

RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
March 23, 2017

CALL TO ORDER

Substitute Chair Don Davis 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:, Sarah David, Don Davis, John Hinshaw, Jimmy Thiem

Alternate Present: Caleb Smith

Excused Absence: Elizabeth Caliendo

Staff Present: Tania Tully, Melissa Robb, Martha Lauer; Teresa Young; Francis P. Rasberry, Jr., Attorney

Approval of the Minutes

Ms. David moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the January 26, 2017 hearing and to adopt said minutes as revised. Mr. Hinshaw seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

Ms. David moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the February 23, 2017 hearing and to adopt said minutes as submitted. Mr. Thiem seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

Ms. David moved to adopt the findings of fact for case 163-16-CA as submitted. Mr. Thiem seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

Minor Works

There were no questions regarding the Minor Work report.

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

<u>Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address</u>	<u>Case Number</u>
Jordan Lewis, 608 S Boylan Avenue 27603	034-17-CA
John Zuch, 711 S Boylan Avenue 27603	036-17-CA
Dustin Brice, City of Raleigh	022 & 023-17-CA
Jed Niffenegger, City of Raleigh	022 & 023-17-CA
Mark Riedeman, 506 Cole Street 27605	041-17-CA
Hunt Choi, City of Raleigh	022 & 023-17-CA
Rebecca Duffy, City of Raleigh	022 & 023-17-CA
Jim Johnson, 525 N Bloodworth Street 27604	020-17-CA
Tom Kane, 306C Parham Street 27601	
Peter Pagano, 306C Parham Street 27601	

Dottie Leapley, PO Box 590 27602	
David Walker, 222 W Hargett Street 27601	
Dahr J. Tanoury, PO Box 590 27602	
Graham Stone, 506 N Boundary Street 27604	
Aviva Imbrey, 506 N Boundary Street 27604	
J. Rich Leonard, 225 Hillsborough Street 27603	035-17-CA
Zeke Bridges, 225 Hillsborough Street 27603	035-17-CA
Linda Davenport, 225 Hillsborough Street 27603	035-17-CA
Eric Green, PO Box 721 27560	089-16-CA
Gil Johnson, 8716 Silverthorne Drive 27612	
Charles Holden, 217 Dexter Place 27605	041-17-CA
Steve Schuster, 311-200 W Martin Street 27601	

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

EVIDENTIARY HEARINGS

Chair Davis 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: 089-16-CA, 019-17-CA, 020-17-CA, 022-17-CA, 023-17-CA, 033-17-CA, 034-17-CA, 035-17-CA, 036-17-CA, 037-17-CA, 038-17-CA, 040-17-CA and 041-17-CA.

DEFERRED APPLICATIONS

Ms. David moved to defer case 131-16-CA. Mr. Hinshaw seconded; motion carried 5/0.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

089-16-CA 212 E LENOIR STREET
Applicant: TRIANGLE GREEN PROPERTIES
Received: 7/29/2016 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 10/27/2016 1) 6/23/2016 2) 10/27/2016 3) 3/23/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: PRINCE HALL HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: [After-the-Fact] Remove and install porch columns and railings (Remainder of the application decided 10/27/16.)

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

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

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	remove and install porch columns and railings

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report. Ms. Tully stated most of the original application had been decided and it was just the removal of the porch and column railings left to decide. She added that the case was to be treated as though the work hasn't been done. Ms. Tully stated staff recommended approval with the condition that the porch posts match what had been there and that the applicant be allowed to work with staff for those details. Ms. Tully stated the windows were non historic and were put in with non wood windows that were denied but the windows that were removed were small and the windows that were put in needed additional clarification.

Support:

Eric Green was present to speak in support of the application.

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

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

Committee Discussion

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

The only question is how to address the issue of the windows, should that be added as a condition to clarify? [Thiem]

Just add it to the motion and say to clarify the prior decision on this case that the material of the windows was denied and the size for replacement windows need not be the previous size.

[Tully]

It is in there a fact that we do have photographs with paired posts and those were taken off and there is nice current photographs of a sister house with paired posts. [David]

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 1-7) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Installation of porch railings is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.8.6; however the design of the railings is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.8.6, 3.8.10 and the removal of the porch posts is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.8.1, and the following facts:
- 1* The 2011 *Historic Research Report for the Designation of the South Person/South Blount District* describes the building as “a contributing ca. 1880 one-story frame house with...a front porch with slender wood posts...”
 - 2* No information regarding the condition of the posts was provided. They are proposed to be replaced with 5 plain single posts across the front.
 - 3* The slender wood posts were paired on the front with 3 on each corner. The front appearance was of 4 sets of two posts. They were plain with no ornamentation.
 - 4* The porch railing had simple square balusters.
 - 5* A sister house at 218 E. Lenoir Street (same historic footprint under 1-story hip roof with front hip roofed porch), two doors to the east of this property, provides a clear indication of what the original ornamentation for the paired front porch columns and railing would have been: paired slender columns with filigree jigsawn tracery at the top and jigsawn decorative porch balustrade (photo attached).
 - 6* The amended application includes photos of other porch posts and railings on other houses in the district including 320 E. Davie Street, 324 E. Davie Street, 322 E. Davie Street, 316 E. Davie Street, 412 S. Bloodworth Street, 416 S. Bloodworth Street, 225 E. South Street, 219 E. South Street, 217 E. South Street, 211 E. South Street, and 209 E. South Street, 121 E. South Street, 501 S. Blount Street, 213 E. Cabarrus Street, 215 E. Cabarrus Street, 217 E. Cabarrus Street, 508 S Person Street, 307 E. Cabarrus Street, 309 E. Cabarrus Street, 311 E. Cabarrus Street, 317 E. Cabarrus Street, 418 S. Bloodworth Street, 410 S. Bloodworth Street.
 - 7* Of those listed above, the houses with turned baluster railings are: 412 S. Bloodworth Street, 418 S. Bloodworth Street, 408 (misidentified as 410) S. Bloodworth Street, and 316 E. Davie

Street. 410 and 418 S. Bloodworth Street are ca. 2000 non-contributing houses and the balusters at 316 E. Davie Street and 412 and 416 S. Bloodworth Street are replacements in place in 2011 when the *Historic Research Report for the Designation of the South Person/South Blount District* was prepared.

8* The replacement windows are of a larger size than the previous non historic windows.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the porch posts match what was removed.
2. That the design and details of the railing be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of the blue placard.
3. That the new windows be wood and sized to fit the historic window openings.

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

Committee members voting: David, Davis, Hinshaw, Thiem, Smith.

Certificate expiration date: 9/23/17.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

019-17-CA 5 W HARGETT STREET
Applicant: AT&T MOBILITY
Received: 2/3/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 5/4/2017 1) 2/23/2017 2) 3/23/2017 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Raleigh Historic Landmark: RALEIGH BANKING & TRUST
Nature of Project: Install wall mount antennas on penthouse
Amendments: Amended to remove request for equipment platform and shelter on rooftop;
install cable trays on rooftop. Revised drawings received 3/15/17 are attached.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3.5	Roofs	Install wall mount antennas on penthouse
3.10	Utilities and Energy Retrofit	

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report. Ms. Tully reported the application had been deferred at the last meeting to find an alternative location for the equipment shelter. The application was amended to remove the request for the shelter as the applicant found room in the basement. The amendment is just what little cable and antennas and the condition of paint to be approved by staff.

Support:

Mr. Mike Hitchcock [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Hitchcock stated he presented the issue at the last meeting and the gave information to the landlord and there happened to be good timing as the basement was renovated and the equipment will not go in the basement with the shelter being taken off the roof.

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

At Mr. Davis's suggestion Mr. Hinshaw 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

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 1-7) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Installation of wall mounted antennas on penthouse is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.5.11, 3.10.12, and the following suggested facts:
- 1* The Landmark designation ordinance describes the building as an “eleven-story commercial building erected in two distinct phases, the first three floors of which were constructed in 1913 (originally in the Neo-Classical Revival style), the upper eight floors were constructed in 1928, with a substantial renovation in 1935-36 which resulted in the only Raleigh example of the transition from the NeoClassical Revival to the Moderne style.”
 - 2* The landmark designation report states “The location of the Raleigh Building, one block south of the Capitol on the southwest corner of the busy Fayetteville and Hargett streets, is one of the premier focal points in the central business district of Raleigh.”
 - 3* Six antennas are proposed to be mounted on the exterior of the brick penthouse. All but one will be flush mounted, which will be mounted on a standoff bracket.
 - 4* The amended application notes on the drawings indicate that the mounting brackets on the penthouse will be bolted into mortar joints
 - 5* The antennas are proposed to be located unobtrusively on the east, north, and west sides of the penthouse in pairs of 2. The existing penthouse is not visible from the north or east.
 - 6* Each antenna extends about 6 inches above the top of the existing brick parapet and will be painted to match the adjacent brick. Paint samples were not provided.
 - 7* The penthouse has existing utility equipment mounted on the exterior.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That paint samples be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.

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

Committee members voting: David, Davis, Hinshaw, Thiem, Smith.

Certificate expiration date: 9/23/17.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

020-17-CA 525 N BLOODWORTH STREET

Applicant: JIM JOHNSON

Received: 2/6/2017

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 5/7/2017

1) 2/23/2017 2) 3/23/2017 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: GENERAL HOD

Nature of Project: Remove shed; construct new 1-1/2 story 2-car garage; alter driveway; remove tree

Amendments: Additional evidence was received 3/8/17 and was provided in the commissioner packets. The requested staff summary of recent garages is attached.

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its February 13 meeting. Members in attendance were Curtis Kasefang, Jenny Harper, David Maurer, Dan Becker, and Mary Ruffin Hanbury; also present were Jim Johnson, Martha Lauer, Tania Tully, and Melissa Robb.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- Unified Development Code section 10.2.15.E.1 provides that “An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure or site within any Historic Overlay District...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

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Trim trees
2.5	Walkways, Driveways and Offstreet Parking	Alter driveway
2.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	Construct new 1 ½ story 2-car garage
5.2	Demolition	Remove shed

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Melissa Robb [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report. Ms. Robb stated the analysis of garages in the Oakwood neighborhood was completed by staff and included as an amendment. Ms. Robb showed pictures of the small shed and views of the house from Pell Street. Staff was unable to determine the age of the shed. Ms. Robb stated staff recommended approval with conditions.

Support:

Mr. Jim Johnson [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Johnson stated the house that stands there now has undergone renovations and in 2001 a 2-story addition was put on which was one of the last projects worked on by Betsy Ross. Mr. Johnson stated he and Ms. Ashley Morris looked at all the garages in Oakwood and created a spreadsheet which was completed from tax data. Mr. Johnson stated the 1½-story garages were approved in 2004-2005 in Oakwood. The only one that was not in the table was at 304 Polk Street which was approved but not built yet. Mr. Johnson added that most of the garages in Oakwood vary in size, and the garage proposed for this site is not obtrusive in its proposed location and he believed it to be a great addition to the house. Mr. Johnson also added the project has been through the design review advisory committee.

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Thiem inquired about the two staked flags he observed on the site, asking if they were identifying the corners of the proposed garage. Mr. Johnson responded that they were and that the footprint was moved so it sits 9 feet off the back lot line.

Mr. Smith inquired about whether the mulberry tree was being trimmed or taken down. Mr. Johnson stated it is being trimmed as they do not want to take the tree down.

Mr. Davis noted that the footprint of the proposed garage is not dissimilar to two other historic garages. Mr. Johnson stated there is one on Polk Street and another on Bloodworth Street and the outside stairs enlarge the footprint. Mr. Davis asked if it was a 1½-story garage. Mr. Johnson stated a 2-car garage would be bigger and the proposed garage is within the square footage range of the other Oakwood garages shown in the table.

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

Committee Discussion

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

Some concerns about the size and proportions with the house and lot and it looks like it fits well and is subservient to the house. [Hinshaw]

It's not just the house but the size of the garage. Most historic garages are 1-story, 1-bay and the mission creep means they've gradually become 1 ½-story, 2-bay. [David]

There are several there already. [Hinshaw]

My concern is about guideline 2.6.6 with the orientation towards the sidestreet and driveway. The orientation does not meet that and the size and scale. Yes, it is a big house and it is not overwhelming the existing house but all these garages are overwhelming the historic character of the districts and if we keep approving them then the next person who comes back will say you approved all of these. We are being overwhelmed by 1 ½-story, 2-car garages. Ashley designed the one at 300 Polk Street and I also voted against that one for the same reasons. [David]

There are two pretty big garages that are in one old picture that you supplied at the corner of Polk and Bloodworth that was a giant barn. [Smith]

That was on the Sanborn map as a dairy barn. [David]

It is out of place but old. [Smith]

The lot size provides the opportunity to reorient the garage and that is unusual for the neighborhood but it is a special thing. The location seems to be the most congruent spot relative to the impact of the structure on the streetscape and in either direction with the orientation of the doors. [Hinshaw]

Yes, but we come back to the concern that the garage was moved away from the house when architecturally it's connected to the next door neighbor who has that kind of garage. We are seeing a trend where the accessory structures are larger than the adjacent primary structures. The incongruent relationship to the scale of buildings is my concern. I appreciate the comment about the flags and the impact to the neighbors felt more like a mediated relationship. I also appreciate the staff comments about the recommendations for a tree plan. One other thing I am concerned with is the massing of the building. We do not deal with the interior but the larger dormer sheds on either side increase the massing of the building and this building is beginning to approach a 2-story. I am not sure how I would address the issue of the orientation to have the doors line up with the driveway which brings it closer to north Bloodworth Street. It would provide some insight in regard to garage doors and where they face when it becomes an issue. I heard good discussion earlier about garage doors visible from the street. [Thiem]

I have some concerns about the orientation. Even though they are somewhat downhill it is visible from Bloodworth but they must have closed off that driveway to go right up to where the garage doors are visible. They do however meet the guidelines about material and construction but I can probably get over the orientation because of the other things. [Davis]

If it was to come closer down the massing would stay the same. [Thiem]

If you brought it closer to Bloodworth you would have to reorient it and it would become a lot bigger than where it is now and it is more subtle where it is. [Hinshaw]

You brought up a good point that it is closer to the neighbor's house than other 1 ½ story garages. [Davis]

I want to reflect on that comment in regard to the two trends with 1-car garages going to 2-car garages and being larger mass in footprint. The other piece is looking for additional space above. To some extent these structures need to take on another name. This isn't a garage. [Thiem]

Perhaps accessory structures. [Davis]

The trend is these becoming occupied structures. What we want to regulate is the challenge about the massing of the building that is touching the limit of what is an acceptable size structure within the context of the neighborhood. I appreciate the comments about the orientation but it may not be necessary to have one element of the guidelines and cite the conditions. I feel the orientation is an appropriate response to allow it to have a garage and to have the garage doors face east versus south. [Thiem]

The guidelines that you are working with is titled garages and accessory structures I just wanted to make sure you were clear. [Tully]

I agree with you Don. We approve things that do not quite meet every piece but it meets the important parts. The orientation, where it is on the lot, the materials. [Smith]

The size is what we have been approving more and more of and the more I see of these it's been a mistake to approve them. I think we have been making a mistake by approving these. [David]

If you look more through Oakwood and Boylan Heights there are not many accessory structures of that size and the more we add the more we change the character. [Davis]

We all walk around Oakwood a lot. How often do you really notice them? You notice the house but not really the accessory structure and usually they are located in the rear of the yard. [Hinshaw]

If this were a small lot I would be in keeping with what Sarah offered, but in the findings of fact we can state the site is larger than typical for the neighborhood and the location is what we would have to do with proximity of location to adjacent structures. If the next step is a 3-car garage and finding a way to remove the stairs to have a smaller footprint would be better to remove the upstairs structures. We are going to have to struggle with the number of applicants that are going to be dealing with the context of site challenges for approval. [Thiem]

I do not have a vision of what will happen in the future but anyone who sits on this committee would probably be appalled at the prospect of a 3-car garage. [Hinshaw]

We have an urban residential area that predates cars. The more we approve them the more we will be asked to approve. What about the existing shed? [David]

We do not know if it is historic or not so we can waive the 365-day delay. [Davis]

Does the period of significance end in 1930? [Hinshaw]

We have been using 1932 but formally no exact number. [Tully]

There is enough doubt about its age and origin. We got a lot of variety of ideas about it. If it was original it's hard to tell from looking at it. [Smith]

I would agree in absence of anything definitive we would proceed as if it is not. [Davis]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Mr. Hinshaw 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, 3-9), B. (inclusive of facts 1-5), C. (inclusive of facts 1-5), and D. (inclusive of facts 1-24), to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Demolition of shed is not incongruous in concept; according to Guidelines 2.6.1, 2.6.3, 5.2, paragraph 1, page 62, sections 5.2.2, 5.2.4, 5.2.5, 5.2.6, 5.2.7, and the following facts:
- 1* The shed is rectangular, has a gable metal roof, and has board and batten siding.
 - 2* The 1950 Sanborn Fire Insurance map sites an automotive garage in a similar spot. The applicant does not think the shed is the original garage that the Sanborn map is referring to.
 - 3* An overlay of the estimate of the Sanborn accessory buildings and the current shed is provided.
 - 4* The amended application includes additional explanation regarding the assessment of the date of construction including the materials and construction.
 - 5* The current shed has a framed floor set above grade and the wood used for the structure was possibly from several different sources and periods of time. There are pieces of that look like they may have been part of the original garage, but other pieces are more recent. It has a piecemealed appearance.
 - 6* The brick foundation consists of piers which suggest that the shed was always a shed and not a garage to house a car.
 - 7* COA 148-16-CA delayed demolition of a similar shed at 605 N East Street. Relevant facts from that decision include:
 - a. [It] is a saddle-roofed frame one-car frame garage built in c.1936, to be used by the residents of 605. It is sided in vertical boards. It has been converted to a shed.
 - b. When [605 N East Street] and the property to the north are considered together, the twin duplex buildings and the mirror-image design and layout of the accessory buildings form an ensemble that is significant as a rare surviving example of coordinated multi-parcel development during the Oakwood Historic District's period of significance. The removal of this accessory building will have a negative impact on the development symmetry displayed by these structures on the two parcels, leaving its twin building near the north property line of 609-611 an orphan.
 - c. The accessory building has been altered in its conversion into a shed. The original garage opening in the east façade of the building has been infilled with plywood sheathing and a contemporary 6-panel door. The upper portion of the door has been cut into the original vertical board siding of the accessory building, impacting eight of the original boards that would have to be replaced or patched to restore the historic configuration.
 - 8* Photographs and measured drawings documenting the exterior of the building were not provided.

- B. Trimming trees is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.1, 2.3.3, 2.3.6, 2.3.7, and the following facts:
- 1* The applicant provided a report prepared by arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) that described the necessity of pruning the large mulberry tree due to a weakened attachment point.
 - 2* Additional limbs that are either now dead or growing toward the new garage will be removed from the mulberry. Pruning will be done in accordance with ANSI 300 standards.
 - 3* A hackberry at the back right side of the property will be trimmed and cabled to support it.
 - 4* The garage site was selected with the goal of preserving the existing large trees.
 - 5* A tree protection plan was provided but was not prepared by an arborist certified by ISA.
- C. Alteration of the driveway is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.5.1, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, and the following facts:
- 1* The new portion of the driveway is proposed to be finished with gravel to match the existing portion of the driveway that connects to the curb cut.
 - 2* The new gravel driveway location was selected to avoid compromising significant site features such as the large trees.
 - 3* The existing brick portion of the driveway/patio will be retained.
 - 4* According to Wake County Real Estate data and the application, the lot is 11,761 SF; the current driveway/patio is 1,166 SF; the new driveway area is 1,693 SF. The built area is being increased by 527 SF.
 - 5* A tree protection plan was provided but was not prepared by an arborist certified by ISA.
- D. Construction of a new garage is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.6.6, 2.6.9, and the following facts:
- 1* The garage site was selected with the goal of preserving the existing large trees. A tree protection plan was provided but was not prepared by an arborist certified by ISA. Because the garage sits in the critical root zones the commission typically requires tree protection plans be professionally prepared.
 - 2* According to Wake County Real Estate data and the application, the lot size is 11,761 SF. The footprint of the existing house (including porches) is 2,288 SF; the shed is 176 SF. Current built mass is 21%. The proposed garage is 572 SF. The new built area is approximately 24%. The lot size is atypical for the neighborhood.
 - 3* The house is a 2-story wood sided Neo-Classical home built in 1916 [Inventory of Structures in the Oakwood National Register Historic Districts, by Matthew Brown, former Historian, Society for the Preservation of Historic Oakwood, 2004-2015.]
 - 4* There is not a tradition of 2-story garages houses in Oakwood. Staff is aware of one historic 1-1/2-story horse barn accessory building at the architecturally-elaborate Heck-Pool House at 218 N. East Street.
 - 5* There have been committee-approved exceptions of taller and 2-bay garages. After an initial denial due to lack of evidence, in 2006 a 1½-story, 15' x 17' storage building with loggia and exterior stair was approved at 715 N. Bloodworth Street (COA 166-06-CA).

- 6* New staff analysis: In reviewing 16 new garages built in Oakwood (primarily since 2008), half have been 1-story and half have been 1 ½-story buildings. The tallest 1-story garage is 18' and the tallest 1 ½-story is 22'. Three existing garages are taller than this proposed garage. Of the group examined, only two houses are taller than this house at approximately 45'. The average footprint is 475 square feet, with the smallest being 255 SF and the largest being 656 SF.
- 7* The amended application also includes information about recent approved garages and states that the size of the garage has been created to have the tightest interior garage dimension for a 2 car garage for present day vehicles.
- 8* In 2008, based in part on the 2006 decision referenced in fact 5*, the commission approved a 1½-story, 22'x27' garage at 608 Oakwood Avenue (COA 212-07-CA). That garage was 21'6.5" tall, compared to the 28'2" height of the historic house. The lot sloped towards the rear of the yard helping to visually reduce its mass.
- 9* The proposed new garage is located where an existing outbuilding has historically been located, maintaining the relationship of a secondary building to the historic main structure.
- 10* The grade slopes from Pell Street north towards the side property line.
- 11* The amended application states that the existing site has a perimeter fence of 48"+ in height that encloses the property and in areas has been covered with vegetation making the screening even taller and more dense from the street.
- 12* The proposed garage is 20 feet 10 inches tall.
- 13* Accessory buildings are characteristically subservient to the main dwelling.
- 14* The gable roofed garage is oriented with the garage doors oriented toward Bloodworth Street, the same direction as the house.
- 15* The garage utilizes the existing curb cut and driveway which are located on Pell Street. This orientation requires a larger driveway area in front of the garage to allow for maneuvering vehicles into and out of the building, but allows for retention of the mulberry tree.
- 16* Garages are typically oriented to the street where the driveway enters the site. The gable end of the garage is oriented towards Pell Street.
- 17* The siting for the garage means that the structure is relatively close to the neighboring house at 317 Pell Street. The roof ridge of the garage is lower than the neighboring building; the massing is similar.
- 18* While the scale, proportion and size of window and door openings are appropriate to the district, the placement of the windows and doors on the east elevation creates an unbalanced composition which is not characteristic of the district.
- 19* The proposed garage doors are wood with a row of windows at the top. The panels are oriented horizontally, which is atypical of the district. Detailed specifications are not provided.
- 20* Smooth-faced southern yellow pine siding with a 4 ½" exposure is proposed. The wood trim will be painted to match the main house.
- 21* The roofing proposed is architectural asphalt shingles. Detailed specifications are not provided.
- 22* The proposed garage is offset nine feet from the property line, more than is required by code.

- 23* The garage has been sited at the north edge of the property to minimize its height.
24* The lot is larger than typical lots in the neighborhood relative to the structures.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That photographs and measured drawings documenting the shed be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard.
2. That the garage door panels not be oriented horizontally.
3. That the locations of the windows on the east façade be revised to either be centered on the wall or over the garage doors.
4. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard:
 - a. A tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the ISA that also includes a professional assessment on the type of foundation would best preserve the trees;
 - b. Windows;
 - c. East elevation per condition 3.
5. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. Roof material;
 - b. Doors;
 - c. Garage doors;
 - d. Lighting.

Mr. Smith agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 4/1 (Ms. David opposed).

Committee members voting: David, Davis, Hinshaw, Thiem, Smith.

Certificate expiration date: 9/23/17.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

022-17-CA MULTIPLE IN MOORE AND CAPITOL SQUARE RIGHTS-OF-WAY
Applicant: CITY OF RALEIGH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Received: 2/3/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 5/4/2017 1) 3/23/2017 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: CAPITOL SQUARE AND MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICTS

Zoning: General HOD

Nature of Project: Programmatic COA to replace existing high-pressure sodium (HPS) teardrop style street light fixtures with new light emitting diode teardrop style light fixtures.

Amendments: A color temperature chart of Kelvin (K) values has been provided by staff and is attached.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- Cases referenced in the staff report are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.1	Public Rights-of-Way and Alleys	Replace existing high-pressure sodium teardrop style street light fixtures with new light emitting diode teardrop style light fixtures
2.7	Lighting	Replace existing high-pressure sodium teardrop style street light fixtures with new light emitting diode teardrop style light fixtures

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Melissa Robb [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report. Ms. Robb stated these were multiple right-of-way fixtures in both districts and there are a few lights outside of the districts. Ms. Robb showed pictures of the existing light fixtures and the new proposed ones. Staff recommended approval with the condition that the lamp provided be the same temperature as other lights.

Support:

Mr. Hunt Choi [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Choi stated he was representing the City for both applications and asked 022-17-CA be heard at the same time as 023-17-CA since they have the same issues. Mr. Choi passed out notebooks for the City's presentation including exhibits and an affidavit of Mr. Dustin Brice's testimony in the interest of saving time. Mr. Choi stated he deliberately chose government publications and documents and photographs for the notebooks, and wanted to admit the evidence in notebooks to the

committee. Mr. Rasberry advised that Mr. Choi was an experienced litigator and it was up to the committee to accept the notebooks as evidence. Ms. Lauer stated if the committee continues to receive affidavits they must be prepared to treat them all the same. Mr. Davis pointed out that the committee always asked the person to be there for consistency. Mr. Choi replied it was merely to expedite things.

Mr. Choi gave an overview of the history of the lights in the area. The current lights are made of the old high-pressure sodium (HPS) and are maintained by Duke Energy Progress and the lease has been up for some time. The lease commitment is lengthy at 20 years. In late 2016, Mr. Choi stated Duke could not find replacements for the current equipment which is why the application is in front of the committee. The problem is a combination of deteriorating equipment as well as replacement of the bulbs being a burden. Mr. Choi pointed out that Duke, as a regulated utility, is limited in what they can provide so this is a viable alternative. The HPS technology is at the precipice of obsolescence. HPS fixtures require ballasts to regulate the energy, in addition to the lamps themselves. The LED lights are at the forefront of technology and require less maintenance and cost so the City wishes to move forward with replacing these lights. The proposal is for the existing poles to be refurbished and the fixtures to be replaced with a replica of a historic cast iron style with tear drop fixtures.

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Hinshaw stated the only thing the committee is concerned with is the color temperature and the shape. Mr. Choi responded that all that was available was 4000 Kelvin (K) bulbs but other things could be looked into. Mr. Choi pointed out that in looking at the proposed design guidelines update for the commission, these new fixtures move towards what the commission is moving towards. Mr. Choi acknowledged that the 2001 guidelines stated that the HPS lights had a warmer temperature.

Mr. Davis asked if the tear drop fixtures were available. Mr. Choi responded that they were.

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

Committee Discussion

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

This form of lights is fine for LEDs. [Davis]

In the past our problem was the color temperature. [Davis]

What are the measurements we have for this color temperature? [Hinshaw]

Does it make a difference if this is in a commercial area versus the earlier conversation in a residential area? [David]

The difference is the light at night. [Smith]

Because people were not accustomed to the very bright white light and they need to get accustomed to something different. [Hinshaw]

This is in a commercial setting. [David]

Would it be preferable? [Hinshaw]

Basically this is to keep the fixtures but we have there so we would keep the appearance, but at night the LED light is brighter. A lot of people wonder if the other fixtures in town are too bright and I do not know if we came to that conclusion before. [Smith]

In the Oakwood discussion the preference was for a 3000 Kelvin temperature. [David]

I would recommend what staff stated. [Smith]

We can reopen this if we are basically denying the application. [Davis]

They provided you with a lot of information. You have to decide this technical feasibility question, which may or may not be appropriate to consider in this case when looking at another substitute material. The lamp not suggesting one way or another. [Tully]

I went and looked at other historic developments and 3000 Kelvin is not an unusual requirement. Someone is providing 3000 Kelvin lamps, and teardrops are now available when we were told they were not before. [Davis]

Ms. David made a motion to reopen the public hearing portion of the hearing; Mr. Hinshaw seconded; motion carried 5/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Mr. Choi addressed the color temperature issue, stating the LEDs are whiter. Duke does not now have the option of a warmer color. The disparity of the two colors is the issue. At the State Capitol the lamps have been switched over in the center of the district. The yellow is no longer ubiquitous. Some of the streets in the six block radius have the new lamps, creating a patchwork which is more incongruent. The patchwork will get worse over time and safety is an issue.

Mr. Hinshaw made a motion to close the public hearing portion of the hearing; Mr. Smith seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Committee Discussion (2)

Should we defer? [Davis]

Should approve if we are already using 4000 Kelvin in not primarily residential areas? [Hinshaw]

What was the case in Oakwood about? [Smith]

It was not the LED bulbs it was the fixtures. The one thing we did at the time is the City provided us with one or two neighborhoods to go look at the 4000 Kelvin in commercial districts at night. Duke's stranglehold is not in the guidelines. [David]

In mentioning the UDO there is a provision regarding unreasonable hardship and I would advise against ignoring this. This issue is with the availability and the burden is a possibility and that code provision requires you to take that into consideration. [Rasberry]

Whatever decision is made will come back into the residential discussion later. [David]
The fixtures on Hillsborough are approvable at the height and type. The two guidelines we struggle with are about the color of the light. I can deal with the color of the fixture and type and height of the poles are good. I thought they looked good. [Smith]
I understand that the appearance of white light is harsher and there is a disconnect in having this. The temperature and brightness are two different elements. I understand one of the criteria in determining light levels are foot candles. At the street level does it have anything to do with the temperature of daylight? I am guessing the question is I do not understand changing these lights out on the grounds of the application with the character. I question myself with the modification to change the temperature but reduce the brightness. [Thiem]
LEDs do not have a ballast. [Davis]
Can they change the intensity? [Thiem]
Once they have the 4000 K you cannot put a dimmer switch on. [Davis]
We can take some time to go get a look at it yourself and see. That is the best way to judge it. [David]
I recall from the last hearing researching they do come in different wattages with a different level of brightness from what they are proposing. I do not know if that is the same. [Tully]
Can we ask if that is an option? [Thiem]

Mr. Thiem made a motion to reopen the public hearing portion of the meeting; Mr. Smith seconded; motion carried 5/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (3)

Mr. Thiem inquired about the various different bulbs. Mr. Choi stated that a range is available, but he's not sure if that is applicable here. Mr. Brice stated there was a 50 watt and a 150 watt, and we currently have a 250 watt, and Duke has stated that the 150 watt is the equivalent as 50 watt is below standards. Mr. Thiem inquired about the temperature issue and Mr. Brice answered there was only the 4000 Kelvin option. Ms. David asked if there were any equivalent lighting that could be looked at for comparison. Mr. Brice stated Fayetteville Street is a viable option. Mr. Thiem also asked if there was a 3000 Kelvin light example and Mr. Brice stated there wasn't any available.

There was discussion about the globe lighting on Fayetteville Street and how the LED lights can be diffused in that light fixture. Ms. Lauer asked if the 50 watt bulb could be used within globe lights, or if a softer wattage could be used. Mr. Brice stated it would have to meet City Council-approved lighting requirements and for post top lights 50 watts is the only option. Ms. David pointed out staff is still looking at 3000 Kelvin alternatives.

Ms. David suggested the committee look at the lighting on Fayetteville Street and request deferral to give the committee more time to look at the binders. Ms. David moved that the case be deferred; Mr. Smith seconded; motion carried 4/0 (Hinshaw abstaining).

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS –CERTIFIED RECORD

023-17-CA MULTIPLE IN HILLSBOROUGH STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY
Applicant: CITY OF RALEIGH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Received: 2/3/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 5/4/2017 1) 3/23/2017 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: CAPITOL SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: General HOD

Nature of Project: Programmatic COA to replace existing decorative high pressure sodium post top-street light fixtures with new light emitting diode (LED) Mitchell style light fixtures.

Amendments: A color temperature chart of Kelvin (K) values has been provided by staff and is attached.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- Cases referenced in the staff report are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.1	Public Rights-of-Way and Alleys	replace existing decorative high pressure sodium
2.7	Lighting	post top-street light fixtures with new light emitting diode Mitchell style light fixtures

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Melissa Robb [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report. Ms. Robb stated these were multiple right-of-way fixtures in both districts and there are a few lights outside of the districts. Ms. Robb showed pictures of the existing light fixtures and the new proposed ones. Staff recommended approval with the condition that the lamp provided be the same temperature as other lights.

Support:

Mr. Hunt Choi [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Choi stated he was representing the City for both applications and asked 022-17-CA be heard at the same time as 023-17-CA since they have the same issues. Mr. Choi passed out notebooks for the City's presentation including exhibits and an affidavit of Mr. Dustin Brice's testimony in the interest of saving time. Mr. Choi stated he deliberately chose government publications and documents and photographs for the notebooks, and wanted to admit the evidence in notebooks to the committee. Mr. Rasberry advised that Mr. Choi was an experienced litigator and it was up to

the committee to accept the notebooks as evidence. Ms. Lauer stated if the committee continues to receive affidavits they must be prepared to treat them all the same. Mr. Davis pointed out that the committee always asked the person to be there for consistency. Mr. Choi replied it was merely to expedite things.

Mr. Choi gave an overview of the history of the lights in the area. The current lights are made of the old high-pressure sodium (HPS) and are maintained by Duke Energy Progress and the lease has been up for some time. The lease commitment is lengthy at 20 years. In late 2016, Mr. Choi stated Duke could not find replacements for the current equipment which is why the application is in front of the committee. The problem is a combination of deteriorating equipment as well as replacement of the bulbs being a burden. Mr. Choi pointed out that Duke, as a regulated utility, is limited in what they can provide so this is a viable alternative. The HPS technology is at the precipice of obsolescence. HPS fixtures require ballasts to regulate the energy, in addition to the lamps themselves. The LED lights are at the forefront of technology and require less maintenance and cost so the City wishes to move forward with replacing these lights. The proposal is for the existing poles to be refurbished and the fixtures to be replaced with a replica of a historic cast iron style with tear drop fixtures.

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Hinshaw stated the only thing the committee is concerned with is the color temperature and the shape. Mr. Choi responded that all that was available was 4000 Kelvin (K) bulbs but other things could be looked into. Mr. Choi pointed out that in looking at the proposed design guidelines update for the commission, these new fixtures move towards what the commission is moving towards. Mr. Choi acknowledged that the 2001 guidelines stated that the HPS lights had a warmer temperature.

Mr. Davis asked if the tear drop fixtures were available. Mr. Choi responded that they were.

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

Committee Discussion

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

This form of lights is fine for LEDs. [Davis]

In the past our problem was the color temperature. [Davis]

What are the measurements we have for this color temperature? [Hinshaw]

Does it make a difference if this is in a commercial area versus the earlier conversation in a residential area? [David]

The difference is the light at night. [Smith]

Because people were not accustomed to the very bright white light and they need to get accustomed to something different. [Hinshaw]

This is in a commercial setting. [David]

Would it be preferable? [Hinshaw]

Basically this is to keep the fixtures but we have there so we would keep the appearance, but at night the LED light is brighter. A lot of people wonder if the other fixtures in town are too bright and I do not know if we came to that conclusion before. [Smith]

In the Oakwood discussion the preference was for a 3000 Kelvin temperature. [David]

I would recommend what staff stated. [Smith]

We can reopen this if we are basically denying the application. [Davis]

They provided you with a lot of information. You have to decide this technical feasibility question, which may or may not be appropriate to consider in this case when looking at another substitute material. The lamp not suggesting one way or another. [Tully]

I went and looked at other historic developments and 3000 Kelvin is not an unusual requirement. Someone is providing 3000 Kelvin lamps, and teardrops are now available when we were told they were not before. [Davis]

Ms. David made a motion to reopen the public hearing portion of the hearing; Mr. Hinshaw seconded; motion carried 5/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Mr. Choi addressed the color temperature issue, stating the LEDs are whiter. Duke does not now have the option of a warmer color. The disparity of the two colors is the issue. At the State Capitol the lamps have been switched over in the center of the district. The yellow is no longer ubiquitous. Some of the streets in the six block radius have the new lamps, creating a patchwork which is more incongruent. The patchwork will get worse over time and safety is an issue.

Mr. Hinshaw made a motion to close the public hearing portion of the hearing; Mr. Smith seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Committee Discussion (2)

Should we defer? [Davis]

Should approve if we are already using 4000 Kelvin in not primarily residential areas? [Hinshaw]

What was the case in Oakwood about? [Smith]

It was not the LED bulbs it was the fixtures. The one thing we did at the time is the City provided us with one or two neighborhoods to go look at the 4000 Kelvin in commercial districts at night. Duke's stranglehold is not in the guidelines. [David]

In mentioning the UDO there is a provision regarding unreasonable hardship and I would advise against ignoring this. This issue is with the availability and the burden is a possibility and that code provision requires you to take that into consideration. [Rasberry]

Whatever decision is made will come back into the residential discussion later. [David]
The fixtures on Hillsborough are approvable at the height and type. The two guidelines we struggle with are about the color of the light. I can deal with the color of the fixture and type and height of the poles are good. I thought they looked good. [Smith]
I understand that the appearance of white light is harsher and there is a disconnect in having this. The temperature and brightness are two different elements. I understand one of the criteria in determining light levels are foot candles. At the street level does it have anything to do with the temperature of daylight? I am guessing the question is I do not understand changing these lights out on the grounds of the application with the character. I question myself with the modification to change the temperature but reduce the brightness. [Thiem]
LEDs do not have a ballast. [Davis]
Can they change the intensity? [Thiem]
Once they have the 4000 K you cannot put a dimmer switch on. [Davis]
We can take some time to go get a look at it yourself and see. That is the best way to judge it. [David]
I recall from the last hearing researching they do come in different wattages with a different level of brightness from what they are proposing. I do not know if that is the same. [Tully]
Can we ask if that is an option? [Thiem]

Mr. Thiem made a motion to reopen the public hearing portion of the meeting; Mr. Smith seconded; motion carried 5/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (3)

Mr. Thiem inquired about the various different bulbs. Mr. Choi stated that a range is available, but he's not sure if that is applicable here. Mr. Brice stated there was a 50 watt and a 150 watt, and we currently have a 250 watt, and Duke has stated that the 150 watt is the equivalent as 50 watt is below standards. Mr. Thiem inquired about the temperature issue and Mr. Brice answered there was only the 4000 Kelvin option. Ms. David asked if there were any equivalent lighting that could be looked at for comparison. Mr. Brice stated Fayetteville Street is a viable option. Mr. Thiem also asked if there was a 3000 Kelvin light example and Mr. Brice stated there wasn't any available.

There was discussion about the globe lighting on Fayetteville Street and how the LED lights can be diffused in that light fixture. Ms. Lauer asked if the 50 watt bulb could be used within globe lights, or if a softer wattage could be used. Mr. Brice stated it would have to meet City Council-approved lighting requirements and for post top lights 50 watts is the only option. Ms. David pointed out staff is still looking at 3000 Kelvin alternatives.

Ms. David suggested the committee look at the lighting on Fayetteville Street and request deferral to give the committee more time to look at the binders. Ms. David moved that the case be deferred; Mr. Smith seconded; motion carried 4/0 (Hinshaw abstaining).

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

033-17-CA 300 BLAKE STREET - RIGHT-OF-WAY
Applicant: MICHAEL HAKAN
Received: 2/22/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 5/23/2017 1) 3/23/2017 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: General HOD

Nature of Project: Widen sidewalk

Amendments: Additional documents were received 3/20/17 and are attached.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- Preservation staff has attended several meetings with other City staff regarding versions of this proposal. The applicant was guided to file the COA application first.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.1	Public Rights-of-Way and Alleys	Widen sidewalk

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report. Ms. Tully showed the proposed section of work and what it currently looks like. Ms. Tully noted that the application included plats from 1914 which had the sidewalks that were proposed to be 7 feet on one side and 8 feet on the other. The applicant wanted 12 feet and staff proposed 8 feet as a work around that would match the other side of the street.

Support:

Mr. Peter Pagano [affirmed] and Mr. Tom Kane [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Pagano stated he wanted to extend the sidewalk as in this particular area of city market because it is difficult to walk in. He wished to make it more pedestrian friendly so that a stroller could get around it and this is a 4 feet section. They want it to match the existing bumpouts.

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Davis inquired as to why 8 feet versus 12. Mr. Pagano stated it could create water issues. Ms. David asked if the applicant was going to use granite curb replacement or use the existing. Mr. Kane said they would keep the existing granite. He also stated that they plan on extending it the full 8 feet to match the existing bumpouts on the street and it will be brick with cement to match what was existing. They wanted to match the void versus leaving it small. Mr. Davis stated the other side has 8 feet and Ms. Tully replied extending it to 12 feet is incongruous in her judgment.

At Mr. Davis' suggestion Mr. Hinshaw moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Mr. Smith seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Committee Discussion

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

I am with staff that the 8 feet would make it match the other side. [Davis]

I agree. [Hinshaw]

One thing I noticed out there that is not addressed here is the drainage issues which runs down to the existing curbage. The drainage has been solved by trench drains that separate the landscape and carry the gutter through the sidewalk. The proposed solution of 12 feet takes care of that water. That trench section would remain in place and you cannot really see it. [Thiem]

The bumpout will cause drainage issues because the drainage issues are caused by the sidewalk? [Davis]

Because you are pushing the side out you have about 4 feet of sidewalk that will drain down to a new curb. [Thiem]

Is that happening on the other side? [Davis]

I did not look at the other. I am curious about the thing staff appropriately has offered the appropriate width of the walk. In my way of looking at it, the question is if a 4 foot indent of road appropriate because a parallel parking space would have an 8 foot width to it. We do not deal with safety but there is a piece about parking space being too small to still be viewed as a parking space. [Thiem]

Not our purview. [David]

If an additional 4 feet remains we have a strip that is potentially incongruent. That is not a normal condition to have a 4 foot strip. I am arguing from a visual consistency standpoint. [Thiem]

Should we match the other side of the street? [Davis]

The bumpout is 8 feet. [David]

To address drainage it is staff's intent to work with other City staff as noted in the condition. [Tully]

The drainage issues can be handled if they are consistent with the materials. My argument has to do with the consistency of the walk and if there is a compromise making the walk consistent and with incongruity with the road. I would support an 8 foot width. The applicant has proposed to curb the edge and leave that edge of the road consistent. [Thiem]

You need to talk about the appropriateness of a 12 foot sidewalk. [Tully]
Otherwise you have 12 foot bumpouts. [Davis]
You rarely see a place with a partial bumpout. [Thiem]
I think the applicant may want the opportunity to defer or discuss another idea. [Tully]

Mr. Smith made a motion to reopen the public hearing portion of the meeting; Mr. Hinshaw seconded; motion carried 5/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Mr. Kane stated that they want to do the 12' width because if there was only a little bit of bumpout left where the tree is then there is no way to drain that trench drain and there would be a pocket of water created. Mr. Kane stated that they are trying to solve the problem of water where the street crowns then it flows on either side. Mr. Davis inquired as to how the trenches work. Mr. Kane stated there are trench drains with bumpouts and one continues down. Mr. Smith asked if the trench cuts through the bumpout. Mr. Kane responded it does.

Mr. Smith made a motion to close the public hearing portion of the meeting; Mr. Hinshaw seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Committee Discussion (2)

The trench drain picks up in the island and the trench drain carries it through. [Thiem]
Were 7 foot sidewalks built? [Davis]
Approximately. This is the only portion that we are aware of that did not get built with the width noted on the plat. [Tully]
Could we deny this the way it is? [Davis]
When we think about the character of the district we are so focused on walking and not about the street. I am saying that whether you go 8 feet or 12 feet, at 12 the road is consistent with other places where the curb is continuous and not consistent for the road to widen a few feet then come back. That is where the dilemma is. Somewhere there are 2 sets of congruencies overlapping and we need to make a call. [Thiem]
The sidewalk would not widen at all. [Davis]
It provides parallel parking. [Thiem]
Arguing it could be kept the same? [Davis]
It could in my judgment. For me it allows greater congruency to allow the sidewalk to go out to the road edge rather than allowing it to go out just 4 feet. [Thiem]
On the plat it is 7 feet wide but it does not have the bumpouts. Looking at the appearance or measurements it is just a straight line down the street. [David]
The 8 foot wide sidewalk sounds congruous regardless of drainage and bumpouts. [Smith]
The sidewalk width is the primary consideration. [Davis]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Mr. Smith moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the evidentiary hearing, the committee finds staff suggested finding A. (inclusive of facts 1-10) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Widening of the sidewalk is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.12, 2.1.13 according to *Guidelines* 2.1.1 and the following facts:
- 1* The proposed change is to the west side of the southern block of Blake Street within the area of the Moore Square Historic District called City Market.
 - 2* The Special Character Essay of the Moore Square Historic District states: "In the southeast corner of the district, the grid of original streets from the 1792 town plat is supplemented by three smaller, narrower streets that were created to serve the 1914 City Market complex. The effect of this system of smaller streets is to create within the district a sub-area of greater intimacy, a finer scale especially suited to pedestrian amenity."
 - 3* The 1913 plat of the "New Market House Site and Proposed Building Sites" was included in the application.
 - 4* Excepting for the 10 foot sidewalks around the Market House Site, the plat notes the following sidewalk widths: 7 feet on Blake Street, 7 feet on Pullen Street (now Wolfe Street), 8 feet on Parham Street, and 12 feet on Blount Street.
 - 5* A 1920 plat of "Part of Kramer Property and Market Block" notes 7 foot wide sidewalks along the southern part of Blake Street and 12 feet on Davie and Blount Streets.
 - 6* The application initially stated it was requesting a change from 4 feet to 8 feet, but was clarified that an increase of 8 feet is requested for a total width of 12 feet.
 - 7* The amended application includes an existing condition plan prepared by a landscape architect registered with the state of North Carolina. These dimensions note the existing sidewalks on Blake Street as being 3'8" wide on the west and 8'6" on the east.
 - 8* The sidewalks in the City Market complex are brick with granite curb. The extension is proposed to match the existing.
 - 9* A section drawing showing the proposal was provided. The existing granite is proposed to be retained and new granite installed at the edge of the new walk.
 - 10* The section of sidewalk proposed to be widened extends 132 feet between two non-historic bump outs. The date of construction of the bump outs is unknown; there is no COA on file.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the sidewalk be widened to no more than 8 feet in total.
2. That revised drawing(s) reflecting condition 1 be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of the blue placard.
3. That details and specifications for the construction be provided to and approved by staff in conjunction with other City review processes.
4. That material samples be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Hinshaw; passed 3/2 (Ms. David, Mr. Thiem opposed).

Committee members voting: David, Davis, Hinshaw, Thiem, Smith.

Certificate expiration date: 9/23/17

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

034-17-CA 608 S BOYLAN AVENUE
Applicant: JORDAN LEWIS
Received: 3/3/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 6/1/2017 1) 3/23/2017 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: GENERAL HOD
Nature of Project: Implement master landscape plan: install new planting beds; add lawn; pave rear drive; alter patio; plant trees, etc.
Amendments: Aerial view provided by staff.
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- There is an outstanding COA application from 8/26/16 that has yet to be resolved for the installation of a new railing on the north side of the front porch.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Implement master landscape plan: install new planting beds; add lawn; plant trees
2.5	Walkways, Driveways and Offstreet Parking	Pave rear drive; install patio

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 different images of the condition of the landscape as well as pictures of the home in aerial view including an alley. There was a small area of gravel parking in the back. Ms. Robb stated staff recommended approval with conditions.

Support:
Mr. Jordan Lewis [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Lewis stated the first picture was when there was new sod that was put in which was not watered properly after installed. He wants to have a nice landscaped area. Mr. Lewis reported he worked with a landscape designer and tried to select materials from around town as well as choosing grass and plants that would thrive in this area.

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Thiem inquired about the plan in the back near the parking pad area, if to the left of it was grass. Mr. Lewis responded that it was grass and the plans is for it to be grass anywhere there are not tree plantings or raised beds. Mr. Thiem inquired about any trees in the backyard. Mr. Lewis stated there was a tree that was just over the property line that fell during the hurricane that is now gone. Mr. Thiem added he was glad the white oak was being kept in the front.

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

Committee Discussion

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

Are we okay with the flagstone? [Smith]

It is in the back so it is fine. [Davis]

Are cement pavers okay for the parking pad? [Smith]

We have approved those before. [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 1-6) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-4), to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Installing new planting beds, adding a lawn and planting trees is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section 2.3.2, 2.3.4, and the following facts:
 - 1* The application states that at the time of purchase the newly planted sod in the yard had died due to lack of maintenance. The landscape plan does not involve the removal of any trees.
 - 2* The yard will be planted with both fescue and zoysia sod, depending on the likely success of thriving in different areas of the yard.
 - 3* Flower beds will be installed against the front porch foundation and in areas that would be unlikely to support grass. The special character essay states, "Foundation plantings are common."
 - 4* A raised garden will be installed on the south edge of the backyard.
 - 5* A variety of trees and shrubs will be planted along the north and south edges of the backyard. Several of the trees are to be crepe myrtles, a common tree in the district.
 - 6* The area in the southwest corner is proposed to be a grass lawn.

- B. Paving the rear drive and installing the patio is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section 2.3.2, 2.3.8, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.7, and the following facts:
- 1* The proposal states that a new patio will be installed at the rear of the house adjacent to the existing deck. The paving material is proposed to be Pennsylvania blue irregular flagstone. Installation details were not provided. Numerous types of natural stone has been approved for use in rear yard patios in Boylan Heights.
 - 2* The same Pennsylvania blue irregular flagstone will be used to create loose pathways from the front of the house to the north side of the house, and from the patio to the rear parking area.
 - 3* The existing gravel parking area will be formalized with the installation of gray concrete pavers. Installation details were not provided.
 - 4* It appears that there will be no tree roots impacted by excavation required for installation of either the patio or the parking area.

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 a motion that the application be approved, with the following conditions:

1. That installation details for the patio and walkway paving material be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard.

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

Committee members voting: David, Davis, Hinshaw, Thiem, Smith.

Certificate expiration date: 9/23/17.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

035-17-CA 11 S BLOUNT STREET
Applicant: CAMPBELL LAW SCHOOL, CAMPBELL UNIVERSITY
Received: 3/6/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 6/4/2017 1) 3/23/2017 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: CAPITOL SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT
Raleigh Historic Landmark: HORTON-BECKHAM-BRETSCH HOUSE
Zoning: General HOD
Nature of Project: Install 36"x22" painted sign on site wall
Conflict of Interest: Mr. Davis does work with one of the charities that partners with the Campbell Law Clinic but stated he could remain impartial.

Staff Notes:

- The Capital Square Historic District was locally designated in 1976.
- Section 2.8 of the *Guidelines* under Things to Consider As You Plan it states “For commercial adaptive uses in a historic district with residential character, small simple signs constructed of traditional sign materials and affixed flush to the body of the building near the front door are considered appropriate. Alternatively, the sign might be applied to the glazing of a storm or front door, as is seen along North Blount Street. For historic institutional uses within predominantly residential districts, simple signs constructed of traditional sign materials should be discreetly located. Small historic plaques and markers are usually mounted near the entrance on the exterior wall in a location where no architectural detail is damaged or concealed.”
- The guidelines do not specifically address mounting signs on site walls.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.8	Signage	Install 36"x22" painted sign on site wall.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report. Ms. Tully stated that a ground sign previously was applied for a few months ago and now what is being proposed is a painted sign adjacent to the sidewalk. The size noted on the pictures is an example. Ms. Tully added that staff was not offering a suggestion.

Support:

Mr. Rich Leonard [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Leonard gave an overview of the history of the Campbell Law Community Clinic and its legal services. He reported that their previous application was denied and they saw this as a reasonable alternative as their clients have a hard time finding their location. Mr. Leonard noted the pictures of the parking lot that had views of the wall and saw the off center sign on the wall as historically appropriate as this is a business operating in what was a residential house. Mr. Leonard pointed out that the colors of the sign were the same as the house. He added that the house shares the intersection with a church, a parking lot, and an abandoned garage. Additionally, he reiterated that other locations were considered.

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

Responses and Questions:

Ms. Tully explained that she had shared a prior COA case at 530 N Blount Street with the applicant. She chose not to include it in the staff report because that request was for a sign on a fence. The fence sign was denied, but a diagonally hanging perch sign was in part due to the 1 way street. Mr. Leonard stated he did think this position was low and inconspicuous enough to get approved. Ms. Leonard added this location also had the least amount of impact on appearance.

At Mr. Davis' suggestion Mr. Hinshaw moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Mr. Thiem seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Committee Discussion

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

The other sign COA was several meetings ago. [David]

This is different. [Davis]

Did we reject on size? [Hinshaw]

It was residential house. I think this is an improvement because it is out of the yard and it is much lower and less disruptive to the landscape. [David]

It sort of strikes me that the guidelines talk about signs attached to houses but would that be stretch to attach to a retaining wall? [Davis]

The retaining wall isn't historic and the house was moved to this location and its position is at the edge of the district. [Smith]

It has a residential character per the special character essay references. [David]

I have the same concerns her as with the garages. Where does it stop? Are we going to open up the potential here for signs that show up in other places? Can the sign be smaller? I wonder if there is a way to identify fit it with just the name without the logo or byline. I am struggling with the way I read the previous case. Although it is in a different location, the same issue comes up. I do not see this as in character with the architecture of the building. [Thiem]

We rejected the sign before because it is a residential building. The problem now is even though it's primarily in a business area we have conflict here with it being residential in character. It is a business in a historic structure. [Hinshaw]

The solution is our preferred guideline which says to attach this to the structure of the house. However, on this house there is that bumpout of the front door. It that does create an exception that we might consider alternatives. This being on the wall does not affect the residential nature as much as the ground sign did. [Davis]

The wall location addresses the problems of interrupting the residential character. [David]

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 1-12) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Installation of 36"x22" painted sign on site wall is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.8.2, 2.8.5, 2.8.6, 2.8.7, 2.8.8 and the following facts:

- 1* The sign is proposed to be mounted near the top of a 37" tall brick retaining wall adjacent to the public sidewalk.
- 2* The ground level of the historic house is at the top of the wall.
- 3* Wood is a traditional material used for signs.
- 4* The text of the sign is simple and easy to read and will be painted using black and the colors of the house.
- 5* The proposed sign does not obstruct or damage any facades or architectural details of the house.
- 6* The Special Character of the Capitol Square Historic District (p. 80-81) of the *Design Guidelines for Raleigh Historic Districts* states:
 - a. "The street pattern is regular, with streets intersecting at right angles as laid out in the original city plan. The one exception is at the east end of the district, where contemporary traffic engineering concerns for one-way traffic patterns led to the curving connection of Morgan Street to New Bern Avenue, creating a cul-de-sac at New Bern Place."
 - b. "The architectural character of the district is largely institutional in nature, dominated by state government buildings and church complexes" and "To the east of the Capitol, however, awaits a surprise of domestic delight unusual in the heart of an urban setting. Owing to the landscape and architectural qualities displayed in the two blocks of New Bern Avenue, this area departs from the strongly institutional character of the rest of the district."
 - c. New Bern Place is called out specifically as being residential in character and having a "calm ambiance of repose in an otherwise bustling downtown scene."
- 7* Since 1982 the house has sat on a .35-acre lot. North of the house is a seven-car paved parking lot, and another paved fourteen-car lot extends to the rear, occupying the remainder

of the parcel. The brick retaining wall is not called out as a character defining or significant feature of the landmark.

- 8* The property sits at the southern boundary of the Capitol Square district immediately adjacent the Moore Square district.
- 9* The properties on the other corners (north and west) of the intersection include a parking lot, a former auto garage rehabbed as a church, and a vacant auto garage and parking lot. To the north of the property are three houses facing New Bern Place including the White-Holman and Montgomery Houses.
- 10* This is the only house facing Blount Street in the district.
- 11* The application includes information regarding the lack of visibility of possible sign locations on the house. It states that the fact that traffic on both of the cross streets of Blount and Morgan are one-way make it difficult to see a sign affixed to the house from either the southbound Blount Street or the eastbound Morgan Street.
- 12* There is no known precedent of mounting a sign on a site wall.
- 13* The projecting front door precludes locating a sign on the house.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Hinshaw; passed 4/1 (Thiem opposed).

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the bolts be mounted into the mortar joints.

Mr. Smith agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 4/1 (Thiem opposed).

Committee members voting: David, Davis, Hinshaw, Thiem, Smith.

Certificate expiration date: 9/23/17.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

036-17-CA 711 S BOYLAN AVENUE
Applicant: ENVISION REAL ESTATE
Received: 3/6/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 6/4/2017 1) 3/23/2017 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: General HOD

Nature of Project: Remove rear addition [after-the-fact]; construct new rear addition; remove front porch enclosure; remove side egress stairs [after-the-fact]; construct rear deck; replace gable end wood shakes; alter windows [after-the-fact].

Amendments: An amended application was received 3/20/17 and is attached.

DRAC: The application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its March 13 meeting. Members in attendance were Curtis Kasefang, Jenny Harper, David Maurer, Dan Becker, and Mary Ruffin Hanbury; also present were John and Jessica Zuck, Martha Lauer, Melissa Robb, and Tania Tully.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

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

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3.1	Wood	replace gable end wood shakes
3.6	Exterior Walls	replace gable end wood shakes
3.7	Windows and Doors	alter windows
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	remove front porch enclosure; remove side egress stairs
4.1	Decks	construct rear deck
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Remove rear addition; construct new rear addition

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report. Ms. Tully showed the proposed amended design of the addition with a lot of different elements. There will be removal of an addition as well as changes to non-historic door. Ms. Tully recommended denial of the removal of the historic windows with the approval of the remainder of the application. She noted that there is evidence that two of the windows are 16 over 1 or 8 over one. The conditions suggested have to do with the assessment of the historic fabric. Ms. Tully also reported the wood shingle siding is

deteriorated and there was no assessment of the condition of that either. The front porch columns were enclosed and the replacements, if needed, would have to match.

Support:

Mr. John Zuch [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Zuch stated most of the improvements on the site were done by the lack of due diligence by previous property owners. Mr. Zuch stated he was a contractor and the house is a Frankenstein house and it was a triplex with an unoccupiable upstairs apartment. Mr. Zuch said that the old porch was enclosed and laundry and bathroom was added and this area was falling off the back of the house. Mr. Zuch stated a lot of the current foundation is deteriorating and has to be reinforced and put back up. Much of the property has deterioration and if the house had not been saved it would have been bulldozed.

Mr. Zuch added he didn't think the addition would negatively affect the property. The addition is to the side and the rear so as to keep a rear yard. The addition is set back and the lot is oddly shaped. The chimney will remain. The porch is also falling apart and needs to be rebuilt. The siding was also questionable. Mr. Zuch said that in his opinion the windows were beyond repair and the second front door would be taken out.

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

Responses and Questions:

Ms. Tully stated with the storm window you could not tell what the light pattern was. Ms. David pointed out the size of the windows and asked if Mr. Zuch remembered what the previous windows were. Mr. Zuch stated they had been more of a square pattern.

Mr. Smith inquired about a portion of the house in the front near the enclosed front porch and what a gap looked like that was a rectangle chopped into the wall. Mr. Zuch stated that was all of the front porch that was enclosed and he believed that was siding and part of the railing that has since fallen off.

In response to Ms. David, Mr. Zuch said that the windows were gone. Ms. David inquired if there was information on the National Register nomination of the property showing the windows. Ms. Tully stated if the committee went with that route to deny the windows the applicant can work with staff to find appropriate ones.

Ms. David asked if there were any existing porch columns or other railings. Mr. Zuch answered that the material used on the existing rail was finger jointed baseboard that was placed upside down. Mr. Zuch added he is also getting rid of the floor.

Mr. Thiem wanted to ask where the site plan was for the addition. Mr. Zuch stated there was one and distributed one to the committee. Mr. Thiem asked how far was the distance of the corner of the new addition to the back property line. Mr. Zuch stated it was about 10 feet.

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

Committee Discussion

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

The proximity to lot lines towards the front of street and the backyard is what struck me in this instance. This is getting really close to the property line and we have not seen a situation like this. [Thiem]

In Boylan heights we see it occasionally with small lot sizes and unusual lot size. Examples are at the corner of Cutler Street and Montford. The lots are squashed in a corner and the additions got closer due to the small nature of the lots. It's up to you to make a decision based on the specific situation. This is a wedge shaped lot. [Tully]

It is due to the curvy shape of the streets. [Davis]

Regarding the side windows, Mr. Zuch sent additional emails that does propose keeping the sizes that staff is suggesting in the comments. [Tully]

Do we see houses that are 6 feet near the line? [Davis]

Is this lot as deep as normal lots? [Thiem]

Normal rectangular lots are deeper than this. [Davis]

The square footage is the same. [Hinshaw]

The addition is set back far enough to be unobtrusive and meet the Guidelines. There are not enough details on the materials. 6/6 windows are not appropriate. [Davis]

What are more typical window patterns? [Hinshaw]

A bungalow will have a 3/1 or 4/1 even sometimes. This house seems to have had 16/1. [Tully]

What about the removal of the porch enclosure? [Davis]

That was not original. [Hinshaw]

The 6b revised elevation of the light patterns? [Davis]

Mr. Smith made a motion to reopen the public hearing portion of the meeting; Mr. Hinshaw seconded; motion carried 5/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY(2)

Mr. Zuch stated he is not putting a kitchen in the area where the kitchen was and he was adjusting those to err on the side of caution. Ms. David suggested putting a pocket behind the cabinet. Ms. Tully stated she has seen approval of the shortening of double hung windows towards the rear, but this is high profile and character defining. Mr. Zuch inquired about blacking out the windows. Ms. David stated some people do black out their windows and Ms. Tully added it's appropriate to match each window to the character. Mr. Zuch stated he can't pull permits. Ms. Tully stated those were separate issues.

Ms. Davis inquired about the chimney. Mr. Zuch stated the chimney comes in the master bedroom and it would just be removal of the flue. Ms. David stated it was not character defining and we can approve removal.

Ms. David noted that the existing condition drawings are not accurate.

Mr. Hinshaw moved to close the public hearing portion of the meeting; Mr. Smith seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Mr. Hinshaw moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the evidentiary hearing, the committee finds staff suggested finding A. (inclusive of facts 1-13), B. (inclusive of facts 1), C. (inclusive of facts 1-7), D. (inclusive of facts 1-5) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Removal of rear addition; removal of rear chimney, construction of new rear/side addition, construction of rear deck is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.5.7, 4.1.1, 4.1.3, 4.1.5, 4.2.1, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 7.2.8, 4.2.9, and the following facts:
 - 1* The Boylan Heights designation report describes the house as a "ca.1925 One-story Bungalow; gable is perpendicular to the street with intersecting gable/dormer centered over entry."
 - 2* Based on Google Streetview images and Wake County Real Estate Data the rear addition proposed for removal appears to be an enclosed rear porch as well as a rear deck and open porch.
 - 3* The cross-gable rectangular form portion of the addition is a traditional way of adding onto a house. The roof pitch matches the historic house.
 - 4* The proposed addition is at the rear of the house and extends 13'4" to the left (north) of the existing bumpout. The front façade of the historic house is 31' wide and the existing bumpout extends 4' north.
 - 5* The side addition sits 38' back from the front of the engaged porch and 31' back from the front wall of the house.
 - 6* A small rear deck is proposed for the inside corner at the rear of the addition.
 - 7* The large tree visible in images from February and March 2016 is no longer extant. It is unknown when it was removed.
 - 8* There are trees on adjacent property that may be impacted by construction activity. A tree protection plan was not provided.
 - 9* The lot, while similar in size to others along S Boylan Avenue is trapezoidal in shape.
 - 10* According to Wake County Real Estate data and the application, the lot size is 6,970 SF. The footprint of the existing house (including porches and deck) is 1,768 SF. Current built mass is 25%. The proposed addition is 1,088 SF; the portion removed is 420 SF for an increase of 688 SF. The new built mass is approximately 35%.

- 11* A pair of double-hung windows is proposed on the front of the addition. This historic house has at least one pair of double-hung windows. None of the existing windows on the house are 6/6 as proposed in the addition.
- 12* The drawings show pork-chop eaves on the historic house and the addition. The drawings do not reflect the actual eave condition. The south east corner of the bumpout has a sloped eave with exposed rafters.
- 13* The addition proposes fiber cement siding. The commission has approved the use of smooth faced fiber cement siding on rear additions when not abutting historic wood siding in the same plane.
- 14* The rear chimney will be removed; the other chimney will remain.
- 15* There was an additional site plan submitted by the applicant that showed the of the corner of the new addition as approximately 10 feet from the back property line.

B. Replacement of gable end wood shakes is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.6.2, 3.6.5, 3.6.6; however removal of siding material that is not deteriorated beyond repair is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.6.6, and the following facts:

- 1* No evidence was provided in the application that the entirety of the wood shingle siding is deteriorated beyond repair.

C. Removal of front porch enclosure; removal of side egress stairs is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.7.7, 3.8.1, 3.8.4, 3.8.7, 3.8.8, and the following facts:

- 1* The side egress stair is not historic.
- 2* The date of the enclosure of the front porch is unknown; however based on its construction it is a later addition.
- 3* The application drawings note a new column to match the existing; however the drawings are not an accurate representation of the existing columns.
- 4* A new window and wall matching the adjacent is proposed. Trim details were provided. Details and specifications for the new window were not.
- 5* The casing and sills for the historic window opening remain. The sills are thick and extend beyond the casing. The trim on the new window should match this condition.
- 6* The porch railing is proposed to be removed. Historically railings were low – approximately 24". The existing railing appears to be 30" to 36" high.
- 7* In the drawings it appears as though the wood columns incorporated into the porch enclosure are proposed to be replaced. Evidence was not provided that they are deteriorated beyond repair.

D. Alteration of windows and doors is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.7.1; however removal of historic windows and openings on character defining façades is incongruous according to *Guideline* 3.7.13, and replacement of windows that are not deteriorated beyond repair is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.7.4, 3.7.5, 3.7.9, and the following facts:

- 1* The second level door proposed for removal is not historic.

- 2* Based on Google Streetview images from 2016 some of the historic windows were wood double hung sash with multiple lights over 1 including 16/1 and 8/1.
- 3* No evidence was provided in the application that the windows are deteriorated beyond repair.
- 4* The application shows all windows new and existing as 6/6.
- 5* The application was amended to maintain the two forward most windows and openings the windows on the On the south façade, are proposed to be removed and replaced with two small horizontal windows placed near the top of the wall. This window size and configuration is not seen in this location on historic houses in Boylan Heights.

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

Decision on the Application

Mr. Smith made a motion that the application be denied in part and approved in part.

Replacement of the historic wood windows is denied.

The remainder of the application is approved as amended with the following conditions:

1. That only the deteriorated portions of the shingles be replaced in kind and that the new shingles match the original in design, dimension, detail, texture, pattern, color, and material with the new shingles to be provided to and approved by staff prior to removal of the existing shingles.
2. That should a contractor/craftsman with experience rehabilitating historic buildings provide evidence that more than 50% of the shingles are deteriorated beyond repair on any given side the entire side may be replaced provided that:
 - a. The condition assessment be provided to and approved by staff;
 - b. That the new shingles match the original in design, dimension, detail, texture, pattern, color, and material;
 - c. That the new shingles be provided to and approved by staff prior to removal of the existing shingles.
3. That the porch columns be retained unless determined by staff to be deteriorated beyond repair. If the applicant disagrees with staff's assessment then an assessment made by a contractor/craftsman with experience rehabilitating historic buildings be provided to and approved by staff.
4. That the windows in the addition not be 6/6, but be changed with 1/1 or some number/1.
5. That the eaves of the addition have an open sloped soffit similar to the rear of the bumpout – either with or without exposed rafter tails.
6. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of the blue placard:
 - a. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan.
 - b. Revised elevations reflecting accurate shingles locations, the true light pattern of the existing windows, and condition 4 above.

- c. Eave construction;
 - d. New windows.
7. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
- a. Doors;
 - b. Deck stairs;
 - c. Smooth faced fiber cement siding;
 - d. New column (if needed) construction either through detailed drawings or photographic and dimensional documentation of the existing columns.
 - e. New window at former porch enclosure location.
 - f. Revised casing and sill detail for the new window at former porch enclosure location.

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

Committee members voting: David, Davis, Hinshaw, Thiem, Smith.

Certificate expiration date: 9/23/17.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

037-17-CA 506 N BOUNDARY STREET
Applicant: TACTILE WORKSHOP
Received: 3/6/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 6/4/2017 1) 3/23/2017 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: General HOD

Nature of Project: Construct 2nd level addition; construct rear deck

Amendments: Additional evidence was received 3/20/17 and is attached.

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its March 13 meeting. Members in attendance were Curtis Kasefang, Jenny Harper, Dan Becker, and Mary Ruffin Hanbury; also present were Courtney Evans, Sam Adams, Martha Lauer, Tania Tully, and Melissa Robb.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.3	Site Features and Setting	Alter concrete walkway; demolish retaining wall
4.1	Decks	Construct new deck
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Construct 2 nd level 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. Ms. Robb stated there was supplemental information provided. The small brick retaining wall in the backyard will be coming down. Ms. Robb stated staff recommended denying the second story addition and approving the remainder of the application.

Support:

Mr. Sam Adams [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Adams stated this was a thorough application and they were taking several examples from different properties in the district. Mr. Adams added the house was built in 1954 and is a non-contributing structure. The plan is the removal of the shed roof over the front porch and the gable roof adjacent to the porch, and to add a second story to expand the square footage to make it more functional for the owners.

Mr. Graham Stone [affirmed] stated they are trying to make the house fit in with the context of the neighborhood. The roof will not have the same flat dormer style addition that was seen on Boundary and Bloodworth as well as Euclid. Mr. Stone added they are trying to do their due diligence and the houses on either side of them are taller so they do not believe this 2-story addition is out of character.

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Adams stated you can see there is no clear visibility from the street as the lot is on a hill. There are not a lot of vantage points where it would be seen, only if you are looking from the right. It would be foreshortened.

Ms. David asked if it was a pop-up vs. a dormer. Mr. Adams answered it is a conceptual dormer, and that they added roof overhangs that you see typically in bungalow type houses. Mr. Davis added that in fact those are dormers, and asked if there was another example of a second story flat roof addition. Mr. Adams stated these additions are visible from the street and he did not know if they would be okay.

Mr. Hinshaw asked about removing the chimney. Mr. Adams stated the one with the flue will remain.

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

Committee Discussion

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

It is a minimal traditional house. [David]

The question is not whether this is a contributing structure or not but rather the removal of the gable on the existing house in that context. [Thiem]

I can speak to the type of house this is. It is a prototypical, low-pitched roof, minimal traditional with flush gable ends and a low gable coming forward. It's an excellent example of its type. Oakwood is a pre-war neighborhood and this house is post-war and taking the gable off, I do not think we have done that before and we have not changed roof lines that dramatically. This is radically changing the house. [David]

It is not a bungalow. It looks like it is trying to become a totally different house and just looking at it I could not understand the intent. [Thiem]

I am conflicted. This is a 50s modernist house in Oakwood. This is a dramatic change of character of a house, and how it fits with guidelines 4.2. Additions to Historic Buildings. [Hinshaw]

Guidelines 4.2.1 – 4.2.8 address changing the character-defining aspects of the house with the gable, and this low flat roof changes the overall character. [Davis]

We have approved 2-story additions. They just have not come over the ridge like this. [David]

There is a way to do it, but just not this. [Smith]

4.2.1 does not differentiate if this is a contributing or non-contributing structure. We are focused on modifications to additions. [Thiem]

Guidelines for additions are more towards the back of the property. [Davis]

How many applications have been like this? [Hinshaw]

There is several of these around, but they are just scattered. [Smith]

In the 600 block of North Boundary there is new construction that totally transformed the house in 2012. I have to look at it. It was not treated as an addition but as new construction. I do not remember if it was the same era or not but it did not have a front gable. [Tully]

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 1-7) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-15), to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Altering concrete walkway; demolishing retaining wall , constructing a new deck is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.5, 4.1.7, and 4.1.8; and the following facts:
- 1* Stone paver walks are not uncommon in rear yards in Oakwood. Installation and material details were not provided.
 - 2* Details on the regrading after removal of the brick wall were not included.
 - 3* The proposed new deck will span most of the back of the house and will be built over an existing hardscape patio.
 - 4* Detailed drawings of the deck were not provided with the application. It is unclear if any railings are to be constructed. Materials and finishes were not provided.
 - 5* The existing concrete walkway off the back of the house is proposed to be removed and replaced with stone pavers. Materials were not specified, nor were samples provided.
 - 6* The 4" brick retaining wall will be removed and the backyard regraded.
 - 7* There are no existing trees on the site.
- B. Constructing a 2nd level addition is incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 4.2.1, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, and 4.2.8, and the following facts:
- 1* The house is a non-contributing structure in the Oakwood HOD. It's minimal traditional in style and was built in 1954. The main body is a low-pitched side gable roof, with a projecting gable front on the left side of the front elevation. A small porch extends from the gable extension to the right side of the house.
 - 2* The proposed addition is roughly 560 SF. The existing house measures 1,108 SF.
 - 3* The low-slope shed roof form of the addition projects above the existing roof ridge by 2 ½'. The new roof height will be 18 ½'. While it is called a dormer in the application, it does not function like a dormer since it involves the removal of the entire central portion of the roof ridge and spans both sides of the ridge from front to back.

- 4* The adjacent house to the east at 509 N. Boundary Street has a roof ridge at 22', while the house to the west at 565 N. East Street has a roof ridge at 30'.
- 5* The front wall of the second story sits just forward of the roof ridge. The new addition will be clearly visible from the street rather than being in an inconspicuous location.
- 6* The projecting gable on the first story of the front elevation will be removed.
- 7* The new front and rear eaves will extend 12".
- 8* The shed roof will be finished with a click lock standing seam metal roof in slate gray.
- 9* The gutters will be removed.
- 10* The addition will be clad with a smooth cementitious siding with a 4" reveal. The rear elevation will include bands of 4" wood shiplap siding.
- 11* The corner boards will be 4" wide using the same material. Windows will be trimmed with 2" cementitious boards. The siding and trim on the existing house will not be altered.
- 12* Site Line Jeldwen windows will be nearly square in design (2'-6" x 2') according to the drawings, aluminum clad wood. This form of window is not usually found in the district. The rear elevation will include a grouping of four vertical windows measuring 2'-6" x 4'.
- 13* Paint colors were provided.
- 14* The front door will be moved to the left a few feet from its original location.
- 15* The central chimney will be removed.

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

Decision on the Application

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Mr. Thiem and seconded by Mr. Smith, Mr. Thiem made a motion that the application be approved as amended, with the addition denied and 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. Detailed drawings of the deck, including materials and finishes.
 - b. Material and installation of stone walkway.
 - c. Grading.

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

Committee members voting: David, Davis, Hinshaw, Thiem, Smith.

Certificate expiration date: 9/23/17.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

038-17-CA 233 S WILMINGTON STREET
Applicant: CITY OF RALEIGH
Received: 3/8/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 6/6/2017 1) 3/23/2017 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: General HOD

Nature of Project: Install video displays on new bus shelter canopy structures within the GoRaleigh Station.

Amendments: Additional documentation was provided 3/20/17 and is attached.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- COAs mentioned are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.1	Public Rights-of-Way and Alleys	Install video displays on new bus shelter canopy
2.8	Signage	structures within the GoRaleigh Station.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report. Ms. Tully stated the alterations were for the GoRaleigh Station and the proposal is for video displays. The colors were already being used and the attorney was present for any additional explanations. Ms. Tully stated staff recommended approval.

Support:

Ms. Dottie Leapley [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Suggested findings-of-fact were distributed to the committee. Ms. Leapley stated she was there to give any additional information and that they agree with staff recommendations. Ms. Leapley added the project manager and transit official as well as the architect were there to answer any additional questions.

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

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

Committee Discussion

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

The interior is not really a big deal so we can make exceptions for things. [Davis]

The intent is adding to a public facility that needs to be available in a useful way. Basically it's all internal and the Moore Square Go Transit station is not really historic. [Hinshaw]

Are there any facts from Ms. Leapley's hand out of proposed findings that should be added? [Tully]

Fact 8, the city added to entire staff recommendation it is probably less driving than the decisions. [Davis]

Add city finding 8 over to staff. [Thiem]

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 1-7) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Installation of video displays on new bus shelter canopy structures within the GoRaleigh Station is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.1.6, 2.8.2, 2.8.3, 2.8.5, 2.8.7, 2.8.10, and the following facts:
 - 1* 29 displays are proposed within the bus station facility and will be mounted so as to be nestled within the bus shelter canopies.
 - 2* The 39"x23" displays are proposed to be mounted at least 9' above the sidewalk and angled downward. The units proposed along Hargett and Martin Streets would face inward towards the facility so as to limit visibility from outside the station.
 - 3* The displays will convey real time information to bus patrons.
 - 4* Historically, most signs in the districts indicated particular business or building names. The proposed video displays are a more modern concept, intended to help users navigate to the appropriate location within the bus station.
 - 5* In 2007 the committee approved fiberglass signage for the downtown wayfinding system (124-07-CA) in part because the non-traditional material of fiberglass would be housed within a body of a traditional material (metal) and allowed for durability of detailed graphics on sign types that have no close historic precedents but considered necessary for modern pedestrian navigation purposes.
 - 6* Fact B.2. of COA 124-07-CA stated that "When the design guidelines were being formulated, the intent of these provisions was to prohibit the use of modern commercial-standard internally-lit translucent-colored plastic box signs or colored translucent awning material that would create an expanse of glowing material using an internal light source to project images outward toward the eye. The green "P" of the proposed public parking signs is made of fiberglass to allow internal illumination, and the parking deck information signs are proposed to have changeable LED parking message panels to indicate parking availability. Additionally, the pedestrian map kiosks are proposed to be internally

illuminated and have an optional illuminated blue "I" lantern. The illuminated "P," "I," and LED message panels are smaller than the colored plastic box signs or translucent awnings that the design guidelines seek to prohibit. These changeable information elements of the signs may be compared to the historic precedent of neon "vacancy/no vacancy" signage for hotels and motels."

- 7* The proposed video displays may be compared to the historic precedent of changeable type signs.
- 8* Given their function and purpose, the displays are located unobtrusively, which is consistent with Guideline 2.3.9. The majority of the displays are located inside the Station beneath the parking deck and are not visible from any right-of-way. Interior features are not subject to Commission review. As previously determined by the Commission in granting Certificate of Appropriateness 125-15-CA, the Station's interior is in the middle of the block and has been traditionally used as a utilitarian space.

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

Decision on the Application

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

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

Committee members voting: David, Davis, Hinshaw, Thiem, Smith.

Certificate expiration date: 9/23/17.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

040-17-CA 529 EUCLID STREET
Applicant: LOUIS PASCUCCI
Received: 3/9/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 6/7/2017 1) 3/23/2017 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: General HOD

Nature of Project: Construct rear addition; construct rear deck

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its March 13 meeting. Members in attendance were Curtis Kasefang, Jenny Harper, David Maurer, Dan Becker, and Mary Ruffin Hanbury; also present were Louis Pascucci, Martha Lauer, Tania Tully, and Melissa Robb.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
4.1	Decks	Construct new deck
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Construct rear 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. Ms. Robb stated staff recommended approval with conditions.

Support:

Mr. Louis Pascucci [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Pascucci stated the addition was due to his wife expecting a baby. They would like a new room at the back with the same siding. They will be copying the front roof line and putting a deck on to even it out in the back.

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Davis pointed out that a lot of additions are set in by 6 inches from the main body of the house to distinguish it. Ms. Lauer stated there is a piece of vertical trim that marks that line and with a traditional addition it has been approved. Mr. Smith added it is usually just scooted in a little bit.

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

Committee Discussion

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

It's a straightforward application. [David]

Is everyone okay with the addition not being inset? Is it sufficient differentiation between the house and the addition? [Davis]

It's not uncommon for an addition to be demarcated by the use of vertical trim. [Robb]

The trim piece is subservient. [David]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Mr. Smith 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) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-10), to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Construction of a new deck is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.5, 4.1.7, 4.1.8, and the following facts:

- 1* The applicant proposes constructing a deck located on the northwest corner of the house in the rear yard. The only exterior element in the rear of the house now is a wood stair leading from the small rear addition to the backyard.
- 2* The deck is to be constructed of wood and will measure roughly 12' x 12'. A wood railing will surround it on two sides, and lattice will screen it from below. The wood will be sealed without stain. The drawings provided lack detail on the deck railings and lattice.
- 3* The floor height of the deck will match the floor height of the house interior. Steps will be built leading to the ground level in the rear yard.
- 4* The door leading onto the deck from the new living room addition will be the original front door which had been replaced previously. The door onto the deck from the kitchen will remain.
- 5* Rear wood decks that are inset from the corners of the house are regularly approved.

B. Constructing a rear addition is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 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 facts:

- 1* The house is a vernacular single-story residence with a small front porch inset in the L-form. It has an enclosed rear addition with steps that lead down to the backyard. It was built around 1935, according to Wake County records.

- 2* The applicant proposes constructing an addition located on the northeast corner of the house at the rear. The addition measures approximately 16' x 16'. According to Wake County records, the house is 814 square feet.
- 3* The cross gable rectangular form addition is a traditional way of adding onto a house.
- 4* The roof will be a gable form that mirrors the gable on the front of the house in form, height and finish. Shingles that match the rest of the roof will be used.
- 5* The gable end of the addition will be clad with cedar shakes like the front gable, and will also include a round vent as on the front. Exposed rafter tails will mimic the same element on the front of the house. Also reflecting the front gable, the back will include bargeboards with a notched detail.
- 6* The addition will be clad with lapped siding with a 5" reveal that matches the original siding on the rest of the house in material, dimensions and color. The trim will match the existing wood trim in design, materials and color. A 5" vertical trim board will demarcate the addition from the original structure on the east wall.
- 7* The addition will include two windows on the north side and three on the east side. Double-hung Anderson 200 Series windows are proposed. The windows match the existing in size and will be painted white to match the existing. The exterior of the windows do not appear to be wood. The documentation states that the frames are wrapped in vinyl and that the sash have Perma-Shield and/or Flexacron exteriors.
- 8* The foundation of the addition will be faced with brick. The crawl space door will be moved from the north side of the house to the east under the new addition.
- 9* The existing HVAC unit will be moved from its place at the rear of the house to the rear of the new addition. It will remain on the ground.
- 10* There are trees in the rear yards of adjacent properties whose roots may be impacted by construction activity. A tree protection plan was not provided.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the notched bargeboard detail not be used on the addition.
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard:
 - a. Detailed drawings of the deck railings and lattice.
 - b. Windows that are wood on the exterior or aluminum clad wood.
 - c. Tree protection plan similar to the RHDC sample plan.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. Roof material;

- b. Brick foundation material;
- c. Details on the location and installation of the HVAC unit.

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

Committee members voting: David, Davis, Hinshaw, Thiem, Smith.

Certificate expiration date: 9/23/17.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

041-17-CA 506 COLE STREET
Applicant: MARK RIEDEMAN
Received: 3/9/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 6/7/2017 1) 3/23/2017 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: GLENWOOD-BROOKLYN HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: Streetside HOD

Nature of Project: Construct 2nd level addition

Amendments: Additional written description and 3-D drawings were provided 3/20/17 and are attached.

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its February 13 meeting. Members in attendance were Curtis Kasefang, Jenny Harper, David Maurer, Dan Becker, and Mary Ruffin Hanbury; also present were Charles Holden, Trashanna Sanchez, Melissa Robb, Martha Lauer, and Tania Tully.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- The amended application references the not yet adopted updated guidelines.
- The Glenwood-Brooklyn Historic District is a Streetside HOD. This means that only part of the entire property is subject to the COA process.
- Section 5.4.2.B. of the Unified Development Ordinance governs the applicability of the COA process in Streetside HODs. The proposed addition projects beyond the existing building's maximum side wall and roof plane envelope as described in 5.4.2.B.2.e. Additionally the proposed work is within the first 50% of the depth of the existing principal building as described in 5.4.2.B.2.d.
- Those items shown on the plans or mentioned in the written description that are not subject to COA review are:
 - Changes to the connection between the historic house and the existing addition;
 - Changes to the rear of the existing addition;
 - Roof changes and walls added to the rear addition (they appear to not be taller than the roof of the historic house).
- Because staff is suggesting that the addition will detract from the overall historic character of the principal building and the site and require the removal of a significant building element, design details including materials were not evaluated in the staff report.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3.5	Roofs	Construct 2nd level addition
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Tania Tully [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report. Ms. Tully stated there were additional drawings and a 3D model. Ms. Tully explained that not every addition in the Streetside HOD requires a COA. She noted that this one does because it is taller and wider than the historic house.

Support:

Mr. Mark Riedeman [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Riedeman stated this was his house which was a craftsman era bungalow with a nice hip roof and an addition that was added in the 1980s that was bolted onto the existing house. Mr. Riedeman stated that Hurricane Matthew put a tree through his house which created a massive hole. He took this as an opportunity to make the house more usable. Mr. Riedeman stated he did not think it was appropriate to add a back mass to the rear of the building and the camel back style looked massive with a bungalow. Additionally, he did not want to reduce the amount of usable land in the back.

Mr. Charles Holden [affirmed] stated he was the architect and builder of the proposed addition and he was blindsided by the comments at DRAC. Mr. Holden talked about the history of the bungalow. He asserted that they were staying true to the roots of this watered down version of an arts and crafts style bungalow. They are trying to embrace the nature and authentic craftsmanship of this kind of bungalow and becoming part of nature. Mr. Holden emphasized the small volume of the addition and that the glazing at the front allowed the eaves to be seen through the stair enclosure.

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

Responses and Questions:

Ms. David stated she enjoyed reading the application, and loved the design, and as an architectural historian she loved reading the story. However, as nice as the application was you could not see the original house anymore and does not meet the Guidelines. Mr. Davis also pointed out that he enjoyed Mr. Holden's description and that the proposed addition changes the original house so it could not be seen. The 3-D model was passed around. Mr. Holden asked if the design could fit into the Guidelines.

Mr. Riedeman stated that it would not be right for the house to have more mass added to the front and a dormer to the addition. He was trying to keep the open area still there.

Ms. David stated that the streetside district is still new to them and even all the changes behind that 50% would still have to be reviewed by the committee. Ms. Tully clarified that changes to the house in the first 50% closest to the street are reviewed. With the addition, once it is determined to need a COA the entire addition is subject to review regardless of its location. Ms. Tully added that the streetside district allows for more flexibility. Mr. Riedeman asked if this were new construction would it be treated differently. Ms. Tully stated it's either a new house or if it were a non-contributing structure but there was nothing in the city's code about this. Mr. Holden inquired about tearing down the first half of the house in order to get it approved. Ms. Tully stated this was a procedural question that the committee does not have the power to answer. Ms. David stated they could make the case for a demolition at the earliest meeting on May 25th. Mr. Riedeman stated he would not like to demolish the house to get this done but what about the guidelines? Mr. Holden asked if the new construction could be approved with the demolition. Ms. Lauer stated demolition has to be approved before new construction is requested. Ms. Tully stated there is an appeal process regardless of what is decided at the meeting.

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

Committee Discussion

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

It clearly does not meet the guidelines. [David]

I agree it just swallows up too much of the original house. [Davis]

Guideline 3.5.1 states to maintain and preserve roof forms and this is a significant change to the roof. Guidelines 3.5.7 and .10 introduces a lot of new features, 4.2.1 says to respect the features of the house indefinitely. 4.2.5 speaks to an addition being on inconspicuous elevations usually to the rear. This is a very high profile location for an addition. [David]

Guideline 4.2.8 significant site features. [Davis]

There are a lot of windows there. [Smith]

It overwhelms the historic house. [David]

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

- A. Construction of 2nd level addition is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.5.1, 3.5.7, 3.5.10, 4.2.1, 4.2.5, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, and the following facts:
- 1* The Glenwood-Brooklyn designation report described the house as a “ca.1925 one-story frame Craftsman bungalow with novelty weatherboard siding and an asphalt-shingled hip roof with a hipped ventilation dormer. The engaged front porch has wood posts. Other features include a brick foundation and exterior side chimney, a rear wing, and double-hung windows with decorative upper sash.”
 - 2* The subject house is flanked by 2-story houses. 508 Cole Street, to the west, is noncontributing to the district and 502 Cole Street, to the east, is contributing.
 - 3* In October 2016 a large tree (100+ year old Oak tree) hit the house damaging the roof and northwest portion of the house. The exterior portion of a utilitarian chimney was also removed by the tree.
 - 4* The amended application states that the “proposal is to keep the porch, the original roof, siding and most of the eaves intact and make the original attic usable by raising the center of the bungalow portion about 6’ 4” higher with a side staircase added for access.”
 - 5* The proposed addition removes the ca. 1925 hipped ventilation dormer and introduces a front roof balcony. From the amended application: “The original dormer cutout will be converted to a door with a small patio for the added level.”
 - 6* The proposed addition includes an opening in the hipped roof that extends vertically through the house as an internal courtyard.
 - 7* The application proposes to remove the top portion of the historic hipped roof and replace with a hipped roof at the second level. From the amended application: “we will be ‘lifting’ and reusing most of the original roof while also adding new support structures to reduce the weight of the roof that is resting on the existing eaves.”
 - 8* The historic eave and lower portion of the roof remain except on the east side of the house.
 - 9* The 2nd level addition includes a side extension/staircase access on the east.
 - 10* The new addition sits on top of the historic 1-story house and except for the east side stair extension, is inset from the side walls by a few feet.
 - 11* The relationship of solids to voids in the historic house is a rhythm of single and paired vertically proportioned double-hung windows flanked by wall sections of varying sizes.
 - 12* The relationship of solids to voids on the addition is different on each side. There are no windows on the west side of the addition and two on the east. From the amended application: “The original house had a 25% glazing to solid ratio, which we are maintaining in the addition.”
 - 13* The addition only adds about 5% to the built mass of the site.
 - 14* Staff is unaware of any cases where the commission has approved a 2nd level addition on top of the front portion a historic house.

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

Decision on the Application

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

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

Committee members voting: David, Davis, Hinshaw, Thiem, Smith.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Design Guidelines Update
2. COA Application Deadlines and Staff Report Changes
3. Committee Discussion
 - a. Application Completeness
 - b. Meeting Post-Mortem

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner