RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
January 5, 2015

CALL TO ORDER

Elizabeth Caliendo called the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Committee meeting to order at 4:01 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Tania Tully, Preservation Planner, called the roll as follows:
Present: Elizabeth Caliendo, Sarah David, Miranda Downer, Laurie Jackson
Alternate Present: Fred Belledin, Don Davis
Excused Absence: Scott Shackleton
Staff Present: Tania Tully, Martha Lauer

Approval of the December 1, 2014 Minutes

Ms. David moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing and adopt said minutes as submitted. Mr. Belledin seconded the motion; passed 6/0.

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
Tom West, 530 N Blount Street 27604	Yes
Linda Rogers, 314 N Boundary Street 27604	Yes
Ronald Rogers, 314 N Boundary Street 27604	Yes
John Brooks, 516 N Blount Street 27604	Yes
Nancy Brooks, 516 N Blount Street 27604	Yes
Michael Ruiz, 110 E Hargett Street 27601	No
Maggie McDonald, 710 Independence Pl, #509 27603	Yes
Mackey McDonald, 710 Independence Pl, #509 27603	Yes
Nathan Romblad, 1405 Cameron Street 27605	Yes
Frank Liggett, 725 Pershing Road 27608	Yes
Scott Thompson, 421 Chesterfield Road 27608	Yes
Jeffrey Sharp, 219 E South Street 27601	Yes
Noah Morris, 510 Glenwood Avenue #201 27603	Yes
John Rufty	Yes
Parker Shanahan	Yes

REVIEW OF SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The applicant for case 194-14-CA requested that the item be deferred. Case 189-14-CA was requested to be moved to the Public Hearing portion of the agenda. Ms. Downer 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 193-14-CA for which the Summary Proceeding is made part of these minutes.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – SUMMARY PROCEEDING

193-14-CA 219 E SOUTH STREET
Applicant: SHARP PROPERTIES NC
Received: 12/12/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 3/12/2015 1) 1/5/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: PRINCE HALL HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: DOD, RB
Nature of Project: Construct concrete strip driveway and parking pad; construct 6' tall rear yard fence.
Conflict of Interest: Ms. Jackson abstained from voting and did not receive staff comments.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	construct concrete strip driveway and parking pad; construct 6' tall rear yard fence
2.4	Fences and Walls	construct 6' tall rear yard fence
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	Construct concrete strip driveway and parking pad

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Construction of 6' tall rear yard fence is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.4.8, 2.4.10 and the following findings:
1* There are no trees that may be impacted by construction of the driveway.
2* The new fence is proposed along the rear and rear side property lines; this is a traditional location for fences.
3* The fence is a 6' tall wood privacy fence with dog-eared pickets. Detailed drawings and specifications for the fence and gate were included in the application.
4* The application does not indicate that the fence will be installed using neighbor friendly design with the structural members facing the interior of the yard.
5* There is a chain-link fence visible in some of the photos that appears to be removed. Chain-link fences are a prohibited item.

B. Construction of concrete strip driveway and parking pad is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.5.1, 2.5.5, and the following findings:
1* There are no trees that may be impacted by construction of the driveway.

2* The driveway will utilize an existing curb cut and driveway apron and be in the location of the compacted earth currently utilized as a drive.
3* Concrete ribbon driving strip driveways are typical for early Raleigh historic districts; the parking pad and driveway strips will have a water-washed finish.

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

1. That the installation of the fence be neighbor friendly design with the structural members facing the interior of the yard.

Decision on the Application

There were no objections to approval without a public hearing.

Ms. David moved to approve the application, adopting the staff comments as the written record of the summary proceeding on 193-14-CA. Mr. Belledin seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 7/5/15.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Ms. Caliendo introduced the public hearing portion of the meeting. The committee heard the following cases in the following order for which the Certified Records are made part of these minutes: 189-14-CA, 081-14-CA, 190-14-CA, 176-14-CA, 191-14-CA and 192-14-CA.

Due to illness, Ms. Downer requested to be excused from the meeting after case 176-14-CA. Ms. David moved that she be allowed to leave. Mr. Belledin seconded; motion carried 6/0.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

189-14-CA 314 N BOUNDARY STREET
Applicant: LINDA ROGERS
Received: 12/1/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 3/1/2015 1) 1/5/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Extend east side dormer; [after-the-fact] construct low retaining wall in rear yard.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- After the fact applications are treated as though the work has not yet been completed.
- File photos and 1928 architectural drawings are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Construct low retaining wall in rear
2.4	Fences and Walls	yard
3.5	Roofs	Extend east side dormer
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Construction of low retaining wall in rear yard is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.11, 2.4.8, and the following findings:
1* A low retaining wall was constructed at the rear of the house after reconstruction of the rear porch steps per COA 156-14-MW.
2* The retaining wall is treated lumber roughly 12″ tall at its highest point. It aligns with the rear porch post bases.
3* The regrading for the wall was to alleviate runoff from the adjacent property.

B. Extension of east side dormer is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.5.1, 3.5.10, 4.2.1, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, and the following findings:
1* Trees will not be impacted by the actual dormer expansion; however there are trees in the vicinity that may be impacted by construction activity. A tree protection plan was not provided.

2* Dormers are a character defining feature of the house; there are 3 dormers on the house; one each on the front and back and one on the east side. They are all retained.
3* The extension of the historic dormer is toward the rear of the house and will not be obscured.
4* Corner boards will be used to help distinguish the new portion of the dormer from the old as will the windows.
5* The siding, windows and eaves are proposed to be wood and compatible in appearance to the historic dormer; details and specifications were not included.
6* Two small square windows are proposed on the dormer expansion; the size of the windows in comparison to the expanse of the wall is too small.

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

1. That the two new windows be the approximately same size as the upper sashes of the adjacent historic windows.
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan;
   b. Windows;
   c. Eave construction.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Support:
Linda Rogers [affirmed] and Ronald Rogers [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Rogers noted that the windows are sized to fit the interior program and noted that there is confusion about which windows are under discussion.

Ms. Tully stated that in her judgment the windows in Exhibit B were too small to be in proportion. She suggested to the applicants that they size them to be the same as the upper sash on the historic windows. In the revised drawings, the proposed windows were square, but smaller windows. Ms. David asked which windows were actually proposed. Ms. Tully said that staff comments were based on square windows.

Ms. Rogers said that she would prefer the longer ones, in Exhibit B. Ms. Davbid asked staff if they could do that. Ms. Tully said yes, they can state that the windows in Exhibit B are the ones approved. Mr. Rogers clarified that the B versions were 1’8”.

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

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
The smaller windows are in keeping with a lot of windows on houses. [Davis]
I don't think having different sized windows is incongruous. [David]
In the revised drawings, showing longer windows, the size in comparison with the expanse of the wall is not an issue. [Jackson]
Guideline 4.2.7 appears most relevant. It sounds like you're saying the relationship of solids to voids is more compatible. [Tully]
Yes. [Jackson]
The house is asymmetrical and has a couple of different window configurations already. The application pretty clearly meets the other addition guidelines. [David]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Ms. Jackson moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-3) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-6) to be acceptable as findings of fact as listed below:

A. Construction of low retaining wall in rear yard is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.3.11, 2.4.8, and the following findings:
1* A low retaining wall was constructed at the rear of the house after reconstruction of the rear porch steps per COA 156-14-MW.
2* The retaining wall is treated lumber roughly 12" tall at its highest point. It aligns with the rear porch post bases.
3* The regrading for the wall was to alleviate runoff from the adjacent property.

B. Extension of east side dormer is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.5.1, 3.5.10, 4.2.1, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, and the following findings:
1* Trees will not be impacted by the actual dormer expansion; however there are trees in the vicinity that may be impacted by construction activity. A tree protection plan was not provided.
2* Dormers are a character defining feature of the house; there are 3 dormers on the house; one each on the front and back and one on the east side. They are all retained.
3* The extension of the historic dormer is toward the rear of the house and will not be obscured.
4* Corner boards will be used to help distinguish the new portion of the dormer from the old as will the windows.
5* The siding, windows and eaves are proposed to be wood and compatible in appearance to the historic dormer; details and specifications were not included.

6* Two small square windows are proposed on the dormer expansion; the size of the windows in comparison to the expanse of the wall is too small.

The motion was seconded by Ms. David; passed 6/0.

Decision on the Application

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

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

The motion was seconded by Ms. David; passed 6/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 7/5/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

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

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Alter front porch; construct 1-story rear addition; replace windows; change exterior paint colors; install new HVAC unit and electrical panel; repair/replace siding; remove chimney
Amendments: A window survey was provided December 22, 2014 and is attached to these comments.
Conflict of Interest: Mr. Belledin and Ms. Caliendo noted that the firm where they work has business with the applicant's firm unrelated to this case and that they were able to be unbiased in their decision making.
Staff Notes:

- File for approved COA 188-14-MW for "Alter front porch; remove non-historic siding; replace front concrete walk in-kind; remove metal railings; remove shrubbery; prune trees; remove intertwined trees; replace roof covering; install attic vent; alter foundation" is available for review.
- Alteration/Construction/Removal of service/utility Chimneys is a Minor Work; Alteration/Construction/Removal of character-defining Chimneys is a Major Work.
- COAs mentioned in the staff comments, Sanborn Fire Insurance maps, and staff photos are available for review.
- References to the windows in the comments below use the numbering system provided by the applicant.
- 080-12-CA 10 N EAST STREET and 024-09-CA 903 W LENOIR STREET

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	construct 1-story rear addition; install new HVAC unit
3.1	Wood	repair/replace siding
3.2	Masonry	remove chimney
3.4	Paint and Paint Color	change exterior paint colors
3.5	Roofs	remove chimney
3.6	Exterior Walls	repair/replace siding
3.7	Windows and Doors	replace windows

3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	alter front porch
3.10	Utilities and Energy Retrofit	install new HVAC unit and electrical panel
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	construct 1-story rear addition

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Alteration of front porch; changing of exterior paint colors; installation of new HVAC unit and electrical panel; repair/replacement of siding; is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.9, 3.1.4, 3.4.3, 3.6.2, 3.6.5, 3.8.1, 3.8.6, 3.10.3, 3.10.8, and the following findings:

1* The new HVAC unit will sit on a concrete pad on the west side of the house behind the electrical panels and approximately 15 feet back from the front wall of the house. No screening is proposed.

2* Siding will be replaced only where necessary and will be matching wood.

3* Photocopies of paint colors were provided; paint samples were not.

4* Removal of non-historic screening and partial porch enclosure was approved with COA 188-14-MW.

5* Based on Sanborn Fire Insurance maps the porch was enclosed after 1950.

6* The proposed new porch supports are paneled battered columns sitting on wide paneled bases. The heaviness of the columns seems out of proportion with the small porch and simply detailed bungalow.

7* A new window is proposed to be reinstalled in an existing opening that had been converted to a door on the reopened front porch; details and specifications were not included.

8* The new electrical panel is in the same location as the existing.

B. Removal of chimney is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.2.1, 3.5.7 and the following findings:

1* There is one remaining brick chimney on the ca. 1925 bungalow; the chimney is internal and connects to a fireplace. The chimney protrudes through the ridge of the roof near the front of the house, has some brick corbelling, and has a terra cotta cap.

2* The chimney is an original roof feature of the building. It provides an important vertical accent to the main ridge of the building and conveys information about the history of heating the structure.

3* The applicant states that the chimney has structural deficiencies, but provided no evidence of this deficiency from a professional qualified to make such an evaluation, nor evidence why it cannot be repaired.

4* Utility chimneys are commonly approved by staff and the commission; chimney removal was denied at 919 W. South Street (105-12-CA) and 1014 W. Cabarrus Street (086-06-CA); determination of what is a "service/utility" chimney is made on a case-by-case basis.

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

1* The applicant has not attempted to repair the windows.

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

   a. The descriptions for all windows proposed for replacement state that they have severe sash, sill, and muntin deterioration, that the sash is in such bad condition that the profile details are completely gone due to deterioration, that the sash cords and counterweights are missing (where applicable), that panes have visible cracks, and that the window does not operate correctly.
   b. On the front (south) elevation 4 windows and/or sashes are proposed for removal. Windows A2-A5 are a bank of 4/1 wood double-hung windows. They are in a section of porch that based on Sanborn Fire Insurance maps was enclosed after 1950.
   c. Window B1 is on the east side of the enclosed porch. It is a 6/6 wood double-hung window; based on the pulley system, the bottom sash appears to have been replaced with a newer six lite muntin configuration.
   d. Windows A6, A7, B6, B7 are steel frame windows into the basement that are not proposed for replacement.
   e. Windows B2, B4, B12 are 6/1 wood double-hung windows. The sill of B2 has newspaper on it that has caused rotting and there is also soot on the window/frame and apparent fire damage.
   f. Windows B3 and B8 are missing. There are currently only storm windows installed.
   g. Window B9 is a 6-lite fixed window that is completely rotted across the bottom of the sash and has begun to fall apart. Several muntins are broken and deteriorating.
   h. Windows B10 and B11 are banked 6/1 wood double-hung windows. There are vines growing through rotted portions of the sash.
   i. The windows on the north elevation (C1, C2, and C3) as well as window B5 are all on the proposed new addition and not relevant to the discussion of replacement windows.

3* The following facts are based on staff's observations of the windows and general knowledge of window repair:

   a. In support of the Sanborn map evidence, the bank of windows A2-A5 are clearly installed as a retro-fit. The mullions are of varying widths which is atypical of 1920s construction. Given the 4/1 muntin pattern, the windows are historic, but not necessarily originally from this house. The sashes do not currently fit well in the frames; light is visible between the sash and the frame.
   b. Missing sash weights, pulleys, and cords can be replaced as can broken panes of glass.
   c. There is evidence of wood damage on the lower sash of window B2; it is unclear how deep into the wood the damage goes and whether or not it is repairable. Similar damage is shown on the lower rail of the upper sash and on window B12.
   d. The bottom rail of B9 appears to be splitting and at least one joint has come apart.

e. Windows B10 and B11 are a pair of banked windows. Photographs show some evidence of wood damage at the meeting rail, but it is unclear how deep into the wood the damage goes and the whether or not they are repairable.

4* It is unclear from the application if replacements are for the entire window units or just the sashes.

5* All the window trim is also proposed to be replaced. The window survey states on most windows that the exterior trim is deteriorating at the sill from what appears to be years of leaves and rotting yard debris stuck between the sash and the window screen.

6* There is insufficient evidence to support that the windows A2-A5, B1, B2, B4, and B10-B12 are deteriorated beyond repair.

D. Construction of a 1-story rear addition is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9, and the following findings:

1* There are trees on the property that may be impacted by construction of the addition. A plan locating trees is included in the application, but the size and species of the trees are not. The addition will be within the drip line of at least one large tree. A tree protection plan was not included in the application.

2* The lot slopes up towards the rear of the property.

3* According to Wake County tax records the lot size is 6,970 SF. The footprint of the existing house (including porches) is 1,568 SF; current lot coverage is 22%. The new addition is about 400 SF for new lot coverage of 27%.

4* The proposed addition is at the rear of the house, is 1-story in height, is 2 feet narrower than the historic house, and extends 13 feet into the rear yard. The addition has a rectangular form and a gable roof the same pitch as the roof of the historic house. The roof of the addition tucks under the eaves of the historic house.

5* The west side of the addition is an engaged porch without railings; detailed drawings were not included.

6* The application states that the new addition will have wood lap siding and gable end cedar shingles to match the existing, wood 6/1 windows, a parged concrete foundation, and an asphalt shingle roof. Details and specifications of the siding, trim and windows were not included in the application.

7* The eaves of the addition are drawn to match the historic house in width and the exposed rafter detail. Detailed drawings are not included in the application.

8* In the written description the rear door is proposed to be fiberglass. The west elevation drawing calls out a wood door. The drawing is the correct notation per email correspondence with the applicant.

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

1. That the new porch supports be narrower in proportion.
2. That the siding under the new window be woven in with the existing so as to avoid matching vertical seams.

3. That the following details and specifications for the front porch be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Column/post revisions;
   b. New window.
4. That the exterior portion of the chimney remain.
5. That windows A2-A5, B1, B2, B4, and B10-B12 be repaired.
6. That window sash B9 may be replaced.
7. That missing windows A1, B3, and B8 may be replaced.
8. That the rear door be wood.
9. That the following details and specifications for the addition be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. A tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) that includes a recommendation regarding the foundation of the addition as well as protection of nearby trees during construction;
   b. Eave construction;
   c. Windows.
10. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction or installation:
    a. Paint sample;
    b. HVAC screening;
    c. Replacement windows;
    d. Addition porch posts;
    e. Addition siding;
    f. Addition trim;
    g. Window and door trim.
11. That the windows approved for removal be salvaged and stored on site or made available for reuse either via private sale or donation.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from staff comments. She stated that she suggested changes to the proportion of the front porch posts, recommends that the chimney remain and that the window removal request to be reviewed carefully. The rest of the conditions are pretty standard.

Support:
Nathan Romblad [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. He noted that he was ok with staff recommended conditions 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, and 11, but he wanted to discuss the chimney and windows. Mr. Romblad distributed a letter from a structural engineer about the chimney. He noted that of the windows staff is suggesting be repaired, most of the damage is on the inside of the house. They are very deteriorated with vines etc. and that a lot of the detailing on the insides has since rotted away. Mr. Romblad added that he had another person look at them who also recommends that he replace them. He brought a window sample that

happened to be PVC, but that he is going to be doing wood with the pattern to match the existing.

Mr. Belledin said that he is struggling with is the four windows on the front which are old yes but not original and asked staff to comment. Ms. Tully said that the addition was definitely after 1950. She took the conservative route, as is typical for staff and recommended repair. She noted that even though they are not original fabric to the house, they are what would typically be preferred - using salvaged windows rather than new wood. In her mind it's still a question of reparability, adding that 4/1 is very common on bungalows, and these do contribute to character even if they are not original. She added that because this was enclosed after 1950, they do have flexibility on the muntin pattern.

Mr. Belledin asked how that is different than the siding. Ms. Tully said that asbestos siding wasn't put on in the 1920s, while 4/1 windows were. She added that these windows were very likely salvaged from somewhere else.

Ms. David asked if the applicant had looked at using true divided lights instead of simulated. Mr. Romblad said yes, he did discuss it with contractors and looked at other approved COAs. Ms. David said that she was concerned with guideline 3.7.15 that disallows snap-in-muntins. Ms. Tully said that most simulated divided windows have permanently adhered muntins on both sides. The ones with clips are not approved.

Mr. Romblad said that the general consensus from the contractors walking through inside was that the window sashes would have to be removed from the house, taken to the shop, redone, and reinstalled, or be replaced. With all of the needed replacement parts it would be a new window by that time. He added that there is no detailing left on inside of window. Ms. Tully stated that we know that windows do get to the point that they are deteriorated beyond repair, but that commission should be confident that this is the case with these windows. Mr. Romblad said he would be happy to arrange for a site visit. Ms. Caliendo said that he could have a professional submit a letter. Mr. Belledin added that it should be from experts in wood window restoration.

Ms. David noted that on the trim, it looks like someone clipped off returns so the asbestos siding would be flush – but that's a guess. She said his plan shows flush window trim as well and wonders if that is what he intends. Mr. Romblad said that it depends on what is behind it. If there's no siding, it makes no sense to put in siding just to add on top of it. Ms. Tully noted that in the drawing in the original application they show a return. She took the window survey to be showing current conditions, but return on repaired/replaced windows. Mr. Romblad said that sounds like a detail that can be worked out with staff.

Ms. David said the front door has damage to it and asked if it is not usable. Mr. Romblad said that there is a list of things that are wrong with it. He noted that currently there's plywood over the window part of it and that the jamb is split. Ms. David said that it looks like an original door

and asked if he had thoughts on keeping it. Mr. Romblad said that he might salvage, but would paint it not stain.

Staff photos of the chimney were passed around. Ms. Tully noted that the commission has had people remove chimneys from the interior but keep the exterior and also has had people rebuild them. Ms. Caliendo said that it does seem like this letter doesn't say that it can't be repaired. Ms. Tully pointed out the part of the letter that is relevant to the exposed chimney.

Regarding the window restoration Mr. Belledin asked the applicant if he'd prefer to see us act on what's presented or would you prefer to defer to provide additional information.

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

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
On the chimney, I'd like to see it left in place, supported in the attic as we typically require. [David]
The chimney contributes to the character. [Belledin] [Caliendo]
The applicant is okay with the rear door being wood, changing porch supports, and we may defer windows for additional information. [Caliendo]
Does anyone care about replacing the front door? [David]
It is awfully deteriorated. [Caliendo]
It seems like this was original door. [David]
How about we ask for additional information like on the windows? [Belledin]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Ms. David and seconded by Ms. Jackson, Ms. David made an amended motion that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comments A. (inclusive of facts 1-8), B. (inclusive of facts 1-2), and D. (inclusive of facts 1-8) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Alteration of front porch; changing of exterior paint colors; installation of new HVAC unit and electrical panel; repair/replacement of siding; is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.9, 3.1.4, 3.4.3, 3.6.2, 3.6.5, 3.8.1, 3.8.6, 3.10.3, 3.10.8, and the following findings:

1* The new HVAC unit will sit on a concrete pad on the west side of the house behind the electrical panels and approximately 15 feet back from the front wall of the house. No screening is proposed.
2* Siding will be replaced only where necessary and will be matching wood.
3* Photocopies of paint colors were provided; paint samples were not.
4* Removal of non-historic screening and partial porch enclosure was approved with COA 188-14-MW.
5* Based on Sanborn Fire Insurance maps the porch was enclosed after 1950.
6* The proposed new porch supports are paneled battered columns sitting on wide paneled bases. The heaviness of the columns seems out of proportion with the small porch and simply detailed bungalow.
7* A new window is proposed to be reinstalled in an existing opening that had been converted to a door on the reopened front porch; details and specifications were not included.
8* The new electrical panel is in the same location as the existing.

B. Removal of chimney is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.2.1, 3.5.7 and the following findings:
1* There is one remaining brick chimney on the ca. 1925 bungalow; the chimney is internal and connects to a fireplace. The chimney protrudes through the ridge of the roof near the front of the house, has some brick corbelling, and has a terra cotta cap.
2* The chimney is an original roof feature of the building. It provides an important vertical accent to the main ridge of the building and conveys information about the history of heating the structure.
3* The applicant states that the chimney has structural deficiencies and provided evidence of this deficiency from a professional qualified to make such an evaluation, but no evidence why it cannot be repaired.
4* Removal of utility chimneys are commonly approved by staff and the commission; chimney removal was denied at 919 W. South Street (105-12-CA) and 1014 W. Cabarrus Street (086-06-CA); determination of what is a "service/utility" chimney is made on a case-by-case basis.

D. Construction of a 1-story rear addition is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9, and the following findings:
1* There are trees on the property that may be impacted by construction of the addition. A plan locating trees is included in the application, but the size and species of the trees are not. The addition will be within the drip line of at least one large tree. A tree protection plan was not included in the application.
2* The lot slopes up towards the rear of the property.
3* According to Wake County tax records the lot size is 6,970 SF. The footprint of the existing house (including porches) is 1,568 SF; current lot coverage is 22%. The new addition is about 400 SF for new lot coverage of 27%.
4* The proposed addition is at the rear of the house, is 1-story in height, is 2 feet narrower than the historic house, and extends 13 feet into the rear yard. The addition has a rectangular

form and a gable roof the same pitch as the roof of the historic house. The roof of the addition tucks under the eaves of the historic house.

5* The west side of the addition is an engaged porch without railings; detailed drawings were not included.

6* The application states that the new addition will have wood lap siding and gable end cedar shingles to match the existing, wood 6/1 windows, a parged concrete foundation, and an asphalt shingle roof. Details and specifications of the siding, trim and windows were not included in the application.

7* The eaves of the addition are drawn to match the historic house in width and the exposed rafter detail. Detailed drawings are not included in the application.

8* In the written description the rear door is proposed to be fiberglass. The west elevation drawing calls out a wood door. The drawing is the correct notation per email correspondence with the applicant.

Ms. Jackson agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 6/0.

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

Ms. David made a motion that the application be approved in part and deferred in part as amended.

That the proposed window and door replacements be deferred requesting the following additional information:

- Analysis of whether or not the windows and front door on the house are reparable made by an expert in wood window rehabilitation.

That the remainder of the application be approved with the following conditions:

1. That the new porch supports be narrower in proportion.
2. That the siding under the new window be woven in with the existing so as to avoid matching vertical seams.
3. That the following details and specifications for the front porch be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Column/post revisions;
   b. New window.
4. That the exterior portion of the chimney remain.
5. That the rear door be wood.
6. That the following details and specifications for the addition be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. A tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) that includes a recommendation regarding the foundation of the addition as well as protection of nearby trees during construction;
   b. Eave construction;

   c. Windows.
7. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction or installation:
   a. Paint sample;
   b. HVAC screening;
   c. Replacement windows;
   d. Addition porch posts;
   e. Addition siding;
   f. Addition trim;
   g. Window and door trim.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Jackson; passed 6/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 7/5/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

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

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BLOUNT STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: O&I-2, PDD
Nature of Project: Construct new 2-story house; remove water oak tree; plant 2 dogwood trees; install plantings at foundation; construct new rear retaining wall and rear fence; install rear walkway
Amendments: Additional information was received November 24, 2014, distributed at the December meeting, and included in commissioner packets. The driveway is no longer proposed with revised drawings including a new site plan. Additional information regarding the widths of houses in Blount Street was information was provided December 3, 2014 and is included in commissioner packets.
DRAC: The application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its November 19 meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker and Erin Sterling; also present were Maggie McDonald, Mackey McDonald, Jon Rufty, and Tania Tully.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

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

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Construct new 2-story house; remove water oak tree; plant 2 dogwood trees; install plantings at foundation; construct new rear retaining wall and rear fence; install walkways; install rear patio
2.4	Fences and Walls	construct new rear retaining wall and rear fence
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	install walkways
4.3	New Construction	construct new 2-story house

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application:

A. Construction of new 2-story house is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 4.3.1, 4.3.4, 4.3.5, 4.3.6, 4.3.7, 4.3.8, 4.3.9, 4.3.10, 4.3.11; however the use of cellular PVC windows is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 4.3.9, 4.3.10 and the following findings:

1* There are 3 trees located directly inside the north property line. They are a 26" DBH Ash tree, a 13" DBH Sugar Maple, and a 28" DBH Water Oak. The water oak is proposed for removal (See comment B).

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

3* The applicants are choosing to retain the Ash and the Maple. A tree protection plan was not included in the application.

4* According to the online Wake County Real Estate Data, the lot is 11,326 SF. The footprint of the proposed house is 1,900 SF; porches are about 741 SF for a total footprint of approximately 2,641 SF for lot coverage of 23%, within the norm for Blount Street.

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

6* The house sits towards the right of the lot to be father away from the trees and to allow for a possible future driveway. The distance between the new house and the house on the adjacent lot was not included.

7* The house fronts onto Blount Street as is typical of the district. The application states that the front yard setback for the house at 630 N. Blount Street is 31′; the adjacent houses are set back 16′ and 40′. A scaled site plan is not included.

8* The proposed height of the two-and-one-half story house is 35′8″. As seen in the application photos, houses many houses in the district are 2 to 2 ½ stories in height. Actual heights of the immediately adjacent buildings were not included; the amended application includes a list of the heights of the historic buildings in the Blount Street Commons master plan. The new house is within the range of heights.

9* The proposed house is 2-stories with a moderately pitched hipped roof. It has a wide symmetrically balanced front façade with a central pediment and two-story porch.

10* The hipped-roof form of the house is not uncommon in the Blount Street district; examples of houses with double porches in both the Blount Street and Oakwood districts were included in the application. Discussion at the December hearing revealed that most of the double porch examples are in Oakwood.

11* The facade of the house is 53′ wide with two 3′ wide wings set back about 21′ feet back from the façade. The amended application includes the widths of other houses in the Blount Street district; the houses on either side are 63′ and 58′ each.
12* Details of the house include exterior cove crown molding with a piece of inverted base cap, 10" freeze board with a heavy molded base cap, and large columns. The materials of and detailed drawings of the architectural features were not included except for the columns.
13* The locations of windows are deliberate, have a sense of rhythm, and are in locations typical of other houses in the district. The windows are traditionally proportioned.
14* The front doors are solid wood with true divided lights. Details and specifications were not included in the application.
15* Shutters on the front façade are proposed to be operational and sized so that they can be closed.
16* The windows are simulated divided light double hung with 7/8″ muntins; the casing is 5/4″x4″ with a traditional window sill. Windows are proposed to be vinyl (cellular PVC) with simulated divided lights. The amended application includes some details and specifications.
17* The proposed windows are an extruded product that can be painted.
18* The commission has only approved either wood windows or aluminum clad wood windows in detached new construction. Cellular PVC has not been approved except for sills.
19* A full-sized mock-up of the proposed window was presented at the December hearing along with testimony that it looks like wood when it's painted and that they would choose the color shade very carefully. It is PVC molded material with several casing designs and will have a putty glaze profile. The window will never be structurally damaged with rot and looks like a traditional wood product. The jambs are wood and anything exposed to the weather is PVC. It's assembled like a wood window. There are multiple brands available that don't have the historic look. They chose this particular product because of its details.
20* The application states that materials include cementitious lap siding with an 8" lap; wood doors; dimensional asphalt shingles on the house; metal roof on the porches; and a brick foundation. Photographs of materials were provided; samples and details were not. The material of the corner boards and trim is not stated.
21* Painted smooth faced fiber cement siding is regularly approved for detached new construction in the historic districts; most recently at 630 N Blount Street (061-14-CA). The application does specify that the house will be painted and colors were shown, but samples were not provided.

B. Removal of water oak tree; planting of 2 trees; installation of plantings at foundation; construction of new rear retaining wall and rear fence; installation of walkways is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.4, 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.4.8, 2.5.5, and the following findings: (Raleigh City Code Section 10.2.15.E.1. states that "An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure or site within any Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark may not be denied…However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period

of up to 365 days from the date of issuance…If the Commission finds that the building, structure or site has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark, it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal.")

1* The arborist report states that the 28″ DBH Water Oak cannot withstand construction of the new house. The removed tree is proposed to be replaced with either a Crimson Spice Oak or Blackjack Oak. A dogwood is also proposed.

2* Vegetation and small trees on the right side of the property are also proposed for removal; the amended application states that the largest tree is 7″ DBH.

3* The low retaining wall and new wood fence with gates are along the rear and side property lines as is typical. The new fence will abut the fencing that is currently in place on the right side of the property and will allow access to the garage located in the carriage house on the adjacent property.

4* The fence and gate designs were not included.

5* The front concrete walkway goes directly from the sidewalk to the front of the house as is traditional in the historic district. Exact dimensions were not provided.

6* The finish of the concrete walkways and concrete paver patio are not provided. The commission typically requires a water-washed finish similar to historic concrete sidewalks in the district.

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

1. That the tree protection plan be in place prior to commencement of work on the property.
2. That new concrete have a water-washed finish.
3. That the new windows either be wood or aluminum clad wood.
4. That the siding have a smooth finish.
5. That the fence be installed utilizing neighbor friendly design with the structural members facing inward towards the yard.
6. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Tree protection plan for the new house and general construction activity prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture that includes an analysis of a pier foundation and trees on adjacent properties whose roots may extend onto this property;
   b. Windows;
   c. Section drawings of eave, fascia and water table.
7. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction/installation:
   a. Doors;
   b. Window and door trim;
   c. Railings;
   d. Metal roofing;

e. Trim material;
f. Front steps;
g. Concrete paver patio;
h. Fence and gates designs;
i. Front walkway.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from staff comments. She noted that the amendments presented at last month's meeting and additional information requested at last meeting went out with the packets and that that the requested wood window sample is present. The staff recommendation remains the same, although she added the removal of the demolition delay on the tree.

Support:
John Rufty [affirmed], Parker Shanahan [affirmed], and Maggie and Mackey McDonald [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Ms. McDonald spoke to the widths of the houses. She said that the houses get larger as you move south along Blount Street. The average width is 58'. The proposed total house width is 59 feet, but the wings being set back will diminish the house's width. She maintained that the house is an appropriate width. Ms. McDonald, in response to comments about the roof at the last meeting, said that the use of a center front gable splits up the bulkiness of the roof, brings the eye to the center and upward. The inspiration for the design came from the buildings at Peace University, cattycorner from Blount Street. She also spoke to the question about the architecture and whether or not the double porches made the house look too wide. She pointed out that they provided multiple examples of houses with double porches, including 215 E Lane Street which is 60' wide. It is a great example of a double porch house that doesn't appear too wide or out of place. Another example is the Lewis-Smith House. Ms. McDonald said that while they wanted to complement that house across the street, they didn't want to copy it so they went with full width porches. She handed out a drawing of the house with shaded wings and pictures of other houses with the PVC windows. The reiterated that per guideline 4.3.11 the house is compatible and discernable.

Mr. Shanahan said that they were asked to bring an aluminum clad window and a wood window in for comparison. They have a preference of PVC because it can be painted any color and aluminum would add $25,000 to project. It is not a vinyl window; it is extruded cellular PVC. The pictures handed out were examples of that window on other homes.

Opposition:
John and Nancy Brooks [affirmed], 516 N Blount Street, were present to speak in opposition to the application. Mr. Brooks began by saying that they endorse the architecture and design of the house and are supporters of project generally. He went on to make the following points:

- Behind the site there is a double garage that goes with this property.

- The State was concerned that Blount Street would be getting increased traffic including the apartments across the street. Because of that, 20 years ago the Capital City Planning Commission voted to limit curb cuts in that area as much as possible. Toward that end the redevelopment was to have alleys reopened to add access and egress down the alleys and side streets rather than turns off of Edenton Street. The state sold the property and he is not aware how binding the program instituted by the state as far as the restoration of the property on Blount Street is what degree the curb cuts will be honored.
- The location of the house is awkward in terms of the structure in the background, which extends more to the north than the south.
- On the right side of the lot there is currently a shrubbery screen (some of the hedge is evergreen trees) that shields that side of his house. That shrubbery is between a driveway and this lot. The shrubbery is on this property.
- The purchasers of this property have an easement to the driveway there on the right.
- The problem with the location of what's proposed is that the distance of the house on the right and the proposed house is 15′. The independent college building has a 24′ setback. Plus you'll be able to see the duplex very clearly.
- The curb cut that was here has been filled in and has been restored, so the issue they're concerned with is the visibility of the structure in the back from a historic standpoint.
- It is much better to have this house centered on the lot and obscuring the back building.
- The reason for this placement is the future hope of a driveway to the north.
- There doesn't need to be another driveway here, they can use the one that they share with the property to the south.
- Most of the canopy on the left is the tree slated for removal.
- His concern is placement of house, and he understands that as far as the development division of the city is concerned, this COA has the authority on what setbacks should be set in place for any new structure.

Mrs. Brooks added that the house will look strange to be put so far off center on lot. If they put the house 5′ from the property line, there will be no room for any kind of screen between houses. She is not attached to the plantings and is willing to work with them on the shared driveway.

Mrs. Brooks brought up an additional comment. She said that this is supposed to be a public hearing, and the ADA says that for folks with disabilities, we're supposed to provide accommodations. They cannot hear and request that the meeting be relocated or the room adapted.

Ms. Caliendo asked for clarification on how far their house is from property line? Mr. Brooks stated that it was 3′ to his house and 5′ to the new house for an 8′ total between houses. He noted that the diagram doesn't show the alley or driveway.

Ms. Tully stated that at the last meeting the applicants removed the request for a new driveway because of the Blount Street Master Plan. She doesn't know how binding the Capitol Planning Commission's decision is, but one of the goals of the Master Plan was not increasing the number of curb cuts. It was staff's guidance that it would be a much bigger challenge to get a curb cut due to the Master Plan and that the COA could get delayed based on this. It is true that it is a challenge to be addressed separately, and not part of this application. Ms. David noted that it sounds like the discussion of paved surfaces becoming a deck and then a sunroom.

Ms. Tully added that the location of the property line is outside of the commission's purview. It's about how it fits into the district regardless of legal access.

Mr. Brooks noted that Drummond Way, the alley way at the very top of the map is that new alleyway that cuts from Person to Blount. It is part of the new development, as well as the alleyway vertically down the middle of the block. In addition to the apartments being built across the street, two more buildings like that are under construction, and three more apartment buildings are being built this year. On Person Street they are building 16 new apartments. On Peace Street you can see the outline of offices and apartments with parking there on the alley, so you're going to see a considerable amount of traffic coming out of that entrance onto Blount Street.

Support:
Tom West [affirmed], general counsel for the NC Independent Colleges and Universities, 530 N Blount Street was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. West said that the tree that has been discussed is an issue. The water oak is partly on their property, and they support the removal of the tree based on the application. He is concerned about it being a hazard to their house. He is interested in seeing a house built there. He has no opposition to the PVC windows and supports a curtain rather than a pier foundation. Mr. West added that they have a driveway.

Responses and Questions:
Ms. McDonald said that she doesn't want to misspeak on plot plan of house, but to her recollection the right side is setback is 5' and the left side is 13'. For the house to be centered it would be only 3 to 4 feet over. She stated that there are two reasons for the placement of the house – the potential driveway and saving the Ash tree. Ms. McDonald added that the vegetation makes it look like the Brooks' have additional property which is not there. And that the vegetation itself is not desirable.

Ms. David asked if the applicant would consider centering the house on the lot. Ms. McDonald said yes, but it would mean the loss of two trees.

Ms. Tully reminded the commission that there is a letter from an arborist in the original application and that Fact A.2* summarizes the comments. She said that staff has recommended

as a condition that there be an analysis of whether or not a pier foundation at least on that side of the house would be better protection for the tree.

Ms. Caliendo asked if there was anything that shows the distance from the proposed house to the Brooks' house. Ms. Tully said that there was a sketch, but it is not to scale.

Mr. Shanahan noted that on Mr. Brooks' house it is the stoop that is 3' from the property line, not the wall of the house.

Ms. McDonald stated that while they are grateful for the garage in back, no one else can visit and park. She noted that you walk around the garage you are using the front door area of the condos – their private space. Future plans for Blount Street include less parking and more bike lanes, which would mean no access. She is afraid it would hurt resale of property. Ms. McDonald said that she was opposed to sharing a driveway. Ms. David noted that it is an urban setting where there are a lot of shared driveways. Ms. Tully commented that it might be easier to request that the existing curb cut be widened to be adjacent to ether existing driveway, rather than ask for complete new curb cut. Mr. Rufty added that unlike next door, although there is a garage in back, there is not direct access from the alley to this property.

Ms. Caliendo asked if there had been any analysis on the widths of two story porches. Ms. McDonald said that shape of the house at 215 E Lane is similar and that the width of the its porches is wider than the width they are proposing. Mr. Shanahan said that the 215 architectural style is closer than 218. Ms. Tully noted that there are a wide variety of architectural styles in the Blount Street Historic Overlay District. Mr. Shanahan said that the columns at 515 N. Blount are wider.

Mr. West spoke to the driveway. He said that he represented to the McDonalds that he supports them having a driveway. He is not interested in getting into a fight with the Brooks. His property has a driveway, the Brooks' have a driveway and so he supports the applicants having a driveway.

Mr. Rufty made a clarification to fact A. 14* which says that the front doors are to be solid wood with true divided lights. He noted that until they pick the manufacturer it could have simulated divided lights. Regarding the foundation, he said that they will be working with the arborist on the best way to protect the roots and that footers are necessary even with pier and curtain construction.

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

Committee Discussion

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

The three sample windows were placed in full view of the commission.

It does seem like a Pandora's Box – synthetic materials in the districts. [David]
With aluminum, we made sure that the breaks in the aluminum are the same as the wood window, and the PVC doesn't have same breaks in the sash assembly. The second thing was that both of those applications were showing a dark finish which would minimize visual breaks. The reveals in aluminum are consistent with wood, and PVC are not. [Belledin]
Shortly after the first application the commission approved a beige aluminum clad product at Peace. [Tully]
I agree, especially the reveal on the inside of the sash. [Caliendo]
Agree. [David]
The second issue is the width of the house where we requested more information. [Caliendo]
They did a great job of coming back with solid numbers of what is in the district. Overall it is still visually very wide with the broad gable and double porches. In comparison 215 is three bays and has fewer columns, which make it look less wide. [David]
The porch width with the lot size is consistent. [Caliendo]
Yes, the overall width. But there are so many columns across the front, and the broad gable extrudes it visually. The building to the north is wider, but does not appear so because of the front el breaking up the porch. [David]
The gable in the proposed house extends to the ridge. 218 Elm is closer in appearance. In that case the gable doesn't go to ridge which deemphasizes the width. [Belledin]
What about the columns getting smaller as you go up
That is a typical feature – for columns to get narrower on 2nd level porch columns.[Caliendo]
Siting: it's a little bit off. [Caliendo]
Most of the houses on the block are centered. [David]
The reason behind the siting is solid. It is the trees vs. the siting. If you have to re-center the house, being off-center is the lesser of two evils. [Jackson]
There could be a driveway compromise. [Belledin]
I remember the mention of the driveway being two driving strips. [Davis]
The tree canopy contributes to the Blount Street Historic District and so preserving trees is an important criteria. [Belledin]
The houses on this street are well-spaced, and this is one house is on top of another house. [David]
It would be helpful to see the elevation of houses as you go down street. Also a scaled site plan. [Downer]

At Ms. Caliendo's suggestion Ms. David moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be re-opened. Ms. Downer seconded; motion carried 6/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Ms. McDonald said that their eventual plan is to do a two-strip driveway that is built up over the roots so as to preserve the trees. She noted that this block is unique because it seems like there's a lot of room because there are empty lots. As the lots are filled, the houses will be closer together.

Mr. West said that he heard mention of an arborist that would come back and tell what will happen if there's a driveway proposed. He noted that the front tree has a large canopy. It looks smaller because of how far onto the McDonald's lot it extends.

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

Committee Discussion (2)

As you think about who's going to do the motion, go ahead and decide what facts you're going to add so you're not adding them as you go. Whether it's relevant to the decision or not, I heard the comment on the vacant lots and proposed driveway construction. [Tully]
It seems like the house should be centered on the lot. [David]
Many houses in Boylan Heights aren't centered, not such a big deal. [Davis]
That's why a contextual elevation would help. [Downer]
If we're going to ask for additional information, should we give them the opportunity to defer? [Belledin]
I'm personally not so concerned about the siting of the house on the lot. If that's important, additional information from arborist would help. [Jackson]
In order to provide some level of comfort to the applicant that new issues will not continue to arise, I suggest you make decisions on everything but the siting issue or whatever main questions need to be asked. [Tully]
Blount Street is the most formal district, and they admit that this is Antebellum Vernacular, and vernacular is by definition not formal. This is about the range of styles that would be appropriate not a comment on personal taste. I find this house to be in the range. [Jackson]
It does read as a Louisiana plantation and not a Raleigh town house. [David]
They have illustrated that there are many styles in the district. The other houses with wide porches don't have as many bays. This is very rural in appearance. [Jackson]
Sarah, are you okay just deferring siting? [Caliendo]
Sure. [David]
To that end, the details of the design are not really being deliberated. [Jackson]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Mr. Belledin and seconded by Ms. Jackson, Mr. Belledin made an amended motion that based upon the facts presented in the application

and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comments A. (inclusive of facts 1-10, 12-13, 15-21) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-6) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Construction of new 2-story house is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 4.3.1, 4.3.4, 4.3.5, 4.3.6, 4.3.7, 4.3.8, 4.3.9, 4.3.10, 4.3.11; however the use of cellular PVC windows is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 4.3.9, 4.3.10; and the location of the house **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* 4.3.11 and the following findings:

1* There are 3 trees located directly inside the north property line. They are a 26" DBH Ash tree, a 13" DBH Sugar Maple, and a 28" DBH Water Oak. The water oak is proposed for removal (See comment B).

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

3* The applicants are choosing to retain the Ash and the Maple. A tree protection plan was not included in the application.

4* According to the online Wake County Real Estate Data, the lot is 11,326 SF. The footprint of the proposed house is 1,900 SF; porches are about 741 SF for a total footprint of approximately 2,641 SF for lot coverage of 23%, within the norm for Blount Street.

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

6* The house sits towards the right of the lot to be father away from the trees and to allow for a possible future driveway. The distance between the new house and the house on the adjacent lot was not included.

7* The house fronts onto Blount Street as is typical of the district. The application states that the front yard setback for the house at 630 N. Blount Street is 31′; the adjacent houses are set back 16′ and 40′. A scaled site plan is not included.

8* The proposed height of the two-and-one-half story house is 35′8″. As seen in the application photos, houses many houses in the district are 2 to 2 ½ stories in height. Actual heights of the immediately adjacent buildings were not included; the amended application includes a list of the heights of the historic buildings in the Blount Street Commons master plan. The new house is within the range of heights.

9* The proposed house is 2-stories with a moderately pitched hipped roof. It has a wide symmetrically balanced front façade with a central pediment and two-story porch.

10* The hipped-roof form of the house is not uncommon in the Blount Street district; examples of houses with double porches in both the Blount Street and Oakwood districts were included in the application. Discussion at the December hearing revealed that most of the double porch examples are in Oakwood.

11* The facade of the house is 53′ wide with two 3′ wide wings set back about 21′ feet back from the façade. The amended application includes the widths of other houses in the Blount Street district; the houses on either side are 63′ and 58′ each. An elevation drawing of the front façade with the wings shaded was provided by the applicant.

12* Details of the house include exterior cove crown molding with a piece of inverted base cap, 10" freeze board with a heavy molded base cap, and large columns. The materials of and detailed drawings of the architectural features were not included except for the columns.

13* The locations of windows are deliberate, have a sense of rhythm, and are in locations typical of other houses in the district. The windows are traditionally proportioned.

14* The front doors are solid wood. Details and specifications were not included in the application.

15* Shutters on the front façade are proposed to be operational and sized so that they can be closed.

16* The windows are simulated divided light double hung with 7/8″ muntins; the casing is 5/4″x4″ with a traditional window sill. Windows are proposed to be vinyl (cellular PVC) with simulated divided lights. The amended application includes some details and specifications.

17* The proposed windows are an extruded product that can be painted.

18* The commission has only approved either wood windows or aluminum clad wood windows in detached new construction. Cellular PVC has not been approved except for sills.

19* A full-sized mock-up of the proposed window was presented at the December hearing along with testimony that it looks like wood when it's painted and that they would choose the color shade very carefully. It is a PVC molded material with several casing designs and will have a putty glaze profile. The window will never be structurally damaged with rot and looks like a traditional wood product. The jambs are wood and anything exposed to the weather is PVC. It's assembled like a wood window. There are multiple brands available that don't have the historic look. They chose this particular product because of its details.

20* The application states that materials include cementitious lap siding with an 8" lap; wood doors; dimensional asphalt shingles on the house; metal roof on the porches; and a brick foundation. Photographs of materials were provided; samples and details were not. The material of the corner boards and trim is not stated.

21* Painted smooth faced fiber cement siding is regularly approved for detached new construction in the historic districts; most recently at 630 N Blount Street (061-14-CA). The application does specify that the house will be painted and colors were shown, but samples were not provided.

22* The reveals of the sample cellular PVC product are not constructed with the reveals similar to the sash construction of the wood and aluminum clad wood windows.

B. Removal of water oak tree; planting of 2 trees; installation of plantings at foundation; construction of new rear retaining wall and rear fence; installation of walkways is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.4, 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.4.8, 2.5.5, and the following findings: (Raleigh City Code Section 10.2.15.E.1. states that "An application for

a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure or site within any Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark may not be denied…However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of issuance…If the Commission finds that the building, structure or site has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark, it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal.")

1* The arborist report states that the 28″ DBH Water Oak cannot withstand construction of the new house. The removed tree is proposed to be replaced with either a Crimson Spice Oak or Blackjack Oak. A dogwood is also proposed.
2* Vegetation and small trees on the right side of the property are also proposed for removal; the amended application states that the largest tree is 7″ DBH.
3* The low retaining wall and new wood fence with gates are along the rear and side property lines as is typical. The new fence will abut the fencing that is currently in place on the right side of the property and will allow access to the garage located in the carriage house on the adjacent property.
4* The fence and gate designs were not included.
5* The front concrete walkway goes directly from the sidewalk to the front of the house as is traditional in the historic district. Exact dimensions were not provided.
6* The finish of the concrete walkways and concrete paver patio are not provided. The commission typically requires a water-washed finish similar to historic concrete sidewalks in the district.

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

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

Mr. Belledin made a motion that the siting of the house be deferred and that the remainder of the application be approved as amended, with the following conditions:

1. That the tree protection plan be in place prior to commencement of work on the property.
2. That new concrete have a water-washed finish.
3. That the new windows either be wood or aluminum clad wood.
4. That the siding have a smooth finish.
5. That the fence be installed utilizing neighbor friendly design with the structural members facing inward towards the yard.
6. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
    a. Tree protection plan for the new house and general construction activity prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture that includes an analysis of a pier foundation and trees on adjacent properties whose roots may extend onto this property;
    b. Windows;

   c. Section drawings of eave, fascia and water table.
7. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction/installation:
   a. Doors;
   b. Window and door trim;
   c. Railings;
   d. Metal roofing;
   e. Trim material;
   f. Front steps;
   g. Concrete paver patio;
   h. Fence and gates designs;
   i. Front walkway;
   j. Shutters.

Additional information requested for the deferred item is:

- More information about the siting of other houses on Blount Street with special consideration to the spacing between houses and relationships to the side lot lines.
- An opinion of an arborist regarding placing the house closer to the trees.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Davis; passed 5/1 (Ms. David).

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

Certificate expiration date: 7/5/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

191-14-CA 412 OAKWOOD AVENUE
Applicant: LIGGETT DESIGN GROUP
Received: 12/12/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 3/12/2015 1) 1/5/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: R-10
Nature of Project: Enclose rear deck as screened porch; master landscape plan to include: relocate and redesign fountain; add seat wall and outdoor fireplace; alter rear patio; alter path lighting
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- File photos are available for review.
- COAs mentioned in the comments are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	enclose rear deck as screened porch; master landscape plan to include: relocate and redesign fountain; add seat wall and outdoor fireplace; alter rear patio; alter path lighting
2.4	Fences and Walls	add seat wall
2.7	Lighting	alter path lighting
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	enclose rear deck as screened porch

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Enclosure of rear deck as screened porch is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9, and the following findings:

1* Based on file photos, the existing deck has been in place since at least 1981; the new approximately 100 SF covered porch will sit in the same location and not increase the amount of built area.

2* The lot at 412 Oakwood Avenue is at the corner of N East Street.

3* The new covered porch is located at the rear southwest corner of the house. Like the existing deck it will extend 2′ 10″ beyond the west wall of the house where it attaches, which is inset 2′ from the wall of the west bay. It is flush with the rear wall of the house.
4* The new porch has a gable roof with the same eave details as the existing house. A section drawing is included.
5* The porch will sit on a wood posts; the porch and wood steps have lattice under deck screening.
6* The materials and colors are not noted. The roof is drawn as asphalt shingles to match the existing house.
7* From the drawing it appears as though the porch rails are inside the screening. It is more typical for the screening to be inside the railings.
8* A section drawing of the railings were not included.

B. Implementation of master landscape plan to include: relocation and redesign of fountain; addition of seat wall and outdoor fireplace; alteration of rear patio; alteration of path lighting is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, 2.3.8, 2.3.9, 2.4.8, 2.7.5, 2.7.6, and the following findings:
1* All changes are occurring inside the existing courtyard. The existing fences and walls were constructed per a May 1982 approved COA.
2* No additional paving square footage is being added.
3* One section of existing fence is being relocated and several additional feet of the same fence added.
4* Changes are to non-historic features. Detailed drawings of the proposed fountain, fireplace, and seat walls are included in the application. Outdoor fireplaces have been approved in rear yards in Oakwood when minimally visible, including at 605 N Bloodworth Street (192-13-CA). This one will not extend above the existing fence.
5* Material samples are not included.
6* Existing low-voltage lights will be reused where possible and under seat wall lighting will be installed. Specifications were included.

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

1. That the porch rails be outside the screening.
2. That the materials and colors on the screened porch match the historic house.
3. That the following details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Revised screening detail;
   b. Railing section.
4. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction or installation:
   a. Material samples;
   b. Paver pattern;
   c. Paver material if existing not reused.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Support:
Frank Liggett [affirmed] and Scott Thompson [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Liggett stated that they have an 8'x18' deck that the owners want to enclose. He noted that because of the proximity to the property line the gutter determines the width of the whole structure, so they went with a gable design that would shed water off the front and back. There is a small overhang the same as on the rear one-story porch that will include crown molding etc. to match. This design maximizes the usable space for the homeowners.

Mr. Belledin asked if they were comfortable with staff conditions including the porch rail details. Mr. Thompson said that they should have included that and described the railings. He noted that the screen panels are removable and could be installed inside the rails.

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

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

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

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

A. Enclosure of rear deck as screened porch is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9, and the following findings:

1* Based on file photos, the existing deck has been in place since at least 1981; the new approximately 100 SF covered porch will sit in the same location and not increase the amount of built area.

2* The lot at 412 Oakwood Avenue is at the corner of N East Street.

3* The new covered porch is located at the rear southwest corner of the house. Like the existing deck it will extend 2' 10" beyond the west wall of the house where it attaches, which is inset 2' from the wall of the west bay. It is flush with the rear wall of the house.

4* The new porch has a gable roof with the same eave details as the existing house. A section drawing is included.

5* The porch will sit on a wood posts; the porch and wood steps have lattice under deck screening.
6* The materials and colors are not noted. The roof is drawn as asphalt shingles to match the existing house.
7* From the drawing it appears as though the porch rails are inside the screening. It is more typical for the screening to be inside the railings.
8* A section drawing of the railings were not included.

B. Implementation of master landscape plan to include: relocation and redesign of fountain; addition of seat wall and outdoor fireplace; alteration of rear patio; alteration of path lighting is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.2, 2.3.8, 2.3.9, 2.4.8, 2.7.5, 2.7.6, and the following findings:
1* All changes are occurring inside the existing courtyard. The existing fences and walls were constructed per a May 1982 approved COA.
2* No additional paving square footage is being added.
3* One section of existing fence is being relocated and several additional feet of the same fence added.
4* Changes are to non-historic features. Detailed drawings of the proposed fountain, fireplace, and seat walls are included in the application. Outdoor fireplaces have been approved in rear yards in Oakwood when minimally visible, including at 605 N Bloodworth Street (192-13-CA). This one will not extend above the existing fence.
5* Material samples are not included.
6* Existing low-voltage lights will be reused where possible and under seat wall lighting will be installed. Specifications were included.

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

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

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

1. That the porch rails be outside the screening.
2. That the materials and colors on the screened porch match the historic house.
3. That the following details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Revised screening detail;
   b. Railing section.
4. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction or installation:
   a. Material samples;
   b. Paver pattern;
   c. Paver material if existing not reused.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 7/5/15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

192-14-CA 511 N BLOUNT STREET
Applicant: GREYSTAR DEVELOPMENT & CONSTRUCTION, LP
Received: 12/12/2014 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 3/12/2015 1) 1/5/2015 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BLOUNT STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: PDD, O&I-2
Nature of Project: Master landscape plan including: prune pecan tree; brick walls; bronze aluminum fences; concrete paver walkways; removal of existing shrubs; lighting; grading.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:
The "Special Character of Blount Street Historic District" description in the *Design Guidelines for Raleigh Historic Districts* states:

> "The Blount Street Historic District includes the last remaining elements of Raleigh's premier late 19th and early 20th century residential neighborhood. The district comprises a six-block stretch of North Blount Street plus portions of some intersecting streets. Anchored at its southern end by the Executive Mansion on Burke Square, *the district commemorates the fashionable neighborhood and illustrates the results of 20th century inter-governmental cooperation in historic preservation*. (emphasis added)
>
> "Blount Street was included in a legislated state government development area in the late 1960s, and at that time many of the mansions were destroyed and replaced by parking lots. In 1976, the City Council, in cooperation with the State Properties Office and the Council of State, designated the area a historic district upon the recommendation of the Raleigh Historic Districts Commission. This district designation sparked a restoration and beautification program in the district that includes using many of the former homes of Raleigh's 19th century leaders as state government office space…. Despite the fact that many of the buildings are adaptively used for office space, the district maintains a decidedly residential feeling."

In evaluating this application, staff has taken the point of view that in addition to its historic architectural associations, Blount Street also has significance in communicating the history of inter-governmental cooperation in historic preservation in Raleigh; this application represents a further chapter in the evolution of stewardship of a place that seeks to create a feeling of association with the Blount Street of old, rather than a strict recreation of the historical fact of Blount Street.

The "Special Character of Blount Street Historic District" description in the *Design Guidelines for Raleigh Historic Districts* states:

Setbacks vary considerably, from isolated houses centered on generous lots to others set close to each other and to the street. However, there are enough large lot properties to render Blount Street unique in establishing a more open spatial quality and character; the city's other primarily residential historic districts impart a much more compact feeling. Because many properties in the Blount Street district are in office usage under the same ownership, the district's side and rear yards are not segmented by privacy fences to the extent of the other residential districts, which also contributes to the feeling of spatial openness. Even though the Executive Mansion grounds are encircled by a high fence, the design of the fence with its simple wrought iron panels is transparent enough that it provides the necessary security without markedly detracting from the sense of open space in the district.

- COA files mentioned in the comments and 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	Master landscape plan including: prune pecan tree; brick walls; bronze aluminum fences; concrete paver walkways; removal of existing shrubs; lighting; grading
2.4	Fences and Walls	Construct brick walls; bronze aluminum fences
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	Install concrete paver walkways
2.7	Lighting	Install lighting

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application:

A. Implementation of master landscape plan including: pruning of pecan tree; construction of brick walls; installation of bronze aluminum fences; installation of concrete paver walkways; removal of existing shrubs; installation of lighting; grading is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.3, 2.3.4, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.3.9, 2.4.8, 2.4.11, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.9, 2.5.11, 2.7.4, 2.7.8; however the location and configuration of low front yard wall is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.4.8 and the use of concrete pavers on the front yard walks is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.5.5 and the following findings:

1* In the approved North Blount Street Revitalization Plan (106-06-CA) this lot is shown as being for a new house and the general location of the carriageways was approved. Deviation from the previous approval 106-06-CA is not material in this case.

2* Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps from 1903 through 1950 suggest that historically there has been a large side yard between 507 N Blount Street and the house to its north. The maps show that the amount of space between the house at 507 N Blount Street and the next house at 513 N Blount Street (demolished – now the site of the Lewis-Smith House and addressed

as 515) was larger than the space between any of the other houses on Blount Street in that block.

3* In 2008, reconfiguration of the existing gravel parking area and pavement with aggregate textured asphalt was approved (195-08-CA). This COA also approved removal of the photinia and mulberry bushes.

4* This site is a park, not a building with a front and rear yard.

5* A letter prepared by a NC licensed landscape architect states that there is a 36″ DBH pecan tree on the south side of the property which is proposed to be pruned and limbed; all tree pruning will be performed by a licensed arborist.

6* The letter further states that the construction of site improvements will intrude into the root zone of the Pecan tree, but that there is no encroachment into the crown roots. The draft grading plan has been modified to minimize impact the tree's root zone. The assessment is that the amount of impact is reasonable and should not adversely impact the tree. Tree protection measures are spelled out.

7* Not mentioned in the letter are a 21″ Pecan tree and 20″ Ginko tree adjacent to the south property line whose canopies fall into the project area. Tree protection should also address these trees.

8* There is no arborist certification specific to North Carolina, but rather through the International Society of Arboriculture.

9* The rear portion of the yard will be mostly grass with a single curving permeable concrete paver path. Details for the installation were provided, but the color and material samples were not. Concrete pavers have been approved in rear yards.

10* The rear portion of the lot is proposed to be enclosed by a 5′ tall bronze metal fence. Detailed drawings of the fence design and installation were provided in the application. Simple metal fences are seen in the historic district, but are typically black.

11* At the front and rear of the fenced area are two double entryways to allow for ingress and egress without dogs escaping. These sets of gates are flanked by 5′ tall brick walls, 6′ tall brick columns, and metal fences atop low brick walls; they will be the tallest features on the site. A 5′ tall brick wall with integrated brick planter will also extend out from the front gate across the property as a screen wall for the park.

12* The fencing extends beyond the front wall of the Lewis-Smith house to the north, but is behind the front wall of the Cowper House to the south.

13* The front yard area consists of a curved 2′ tall brick wall adjacent a permeable paver walkway. Curved walls are atypical in front yards in the historic district. Low walls were generally used to demark property boundaries or retain earth rather than act as decorative features.

14* Section drawings and partial elevation drawings for the brick walls and fences were included in the application. Material samples were not.

15* The use of the brick walls around the entry gates may serve to highlight a contemporary feature.

16* The rear yard area is being substantially regarded for accessibility.

17* Concrete pavers have not been approved for front walkways in the historic district. Walkways in the Blount Street historic district are typically brick or water washed concrete.

18* The contemporary features such as pet waste disposal stations are behind the fence. Specifications for these and the benches (installation details were) were not included in the application.

19* A utility provided pole mounted light fixture is noted to be installed in the center of the fenced area. Specifications details and height are not included in the application. Guideline 2.7.8 states that it is not appropriate to introduce new security lighting on standard-height power poles in the residential historic districts.

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

1. That the tree protection plan be implemented prior to commencement of work on the property.
2. That the metal fence be black.
3. That there not be a low wall in the front yard area.
4. That the entryways be constructed using only the metal fencing.
5. That the front walks either be brick or water washed concrete.
6. That the following details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Revised tree protection plan that include the tress on the adjacent property prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture or a NC Registered Landscape Architect;
   b. Revised design for the entryways.
7. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction or installation:
   a. Paver samples;
   b. Brick samples;
   c. Pet waste disposal stations;
   d. Benches;
   e. Site lighting.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from staff comments. Ms. Tully pointed out the items she felt warranted discussion. The brick wall at the entry gates highlights those features and don't seem necessary for the district. It seems incompatible with the district. She noted that the use of concrete pavers on front walks has not been approved in any district, much less Blount Street. She added that the decorative low wall may be incongruous.

Support:
Noah Morris [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. He noted that the brick wall is 50' back from the property line and there was a concern that double fences would look funny. The Master Plan requires that this property be open space.

Ms. Tully noted that it may now, but when the initial COA was approved, a house was going to be there. A prior COA on this site determined that a potential house going in compared to open space was irrelevant noting that squeezing a house onto this site would be a challenge. She stated that the commission cannot require a building there.

Ms. Tully commented that the intent of her condition was to remove the curving wall. The yard is fenced in metal except at the gates. The brick at the gates makes it much more a feature, which seems incongruous. It highlights a non-historic feature.

Ms. Tully stated that the pervious pavers in the fenced area are not her concern, but in the front yard it's a concern.
Mr. Belledin asked if there was any reason that the front entry can't be moved back behind the screening wall, in deference to the Lewis-Smith House. Mr. Morris said that if he was suggesting that it be moved more to the middle of the lot, they have to be conscious of this being an accessible route. He added that the adjacent to the pecan tree is an issue.

Ms. Caliendo noted that for the front wall of the planter, the section shows it as 6′ tall. Mr. Morris said that it was a 5′ wall with 6′ columns.

Questions:
Mr. John Brooks [affirmed] noted that he didn't receive notification on this application. Ms. Tully checked the file and stated that he was listed as an adjacent owner and she didn't know why he did not receive the letter.

Mr. Belledin asked about the site lighting. Mr. Morris said it would be the standard energy company model. Ms. Tully pointed out the Guideline regarding the height lighting fixture and that they be of pedestrian scale; staff can direct.

Ms. Lauer asked if there was a tradition of circular paving. Ms. Tully noted the circular drive next door.

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

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

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
I agree with staff [David] [Jackson] [Caliendo]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Ms. Jackson moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-19) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Implementation of master landscape plan including: pruning of pecan tree; construction of brick walls; installation of bronze aluminum fences; installation of concrete paver walkways; removal of existing shrubs; installation of lighting; grading is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.3, 2.3.4, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.3.9, 2.4.8, 2.4.11, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.9, 2.5.11, 2.7.4, 2.7.8; however the location and configuration of low front yard wall is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.4.8 and the use of concrete pavers on the front yard walks is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.5.5 and the following findings:

1* In the approved North Blount Street Revitalization Plan (106-06-CA) this lot is shown as being for a new house and the general location of the carriageways was approved. Deviation from the previous approval 106-06-CA is not material in this case.

2* Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps from 1903 through 1950 suggest that historically there has been a large side yard between 507 N Blount Street and the house to its north. The maps show that the amount of space between the house at 507 N Blount Street and the next house at 513 N Blount Street (demolished – now the site of the Lewis-Smith House and addressed as 515) was larger than the space between any of the other houses on Blount Street in that block.

3* In 2008, reconfiguration of the existing gravel parking area and pavement with aggregate textured asphalt was approved (195-08-CA). This COA also approved removal of the photinia and mulberry bushes.

4* This site is a park, not a building with a front and rear yard.

5* A letter prepared by a NC licensed landscape architect states that there is a 36″ DBH pecan tree on the south side of the property which is proposed to be pruned and limbed; all tree pruning will be performed by a licensed arborist.

6* The letter further states that the construction of site improvements will intrude into the root zone of the Pecan tree, but that there is no encroachment into the crown roots. The draft grading plan has been modified to minimize impact the tree's root zone. The assessment is that the amount of impact is reasonable and should not adversely impact the tree. Tree protection measures are spelled out.

7* Not mentioned in the letter are a 21″ Pecan tree and 20″ Ginko tree adjacent to the south property line whose canopies fall into the project area. Tree protection should also address these trees.

8* There is no arborist certification specific to North Carolina, but rather through the International Society of Arboriculture.

9* The rear portion of the yard will be mostly grass with a single curving permeable concrete paver path. Details for the installation were provided, but the color and material samples were not. Concrete pavers have been approved in rear yards.

10* The rear portion of the lot is proposed to be enclosed by a 5′ tall bronze metal fence. Detailed drawings of the fence design and installation were provided in the application. Simple metal fences are seen in the historic district, but are typically black.
11* At the front and rear of the fenced area are two double entryways to allow for ingress and egress without dogs escaping. These sets of gates are flanked by 5′ tall brick walls, 6′ tall brick columns, and metal fences atop low brick walls; they will be the tallest features on the site. A 5′ tall brick wall with integrated brick planter will also extend out from the front gate across the property as a screen wall for the park.
12* The fencing extends beyond the front wall of the Lewis-Smith house to the north, but is behind the front wall of the Cowper House to the south.
13* The front yard area consists of a curved 2′ tall brick wall adjacent a permeable paver walkway. Curved walls are atypical in front yards in the historic district. Low walls were generally used to demark property boundaries or retain earth rather than act as decorative features.
14* Section drawings and partial elevation drawings for the brick walls and fences were included in the application. Material samples were not.
15* The use of the brick walls around the entry gates may serve to highlight a contemporary feature.
16* The rear yard area is being substantially regarded for accessibility.
17* Concrete pavers have not been approved for front walkways in the historic district. Walkways in the Blount Street historic district are typically brick or water washed concrete.
18* The contemporary features such as pet waste disposal stations are behind the fence. Specifications for these and the benches (installation details were) were not included in the application.
19* A utility provided pole mounted light fixture is noted to be installed in the center of the fenced area. Specifications details and height are not included in the application. Guideline 2.7.8 states that it is not appropriate to introduce new security lighting on standard-height power poles in the residential historic districts.
20* Pervious brick pavers were recently approved for a driveway in Oakwood, but have not been approved for front walks.

The motion was seconded by Ms. David; passed 4/1 (Mr. Belledin opposed).

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

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

1. That the tree protection plan be implemented prior to commencement of work on the property.
2. That the metal fence be black.
3. That there not be a low wall in the front yard area.
4. That the entryways be constructed using only the metal fencing.
5. That the front walks either be brick or water washed concrete.

6. That the following details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
   a. Revised tree protection plan that include the tress on the adjacent property prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture or a NC Registered Landscape Architect;
   b. Revised design for the entryways.
7. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction or installation:
   a. Paver samples;
   b. Brick samples;
   c. Pet waste disposal stations;
   d. Benches;
   e. Site lighting.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Davis; passed 4/1 (Mr. Belledin opposed).

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

Certificate expiration date: 7/5/15.

OTHER BUSINESS

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

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:38 p.m.

Elizabeth Caliendo
Certificate of Appropriateness Committee,
Raleigh Historic Development Commission

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner