**RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
October 5, 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 (arrived just prior to public hearings), Don Davis, Laurie Jackson, Kaye Webb
Alternate Present: Caleb Smith
Staff Present: Tania Tully, Martha Lauer; Teresa Young

## Approval of the September 8, 2015 Minutes

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

## Minor Works

There were no questions regarding the Minor Work report.

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

| Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address | Affirmed |
|---|---|
| Matthew Griffith, 111 Longview Lake Dr 27610 | Yes |
| Zach Hoffman, 217 Bagggett Ave 27604 | Yes |
| Elisabeth Brown, 115 N Bloodworth Street 27601 | No |
| Jodi Strenkowski, 500 N Blount Street 27604 | Yes |
| Matt Hutchinson, 500 N Blount Street 27604 | Yes |
| John Strenkowski, 500 N Blount Street 27604 | Yes |
| John Cowper, 319 Fayetteville Street 27607 | Yes |
| Vanvisa Nolivia, 222 S Blount Street 27601 | Yes |

## REVIEW OF SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. David moved to approve the agenda as amended. Mr. Davis seconded the motion; passed 6/0.

**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 131-15-CA for which the Summary Proceeding is made part of these minutes.

## APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – SUMMARY PROCEEDING

131-15-CA 707 FLORENCE STREET
Applicant: RYAN VANCE
Received: 9/14/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 12/13/2015 1) 10/5/2015 2) 3)

### INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Raleigh Historic Landmark:
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Install 6' tall wood rear yard fence; install gravel driveway
Amendments: Clarifying information was provided via email and is attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- The location of property lines and legal authority to perform work is a civil matter outside the jurisdiction of the commission.
- File photos are available for review.

### APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

| Sections | Topic | Description of Work |
|---|---|---|
| 2.3 | Site Features and Plantings | Install 6' tall wood rear yard fence; install gravel driveway |
| 2.4 | Fences and Walls | Install 6' tall wood rear yard fence |
| 2.5 | Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking | install gravel driveway |

### STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Installation of 6' tall wood rear yard fence; is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.4, 2.3.7, 2.4.8, 2.4.11, and the following findings:

1* Fence post holes will be dug manually and located to avoid damage to tree roots and roots larger than 1" caliper will be cut cleanly using proper tools such as loppers.

2* The proposed fence is along the rear property line which is characteristic of the district. Two gates are proposed that extend from the rear of the house to the side yard fences.

3* The 6’ tall wood dog-eared privacy fence will match existing fencing.

4* The fence will be installed using neighbor friendly design with the structural members facing inward towards the rear yard.

5* No information regarding the gate hardware is included.

B. Installation of gravel driveway is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, 2.3.8, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.9 and the following findings:

1* There are no trees in the vicinity of the proposed gravel area.

2* There is an existing curb cut.

3* The proposed gravel area is 8′ wide by 90′ deep and composed of gravel. It will run along the entire right side of the house and extend approximately from the wall of the subject house to the wall of the adjacent house.

4* Gravel is a traditional driveway and walkway material.

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

1. That details and specifications on any edging be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.
2. That the gate hardware be simple black metal.

## 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 131-15-CA. Ms. Jackson seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 4/5/16.

**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, 132-15-CA, and 133-15-CA.

Case 128-15-CA was deferred at the request of the applicant. Ms. Jackson moved to defer the application. Ms. David seconded; motion carried 6/0.

Prior to the beginning of case 133-15-CA, Ms. David made a notion to recuse Ms. Jackson; Mr. Davis seconded; motion carried 5/0 and Mr. Smith made a motion to excuse Ms. Webb from the rest of the meeting; Mr. Davis 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)

## INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Raleigh Historic Landmark:
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Construct 1-story garage attached by breezeway; install rear driveway
Amendments: Additional evidence provided by the applicant was included in the commissioner packets.
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 attached by breezeway; install rear driveway |
| 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 attached by breezeway |
| 4.3 | New Construction | Construct 1-story garage attached by breezeway |

## 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 attachment and location of the garage **is** incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.6.5, 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 or pavers 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 application includes a letter from the contractor stating that the garage as proposed is within 11' of the existing retaining wall and recommends not building any closer to avoid damaging the wall.

6* 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.

7* 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 states that samples will be provided at the hearing.

8* The application describes the garage as detached, but it sits between 5-½ feet and 10 feet from the rear of the house and is connected by a covered breezeway.

9* 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.

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

11* 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.

12* 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.

13* 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.
14* The size and scale of the garage is typical of garages in the district. The design features are similar to that of the main house which is often seen in accessory buildings.
15* 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 brick wall (Is it a significant site feature?)**: Staff recommends that the committee approve the amended application, with the following conditions:

1. That the garage as proposed be denied.

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 had already been approved and that the primary items for discussion were the location and attachment of the garage. At the last hearing the commission indicted that enough evidence was provided for the size of the garage.

Support:
Ms. Riana Smith [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application.

Ms. Smith stated she could not find an old survey that recorded the retaining wall but there are pictures that she showed the problems with the retaining wall. Ms. Smith stated that all of the houses with garages, the garages are located near the alleyways or the roadways and due to the footprint of her lot there is almost nowhere else where the garage can go. Ms. Smith added that she is happy to move it closer to the house if it is needed but that the retaining wall should be allowed to remain as it is still functioning. Ms. Smith also added there is an attached one car garage at Boylan and Lenoir Street and if that lot is looked at there was nowhere else to put the garage. Ms. Smith stated that given the constraints on her lot the garage was designed with the highest and best use.

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

Responses and Questions:
Ms. Caliendo questioned if the members of the committee were able to view the property.
Mr. Davis inquired about the attached garage at Lenoir and Boylan. Ms. Tully replied that the decision had to do with existing location, the driveway and then there not being anywhere else

for the garage. Ms. Tully added the discussion for it was not long and was about how close it was to the adjacent property and the house rather than it being attached. Ms. Tully noted she did not find evidence to support or not support this particular case.

Mr. Davis asked Ms. Smith if she was comfortable moving the garage closer to the alley and if she had talked with the builder. Ms. Smith replied that she had and she had discussed with her builder the potential of moving it as close to the retaining wall as she could and that the intent was to have a portico with a two car garage. Ms. Smith added she would like to keep her two car garage and that the size and location of her lot does not allow it to sit close to the alleyway.

Ms. Caliendo questioned if the garage could be aligned with the wall and Ms. Smith stated it could be made to get as close as it could.

Ms. Jackson inquired about the brick material of the retaining wall. Ms. Smith presented the bricks to the panel (photos of which were in the application) which were then inspected. Ms. Tully noted that based on when the house was likely built the wall is contemporary to the adjacent house. Ms. Smith stated she had tried to find a map of the location showing the retaining wall and the wall is likely 100 years old. Ms. Smith added that it is functioning retaining wall and it supports the neighbor's property and it would be cost prohibitive to do any sort of modification so the proposed garage could be closer to the wall. Ms. Tully added that the committee has the authority to override setbacks and it is common to have a structure within 2 to 3 feet of a property line. Ms. Caliendo noted that the commission cannot consider cost.

At Ms. Caliendo's suggestion Ms. Davis moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Ms. Webb seconded; motion carried 6/0.

<u>Committee Discussion</u>

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
The issue appears to be the attachment and the location. [Caliendo]
How is it compared to the size of other garages in the neighborhood? [Smith]
It is larger based on the Sanborn maps but it is a typical size. It has also minimized the appearance of a two car garage. [Jackson]
Moving it closer to the alley would lower some of our concerns. [Davis]
Is this something we want to defer? [Caliendo]
We could maybe approve it if closer to alley. [Davis]
You could chose to defer and ask for a revised site plan showing how close it could go and then make your decision based on that. You could approve it with the condition that it be moved closer with it coming back to you for administrative review of conditions. I think it is more in keeping to hold it open and give her the confidence it could be approved. You need to decide if you need to look at it as close as it can be or if you have enough information. [Tully]
Deferring has the best outcome. [Davis]

There was a good job with minimizing the appearance and good supplemental information but all examples are old. There are more two car garages in Boylan Heights than I thought and that was helpful. It does need to be as close to the alley as possible if it's considered for approval and the one car garage was not a great decision. For me to approve it, it needs to be detached and as close to the alley and I need to see it on the site plan. [David]
What about the brick wall? [Tully]
We did have a retaining wall issue in Oakwood and there we did decide it was an important feature of the landscape and it is doing its job and it is old. It has been there for a long time and undoing it would be undoing a historical feature. [David]
Was there a house on this site? [Smith]
No, a garage. [Davis]
It was stated in the facts. [Caliendo]
We need to figure out what the brick wall is and what it was associated with to determine the historic nature. [Smith]
Ms. Tully handed out Sanborn maps from 1950, 1962 and 1914 that showed an accessory structure.
Did we decide last time if it's attached or detached? [Smith]
That was the original design; we deferred. [Davis]
What are the committee's thoughts if it is moved further away? [Caliendo]
If it is moved further away it could be detached and have no breezeway. [David]
If you defer it based on the location it would give the applicant more time to gather evidence on being attached and you could give applicant where there are issue is in the guidelines. [Tully]
These later garages are detached. [Davis]
If there is evidence of connecting breezeways she can present it. Are there any other thoughts on deferring? [Caliendo]
In terms of attachment is there anything in the guidelines that states it cannot be attached? [Jackson]
It is sited in the rear yard. [David]
2.6.6 states that locations must be compatible with the traditional relationship. You have to decide if it's compatible with it. [Tully]
I think that it is sited appropriately and everything is appropriate. It is adhering to the guidelines. I am not sure if the attachment itself is as much of a concern. It being on the back of the residence and you can access it with the narrow width of the lot. The appearance of the garage itself is good so if we are talking about deferring it based on the precise location of the garage on the lot I think that is a separate issue from any kind of covered portico from the house itself. [Jackson]
I cannot see many examples of attached garages in Boylan Heights. I would defer for more information and examples of attached single or double car garages in Boylan Heights. I do not think the committee fully addressed the attached versus detached issue a few years ago. I need to see more information that this is a traditional arrangement in Boylan Heights or it has to be done further away and as close to the alley as possible. [David]
I would also like to see if the applicant will proposes a breezeway just to be able to see the openness of that. [Caliendo]

It is most approvable if it is a detached garage that is on the alley. [David]
Of all the lots that have garages they are all small little structures on the alley. I do not feel like the designs given to us last time looked like that. [Smith]
Someone needs to make a motion to defer or the finding of facts. You could defer to bring more information on siting of the garage closer to the alley and citing the standard garages in Boylan Heights being detached from the houses as well as more evidence of attached garages.

Decision on the Application

Mr. Davis made a motion to defer the application for more information; Ms. David seconded the motion; carried 6/0.

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERIFIED RECORD

132-15-CA 314 E CABARRUS STREET
Applicant: ZACH HOFFMAN FOR IN SITU STUDIO
Received: 9/16/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 12/15/2015 1) 10/5/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: PRINCE HALL HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: RB, DOD
Nature of Project: Alter front door; alter windows; add new window; remove non-historic rear addition; construct new rear addition; remove tree.
Amendments: Amended drawings and additional photos were provided 10/2/15 and are attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- Sanborn Fire Insurance maps are available for review.
- 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 non-historic rear addition; construct new rear addition; remove tree |
| 3.5 | Roofs | add skylights |
| 3.7 | Windows and Doors | alter front door; alter windows; add new window |
| 4.2 | Additions to Historic Buildings | remove non-historic rear addition; construct new rear addition |

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Alteration of front door; alteration of windows; add skylights; add new window; removal of tree is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.5, 3.5.10, 3.7.1, 3.7.2, 3.7.7,

3.7.9; however, the design of the front door **is** incongruous with *Guidelines* 3.7.7 and the following findings:

1* The tree proposed for removal is a large evergreen that obscures the house and does not contribute to the tree canopy.
2* There is one other tree on the lot, but none in the right-of-way. A replacement tree is not proposed.
3* Skylights are proposed on the side roofs; details and specifications are not provided.
4* The front doors being removed are not historic.
5* The proposed front door is aluminum clad wood with sidelights on either side. The main door is a full glass opening. The configuration is traditional and seen in foursquare houses. The full glass door, however, is atypical. Doors on foursquare houses are typically some proportion of glass on top and wood below. Aluminum clad wood doors have not been approved for use on historic buildings.
6* The proposed new window and altered window are on a side elevation and have the same proportions as the historic windows. They are proposed to be 9/1 wood windows; details and specifications were not included in the application.

B. Removal of non-historic rear addition; construction of new 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; however, the west wall of the addition **is** incongruous according to Guideline 4.2.1; the glass wall on the rear and the tall window on the east elevation of the addition **are** incongruous according to Guideline 4.2.7 and the following findings:

1* There are no trees that may be impacted by construction activities.
2* The new addition is just under 180 SF; the lot is approximately 5,227 SF.
3* Based on the Suborn Fire Insurance map the addition being removed was constructed after 1962.
4* The addition on the west appears to be an extension of the house rather than an addition. The square form is a character defining feature. The *Guidelines* state that new additions should be "constructed so that they can be removed in the future without damage to the building."
5* On the east side of the addition, the non-historic brick wall is being extended by 1 foot. Details of how the connection will be made were not included in the application; brick samples were not provided.
6* The new addition is rectangular in form similar to the existing house and is on the rear elevation.
7* The roof of the new addition is a low hip with a deep rear overhang. The new roof is several feet lower than the historic hipped roof.
8* Aluminum clad wood windows have been approved for use on additions to historic buildings.
9* The Prince Hall designation report describes the property as a ca. 1926 two-story Craftsman frame house with original brick veneer, an asphalt-shingled pyramidal roof with a hipped front ventilation dormer, a one-story front porch with patterned battered wood posts on brick piers, and 9/1 windows.

10* The bulk of the addition is clad in smooth faced fiber cement siding with a 6″ reveal. Fiber cement siding has been approved for use on additions to historic brick buildings including a dormer addition at 319 S Boylan Avenue (COA 007-12-CA). Colors were not included in the application.

11* The entire wall of glass on the west side of the rear (south) elevation makes it appear as though a section of wall is missing. Traditionally, large expanses of glass were created through the use of banked windows or doors.

12* The windows on the rear elevation are a variety of single pane sizes; the overall amount of wall to window is typical of the district and houses of this era.

13* The tall thin window on the east elevation of the addition is in the same plane as the wall of the historic house. There are no other windows of this proportion on the house and it is atypical of the district.

14* There is an open porch under the new addition on the west side; this is a feature sometimes seen in additions to historic houses.

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

1. That a new tree be planted in the right-of-way during the next tree planting season with the species to be approved by Urban Forestry and provided to staff prior to planting.
2. That the front door and sidelights be wood with a tradition glass and panel design, with the design to be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.
3. That the west wall of the addition not be an extension of the brick wall and that it be inset from the corner of the house by at least 6 inches.
4. That the rear wall under the addition be revised so as to not be a single pane of glass.
5. That the window on the east wall of the addition be similar in proportion to other windows on the house.
6. That the following specifications and details be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Revised design based on conditions listed above;
   b. Windows in addition;
   c. Eave construction detail;
   d. Brick wall extension details and material sample.
7. That the following specifications and details be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Skylights;
   b. Paint colors;
   c. New front door;
   d. New windows in existing house;
   e. Lighting 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 question here is the alterations to the building versus the addition itself. The changes met the guidelines for the front door as well as with the rear addition. Ms. Tully added that the conflict is with the windows and if the portions that are being proposed are in character with the historic house and if it meets the guidelines.

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

Mr. Griffith gave a presentation regarding all of the changes to the house which displayed pictures and descriptions of the changes. Ms. Griffith stated that the house next door has wood siding in contrast to the house on the property which is made of bricks. Mr. Griffith stated that the existing addition is non-historic that is painted red and the attached shed roof has poor roofing at the hip which will be replaced and corrected. He clarified that the addition will be demolished and rebuilt entirely. He noted that the frameless glass wall is screened and set back 8 feet.

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

Responses and Questions:
Ms. Jackson inquired about the extension of the west wall and if the brick would try to be matched to the original brick. Mr. Griffith responded that would be the goal as the brick in that area is in bad shape and a lot of brick work has to be done already.

Mr. Griffith expressed concern at changing the material on the extended wall as he believed it looked more historic with the brick and it would create a jog in the bedroom upstairs. Ms. Tully responded that was only suggested on the west side and that it originally was a porch that was changed into a kitchen. Mr. Griffith reiterated it is a flush brick extension and that would make it at an odd angle. He added that five feet was more doable. Ms. Caliendo stated that the wall could be furred out. Mr. Griffith agreed.

Mr. Davis inquired about the window on the east side of the house. Mr. Griffith responded that it is a nice idea and he would be amendable to making it identical in portions but he would prefer to keep the sill at the floor if it was possible. Mr. Davis questioned if it would still extend to the eave or would it create another window wall. Mr. Griffith responded that the window would have to be made twice as wide and it would look a lot like it does now. Ms. Tully pointed out it may have to go three times as wide.

Ms. Jackson stated that the distinguishing between the old and the new with the placement of the window at the connection point makes it clear that there is new there and if it got wider it would not have the same effect. Ms. Tully questioned what level of differentiation is needed and if it was too differentiated.

Ms. Caliendo questioned the height of the glass window on the south orientation. Mr. Griffith responded it is under 10 feet and that it is the limit of the largest pane of glass you could acquire. Ms. Caliendo asked if it was an opening or a wall out of metal fabrication. Mr. Griffith responded it is the siding beyond the west wall of the kitchen. Ms. David point out that giving the window on the back of the house a banked appearance would be more traditional. Mr. Griffith responded that the design is composed of four different windows and they were mirrored and that they kept a large opening in the middle. The large pane of glass was similar to a Chicago window and that the pane could be divided evenly but the windows would be unequal. Ms. David responded a sleeping porch kind of look would have been more typical. Ms. Jackson inquired about the front door. Mr. Griffith responded it is four feet wide and has wood styles around the perimeter and a single pane of glass looking into the house.

At Ms. Caliendo's suggestion Ms. David moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Mr. Davis seconded; motion carried 6/0.

<u>Committee Discussion</u>

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

The front door material and configuration of a new window on the east wall, glass wall on the south, and the fact that the west wall indicates it is a new addition that is flush with the existing house. What about the front door? [Caliendo]
According to the guidelines a full pane would not be in character with the house. [Davis]
The configuration is keeping with the character versus the current one. [Jackson]
For the tall window on the east wall I agree with Laurie that the gap that it creates with the old and the new helps distinguishes the addition from the historic house. [Caliendo]
On the other side of the west wall the siding would more effectively distinguish the old and new with the extension of the sidewall. We are looking for differentiation and the addition itself does not necessarily have to look historic. It is really similar to what is there. On the west wall I do not think a jog is necessary; a change of materials could provide that line. [Jackson]
A change of materials will do that job. [Caliendo]
I agree. [Davis]
What about the glass in the back? The large pane of glass does not look historic but it is in an inconspicuous location and the elevation is deeply recessed in terms of the design. It is long and narrow and I think it is compatible. It is different. [Jackson]
In 4.2.7 the design has to be compatible with the historic. There is now a wall between the window and the large pane of glass. It extends all the way to the exterior wall. [Caliendo]
It is basically a void. [Jackson]

It would not be seen. It is in the back of the house. [Caliendo]
That is not what the guidelines say. [Tully]
It is different from the old. It is in conflict with the guidelines. [David]
If there was a certain amount of solid. [Caliendo]
You could have the wall come back with administrative review of conditions. [Tully]
3.7.9 to install them it has to be compatible with the overall design but not duplicate the original. [David]
It reads as a void but if there was a porch it would also read as a void. [Jackson]
Sleeping porches were traditionally on the second floor. The downstairs window is different in that it its downstairs and a big plate of glass. [David]
Sleeping porch is not the right thing to call it. A recessed porch? [Jackson]
You do see them you just see the wall of the house eventually. [David]
You cannot ignore one of them. [Tully]
All should be taken into consideration. Without redesigning what they have proposed it is compatible. I am trying to think on other additions and new constructions. [Jackson]

Ms. Jackson made a motion to reopen the public testimony portion of the meeting; Mr. Davis seconded; motion carried 6/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Ms. Tully stated that the wall is the back wall that is under the addition. It is the existing back wall of the house that will be removed. Ms. Tully noted that a non-character dividing wall in 3.7.9 would be more appropriate. Ms. Jackson questioned if this would compromise the integrity of the house. Mr. Griffith responded that the wall that goes away is on the opposite side of the bedroom upstairs and that it does not have a side as its astylistic. Ms. Tully responded that you could interpret guideline 3.7.9 about whether or not it compromises the architectural integrity.

Ms. Lauer stated facts are going to be important because of the removal of a wall so it is important to consider precedent. Ms. Caliendo questioned how far back goes the wall face. Mr. Griffith replied about 8 feet and from the proposed rear design, about 8 feet.

At Ms. Caliendo's suggestion Ms. Webb moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Mr. Davis seconded; motion carried 6/0.

Committee Discussion (2)

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

Should we approve in part and defer in part? [Jackson]
We could do administrative review of conditions. [Caliendo]

According to 3.7.9 it is not character defining, the elevation of the house. We cannot get a good case for an expansive plate of glass to be compatible with the historic design. This holds true upstairs as well. [David]
Coming back as administrative review of conditions will only work if the plate of glass is incongruous. [Tully]
I do not think it compromises the architectural integrity of the building, the addition. [Caliendo]
You are cutting a big whole into the historic wall. It is still an exterior wall where you do not see big openings. [David]
They could move it up a foot. [Caliendo]
The second floor one is much more visible from Person Street. [David]
Especially looking at the back of the house. [Davis]
You have to go through the backyards to see. [David]
It is solid to void, if it was a recessed porch it would still read as a void. [Jackson]
It would still read as a void but not a great big plate glass window. [David]
Are we thinking that it is not changing he character because it is the back wall of the porch? If there was no porch there would that change the character? [Davis]
If it was just solid? [Jackson]
No porch. [Davis]
It would read differently. [Jackson]
A five foot recess does not compromise. [Caliendo]
It would read as a solid, an 8 foot or more recess. [Jackson]
It is well hidden. We have seen some with a lot of glass but none with a lot of plate glass without any separation. Upstairs has more division and with the guidelines it would come across as more of a sleeping porch that is compatible with the house and neighborhood. [David]
I agree with that. A big expanse is not at all compatible with the guidelines, 3.7.9. [Davis]
You need to go back to 4.2.7. [Tully]
The siding, jog, and argument about the narrow vertical window? [David]
There are differing opinions about the windows on the south wall. [Caliendo]
The window in the historic house part or part of the addition of the historic house? [Jackson]
You heard testimony on that. [Tully]
Where does the house stop and the addition start with that location? [Jackson]
If they were changing it to a door, it would be plate glass window in an old house. [David]
I see it as part of the addition. [Caliendo]
I do too. [Jackson]
I see it as part of the old house. [Webb]
Make a motion and see what happens. Mention the testimony of the tall vertical window on the east wall. [Tully]
If it had division bars would it read as less of a void? [Jackson]
Make a motion. [Tully]
We seem split; we could have them come back with a revised plan? [Caliendo]

Ms. Webb made a motion to reopen the public testimony portion of the meeting; Mr. Smith seconded; motion carried 6/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (3)

Mr. Griffith stated that a vertical division could be added and that having the project move forward in the near term would be good. Mr. Griffith stated he would be willing to do a staff review of a revised design of the window in addition to his clients being willing to revisit the windows.

At Ms. Caliendo's suggestion Mr. Smith moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Ms. Jackson seconded; motion carried 6/0.

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) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-14) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Alteration of front door; alteration of windows; add skylights; add new window; removal of tree is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.5, 3.5.10, 3.7.1, 3.7.2, 3.7.7, 3.7.9; however, the design of the front door **is** incongruous with *Guidelines* 3.7.7 and the following findings:

1* The tree proposed for removal is a large evergreen that obscures the house and does not contribute to the tree canopy.

2* There is one other tree on the lot, but none in the right-of-way. A replacement tree is not proposed.

3* Skylights are proposed on the side roofs; details and specifications are not provided.

4* The front doors being removed are not historic.

5* The proposed front door is aluminum clad wood with sidelights on either side. The main door is a full glass opening. The configuration is traditional and seen in foursquare houses. The full glass door, however, is atypical. Doors on foursquare houses are typically some proportion of glass on top and wood below. Aluminum clad wood doors have not been approved for use on historic buildings.

6* The proposed new window and altered window are on a side elevation and have the same proportions as the historic windows. They are proposed to be 9/1 wood windows; details and specifications were not included in the application.

B. Removal of non-historic rear addition; construction of new 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 no trees that may be impacted by construction activities.

2* The new addition is just under 180 SF; the lot is approximately 5,227 SF.

3* Based on the Suborn Fire Insurance map the addition being removed was constructed after 1962.

4* The addition on the west appears to be an extension of the house rather than an addition. The square form is a character defining feature. The *Guidelines* state that new additions should be "constructed so that they can be removed in the future without damage to the building."

5* On the east side of the addition, the non-historic brick wall is being extended by 1 foot. Details of how the connection will be made were not included in the application; brick samples were not provided.

6* The new addition is rectangular in form similar to the existing house and is on the rear elevation.

7* The roof of the new addition is a low hip with a deep rear overhang. The new roof is several feet lower than the historic hipped roof.

8* Aluminum clad wood windows have been approved for use on additions to historic buildings.

9* The Prince Hall designation report describes the property as a ca. 1926 two-story Craftsman frame house with original brick veneer, an asphalt-shingled pyramidal roof with a hipped front ventilation dormer, a one-story front porch with patterned battered wood posts on brick piers, and 9/1 windows.

10* The bulk of the addition is clad in smooth faced fiber cement siding with a 6" reveal. Fiber cement siding has been approved for use on additions to historic brick buildings including a dormer addition at 319 S Boylan Avenue (COA 007-12-CA). Colors were not included in the application.

11* The entire wall of glass on the west side of the rear (south) elevation makes it appear as though a section of wall is missing. Traditionally, large expanses of glass were created through the use of banked windows or doors.

12* The windows on the rear elevation are a variety of single pane sizes; the overall amount of wall to window is typical of the district and houses of this era.

13* The tall thin window on the east elevation of the addition is in the same plane as the wall of the historic house. There are no other windows of this proportion on the house and it is atypical of the district.

14* There is an open porch under the new addition on the west side; this is a feature sometimes seen in additions to historic houses.

15* Photos of the existing condition of the brick walls were presented.

16* The applicant testified that the change in materials of the west wall brick to match existing fiber cement siding would be a difference of several inches between the plane of the existing wall.

17* The applicant testified that the placement and design of the tall brick east wall will differentiate between the existing and the new addition.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Webb; motion failed 3/3 (Mr. Davis, Ms. Webb, Ms. David opposed).

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) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-14) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Alteration of front door; alteration of windows; add skylights; add new window; removal of tree is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.5, 3.5.10, 3.7.1, 3.7.2, 3.7.7, 3.7.9; however, the design of the front door **is** incongruous with *Guidelines* 3.7.7 and the following findings:

1* The tree proposed for removal is a large evergreen that obscures the house and does not contribute to the tree canopy.

2* There is one other tree on the lot, but none in the right-of-way. A replacement tree is not proposed.

3* Skylights are proposed on the side roofs; details and specifications are not provided.

4* The front doors being removed are not historic.

5* The proposed front door is aluminum clad wood with sidelights on either side. The main door is a full glass opening. The configuration is traditional and seen in foursquare houses. The full glass door, however, is atypical. Doors on foursquare houses are typically some proportion of glass on top and wood below. Aluminum clad wood doors have not been approved for use on historic buildings.

6* The proposed new window and altered window are on a side elevation and have the same proportions as the historic windows. They are proposed to be 9/1 wood windows; details and specifications were not included in the application.

B. Removal of non-historic rear addition; construction of new 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; however, the glass wall on the rear of the house **is** incongruous according to Guideline 4.2.7 and the following findings:

1* There are no trees that may be impacted by construction activities.

2* The new addition is just under 180 SF; the lot is approximately 5,227 SF.

3* Based on the Suborn Fire Insurance map the addition being removed was constructed after 1962.

4* The addition on the west appears to be an extension of the house rather than an addition. The square form is a character defining feature. The *Guidelines* state that new additions should be "constructed so that they can be removed in the future without damage to the building."

5* On the east side of the addition, the non-historic brick wall is being extended by 1 foot. Details of how the connection will be made were not included in the application; brick samples were not provided.

6* The new addition is rectangular in form similar to the existing house and is on the rear elevation.

7* The roof of the new addition is a low hip with a deep rear overhang. The new roof is several feet lower than the historic hipped roof.

8* Aluminum clad wood windows have been approved for use on additions to historic buildings.
9* The Prince Hall designation report describes the property as a ca. 1926 two-story Craftsman frame house with original brick veneer, an asphalt-shingled pyramidal roof with a hipped front ventilation dormer, a one-story front porch with patterned battered wood posts on brick piers, and 9/1 windows.
10* The bulk of the addition is clad in smooth faced fiber cement siding with a 6″ reveal. Fiber cement siding has been approved for use on additions to historic brick buildings including a dormer addition at 319 S Boylan Avenue (COA 007-12-CA). Colors were not included in the application.
11* The entire wall of glass on the west side of the rear (south) elevation makes it appear as though a section of wall is missing. Traditionally, large expanses of glass were created through the use of banked windows or doors.
12* The windows on the rear elevation are a variety of single pane sizes; the overall amount of wall to window is typical of the district and houses of this era.
13* The tall thin window on the east elevation of the addition is in the same plane as the wall of the historic house. There are no other windows of this proportion on the house and it is atypical of the district.
14* There is an open porch under the new addition on the west side; this is a feature sometimes seen in additions to historic houses.
15* Photos of the existing condition of the brick walls were presented.
16* The applicant testified that the change in materials of the west wall brick to match existing fiber cement siding would be a difference of several inches between the plane of the existing wall.
17* The applicant testified that the placement and design of the tall brick east wall will differentiate between the existing and the new addition.

Ms. Webb seconded; motion passed 6/0.

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

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

1. That a new tree be planted in the right-of-way during the next tree planting season with the species to be approved by Urban Forestry and provided to staff prior to planting.
2. That the front door and sidelights be wood with a tradition glass and panel design, with the design to be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.
3. That the material of the west wall of the addition be changed to match the fiber cement siding on the rear of the addition.
4. That the rear wall under the addition be revised so as to not be a single pane of glass with the revised design to be provided to and approved by the commission.

5. That the following specifications and details be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits:
   a. Revised design based on conditions listed above;
   b. Windows in addition;
   c. Eave construction detail;
   d. Brick wall extension details and material sample.
6. That the following specifications and details be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
   a. Skylights;
   b. Paint colors;
   c. New front door;
   d. New windows in existing house;
   e. Lighting fixtures.

Mr. Davis agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 5/1 (Ms. David opposed).

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

Certificate expiration date: 4/5/16.

## APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

133-15-CA 500 & 510 N BLOUNT STREET
Applicant: JODI STRENKOWSKI
Received: 9/16/2015 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 12/15/2015 1) 10/5/2015 2) 3)

## INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BLOUNT STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT
Raleigh Historic Landmark: MERRIMON-WYNNE HOUSE
Zoning: O&I-2, PDD
Nature of Project: Install synthetic grass in a 7,900 SF area.
Conflict of Interest: Ms. David made a notion to recuse Ms. Jackson; Mr. Davis seconded; motion carried 5/0.
Staff Notes:

- Several sections of the *Guidelines* dealing with building parts have the statement: "Consider compatible substitute materials only if using the original material is not technically feasible." Substitute materials are not specifically addressed in section 2.3.
- City of Raleigh aerial photos are available for review.

## APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

| Sections | Topic | Description of Work |
|---|---|---|
| 2.3 | Site Features and Plantings | Install synthetic grass in a 7,900 sf area. |

## STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Installation of synthetic grass is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.8, 2.3.9; however, it **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.4 and the following findings:

1* The grass proposed for replacement is not historic.
2* The entire area was a paved parking lot from at least 1999 lot until 2008 when the house was move to the site. From sometime in 2009 until early 2014 there was patchy grass and weeds on the majority of the site. The current landscaping was installed by February 2014.
3* The front yard was a gravel parking area from sometime in 2009 until 2013.
4* The front yard and most of the north side yard are proposed to be synthetic grass for a total of 7,900 SF.
5* The synthetic grass will transition to the beds the same way that the current lawn transitions to these borders.

6* The proposed synthetic grass product (EasyTurf Commercial - Elite Line, Nutmeg Lush) has a mix of different colored grass blades that resembles the look of real grass. It is made of 100% polyethylene multi-colored grass fiber and secondary shorter curled nutmeg-colored thatch fiber. It is is installed with a sand infill to add to a natural appearance. Regular maintenance, including brushing, is required.
7* Unlike many natural grasses, EasyTurf remains green year-round.
8* Photos of an installation of EasyTurf in Cary was provided.
9* There is a drainage system in the yard.
10* The yard is screened from with mature landscaping.
11* The application references *Guideline* 3.1.4 and says that more than $50,000 has been invested in an attempt to grow grass. Advice from 6 different experts was obtained, the soil was tested, the grass was treated with fungicides, insecticides, and fertilizers as recommended, and the turf was watered appropriately.
12* The prior history of the site has created extreme compaction, soil composition, and drainage issues. Documentation from a Registered Landscape Architect, landscaping contractor, and a soil report from the NCDA & CS Agronomic Division was provided to support the claim.
13* A letter from a Registered Landscape Architect states that a successful grass lawn cannot be established unless there is deep excavation and more imported soils and that the deep excavation approach may cause damage to critical root zones of existing trees, shrubs, and other on-site plantings.
14* A letter from the landscaping contractor for the project summarized the soil report and added warm season lawns like a Bermuda or a zoysia lawn were eliminated from consideration due to the lack of available sunlight.
15* The two types of sod used did not live more than a few months.

Staff makes no recommendation.

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 staff made no recommendation regarding the application.

Support:
Mr. John Strenkowski, Ms. Jodi Strenkowski, Mr. Matt Hutchison and Mr. Josh Decker [all affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Strenkowski stated it was not without a lot of effort that they came forward with the request that was before the committee. Ms. Strenkowski stated that due to the site being used as a parking lot previously it was impossible to grow grass and experts have attested to this. Ms. Strenkowski stated this is the best possible alternative and the way the site exists now it is less of an eyesore and is not as extreme as some of the photos portray it to look. Ms. Strenkowski reiterated that putting down new sod continuously is not something that can be afforded to keep doing in the long term.

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

Responses and Questions:
Mrs. Strenkowski provided examples of the synthetic grass proposed to be installed on the site which included a sand infill layer which was passed around to the committee.

Ms. David had a question about the asphalt at the location. Ms. Strenkowski replied that it has been removed and the site has been excavated down into the soil. Mr. Strenkowski stated that the soils have lingering manganese as well as gas and oil that are causing issues for the grass to grow.

Ms. Tully stated that fact number eleven and the staff note mentions several sections of guidelines dealing with building parts that may be considered applicable.

Mr. Smith questioned if the installation was permanent. Mr. Strenkowski responded the life is about ten to fifteen years. Mr. Hutchison stated that on the west coast the product lasts between fifteen to eighteen years and that the application has been more of an athletic field or animal type application. He added that the sands are antimicrobial as well as one hundred percent permeable and provides an environment for the filtering of water on the property.

Mr. Davis questioned about the compaction issue. Mr. Hutchison responded that the water can slowly dissipate through if we increase the sandfill one to three inches. Ms. Strenkowski added that the soil is so compacted the grass cannot grow at all. Ms. Strenkowski also stated that they have tried to grow grass on the property twice but it has not been successful. Mr. Strenkowski added that the only way to grow grass is to dig much more on the site which could potentially damage the trees on site and they wish to avoid this as it goes against the historical development guidelines. Mr. Smith questioned again if the artificial grass could come up and Ms. Strenkowski stated that it could be removed.

Ms. Tully stated that guideline 2.3.4 is the applicable guideline as to if it is compatible or not.

Ms. Caliendo questioned if specific trees were identified that could be harmed if the site was excavated. Mr. Strenkowski stated that the plantings on the north side of the property that are close to Mr. Brooks' property are part of the historic trees and plantings.

Ms. Strenkowski stated that the site has already been excavated quite a few times and it has not been successful and while they could continue it would be cost prohibitive. Mr. Josh Decker [affirmed], landscape architect, stated that this is a unique situation and they would not recommend many instances with high traffic areas to install synthetic grass. Mr. Decker clarified that in this area there was extensive preparation before the first sod was put down and then later failed. He clarified there was additional preparation and then a second layer of sod was placed down which additionally failed. Mr. Decker stated that the second layer of sod that

was placed also failed and across the board there were drainage issues and additional work on the site has not seen any additional improvement in making any changes. Ms. Caliendo questioned if the grass died. Mr. Decker stated that both times the grass died and in some areas it takes more to keep the grass in a healthy condition. He added that Dr. Peacock from NC State University also visited the property and did an analysis that concluded that the compaction issue could only be handled through excavation but it is unknown how much excavation would have to be done on the site. Ms. Strenkowski added that there are many spots on the site that the lawn is completely dead and if it was not uniform they could fix the spots with turf paint and due to the nature of the site patches of dirt are not preferable.

Ms. Tully stated the process was a last resort and is specific enough to this case that is deteriorated beyond repair but that the guidelines do not speak to synthetic turf. Ms. Lauer added that it is similar to when a window inventory is done you can see the steps that have been taken to make it different than most cases with replacement materials the question is with guideline 2.3.9 compatibility.

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
There is no historic substitute for grass. How would we talk about this, what if it was a private home and not a business? [Smith]
It is very site specific and on soil that is so compacted. [David]
They do not have to have grass. Does that make a difference in our decision? [Smith]
We do have experience using substitute materials on buildings. [David]
In those cases were we approved it always had a finish. We are not looking at the bare synthetic. [Caliendo]
It looks like grass. [David]
2.3.8 if it is not permeable then you have to have a portion of built area in an open space. [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 1-8, 11-15) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Installation of synthetic grass is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.4, 2.3.8, 2.3.9 and the following findings:

1* The grass proposed for replacement is not historic.

2* The entire area was a paved parking lot from at least 1999 lot until 2008 when the house was move to the site. From sometime in 2009 until early 2014 there was patchy grass and weeds on the majority of the site. The current landscaping was installed by February 2014.
3* The front yard was a gravel parking area from sometime in 2009 until 2013.
4* The front yard and most of the north side yard are proposed to be synthetic grass for a total of 7,900 SF.
5* The synthetic grass will transition to the beds the same way that the current lawn transitions to these borders.
6* The proposed synthetic grass product (EasyTurf Commercial - Elite Line, Nutmeg Lush) has a mix of different colored grass blades that resembles the look of real grass. It is made of 100% polyethylene multi-colored grass fiber and secondary shorter curled nutmeg-colored thatch fiber. It is is installed with a sand infill to add to a natural appearance. Regular maintenance, including brushing, is required.
7* Unlike many natural grasses, EasyTurf remains green year-round.
8* Photos of an installation of EasyTurf in Cary was provided.
9* There is a drainage system in the yard and expert testimony that the proposed turf is permeable.
10* The yard is screened from the street with mature landscaping.
11* The application references *Guideline* 3.1.4 and says that more than $50,000 has been invested in an attempt to grow grass. Advice from 6 different experts was obtained, the soil was tested, the grass was treated with fungicides, insecticides, and fertilizers as recommended, and the turf was watered appropriately.
12* The prior history of the site has created extreme compaction, soil composition, and drainage issues. Documentation from a Registered Landscape Architect, landscaping contractor, and a soil report from the NCDA & CS Agronomic Division was provided to support the claim.
13* A letter from a Registered Landscape Architect states that a successful grass lawn cannot be established unless there is deep excavation and more imported soils and that the deep excavation approach may cause damage to critical root zones of existing trees, shrubs, and other on-site plantings.
14* A letter from the landscaping contractor for the project summarized the soil report and added warm season lawns like a Bermuda or a zoysia lawn were eliminated from consideration due to the lack of available sunlight.
15* The two types of sod used did not live more than a few months.
16* The applicants provided two samples of the replacement materials and a color sample.
17* The material can be easily removed.
18* There is an overarching philosophy in the guidelines that a compatible substitute material can be used when the original deteriorated beyond repair.

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

## Decision on the Application

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

The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith; passed 3/1 (Caliendo opposed)

Committee members voting: Caliendo, David, Davis, Smith

Certificate expiration date: 4/6/16.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Administrative Review of Conditions: 136 E Morgan Street (078-14-CA)
2. Design Guidelines Update
3. Committee Discussion
    a. Application Completeness
    b. Meeting Post-Mortem

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:19 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner