RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
July 6, 2015

CALL TO ORDER
Kiernan McGorty 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: Miranda Downer, Laurie Jackson
Alternate Present: Fred Belledin, Kiernan McGorty
Excused Absence: Elizabeth Caliendo, Sarah David, Don Davis
Staff Present: Tania Tully, Martha Lauer, Teresa Young

Approval of the June 1, 2015 Minutes
Ms. Jackson moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing and to adopt said minutes as submitted. Mr. Belledin seconded the motion; passed 3/0 (Belledin abstained).

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
Darren Bridges, 703 Van Buren Road 27604	No
Zachary Taylor, 3200 Hillsborough Street 27607	No
Wyeth Johnson, 903 W Lenoir Street 27603	No
Michael Morrison, 115.5 E Hargett Street 27601	Yes
Michael Ruiz, 712 Tucker Street 27603	Yes
Nicole Johnson, 811 Historian Street	Yes
Darian Walker, 918 Minerva Dale Drive 27526	No
Jason Thurston, 511 Oakwood Avenue 27601	Yes
Rebecca Morris, 115.5 E Hargett Street 27601	Yes
John L. Thomas, 5508 Swiftbrook Circle 27606	Yes
Richard Dickie, 5203 Asbury Circle 27606	No
Gail Wiesner, 515 Euclid Street 27604	Yes
Matthew Konar, 706 Mountford Street 27608	Yes
Matt Hirsh, 706 Mountford Street 27608	Yes
Marilla Sa Ribiero, 706 Mountford Street 27608	Yes
Jodi Heyens, 500 N Blount Street 27602	Yes
Ken Dunn, City of Raleigh Public Works 27602	No

REVIEW OF SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Belledin moved to approve the agenda as amended. Case 084-15-CA was deferred at the applicant's request. Ms. Downer seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS

There were no objections to the approval of the Summary Proceedings without a public hearing. The committee reviewed and approved the following cases 083-15-CA, 085-15-CA, and 086-15-CA for which the Summary Proceeding is made part of these minutes.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – SUMMARY PROCEEDING

083-15-CA 515 N BOUNDARY STREET
Applicant: ROBERT SCOTT FORTENBERRY
Received: 6/15/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/13/2015 1) 7/6/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Construct rear porch and deck; replace rear window with door; remove rear door
Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Construct rear porch and deck;
3.7	Windows and Doors	replace rear window with door; remove rear door
4.1	Decks	Construct rear porch and deck;
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Construct rear porch and deck;

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Construction of rear porch and deck; replacement rear window with door; removal of rear door is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 3.7.2, 3.7.9, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.5, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.9, and the following findings:

1* The proposed changes are at the rear of the house.

2* There are no trees immediately in the footprint of the proposed new construction; however there are existing trees that may be impacted by construction activities. A tree protection plan is not included.

3* Based on the application and Wake County Real Estate Data the lot is 7,840 SF. The existing built area including house and porch is about 1,747 SF for 22% lot coverage. The proposed built area including house, porch, and new porch and deck is about 1,854 SF for 24% lot coverage.

4* The proposed new porch is at the rear of the historic house; the roofline tucks under the eave of the existing house and is a simple open shed. Detailed drawings and description are included in the application. The porch railings will be the same design as the front porch.

5* The porch and deck are inset from the walls of the house by at least a foot. Their floors are at the level of the main floor of the house which sits a full story above the ground.
6* An existing window on the rear of the house will be replaced with a wood door with transom and a non-historic door will, be removed and replaced with wood siding. There is no indication as to what will happen with the removed window.
7* Based on the application and Wake County Real Estate Data the lot is 7,840 SF. The existing built mass including house and porch is about 1,747 SF for 22% lot coverage. The proposed built mass including house, porch, and new porch and deck is about 1,805 SF for 23% lot coverage.

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

1. That the window being removed be stored on-site.
2. That the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan.
3. That the specifications and detailed for following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Metal roofing;
   b. New door.

Decision on the Application

There were no objections to approval without a public hearing.

Mr. Belledin moved to approve the application, adopting the staff comments as the written record of the summary proceeding on 083-15-CA. Ms. Jackson seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

Committee members voting: Belledin, Downer, Jackson, McGorty.

Certificate expiration date: 1/6/16.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – SUMMARY PROCEEDING

085-15-CA 903 W LENOIR STREET
Applicant: WYETH JOHNSON
Received: 6/16/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/14/2015 1) 7/6/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Construct 54" tall fence; remove back porch; construct screened porch; construct low deck; alter roof covering
Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Construct 54" tall fence; remove back porch; construct screened porch; construct low deck;
2.4	Fences and Walls	Construct 54" tall fence
3.5	Roofs	alter roof covering
4.1	Decks	construct low deck
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	remove back porch; construct screened porch

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Removal of back porch; construction of screened porch construction of low deck is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.5, 4.1.8, 4.2.1, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.9, and the following findings:

1* The proposed changes are at the rear of the house.

2* There are no trees immediately in the footprint of the proposed new construction; however there are existing trees that may be impacted by construction activities. A tree protection plan is included.

3* Based on the application and Wake County Real Estate Data the lot is 6,970 SF. The existing built area including house and porches is about 2,388 SF or 34%. The proposed built area including house, porches, and new porch and deck is about 2,858 SF or 41%.

4* The low deck is proposed to be made of wood and be approximately 6 inches above grade.

5* The porch being removed is a utilitarian wood frame porch with a concrete slab floor sitting on steel supports; it has a simple shed roof and is at the rear of the house.

6* The proposed new screened porch sits in the same general location as the one being removed; the new roof is a hipped roof that extends over the roof of the existing bump-out; the eave will match that of the adjacent bump-out. A roof plan is provided, but detailed drawing of the eave is not included in the application.
7* The porch is inset from the wall of the house by one foot.
8* The porch railings will be a simple wood picket; detailed drawings are included. The application does not clarify how the screening interacts with the railings; typically the railings are on the outside of the screening.
9* Based on the application and Wake County Real Estate Data the lot is 6,970 SF. The existing built mass including house and porches is about 2,388 SF or 34%. The proposed built mass including house, porch, and (250) new porch and deck is about 2,534 SF or 36%.

B. Construction of 54" tall fence; alteration of roof covering is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.4.8, 3.5.6, and the following findings
1* There are no trees immediately in the patch of the new fencing.
2* The house is on a corner lot so a portion of the rear fence runs along Cutler Street.
3* The fence is located in the rear yard in the traditional location near property lines. At the north it will connect to the new porch. On the south it is behind the rear side bay of the house at the approximate location of an existing concrete curb.
4* The design of the fence has a solid portion is up to 42" tall with an open picket portion on top reaching a maximum 54" height. The application is unclear as to whether or not the fence will be installed using neighbor-friendly design with the structural members facing towards the subject yard.
5* The design of the gates is not provided.
6* Roofing alterations are typically approvable as a Minor Work and is included here for administrative efficiency.

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

1. That the fence be installed using neighbor-friendly design with the structural members facing towards the subject yard.
2. That the screening on the porch be inside the balustrade.
3. That the specifications and details for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Deck edge;
   b. Eave construction.
4. That the specifications and details for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Lighting fixtures;
   b. Fence gate designs.

Decision on the Application

There were no objections to approval without a public hearing.

Mr. Belledin moved to approve the application, adopting the staff comments as the written record of the summary proceeding on 085-15-CA. Ms. Jackson seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

Committee members voting: Belledin, Downer, Jackson, McGorty.

Certificate expiration date: 1/6/16.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – SUMMARY PROCEEDING

086-15-CA 3200 HILLSBOROUGH STREET
Applicant: RICHARD DICKIE FOR CITY OF RALEIGH PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
Received: 6/16/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/14/2015 1) 7/6/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: NONE
Raleigh Historic Landmark: WILMONT APARTMENTS
Zoning: NB, SRPOD
Nature of Project: Alter southeast corner of lot: remove 1 tree and 2 shrubs; replace concrete steps; construct new sidewalk.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- The proposed changes will also result in the City of Raleigh obtaining ownership of the .018 acre.
- At a later date, staff will process a technical change to the landmark ordinance that would remove designation from the .018 acre.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Alter southeast corner of lot: remove 1 tree and 2 shrubs; replace concrete steps; construct new sidewalk
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	Alter southeast corner of lot: remove 1 tree and 2 shrubs; replace concrete steps; construct new sidewalk

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Alteration of southeast corner of lot: removal of 1 tree and 2 shrubs; replacement of concrete steps; construction of new sidewalk is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.6, 2.3.10, 2.5.1, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, and the following findings:

1* The designation ordinance states that the four-story U-plan Wilmont Apartments and the approximately .89 acre upon which it sits are significant architecturally and historically. The most significant site element is the placement of the building, set back from the street and a

slight angle, making the building visually more prominent as approached from the east (downtown). Trees and shrubs have been added since the building's construction (1926).

2* The proposed changes are at the southeast corner of the lot immediately adjacent to the current right-of-way. Impacts will be to .018 acre (798 SF) or .02% of the lot.

3* Two shrubs and a two-trunk dogwood are proposed for removal. These are not historic elements.

4* A new brick paver sidewalk and paved street will be constructed. The design will be the same as constructed previously eastward on Hillsborough Street.

5* Replacement of a portion of historic walks and steps may be needed to facilitate construction of underground items.

6* Two segments of walkway extending from the new brick sidewalk to the historic steps are shown to have the same design as the new sidewalk - this is currently historic concrete. The detail of the replacement steps adds a railing and extends the cheek walls 2′ farther than currently constructed.

7* The proposed changes to do not affect the siting of the building or its visual prominence.

8* All other proposed changes mentioned in the application occur outside of the landmark boundary.

Staff recommends that the committee approve the application with the proposed condition.

1. That the section of walkway extending from the new brick sidewalk to the historic steps be water-washed concrete.
2. That should the historic steps be damaged during construction, that they be replaced matching the design and dimensions of the existing steps, with the specifications and details to be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

There were no objections to approval without a public hearing.

Mr. Belledin moved to approve the application, adopting the staff comments as the written record of the summary proceeding on 086-15-CA. Ms. Jackson seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

<u>Committee members voting</u>: Belledin, Downer, Jackson, McGorty.

<u>Certificate expiration date</u>: 1/6/16.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Ms. McGorty 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: 061-15-CA, 082-15-CA, 087-15-CA, 088-15-CA, and 089-15-CA.

Case 061-15-CA: Ms. Downer made a motion to recuse Ms. Jackson from the case. Mr. Belledin seconded; motion carried 3/0. Mr. Belledin noted for the record that his firm worked on the rehabilitation and addition to the historic house, but had no relation to this project and could remain unbiased.

Prior to case 082-15-CA Ms. Downer made a motion to readmit Ms. Jackson back to the meeting. Mr. Belledin seconded. Motion passed 3/0.

Case 082-15-CA: Mr. Belledin noted that his firm was responsible for the design of the building but not the items being brought before the committee. He stated he could remain impartial to this application.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

061-15-CA 500 N BLOUNT STREET
Applicant: MIKE MORRISON FOR MAURER ARCHITECTURE
Received: 5/12/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 8/10/2015 1) 6/1/2015 2) 7/6/2015 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BLOUNT STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT
Raleigh Historic Landmark: MERRIMON-WYNNE HOUSE
Zoning: O&I-1, O&I-2, PDD
Nature of Project: Construct new 60'x40' accessory structure with porch and pergola; alter patio; remove tree.
Amendments: Additional information and revised drawings were provided in the commissioner packets.
DRAC: A pre-application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its April 22 meeting. Members in attendance were Curtis Kasefang, Jerry Traub, and Dean Ruedrich; also present were Jodi Strenkowski, Mike Morrison, David Maurer, and Tania Tully.
Conflict of Interest: Ms. Downer made a motion to recuse Ms. Jackson from the case as she works for Maurer Architecture. Mr. Belledin seconded; motion carried 4/0. Mr. Belledin noted for the record that his firm worked on the rehabilitation and addition to the historic house, but had no relation to this project and could remain unbiased.
Staff Notes:

- COAs mentioned in comments are available for review.
- The 1975 "Merrimon House" National Register of Historic Places nomination describes the 1875 house as: "…a two-story weatherboarded frame structure in Victorian Italianate style. The main block is six bays long and five deep, with the main façade dominated by an off-center two-story gable projection. Another similar projection extends at the south side. There are two elaborately ornamented one-story porches on either side of the front gable projection."
- The landmark designation report for the Merrimon-Wynne House states that the house "is significant as an excellent, intact local example of the Italianate residential style with very fine Eastlake detailing at the porch. It is one of the city's best examples of both the Italianate style and of Eastlake decoration."
- Locations of property lines are outside of the purview of the Commission.
- Additional facts as heard at the June hearing are included in the Staff Comments below.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Construct new 60'x40' accessory structure with porch and pergola.
2.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	Construct new 60'x40' accessory structure
4.3	New Construction	with porch and pergola.

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Construction of new 60'x40' accessory structure with porch and pergola; alteration of patio; removal of tree is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.5, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.6.6, 2.6.8, 2.6.9, 4.3.1, 4.3.4, 4.3.5, 4.3.6, 4.3.8, 4.3.9, 4.3.10, 4.3.11 and the following findings:

1* There is an oak tree at the northeast corner of the new building that is proposed for removal as it is in decline and unlikely to survive construction; a replacement tree is proposed in the amended application.

2* There are other trees on the property that may be impacted by construction activities; a tree protection plan was not provided.

3* The addition on the house was approved in 2013 (COA 107-13-CA) with minor changes approved in 2015 (COA 011-15-MW); the patio was approved with COA 200-13-MW.

4* Although currently mapped as two lots, the house and yard are visually one lot and are treated as such for this review.

5* According to the Wake County Real Estate Data the two parcels are 32,234 SF in area; including the approved COA data, the current footprint of the house with porches and addition is approximately 3,280 square feet and the patio is 3,200 SF; not including the parking area the current built area (surface coverage) is approximately 20%. The new accessory structure will sit on the existing patio and not significantly increase the built area.

6* The building is located in a traditional location for accessory buildings: it is sited at the rear corner of the property, set back from the primary structures façade along Blount Street with the main façade oriented towards Polk Street.

7* Most accessory buildings in the district are utilitarian in nature; however, in some cases the garage or the accessory building echoes the architectural style, materials, and details of the principal structure on the site (*Guidelines* p. 18).

8* The amended application states that "the design of the building will utilize Italianate principles including: a gable perpendicular to the ridge to allow for high windows, painted columns and woodwork at a scale appropriate for an accessory building while also providing a similarity to the existing by emphasizing wood working and wood detailing, a cupola which allows for additional centralized day lighting, large openings at grade for daylighting and access, color scheme similar to the existing structure." The June amendment eliminates the front facing gable and simplifies the detailing.

9* The primary building is of high-style and is a Raleigh Historic Landmark that is significant specifically for its grand architecture.

10* There is not a tradition of 1-1/2 or 2-story accessory buildings in most of Raleigh's historic districts. Staff is aware of one historic 1-1/2-story horse barn accessory building at the architecturally-elaborate Heck-Pool House at 218 N. East Street.

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

12* The amended application includes detailed information on the following:

- Accessory building with cupola at 407 N Blount Street which is an example in the district of a building that is of the same high-style Italianate design located on a corner lot that has a 1.5 story accessory building which is located at the rear corner of the site away from both streets.
- 1914 Sanborn Fire Insurance maps that show large accessory structures at 421 and 516 N. Blount St. The accessory building at 421 N Blount Street had the same approximate footprint as the house on the lot.
- Tucker Carriage House as an example of a 1.5 story accessory building which is comparable in footprint to the former primary structure on the site. The Tucker Carriage House is a Raleigh Historic Landmark.
- 218 N East Street as an example of a Raleigh Historic Landmark which has an accessory building that is almost equal in height (20′ ridge) to the main roof of the primary structure (25′-6″).

13* The amended application states that the new building is subservient in scale (14′-10″ lower in height than the main house) and has less enclosed footprint area (3, 000 SF to 2,624 SF). The roof pitch will match that of the main house. The ridge height of the new building is 24′ 8″ and the ridge height of the Merrimon-Wynne House is 39′ 6″.

14* The amended application included examples of large accessory structures at other Raleigh Historic Landmarks as well as an illustration comparing the temporary tent with the proposed accessory building. The building will be 5′2″ taller than the tent.

15* The amended application compares the height and design of the previous proposal with the amended submittal.

16* The application includes a visual comparison of the footprint with the historic house to the north of the property, but does not include an elevation comparison.

17* Proposed materials are wood lap siding with the same exposure as the historic house; synthetic trim; synthetic column trim; wood brackets, standing seam metal roof, brick base to match historic house, aluminum clad wood windows and doors, and a folding door system. Details and specifications were not included.

18* According to the Wake County Real Estate Data the two parcels are 32,234 SF in area; including the approved COA data, the current footprint of the house with porches and addition is approximately 3,280 SF; the current built mass (buildings) is approximately 10%; the new accessory structure and with porch and pergola is approximately 3,880 SF for a proposed built mass of 22%.

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

1. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan;
   b. Windows;
   c. Folding door system;
   d. Eave construction.
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction or installation:
   a. Replacement tree species and location;
   b. Metal roof;
   c. Porch posts;
   d. Pergola construction;
   e. Brackets;
   f. Light fixtures;
   g. Cupola construction;
   h. Foundation material sample.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from staff comments. She noted that this was a case deferred from last month and that revised drawings and additional information was provided in the commissioner packets.

Support:
Jodie Heyens and Mike Morrison [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Morrison stated that the design had been revised based on comments from the last meeting and that they provided more precedent research.

Opposition:
Gail Wiesner of [affirmed] was present to speak in opposition to the application Ms. Wiesner stated that while the research on the project is good, the angle of 90 degrees for the project is

incorrect for a historic district. The building would be odd and would impact the characteristic of the historic district in a negative way. She stated that the example at 218 N East Street is not visible from the street and that this building would be a huge draw to the eye.

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

Responses and Questions:
Mr. Morrison noted that 516 N Blount Street does run parallel to the Blount Street. Ms. McGorty questioned as to how the scale was taken down on the structure. Mr. Morrison responded that the ridge height was lowered as well as the eave height and the cupola height. He added that the front gable was also eliminated. He added that there was no longer a brick base.

Ms. Wiesner clarified that her concern was not the orientation to the street, but to the building. Ms. Heyens pointed out that the orientation of the structure was in the same direction as the historic accessory building associated with the house on its prior site. Mr. Morrison added that 516 N Blount Street has the same relationship.

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

Committee Discussion

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

The Sanborn maps are a critical piece of evidence in this case and recognize how things worked historically. [McGorty]
The Sanborn maps are a guiding example. There are not many, but a few examples of accessory buildings co-located with ornate buildings. We heard additional evidence that there was a large accessory structure at 516 that was parallel to the front. [Belledin]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Mr. Belledin moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-11, 13-18) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Construction of new 60'x40' accessory structure with porch and pergola; alteration of patio; removal of tree is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.5, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.6.6, 2.6.8, 2.6.9, 4.3.1, 4.3.4, 4.3.5, 4.3.6, 4.3.8, 4.3.9, 4.3.10, 4.3.11 and the following findings:

1* There is an oak tree at the northeast corner of the new building that is proposed for removal as it is in decline and unlikely to survive construction; a replacement tree is proposed in the amended application.

2* There are other trees on the property that may be impacted by construction activities; a tree protection plan was not provided.

3* The addition on the house was approved in 2013 (COA 107-13-CA) with minor changes approved in 2015 (COA 011-15-MW); the patio was approved with COA 200-13-MW.

4* Although currently mapped as two lots, the house and yard are visually one lot and are treated as such for this review.

5* According to the Wake County Real Estate Data the two parcels are 32,234 SF in area; including the approved COA data, the current footprint of the house with porches and addition is approximately 3,280 square feet and the patio is 3,200 SF; not including the parking area the current built area (surface coverage) is approximately 20%. The new accessory structure will sit on the existing patio and not significantly increase the built area.

6* The building is located in a traditional location for accessory buildings: it is sited at the rear corner of the property, set back from the primary structures façade along Blount Street with the main façade oriented towards Polk Street.

7* Most accessory buildings in the district are utilitarian in nature; however, in some cases the garage or the accessory building echoes the architectural style, materials, and details of the principal structure on the site (*Guidelines* p. 18).

8* The amended application states that "the design of the building will utilize Italianate principles including: a gable perpendicular to the ridge to allow for high windows, painted columns and woodwork at a scale appropriate for an accessory building while also providing a similarity to the existing by emphasizing wood working and wood detailing, a cupola which allows for additional centralized day lighting, large openings at grade for daylighting and access, color scheme similar to the existing structure." The June amendment eliminates the front facing gable and simplifies the detailing.

9* The primary building is of high-style and is a Raleigh Historic Landmark that is significant specifically for its grand architecture.

10* There is not a tradition of 1-1/2 or 2-story accessory buildings in most of Raleigh's historic districts. Staff is aware of one historic 1-1/2-story horse barn accessory building at the architecturally-elaborate Heck-Pool House at 218 N. East Street.

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

12* The amended application includes detailed information on the following:

- Accessory building with cupola at 407 N Blount Street which is an example in the district of a building that is of the same high-style Italianate design located on a corner lot that has a 1.5 story accessory building which is located at the rear corner of the site away from both streets.

- 1914 Sanborn Fire Insurance maps that show large accessory structures at 421 and 516 N. Blount St. The accessory building at 421 N Blount Street had the same approximate footprint as the house on the lot.
- Tucker Carriage House as an example of a 1.5 story accessory building which is comparable in footprint to the former primary structure on the site. The Tucker Carriage House is a Raleigh Historic Landmark.
- 218 N East Street as an example of a Raleigh Historic Landmark which has an accessory building that is almost equal in height (20′ ridge) to the main roof of the primary structure (25′-6″).
- The Sanborn map shows a large rear outbuilding at 516 N Blount Street; it has its long side parallel to the street.

13* The amended application states that the new building is subservient in scale (14′-10″ lower in height than the main house) and has less enclosed footprint area (3, 000 SF to 2,624 SF). The roof pitch will match that of the main house. The ridge height of the new building is 24′ 8″ and the ridge height of the Merrimon-Wynne House is 39′ 6″.

14* The amended application included examples of large accessory structures at other Raleigh Historic Landmarks as well as an illustration comparing the temporary tent with the proposed accessory building. The building will be 5′2″ taller than the tent.

15* The amended application compares the height and design of the previous proposal with the amended submittal.

16* The application includes a visual comparison of the footprint with the historic house to the north of the property, but does not include an elevation comparison.

17* Proposed materials are wood lap siding with the same exposure as the historic house; synthetic trim; synthetic column trim; wood brackets, standing seam metal roof, brick base to match historic house, aluminum clad wood windows and doors, and a folding door system. Details and specifications were not included.

18* According to the Wake County Real Estate Data the two parcels are 32,234 SF in area; including the approved COA data, the current footprint of the house with porches and addition is approximately 3,280 SF; the current built mass (buildings) is approximately 10%; the new accessory structure and with porch and pergola is approximately 3,880 SF for a proposed built mass of 22%.

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

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

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

1. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan;
   b. Windows;

   c. Folding door system;
   d. Eave construction.
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction or installation:
   a. Replacement tree species and location;
   b. Metal roof;
   c. Porch posts;
   d. Pergola construction;
   e. Brackets;
   f. Light fixtures;
   g. Cupola construction;
   h. Foundation material sample.

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

Committee members voting: Belledin, Downer, McGorty.

Certificate expiration date: 1/6/16.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

082-15-CA 201 E HARGETT STREET
Applicant: NICOLE JOHNSON FOR JDAVIS ARCHITECTS
Received: 6/12/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/10/2015 1) 7/6/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: DOD, BUS
Nature of Project: Alter non-historic courtyard; construct low deck; construct art piece/play structure
Conflict of Interest: Mr. Belledin noted that his firm was responsible for the design of the building but not the items being brought before the committee. He stated he could remain impartial to this application

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Alter non-historic courtyard; construct low deck; construct art piece/play structure
4.1	Decks	construct low deck

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Alteration non-historic courtyard; construction of low deck; construction of art piece/play structure is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.9, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.7 and the following findings:

1* Existing trees will be protected and are part of the design.
2* No historic fabric is being altered.
3* The proposed work is at the rear of a deep courtyard - approximately 180 feet from Hargett Street.
4* The play structure/art piece will be screened by existing courtyard trees,
5* The proposed colors will coordinate and blend with the natural tones of the courtyard.
6* The proposed deck is inside an existing walled courtyard.
7* Detailed drawings and materials information is included in the application. Synthetic decking has previously been approved for use on new rear decks,

Staff recommends that the committee approve the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Support:
Nicole Johnson and Darion Walker [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Johnson stated that it was a complete package and did not have anything to add.

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

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

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Ms. Downer moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-7) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Alteration non-historic courtyard; construction of low deck; construction of art piece/play structure is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.9, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.7 and the following findings:

1* Existing trees will be protected and are part of the design.
2* No historic fabric is being altered.
3* The proposed work is at the rear of a deep courtyard - approximately 180 feet from Hargett Street.
4* The play structure/art piece will be screened by existing courtyard trees,
5* The proposed colors will coordinate and blend with the natural tones of the courtyard.
6* The proposed deck is inside an existing walled courtyard.
7* Detailed drawings and materials information is included in the application. Synthetic decking has previously been approved for use on new rear decks.

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

Decision on the Application

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

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

Committee members voting: Belledin, Downer, Jackson, McGorty.

Certificate expiration date: 1/6/16.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

087-15-CA 511 OAKWOOD AVENUE
Applicant: JASON & AMY THURSTON
Received: 6/16/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/14/2015 1) 7/6/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Construct 2nd level screen porch on existing rear addition; replace 2 windows with doors
Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
3.7	Windows and Doors	replace 2 windows with doors
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Construct 2nd level screen porch on existing rear addition

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Construct 2nd level screen porch on existing rear addition; replace 2 windows with doors is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.7.9, 4.2.1, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, and the following findings:

1* Two rear windows are proposed to be removed and replaced with doors. There is no indication what will happen to the removed windows.
2* The proposed changes are at the rear of the house.
3* There are no trees immediately in the footprint of the proposed new construction; however there are existing trees that may be impacted by construction activities. A tree protection plan is not included.
4* Rear second level porches are not uncommon in Oakwood.
5* The proposed new screened porch sits on top of an existing rear addition; it is inset from the side of the main house by a foot or so (the rear elevation drawing is inaccurate).
6* The existing hipped roof will be replaced by a porch floor; the porch roof is proposed to have low pitched shed roof sheathed with metal.
7* The drawings provided give a general idea of the location and form of the proposed porch; specifications and details of how it will actually look and be constructed are not provided.

8* The porch railings appear to be a simple wood picket; detailed drawings are not included. The application does not clarify how the screening interacts with the railings; typically the railings are on the outside of the screening.

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

1. That the windows removed either be stored on site or made available for salvage/reuse.
2. That the screening on the porch be inside the balustrade.
3. That the specifications and details for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan that indicates storage of construction materials and any pruning needed of adjacent trees;
   b. Porch construction including:
      - Porch floor edge;
      - Roof supports;
      - Eave construction;
      - Screening;
      - Porch railing.
4. That the specifications and details for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Doors;
   b. Metal roofing;
   c. Lighting fixtures;
   d. New location of satellite dish.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Support:
Jason Thurston [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Thurston pointed out that in fact number three in the staff comments the weather pruned the tree branch so it will no longer be a problem. He added that the windows will be donated.

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

At Ms. McGorty's suggestion Ms. Downer 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]:
Details regarding the project will be approved at the staff level? [Jackson]
It is not uncommon. [McGorty]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Ms. Jackson and seconded by Ms. Downer, Ms. Jackson made an amended motion that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 2-8) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Construction of 2nd level screen porch on existing rear addition; replacement of 2 windows with doors is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.7.9, 4.2.1, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, and the following findings:

1* Two rear windows are proposed to be removed and replaced with doors. The removed windows will be donated.
2* The proposed changes are at the rear of the house.
3* There are no trees immediately in the footprint of the proposed new construction; however there are existing trees that may be impacted by construction activities. A tree protection plan is not included.
4* Rear second level porches are not uncommon in Oakwood.
5* The proposed new screened porch sits on top of an existing rear addition; it is inset from the side of the main house by a foot or so (the rear elevation drawing is inaccurate).
6* The existing hipped roof will be replaced by a porch floor; the porch roof is proposed to have low pitched shed roof sheathed with metal.
7* The drawings provided give a general idea of the location and form of the proposed porch; specifications and details of how it will actually look and be constructed are not provided.
8* The porch railings appear to be a simple wood picket; detailed drawings are not included. The application does not clarify how the screening interacts with the railings; typically the railings are on the outside of the screening.
9* The tree branch hanging over the roof fell during a storm.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the windows removed either be stored on site or made available for salvage/reuse.
2. That the screening on the porch be inside the balustrade.

3. That the specifications and details for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan that indicates storage of construction materials and any pruning needed of adjacent trees;
   b. Porch construction including:
      - Porch floor edge;
      - Roof supports;
      - Eave construction;
      - Screening;
      - Porch railing.
4. That the specifications and details for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Doors;
   b. Metal roofing;
   c. Lighting fixtures;
   d. New location of satellite dish.

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

Committee members voting: Belledin, Downer, Jackson, McGorty.

Certificate expiration date: 1/6/16.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

088-15-CA 610 N BLOODWORTH STREET
Applicant: JOHN L THOMAS - GARDENER BY NATURE LLC
Received: 6/16/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/14/2015 1) 7/6/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Master landscape plan: remove one tree; plant three trees; replace fence; add plantings, walkways, low walls and patios.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Master landscape plan: remove one tree; plant three trees; replace fence; add plantings, walkways, low walls and patios
2.4	Fences and Walls	replace fence; low walls
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	walkways

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Master landscape plan: remove one tree; plant three trees; replace fence; add plantings, walkways, low walls and patios is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 2.3.4, 2.3.7, 2.3.11, 2.4.8, 2.5.5, 2.2.6, (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."), and the following findings:

1* According to Matthew Brown's 2015 "Inventory of Structures in the Oakwood National Register Historic Districts" the c.1925 house is a Craftsman frame bungalow. It goes on to

add that "Under the horizontal eaves are exposed rafter tails with decorative ends inspired by Japanese architecture."

2* The maple tree proposed for removal is impeding growth of another, larger maple; three new trees are proposed in the public right-of-way; the application states that they will work with the City's Urban Forester. Species and locations are included in the application.

3* The large sycamore in the front yard will be protected.

4* The front yard area is proposed to be altered with the addition of a winding path with the appearance of stepping stones; grass is to be replaced with ground covers and flowering plants; 3 boulders are to be placed; and the front walk is to be edged in stone. Existing shrubs will be maintained.

5* Photographic examples of similar yard treatments in the district were provided in the application.

6* The side yard is being altered with the addition of a stone patio, raised planters, and stone veneering of existing walls as well as new low retaining walls; these items will be screened by a privacy fence. Low retaining walls are seen throughout Oakwood.

7* Material samples were not included in the application.

8* The rear yard is proposed to be a Japanese meditation garden of approximately 250 SF; it is located inconspicuously at the rear of the house. Detailed info ration was not provided. This area is currently approved to be a low deck.

9* An existing wood fence is being replaced with a new wood fence with two pergola style gates. Detailed drawings were provided.

Staff recommends that the committee approve the application waiving the 365-day delay for removal of the tree, 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. Stone samples;
   b. Rear garden details.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Support:
John Thomas [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Thomas stated he had no problems with the staff comments.

Opposition:
Gail Wiesner [affirmed] was present to speak in opposition to the application. Ms. Wiesner questioned the addition of a winding path in the historic district and what materials were being used for the path as they may not be characteristic to the district if fake. Ms. Wiesner added further that the use of boulders in a historic district was not common in the district and it would throw the look of the district off.

Responses and Questions:
Mr. Thomas stated he provided photographs of the type of stone which would be used and clarified that the stone would be natural stone. Mr. Thomas clarified that the boulders would be two to two and a half feet in diameter. Mr. Thomas added that the architecture was inspired by Japanese architecture which was not prohibited in the district.

Ms. Tully clarified that the primary walks typically go straight from the sidewalk to the front door and that smaller paths may extend to side yards. She added that the size of the boulders wasn't included in the application but the materials that would be used were included. Ms. McGorty clarified that the main front walk was to remain. She added that given the comment they should be discussed.

Ms. Jackson inquired about the paths and Mr. Thomas responded that the paths are not intended to be a main path around the house.

Ms. McGorty stated that boulders in lawns are common landscape features. Ms. Jackson inquired about the location of the boulders. Mr. Thomas responded that the boulders would be on the southwest corner of property line at Bloodworth Street and at the corner of Pace Street diagonally. He added that there will be another behind the privacy fence. Ms. Jackson clarified that none were grouped in the center of the lot, but were along the property lines.

Ms. McGorty questioned Ms. Tully about the approval of the placement of the boulders. Ms. Tully responded that as long as it is not incongruous, they are to be approved. She noted that section 2.3 speaks primarily about what not to do, with little guidance on what to do.

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

Committee Discussion

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

Kiernan said that in terms of compatibility in feature in a landscape, site boulders are commonly used and are not inappropriate in or prohibited in the guidelines. [Jackson]
Boulders can be moved or removed. [McGorty]

I do not believe it is significantly impacting the relationship between the buildings of the historic district or the space. In terms of other examples of boulders for the district do you think it is necessary for the applicant to bring in examples of boulders? [Jackson]
I do not think the examples would dictate things either way. [McGorty]
That is true. [Jackson]
Should the boulders be secondary so they do not take away focus? [Belledin]
They have already taken some measures to make them subservient to the groupings and plantings that are already there. [Jackson]
I am comfortable with that and regarding the path it is secondary and subservient to the plantings. [Belledin]
The evidence in the application satisfies any questions regarding the stepping stones and curved paths. [Jackson]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Mr. Belledin moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 9) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Master landscape plan: remove one tree; plant three trees; replace fence; add plantings, walkways, low walls and patios is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 2.3.4, 2.3.7, 2.3.11, 2.4.8, 2.5.5, 2.2.6, (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."), and the following findings:

1* According to Matthew Brown's 2015 "Inventory of Structures in the Oakwood National Register Historic Districts" the c.1925 house is a Craftsman frame bungalow. It goes on to add that "Under the horizontal eaves are exposed rafter tails with decorative ends inspired by Japanese architecture."

2* The maple tree proposed for removal is impeding growth of another, larger maple; three new trees are proposed in the public right-of-way; the application states that they will work with the City's Urban Forester. Species and locations are included in the application.

3* The large sycamore in the front yard will be protected.

4* The front yard area is proposed to be altered with the addition of a winding path with the appearance of stepping stones; grass is to be replaced with ground covers and flowering plants; 3 boulders are to be placed; and the front walk is to be edged in stone. Existing shrubs will be maintained. The boulders will be visually subservient.

5* Photographic examples of similar yard treatments in the district were provided in the application.
6* The side yard is being altered with the addition of a stone patio, raised planters, and stone veneering of existing walls as well as new low retaining walls; these items will be screened by a privacy fence. Low retaining walls are seen throughout Oakwood.
7* Material samples were not included in the application; the applicant stated that the paving materials were natural stone.
8* The rear yard is proposed to be a Japanese meditation garden of approximately 250 SF; it is located inconspicuously at the rear of the house. Detailed information was not provided. This area is currently approved to be a low deck.
9* An existing wood fence is being replaced with a new wood fence with two pergola style gates. Detailed drawings were provided.
10* The proposed boulders will be not more than 30" in diameter and located at the periphery of the site plan.

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

Decision on the Application

Mr. Belledin made a motion that the application be approved waiving the 365-day delay for the tree removal and 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. Stone samples;
   b. Rear garden details.
2. That the boulders be subservient to the primary landscape elements.

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

Committee members voting: Belledin, Downer, Jackson, McGorty.

Certificate expiration date: 1/6/16.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

089-15-CA 110 E HARGETT STREET
Applicant: MATTHEW KONAR ARCHITECT
Received: 6/16/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/14/2015 1) 7/6/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: DOD, BUS
Nature of Project: Replace rear door; install rear accessory building; install canopy structure
Amendments: Additional drawings were provided June 23, 2015 and were included in your commissioner packets. A small shed wood shed constructed without a COA was observed on-site by staff. Photos provided by the applicant are attached to these comments.
Staff Notes:

- After-the-fact applications are reviewed as though the work has not been completed.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	install rear accessory building; install canopy structure
2.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	install rear accessory buildings
3.7	Windows and Doors	Replace rear door

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Installation of rear accessory building; installation of canopy structure is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.9, 2.6.6, 2.6.7, 2.6.9; however the details **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.6.7 and the following findings:

1* All of the proposed changes are at the rear of the building in a treeless fenced courtyard.

2* A steel framed canopy is proposed adjacent to the proposed accessory building. It is stated to be of post and beam construction with a corrugated metal roof; drawings were not included. A photo of a similar structure is provided.

3* The plan drawing is unclear, but it appears as though the canopy structure is proposed to cover most of the courtyard between the new accessory building and existing stairs to the 2nd level. This is approximately 676 SF. The height is not stated except that it would fit under the existing metal deck. It is unclear how the canopy interacts with the new building.

4* The text describes the canopy as sloping downwards, from east to west, in the direction of the accessory building. Shed roof structures that close to a building typically slope away from the building rather than to one side or the other.
5* There is not enough information to make a determination regarding the appropriateness of the canopy.
6* The 1914 Sanborn Fire Insurance map of the block is included in the application; it shows that there were numerous accessory buildings on the interior of the lot historically.
7* The accessory building is proposed to sit adjacent to the rear of the building and an existing wood fence.
8* The proposed accessory building is 204 SF in footprint (8.5'x24') and 8' tall, has a flat roof, and sits on a new 10'x26' concrete slab.
9* The structure is sheathed in smooth aluminum cladding and has unpainted aluminum trim. Traditionally, metal accessory buildings had some sort of corrugated or textured siding.
10* A photo of a "typical" building of this type is included to indicate its general appearance. The windows and doors shown are not necessarily what is proposed.
11* There are details of the structure as shown in the photo give it the appearance of a vehicle rather than a permanent building; these include: riveted construction, reflectors, wheels, shiny metal.
12* According to the section drawing of the courtyard showing the east elevation of the accessory building there will be one door on the east side and a serving window with a flip-up door on the north. The application text states that there will be "a side viewing window on the east side of the accessory structure;" this is not shown in the drawing.
13* There is not enough information to make a determination regarding the appropriateness of the accessory structure.

B. Replacement of rear door; installation of rear accessory building is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.9, 2.6.6, 2.6.7, 2.6.9, 3.7.7, and the following findings:
1* All of the proposed changes are at the rear of the building in a treeless fenced courtyard.
2* A small wood shed is proposed for the southeast corner of the courtyard. The amended application states that it is 52" deep x 104" wide and 84" tall at front and 94" tall at the back. Detailed photos are included.
3* The door being replaced is not historic. The new door is proposed to be a "commercial, glazed aluminum-framed door with panic hardware." Specifications were not provided.

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

That the proposed canopy be deferred with the following additional items to be requested:

- Drawings that illustrate its location;
- Drawings of what it will look like;
- How it would interact with the existing stairs and the proposed accessory building.

That the proposed accessory structure be deferred with the following additional items to be requested:

- Drawings that accurately depict the proposed appearance of the structure;
- Revisions that reduce the vehicular appearance of the proposed structure.

That the door replacement and small shed portion of the application be approved with the following condition:

1. That details and specifications for the door 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.

Support:
Matthew Konar [affirmed] and Michael Ruiz [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Konar stated that they showed the location of the canopy and where it is going to be but did not provide materials as they wanted guidance on this. The canopy will be going where the current umbrellas are sitting and will sit within the existing stairs and under the balcony space. There is no need to penetrate the building. He added that as the location is in the fire district, materials that could be used are limited – primarily steel and aluminum. Regarding the slope he stated that the intent was to not have the water sloped into the patio and onto customers.

Mr. Konar added that the design is of an accessory structure to be able to maximize kitchen space in the building. Mr. Konar added that the structure would only be visible from the parking deck and that it is obscured by the building. Regarding the vehicular appearance he could add a skirt.

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

Responses and Questions:
Mr. Belledin questioned if the structure would be a permanent structure. Mr. Konar responded that it will be a permanent structure on a permanent foundation.

Ms. Tully pointed out that it is not the size and location of the structure that staff has any issue with. It is the appearance and not making the structure looking like a food truck. Ms. Tully added that getting more information on this regard would be helpful. Ms. McGorty added that the design is up to the applicants.

Ms. Jackson asked if the photo showed the actual proposal. Mr. Konar said yes. Mr. Ruiz stated that a wrap could be made in any material desired. He said that the axles could be removable and that it did not have to be that shiny white. Mr. Ruiz added that he would be flexible to meet the standard for the canopy. The intent is to obscure the kitchen and have it blend in better.

Ms. Jackson asked about the gas tanks, if they were to be for cooking. Mr. Ruiz confirmed.

Mr. Konar added that the subtlety was lost in the photos. Ms. Jackson stated that the enclosure didn't have to be historic looking. There are lots of existing elements to work with. Mr. Belledin added that they need to see what is actually proposed. It needs to look like a permanent structure. Ms. Jackson said that the photo of the trailing is misleading, but that the intent seems to be meeting the Guidelines.

The committee discussed the design of the canopy and the difficulty of visualizing the appearance of the accessory structure due to the lack of information in the application and the location of the structure in the fire district. Ms. McGorty suggested to Mr. Konar and Mr. Ruiz to attend DRAC for advice if it was needed.

Ms. Tully then stated the application could be deferred by the committee with parts approved. Mr. Konar and Mr. Ruiz stated that the shed and door are ready to move forward on.

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
In regards to the drawing, something that does show the interaction between the stairs, existing historic building and canopy would be helpful. [Jackson]
I would be in favor of deferring his application for more information and moving forward with the door replacement and small shed replacement. [McGorty]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Mr. Belledin moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment B. (inclusive of facts 1-3) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

B. Replacement of rear door; installation of rear accessory building is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.9, 2.6.6, 2.6.7, 2.6.9, 3.7.7, and the following findings:

1* All of the proposed changes are at the rear of the building in a treeless fenced courtyard.

2* A small wood shed is proposed for the southeast corner of the courtyard. The amended application states that it is 52" deep x 104" wide and 84" tall at front and 94" tall at the back. Detailed photos are included.

3* The door being replaced is not historic. The new door is proposed to be a "commercial, glazed aluminum-framed door with panic hardware." Specifications were not provided.

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

Decision on the Application

Mr. Belledin made a motion that the door and shed portion of the application be approved as amended, with the following condition:

1. That details and specifications for the door be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

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

Mr. Belledin made a motion that the proposed canopy and accessory structure be deferred with additional information requested.

For the canopy, the committee requests:

- Drawings that illustrate its location;
- Drawings of what it will look like;
- How it would interact with the existing stairs and the proposed accessory building.
- Section drawing.

For the accessory structure, the committee requests:

- Drawings that accurately depict the proposed appearance of the structure;
- Revisions that reduce the vehicular appearance of the proposed structure.

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

Committee members voting: Belledin, Downer, McGorty Jackson.

Certificate expiration date: 1/6/16.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Request for Reconsideration: 059-15-CA (600 N Boundary Street)
   Marie Scheuring addressed the committee about her petition for a request for reconsideration. Ms. Scheuring stated facts she believed were omitted in the application and presented facts that should allow the committee to reconsider the application. Her concerns included: that the house is one-story not two-stories, that the magnolia tree wasn't represented accurately in the pictures, and that the proposed garage would obstruct views on her property. Ms. Scheuring added that an applicant in a house behind her applied for a two-story garage which was denied.

   Ms. Tully responded that based on the information presented if the committee believed that there is new information based on Ms. Scheuring's letter, a new application could be filed. The committee then discussed if the new information was enough to reconsider the application. Ms. McGorty pointed out that the most significant new evidence was the garage that was denied. Ms. Jackson agreed. Ms. McGorty thought the information presented was enough to reconsider the facts of the application.

   Ms. Jackson then made a motion to approve the petition of reconsideration. Ms. Downer seconded; the motion passed 4/0.

2. Notification of Intent to Appeal: 059-15-CA (600 N Boundary Street)
3. Design Guidelines Update
4. Committee Discussion
   i. Application Completeness
   ii. Meeting Post-Mortem

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:44 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner