They indicate that the current drive is 3x the recommended grade for earth and 2x the recommended grade for gravel.
13* An email from the City of Raleigh Transportation Field Services Manager, Christopher McGee, referencing the letter from Wise Engineering, states that subsurface drainage is impractical due to the sanitary sewer line and that the proposed paving solution will eliminate the City's problem with gravel washing into the right-of-way.
14* A solid concrete drive was approved at 327 Oakwood Ave in 1988 (COA CAD-87-117) in part because of the "because of excessive amounts of water that drain across his property."
15* In 2006 an application at 105 N. Bloodworth Street (037-06-CA) for a solid concrete driveway was denied because no special circumstances were indicated for constructing a solid driveway in that location.

Staff recommends that the committee approve the removal of the trees, waiving the 365-day demolition delay, and with the following conditions:

1. That the tree species and locations be provided to and approved by staff prior to removal of the trees.

Staff recommends that the proposal for the paving of the alley/driveway be deferred to allow time for consideration of additional evidence provided with these comments and at the public hearing.

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 attached to staff comments there is an additional letter from the Stormwater Management Division, an email from the Public Works Department as well as an arborist report that was prepared in November of last year. Ms. Tully recommended deferring.

Support:
Mr. Randy Scott [affirmed] and Ms. Heather Scott [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Scott reported that over the last few years the driveway has washed out repeatedly. Mr. Scott reported he reached out to Ms. Tully two years ago under the impression it was a public alleyway and after investigation it was discovered it was a private alley that he later purchased from the remaining heirs. Mr. Scott reported that repeatedly after high volume rain events the driveway becomes washed out and he repeatedly has to refill and pack the driveway again. He added that he received a letter from the City that further washout would result in being cited for violating the illicit discharge ordinance. To alleviate the problem in the interim, they have dammed water at the top of the alley.

Mr. Scott stated that the alley was created in 1909 from and to access the adjacent properties. The City maintained the alley for 20 years. He had stormwater look at the alley and hired an engineer. The engineer proposed a solution to pave it with a reverse crown. He also met with City staff who said that he couldn't do an underground drain because of existing sewer lines.

Mr. Scott reiterated that because the driveway is so steep, the length, and the fact it was neglected for twenty years makes it severely degraded and that paving it is the only option to make it safe and drivable. He added that he would prefer to use brick or stone, but that water could get under those materials and erode from underneath. He added that he builds driveways for a living.

Mr. Scott described the stalite product proposed for under the concrete including how made and the purpose. He pointed out its use at 315 N Boundary Street and how the product allows for air and water to get to tree roots. He added that the solid concrete over the product spreads out the weight of vehicles driving over roots. Mr. Scott stated that they also considered and glue and fiberglass gravel system.

The applicant then passed out a report from an arborist. Mr. Scott stated that the locust at the top of the driveway is experiencing rot due to the damage at the bottom of the trunk. Mr. Scott

reported additionally that the mulberry tree's root system encroaches on the driveway and that paving over the driveway will keep pressure off of any trees.

Ms. Gail Wiesner [affirmed] stated that she was only able to get half-way up the drive when she tried and that there is a disabled next door neighbor and the driveway could be potentially dangerous to them. Ms. Wiesner stated that due to the environmental hazards, water runoff as well as noise, paving the driveway while not the best is the only solution that is viable.

Mr. Peter Rumsey [affirmed], a real estate agent, stated he tried to drive up the driveway and could not. He stated his support for the application as it is the only safe way to access the property if it could be paved over.

Ms. Darcia Black [affirmed] stated that in the eight years living here she has seen the gravel from the driveway repeatedly being washed into the road and stated she believed it was a safety hazard and that paving the driveway was the only way to solve the problems.

Mr. Joe Nunnery [affirmed] stated that paving the driveway is the only way to remain friendly to the environment and prevent the continuous maintenance.

Opposition:
Ms. Lee Ann Gillan [affirmed] and Mr. Bob Gillan [affirmed] were present to speak in opposition to the application. Mr. Gillan stated they appealed a decision that the addition of gravel onto the driveway did not need a COA, but that the Board of Adjustment upheld the zoning enforcement officer's decision. Mr. Gillan stated he has never seen runoff on the driveway as bad as has happened within the past three years.

Ms. Gillan gave a presentation, including hard copies of the slides, about the recent history of the driveway. Ms. Gillan highlighted Google earth images that showed the loss of a Pecan grove and installation of a retaining wall presumably to retain water (slide 14). She notes in slide 18 that the wall is removed sometime between April 2013 and March 2014.

Ms. Gillan stated there was never a pipe sticking out of the alleyway prior to installation of the PVC pipe. Ms. Gillan played a video of water flow out of and around the PVC pipe.

Mr. Gillan stated that Jake Brantley maintained the driveway, including adding gravel, for 20 years and that the water problem is recent. He noted that Mr. Nance with the City never added gravel. He cited guideline 2.3.11 and argued that there is not an ongoing long term issue with drainage.

Mr. Gillan stated that there is a total of 21,705 gallons per hour with a one inch rain that will come down the driveway. He also disputed the relevancy of the driveway at 327 Oakwood Avenue.

Mr. Gillan also questioned how the vegetation on the property will be impacted due to the proposed paving. Mr. Gillan also added that it is not appropriate to remove healthy trees. He requested additional information on stalite including if it needed to be built up to cover the roots and the impact on the tree canopy.

Ms. Gillan added that a lot of cars drive on the driveway which has probably also degraded it.

Ms. Gillan summarized her presentation (slide 43) by stating the reasons for the deterioration of the driveway: its use by heavy equipment, removal of the retaining wall, and stormwater runoff. She added the need for a tree protection plan.

Mr. Davis asked if the Mrs. Barbour told the Gillans that the wall was to retain water. They said that they did not have discussions about water with her.

Responses and Questions:
Mr. Scott agreed that much of the Gillan's testimony is true, but that the pipe is not an issue. Ms. Scott showed pictures of a clay pipe that ran under the driveway and how it was included on the 1947 landscape plans and that it is a footing drain. Mr. Scott also clarified that the previous owner (Jake Brantley) added two truckloads of gravel per year for twenty years on the driveway, noting the sections of concrete they added to help get vehicles up the drive. He stated that he has not added new gravel, but scooped up the wash-out and put it back.

Mr. Scott stated that the retaining wall in question was merely a pile of rubble and stones with no mortar. He hauled it away with a wheelbarrow. He cannot continue to contain water in their yard. Ms. Scott added that they have a long term landscape plan in the works including the addition of trees similar to Ms. Gillan's slide 31.

Mr. Scott added that it does not have a crown on the driveway and they are proposing adding a reverse one that will carry the water and keep it off other properties. Mr. Scott added he did not wish to pave the driveway but this is the only safe way and they are trying to preserve the historic alleyway.

Ms. Caliendo questioned the amount of run off on the driveway. Ms. Tully responded that the City has approved a concrete driveway if the committee is thinking of deferring she can provide the minutes. Ms. Tully reminded the committee they could request more information on the stalite and that is has been approved for use underneath garages.

Ms. Caliendo asked the applicants if they have talked to a civil engineer. Ms. Scott responded there have been a few.

Ms. Caliendo asked about the Board of Adjustment ruling. Ms. Tully responded that the gravel was considered maintenance and that the minutes can be provided at the next meeting after they have been approved.

Ms. Jackson stated that the arborist in the report is not as familiar with stalite. Ms. Tully responded that any testimony on stalite would be best if it came from the company.

Ms. Scott added that the trees are not in a great place on the property and they want to protect the ones that they can.

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
We should defer this since we were given a lot of information. [Caliendo]
We could request additional information as well. [Webb]
Just being a little bit more educated on the stalite product would be helpful. [Jackson]
We could request more information for the items Tania mentioned and more information on the trees. [Caliendo]
I am a little overwhelmed with the information. Our task is to decide whether or not this meets the guidelines regarding the tree canopy, if the material changed on the driveway is the crux we're getting at. What is the date for the next application deadline? [Jackson]
November 16th. I could pull the information on the 327 Oakwood case and the Board of Adjustment minutes. [Tully]

Mr. Davis made a motion to defer the application. Ms. Jackson seconded; motion carried 4/0.

Committee members voting: Caliendo, Davis, Jackson, Webb.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Administrative Review of Conditions: 132-15-CA (314 E Cabarrus Street) Ms. Tully stated the applicants were instructed to bring back a revision to the rear lower window that was not just a single wall of glass. Ms. David stated it looks less like a hole in the wall. Ms. Tully added there were two vertical windows and a vertical door proposed now. Ms. David made a motion to approve the revised window as submitted; Ms. Webb seconded; motion carried 5/0.
2. Design Guidelines Update
3. Committee Discussion
   a. Application Completeness
   b. Meeting Post-Mortem

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:33 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner