RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
August 24, 2017

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

Tania Tully, Preservation Planner, called the roll as follows:
Present: Elizabeth Caliendo, Sarah David, Don Davis, Nick Fountain, Jimmy Thiem
Excused Absence: Ms. Caliendo left after hearing case 127-17-CA.
Staff Present: Tania Tully, Melissa Robb, Allison Evans, Francis P. Rasberry, Jr., Attorney

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. Francis P. Rasberry, Jr., Attorney administered the affirmation.

Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address	Affirmed
Matthew Konar, 611 W Club Blvd 27701	Yes
Patti Gillenwater, 1804 Hillsborough Street 27605	Yes
Brent Floyd, 706 N East Street 27604	Yes
Melissa Mason, 120 N Bloodworth Street 27601	Yes
David Maurer, 115.5 E Hargett Street 27601	Yes
Myrick Howard, 220 Fayetteville Street, Suite 200 27611	Yes
Ashley Morris, 306 Pell St 27604	Yes
Fred Belledin, 711 Gaston Street 27605	Yes
Gary Roth, 1101 Haynes Street 27604	Yes
John Thomas, 5508 Swiftbrook Circle 27608	Yes
Ted Van Dyk, 1304 Hillsborough St 27605	Yes

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Fountain moved to approve the agenda as printed. Mr. Davis seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chair Caliendo introduced the public hearing portion of the meeting. The committee heard the following cases in the following order for which the Certified Records are made part of these minutes: 105-17-CA, 123-17-CA, 124-17-CA, 125-17-CA, 126-17-CA, 127-17-CA, 128-17-CA, and 129-17-CA.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

105-17-CA 120 N BLOODWORTH STREET
Applicant: MELISSA MASON
Received: 6/14/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/12/2017 1) 7/27/2017 2) 8/24/2017 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: HOD-G
Nature of Project: Amended: Construct new 234 SF 1-story accessory building
DRAC: The original application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its July 3, 2017, meeting. Members in attendance were Curtis Kasefang and Jenny Harper; also present were Melissa Mason, Tania Tully, and Melissa Robb.
Staff Notes:

- COAs mentioned are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
1.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	Amended: Construct new 234 SF 1-story accessory building

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report.

Support:
Ms. Melissa Mason [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Mason said that she had looked at other COAs in the area, specifically at typical accessory buildings, and she made changes to the proposal based on that research and input from the committee. The accessory building is now a one-story structure with a utilitarian design and a shed roof, which she found to be typical of the neighborhood. Ms. Mason continued by saying that the materials would match the house, including the windows and trim. In addition, she changed the French-style doors to barn-style doors. The height is subservient to the house, and she proposed using grade beam construction to minimize impact to the roots of trees. At the meeting Ms. Mason submitted a tree protection plan from Bartlett Tree Experts.

Ms. Mason presented slides that showed her new proposal. The maximum roof height is now 13′-7″, a height that is noticeably lower than similar accessory buildings in neighboring backyards. Ms. Mason showed an iMaps image highlighting accessory buildings on the block,

as well as a site section that showed the decreasing grade toward the back of the lot. Ms. Mason also stated that the siting of the building was a concern because of her intention to preserve the trees on the rear property line. She found that she could not avoid putting the shed near the trees unless it was in middle of the backyard. Ms. Mason addressed the footprint of the shed (225 SF) which is smaller than neighboring sheds, which average 400 – 500 SF.

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

Responses and Questions:
Ms. Caliendo thanked Ms. Mason for her thorough application. Mr. Thiem expressed his appreciation for the applicant's efforts regarding trees. He asked for clarification on the diagram illustrating a comparison of the heights of neighboring buildings. Ms. Mason stated that it showed that other sheds are sitting at a higher grade than her building will be. Mr. Thiem pointed out that grade beam construction usually raises a building up above grade. Ms. Mason answered that her measurement of 13′ 7″ is inclusive of the foundation.

Mr. Fountain asked to clarify the accuracy of item 4.e on the staff report. Ms. Tully replied that it was from a 2013 COA application for 520 N Bloodworth Street, a property that was noted for its accessory building.

Mr. Davis asked if the doors are glass. Ms. Mason responded they are to be solid wood.

Without objection Ms. Caliendo closed the evidentiary portion of the hearing.

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
With the previous application the two issues were the height and the window openings. They did a good job addressing these issues. [Caliendo]
The previous application did not meet the guidelines, but this one does. [David]
I agree. [Davis]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Mr. Thiem moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the evidentiary hearing, the committee finds staff suggested finding A. (inclusive of facts 1-14) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Constructing a new 234 SF 1-story accessory building is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 1.3.8, 1.6.5, 1.6.6, 1.6.7, 1.6.8, 1.6.9, 1.6.10, 1.6.11, 1.6.12, and the following facts:

1* The applicant indicates there are trees whose roots may be impacted by construction of the building. The building will be constructed using a post and beam foundation to avoid an adverse effect to the trees. A tree protection plan was not provided.

2* The house is a one-story minimal traditional non-contributing structure built in 1981. According to the Inventory of Structures in the Oakwood National Register Historic Districts, by Matthew Brown, former Historian, Society for the Preservation of Historic Oakwood, 2004-2015, at the time of construction this was the first new building in the district in 20 years.

3* According to the applicant, the footprint of the house is 1,060 SF, while the footprint of the proposed accessory building is 234 SF and the lot is 5512.5 SF. The built area to open space ratio is currently 19%, and with the new construction it will be 23%.

4* COA 030-13-CA approved the construction of a 1½-story garage at 520 N Bloodworth Street. Relevant facts from that decision include:

   a. The 1-story frame house at 520 N Bloodworth Street, constructed in the 1940s, is a non-contributing resource in the Oakwood Historic District.
   b. The garage is proposed to be slab on grade; the applicant stated that no excavation will be required for installation of the garage, but that fill will be brought in for leveling.
   c. The lot size is 5,663 SF; the existing house has a footprint of 881 SF inclusive of stoops; the proposed garage has a footprint of 528 SF; total footprint is 1,409 SF. The current lot coverage is 16%; the proposed lot coverage with garage is 25%.
   d. The location and orientation of the garage is not unusual in the Oakwood Historic District; it is located at the end of the driveway.
   e. The height of the proposed garage is 22 feet to the ridge, plus an approximate 8″ foundation; the existing house is 20 feet tall; the lot sits 3½ feet above the sidewalk; accessory buildings are typically deferential to the main building.

5* The applicant's house is the only single-story house on the east side of Bloodworth St between Edenton and Jones Streets. The other seven houses are either 1½- or 2-story.

6* There is a space of roughly 9 feet between this house and the house to the south (118 N Bloodworth St). A small driveway ends at the front edge of the house.

7* The proposal is for a one-story accessory building constructed in the southeast corner of the lot in the area where a chicken coop is currently located. It has a roof height of approximately 13.7 feet. The height at the peak of the house roof is 18 feet. The backyard slopes away from the house, with the interior floor level of the accessory building at about 2 feet lower than the interior floor level of the house, making the roof peaks of the accessory building roughly 7 feet lower than the roof ridge of the house.

8* The roof is a low-sloped shed form with the peak towards the front of the building and the front of the lot. No specifications were provided for the roofing material.

9* The building will be clad in fiber cement siding with a 4″ exposure and the smooth side out.

10* Aluminum-clad casement windows are proposed.

11* Wood barn-style doors are proposed on the front of the building.

12* Two skylights are proposed in the roof on the slope facing away from the street.

13* The building will be painted to match the house.

14* No exterior lighting was proposed.
15* An arborist report was submitted by the applicant with recommendations regarding the willow oak and hackberry trees.

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

Decision on the Application

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Mr. Thiem and seconded by Ms. David, Mr. Thiem made an amended 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 issuance of the blue placard:
    a. Windows, especially the section view with trim;
    b. A tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture or by a licensed landscape architect, and that the fencing be in place prior commencement of construction.
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
    a. Roofing;
    b. Barn-style doors;
    c. Skylights, especially the section view with trim;
    d. Lighting.

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

Committee members voting: Caliendo, David, Davis, Fountain, Thiem.

Certificate expiration date: 2/24/18.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

123-17-CA 219 E NORTH STREET
Applicant: MATTHEW KONAR ARCHITECT
Received: 6/28/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/26/2017 1) 8/24/2017 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BLOUNT STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: HOD-G
Nature of Project: After-the-Fact: Installation of sidelight on rear door
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- A minor work COA (095-17-MW) was approved 6/2/17 for various items of work for this property. Staff was not able to approve the installation of a sidelight on the rear door in the previous COA; therefore the applicant removed it from that application.
- COAs mentioned are available for review.
- After-the-Fact applications are reviewed as though the work has not been completed.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.7	Windows and Doors	After-the-fact: Installation of sidelight on rear door

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report.

Support:
Mr. Matthew Konar [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. He stated the house is a modest Queen Anne style and not as detailed as nearby homes. The owner has been granted historic preservation tax credits for the rehabilitation. Mr. Konar said they had two previous COA applications for the property that addressed the installation of an accessible entrance on the side and for other exterior features including windows. The sidelight on the rear door was withdrawn from one of the earlier COA applications so they could get approval for the reminder of the work in the application since staff could not approve the skylight. The front door of the house has both two existing sidelights and a transom.

Mr. Konar discussed the history of the house and that it was originally two separate structures, both the historic front house and a rear kitchen, which were shown on the 1903 Sanborn map. Over time the house has been added onto and combined into one building. At the time of the

new owner's purchase the façade required many modifications. The rear portion of the house where the sidelight is located was not original.

Mr. Konar stated that in addressing staff comment #2 about the historic context, he found some examples that show the relationship between windows and doors. He showed a grouping of photographs and argued that other houses in the neighborhood have rear doors that echo their front doors in design. Mr. Konar said that the sidelight is in character with surrounding buildings while also highlighting an original feature, the older kitchen building.

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

Responses and Questions:
Ms. David asked for clarification on the order of events with the application, that he removed the sidelight from the previous application so that it could pass and then installed it anyway? Mr. Konar responded that yes, because the doors were already ordered it would have caused additional expense. Also, the State Historic Preservation Office did not have an issue with the sidelight.

Ms. David asked to confirm the dates of the Sanborn maps as 1903 and 1914. Mr. Konar affirmed those dates.

Without objection Ms. Caliendo closed the evidentiary portion of the hearing.

Committee Discussion

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

I agree with the staffs' assessment. [David]
I don't see it as a character-defining façade. [Fountain]
I agree with staff. [Caliendo]
Did the brick house example get a COA? [David]
It's in the district, but I don't know about whether or not it got a COA. [Tully]
To me fact 5 on the staff report is the most important: "Rear doors were generally treated as secondary/service entries; a sidelight is atypical." [David]
It's not a character-defining façade to me. There is some evidence of similar treatments. [Fountain]
I agree with Nick. There has been some latitude for back doors. But I am concerned that they built it knowing it wasn't acceptable. [Davis]
Even for less significant facades, the details should still be characteristic. [Caliendo]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Mr. Davis moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the evidentiary hearing, the committee finds staff suggested finding A. (inclusive of facts 1-5) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. The installation of a sidelight on the rear door is incongruous according to *Guideline* 2.7.9, and the following facts:

1* The S.B. Shepherd House was built in 1903, according to the report prepared in 1975 to establish the Blount Street Historic District. It is a 2-story Queen Anne with a wraparound front porch. The rear of the house has been significantly modified over the years with both 1-story and 2-story additions. According to photographs provided by the applicant, prior to the current renovations, the rear door led out to a concrete stoop and stairs. The door was a half-light with two panels. There was no sidelight.

2* From *Guidelines* section 2.7 Windows and Doors, Things to Consider As You Plan: "Changing existing window and door openings, closing existing openings, or adding new openings on a historic building should be carefully considered and undertaken only for compelling reasons. Changes to original openings in a character-defining facade should never be considered. For less significant facades, the pattern of proposed openings should be characteristic of and complementary to the historic building and the historic district context."

3* From the original COA application (095-17-MW) submitted 1/13/17: "The relocated rear door will be a new wood door similar to the front door and be consistent in size, glazing, detailing, trim, etc., yet more modest than the front door as this is a rear door."

4* According to the drawings of the front and rear elevations, the front and rear doors are identical. The front door includes a transom and two sidelights, while the rear door includes a single sidelight.

5* Rear doors were generally treated as secondary/service entries; a sidelight is atypical.

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

Decision on the Application

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

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

Committee members voting: Caliendo, David, Davis, Fountain, Thiem.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

124-17-CA 814 OBERLIN ROAD
Applicant: PRESERVATION NORTH CAROLINA
Received: 7/13/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 10/11/2017 1) 8/24/2017 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Raleigh Historic Landmark: Plummer T Hall House & Willis Graves House

Nature of Project: Relocation of Plummer T Hall house on same lot; relocation of Willis Graves house from 802 Oberlin Rd to 814 Oberlin Rd; installation of foundations, walkways, parking, deck and ADA ramp; removal of non-historic additions; removal of non-historic siding; construction of new additions; remove trees; alter windows and doors

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its August 7, 2017 meeting. Members in attendance were Curtis Kasefang, David Maurer, Dan Becker, and Mary Ruffin Hanbury; also present were Myrick Howard, Ashley Morris, and Roberta Fox.

Conflict of Interest: Mr. Davis moved to recuse Sarah David for hearing the case due to extensive involvement in the project as Chair of RHDC. Mr. Fountain seconded; motion carried 5/0

Staff Notes:

- COAs mentioned were available for review.
- Raleigh City Code Section 10.2.15.E.1. states that "An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure or site within any Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark may not be denied…However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of issuance…If the Commission finds that the building, structure or site has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark, it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal."

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
1.2	Archaeological Sites and Resources	Construct foundations; install walkways and parking
1.3	Site Features and Plantings	Remove trees
1.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Off-street Parking	Install walkways and parking
2.6	Exterior Walls	Remove non-historic siding
2.7	Windows and Doors	Alter windows and doors
2.11	Accessibility, Health, and Safety Considerations	Construct ramp

3.1	Decks	Construct deck
3.2	Additions	Construct additions
4.1	Relocation	Relocate houses; construct foundations

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report. She displayed diagrams showing the houses' orientation to each other. Both applications mention removing non-historic elements and moving them onto new site.

Support:
Ashely Morris, architect and Myrick Howard, President of PNC [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Howard noted that both of the houses, despite looking larger are actually smaller than a typical Oakwood house. The two houses plus the additions add up to just 3000 sq ft. The Hall house is 600 sq ft. The houses have different ceiling heights and windows sizes. The yard is overgrown and they recently found a 10 x 10 concrete pad.

Ms. Morris commented on the proportions of the windows. She said that they were trying to relate the additions to each other. There is currently no consistency. She said they would be glad to work with staff on the windows.

Gary Roth with Capital Area Preservation is an easement holder on property. He was initially concerned about the connection of buildings, but is delighted with the proposed solution. He would like to see landscaping in the future. He said they will review the subsequent documents that will be submitted to staff.

Fred Belledin, Chair of the Board of PNC stated the board's support.

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

Responses and Questions:
Mr. Davis asked if there a basement under the deck. Ms. Morris said yes, that they are going to try to share utilities under the buildings so they act as one. It will also serve as storage. Mr. Howard noted that this also helps decrease footprint of additions and with stormwater concerns.

Without objection Ms. Caliendo closed the evidentiary portion of the hearing.

Committee Discussion

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

The application seems straightforward. Staff comments are on the proportions of the windows. The windows are not a match, but there are a variety of windows and I believe what they have done is compatible. [Caliendo]
It strikes me that we're putting 2 single family houses together. The context of the neighborhood is single family. I disagree with the use of one sidewalk for two houses. It is not characteristic and I know of no examples where two single family houses share one sidewalk. The precedent is for driveways. I would not approve the sidewalk as shown. They should come back with a broader landscape plan. The deck is a unique way to solve the problem. I would find the deck more compatible if it were smaller. [Thiem]

Without objection Ms. Caliendo reopened the evidentiary portion of the hearing.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Ms. Morris stated that the reason for the single walk is due to the retaining wall and steps needed for the grade. They are using the existing steps. She also said that there is precedent in Oakwood. Mr. Thiem said he's never seen anything like this. Ms. Morris maintained that there is something similar and agreed that driveways don't count as something to walk up to the house. Mr. Thiem asked if she had examples in this neighborhood. She said no. Mr. Howard said that they would be fine with two separate sidewalks, but that one would need to be angled due to grade. Mr. Thiem said that two would be more in character.

Mr. Thiem asked for a response on the deck. Mr. Belledin said that the reason the basement exists is to unify the structures so that they are one in terms of the building code and stormwater. The deck dimensions are driven by the basement connection between the houses. The deck is low enough to grade that with the landscaping you wouldn't see it from the public right-of-way. Mr. Thiem asked if they could reduce the size of the deck. Mr. Belledin said that the deck covers the basement roof, so its removal would mean you looked at the basement roof. Mr. Thiem noted that he still has concerns about the size of the deck.

Without objection Ms. Caliendo reclosed the evidentiary portion of the hearing.

Committee Discussion (2)

There are lots of site plans; which do we address? [Thiem]
The various plans show different iterations. The final plan is on page 61 of the application packet. [Tully]
I am concerned that lots of changes are coming to the site. I would like to see the access and landscape plans brought back to us. [Thiem]

I would like to see that. The landscape is important to this project. [Fountain]
Perpendicular walks would be more appropriate. It can be included with landscape. [Caliendo]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Mr. Thiem and seconded by Mr. Fountain, Mr. Thiem moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the evidentiary hearing, the committee finds staff suggested finding A. (inclusive of facts 1-11), B. (inclusive of facts 1-8), C. (inclusive of facts 1-5), D. (inclusive of facts 1-13), E (inclusive of facts 1-5), F. (inclusive of facts 1-4), G. (inclusive of facts 1-10), H. (inclusive of facts 1-3) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

Hall House

A. Relocation of the Hall House; removal of non-historic additions; construction of new foundation is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.1.6, 4.1.7, 4.1.8, and the following facts:

1* The Hall house was approved for relocation in 2016 under COA 076-16-CA. The approved site plan is included in the application, but not labeled. This proposal changes the location of the house on its current lot in order to also accommodate the relocation of the Graves house on the lot.

2* A tentative tree protection plan is provided; it was not prepared by a certified arborist or registered landscape architect. A preliminary tree removal plan has been provided; the exact move route has not been determined. See item H for tree removals.

3* The 1996 addition is proposed to be removed prior to the move.

4* The house sits in the right-of-way. The proposed location reduces the impact to the dwelling from the existing roadway and from any future widening.

5* The proposed location will create a larger front lawn to buffer the house from the traffic.

6* The house will maintain its current and historic orientation to the street.

7* According to COA 076-16-CA, the original height of the foundation was very low which contributed to termite-damage discovered in the floor framing system. The height of the new foundation seeks to balance proximity of the house's original relationship to the ground with code-mandated clearance to floor framing.

8* The application proposes a continuous brick veneer foundation wall on the entire house. COA 076-16-CA approved a brick veneer detailed to convey the appearance of the original pier locations under the historic sections of the house. Material samples were not provided.

9* The front porch floor is currently a non-original concrete slab supported by concrete block. This will be demolished and replaced at the new location.

10* The property will be re-landmarked after relocation.

11* An archaeological investigation completed in May 2015 found that no significant archaeological remains would be disturbed by the relocation of the house.

B. Reconstruction of porch floor; construction of addition on the Hall House is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.8.5, 3.2.1, 3.2.3, 3.2.4, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.7, 3.2.8, 3.2.9, 3.2.10, 3.2.11, and the following facts:

1* The new porch floor is proposed to have wood decking. Detailed drawings were not provided.

2* The new addition is one story, rectangular in form, and lower than the historic house.

3* The application includes evidence that the house once had a side ell as seen in a 1994 photograph and the 1914 Sanborn Fire Insurance map.

4* The depth of the new addition is less than the addition being removed.

5* The proportions of the windows on the addition are narrower than those on the historic house.

6* New windows are proposed to be wood casement windows with no divided lights. Details and specifications were provided.

7* Siding on the addition is proposed to be smooth faced fiber cement siding with a thick profile and reveal to match the historic wood siding. The commission has approved the use of fiber cement on additions when not abutting wood siding in the same plane.

8* All new trim will match the style and dimensions of the historic trim. Fascia and eaves will match existing but be less ornate. Detailed drawings were not provided.

C. Alterations to the Hall house including replacement of one front window; installation of porch railings; replacement of 2nd front door is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.7.1, 2.7.2, 2.7.6, 2.7.7, 2.8.6, and the following facts:

1* The central of the ganged windows on the front porch is proposed to be removed and replaced with a wood 6/6 double hung window. Specifications were not provided.

2* The window being removed is a single pane of glass and unlikely contemporary with other historic windows.

3* The secondary door on the front porch is damaged and is proposed to be replaced. Details were not provided.

4* Details of the proposed new railing were not provided.

Graves House

D. Relocation of the Graves house; removal of non-historic additions; construction of new foundation is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.7, 4.1.8,, and the following facts:

1* The Willis Graves house is significant as a rare, intact, surviving example of a two-story Queen Anne residence built in one of Raleigh's freedman villages around the turn of the century and is the only two-story Queen Anne residence in Oberlin Village.

2* A tentative tree protection plan is provided; it was not prepared by a certified arborist or registered landscape architect. A preliminary tree removal plan has been provided; the exact move route has not been determined. See item H for tree removals.

3* The Graves house is threatened with demolition.

4* The new location of the house is the same lot as the Hall House and is to the north side of Oberlin Church; it currently sits on a lot to the south of the church.
5* Altered rear additions are proposed to be removed prior to the move.
6* In its newly proposed location the house maintains its historic orientation to the street.
7* The 1914 Sanborn Fire Insurance map shows that a house used to sit in approximately the same location.
8* The original height of the foundation is low. The height of the new foundation seeks to balance proximity of the house's original relationship to the ground with having the same finished floor height as the Hall House.
9* The application proposes a continuous brick veneer foundation wall on the entire house. Details were not provided.
10* The Graves House will, at its closest, be 5 feet from the Hall House.
11* Grading is proposed to allow for at least a 9" exposed foundation and to keep the finished floor the same height as the Hall House.
12* An archaeological investigation completed in May 2015 found that no significant archaeological remains would be disturbed by the relocation of the house to the Hall House lot.
13* The property will be re-landmarked after relocation.

E. Construction of an addition on the Graves House is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.2.1, 3.2.3, 3.2.4, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.7, 3.2.8, 3.2.9, 3.2.10, 3.2.11, and the following facts:
1* The new one story addition is a gable extrusion in approximately the same location as the removed additions.
2* The proportions of the windows on the addition are narrower than those on the historic house.
3* New windows are proposed to be wood casement windows with no divided lights. Details and specifications were provided.
4* Siding on the addition is proposed to be smooth faced fiber cement siding with a thick profile and reveal to match the historic wood siding. The commission has approved the use of fiber cement on additions when not abutting wood siding in the same plane.
5* All new trim will match the style and dimensions of the historic trim. Fascia and eaves will match existing but be less ornate. Detailed drawings were not provided.

F. Alterations to the Graves house including removal of non-historic siding; awning removal; replacing a door with a window are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.6.2, 2.6.10, 2.7.2, 2.7.7, 2.7.10, and the following facts:
1* The house is partially sided in either aluminum or asbestos siding; the application calls out both. Neither is a historic material.
2* The status of the window trim under the siding is unknown.
3* A non-historic door on the south wall on the porch is proposed to be replaced with a wood double hung window matching the others on the porch. Details and specifications were not provided.

4* The aluminum awning proposed for removal does not date to the period of significance of the house.

Site and Joint Features

G. Installation of parking; installation of front walks; construction of deck and access ramp is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.5.5, 1.5.6, 1.5.7, 2.11.1, 2.11.2, 2.11.3, 2.11.5, 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.6, 3.1.7, and the following facts:

1* A tentative tree protection plan is provided; it was not prepared by a certified arborist or registered landscape architect. A preliminary tree removal plan has been provided; see item H for tree removals.

2* A front walk that splits to access both houses is proposed. It utilizes an existing set of steps leading from the sidewalk into the lot.

3* The application provides examples of shared exterior features for adjacent properties in Raleigh historic districts.

4* Minimal parking is proposed for the lot and appears to utilize access agreements with adjacent properties. A driveway curb cut will not be required on Oberlin Road.

5* The proposed parking areas will be screened from the street by the houses.

6* The materials of the parking areas and walkways were not provided, nor was information on lighting.

7* A low deck with no railing is proposed to run between the additions on the two houses. As such, the deck is set back from the front and is partially screened by the historic houses.

8* The deck will be screened with vegetation also. Details are not provided.

9* The proposed joint deck will allow for a single accessible access point.

10* Detailed drawings of the new deck and ramp are not provided.

H. Removal of trees is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.5, 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 1.3.13, and the following facts:

1* A preliminary list of trees to remove was provided. Only trees affected by the relocation of the houses, located within utility easements, or located in the proposed parking area are proposed for removal. This includes 6 Pecans, 1 Birch, 1 Oak, 1 Maple, 1 Mulberry, 3 Hackberrys, 2 Walnuts, 1 black cherry, and, 1 unidentified tree.

2* Five mature trees and several smaller trees will remain.

3* A tree replacement plan was not provided.

Mr. Fountain agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 4/0.

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

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

1. That the 365-day demolition delay not be applied for removal of the trees.
2. That an application for landmark re-designation be filed prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy.

Hall House

3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of the blue placard for the move:
    a. Grading plan;
    b. Final foundation height;
    c. Revised foundation design under the historic house that is detailed to convey the appearance of the original pier locations.
    d. Move route;
    e. Tree removal;
    f. Tree protection plan prepared by a registered landscape architect or ISA-certified arborist.
4. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of the blue placard for the addition:
    a. New front window;
    b. Front porch flooring;
    c. Eave construction;
    d. Window and door trim.
5. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction/installation:
    a. Front porch railing;
    b. New front door;
    c. New storm doors;
    d. Foundation brick face finish and color;
    e. Paint color selections if different than the existing;
    f. Front steps;
    g. Roofing material;
    h. HVAC size and location and screening, if needed;
    i. Any other exterior changes required for the project not specifically addressed.

Graves House

6. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of the blue placard for the move:
    a. Grading plan;
    b. Final foundation height;
    c. Revised foundation design under the historic house that is detailed to convey the appearance of the original pier locations.
    d. Move route;
    e. Tree removal;

f. Tree protection plan prepared by a registered landscape architect or ISA-certified arborist.

7. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of the blue placard for the addition:
    a. New window on south façade;
    b. Eave construction;
    c. Window and door trim.
8. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction/installation:
    a. Foundation brick face finish and color;
    b. Front steps;
    c. Paint color selections if different than the existing;
    d. Any modifications to trim underneath the non-historic siding;
    e. New storm doors;
    f. Roofing material;
    g. HVAC size and location and screening, if needed;
    h. Any other exterior changes required for the project not specifically addressed.

Site Alterations

9. That the approved tree protection plan (per conditions 3.f. and 6.f.) be implemented prior to any work on the site and that it remain in place for the duration of construction.
10. That a unified site landscape plan be provided to and approved by the commission. This includes:
    a. Tree replacement plan;
    b. New shrubs and planting beds;
    c. Sidewalks;
    d. Deck;
    e. Ramp;
    f. Parking area materials;
    g. Walkway materials;
    h. Site lighting;
    i. Site wall alterations;
    j. Any other site changes required for the project not specifically addressed.
11. That replacement trees be planted during the next tree planting season after receipt of the certificate of occupancy.

Mr. Fountain agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 5/0.

Committee members voting: Caliendo, Davis, Fountain, Thiem.

Certificate expiration date: 2/24/18.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

125-17-CA 1012 W CABARRUS STREET
Applicant: DAVID MAURER
Received: 7/13/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 10/11/2017 1) 8/24/2017 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: HOD-G
Nature of Project: Construction of 1-story addition; removal of rear deck; construction of rear and side decks; installation of fence; installation of ribbon driveway
DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its August 7, 2017, meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker, Mary Ruffin Hanbury and Curtis Kasefang; the applicants, Meg and Gary Bullard, were represented by David Maurer; also present was Roberta Fox.
Staff Notes:

- Raleigh City Code Section 10.2.15.E.1. states that "An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure or site within any Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark may not be denied…However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of issuance…If the Commission finds that the building, structure or site has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark, it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal."
- COAs mentioned are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
1.3	Site Features and Plantings	Construction of 1-story addition
1.4	Fences and Walls	Installation of fence
1.5	Walkways, Driveways and Off-street Parking	Installation of ribbon driveway
3.1	Decks	Removal of rear deck; construction of rear and side decks
3.2	Additions	Construction of 1-story addition

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report. The house is a bungalow in Boylan Heights. It

currently has a deck in back and the applicant is seeking approval for an addition. The staff suggestion is for the committee to discuss the mass of the addition, the use of fiber cement shake shingles, the removal of a site wall, and the delay of the removal of a crape myrtle. Staff has suggested conditions if approved.

Support:
Mr. David Maurer [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Both Gary Bullard and Meg Bullard were also affirmed.

Mr. Maurer began with the dispersal of handouts to the committee. Mr. Maurer stated that by his calculations the built area to open space will be 43%. He also showed three other examples, one of which was approved at last month's COA meeting at 915 W South St, which got approval for 48% built area to open space (an increase of 8%).

Mr. Maurer said that they propose to use fiber cement shakes that imitate cedar shakes, and this is the first time this has been proposed to RHDC. Their goal is to make the addition low maintenance. Mr. Maurer addressed some site issues, especially the relocation of an electric power pole to allow for the installation of a driveway. The applicant is fine with the recommended delay for the removal of the crape myrtle, as they would like to keep it. They are also requesting the removal of a decorative tree in the backyard.

Ms. Tania Tully [affirmed] clarified that the staff suggestion was not to delay the removal of the decorative tree in the backyard, but rather to delay the removal of the crape myrtle.

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

Responses and Questions:
Mr. Thiem said that he is concerned about the saucer magnolia and the tree protection area for the willow oak in the backyard, requesting that it match the requirements in the Design Guidelines at 1.3 times the trees' diameter. He also wanted to see the tree protection area closer to the existing building, and asked the applicant to work with staff on the details. Mr. Maurer responded that he was willing to work with staff. He stated that he could move the tree protection area to start 5 feet off the back wall of the new addition.

Mr. Thiem stated that based on the proposed driveway length it appeared a portion of a parked car would be in the right-of-way. He believed that the right-of-way line would include 6 or 7 feet of the 20' driveway length shown. Mr. Thiem also asked why the parking area couldn't be moved to other side of front yard. Ms. Tully responded that in the historic districts driveways cannot terminate at the front of a house, but must go to the side. Mr. Maurer replied that they are concerned with preserving the crape myrtle. There are other strip driveways in Boylan Heights that are 20' long and there are no issues with cars fitting entirely on the driveway. Mr. Thiem observed that there are new standards from the City now and that future City improvements may mean that the sidewalk is closer to the house. Mr. Maurer stated that there

are still a lot of moving parts on this project and that it all hinges on moving the power pole, and the cost of that. Mr. Thiem asked staff if this item could be left open. Ms. Tully responded that if the committee defers it, the applicant must act on it within 6 months. Alternatively, the committee could approve it and include specific conditions. Mr. Thiem observed that the applicant seems to want it to be open-ended. Mr. Maurer replied that they would appreciate an approval with conditions today. They don't currently have all the necessary information today. Mr. Thiem responded that he prefers for this item to come back to the committee for review.

Mr. Davis asked to talk about the retaining wall in the front yard, as it could potentially be historic. Ms. Caliendo asked if the applicant was still requesting its removal. Mr. Davis inquired if the removal of the wall was for the installation of the driveway. Mr. Maurer said that yes that was the reason and also asked if there was a way to address the wall without deferring the whole application. Ms. Tully interjected that the committee could defer item B. The committee discussed how this condition would be handled when a motion was made.

Mr. Thiem asked how they would be getting construction materials to the back of the site if the crape myrtle tree was there. Mr. Maurer said they would use the left side of the property.

Mr. Davis stated the retaining wall looks to be historic, and he would not be in favor of taking it out. Mr. Maurer responded that it's in an odd location. Mr. Davis asked if there had been a shared driveway with the neighbor at 1014 W Cabarrus Street in the past. Mr. Bullard answered that a title search showed there was never a shared driveway. Ms. Bullard said the driveway is totally within the property lines. There was further discussion about shared driveways and garages.

Ms. Caliendo inquired how the applicant proposed to address the grade change. Mr. Maurer responded that would be part of their exploration. The need to dig down and see if it was a retaining wall, and if it is found to be historic they can explore options such as moving it.

Ms. Caliendo requested to talk about the mass of the addition. Ms. David asked for clarification from staff about another Boylan Heights application from last month's COA meeting and whether that addition was inset on one side and flush on one side. Ms. Tully confirmed the information. Mr. Thiem asked the committee members if they have established a point they won't go beyond regarding the proportion of built space to the site. He sees they are getting a lot of applications in the 40-50% range. Ms. Caliendo responded that the guidelines leave it up to the committee to decide what's appropriate, and in 3.2.12 it talks about additions with the built mass to open space when it will "significantly vary". Mr. Thiem asked what's adjacent to this property. Mr. Davis responded that 602 Boylan had a long backyard but part of it was sold, so the large mass of the building on the now smaller lot was appropriate given that history. Ms. David said that that addition brought it into line with the rest of the street. This application shows the house getting bigger than other ones on the street. Mr. Maurer stated that the UDO allows 75% and does this conflict with the RHDC? Mr. Davis responded that the committee's charge is to consider what is appropriate. Ms. Tully interjected that it was something to talk to

the attorneys about. Ms. David noted that during the revisions to the Design Guidelines they had talked about putting a numerical limit on increases, but intentionally chose to leave it open ended. Mr. Maurer stated that he and his clients recognized this addition is at top end of what may be allowable, and they won't be coming back for more additions later.

Without objection Ms. Caliendo closed the evidentiary portion of the hearing.

Committee Discussion

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

We need to discuss the new built mass. [Caliendo]
The additional facts show 43% is typical for Boylan Heights. It doesn't seem out of line. [Davis]
We need to discuss the mass percentage limit in the future. It might end up being contextual, with different tests for different streets. The size of lots and typical houses bears into it. I'm more concerned about the siding and the visibility from the street. [Fountain]
Before we get onto materials, we generally don't see additions popping out on both sides of the house. It seems out of character. Usually at least one side is flush or inset. I do think the scale overwhelms the original house. [David]
Looking at the mass versus the size of the addition to the main house, is it 1,000 square feet being added to a 1,300 square foot house? [Davis]
It's approximately 993 SF. [Tully]
With the addition the house footprint is 2,353 SF, and with all the built improvements on the property the footprint is 3,371 SF. [Robb]
The guidelines just ask if the addition is overwhelming or not. [Tully]
Just clarifying the guidelines, in 3.2.11 going from 25% to 38% is not significant. And with 3.2.12, "significantly vary from the surrounding buildings", going from 28% to 45%. Based on the evidence presented today it is in line with the surrounding area. The roof plan shows that the addition is not overwhelming the existing house. [Caliendo]
What about the width and the addition coming out on both sides? [David]
I think that because the addition comes back in, it's okay. [Caliendo]
I can't think of any other examples like this. [David]
I'm troubled with where this leads, and about setting a precedent for bump-outs. [Fountain]
What's appropriate if it's going to be set in? [Caliendo]
Just a few inches. [Fountain]
Yes, just a few inches. [David]
On both sides? [Davis]
Yes. [Fountain]
Other houses on the block have bump-outs on both sides. [Davis]
Both sides need to be inset. The side with the steps and the pathway around it, I don't see how it works. They need to find another way. [Fountain]
We have okayed some that were flush on one side with a bump-out on the other side. If we approve this popping out on both sides, everyone will ask for it. [David]

The bump-outs with different materials is adding to the issue. [Fountain]
I might suggest deferring the approval of materials until a sample is supplied. [Tully]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Ms. David moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the evidentiary hearing, the committee finds staff suggested finding A. (inclusive of facts 1-4), C. (inclusive of facts 1-4) and D. (inclusive of facts 1-14) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. The installation of a fence is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 1.4.1, 1.4.2, 1.4.8, and the following facts:
1* The lot currently includes a low block retaining wall on the east side, running from near the sidewalk to a few feet behind the house.
2* The applicant proposes installing a 6′ tall privacy fence along portions of the east and west property lines, and along the full width of the north property line. Two gates are proposed.
3* The fence has the same appearance on each side. A detailed section was provided.
4* Photographs and a drawing of the fence and gate were provided, but the stain color was not provided.

C. Removal of a rear deck and construction of new rear and side decks is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.6, 3.1.7, 3.1.8, and the following facts:
1* The existing rear deck is not original to the house. It extends from the enclosed rear porch.
2* A new deck is proposed for the rear of the house and is designed to be set in from the surrounding walls.
3* A new side deck is proposed for entry into the mudroom.
4* The original deck measured 112.5 SF, while the new rear deck measures 196 SF and the new side deck measures 32 SF, for a total of 228 SF. The new deck area is 103% larger than the existing deck area. See more about the built area to open space in D.3 below.

D. Construction of a 1-story addition, including the mass of the new addition, is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.4, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.7, 3.2.8, 3.2.9, 3.2.10, 3.2.11, 3.2.12; however the removal of a large tree is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 1.3.6, 3.2.2, 3.2.10, and the following facts:
1* The house is a one-story bungalow with a front-facing gable that is typical of the district. It features a wide front porch supported by four tapered square columns. It is clad with cedar shake siding. According to the National Register nomination for the district it was built in 1921, and is a good example of the type.
2* The lot is larger than many others in the district, measuring 50′ wide and 150′ deep. According to the Special Character Essay of the Boylan Heights Historic District, "The typical frontage is 30 to 50 feet with an average lot depth of 130 feet with a 15 to 30 foot setback." This makes the applicant's lot roughly 44% larger than the average lot.

3* Built **area** to open space analysis: The lot is 7,500 SF. The footprint of the existing house is 1,360 SF; including the front porch, rear deck, front walk and stairs, and accessory building it is 2,078 SF. The proportion of built area to open space is currently 28%. The footprint of the house after the addition will be 2,353 SF; including the front porch, new decks, front walk and stairs, accessory building and driveway it is 3,371 SF. The proportion of built area to open space will be 45%.

4* Built **mass** to open space analysis: The footprint of the existing house is 1,360 SF; including the front porch and accessory building it is 1,846 SF. The proportion of built mass to open space is currently 25%. The footprint of the house after the addition will be 2,353 SF, and including the front porch and accessory building it will be 2,840 SF. The proportion of built mass to open space will be 38%.

5* The addition will be distinguished from the existing house by a change in materials and by projecting bays along both the east and west sides of the house.

6* The only change to the front elevation will be the addition of a wood railing on the porch. There will be no changes to the sides of the existing house.

7* The roof ridge of the addition lines up with the existing, except over the master bedroom on the northeast corner of the house where the ridge drops due to the narrower interior space to be covered. The entire roof will be resurfaced, however no specifications were provided.

8* The addition will be clad in fiber cement siding with the smooth side out; and hardi shake shingles. The commission has not yet approved the use of fiber cement shingles on either new construction or additions. Trim materials will match the appearance of the existing; wood casement windows without grilles are proposed for the addition; details were provided.

9* Eaves will match the existing in dimension and detail; detailed drawings were not provided.

10* A pair of full-glass wood doors are proposed out to the new rear deck. A half-glass wood door will lead from the mud room to the side deck.

11* The entire exterior will be painted in new colors.

12* A 12″ diameter tree (no species provided) northwest of the existing rear deck is proposed to be removed to allow for construction of the addition. The applicant suggested that a donation would be made to NeighborWoods, but this program has been suspended at this time by the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Resources Department.

13* A tree protection plan was provided for the rear of the property. The applicant agreed to move the tree protection area to be offset 5′ from the rear addition.

14* No specifications were provided for exterior lighting.

15* Additional facts 15-18 provided by applicant: Correction to D.3 – Proposed Built Area is 43%, not 45%.

- House + Addition = 2353sf
- Front Porch = 197sf
- Ex'g Rear addition = 285sf
- Proposed Rear and Side Decks = 228sf
- Existing front walk = 112sf
- Proposed Ribbon Driveway = 80sf
- Total Built Area = 3255sf / 7500sf lot size = 43%

16* Built Area and Built Mass Comparison to 915 W South Street -104-17-CA, approved under new Guidelines July 2017:

- 915 W South St: Original built area is 40%; proposed (and approved) built area is 48%
- 1012 W Cabarrus: Original built area is 28%; proposed built area is 43%
- 915 W South St: Original built mass is 25%; proposed built mass is 39%
- 1012 W Cabarrus: Original built mass is 25%; proposed built mass is 38%
- Proposed Built Area and Built Mass for 1012 W Cabarrus is less than the Built Area and Built Mass approved for CoA at 915 W South St. in 104-17-CA

17* Built Area and Mass Comparison to 1030 W South Street (directly across the street from 1012 W Cabarrus):

- 1030 W South St lot size: 6534sf
- 1030 W South St: Existing built area on property is 3078sf, or 47%
- 1012 W Cabarrus: Original built area is 28%; proposed built area is 43%
- 1030 W South St: Existing built mass of house and outbuilding is 2528sf, or 39%
- 1012 W Cabarrus: Original built mass is 25%; proposed built mass is 38%
- Proposed Built Area and Built Mass for 1012 W Cabarrus is less than the Built Area and Built Mass at 1030 W South St.

18* Built Area and Mass Comparison to 602 S Boylan Avenue; addition approved 037-12-CA

- 602 S Boylan Ave lot size: 5802sf
- 602 S Boylan Ave: Existing built area on property is 2708sf, or 47%
- 1012 W Cabarrus: Original built area is 28%; proposed built area is 43%
- 602 S Boylan Ave: Existing built mass of house and addition is 2379sf, or 41%
- 1012 W Cabarrus: Original built mass is 25%; proposed built mass is 38%
- Proposed Built Area and Built Mass for 1012 W Cabarrus is less than the Built Area and Built Mass at 602 S Boylan Avenue.

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

Decision on the Application

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Ms. David and seconded by Mr. Thiem, Ms. David made an amended 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 issuance of the blue placard for the addition:
    a. Location and species of a replacement tree for the saucer magnolia in the backyard;
    b. Eave construction;
    c. Revised tree protection plan to include the crape myrtle in the front yard.
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:

    a. Fence stain;
    b. Roofing;
    c. Lighting.
3. That the 365-day delay for the removal of the saucer magnolia tree in the backyard be waived.
4. The addition is to be inset on at least one side.

The fiber cement shingles (section D.8 on the staff report) and the site work (section B on the staff report), are deferred pending the receipt of additional information.

Mr. Thiem agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 5/0.

Committee members voting: Caliendo, David, Davis, Fountain, Thiem.

Certificate expiration date: 1/27/18.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

126-17-CA 706 N EAST ST
Applicant: ELIZABETH NASH AND BRENT FLOYD
Received: 7/13/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 10/11/2017 1) 8/24/2017 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Nature of Project: Addition to 2nd floor; extension of two dormers
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- COAs mentioned are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.7	Windows and Doors	Add door and windows
3.2	Additions	Addition to 2nd floor; extension of two dormers

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Support:
Ashley Morris [affirmed] and Brent Floyd [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. She said that they understand what staff is asking. A handout with a proposed design that visually maintains the dormers was dispersed. She explained that the historic fabric of the dormers is maintained while still allowing for the internal connection needed.

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

Responses and Questions:
Mr. Thiem asked for clarification that there are no trees in the backyard. Mr. Floyd confirmed.

Mr. Davis asked how back the setback was between the dormers. Ms. Morris said it was two feet to 30 inches to give a good visual reveal. Mr. Floyd noted that the photo shows the only way the dormers are visible from street. He thinks that setback would still give visual impact.

Without objection Ms. Caliendo closed the evidentiary portion of the hearing.

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
It's a good compromise [Davis]
Should the inset be 24 inches or what? [Caliendo]
Is staff comfortable with it coming back to staff for the inset between dormers? [Davis]
Yes. [Tully]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Mr. Fountain moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the evidentiary hearing, the committee finds staff suggested finding A. (inclusive of facts 1-9) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Expansion of 2nd floor; extension of two dormers is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.2.1, 3.2.4, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.7, 3.2.8, 3.2.9, 3.2.10, and the following facts:

1* The house is a Craftsman 1-1/2 story frame bungalow; it is the "Avondale" model ordered from the Sterling Homes catalog. A comparison of the house to the model is found on Sears Homes national expert Rose Thorton's blog in April 2012. (see attached)

2* In 2001 a small one room addition was constructed per COA 080-01-CA.

3* A traditional way of adding onto a historic house is through new dormers.

4* The existing dormers are 9-1/2 feet wide and roughly centered on the roof. The extension of the dormers obscures form of the historic dormers.

5* Traditionally, when multiple dormers appear on a roof they are designed as separate units across the roof.

6* Proposed materials of the addition will be the same material, design, and dimensions as the existing. New windows are proposed to be wood 3/1 windows singly and in pairs. Details and specifications were provided.

7* Windows on the historic house are of a variety of proportions and are both individual and paired.

8* The rear of the house is proposed to be extruded 4'7" feet to align with an existing 1-story enclosed porch. Windows on the rear wall will be relocated to the new rear wall.

9* The window and door configuration of the 1st floor will be altered to have a new door flanking a bank of three 3/1 wood windows.

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

Decision on the Application

Mr. Fountain 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 the blue placard:
    a. Revised dormer design;
    b. Eave construction.

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

Committee members voting: Caliendo, David, Davis, Fountain, Thiem.

Certificate expiration date: 2/24/18.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

127-17-CA 533 WATAUGA STREET
Applicant: JOHN L THOMAS
Received: 7/13/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 10/11/2017 1) 8/24/2017 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: HOD-G
Nature of Project: Landscape/site improvements: install outdoor kitchen, replace lantern on brick post, install brick walkway, build small deck, install patio, construct accessory building
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- COAs mentioned are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
1.3	Site Features and Plantings	Landscape/site improvements: install outdoor kitchen, replace lantern on brick post, install patio
1.5	Walkways, Driveways and Off-street Parking	Install brick walkway
3.1	Decks	Build small deck
3.2	Additions	Construct accessory building

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report. The applicant's home has a driveway on an incline. The house was built in 1995. The existing landscape has both hardscape and mature plantings.

Support:
Mr. John Thomas [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. He stated that the application is light on detail because they understood the issue of the new guideline 1.3.8 would be paramount. Mr. Thomas said they need to clarify if this can conceptually go forward. He stated he was comfortable with the staff recommendations and that he believes the proposal does not alter the residential character of the district.

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

Responses and Questions:
Mr. Thiem stated that he was concerned about the proportions, but he also had thoughts beyond this. Mr. Thomas responded that he would be coming back with a revised plan.

Without objection Ms. Caliendo closed the evidentiary portion of the hearing.

Committee Discussion

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

It looks like the built area to open space is 47% and they are asking for an increase to 61%. [Caliendo]
The issue is a consistent interpretation. This is higher than I am comfortable with. There are precedents that involved Jacuzzis that didn't have nearly as much impact as this application proposes. I'm concerned with the amount of the new built paving area here. [Thiem]
It comes close to being significant, but it is not. [Caliendo]
Was there a COA for the existing patio? [Fountain]
Yes. The patio was installed when the house was constructed. [Tully]
There is a fair amount of open area scattered around the hardscape. [Fountain]
Rather than looking at this as a percentages issue, maybe we look at back yard space vs front yard space. For example, last month's Bloodworth St landscape plan where the house has a large front yard and a restricted back yard. The ratio of paved to soft areas in the back yard was substantially higher, yet the proportion on the overall lot was low. They had lots of soft space in the front yard. I would argue that this house has an uncharacteristically small front yard. The house is not traditional to Oakwood. It is newer. [Thiem]
The change in elevation in the front yard impacts the usable space. The use of the patio space bears on the decision. [Fountain]
According to the list of work, staff can review landscape master plans affecting less than 25% of the front yard area and 50% of the total side and rear yard area. Staff feels this change is more than they are comfortable with approving. [Tully]
We're dealing with the visual experience and character of a place, not just the numbers. This proposal has more of a ground plane impact. [Thiem]
It looks modest, with most of the change on the ground plane. [Caliendo]
I have a question for staff regarding the 6' fence height. The workshop at fence is taller than that and is that OK? [Thiem]
We do that all the time. [David]

With no objection from the committee, Ms. Caliendo reopened the evidentiary portion of the hearing.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Mr. Thomas said that it's an interesting question about the changes being at the ground level, so are we altering the residential character? It's not visible from the sidewalk, so we don't think so. We are proposing a 14% increase, and saw that this committee previously approved a 13% increase. Mr. Davis replied that yes, it is primarily horizontal and the guidelines do specifically address paving.

Without objection Ms. Caliendo closed the evidentiary portion of the hearing.

Committee Discussion (2)

Do we defer this for more detailed drawings based on our feedback? [Fountain]
What is giving us hesitation? Mine is the 61% built area. What is our magic number? I'd say bring it down and provide more evidence. [David]
How do we continue this process? I still have a number of questions and comments. More context research would be helpful. Do that and bring back more a detailed plan. [Thiem]
Having a target number would be useful if you're not comfortable with 61%. [Thomas]
For me, 50% or less built area is preferred, or proof that 61% is normal in that vicinity. [David]
That number may be okay depending on a number of factors including other site features. [Fountain]
And does 61% make sense because we are starting at 47%? [David]
We need more research. It's based on how much of the site is at grade versus above grade, rather than an arbitrary number. [Caliendo]
Some property owners might prefer a patio to grass. We need to think about it. [Fountain]
We should defer for more information. [Caliendo]
Yes, because we are clear about the information that we need. [David]
The overall issue relates to fact that this is a small lot, so 47% is high but it's mostly the house. 61% of a lot this size might not be unusual. [Davis]
Maybe the applicant can offer information that 61% coverage in Oakwood is not unusual. [David]

Without objection Ms. Caliendo re-opened the evidentiary portion of the hearing.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (3)

Mr. Thomas stated that his inclination was to offer information about the coverage on other lots without editing the current plan. Mr. Thiem advised to bring photos. Ms. Tully added that he should make sure his examples got COAs.

Mr. Thiem said he had questions about the location of the magnolia tree, as well as how the slope of area where the fire pit is planned will work. He also wanted to see more about the area

around the outdoor kitchen equipment. Mr. Thiem also expressed confusion about the tree protection plan and the impact of excavating close to the crape myrtle.

Mr. Fountain made a motion to defer the case to the next meeting; Ms. David seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Committee members voting: Caliendo, David, Davis, Fountain, Thiem.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

128-17-CA 211 S WILMINGTON STREET
Applicant: TED VAN DYK
Received: 7/13/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 10/11/2017 1) 8/24/2017 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: HOD-G
Nature of Project: Removal of non-historic storefront features; construction of new storefront; installation of rooftop mechanical equipment; installation of rear cooler unit.
DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its August 7, 2017, meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker, Mary Ruffin Hanbury, Curtis Kasefang and David Maurer; Ted Van Dyk represented the applicant; also present was Roberta Fox.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- COAs mentioned are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
2.6	Exterior Walls	Removal of non-historic storefront features
2.7	Windows and Doors	construction of new storefront
2.9	Storefronts	Removal of non-historic storefront features; construction of new storefront
2.10	Sustainability and Energy Retrofit	Installation of rooftop mechanical equipment

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report. Ms. Robb showed photos of the property from the front and back. Ms. Robb stated the staff suggestion was to defer the installation of the mechanical equipment and rear roof cooler, and to either defer or deny the storefront modifications.

Support:
Mr. Ted Van Dyk [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. He stated that there are both restored historic buildings and modified buildings from 70s and 80s in the area. The historical photo shows that the building has always been an outlier on the block. The

building is a non-contributing structure in the district. Mr. Van Dyk continued by saying the original façade has been gone for decades, as are adjoining façades. Through working with the State Historic Preservation Office they have taken guidance from the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, especially Standard 9. Mr. Van Dyk stated he believes the design is in the spirit of the district. He took the project to DRAC and discussed a number of elements including the cooler on the roof of the first floor in the rear that will be visible from the parking deck, as well as a metal screen for the HVAC equipment on the roof of the second floor. Regarding the façade design, Mr. Van Dyk discussed the various components of the design and how they relate to the neighboring buildings; a cornice was added, window proportions relate to neighboring buildings, transparency was evaluated, a ground floor door was added to access the second floor, the windows were grouped together, and they used a two-part composition similar to the neighbors. Mr. Van Dyk also submitted new design boards for review.

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

Responses and Questions:
Ms. David stated that the new façade creates a three-story appearance for the two-story building. Mr. Van Dyk responded that he didn't want the building to seem too heavy. Ms. David asked what is under the current façade. Mr. Van Dyk answered it is tar paper and frosted glass. The original façade is gone. Ms. David stated that she was concerned about the use of tile on the façade, especially looking at Guidelines 2.9.4, 2.9.5 and 2.9.6 which call for matching the original materials and design if a façade is replaced and we know what it looked like originally. Mr. Van Dyk responded that he was working from the idea that new construction should be differentiated from the old. He never intended to recreate a façade that has not been in place for 50 years. It is a non-contributing building with no historical façade.

Ms. Tully said the entire building is non-contributing and we can't legally require them to put old façade back. But staff also doesn't necessarily agree with the new configuration. Mr. Davis stated that since the old façade was so elaborate that recreation would be creating a false sense of history. But tiles aren't necessarily enough of a reference. Mr. Van Dyk replied that the original was a very odd creation, an outlier in the district. He was trying to design a fresh look rather than zeroing in on specific materials and details from the old building.

Ms. David said she wanted to get back to the three levels of windows. The extra gang of windows creates a two-story building with a three-story appearance. Mr. Van Dyk responded that the original façade attempted a similar thing. It had the illusion of a third story. Mr. Fountain observed the original had a high ceiling on the second. Mr. Van Dyk said the building has a huge attic cavity due to the false front. Mr. Thiem said he was concerned with the window band being pushed up since the original continued the second floor band of windows from the façades on the south side. Mr. Van Dyk answered that they had reasons for the design, but they were open to change. Mr. Fountain said that the windows would have been stepped back. Mr. Van Dyk mentioned the Juliette balconies on the original façade that acted like windows.

Mr. Davis stated that the proposed façade is really a three-part not two-part, with a cornice and glass above. The old façade had a third part, but it was much more decorative before. Ms. David replied that she was not buying the third part reference argument. Mr. Davis affirmed that they certainly read as windows. Ms. Tully interjected that she could see elements that are not characteristic of the street, especially the frame on the second floor. Other frames in the area are on the first floor, not the second. Typically in the district the lower level is more glassy than the top. This proposal is the opposite. Ms. David noted that the original submission is closer to referencing the historic than the current iteration. Ms. Robb stated that she had concerns about the entire first level façade being pushed back from the street since this is not typical in historic commercial districts. Mr. Van Dyk replied it's about 2 feet back from the sidewalk. The setback might offer some shade since it is a west facing building.

Ms. Tully added that they could leave the screening issue at the staff level for review. It is not uncommon to have mechanical equipment on a roof. Ms. David asked if the equipment was usually in front of historic windows. Ms. Tully affirmed that the applicant would need to supply more details. Mr. Thiem asked if the shape on the drawing was the cooler or the screen. Mr. Van Dyk replied that it was the cooler. Mr. Thiem observed that in downtown the rear spaces were typically very utilitarian. There is no need in celebrating mechanical equipment, so they may not need a screen. Mr. Davis said the screen is open to interpretation, but the cooler in front of the windows may be an issue. Mr. Van Dyk replied that it is a tiny building and they needed the space. The cooler is metal panels with foam in between. It is easy to remove and lightweight. It won't lead to degradation of the material behind it. Ms. David responded that it obscures the historic fabric. The regulations apply to the building all the way around. Her recommendation was to return with a different design. As mentioned before, the original application is closer to the historic design. Mr. Davis said he agreed and had concerns about the materials.

Ms. David responded that she can't see a tile exterior in Moore Square. Brick and glass is typical. Mr. Van Dyk asked what were the original materials. Ms. Tully interjected that there may be better digital images we can inspect. Ms. David stated that it appeared to be cast iron or cast stone. Mr. Van Dyk responded that he tried to portray in the renderings that the tile would be referencing brick. Mr. Davis said the issue is that it looks like wood. Ms. David stated that she agreed. Ms. Tully added that it reads like a faux wood grain. Mr. Van Dyk replied that it is a high quality, high finish, upscale material. Mr. Davis stated that the Design Guidelines do not allow for using materials that look like other materials.

Mr. Fountain said that he was not wedded to 1914 being the primary historical period. Ms. David said that Carrara glass could be seen as a precedent for the opaque glass, but that the tile with a wood finish is a nonstarter for her. Mr. Fountain responded that there is a way to make this really upscale. Ms. David replied that she was inclined to defer it in favor of a different design with different finishes and more information about the cooler and rear windows. Mr.

Van Dyk responded that he agreed that the first version of the design was closer to the historic appearance, and that they can change the storefront pushback, as well as the glass and cornice.

Ms. Tully asked whether the frame appearance was an issue. Mr. Davis replied that the materials make it really jump out and the change of materials might lessen the frame appearance. Mr. Van Dyk stated that they now had two doors on the façade, with the left one opening to the first floor and the right one leading to the second floor. Mr. Davis said he was concerned with the solid wood door. Mr. Van Dyk asked if a glass door with a wood frame was better. If so, they would change the solid wood door. He also asked whether the issues discussed about the cooler addition needed to be addressed. Ms. David replied yes, but he would need to bring it back to the committee for review. It is not uncommon for a door to be inserted into an existing window frame. Mr. Thiem said that he has seen metal representations of window frames placed on the metal face of the cooler to indicate windows. Mr. Davis said that would not be acceptable. Ms. Davis stated that she would like to see a sample of the cooler material when the project is brought back for review.

Ms. David made a motion to defer the case to the next meeting; Mr. Thiem seconded; motion carried 4/0.

Committee members voting: David, Davis, Fountain, Thiem.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

129-17-CA 1804 HILLSBOROUGH STREET
Applicant: PATTI GILLENWATER
Received: 7/13/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 10/11/2017 1) 8/24/2017 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Raleigh Historic Landmark: DR. Z.M. CAVENESS HOUSE
Nature of Project: Install privacy fence; construct garden shed
Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
1.3	Site Features and Plantings	install privacy fence
1.4	Fences and Walls	install privacy fence
1.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	construct garden shed

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Support:
Patti Gillenwater [affirmed] and George Gillenwater [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Gillenwater said that they are using 6x6 posts instead of 4x4 because the house is heavy and so the fence is heavy to match.

Responses and Questions:
Mr. Thiem pointed out that on the submitted map, the maple tree and power pole were mislabeled. Mr. Gillenwater said that it's a maple tree and 2 power poles. Mr. Thiem asked how to place fence without interfering with maple and power pole. Ms. Gillenwater said that she believed there is room for the fence to be on property line. They might need to adjust the posts so as not to interfere with roots. Mr. Thiem stated that if this was a security fence vs screening it would have different results. Mr. Gillenwater said that there is about 20-24 inches between the tree and the property line.

Mr. Fountain said that they might wish they had more height on the fence. He suggested that they consider wire to add plants to increase height. Mr. Gillenwater said that it's a 6 foot fence with an 18 inch see-through section (prairie style).

Mr. Thiem asked where the 42 inches high portion of the fence sat relative to the façade of the house. Ms. Gillenwater said that they can edit the trellis part if it looks wonky. Mr. Davis said it should be no more than 65% solid. Ms. Davis disagreed, saying that that was more relevant when a house is in a district. This application is different. Ms. Tully said the height of the fence total is 5 feet. Ms. Gillenwater asked if the shorter portion should end where the porch ends or the main wall of the house. Mr. Thiem said it was at the main wall of the house. Mr. Davis disagreed saying that this is not a neighborhood so considering different heights is appropriate.

Mr. Davis added that there is a commercial building next to the house. Mr. Thiem agreed that the context of the environment is a valid fact and that it makes him more comfortable supporting the fence. Mr. Fountain said that denying the fence would possibly, down the line, make historic preservation of this landmark untenable.

Ms. Gillenwater said that they want to keep the fence in proportion to the large house. They don't want fence to look dinky.

Mr. Fountain said they don't have to worry about precedent because individual landmarks are distinctive. He suggested adding a fact 7 that the property is not surrounded by residences.

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

With no objections Ms. Caliendo closed the evidentiary portion of the hearing.

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Mr. Fountain moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the evidentiary hearing, the committee finds staff suggested finding A. (inclusive of facts 1-6) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-3) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Installation of privacy fence is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.7, 1.4.8 and the following facts:

1* The landmark designation report states that the 2-story brick foursquare Dr. Z. M. Caveness House is architecturally significant as a well-preserved brick foursquare house with influences of the Prairie School of architects. The house is also significant as a surviving residential structure on a street which was once one of Raleigh's prime residential boulevards, but where today commercial encroachment is predominant. It is also historically significant for its association with Dr. Zebulon Marvin Caveness, a prominent physician and civic leader in Raleigh for over forty years.

2* The Maple tree will be kept inside the fence and protected from harm by manually digging around the roots. If needed, the location of the fence panels will be adjusted to locate the posts away from the roots.
3* The wood fence is proposed to be along the property line as it typical of fences.
4* The fence ranges in height from 5 feet to 8 feet. The maximum height of fences typically approved is 6 feet.
5* The Craftsman design of the fence includes a partially open top portion of 1-1/2 feet. The solid portion ranges from 3-1/2 feet to 6-1/2 feet.
6* There is a 9 foot tall fence on an adjacent property across the alley which is neither a historic landmark nor in a historic district.
7* The property is surrounded by properties of varying character including the commercial and office buildings to the north and south.

B. Construction of a garden shed is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.6.6, 1.6.7, 1.6.8, 1.6.9, 1.6.10, 1.6.11, and the following facts:
1* Accessory buildings up to 144 SF are approvable by staff as Minor Works.
2* The proposed shed sits adjacent the historic garage.
3* The shed is proposed to be wood with a hipped roof and colors to match the house and garage. A photographic example was provided. Details and specifications were not provided.

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

<u>Decision on the Application</u>

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

1. That the solid portion of the fence be a maximum of 6 feet in height and that the revised design be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard.
2. That he details and specifications for the shed be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of the blue placard.
3. That the transition from the shortest section of fencing to a taller section occur no closer to the street than the front of the porch.

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

Committee members voting: David, Davis, Fountain, Thiem.

Certificate expiration date: 2/24/18.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Committee Discussion
    a. Application Completeness
    b. Meeting Post-Mortem

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner