

RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
November 27, 2017

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

Melissa Robb, Preservation Planner, called the roll as follows:

Present: Elizabeth Caliendo, Sarah David, Don Davis, Jimmy Thiem

Excused Absence: Nick Fountain

Staff Present: Tania Tully, Melissa Robb, Karli Stephenson, Francis P. Rasberry, Jr., Attorney

Approval of the October 26, 2017 Minutes

Mr. Davis moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing and to adopt said minutes as submitted. Ms. David seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

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. Elizabeth Caliendo, Chair administered the affirmation.

<u>Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address</u>	<u>Affirmed</u>
Ashley Morris, 306 Pell Street 27604	Yes
Ann Brown, 1409 Tyler Court 27701	Yes
Charles Holden, 217 Dexter Place 27605	Yes
Mark Riedeman, 506 Cole Street 27605	Yes

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Davis moved to approve the agenda as printed. Ms. David seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chair Caliendo introduced the public hearing portion of the meeting. The committee heard the following cases in the following order for which the Certified Records are made part of these minutes: 152-17-CA and 165-17-CA.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

152-17-CA 506 COLE STREET
Applicant: MARK RIEDEMAN
Received: 9/14/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 12/13/2017 1) 10/26/2017 2) **11/28/2017** 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: GLENWOOD-BROOKLYN HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: Streetside HOD

Nature of Project: Construct new house with integrated front patio, porch, steps, and retaining wall; install driveway; demolish tree; alter landscape.

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its October 2 meeting. Members in attendance were Curtis Kasefang, Jenny Harper and David Maurer; also present were Mark Riedeman and Melissa Robb, Preservation Planner.

Amendments: Additional documents were submitted at the October COA meeting. **Drawings reflecting a revised design were provided by the applicant November 10. Notes relevant to the revised design are shown in bold.**

Staff Notes:

- The Glenwood-Brooklyn Historic District is a Streetside HOD. For new construction, the entire building is subject to COA review; additions are subject to COA review when taller or wider than the primary building. Additionally, changes within the first 25% of the yard are regulated.
- This lot is in a configuration not specifically anticipated by the code. For this COA the lot is assumed to be vacant except for the non-historic (former) addition that was not requested to be demolished. Proposed changes shown beyond the rear wall of the new house were not reviewed (corridor connector and non-historic (former) addition).
- Raleigh City Code Section 10.2.15.E.1. states that "An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure or site within any Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark may not be denied...However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of issuance...If the Commission finds that the building, structure or site has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark, it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal."
- The applicant received approval for a previous COA application (070-17-CA) at the May 25, 2017, COA Committee meeting for the demolition of the primary residence. Conditions remain to be met for this COA.
- COAs mentioned are available for review.
- **The applicant provided a letter to the committee regarding this case, the prior cases, and the process in general. A response to the letter is outside the scope of the staff report; the committee will address this separately at the hearing.**

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
1.3	Site Features and Plantings	Install driveway; demolish trees; alter landscape
1.4	Fences and Walls	Install retaining wall
1.5	Walkways, Driveways and Off-street Parking	Install driveway
3.3	New Construction	Construct new house with integrated front patio, porch, steps, and retaining wall

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb and Ms. Tania Tully [affirmed] were the staff members present. Ms. Robb showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report. Staff offered no recommendation, but provided suggested conditions if approved.

Support:

Mr. Mark Riedeman, owner and Mr. Charles Holden, architect [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Riedeman stated that a new outer porch railing was added as one of the alterations since the last COA meeting in October. Copies of additional materials were distributed to the committee members and staff.

Mr. Holden said that the new railing was reminiscent of the old railing, but would only be 32" high which couldn't be done with a traditional railing location. He stated that one of their goals was to bring as much light as possible into the lower level of the house. He said they feel this is a reasonable compromise so it is perceived as a porch, but it still lets light inside on the lower level. He stated that they had reduced the two different brick colors to one that is made in Salisbury in a color that relates to the topsoil, and matches well with an Arts and Crafts style house. Mr. Holden displayed a 3-D fly through video of the proposed house.

Mr. Riedeman concluded by showing the hurricane damage to the house via a video which described the issues listed in his hardship claim. He said he wanted a decision today, as he was not willing to make any other changes or updates to the design.

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

Responses and Questions:

Ms. Caliendo asked if the new pages had changes that were not in the packet they had already received. Mr. Holden responded yes, there were a few additional pages and information based on the last time. On the second page it showed the window type and gravel selected, and a

floor plan was added. Ms. Tully interjected that there were also additional still images from the fly through.

Mr. Davis asked for clarification on the horizontal bar shown under the railing and whether it was metal, as well as the railings themselves. Mr. Holden answered yes, it was a rectangular or square stock metal, and is reminiscent of traditional proportions.

Mr. Thiem asked if they had an rendering that showed the east side, since he was interested in the porch area. A railing was added and he requested to compare it to the drawing labeled floor plan main so he could see if the seat wall was running concurrent with the pickets. Mr. Holden replied they are inset three feet and made of ipe as a continuation of the seat back. Mr. Holden and Mr. Thiem conferred to the side looking at the drawings.

Ms. Tully asked Mr. Holden to restate for the rest of the committee. He said that the pickets are in the same plane as the seat back.

Mr. Thiem responded that the drawings don't quite match. Mr. Holden answered that they use a 3D modeling program so sometimes the 2D view isn't as clear. There are wooden pieces that come across the top.

Ms. Caliendo asked if the front columns are sitting on the front retaining wall. Mr. Holden replied yes, and there is only a 30" drop so they don't have to have a railing. He continued that there is a 3' deep planter and that the light from above allows the plants to grow. They considered the landscaping a large component of the design. Mr. Davis asked if the plants would be spilling over or growing up from below. Mr. Holden responded that they would be both, since the owner's mother will eventually move in and wants a kitchen garden. Mr. Davis followed up by asking if the plants would fill the open space. Mr. Holden answered no, they wanted the winter light to reach the kitchen below.

Mr. Davis asked if there are any other homes that look like this with metal columns and railings and the front porch design. Mr. Holden answered that this is of its time and there are no other houses like this in Raleigh.

Mr. Thiem asked if their intention was to preserve the landscape, particularly the laurels. Mr. Holden replied that construction may not allow the survival of many plants, and the owner is keeping a stock of plants in back in case things don't survive. Mr. Thiem asked if the shrubs are regulated by the COA process. Ms. Tully answered no, the shrubs are not trees and the committee has never considered an overgrown laurel a tree.

With no objection from the committee, Ms. Caliendo closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

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

What are the thoughts from the committee? [Caliendo]

I'm having trouble wrapping my head around the porch not having a floor coming out to the porch columns, but commend the designer on a solution intended to meet the guidelines and allow light in. [David]

I'm also having trouble with the design. All that metal doesn't fit with guideline 3.3.10 calling for compatible material. [Davis]

They are painted if that makes a difference. [David]

I think they will still end up looking like metal. It is new construction, but when you look at new construction it should be compatible. There are no examples in other districts of this difference. [Davis]

In some of the new construction we've seen new uses of traditional materials. [David]

It is a material that is used in historic districts, although there is no evidence to support the use of metal railings in this district. I think one thing that seems a little off is the porch foundation walls with piers extending up to that floor level. In this configuration, it's more like what you'd see in the back of the house. In front, the columns would come to the porch floor without a gap. [Caliendo]

In older neighborhoods, there are brick piers at the foundation with curtain walls so it looks continuous. [Davis]

I'm looking at staff comment A.20. [Caliendo]

The height and setback are creating an illusion of a more traditional design that meets the bigger-picture guidelines. [David]

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Mr. Riedeman stated that he had walked around the district and had seen plenty of columns and plenty of metal.

With no objection from the committee, Ms. Caliendo closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Ms. David moved that based on the information contained in the application and the evidentiary hearing, the committee finds staff suggested findings A. (inclusive of facts 1-26) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-11) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Construction of a new house is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.3, 3.3.4, 3.3.5, 3.3.6, 3.3.7, 3.3.8, 3.3.9, 3.3.10, 3.3.11, 3.3.12; and the following facts:
- 1* From the Special Character Essay for the Glenwood-Brooklyn Historic District: “The characteristic Craftsman house type, nationwide as well as in the district, was the bungalow, a snugly proportioned house of one or one and a half stories. Almost all Craftsman bungalows have front porches, and most of these are engaged (incorporated) under the house roof. Other common Craftsman bungalow features include large dormers that expanded upstairs living space, porch supports with wood posts (usually tapered and sometimes clustered) on brick pedestals, wood-shingle sheathing in gables and on dormers, gable brackets (usually triangular in form, sometimes appearing like purlin ends), and double-hung windows with upper sash composed of three or more vertical panes. Unlike earlier houses in the district, Craftsman bungalows usually dispensed with rear wings by incorporating the kitchen and dining room into the house envelope.”
 - 2* The applicant describes the proposed design as a 1 ½ story bungalow.
 - 3* The subject lot 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.
 - 4* There are three important elements of a house that are relevant to setbacks and uniformity in the historic district: the front wall, the porch, and the roof eave. No detailed site plan was submitted, but the front wall of the first level of the house appears to be in line with the adjacent houses. The design of this house makes determining the setback challenging: the front porch, front wall of the main level and front wall of the second level are all in different planes. Photographs of the streetscape were not provided.
 - 5* **A site plan that includes the adjacent houses provides the setbacks of the front walls and porches. The front of the porch of the proposed new house is within inches of the setbacks of the porches of the adjacent houses. The front wall of the second level is setback the same as the front wall of 502 Cole Street and similar to 508 Cole Street. The wall of the main level is set back an additional 5 feet under the porch roof.**
 - 6* **The amended application illustrates the setbacks of all of the houses on the south side of Cole Street.**
 - 7* See B. below for a discussion of the trees.
 - 8* The proposed new house height is lower than the adjacent houses.
 - 9* **The floor level of the primary floor appears to be at the same level as 508 Cole Street and slightly higher than 502 Cole Street.**
 - 10* The form of the proposed house is roughly a hipped roof rectangle with a multi-faceted hip roofed second level.
 - 11* The roof over the first level of the house is a modified hip roof with asphalt shingles. The roof over the second level of the house is an irregular hipped roof.
 - 12* The roof design includes an opening in the front half of the hipped roof that cuts diagonally into the roof and extends vertically through the house as a **light well**. Staff is unaware of any examples of a cutout roof in the historic district.

- 13* **The applicant testified the roof forming the light well would not be visible from the street.**
- 14* The front wall of the second level is almost entirely glass; there is only one side window. The main level is largely vertically proportioned single light glass windows.
- 15* **The amended application visually compared the fenestration of the proposed house with several in the historic district.**
- 16* **A photograph of a house on N Boylan Avenue (address unknown) was provided at the October hearing as an example of a house with side access to the front porches along with 503, 507, and 508 Cole Street. All of the Cole Street examples have side entrances to the porches supplementing the primary front walk and steps.**
- 17* From the Special Character Essay for the Glenwood-Brooklyn Historic District: "Front porches are common, creating a transition zone from public to private space. Lots that contain parking and/or a garage generally have a drive perpendicular to the street with a garage in the rear of the lot."
- 18* The proposal includes a front porch that is at the same level as the main level of the house that is accessed via a stair that leads directly from the driveway.
- 19* **The house roof rests on four steel columns connected by a steel vertical picket railing. The floor of the main level porch is recessed about 3 feet from the railing on the west and south sides. The main level porch is enclosed on the west and south sides by an incorporated wood bench.**
- 20* **The area under the main level porch is open to the basement level of the house.** Staff is unaware of a similar configuration in the historic district.
- 21* Stone and masonry retaining walls are not uncommon in the Glenwood-Brooklyn Historic District.
- 22* **A detailed drawing of the eave design was provided. The eave is a simply detailed sloped soffit reminiscent, but not duplicative of a historic eave.**
- 23* Materials of the new house are proposed to be standing seam copper roofing, **asphalt shingles**, single light aluminum clad wood windows, wood siding, roman brick, glass, **painted steel columns and railing**, stucco, and glass garage door. The materials palette on the amended application shows 13 material finishes, including three types of brick. Details and specifications were not provided.
- 24* The main level is shown clad in brick and the second level in wood siding. It is not unusual for the two levels of a house to be of different materials.
- 25* The lower level foundation walls **on the east and west are** a mix of stucco and glass.
- 26* Built mass to open space analysis: According to Wake County Real Estate data, the lot is 7,405 SF. Drawings show that the footprint of the house and garage can be estimated at 2,398 SF. The proportion of built mass to open space is approximately 33%. Information on the built mass of surrounding contributing buildings was not provided.

- B. The installation of a driveway demolition of trees; alteration of landscape are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3, 1.3.5, 1.3.6, 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 1.3.9, 1.3.13, 3.3.2, 3.3.3, 3.3.4, 3.3.5, 3.3.6: however, the removal of healthy trees that contribute to the character of the district **is** incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 1.3.1, 1.3.5, 1.3.6, 3.3.2, and the following facts:
- 1* A written description of existing trees was provided **along with a site plan identifying one 12" dbh Mimosa Tree and one 16" dbh Redbud tree. The Mimosa is proposed for removal, the Redbud in the right-of-way is to be retained. No replacement tree was specified.**
 - 2* Aerial views of the property show a dense tree canopy, although it is unknown how much of the canopy is from a tree that was removed after Hurricane Matthew in 2016. See staff evidence for an aerial view from Bing maps.
 - 3* **The 20' tall evergreen hedge is proposed to remain.**
 - 4* **The written description states that a large holly bush in the southeast corner of the lot will be relocated to the northwest corner of the property.**
 - 5* No tree protection plan was provided, although the applicant stated that "All trees and landscaping designated for protection will be cordoned off appropriately throughout construction."
 - 6* A site plan was provided that includes the full extent of the site elements such as the driveway, walkways and sidewalks.
 - 7* Built **area** to open space analysis: According to Wake County Real Estate data, the lot is 7,405 SF. Drawings show that the footprint of the house and garage can be estimated at 2,398 SF, and the walkways, rear steps and patio/driveway are estimated to be 1,195 SF, for a total of 3,593 SF of built area. The proportion of built area to open space is approximately 49%.
 - 8* A new driveway is proposed to run along the east side of the house. There is an existing curb cut on the right front of the property, although it is unclear from the drawings if it will be used.
 - 9* **The driveway is proposed to be paved in salvaged brick or pea gravel. A photograph of the brick was provided; details on the pea gravel were not. Gravel drives in the historic districts have been approved when gray in color and with faceted stones.**
 - 10* It appears that the front walkway will be removed. From *Design Guidelines* section 1.5 Walkways, Driveways, and Off-street Parking, page 26: "In Raleigh's pre-World War II neighborhoods, front walks usually led directly to the front porch from the sidewalk... **With the introduction of carports in the postwar era, walkways to the front door typically led from the driveway to the front entry.**"
 - 11* **Glenwood-Brooklyn is a pre-World War II neighborhood with a period of significance running from 1907 to 1940.**

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Ms. David and seconded by Mr. Davis, Ms. David made an amended motion that the application be approved as amended with no delay on the removal of the tree, and with the following conditions:

1. That conditions 2 and 3 of the demolition COA 070-17-CA remain in effect.
2. That the tree protection plan be revised to include the street tree.
3. That the tree protection be in place prior to construction.
4. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of the blue placard:
 - a. Revised tree protection plan;
 - b. Revised drawings showing matching plan and elevations.
5. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. Driveway material;
 - b. Doors;
 - c. Replacement tree species and location.

Mr. Thiem agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 3/1 (Mr. Davis opposed).

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

Certificate expiration date: 5/27/18.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

165-17-CA 3227 BIRNAMWOOD ROAD
Applicant: ANN BROWN AND KENNETH KOHAGEN
Received: 10/10/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 1/8/2018 1) 11/27/2017 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Raleigh Historic Landmark: PAUL AND ELLEN WELLES HOUSE

Nature of Project: Reconstruct retaining wall; construct driveway retaining walls; reconstruct walkway and stair; install fence; alter existing garage; install new windows and skylight; expand screened porch; alter rear deck; construct two-story addition with screened porch

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
1.3	Site Features and Plantings	Reconstruct retaining wall; construct driveway retaining walls; reconstruct walkway and stair
1.4	Fences and Walls	Reconstruct retaining wall; construct driveway retaining walls; install fence
1.5	Walkways, Driveways and Offstreet Parking	Construct driveway retaining walls
1.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	Alter existing garage
2.5	Roofs	Install skylight
2.7	Windows and Doors	Install new windows
2.8	Entrances, Porches and Balconies	Expand screened porch
3.1	Decks	Alter rear deck
3.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Construct two-story addition with screened porch

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report. Staff offered no suggested decision on the installation of new windows on the primary façade of the historic house or the construction of the new retaining walls. Staff recommended approval with conditions for the remainder of the application.

Support:

Ms. Ann Brown, Mr. Kenneth Kohagen and Ms. Ashley Morris [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Morris stated that they were fine with all the staff considered

more like punches into the solid portion of the façade compared to the expansive amounts of glass on the other sides. Ms. Morris also said that the site walls were to create a more formal entrance into the property from the street. She explained that they researched local mid-century residential design examples to understand landscape design principles and noted that site walls were often included. Ms. Morris asserted that they chose a new material and texture than exists in the rest of the site, and they felt the site walls are more decoration than anything. They will not have a full footing. She said that as designed they won't have any footings so won't create issues for the nearby mature trees.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Thiem thanked Ms. Morris for the examples brought to the committee of other Raleigh Historic Landmark mid-century houses. He asked a question of staff: He has seen a wide diversity of materials being used in the applicants' landscape, and he also noted many materials used in the Matsumoto house. Were those approved previously for the Matsumoto house through a COA? Ms. Tully replied that it appeared that a lot of the hardscape is in the right-of-way and wouldn't have been included in an application for a COA. She stated that the changes along the front of the house did get a COA, but that some of it was already there.

Mr. Thiem said that in looking at all three of the houses shown as mid-century precedents, the hardscape materials were used as retaining walls, not as freestanding walls. He observed that they were used to define the parking areas adjacent to the homes rather than driveways. He found that the one significant element of design is that none of the driveways had edging from the street until they got to the parking area. He found the driveway connections to the street to be less formal.

Ms. Morris responded that she understood his point. She stated that they took note of the materials already on site, such as the large pieces of timber that outline planting areas and the path to the carport. She offered to end the walls at the parking area if that is preferred. Ms. Morris said that this site is unique because there aren't any other houses like it on the street, and that visitors who approach from the street don't easily see the driveway and house, so having something that reaches out to the street was the goal. Mr. Kohagen said there are also piers at the end of the driveway that define it in some way and they were trying to work in some sort of a wall because of how dense the ground cover is, especially since copperheads have been found there.

Mr. Davis responded that the property is naturalistic and the walls are more formal. He noted that when he visited the site he observed that the area where the proposed new windows will be is obscured by the garage, making it a more inconspicuous location which is what the guidelines indicate as appropriate. Ms. Morris noted that one of the new windows goes into the master bathroom where there are currently no windows, making it dark.

Ms. Caliendo said that it seems like all the windows on the front that hit the eave have a transom and have they considered that? Ms. Morris responded that they could, but it's an 8' ceiling height over a shower.

With no objection from the committee, Ms. Caliendo closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

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

The walls outlining the driveway are up for discussion and the northeast elevation windows as well. [Caliendo]

As I drove around the area, I was looking for houses with the entry walls and they weren't present. These houses are unusual, but I couldn't find another example even in the precedence examples. The character of the landscapes is to blend into the natural landscape. I was concerned with the materials selected, but saw there are a variety of materials in the examples. I'm fine with the description of the walls if they start at the top of driveway closer to the more formal landscaping around the house. [Thiem]

I agree with that. The nomination talks about a naturalist look in the site. [Davis]

Staff is correct and there is no evidence where driveways were lined on both sides. It seems that the applicants are open to coming back with a new design. [Caliendo]

What do you think of the material using stone where the house uses brick? [David]

That's why I asked about the Matsumoto house that uses different materials. [Thiem]

Most of the brick is on pathways and some is on the foundation. [Caliendo]

Wood is the primary material. And the stone is less formal than brick. [Davis]

My wall would have been wood and brick since that is what was used and available. Timber was used a lot during this time period. [Thiem]

What about the windows? [Caliendo]

It's much less visible than what I was expecting once you visit the site. [David]

I agree. [Davis]

Windows on the foundation are fine. If the upper window related more to how the windows were treated on the long sides, it would be more compatible. [Caliendo]

Can we reopen the evidentiary hearing? [Thiem]

With no objection from the committee, Ms. Caliendo closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Mr. Thiem asked if the applicant could clarify the wall detail. Ms. Morris said it would be a

4-6" gravel bed with block on that as something to give the wall some support. She said they could span over roots with a thin piece of metal so you don't have to dig or cut them. Mr. Thiem asked if they intend to excavate. Ms. Morris replied yes, at least 4-6" but not a full footing. Mr. Thiem asked if there are some retaining walls along the front of the house now. Ms. Morris responded yes, and that some are only 8" to 16" walls around front and some are retaining walls.

With no objection from the committee, Ms. Caliendo closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Mr. Davis moved that based on the information contained in the application and the evidentiary hearing, the committee finds staff suggested finding A. (inclusive of facts 1-10), B. (inclusive of facts 1-3), C. (inclusive of facts 1-6), and D. (inclusive of facts 1-3) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Reconstructing retaining walls, constructing driveway retaining walls, and reconstructing walkways and stairs are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3, 1.3.4, 1.3.8, 1.3.9, 1.3.12, 1.3.13, 1.4.1, 1.4.2, 1.4.3, 1.4.4, 1.4.5, 1.4.6, 1.4.11, 1.5.1, 1.5.2, 1.5.3, and 1.5.9; however, the extensive retaining wall surrounding the gravel driveway is incongruous according to *Guideline* 1.4.8, and the following facts:
- 1* According to the Raleigh Historic Landmark designation application and the National Register nomination, the house was built in 1956 and designed by architect Kenneth Scott who "actually considered the rear elevation as the front because it overlooks a large meadow that covers most of the site."
 - 2* Also from the Raleigh Historic Landmark designation application and the National Register nomination: "Original contemporary hardscaping relates the house to its site. A four-foot wide brick walkway extends around three sides of the house. In the front, this walkway is elevated, with brick terraces extending down the slope to the driveway. In the rear, the walkway widens into a brick patio beside the living room."
 - 3* The applicant is requesting to rebuild the existing raised brick walk and retaining wall, the adjoining steps and the lower brick path that is on grade. All of these elements are immediately abutting the north side of the house and are constructed of brick. The applicant proposes reusing the existing bricks, with the addition of a concrete slab underneath in order to provide stability and to prevent uneven settling from occurring in the future.
 - 4* The existing gravel driveway leads from the street to the garage on the north side of the house and flows into a brick-paved parking area on the west side of the house. The applicant proposes to install retaining walls that surround this entire surface area and range from 8" to 24" in height depending on the topography.
 - 5* Photographs were provided of three other Raleigh Historic Landmarks to illustrate the use of hardscaping in modernist houses; the George Matsumoto House at 821 Runnymede

Road, the Henry L Kamphoefner House at 3060 Granville Drive, and the Ritcher House at 3039 Churchill Road. While these illustrate the usage of retaining walls alongside such features as stairs and planting areas, they do not provide evidence of retaining walls lining driving and parking areas to the extent proposed by the applicant.

- 6* The 1.85 acre property includes extensive landscaped areas with a variety of tree species, ground covers and other plantings that provide a loose, organic aesthetic. The proposed bluestone retaining walls have a more formal character than what is present on the site now.
- 7* The applicant provided a tree protection plan by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA). There was no separate arborist report provided.
- 8* The site wall will extend below grade.
- 9* A 42" wrought iron fence is proposed for the east side of the lot connecting the eastern corner of the house with the far corner of the garage. Two gates are proposed. The design of the fence was provided but not of the gates.
- 10* An existing wrought iron railing aligns with the wide stairway from the driveway to the front door.

B. Altering the existing garage is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.6.1 and 1.6.2, and the following facts:

- 1* From the Raleigh Historic Landmark Designation Application and the National Register nomination: "Original plans called for a two-car flat-roofed free-standing carport to be centered in front of the house, at the end of the driveway that curves off Birnamwood Road. Because this was not built, the second owners, the Dahles, constructed a combination one-car garage and open carport in the same location about 1990. In order to relate it visually to the house, the outbuilding has similar rough-cut board-and-batten siding, a low shed roof, and solid wooden carport posts. Due to its age, this outbuilding is noncontributing, but its design harmonizes with the house architecture."
- 2* While the above description states the garage is for a single vehicle, it actually has a single vehicular door while having a footprint that can accommodate two cars.
- 3* The only change proposed to the garage is widening the vehicular door from 8' to 16'. The elevation drawings show a similar design for the new door, but no door specifications were provided for the vehicular door.

C. Installing new windows and a skylight, expanding the screened porch, and constructing a two-story addition with a screened porch is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.5.10, 2.7.1, 2.7.2, 2.7.9, 2.8.1, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.4, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.7, 3.2.8, 3.2.9, 3.2.10, 3.2.11, 3.2.12, and the following facts:

- 1* The significance of the Welles House according to the Raleigh Historic Landmark Designation Application and the National Register nomination is for its 1950s Modern design, one of a group of houses designed by faculty and students of North Carolina State University's architecture program. A key element of the design is the large open south elevation which opens to the expansive fields behind the house. The openness of the south façade contrasts with the more solid north façade, which features six grouped openings of

doors and windows. The applicant proposes to add three new sets of openings to the east end of the north façade, thereby altering the relationship of solids to voids.

- 2* The windows on the north façade align at the top with other windows on the same floor, but the newly added window for the master bath does not align with the windows to the right of it, the only other windows on the upper level of the north elevation.
 - 3* One skylight is proposed to be added over the master bathroom. One skylight exists over the kitchen at the opposite end of the house from the proposed location of the new skylight. Both skylights are on the streetside elevation. According to the applicant, "this skylight will not be visible from the street due to the low slope of the roofline and the two-story height of the house."
 - 4* The addition to the screened porch on the main level of the house is an extrusion of the existing screened porch and roof by 5'.
 - 5* The addition to the upper level for the master bedroom is on the west façade of the house, the one that could be deemed the least character defining. It is a modest 287 SF addition which maintains the same architectural style, materials and colors as the existing house. It is also inset from the existing house walls by a foot to distinguish it from the original structure.
 - 6* The screened porch of the addition is proposed for the west end of the south façade, adding more openness so that the bedroom/screened porch addition only increases the voids on the more transparent north elevation.
 - 7* The additional upstairs window is in an inconspicuous location on the front façade.
- D. Altering the rear deck is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.8.1, 2.8.4, 3.1.1, and the following facts:
- 1* The existing rear deck flooring and steps will be replaced with stained rather than painted wood. The application states they will use either ipe or pressure treated lumber.
 - 2* The existing deck has a low rail that is proposed to be replaced with one of similar design at a slightly taller height.
 - 3* No stain color was specified for the deck.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

1. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard:
 - a. Eave construction details;
 - b. Screened porch section drawing;

- c. New site plan drawings showing the site walls not extending the full length of the driveway.
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. Garage vehicular door;
 - b. Brick sample for bedroom addition;
 - c. Window section drawings;
 - d. Gate design;
 - e. Deck stain.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 5/27/18.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Request for Reconsideration: 123-17-CA, 219 E North Street: Ms. Tully explained the process stating that it is not quasi-judicial. The petition requests permission to file a new COA application for the same project prior to the one year waiting period. The petitioner asserted that there was a statement of error in the prior decision. After committee discussion Mr. Thiem moved that the reconsideration request be granted. Ms. David seconded; motion carried 4/0.
2. Committee Discussion
 - a. Application Completeness: Mr. Thiem mentioned again the need to better quality drawings and monitoring of construction.
 - b. Meeting Post-Mortem: There was a brief discussion about the intent of the hardship language in the UDO as well as the difference between the COA language that in the Demolition by neglect section. Staff was requested to investigate hardship language used elsewhere in the state. The demolition by delay statute was discussed. It was also clarified that "In the event of a tie vote for the approval, approval with conditions, or denial of a certificate of appropriateness, the certificate shall be ruled to have been denied."

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner