

RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
December 28, 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, Nick Fountain, Jimmy Thiem

Staff Present: Melissa Robb, Roberta Fox, Francis P. Rasberry, Jr., Attorney

Approval of the November 27, 2017 Minutes

Mr. Fountain moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing and to adopt said minutes as submitted. Mr. Davis 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. Elizabeth Caliendo, Chair administered the affirmation.

<u>Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address</u>	<u>Affirmed</u>
Judy Payne, 1105 W Lenoir Street 27603	Yes
Elizabeth Dunbar, 1122 Cutler Street 27603	Yes
Jason Renzaglia, 709 Hinsdale Street 27605	Yes
Keith Lunday, 709 Hinsdale Street 27605	Yes
David Maurer, 115.5 E Hargett Street 27601	Yes
Nicole Alvarez	Yes
John Dalrymple	Yes

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

An Administrative Review of Conditions vat 912 Williamson Drive was added to the agenda under other business. Mr. Davis moved to approve the agenda as amended. Mr. Fountain seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chair Caliendo introduced the public hearing portion of the meeting. The committee heard the following cases in the following order for which the Certified Records are made part of these minutes: 174-17-CA, 175-17-CA, 176-17-CA, and 177-17-CA.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

174-17-CA 709 HINSDALE STREET
Applicant: JASON RENZAGLIA AND KEITH LUNDAY
Received: 11/9/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 2/7/2018 1) 12/28/2017 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: GLENWOOD-BROOKLYN HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-S

Nature of Project: Construct 2nd story rear addition; replace roofing; restore/replace exterior materials in kind; replace windows and front door; restore chimney; replace mail box and light fixture, and install ceiling fan on front porch; install driveway.

Amendments: An entirely revised application was provided at the meeting.

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its November 28, 2017, meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker, Mary Ruffin Hanbury and David Maurer; also present were the applicants, Jason Renzaglia and Keith Lunday, and their engineer John Dalrymple, as well as staff members Tania Tully and Melissa Robb.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- The applicants received approval for a minor work application (183-17-MW) to begin the rehabilitation process: Remove vinyl siding; remove ramp and replace with steps at side of front porch; remove aluminum handrails from front steps
- COAs mentioned are available for review.
- In Streetside Historic Overlay Districts additions that are taller than the existing house require a COA. In addition, changes to the first 50% of the house also require a COA. For the sake of this measurement the house runs from the front wall (not the front of the front porch) to the rear wall (also not including porches). Changes to the yard behind the front wall of the house do not require a COA.

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
1.5	Walkways, Driveways and Offstreet Parking	Install driveway
1.7	Lighting	Replace light fixture and install ceiling fan on front porch
2.2	Masonry	Restore chimney
2.5	Roofs	Replace roofing
2.6	Exterior Walls	Restore/replace exterior materials in kind

2.7	Windows and Doors	Replace windows and front door
2.8	Entrances, Porches and Balconies	Replace mail box and light fixture, and install ceiling fan on front porch
3.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Construct 2nd story rear addition

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] provided a summary of the project, photographs, and discussed a zoning interpretation related to the location and determination of the 50% line for structures within a Streetside HOD. These details have informed the applicant and new application materials. Staff suggested deferral to allow for a revised design to be submitted by the applicant and/or additional evidence to be submitted. Staff also offered a list of additional information to be required to be submitted.

Support:

Mr. Jason Renzaglia, Mr. Keith Lunday and Mr. John Dalrymple [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Lunday provided an amended application and support materials, including revised drawings, to the Committee. He described the revisions including the withdrawal of the following requests: to use fiber cement siding, replace windows within the first 50% of the structure, and to add gutters and downspouts. Additionally, he provided a summary of the point-by-point response to staff comments to address massing, roofline, fenestration, chimney details, use of the existing front door, and additional drawing details to reflect the location of exterior elements, including the porch light, fan, mailbox, and wall sconce.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Ms. Caliendo requested clarification on the 50% measurement and its applicability to review of improvements in a streetside overlay district. Ms. Robb stated that the guidelines would be applied to the portion of the structure forward of the 50% line and to any additions that are taller or wider than the original. It is all to be reviewed but there has generally been more leniency in materials on the rear in this type of district.

Mr. Renzaglia asked for further clarification of the 50% rule and how and when the guidelines are applied in the streetside historic overlay district. He was especially concerned with the use of a sliding glass door on the rear addition. The Committee discussed the intent of the streetside district as requiring reviewing anything visible from the right-of-way. Ms. Robb noted that the back side of house is being altered as part of current project and that is why the rear addition is under review. Mr. Fountain noted that even in Oakwood the Committee would recognize some greater flexibility on the back side of the building, but since it is an addition that is being reviewed because of the width and height they would be commenting on all of it.

Mr. Thiem thanked the applicant for narrowing down the choices of front porch fixtures and asked for some additional detail related to the overhead light and sconce. He stated that in the context of replacing the sconce, a new fixture, the proposed overhead light reads in keeping with the Craftsman style but the sconce appears more modern. Ms. Robb stated that the general guidance is to either look for something similar to the existing fixtures, or else something compatible or neutral. Ms. Caliendo expressed that she would argue that the proposed lighting was neutral.

Mr. Davis requested of staff information about the roof cricket and if there was staff opposition to it. Ms. Robb relayed that staff needed a better drawing to assess the request, but that crickets are quite common.

Ms. David asked of the applicant how they dated the door from the 1950s. Mr. Dalrymple, speaking on behalf of the co-applicants, relayed that he had found similar doors from past work. He also did not believe that there was any way to fix the existing door which has been modified over time and is not functioning properly and has an approximately ½" variance. He believes that the time period is consistent with many post WWII doors.

Ms. David asked the applicant for more information about the driveway. Mr. Lunday responded that the driveway would be a concrete slab, broom-finished. Ms. David noted that concrete strip driveways are more common and appropriate. Mr. Lunday answered that they had seen other concrete slab driveways in the district. Mr. Dalrymple stated they would not be opposed to modifications and wanted to match the appearance of the sidewalk. Mr. Davis noted that the existence of concrete slabs in the district likely pre-date the formation of the district. Mr. Thiem recommended a water-washed finish vs a broom finish and recommended that the applicant work with staff to find an appropriate finish. Mr. Dalrymple stated that they can change the driveway details if needed.

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 revised application materials appear to have addressed all the staff concerns [Caliendo]
We should be able to save these folks a month because of the work they did after getting staff comments. There's no need to defer now. [Fountain]

The concrete slab driveway is out of character; concrete strips are more in character. [David]
We can put that as a condition. [Caliendo]

I suspect the front door is original, but the replacement is appropriate. [David]

The form is much improved, and the pitch of the roof matching the original and is in keeping with character of the house. [Caliendo]

The addition is big, but you do not lose the historic house. [Davis]

It is set far enough back and is less overwhelming. [Caliendo]

I think the intention of the district is to let things in the back go, even on the new construction. [Davis]

I agree. [Caliendo]

Look at the picture on page 7 of the handout. I take that as something that happened before the district. [Fountain]

I think it depends on the orientation and form of the original house whether a two-story addition makes sense. In this case I think it does. [Caliendo]

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Mr. Davis moved that based on the information contained in the amended application and materials and in the evidentiary hearing, the committee finds staff suggested findings from the Staff Report, A. (inclusive of facts 1-4), B. (inclusive of facts 1 and 2), C. (inclusive of fact 1), D. (inclusive of facts 1-2), E. (inclusive of facts 2, 3 and 5), F. (inclusive of facts 1-3), and G. (inclusive of facts 1, 2, 3, 6, 9 and 11) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Installing a driveway is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 1.5.1, 1.5.3, 1.5.4, 1.5.8 and 1.5.9; however, the use of a concrete slab driveway is incongruous according to *Guideline* 1.5.5, and the following facts:
 - 1* The property includes an existing curb cut on the left side, although the driveway hardscape materials are no longer in place. The area is filled with grass now.
 - 2* A wood ramp will be removed from the left side of the porch under the previously issued COA 183-17-MW.
 - 3* The plot plan shows a 30" oak on the property line near the end of the driveway. In a Streetside HOD landscape elements are only regulated from the front wall of the house to the street, therefore no tree protection plan is required.
 - 4* The application did not include a detailed site plan with the design and dimensions for the driveway, nor a description of materials.

- B. Replacing the light fixture and installing a ceiling fan on the front porch is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 1.7.1, 1.7.2, 1.7.3, 1.7.9, 1.7.10, and the following facts:
 - 1* Replacing light fixtures is categorized as a Minor Work and is included here for administrative efficiency.
 - 2* No information was provided regarding the character of the existing porch light and whether it is historic or not.
 - 3* The applicants propose removing the porch ceiling light fixture and replacing it. A preferred fixture was provided in the amended design materials.
 - 4* The applicants propose installing a wall-mounted porch light fixture. A preferred fixture was provided in the amended design materials.
 - 5* The applicants propose installing a porch ceiling fan. A preferred fixture was provided in the amended design materials.

- 6* The amended application showed the locations of existing fixtures except for the porch ceiling light fixture which was not shown on the elevation drawings, but is noted by the applicant as being centered on the front door.
- C. Restoring the chimney is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.4, 2.2.5, 2.2.6, and the following facts:
- 1* The applicants propose rebuilding the chimney on the east side of the house, as well as the installation of a cricket to provide better handling of roof water run-off.
 - 2* Evidence was provided by the applicant that the chimney needed to be rebuilt above the gutter line.
- D. Replacing roofing is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.5.1, 2.5.5, 2.5.8, 2.5.11, and the following facts:
- 1* The application indicates the existing roofing will be replaced with asphalt shingles and a ridge vent. There was no indication of the existing roof material, nor was the new roofing material specified.
 - 2* A standing seam metal roof is proposed for the front porch. There was no indication of the existing porch roof material, nor were specifications and details for the proposed new roofing material provided. Metal porch roofs are common in early Raleigh historic districts.
- E. Restoring/replacing exterior materials in kind, replacing the front door, and replacing the mail box is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.6.9, 2.6.10, 2.7.4, 2.7.5, 2.7.6, 2.7.9, 2.8.1, 2.8.2, 2.8.3, 2.8.4, 2.8.5, and the following facts:
- 1* Accurate drawings showing the correct location of the 50% line were provided in the amended application materials.
 - 2* Vinyl siding removal was approved in a previous minor work application (183-17-MW).
 - 3* A previous homeowner had insulation blown into the wall cavities through holes drilled through the exterior cladding. Photographic evidence was provided.
 - 4* The applicants amended the application to no longer propose replacing the existing wood siding if over 30% of the siding and corner boards are damaged. The material on the addition is proposed to be wood to match the existing siding.
 - 5* The existing front door will be replaced. Evidence was provided that the door is not original to the house.
 - 6* A replacement door option was provided with the revised application materials.
 - 7* The applicants propose replacing the mail box and have provided one option with the revised application materials.
- F. Constructing a 2nd story rear addition is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.6, 3.2.7, 3.2.9, and the following facts:
- 1* According to the Glenwood-Brooklyn Historic Overlay District Inventory, the house was built circa 1928 and was classified as contributing. The architectural description from the report reads: "One-story frame Craftsman bungalow with vinyl siding and an asphalt-shingled front-gable roof. The porch has tapered wood posts on brick pedestals. Other

features include a brick foundation and exterior side chimney, a parged interior flue, and 3/1 windows.”

- 2* The project includes the removal of an existing ground floor rear addition, the expansion of the ground floor to the rear, and the addition of an upper level for the master bedroom and balcony on top of the expanded lower level. The addition is on the rear of the house, the side that could be deemed the least character-defining. The square footage of the addition was not included on the application.
- 3* Removal of the rear addition is not subject to a COA and is mentioned here for clarity of the project description.
- 4* The applicants cite similarities in design to 708 Hinsdale Street, a contributing house with a second story addition. The Historic Research Report for the Designation of the Glenwood-Brooklyn District as a Historic Overlay District states: “Since 2001 a large two-story hipped roof with a front gable has been added. The addition is set back behind the front gable ridge of the original building thus still contributes to the district.”
- 5* The second level includes a balcony that spans the width of the rear of the house. The revised drawings indicate it will be tempered glass. The house is in a streetside HOD, and these changes are to the back, not on a character-defining elevation.
- 6* The southwest corner of the lower level is designed to include an inset rear porch accessed via sliding glass doors. Staff is unaware of the commission approving sliding glass doors. French doors are approved on a regular basis in the General Historic Overlay Districts. Details and specifications for the new doors were not provided. The house is in a streetside HOD, and these changes are to the back, not on a character-defining elevation.
- 7* The application states that the addition is to be sided to match the rest of the house without clarifying whether that will be wood siding like the original siding or fiber cement siding, and if it is to be fiber cement siding then if the smooth side will face out.
- 8* Windows on the addition are of a variety of sizes and proportions including the following:
 - a. Three large-scale single-lite windows are proposed on the upper level of the rear addition. The proportion of these windows does not correspond with any other windows on the house. The house is in a streetside HOD, and these changes are to the back, not on a character-defining elevation.
- 9* The addition proposed the following doors:
 - a. a rear door on the second level balcony;
 - b. a pair of sliding glass doors on the west side.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Mr. Davis and seconded by Ms. David, 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 installation or construction:
 - a. Roofing material;
 - b. Driveway design and materials reflecting a driveway strip design that is appropriate to the historic district.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

175-17-CA 420 S BLOODWORTH STREET
Applicant: NICOLE ALVAREZ AND MATT TOMASULO
Received: 11/9/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 2/7/2018 1) 12/28/2017 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: PRINCE HALL HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: Install fencing and gates; install porch decking

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- The applicants have received approval for multiple COA applications for this property:
 - 059-16-CA: Place 2-story historic house onto vacant lot with new rear addition and porch/deck; construct new roof; construct new front porch floor and columns; construct new foundation; change exterior colors; reconstruct chimneys; install gutters; construct new front walk; construct front yard retaining wall; install painted wood siding rain screen on addition.
 - 169-16-MW: Renew COA 059-16-CA.
 - 013-17-MW: Revised scope to prepare house for previously approved house move. Preparing new site with tree pruning.
 - 060-17-MW: Changes to previously approved COA 059-16-CA: alter site wall to include access ramp; add new egress window and door; construct rear yard shed; plant two trees.
 - 122-17-MW: Changes to previous COA 059-16-CA; adjust deck to add patio; adjust window spacing on non-historic facades; adjust rear balcony.
 - 161-17-MW: Changes to previous COAs 059-16-CA and 169-16-MW; adjust retaining wall material from brick to parged CMU; lower retaining wall height; adjust windows from casement to double hung; adjust kitchen window to be shorter; add rear skylights; remove planter from rear.
- 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>
1.4	Fences and Walls	Install fencing and gates
2.8	Entrances, Porches and Balconies	Install porch decking

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] provided a summary of the project, description of what had been previously approved, and explained the design change request to install porch decking parallel to the façade. Staff offered no suggested decision on the porch decking. Staff suggested that the committee approve the remainder of the application.

Support:

Applicant Ms. Nicole Alvarez [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Alvarez described the requirement to install the porch decking parallel as opposed to perpendicular to the front façade. She explained that there is conditioned space below the porch and structure existing in the area. The structure must be sloping away for positive drainage. She continued to describe how the porch is very elevated from the sidewalk, with the level of the porch floor approximately 8' above the sidewalk. She also relayed an example of a parallel application in the district and that this was similarly above conditioned space. The materials would be painted wood and would be consistent with other materials found on the structure and in the district.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Thiem asked the applicant why in the application there is no fence in front of the house. Ms. Alvarez responded that there are two trees in the front that are protected and that the front yard will not be used.

Mr. Thiem followed up with a question of why the gate was not lined up with the front porch. Ms. Alvarez responded that the goal was to strike a balance with what is usable space and how the gate is opened next to the door for the space below the porch.

Mr. Davis asked for clarification on the relationship of the wall, fence, and gate. Ms. Alvarez replied that the fence is going on top of the retaining wall and turns back on the wall, the gate is about 36" from the top of the fence, and has been revised to 5'6" in elevation. Mr. Davis expressed that normally such a tall gate would not fit the guidelines, but he could see it being appropriate to make an exception in this instance if the gate was even with the top of the porch. Ms. Alvarez stated they found other similar examples in the district.

Chair Caliendo asked for clarification on the dimension of the porch decking. Ms. Alvarez responded that it would be 1" x 4" tongue and groove.

Mr. Fountain inquired of the applicant why running the decking horizontal was preferable. Ms. Alvarez replied that the slope and structure would need to run perpendicular to the decking

above it. Ms. Caliendo interjected that the decking would be above a membrane that would direct any water that gets below the decking away from the house. Ms. Alvarez affirmed that.

Mr. Thiem asked for more clarification on the porch details. Ms. Alvarez restated the construction details and said the porch would include a fascia board furred out so the decking construction would not be visible.

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 decking would be hardly noticeable because of the elevation, but the “devil is in the details.” [David]

This is a special condition and there was evidence of a similar condition in the district. [Caliendo]

There is a coal chute below which may be why. [Davis]

Let’s discuss the fence. [Caliendo]

The application would less incongruous if the fence and gate were back further and flush with the deck. [Thiem]

The fencing itself is the right size, but creates sort of a canyon in this location. [Davis]

The height is not a problem, because it’s tall but it’s low. But the placement coming forward is a problem.

If the height is not a problem, why is the placement? [Caliendo]

The traditional place is at the front porch corner or even farther back at the corner of the front wall plane. [David]

If the height is not a problem it could technically go across the front of the house. [Caliendo]

The configuration is not traditional with the pop-out design. It would be approvable in line with the porch. [David]

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Ms. Alvarez said that they wanted the space to be controlled for security reasons. She asked if the options were for the gate to be at the porch or sidewalk and not in between. Ms. David said the jut out from the porch is what makes it not congruent with traditional fence patterns.

Mr. Fountain said that because the wall is taller at the street, he had concerns about the aggregate height from the street. Ms. Alvarez reiterated that their concern was with security. Ms. David noted that she understands why it is where the applicant is proposing it.

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]:

I am in favor of pushing the gate back to the porch corner. [David]

She could ask for a reconsideration if more evidence is found. [Caliendo]

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 finding A. (inclusive of facts 1-7) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-4) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Installing fencing and gates is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 1.4.8, 1.4.10 and 1.4.11; however, installing metal fencing and a gate forward of the front face of the porch is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 1.4.11, and the following facts:
 - 1* The applicants propose installing a 6' wood privacy fence along the rear property line and portions of the side property lines, as well as several gates. Photos of an example fence and gate at 416 E Edenton St in Oakwood were provided.
 - 2* The applicants also propose installing a 3' metal fence on top of a retaining wall on a portion of the south property line and a 5'-6" metal entry gate running parallel with the sidewalk and set between the sidewalk and the front edge of the front porch.
 - 3* Examples of taller metal fencing in the front yard were provided by the applicants in the Prince Hall HOD at 125 E South St (the Rogers-Bagley-Daniels-Pegues House) and 121 E South St, as well as in the Oakwood HOD at 414 N Bloodworth St, 547 E Jones St, 401 Polk St and 416 E Edenton St.
 - 4* The top of the proposed entry gate will be at the same height as the 3' tall fence sitting atop the retaining wall, the heights of which are lower than the front porch floor.
 - 5* The front porch floor of the subject house is at the same height as the porch floors of the other houses on the block.
 - 6* The installation of the retaining wall was approved under the previously issued COAs 060-17-MW and 161-17-MW.
 - 7* A tree protection plan for the large tree in the northwest corner of the lot was included in the application.

- B. Installing porch decking is not incongruous according to *Guideline 2.8.5*, and the following facts:
- 1* The house was moved to its current location from outside the historic district. The porch is a reconstruction and no historic fabric is being replaced.
 - 2* The applicants propose installing new porch decking running parallel to the front wall of the house, an atypical detail in the historic district.
 - 3* The applicants were informed during conditions review for COA 059-16-CA that staff could not approve the parallel orientation of the porch decking.
 - 4* Examples of porch decking running parallel to the front wall were provided by the applicant in the Prince Hall HOD at 219 E Cabarrus St and 521 S Person St. Neither of these properties received a COA for the decking installation, so the work was either done prior to the formation of Prince Hall or done without a COA.
 - 5* The porch decking material is to be 1" x 4" tongue and groove.
 - 6* The specifics of the site and building allow for this approval for parallel porch decking to be made; the porch floor is not visible from the sidewalk since it is 8' above the sidewalk, and the space below the porch is occupied, conditioned space.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

1. That the fence and gate is at or behind the front corner of the porch.

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

176-17-CA 1102 W LENOIR STREET
Applicant: DAVID MAURER
Received: 11/9/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 2/7/2018 1) 12/28/2017 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: Demolish non-contributing structure at 1102 and 1104 W Lenoir St; construct house and garage; install walkways, driveways, and fence; remove two trees.

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its November 28, 2017, meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker and Mary Ruffin Hanbury; also present on behalf of the owner were David Maurer and Craig Bethel, as well as staff members Tania Tully and Melissa Robb.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- This application is concurrent with another from the same applicant for a similar project on the adjacent lot at 1104 W Lenoir St (COA application 177-17-CA).
- Note that the original application materials label this property as 1104 W Lenoir St. There was an error in addressing when these lots were recently assigned updated addresses.
- Raleigh City Code Section 10.2.15.E.1. states that “An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure or site within any Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark may not be denied...However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of issuance...If the Commission finds that the building, structure or site has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark, it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal.”

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
1.3	Site Features and Plantings	Remove two trees
1.4	Fences and Walls	Install fence
1.5	Walkways, Driveways and Offstreet Parking	Install walkways and driveways
1.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	Construct garage
3.3	New Construction	Construct house
4.2	Demolition	Demolish non-contributing structure

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] provided a summary of the project, and introduced a notarized opposition letter received by members of the Commission. Mr. Rasberry relayed that should the Commission like to discuss the opposition letter the appropriate time to discuss it would be after the applicant presentation. Pending committee discussion of the house height and massing, staff suggested that the committee approve the application with conditions.

Mr. Davis proposed that the Commission hear both applications for this and the neighboring property, 1104 W Lenoir St (COA application 177-17-CA), at one time. Mr. Rasberry relayed that the Commission had discretion to allow this. There were no objections.

Support:

Applicant David Maurer [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Maurer began his presentation with an amended application and supplemental images provided to the Commission. His additional materials included an analysis of the built area and built mass of nearby properties, and additional research and analysis of the significant trees on the property. He relayed that they have uncovered evidence that these trees are closer to 50-60 years old, and they received a second opinion from an arborist, and from this it appears that they can save some of the trees.

Mr. Maurer continued with a description of the significant amendments to the application shown in revised elevations and including the preservation of trees, the deletion of the carport feature and change to a ribbon driveway at 1104 W Lenoir St. He relayed that he believes that omitting the carport provides differentiation between the two houses and creates a more successful design. Additionally, Mr. Maurer added that no fencing will be included in the project. He had no issues with any of the other staff recommendations.

Opposition:

Judy Payne, 1105 W Lenoir, reported on her analysis of the trees on the two properties. She believes that in looking at the arborist report, tree F should not be removed. Based on her measurement the tree is 67 yrs. old. She continued to say that the two-story houses will be towering over the sidewalk and her bungalow across the street. She does not believe that the carport should be included and explained that she is downhill from the lot and hopes that these considerations will keep stormwater off of her site. Ms. Payne stated that she is basically in favor of the project, but would like to see the trees saved.

Ms. David asked for clarification of the setback she believed to be 15' from the sidewalk. Ms. Robb affirmed the 15' measurement.

Mr. Maurer answered that they are going to work with the arborist and staff to address tree replacement locations, which may be split over the two lots. They will work with neighbors to address erosion controls.

Elizabeth Dunbar, a resident two properties south of the parcels in question, asked for clarification on the second story siding. Both board and batten siding and shake siding is included on the application.

Mr. Davis inquired if there were other examples of board and batten (b&b) and noted that he found it to be an unusual choice. Ms. David noted that the Commission approved b&b on a basement addition in Oakwood. Mr. Mauer noted that there are plenty of examples of a two-material banded choice in the district.

Responses and Questions:

Chair Caliendo noted that according to guideline 3.3.7, the height of a new building should fall within 10% of nearby existing houses and asked for an analysis of the neighborhood height. Mr. Mauer relayed that within a few blocks of the property there are examples of taller houses.

Ms. David noted that both proposed houses are long and tall on the side elevations, making them seem out of scale for the neighborhood. The massing on the side and the solid to void ratio is out of character on 1104, and on 1102 the horizontal window out of character with district. Mr. Mauer responded that with the removal of the porte cochere from 1104 W Lenoir the window sills have been extended down to get more appropriately proportioned windows.

Mr. Davis asked for clarification of the height at the ridgeline. Mr. Maurer estimated it at 27'. Mr. Fountain expressed concern over the appearance of a 3rd floor with steeper roof pitches than shown in the examples, resulting in the appearance of a higher overall height. Mr. Fountain noted that the existing houses do not have two stories with a gable end facing the street. Mr. Mauer responded that his house in the district has a 7/12 pitch roof and these houses are 8/12. They are not opposed to changing this proposal to something similar.

Mr. Thiem asked for additional information on foundation construction in the critical root zone. Mr. Mauer responded that they can use pier and curtain wall or helical piers. This information helped change the application and opinion on how to save the trees. He committed to working with the arborist to provide a post-construction plan for the trees as well.

Mr. Davis asked for additional information regarding the one tree being removed in the back. Mr. Mauer explained that in addition to the pests the tree is also leaning, but offered to work with staff to explore a treatment plan to see if we can save the 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 is missing is the analysis regarding the proposed height to the ridgeline. I don't have enough information to make a decision on the massing. [Caliendo]

I have a question of staff. There is nothing shown in the backyard, such as patio areas and walkways. Do we deal with that when it comes back in as the next application? [Thiem]

Anything that comes in as a patio, or certain sized deck would come in as a minor work. [Robb]
Because there is no landscape plan as part of the package does staff look at that in the context of overall construction, do you track the built area and built mass for minor work applications? [Thiem]

No examples of new patios under the new guidelines come to mind. All large-scale landscape master plans come to you for review. [Robb]

Should we find some other way to track this? [Thiem]

Staff does the built area calculation every time, right? [David]

For major works, yes; for minor work, there are no examples of this under the new guidelines. [Robb]

The new guidelines are intended to keep a check on the transition from a patio to a deck to an addition, this incremental increase. [David]

Should we be tracking it? How much area is too much? I'm concerned about these changes over time. I'll leave the question for staff to consider. [Thiem]

You can only look at each application as it is presented. You're saying we need to be looking down the road. [Robb]

As we discuss how tall is too tall, I'm also saying we need to look at the area and how much area is too much. [Thiem]

Any more thoughts about the height and massing? [Caliendo]

Without having measurements, it is too hard to address the height. The pitch seems high. [Davis]

I think seeing the height in relationship to others, and visually placing them on the street would be needed, in context with neighbors, and would be very informative. Show the massing. [David]

I think that information is needed. [Caliendo]

Is there a sliding scale for height based on the lot size? We need better information so that applicants will know what is needed. The size of adjacent lots is needed. [Fountain]

A site plan with lot dimensions would help, showing specific heights of existing and proposed. And more information about the streetscape view and heights of existing and proposed buildings. [Caliendo]

Do the side elevations meet the guidelines? It seems like a long stretch of flat plane to me. [David]

If the notion is that we will be deferring this, what else needs to be talked about? [Fountain]
Evidence of other buildings with similar flat sides. [Caliendo]

Looking at 3.3.7. considering height, form, scale size and massing, it seems the length of building is a valid concern. [Thiem]

Right, the depth of the building. A little more information showing others that are that deep and flat. [David]

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Mr. Maurer asked what he needed to come back with if it's deferred; on the height, does the Committee want to see just this street or also on adjacent streets? The three houses behind it will be looking down at the roof of these houses. Ms. David responded that the streetscape is important to see and that he has given evidence of the mix of one- and two-stories next to each other, which is typical in all the historic districts. It's about the overall scale and the impact on the overall streetscape.

Mr. Maurer asked for more specifics on what is considered congruous and incongruous in height; is it within a specific percentage? Or within the same block? Several examples were discussed. Ms. David replied that it would be helpful. Mr. Maurer stated that he couldn't present enough evidence today, so clarified that the Committee wants examples of the heights of other houses in the district, specifically the analysis of how much taller two-story houses are than one-story houses is what is needed. Mr. Maurer asked if they wanted to see ridge heights. The Committee responded that they would like examples of other houses to the ridge.

Mr. Maurer asked Mr. Thiem about the side elevation and what about it does not meet the specific guideline. Mr. Thiem said he was following up on Ms. David's comment about the long side length. Ms. Caliendo said it was about the massing and articulation. Mr. Maurer gave the example of the Cutler Street grocery. Mr. Thiem asked if the original structure was residential. Mr. Maurer replied no, it was originally a store, and they added a second story to make it residential.

Ms. David asked if the length is longer than most houses in the area. Mr. Maurer said he could provide that, or else putting in a bay to break that up.

Mr. Fountain said that the 48-50% coverage that is noted in the staff report is not shocking to us. Mr. Maurer replied he was glad he did the analysis. Mr. Davis agreed they are unusually small lots.

Ms. Payne stated that the original design of the neighborhood speaks about more modest structures at the edge of the neighborhood.

Mr. Maurer asked if the Committee could approve the demolition of the structure and the removal of the one tree so they could proceed.

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]:

It looks like we're headed toward deferring. [Caliendo]

I like the offer of the applicant to save the three trees on the north property line and the offer to alter the construction of the building to respond to trees. I'm concerned over the amount of impact from the construction activity. Are we saving a tree to die a couple of years down the road? Are we better served to remove the trees and replace them now? I'm also concerned about the total number of trees to be removed. We're having a problem tracking tree protection plans. We're getting ready to take a tree down, but we haven't approved a structure in its place. I would not support that. [Thiem]

All we can do is put a delay on the demolition of the trees. [Caliendo]

There's no value to delay since we're not moving the trees. There's a balance. The three trees on north will be between two structures and are already compromised. If the trees are going to be saved, I would like to see the protection plan come back to this committee. [Thiem]

One nice thing about the carport is it helped reduce the scale on that side, but I understand why it's been removed. [Caliendo]

I'm not sure about putting the driveway in and constructing the house if it makes a difference to saving the trees. [Thiem]

With the one tree that is slated to come down so the house can be built, in order to save the tree, the house would have to be in the back of the yard, which is not congruous. [Davis]

Mr. Fountain made a motion to approve demolition of the existing building and to defer the remainder of the case to the next meeting; Mr. Thiem seconded and amended it to include the requirement for a tree protection plan for the entire site during demolition; motion carried 5/0.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

177-17-CA 1104 W LENOIR STREET
Applicant: DAVID MAURER
Received: 11/9/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 2/7/2018 1) 12/28/2017 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: Construct house and garage; install walkways, driveways, and fence; remove three trees.

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its November 28, 2017, meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker and Mary Ruffin Hanbury; also present on behalf of the owner were David Maurer and Craig Bethel, as well as staff members Tania Tully and Melissa Robb.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- This application is concurrent with another from the same applicant for a similar project on the adjacent lot at 1102 W Lenoir St (COA application 176-17-CA).
- Note that the original application materials label this property as 1106 W Lenoir St. There was an error in addressing when these lots were recently assigned updated addresses.
- Raleigh City Code Section 10.2.15.E.1. states that “An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure or site within any Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark may not be denied...However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of issuance...If the Commission finds that the building, structure or site has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark, it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal.”

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
1.3	Site Features and Plantings	Remove three trees
1.4	Fences and Walls	Install fence
1.5	Walkways, Driveways and Offstreet Parking	Install walkways and driveways
1.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	Construct garage
3.3	New Construction	Construct house

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] provided a summary of the project, and introduced a notarized opposition letter received by members of the Commission. Mr. Rasberry relayed that should the Commission like to discuss the opposition letter the appropriate time to discuss it would be after the applicant presentation. Pending committee discussion of the house height and massing, staff suggested that the committee approve the application with conditions.

Mr. Davis proposed that the Commission hear both applications for this and the neighboring property, 1104 W Lenoir St (COA application 177-17-CA), at one time. Mr. Rasberry relayed that the Commission had discretion to allow this. There were no objections.

Support:

Applicant David Maurer [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Maurer began his presentation with an amended application and supplemental images provided to the Commission. His additional materials included an analysis of the built area and built mass of nearby properties, and additional research and analysis of the significant trees on the property. He relayed that they have uncovered evidence that these trees are closer to 50-60 years old, and they received a second opinion from an arborist, and from this it appears that they can save some of the trees.

Mr. Maurer continued with a description of the significant amendments to the application shown in revised elevations and including the preservation of trees, the deletion of the carport feature and change to a ribbon driveway at 1104 W Lenoir St. He relayed that he believes that omitting the carport provides differentiation between the two houses and creates a more successful design. Additionally, Mr. Maurer added that no fencing will be included in the project. He had no issues with any of the other staff recommendations.

Opposition:

Judy Payne, 1105 W Lenoir, reported on her analysis of the trees on the two properties. She believes that in looking at the arborist report, tree F should not be removed. Based on her measurement the tree is 67 yrs. old. She continued to say that the two-story houses will be towering over the sidewalk and her bungalow across the street. She does not believe that the carport should be included and explained that she is downhill from the lot and hopes that these considerations will keep stormwater off her site. Ms. Payne stated that she is basically in favor of the project, but would like to see the trees saved.

Ms. David asked for clarification of the setback she believed to be 15' from the sidewalk. Ms. Robb affirmed the 15' measurement.

Mr. Maurer answered that they are going to work with the arborist and staff to address tree replacement locations, which may be split over the two lots. They will work with neighbors to address erosion controls.

Elizabeth Dunbar, a resident two properties south of the parcels in question, asked for clarification on the second story siding. Both board and batten siding and shake siding is included on the application.

Mr. Mauer explained the intent to use Hardie shakes on the upper portion of the facade and provided the Commission with a sample. Additionally, he provided an example of true cedar shake (from 115 W Cabarrus Street) to show the similarities in thickness. He explained that the shake would be painted and noted that the Commission has approved synthetic for new buildings and additions, and therefore felt that it was appropriate. He relayed that they were open to discussion on the pattern.

Mr. Davis noted that the grain on real cedar is more obvious as it ages. Mr. Mauer responded that it takes 80 years to get that texture, more if painted. Additionally, he pointed to an example of painted shake on an upper floor at the Cutler Street grocery.

Responses and Questions:

Chair Caliendo noted that according to guideline 3.3.7, the height of a new building should fall within 10% of nearby existing houses and asked for an analysis of the neighborhood height. Mr. Mauer relayed that within a few blocks of the property there are examples of taller houses.

Ms. David noted that both proposed houses are long and tall on the side elevations, making them seem out of scale for the neighborhood. The massing on the side and the solid to void ratio is out of character on 1104, and on 1102 the horizontal window out of character with district. Mr. Mauer responded that with the removal of the porte cochere from 1104 W Lenoir the window sills have been extended down to get more appropriately proportioned windows.

Mr. Davis asked for clarification of the height at the ridgeline. Mr. Maurer estimated it at 27'. Mr. Fountain expressed concern over the appearance of a 3rd floor with steeper roof pitches than shown in the examples, resulting in the appearance of a higher overall height. Mr. Fountain noted that the existing houses do not have two stories with a gable end facing the street. Mr. Mauer responded that his house in the district has a 7/12 pitch roof and these houses are 8/12. They are not opposed to changing this proposal to something similar.

Mr. Thiem asked for additional information on foundation construction in the critical root zone. Mr. Mauer responded that they can use pier and curtain wall or helical piers. This information helped change the application and opinion on how to save the trees. He committed to working with the arborist to provide a post-construction plan for the trees as well.

Mr. Davis asked for additional information regarding the one tree being removed in the back. Mr. Mauer explained that in addition to the pests the tree is also leaning, but offered to work with staff to explore a treatment plan to see if we can save the 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 is missing is the analysis regarding the proposed height to the ridgeline. I don't have enough information to make a decision on the massing. [Caliendo]

I have a question of staff. There is nothing shown in the backyard, such as patio areas and walkways. Do we deal with that when it comes back in as the next application? [Thiem]

Anything that comes in as a patio, or certain sized deck would come in as a minor work. [Robb] Because there is no landscape plan as part of the package does staff look at that in the context of overall construction, do you track the built area and built mass for minor work applications?

[Thiem]

No examples of new patios under the new guidelines come to mind. All large-scale landscape master plans come to you for review. [Robb]

Should we find some other way to track this? [Thiem]

Staff does the built area calculation every time, right? [David]

For major works, yes; for minor work, there are no examples of this under the new guidelines. [Robb]

The new guidelines are intended to keep a check on the transition from a patio to a deck to an addition, this incremental increase. [David]

Should we be tracking it? How much area is too much? I'm concerned about these changes over time. I'll leave the question for staff to consider. [Thiem]

You can only look at each application as it is presented. You're saying we need to be looking down the road. [Robb]

As we discuss how tall is too tall, I'm also saying we need to look at the area and how much area is too much. [Thiem]

Any more thoughts about the height and massing? [Caliendo]

Without having measurements, it is too hard to address the height. The pitch seems high. [Davis]

I think seeing the height in relationship to others, and visually placing them on the street would be needed, in context with neighbors, and would be very informative. Show the massing.

[David]

I think that information is needed. [Caliendo]

Is there a sliding scale for height based on the lot size? We need better information so that applicants will know what is needed. The size of adjacent lots is needed. [Fountain]

A site plan with lot dimensions would help, showing specific heights of existing and proposed. And more information about the streetscape view and heights of existing and proposed buildings. [Caliendo]

Do the side elevations meet the guidelines? It seems like a long stretch of flat plane to me. [David]

If the notion is that we will be deferring this, what else needs to be talked about? [Fountain]
Evidence of other buildings with similar flat sides. [Caliendo]
Looking at 3.3.7. considering height, form, scale size and massing, it seems the length of building is a valid concern. [Thiem]
Right, the depth of the building. A little more information showing others that are that deep and flat. [David]

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Mr. Maurer asked what he needed to come back with if it's deferred; on the height, does the Committee want to see just this street or also on adjacent streets? The three houses behind it will be looking down at the roof of these houses. Ms. David responded that the streetscape is important to see and that he has given evidence of the mix of one- and two-stories next to each other, which is typical in all the historic districts. It's about the overall scale and the impact on the overall streetscape.

Mr. Maurer asked for more specifics on what is considered congruous and incongruous in height; is it within a specific percentage? Or within the same block? Several examples were discussed. Ms. David replied that it would be helpful. Mr. Maurer stated that he couldn't present enough evidence today, so clarified that the Committee wants examples of the heights of other houses in the district, specifically the analysis of how much taller two-story houses are than one-story houses is what is needed. Mr. Maurer asked if they wanted to see ridge heights. The Committee responded that they would like examples of other houses to the ridge.

Mr. Maurer asked Mr. Thiem about the side elevation and what about it does not meet the specific guideline. Mr. Thiem said he was following up on Ms. David's comment about the long side length. Ms. Caliendo said it was about the massing and articulation. Mr. Maurer gave the example of the Cutler Street grocery. Mr. Thiem asked if the original structure was residential. Mr. Maurer replied no, it was originally a store, and they added a second story to make it residential.

Ms. David asked if the length is longer than most houses in the area. Mr. Maurer said he could provide that, or else putting in a bay to break that up.

Mr. Fountain said that the 48-50% coverage that is noted in the staff report is not shocking to us. Mr. Maurer replied he was glad he did the analysis. Mr. Davis agreed they are unusually small lots.

Ms. Payne stated that the original design of the neighborhood speaks about more modest structures at the edge of the neighborhood.

Mr. Maurer asked if the Committee could approve the demolition of the structure and the removal of the one tree so they could proceed.

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]:

It looks like we're headed toward deferring. [Caliendo]

I like the offer of the applicant to save the three trees on the north property line and the offer to alter the construction of the building to respond to trees. I'm concerned over the amount of impact from the construction activity. Are we saving a tree to die a couple of years down the road? Are we better served to remove the trees and replace them now? I'm also concerned about the total number of trees to be removed. We're having a problem tracking tree protection plans. We're getting ready to take a tree down, but we haven't approved a structure in its place. I would not support that. [Thiem]

All we can do is put a delay on the demolition of the trees. [Caliendo]

There's no value to delay since we're not moving the trees. There's a balance. The three trees on north will be between two structures and are already compromised. If the trees are going to be saved, I would like to see the protection plan come back to this committee. [Thiem]

One nice thing about the carport is it helped reduce the scale on that side, but I understand why it's been removed. [Caliendo]

I'm not sure about putting the driveway in and constructing the house if it makes a difference to saving the trees. [Thiem]

With the one tree that is slated to come down so the house can be built, in order to save the tree, the house would have to be in the back of the yard, which is not congruous. [Davis]

Mr. Fountain made a motion to approve demolition of the existing building and to defer the remainder of the case to the next meeting; Mr. Thiem seconded and amended it to include the requirement for a tree protection plan for the entire site during demolition; motion carried 5/0.

Mr. Mauer asked for additional feedback on the siding. Mr. Davis noted that the Commission would need examples of where they can see an example, whereby Mr. Mauer committed to finding samples and providing addresses of where a painted version of the product could be seen.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Administrative Review of Conditions

a. 176-16-CA, 411 N East Street, Oakwood Historic District

After discussion, Ms. David made a motion that the revised drawings meet the conditions as requested at the December 2016 COA meeting related to the pyramidal roof form. Mr. Thiem seconded the motion. The motion passed 5/0.

b. 131-16-CA, 912 Williamson Drive, Rothstein House

After discussion, Mr. Davis made a motion that staff be allowed issue the blue placard subject to the original conditions of approval noting that proposed window changes are subject to a new COA review. Ms. David seconded the motion. The motion passed 5/0.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:38 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Melissa Robb, Preservation Planner