

RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
January 25, 2018

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

Tania Tully, Preservation Planner, called the roll as follows:

Present: Sarah David, Don Davis, Nick Fountain

Alternate Present: John Hinshaw

Excused Absence: Elizabeth Caliendo, Jimmy Thiem

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

Approval of the December 28, 2017 Minutes

Ms. Robb noted proposed changes to the Findings-of-Fact for case 174-17-CA. Mr. Fountain moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing and to adopt said minutes as amended. Ms. David 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. Acting chair Mr. Don Davis administered the affirmation.

<u>Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address</u>	<u>Affirmed</u>
John L Thomas, 5508 Swiftbrook Circle 27606	Yes
Roger Austin, 2825 Barmettler 27607	Yes
David Maurer, 115.5 E Hargett Street 27601	Yes
Matthew Konar, 611 W Club Blvd 27701	Yes
Jason Renzaglia, 709 Hinsdale St 27605	Yes
Rob Allen, 1108 W Lenoir Street 27603	Yes
Shawn Donovan, 307 S Salem Street 27502	Yes
Jenn Truman, 1928 Sierra Drive 27603	Yes

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Acting Chair Davis introduced the public hearing portion of the meeting. The committee heard the following cases in the following order for which the Certified Records are made part of these minutes: 176-17-CA, 177-17-CA, 151-17-CA, 191-17-CA, 002-18-CA, 003-18-CA, 004-18-CA and 005-18-CA.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] provided a summary of the projects at 1102 and 1104 W Lenoir St (177-17-CA) since the projects are related. Staff suggested that the committee approve the application with conditions.

Support:

Applicant David Maurer and Shawn Donovan [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Maurer stated that he brought samples of the fiber cement shakes, as requested at the previous month's COA meeting.

Mr. Rob Allen [affirmed], 1108 W Lenoir St, spoke in favor of the project. He stated that he is the owner of the property directly to the north of the applicant's properties, and that he appreciated the addition of a tree protection plan to the application. He said the application addressed the comments about the roof height. Mr. Allen said that the Committee was going to set a precedent about the materials, and asked that they consider it carefully.

Opposition:

No one was present to speak in opposition to the application.

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Davis asked the applicant to show the material samples. Mr. Maurer showed painted samples of both cedar shakes and fiber cement shakes. He said that he had previously shown untreated shakes, but the plan is to paint them. Mr. Maurer stated that the rendering they provided showed a staggered style of shakes, with multiple units per board, and that the manufacture makes a flush edge style that may be more typical of the neighborhood.

Mr. Davis said he observed there were a number of houses on Chamberlain St that had the irregular pattern, and that he was in favor of the flush edge product. Mr. Maurer said he could amend the application to use a flush pattern of panels. Mr. Davis and Ms. Tully asked for clarification about the pattern of the panels when installed, and Mr. Maurer clarified that the bottom of the shingles would be straight.

Mr. Fountain asked if any of the addresses provided as examples of fiber cement shakes were approved with a COA. Mr. Maurer responded that the one on Cutler St with shakes on the second-floor addition were approved.

Mr. Davis asked if they were going to change the curb cuts from where they are now. Mr. Maurer answered that they would use the existing curb cut for 1104, and for 1102 they are doing a new one and patching the old curb.

Ms. David thanked the applicant for providing the height comparisons previously requested.

Opposition:

Mr. Davis acknowledged there were some late-comers and asked if there was anyone who wanted to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Judy Payne [affirmed], 1105 W Lenoir Street, stated she was not sure what was subject for approval, and asked the committee to make a decision based on the scale of the neighborhood. She said she would like to see the trees saved, and that she would like to see it made to look nicer and prettier, not just build the biggest square footage possible. Ms. Payne stated that she wanted to see this part of the neighborhood look better with nicer materials and workmanship. Mr. Davis said that the revised application showed the heights of the proposed buildings related to others nearby. Ms. Payne replied that she had seen that, and she was concerned that small lots keep getting filled with larger and larger homes. She continued that currently they get a lot of sunshine but she's not sure that will continue if larger structures keep getting approved.

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

With no objection from the committee, Mr. Davis closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

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

Have we approved fiber cement before? [Hinshaw]

Yes, frequently. [David]

I understand the last speaker was concerned about scale, but I think applicant did a good job addressing the scale, and it meets the guidelines in terms of the scale. I have concern over fiber cement shakes, that it looks fake. I think it could be helped with the flush shingles.

If we are going to approve it, what would that mean for future applicants? [Fountain]

Because this is new construction, not an existing house, it's different. I wouldn't approve it if it was an existing structure with shakes on it already. It would be the same with Hardieplank where we've only approved that for additions or new construction. [Davis]

Other things you could point out, in this case it is on the second level. That would be a fact you could consider. [Tully]

It's farther away from the viewer. [David]

As I recall, the first time you approved fiber cement on an addition was on a second level dormer on a bungalow. You've thought that way in the past. [Tully]

But then it creeps. [David]

I'm not suggesting one way or the other. It certainly has. You've increased over the years where smooth-faced fiber cement has gone from new construction to additions. [Tully]

With the houses on Chamberlain, I thought they were hard to distinguish from the street. I would have had to have gotten up closer. From the street I thought they looked okay. I'd be in favor of approving them for new construction, second floor. [Davis]

Did we discuss the 2-bay garage at the last meeting? [David]

No, there was no discussion about that. [Robb]

It does face the alley, and not the street. [Davis]

Are we addressing the trees? [Hinshaw]

The three trees on the property line to the north will have a tree protection plan, and the one at the back will not come down but will have annual treatments. [Davis]

And there's the one in the middle. [David]

The one in the middle has to be removed. [Davis]

Are they concerned the trees to the north will be affected by construction activity? [Hinshaw]

The tree that's coming down removes a lot of canopy, so we should try and preserve the canopy, that's important. [Davis]

Our alternatives with the tree in the middle, we could impose a delay, but to what end. It's still going to come down. [David]

The only way for the tree to stay is if the house is in the back of the lots and that's not appropriate. [Davis]

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Mr. Hinshaw 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 1-23), B. (inclusive of facts 1-5), C. (inclusive of facts 1-3), and D. (inclusive of facts 1-6) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Constructing a 2-story house is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.2, 1.3.7, 1.3.13, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.3, 3.3.4, 3.3.5, 3.3.6, 3.3.7, 3.3.9, 3.3.10, 3.3.11, 3.3.12, and the following facts:
 - 1* Built area to open space analysis: According to the applicant, the lot is 6,211 SF. The footprint of the house is 1,457 SF; including the front porch, porte cochere, rear porch, garage, rear drive, front drive and front walkway it is 2,997 SF. The proportion of built area to open space is 48%.
 - 2* Built mass to open space analysis: According to the applicant, the lot is 6,211 SF. The footprint of the house is 1,457 SF; including the front porch, porte cochere, rear porch and garage it is 2,505 SF. The proportion of built mass to open space is 40%.
 - 3* A tree protection plan was provided for the water oak at the rear of the property. See section C below for more about the trees on the site.
 - 4* A site section that shows the rise in grade from the street to the rear alley was provided. It shows regrading in the area between the garage and the rear of the house.
 - 5* The location of HVAC units and screening was not provided.

- 6* Context on the block: The proposed house is two stories. The four houses to the north on Lenoir St are single-story bungalows with Craftsman details, while the property to the south (which faces Cabarrus St) is a 1 ½-story bungalow. On the west side of Lenoir St is a one-story bungalow and a group of commercial/industrial buildings.
- 7* The applicant provided drawings illustrating the relative roof heights of the existing quadplex and its neighbors, showing the existing building is 21% taller than at 1108 W Lenoir St and 36% taller than at 916 W Cabarrus St. The ridge heights of the proposed new 2-story houses are roughly 2 feet taller than the existing quadplex, making them 30% taller than at 1108 W Lenoir St and 45% taller than at 916 W Cabarrus St, a 9% increase in roof height compared to the existing quadplex.
- 8* The applicant provided other examples nearby in Boylan Heights where two two-story houses are flanked by single-story houses, all on W South St. This is relevant because the concurrent application at 1104 W Lenoir St (COA application 177-17-CA) is also a two-story house, thus creating a pair of two-story houses on a block that otherwise contains single-story residences. New drawings of these other house groupings illustrate the differences in roof heights, with the two-story houses ranging from 33% to 51% taller than their shorter neighbors.
- 9* The applicant provided illustrations of three other two-story houses on the same block that are taller than the proposed house, all of which are behind the houses across the alley:
 - a. 418 Cutler St – 7% taller than the proposed house;
 - b. 420 Cutler St - 2% taller than the proposed house;
 - c. 422 Cutler St - 11% taller than the proposed house.
- 10* The applicant provided examples of other Boylan Heights buildings that have similar flat side walls to compare with the 56' wall under the main hipped roof of the proposed house;
 - a. 620 Cutler St – 59' side elevation under the main roof;
 - b. 603 Cutler St – 62' side elevation under the main roof;
 - c. 728 W Cabarrus St – 58' side elevation under the main roof.
- 11* The house is a two-story, hipped roof structure with projecting gable-roofed elements on the front and rear. It includes a porte cochere that is integrated with the roof of the front porch, as well as a rear porch that is partially inset.
- 12* Amended drawings show a lowering of the roof height by changing the roof pitch to 7/12.
- 13* The house features some Craftsman details such as paired porch columns on brick piers, exposed rafter tails on the front porch and porte cochere roof, and fiber cement lapped siding on the lower portion of the walls separated by a band board from the board and batten siding above. The foundation is brick, but a sample was not provided. The updated drawings no longer include a dormer window on the front of the hipped roof.
- 14* The applicant provided six examples of buildings in the district that include different siding on the upper and lower floors; 620 Cutler St, 728 W Cabarrus St, 610 S Boylan Ave, 317 S Boylan Ave and 710 McCulloch St.
- 15* One anachronistic feature is the two-story projecting bay on the front façade. This creates a vertical emphasis which is atypical of the Craftsman style.
- 16* The applicant provided a photo of a house with a projecting bay at 422 Cutler St, although in this example the full-width front porch bisects the double-height projecting bay and

limits the impact of the strong vertical element. The example photo of 504 S Boylan shows many similarities, including the two-story projecting bay on the front façade. Another relevant example from staff is the new-construction Craftsman-style house at 503 Cutler Street approved in 2015 (COA 121-15-CA) features a projecting bay above the porch uncommon in historic Craftsman-style houses.

- 17* The porte cochere is not uncommon on historic Craftsman-style houses, but is less common in Boylan Heights. The applicant provided an example of a porte cochere at 511 Cutler St.
 - 18* Another feature that is not uncommon on historic Craftsman-style houses is the partial-width front porch, but is less common in Boylan Heights on two-story residences. The applicant provided an example of a partial-width front porch at 504 S Boylan Ave.
 - 19* A new horizontal window (an atypical window form in the district) is proposed for a bathroom on the second floor on the south side of the house toward the rear in an inconspicuous location.
 - 20* The house will be clad in materials that match the garage with fiber cement siding (smooth side out) and a composite material trim. The windows will match those on the garage. Asphalt shingles will be used for most of the roof, while standing seam metal will be used for the porch/porte cochere and small shed roof over second story front windows.
 - 21* Specifications and details for the roofing material were not provided.
 - 22* Specifications and details were provided for the windows, doors, eaves and railings (if needed). Window trim is traditional with 4" casing on 3 sides and a bottom sill. Muntin profiles for the window were not.
 - 23* No information was provided for the location or specifications of light fixtures.
- B. Constructing a garage is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.6.5, 1.6.6, 1.6.7, 1.6.8, 1.6.10, 1.6.11, and 1.6.12, and the following facts:
- 1* A gable roofed one-story, two-car garage is proposed which is to be accessed from the rear alley. Alley loaded garages are common and historical in the district.
 - 2* The application indicates the garage will feature two overhead doors and a person door. Two windows will be installed; one in the gable above the garage doors, and one in the side wall with the person door. No details and specifications were provided for the garage vehicular doors.
 - 3* The applicant provided photographs of other garages in Boylan Heights at 706 S Boylan Avenue (which must be labeled incorrectly since the address does not show up in iMAPS), 502 Cutler St and 1010 W Lenoir St.
 - 4* The garage will be clad in materials that match the house with fiber cement siding with the smooth side out, and with composite material trim. The windows will match those on the house. Asphalt shingles will be used for the roof. The color was not specified.
 - 5* Paint colors were provided; however, paint color swatches were not. Lighting details were not provided.
- C. Removing two trees is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.5, 1.3.6, and 3.3.2; however, removing a healthy tree is incongruous in concept according to

Guidelines 1.3.1, 1.3.5, 1.3.6 and 3.3.2, and removing trees without replacing them is incongruous in concept according to Guideline 1.3.5, and the following facts:

- 1* The applicants propose removing two mature trees from the site; one is in the path of the new house, while the ash tree is leaning toward the property and is unhealthy. Arborist reports were provided.
 - 2* There was no indication that the two trees would be replaced.
 - 3* One mature water oak tree at the rear of the property will be retained and protected during construction. A tree protection plan was provided.
- D. Installing walkways and driveways is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines 1.5.5, 1.5.6, 1.5.8, 1.5.9, and the following facts:*
- 1* The existing non-historic circle drive that spans both 1102 and 1104 W Lenoir St will be removed with the demolition of the existing building.
 - 2* The applicant proposes installing two driveways; one gravel driveway off the alley leading to the garage and one concrete driveway off the street leading to the carport.
 - 3* Alley-loaded driveways are a common and historic feature in Boylan Heights.
 - 4* The gray gravel of the alley driveway is to be similar to that found on adjacent properties. Gravel driveways are common and historical in the district.
 - 5* The new front driveway will require a new curb cut and apron, as well as filling in the existing curb cut and apron. No curb cut details were provided.
 - 6* A new concrete walkway with a water-washed finish is proposed which runs between the sidewalk and front porch, essentially centered on the front of the house, as is common and historical in the district.

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

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION (2)

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

I thought we discussed in the last meeting we weren't taking down that one in the back.

[Davis]

The application was not amended to that. [Tully]

With no objection from the committee, Mr. Davis reopened the public hearing portion of the meeting.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Mr. Maurer stated that there are two trees in the rear, and that they are keeping the one healthy oak on the alley. Mr. Davis replied that he thought the one that was going to come down was because it needed treatments every year. He said we decided to keep that and just do the

treatments. Mr. Maurer answered that one of the trees is leaning pretty heavily with power lines running through it.

Ms. Tully stated it would be a minor work approval to remove dead, diseased or dangerous trees, and staff would approve it as a minor work without bringing it to the committee. Ms. Robb clarified that it would require a replacement, as well.

Mr. Davis asked if both trees were being replaced that are coming down. Mr. Maurer responded yes, that was the condition.

With no objection from the committee, Mr. Davis closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

1. That there be no demolition delay for the removal of the trees.
2. That tree protection plans be implemented and remain in place for the duration of construction.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. Location and species of replacement trees;
 - b. Curb cut;
 - c. Garage vehicular door;
 - d. Window muntins;
 - e. Roofing materials;
 - f. Brick sample for foundation;
 - g. Paint colors;
 - h. Exterior lighting;
 - i. HVAC location and screening.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 7/25/18.

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) 1/25/2018 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: Construct house and garage; install walkways and driveways.

Amendments: Amendments were received from the applicant on 1/10/18 that include eliminating the fence installation, tree removal, and porte cochere from the application.

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.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
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 projects at 1102 and 1104 W Lenoir St (177-17-CA) since the projects are related. Staff suggested that the committee approve the application with conditions.

Support:

Applicant David Maurer and Shawn Donovan [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Maurer stated that he brought samples of the fiber cement shakes, as requested at the previous month's COA meeting.

Mr. Rob Allen [affirmed], 1108 W Lenoir St, spoke in favor of the project. He stated that he is the owner of the property directly to the north of the applicant's properties, and that he appreciated the addition of a tree protection plan to the application. He said the application addressed the comments about the roof height. Mr. Allen said that the Committee was going to set a precedent about the materials, and asked that they consider it carefully.

Opposition:

No one was present to speak in opposition to the application.

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Davis asked the applicant to show the material samples. Mr. Maurer showed painted samples of both cedar shakes and fiber cement shakes. He said that he had previously shown untreated shakes, but the plan is to paint them. Mr. Maurer stated that the rendering they provided showed a staggered style of shakes, with multiple units per board, and that the manufacture makes a flush edge style that may be more typical of the neighborhood.

Mr. Davis said he observed there were a number of houses on Chamberlain St that had the irregular pattern, and that he was in favor of the flush edge product. Mr. Maurer said he could amend the application to use a flush pattern of panels. Mr. Davis and Ms. Tully asked for clarification about the pattern of the panels when installed, and Mr. Maurer clarified that the bottom of the shingles would be straight.

Mr. Fountain asked if any of the addresses provided as examples of fiber cement shakes were approved with a COA. Mr. Maurer responded that the one on Cutler St with shakes on the second-floor addition were approved.

Mr. Davis asked if they were going to change the curb cuts from where they are now. Mr. Maurer answered that they would use the existing curb cut for 1104, and for 1102 they are doing a new one and patching the old curb.

Ms. David thanked the applicant for providing the height comparisons previously requested.

Opposition:

Mr. Davis acknowledged there were some late-comers and asked if there was anyone who wanted to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Judy Payne [affirmed], 1105 W Lenoir Street, stated she was not sure what was subject for approval, and asked the committee to make a decision based on the scale of the neighborhood. She said she would like to see the trees saved, and that she would like to see it made to look nicer and prettier, not just build the biggest square footage possible. Ms. Payne stated that she wanted to see this part of the neighborhood look better with nicer materials and workmanship. Mr. Davis said that the revised application showed the heights of the proposed buildings related to others nearby. Ms. Payne replied that she had seen that, and she was concerned that small lots keep getting filled with larger and larger homes. She continued that currently they get a lot of sunshine but she's not sure that will continue if larger structures keep getting approved.

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

With no objection from the committee, Mr. Davis closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

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

Have we approved fiber cement before? [Hinshaw]

Yes, frequently. [David]

I understand the last speaker was concerned about scale, but I think applicant did a good job addressing the scale, and it meets the guidelines in terms of the scale. I have concern over fiber cement shakes, that it looks fake. I think it could be helped with the flush shingles.

If we are going to approve it, what would that mean for future applicants? [Fountain]

Because this is new construction, not an existing house, it's different. I wouldn't approve it if it was an existing structure with shakes on it already. It would be the same with Hardieplank where we've only approved that for additions or new construction. [Davis]

Other things you could point out, in this case it is on the second level. That would be a fact you could consider. [Tully]

It's farther away from the viewer. [David]

As I recall, the first time you approved fiber cement on an addition was on a second level dormer on a bungalow. You've thought that way in the past. [Tully]

But then it creeps. [David]

I'm not suggesting one way or the other. It certainly has. You've increased over the years where smooth-faced fiber cement has gone from new construction to additions. [Tully]

With the houses on Chamberlain, I thought they were hard to distinguish from the street. I would have had to have gotten up closer. From the street I thought they looked okay. I'd be in favor of approving them for new construction, second floor. [Davis]

Did we discuss the 2-bay garage at the last meeting? [David]

No, there was no discussion about that. [Robb]

It does face the alley, and not the street. [Davis]

Are we addressing the trees? [Hinshaw]

The three trees on the property line to the north will have a tree protection plan, and the one at the back will not come down but will have annual treatments. [Davis]

And there's the one in the middle. [David]

The one in the middle has to be removed. [Davis]

Are they concerned the trees to the north will be affected by construction activity? [Hinshaw]

The tree that's coming down removes a lot of canopy, so we should try and preserve the canopy, that's important. [Davis]

Our alternatives with the tree in the middle, we could impose a delay, but to what end. It's still going to come down. [David]

The only way for the tree to stay is if the house is in the back of the lots and that's not appropriate. [Davis]

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Ms. David 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 1-23), B. (inclusive of facts 1-5), and C. (inclusive of facts 1-6) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Constructing a 2-story house is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.2, 1.3.7, 1.3.13, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.3, 3.3.4, 3.3.5, 3.3.6, 3.3.7, 3.3.9, 3.3.10, 3.3.11, 3.3.12, and the following facts:
 - 1* Built area to open space analysis: According to the applicant, the lot is 5,951 SF. The footprint of the house is 1,464 SF; including the front porch, rear porch, garage, rear drive, front drive and front walkway it is 2,975 SF. The proportion of built area to open space is 50%.
 - 2* Built mass to open space analysis: According to the applicant, the lot is 5,951 SF. The footprint of the house is 1,464 SF; including the front porch, rear porch and garage it is 2,510 SF. The proportion of built mass to open space is 42%.
 - 3* A site section that shows the rise in grade from the street to the rear alley was provided. It shows regrading in the area between the garage and the rear of the house.
 - 4* The location of HVAC units and screening was not provided.
 - 5* Context on the block: The proposed house is two stories. The four houses to the north on Lenoir St are single-story bungalows with Craftsman details, while the property to the south (which faces Cabarrus St) is a 1 ½-story bungalow. On the west side of Lenoir St is a one-story bungalow and a group of commercial/industrial buildings.
 - 6* The applicant provided drawings illustrating the relative roof heights of the existing quadplex and its neighbors, showing the existing building is 21% taller than at 1108 W Lenoir St and 36% taller than at 916 W Cabarrus St. The ridge heights of the proposed new 2-story houses are roughly 2 feet taller than the existing quadplex, making them 30% taller

than at 1108 W Lenoir St and 45% taller than at 916 W Cabarrus St, a 9% increase in roof height compared to the existing quadplex.

- 7* The applicant provided other examples nearby in Boylan Heights where two two-story houses are flanked by single-story houses, all on W South St. This is relevant because the concurrent application at 1102 W Lenoir St (COA application 176-17-CA) is also a two-story house, thus creating a pair of two-story houses on a block that otherwise contains single-story residences. New drawings of these other house groupings illustrate the differences in roof heights, with the two-story houses ranging from 33% to 51% taller than their shorter neighbors.
- 8* The applicant provided illustrations of three other two-story houses on the same block that are taller than the proposed house, all of which are behind the houses across the alley:
 - a. 418 Cutler St – 7% taller than the proposed house;
 - b. 420 Cutler St - 2% taller than the proposed house;
 - c. 422 Cutler St - 11% taller than the proposed house.
- 9* The applicant provided examples of other Boylan Heights buildings that have similar flat side walls to compare with the 56' wall under the main hipped roof of the proposed house;
 - a. 620 Cutler St – 59' side elevation under the main roof;
 - b. 603 Cutler St – 62' side elevation under the main roof;
- 10* 728 W Cabarrus St – 58' side elevation under the main roof.
- 11* The house is a two-story, hipped roof structure with projecting hipped roof elements on the front and rear. It includes a front porch and a rear porch that is partially inset.
- 12* Amended drawings show a lowering of the roof height by changing the roof pitch to 7/12.
- 13* The house features some Craftsman details such as tapered porch columns on brick piers, exposed rafter tails on the front porch roof, and fiber cement lapped siding on the lower portion of the walls separated by a band board from the fiber cement shake-form siding above. The foundation is brick, but a sample was not provided. It should be noted that fiber cement shake-form siding has not been approved in any historic district up to now. The updated drawings no longer include a dormer window on the front of the hipped roof.
- 14* The applicant provided six examples of buildings in the district that include different siding on the upper and lower floors; 620 Cutler St, 728 W Cabarrus St, 610 S Boylan Ave, 511 Cutler St and 710 McCulloch St.
- 15* One anachronistic feature is the two-story projecting bay on the front façade. This creates a vertical emphasis which is atypical of the Craftsman style.
- 16* The applicant provided a photo of a house with a projecting bay at 501 Cutler St, although in this example it appears a portion of the front porch was infilled at some point, limiting the impact of the strong vertical element. The example photo of 504 S Boylan shows many similarities, including the two-story projecting bay on the front façade. Their final example is at 706 S Boylan Ave, where the porch extends the full width of the façade. Another relevant example from staff is the new-construction Craftsman-style house at 503 Cutler Street approved in 2015 (COA 121-15-CA) features a projecting bay above the porch uncommon in historic Craftsman-style houses.

- 17* One feature that is not uncommon on historic Craftsman-style houses is the partial-width front porch, but is less common in Boylan Heights on two-story residences. The applicant provided an example of a partial-width front porch at 504 S Boylan Ave.
- 18* A new horizontal window (an atypical window form in the district) is proposed for a bathroom on the second floor on the south side of the house toward the rear in an inconspicuous location.
- 19* The house will be clad in materials that match the garage with fiber cement siding (smooth side out) and a composite material trim. The windows will match those on the garage. Asphalt shingles will be used for most of the roof, while standing seam metal will be used for the porch/porte cochere and small shed roof over second story front windows.
- 20* The applicant provided an example of existing houses that feature cedar shingles (614 Chamberlain St) and fiber cement shingles (612 Chamberlain St). Both cedar shingle and fiber cement shingle samples were brought to the meeting and observed by the committee members.
- 21* Specifications and details for the roofing material were not provided.
- 22* Specifications and details were provided for the windows, doors, eaves and railings (if needed). Window trim is traditional with 4" casing on 3 sides and a bottom sill. Muntin profiles for the window were not.
- 23* No information was provided for the location or specifications of light fixtures.
- 24* The fiber cement shingles are being installed on a house that is entirely new construction, and will be on the second level only.

B. Constructing a garage is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.6.5, 1.6.6, 1.6.7, 1.6.8, 1.6.10, 1.6.11, and 1.6.12, and the following suggested facts:

- 1* A pyramidal roofed one-story, two-car garage is proposed which is to be accessed from the rear alley. Alley loaded garages are common and historical in the district.
- 2* The application indicates the garage will feature two overhead doors and a person door. One window will be installed in the side wall with the person door. No details and specifications were provided for the garage vehicular doors.
- 3* The applicant provided photographs of other garages in Boylan Heights at 706 S Boylan Avenue (which must be labeled incorrectly since the address does not show up in iMAPS), 502 Cutler St and 1010 W Lenoir St.
- 4* The garage will be clad in materials that match the house with fiber cement siding with the smooth side out, and with composite material trim. The window will match those on the house. Asphalt shingles will be used for the roof. The color was not specified.
- 5* Paint colors were provided; however, paint color swatches were not. Lighting details were not provided.

C. Installing walkways and driveways is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.5.5, 1.5.6, 1.5.8, 1.5.9, and the following suggested facts:

- 1* The existing non-historic circle drive that spans both 1102 and 1104 W Lenoir St will be removed with the demolition of the existing building.

- 2* The applicant proposes installing two driveways; one gravel driveway off the alley leading to the garage and one concrete driveway off the street.
- 3* Alley-loaded driveways are a common and historic feature in Boylan Heights.
- 4* The gray gravel of the alley driveway is to be similar to that found on adjacent properties. Gravel driveways are common and historical in the district.
- 5* The new front driveway will require altering a portion of the existing curb cut and apron. No curb cut details were provided.
- 6* A new concrete walkway with a water-washed finish is proposed which runs between the sidewalk and front porch, essentially centered on the front of the house, as is common and historical in the district.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

1. That tree protection plans be implemented and remain in place for the duration of construction.
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. Curb cut;
 - b. Garage vehicular door;
 - c. Fiber cement shake form siding;
 - d. Window muntins;
 - e. Roofing materials;
 - f. Brick sample for foundation;
 - g. Paint colors;
 - h. Exterior lighting;
 - i. HVAC location and screening.
3. That the fiber cement shingles have a flush edge.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 7/25/18.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

151-17-CA 408 E LANE STREET
Applicant: JOHN THOMAS FOR GARDENER BY NATURE LLC
Received: 12/19/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 4/3/2018 1) 1/25/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: Implementation of master landscape plan: demolish concrete driveway and slab; install brick driving strips; install brick patio; construct pergolas; replace shrubbery; install rain garden; remove and replace fence; enlarge existing deck

Amendments: None

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

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	Implementation of master landscape plan: demolish concrete driveway and slab; install brick driving strips; install brick patio; construct pergolas; replace shrubbery; install rain garden
1.4	Fences and Walls	Remove and replace fence
1.5	Walkways, Driveways and Offstreet Parking	Demolish concrete driveway and slab; install brick driving strips
3.1	Decks	Enlarge existing deck

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] provided a summary of the project. Staff suggested that the committee approve the application with conditions.

Mr. Francis Rasberry, the COA committee attorney, stated that the applicant’s representative must offer testimony and present the evidence of the case only, but not act as if he is an attorney.

Support:

Applicant Mr. John Thomas [affirmed], 5508 Swiftbrook Circle, was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Thomas agreed with the staff review and stated that the conditions will be very easily dealt with by them.

Opposition:

No one was present to speak in opposition to the application.

Responses and Questions:

Ms. David thanked the applicant for the completeness of the application.

Mr. Davis asked what was the purpose of the brick walkways in the front. Mr. Thomas responded that there was an existing brick pathway that extended 4 feet out from both sides of the front walk inside the gate. The proposal was to reconfigure them to create a space between the fence and the walkway so they can plant shade ornamentals. Mr. Thomas asserted that the cruciform design is a standard cottage garden feature.

With no objection from the committee, Mr. Davis closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

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

The application is thorough. [Davis]

There is nothing controversial or outside of the guidelines. [Hinshaw]

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Mr. Fountain 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 1-7), B. (inclusive of facts 1-2), C. (inclusive of facts 1-4), and D. (inclusive of facts 1-2) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Implementation of a master landscape plan involving installing a brick patio, constructing pergolas, replacing shrubbery, and installing a rain garden is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3, 1.3.4, 1.3.6, 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 1.3.9, 1.3.10, and the following facts:

1* From the Special Character of the Oakwood Historic District: "The street pattern is grid-like, but the blocks are of varying sizes and shapes. Some blocks are roughly square, while others

are rectangular. This can lead to long stretches of sidewalk leading past home after home before an intersecting street is encountered. Most lots are small and narrow, especially between Bloodworth and East streets, and the houses are generally tightly spaced and often located close to the side lot lines. This dense grouping of buildings, which are also set close to the sidewalk, gives a certain intimacy and rhythm to the neighborhood.”

- 2* Also from the Special Character of the Oakwood Historic District: “Front yards are primarily lawn, bordered with planting beds; landscape plantings are generally informal, and often composed of simple foundation plantings.”
 - 3* The property includes a two-story brick house and mature landscaping, as well as brick walkways, front stairs and a patio.
 - 4* The use of brick hardscape features is common and historical in the Oakwood Historic District.
 - 5* The patio at the southeast corner of the house will include two trellis structures to provide shade. A pergola feature is also proposed for the garage. The use of shade structures is common and historical in the district. The applicants provided examples of other shade structures in the district.
 - 6* No detailed information on the original built area to open space was provided by the applicant, although the site plan drawings appear to illustrate a reduction in the total paved area.
 - 7* The application includes the addition of a rain garden and a stepping stone path on the northwest corner of the house, as well as the planting of a hydrangea. With the removal of the existing hollies and the installation of primarily low-lying hardscape and softscape elements, the existing HVAC units may be more visible from the front of the property.
- B. Removing and replacing fencing is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.9, 1.4.1, 1.4.2, 1.4.8, 1.4.11, and the following facts:
- 1* The property is partially surrounded by a black metal fence that runs along the sidewalks on the north and east sides as well as the west property line. The proposal includes the removal of a small portion of the fence that encloses the southeast corner of the lawn area, installation of a gate at the driveway, and installation of fencing on the existing retaining wall adjacent to the driveway. Simple black metal fencing that encloses the perimeter of properties is not common, but also not atypical for the district.
 - 2* The height of the existing fence is 50” at the south gatepost. It is unclear from the application if the 36” tall fence proposed for the top of the retaining wall will match the height of the adjacent fencing where these two items meet at the southeast corner of the lot.
- C. Demolishing a concrete driveway and slab, and installing brick driving strips is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 1.3.2, 1.3.4, 1.3.9, 1.5.1, 1.5.4, 1.5.5, 1.5.6, 1.5.8, 1.5.9, and the following facts:
- 1* From the Special Character of the Oakwood Historic District: “A few of the driveway aprons are still paved with cobblestones or brick; most are concrete. Driveways themselves are most often gravel or concrete ribbon strips, squeezing beside the house to access the rear yard, and pushing the house close to the opposite side-lot line.”

- 2* The existing driveway and garage do not appear to date to the original 1924 construction of the house.
 - 3* The applicant proposes removing the extensively paved driveway/walkway area at the rear of the house to resolve a significant issue with flooding for the house. Slight regrading is proposed.
 - 4* Brick driving strip driveways are a common and historic feature in Oakwood.
- D. Enlarging an existing deck is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.6, 3.1.7, 3.1.8, and the following facts:
- 1* The existing non-historic deck and the proposed deck addition are at the southwest corner of the lot between the house, an enclosed porch, and the garage. The deck is screened from view, as is common and historical in the district.
 - 2* The application implies that the deck extension will match the existing deck, but details are not included.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

- 1. That tree protection plans be implemented and remain in place for the duration of construction.
- 2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard:
 - a. Tree protection plan.
- 3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. Fence height detail where retaining wall fence and driveway fence extension meet;
 - b. Deck extension;
 - c. HVAC screening.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 7/25/18.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

191-17-CA 219 E NORTH STREET
Applicant: MATTHEW KONAR ARCHITECT
Received: 12/6/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 3/6/2018 1) 1/25/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BLOUNT STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: After-the-Fact: Install sidelight adjacent to the rear door

Conflict of Interest: Mr. Hinshaw was recused from the meeting.

Staff Notes:

- A minor work COA (095-17-MW) was approved 6/2/17 for various items of work for this property.
- A major work COA (123-17-CA) was denied by the COA committee at the 8/24/17 hearing. The nature of the project was “After-the-fact: Installation of sidelight on rear door”.
- At the 12/28/17 COA meeting the committee granted the applicant’s reconsideration request petition for the rear door sidelight at 219 E North St. This is to be treated as a new application.
- COAs mentioned are available for review.
- After-the-Fact applications are reviewed as though the work has not been completed.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.7	Windows and Doors	After-the-fact: Install sidelight adjacent to the rear door

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] provided a summary of the project. Staff suggested that the committee deny the application.

Support:

Applicant Mr. Matthew Konar [affirmed], 611 W Club Blvd, Durham, and Ms. Jennifer Truman, 1928 Sierra Dr., were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Konar presented a digital presentation to the Committee, including the history of construction on the site through Sanborn Fire Insurance maps and the fact that it was once residential and is now commercial. He asserted that the sidelight does not compromise the architectural integrity of the building because it is on a non-historic addition.

Mr. Konar stated that he focused on guideline 2.7.9 in his application. Via the slide presentation, he showed the relationship between the front and rear doors and stated that they do not duplicate, but rather compliment each other. Mr. Konar asked what is atypical, and then showed a series of photos from a walk through the neighborhood to address this question. He stated that they went to the National Register nomination and found there were 58 contributing buildings, of which he showed images of 45 back doors to demonstrate the diversity within the district. He said that the house is in a very commercial part of the neighborhood that used to be owned by the state, and that there are no directly adjacent neighbors. Mr. Konar discussed the compelling reasons and architectural integrity topic: this is a home with multiple additions; it is not in its original state; it was previously two buildings which have been incorporated into one building.

Opposition:

No one was present to speak in opposition to the application.

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Fountain stated that the applicant's views depend on the assumption that the sidelight is not on the original house, and how does he know for sure that this is the case? Ms. Tully added information about the format of Sanborn maps and the information the applicant described.

Mr. Konar answered that he can't tell for certain what was there in 1950, and that during deconstruction it seemed like that portion had wood was a lot newer. He observed that the use of that room was more of a storage room/toilet which would suggest it was there for commercial purposes.

Mr. Davis asked what was original door was like. Ms. David interjected that it would likely be very similar to what is there now. Mr. Konar responded that there was door back there with glazing. Mr. Davis observed that the door in the back looks older than the 1970s. Mr. Konar answered that people can put in older doors. Ms. Truman added that there is a window that is next to the rear door, and it was put back the same way which is different than the windows in the rest of the house.

Mr Fountain asked staff if they had seen the applicant's collage of doors. Ms. Tully responded no, the staff assessment was based on the original application packet. Mr. Konar stated the inventory took a long time to complete. Mr. Davis asked which of the rear doors were approved via a COA. Ms. Tully answered that we aren't sure, and that staff does not review any of the structures that are owned by the State. Ms. Truman added that this home was originally owned by the State. Ms. David said it did not have this door. Ms. Tully responded that was correct.

With no objection from the committee, Mr. Davis closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

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

This is a commercial use, not a fenced in backyard. This sits on a sea of asphalt. [Fountain]
A single unadorned door with or without glazing was the pattern. The ones with any kind of sidelight were really homemade and vernacular and part of a utilitarian backdoor wallscape. I still agree with staff comments that it draws attention and formalizes what had been a simple, homemade-looking composition. [David]

A sidelight is more a front door, not back door feature. But it is really tucked away, out of sight. [Davis]

It is a non-character defining elevation. I was part of the decision on the Lewis-Smith house and I think that was a mistake. [David]

We have approved a variety of doors at the rear of residential buildings. I think it is in a very non-character-defining place so even though it is atypical it could be approved. [Davis]

I would ask before you make your motion to spell out any additional facts you are considering in making this decision. [Tully]

One fact is that there are a variety of back doors in this district. [Davis]

But a lot of single doors. [David]

Given the location and how tucked away the door is, it won't really be seen and will have minimal impact. Another fact then is the particular location is on a portion on the back that is not visible from the side of the property and not at all from Blount Street or anywhere along North Street. I would also like to point out we should be careful to say that we aren't being swayed because it's after the fact and it was treated as if it was not installed. [Fountain]

Are there any other facts? Yes, that the applicant showed 44 additional rear doors in the district. [Davis]

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

- E. The installation of a sidelight adjacent to the rear door is not incongruous in concept according to *Guideline 2.7.9*, and the following facts:
 - 1* The S.B. Shepherd House was built in 1903, according to the report prepared in 1975 to establish the Blount Street Historic District. It is a 2-story Queen Anne with a wraparound front porch. The rear of the house has been significantly modified over the years with both 1-story and 2-story additions. According to photographs provided by the applicant, prior to the current renovations, the rear door led out to a concrete stoop and stairs. The door was a half-light with two panels. There was no sidelight.

- 2* From *Guidelines* section 2.7 Windows and Doors, Things to Consider As You Plan:
“Changing existing window and door openings, closing existing openings, or adding new openings on a historic building should be carefully considered and undertaken only for compelling reasons. Changes to original openings in a character-defining facade should never be considered. For less significant facades, the pattern of proposed openings should be characteristic of and complementary to the historic building and the historic district context.”
- 3* From the COA 095-17-MW: “The relocated rear door will be a new wood door similar to the front door and be consistent in size, glazing, detailing, trim, etc., yet more modest than the front door as this is a rear door.”
- 4* According to the drawings of the front and rear elevations, the front and rear doors are nearly identical. The front door includes a transom and two sidelights, while the rear door includes a single sidelight.
- 5* Rear doors were generally treated as secondary/service entries; a sidelight is atypical.
- 6* The application includes:
 - a. An image generated from iMAPS showing the property and surrounding properties numbered from 01 to 15. There is no title or explanation of what this page is meant to convey.
 - b. An 11" x 17" drawing labeled A0101, Architectural Floor Plan Ground Level.
- 7* The applicant states that “a thorough analysis of all rear doors and all adjacent glazing in the entire historic district” was presented at the 1/25/18 COA meeting.
- 8* There are a variety of back doors in the Blount Street HOD.
- 9* This door is on a portion on the back that is not visible from the side of the property, nor from Blount Street or North Street.
- 10* The applicant showed 44 back doors in the district, including some that are more utilitarian than this and one with a sidelight. Some of the doors shown were not subject to review by this body.
- 11* The door is on a non-character defining addition which is not in the period of significance.
- 12* The use of the property is commercial.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Davis; passed 2/1. (Ms. David opposed.)

Decision on the Application

Mr. Fountain made a motion that the application be approved.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Davis; passed 2/1. (Ms. David opposed.)

Committee members voting: David, Davis, Fountain.

Certificate expiration date: 7/25/18.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

002-18-CA 208 WOLFE STREET
Applicant: HAKAN MARKET PARTNERS INC
Received: 12/6/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 2/7/2018 1) 1/25/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: Master landscape/hardscape plan to include: remove existing asphalt surface in parking lot; install decomposed granite surface; install new asphalt; alter existing brick paver sidewalk; remove tree; plant trees; alter plantings in existing beds

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- The property appears as 319 S Blount Street in iMAPS.
- COAs mentioned are available for review.
- Unified Development Code section 10.2.15.E.1 provides that “An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure or site within any Historic Overlay District...may not be denied.... However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of issuance.... If the Commission finds that the building, structure or site has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark, it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<i>Sections</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Description of Work</i>
1.3	Site Features and Plantings	Master landscape/hardscape plan to include: remove existing asphalt surface in parking lot; install decomposed granite surface; install new asphalt; alter existing brick paver sidewalk; remove trees; plant trees; alter plantings in existing beds
1.5	Walkways, Driveways and Offstreet Parking	Remove existing asphalt surface in parking lot; install decomposed granite surface; install new asphalt; alter existing brick paver sidewalk

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] provided a summary of the project. Staff suggested that the committee discuss the decomposed granite material and approve the application with conditions.

Mr. Francis Rasberry, the COA committee attorney, stated that the applicant, as a representative of a corporate entity, must offer testimony and present the evidence of the case only, but not act as if he is an attorney by presenting arguments and examining witnesses and other actions such as an attorney makes.

Support:

Applicant Mr. Peter Pagano [affirmed], 208 Wolfe St, was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Pagano stated he reviewed the staff comments and thought everything was acceptable.

Opposition:

No one was present to speak in opposition to the application.

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Davis asked what decomposed granite is. Mr. Pagano answered it is a material sourced from Durham, and is a natural, dirt-like material with a compact surface. Mr. Davis asked if it is permeable. Mr. Pagano responded that a binder is added to it, so it is a hard surface that he believes is impermeable. Ms. Tully asked if it is similar to the material at the art museum. Mr. Pagano said the art museum used a different material and that a lot of parks have this surface. He stated it is pulled from a quarry and ground down to a fine dirt grain, and it will be a hard surface because they will add a binder, but not be as smooth or flat as concrete. Mr. Pagano said that it will be brown. Ms. David asked if it will be like the tan in the photos. Mr. Pagano confirmed that.

Mr. Davis asked why didn't the applicant choose bricks. Mr. Pagano replied they wanted to create a softer feel within City Market and they would also add landscaping to the area because they want it to feel more like a garden space. Mr. Fountain inquired if the parking will go away. Mr. Pagano answered that there will still be parking on the western part and that cars could drive on it, but the long-term intention is not to keep it as parking. Mr. Fountain followed up by asking if it had anything to do with permeable surface requirements to control run off on site. Mr. Pagano answered in the negative, and that they chose it because they wanted to make upgrades in the area and this was the best material for that. Mr. Fountain responded that he still didn't have a good feel for what it was going to look like. Mr. Pagano stated that the property used to be a livery stable, and it was going back to this exterior look.

Ms. Tully added that one of staff's questions was about the color and that if it were more of a reddish color maybe it could have been a staff-level approval. Part of what kicked it up to a

master landscape plan was the amount of change on the site. Staff recommended approval but wanted the Committee to discuss it because it is a new material. Ms. David added that it looks like dirt which you don't see downtown where it's all paved; dirt is for the country. Mr. Pagano said that it's historically appropriate because it most likely was dirt when it was a livery stable. Ms. David agreed that his point about the livery stable was good.

Mr. Davis stated color was a big thing for him, and it wasn't clear from application what the color would be. Everything in City Market is red brick, so this will stand out. Right now, it's a parking lot which is not adding to the character of the district. He asked the applicant if he has the option to change the color. Mr. Pagano answered that they did look at different color options, and this is the color that can be sourced locally. There was a discussion about the accuracy of the color shown in the photos in the application. Ms. Tully added that she did observe a sample in a bucket on site.

Mr. Fountain said he thought there was a reference to Chapel Hill in the application. Mr. Hinshaw added that it was Chapel Hill gravel and asked if it was from Chapel Hill. Mr. Pagano responded it is sourced from Durham. Mr. Fountain asked if it is like the sandstone walking paths in Chapel Hill. Mr. Pagano answered he didn't know for sure, but assumed so. There was further discussion about the colors shown in the photos in the application. Mr. Pagano passed his cell phone to the committee to see a photo of the bucket sample. Ms. Tully asked Mr. Pagano to email the photo to staff.

Mr. Hinshaw asked if it would be as hard as concrete. Mr. Pagano answered that it would not be discernable from concrete when walking across it.

With no objection from the committee, Mr. Davis closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

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

Let's discuss decomposed granite surfaces. My first reaction was that there is nothing like it in City Market. It's anomalous in City Market. [Davis]

It's kind of hard to find it and it's not very visible. [Hinshaw]

For me it's an issue of color, not that it's compacted and bound together. Subtract color from it and it sounds like concrete or asphalt. Moore Square is where we approved playground surfaces. What colors were there? [David]

Regular concrete color with some pops of color in the corner park, but not on the public sidewalk. [Tully]

This won't be on the public sidewalk. [Davis]

We have approved color in more variety in Moore Square. [David]

You have recently, particularly with murals and it's about whether or not you're painting over historic fabric. On the corner where the Marbles park will be going, a non-historic building came down so it's new. You could compare it since you are replacing non-historic asphalt.

[Tully]

We could reference the park pavilion building we approved for Moore Square with natural stone. [David]

I think this looks like tinted cement. It's a question of the palette of colors, which tend to be more natural. [Fountain]

We usually approve more earth tones in Moore Square. [Hinshaw]

It used to be a stable and this references this past use. [Davis]

There is also the tree removal portion of application. [David]

The privet would have been planted in the 1980s. Is there anything particularly significant about it? [Fountain]

I have no sympathy for non-native species and I actually think non-native species may be incongruous. [Hinshaw]

There are not that many trees in City Market, but the ones that are there seem different than this one they are seeking to remove. There is a tree that's being saved that's the more important tree. [Davis]

FYI that portion was approved in a COA from years ago that was never implemented for a walkway expansion. [Tully]

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Mr. Hinshaw 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 1-8), and B. (inclusive of facts 1-4), to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Implementation of a master landscape/hardscape plan involving removing the existing asphalt surface in the parking lot, installing a decomposed granite surface, installing new asphalt, and altering the existing brick paver sidewalk is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.9, 1.5.1, 1.5.3, 1.5.5, 1.5.9, 1.5.10, and the following facts:
- 1* From the Special Character of the Moore Square Historic District: "In the southeast corner of the district, the grid of original streets from the 1792 town plat is supplemented by three smaller, narrower streets that were created to serve the 1914 City Market complex. The effect of this system of smaller streets is to create within the district a sub-area of greater intimacy, a finer scale especially suited to pedestrian amenity."
 - 2* Also from the Special Character essay: "Asphalt streets throughout the district intersect at right angles in a regular rectangular pattern; however, portions of the streets at City Market have been stripped of asphalt to display their original cobblestone surface. Original granite

curbstones remain in much of the district, with a few concrete curbs introduced, as well as some sections of new granite curbing installed in association with city streetscape improvement programs.”

- 3* The site is bordered on the west by Blount Street which is paved with asphalt and on the north by Wolfe Street where the historic cobblestones have been restored. The sidewalks on both streets are paved in red brick with granite curbs.
 - 4* The existing asphalt parking surface is proposed to be removed and replaced by two different surfaces; decomposed granite on the east of the site and new asphalt on the west. The application calls for Chapel Hill Gravel as the decomposed granite material, which is designed for walkways, patios, plazas and other pedestrian surface areas. The decomposed granite is shown in sample photographs as a beige material with a muted clay tone. No other examples of this material were shown in the Moore Square Historic District.
 - 5* Chapel Hill gravel has been approved in rear yards for paths in the residential character historic districts, although not in Moore Square up to this point
 - 6* The narrow brick walkway at the east end of the site will be widened.
 - 7* Granite curb material may require replacement in two areas according to the applicant, both at the revised Wolfe Street entrance entirely within the existing parking lot area.
 - 8* No changes in granite curbs, curb cuts, sidewalks or driveway aprons in the public right-of-way are proposed.
 - 9* The compacted granite material has the appearance of tinted cement in the range of colors that have been previously approved.
- B. Implementation of a master landscape/hardscape plan involving planting trees and altering plantings in existing beds is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3, 1.3.4, 1.3.7, 1.5.9, 1.5.10; however, removing a tree is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 1.3.5, 1.5.6, and the following suggested facts:
- 1* A 9” caliper Japanese privet tree is proposed to be removed in the northeast corner of the site to allow for an expanded walkway. In the southeast corner, a Chinese pistache is proposed to be trimmed.
 - 2* Three single-stem crape myrtles will be planted on the east side of the site along the newly expanded walkway.
 - 3* A tree protection plan was provided.
 - 4* Existing planting areas are to be replanted and additional planting areas will be added, including around the large area with mechanical equipment on the north edge of the property. Final plant selections were not included in the application.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

1. That there be no demolition delay for the removal of the tree.
2. That tree protection plans be implemented and remain in place for the duration of construction.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. Final plant selections.

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

Committee members voting: David, Davis, Fountain, Hinshaw. Certificate expiration date: 7/25/18.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

003-18-CA 917 W SOUTH STREET
Applicant: JOHN AND CARLEN DEMLER
Received: 12/7/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 3/7/2018 1) 1/25/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: Remove rear deck and screened porch; construct rear addition; construct side deck; replace window with sliding doors; remove tree; remove fence

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its October 2, 2017, meeting. Members in attendance were Curtis Kasefang, Jenny Harper and David Maurer; also present were John Demler, the applicant, and staff members Tania Tully and Melissa Robb.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

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

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<i>Sections</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Description of Work</i>
1.3	Site Features and Plantings	Construct rear addition; remove tree
1.4	Fences and Walls	Remove fence
2.7	Windows and Doors	Replace window with sliding doors
3.1	Decks	Remove rear deck and screened porch; construct side deck
3.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Construct rear addition; remove tree

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] provided a summary of the project. Staff suggested that the committee approve the application with conditions.

Support:

Applicants John Demler and Carlen Demler [affirmed], 917 W South St, were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Demler stated he noticed staff comments about the trees and that they are seeking guidance from tree professionals to create the tree protection plan. He added that they are not changing the paint colors so that is why they didn't provide samples.

Opposition:

No one was present to speak in opposition to the application.

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Davis asked for clarification about the proposed windows and whether they were simulated divided lights. Ms. Tully described the difference between simulated divided lights and other options. She stated that this was one of the most complete applications submitted.

Mr. Davis said the trees were being addressed and asked if there were any other questions. Ms. David concurred about the completeness of the application and said it was impressive.

With no objection from the committee, Mr. Davis closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

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

I thought it met the guidelines. The only question I had was having the roofline continuous, where we might in the past have asked for some differentiation between the house and the addition. [Davis]

It's a long way back from the street. I'd rather they work on inseting these additions rather than extending them out. That bump-out was a nice feature of the original and it will be blown out by this family room that will be all the way to the back. I know that is interrupted by the deck. I worry about overpowering bungalows with whatever goes out the back. [Fountain]

What mitigates it for me is that you don't really see it from the street. [Davis]

At least right now, there's a lot that's grown tall. [Fountain]

The lot slopes severely front to back so you don't see it. [Hinshaw]

It does allow for a second story addition. We approved an addition next door just recently with a two-story addition. [Davis]

I want our comments to be predictable and consistent. [Fountain]

You have approved extrusions like this before. On the east elevation they are keeping the corner board. [Tully]

They show a corner board on both. [David]

That's a way of differentiating when you're extruding a roof like that. [Tully]

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Ms. David 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 1-2), B. (inclusive of facts 1-13), and C. (inclusive of facts 1-2), to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Removing a rear deck and screened porch, and constructing a side deck is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.6, 3.1.7, 3.1.8, and the following facts:
- 1* The rear of the house includes an existing porch which is partially screened and a deck with stairs. All are being proposed for removal. No information was provided regarding the age of the porch. No mention of the rear porch/deck combination was included in the National Register nomination for the district. The deck and stairs were approved via COA 104-99-CA. The screened enclosure on the right side of the porch appears to have been done at some point after 1999, but there is no evidence of COA approval.
 - 2* A new deck is proposed for the east elevation, set behind the existing gable-roofed kitchen bump out. The application states it will be partially concealed from passersby due to mature foliage.
- B. Constructing a rear addition and removing the fence is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.4, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.7, 3.2.8, 3.2.9, 3.2.10, 3.2.11, 3.2.12; however, removing a crape myrtle tree is incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.5, 1.3.6, 3.2.2, and the following facts:
- 1* In the National Register of Historic Places nomination for the Boylan Heights Historic District, the property was deemed contributing, and was described as a 1922 one-story bungalow with clipped gable roof and attached one-story porch across the full façade.
 - 2* Built **area** to open space analysis: The lot is 6,098 SF. The footprint of the existing house is 1,440 SF; the new addition footprint will be 863 SF; the front porch, front walk, deck, stairs, and stoops total 522 SF. The total built area is proposed to be 2,825 SF. The applicants state the proportion of built area to open space is currently 33%, and will increase to 46%.
 - 3* Built **mass** to open space analysis: The lot is 6,098 SF. The footprint of the existing house is 1,440 SF, and the front porch is 224 SF, thus, the total built mass is currently 1,664 SF. The current proportion of built mass to open space is 27%. When the new addition's 863 SF footprint is added to the current built mass it will be 2,527 SF. The proportion of built mass to open space is proposed to be 41%.
 - 4* The applicants provided examples in the historic district of similarly scaled projects which have received COA approvals for additions; 915 W South St (104-17-CA), 1027 W South St (85-13-CA), 1012 W Cabarrus St (125-17-CA), and 1003 W South St (188-16-CA).

- 5* When viewed from the street, the east side of the addition will protrude 2'4" beyond the existing kitchen bump out, while the west side does not extend beyond the existing wall plane and includes a setback where the new addition meets the existing building.
 - 6* The existing windows are primarily eight-over-one wood framed. Windows on the addition are of a variety of sizes and proportions including the following (all are wood from Sierra Pacific and Hurd):
 - a. Three windows on the east elevation and six windows on the south elevation appear to be similarly proportioned to the existing wood double-hung eight-over-one units;
 - b. One window on the south elevation and one on the west elevation appear to be scaled-down versions of the other new double-hung eight-over-one units;
 - c. Four windows on the west elevation are proposed to be wood-framed awning-style windows with eight divided lights, apparently mimicking the smaller awning-style window in the front gable.
 - 7* The existing doors to the screened porch are a pair of French doors with simulated divided lights. The two sets of doors proposed for the rear of the addition are similarly designed Jeld-Wen wood paired French doors with simulated divided lights that lead out from the basement level. Also, see section C for information about the proposed sliding wood-framed door on the east elevation.
 - 8* Paint colors will be the same as on the existing house.
 - 9* As is common in Boylan Heights, the property backs to an alley and has a fenced back yard. The wood fence is being proposed for removal. A 54" picket fence was approved for installation with COA 014-01-CA.
 - 10* A mature crape myrtle tree that straddles the property line between 915 and 917 W South Street is proposed for removal due to the anticipated impact of construction on both properties. The addition at 915 W South St (104-17-CA) was approved at the 7/27/17 COA meeting, however that application did not address the crape myrtle on the property line.
 - 11* A replacement mature crape myrtle tree is proposed for the southeast corner of the lot.
 - 12* A tree protection plan was provided; however, the critical root zones may not be sufficiently protected with the plan. The critical root zone is defined as "The area uniformly encompassed by a circle with a radius equal to one and one-quarter (1.25) foot per inch of the diameter of a tree trunk measured at four and one-half (4.5) feet above the ground, with the trunk of the tree at the center of the circle."
 - 13* Staging areas for construction materials were not specified on the tree protection plan.
- C. Replacing a window with a door is not incongruous according to *Guideline 2.7.9*; however, replacing a window with a **sliding** wood-frame door **is** incongruous according to *Guideline 2.7.9*, and the following facts:
- 1* The only existing window proposed for removal on the east elevation is proposed to be replaced with a Jeld-Wen sliding wood-frame door with simulated divided lights. Sliding doors are not characteristic of the historic district.
 - 2* This alteration may be partially visible from the public right-of-way, although the new sliding door would be partially obscured by mature vegetation.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

1. That tree protection plans be implemented and remain in place for the duration of construction.
2. That there be no demolition delay for the removal of the tree.
3. That the sliding wood-framed door proposed for the east elevation be changed to paired French-style doors.
4. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard:
 - a. A tree protection plan that addresses the critical root zones and provides staging areas for construction materials.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 7/25/18.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

004-18-CA 319 E LANE STREET

Applicant: ROGER AUSTIN

Received: 12/7/2017

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 3/7/2018

1) 1/25/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: Remove existing upper half-story rear addition; construct new 2nd level rear addition over slightly enlarged existing 1st level; construct rear deck; install new HVAC units; change exterior paint color; install storm windows

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its January 2, 2018, meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker, Curtis Kasefang, Jenny Harper and David Maurer; also present were Roger Austin, the applicant, and staff members Tania Tully and Melissa Robb.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- COAs mentioned are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<i>Sections</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Description of Work</i>
1.3	Site Features and Plantings	Remove existing upper half-story rear addition; construct new 2 nd level rear addition over slightly enlarged existing 1 st level; construct rear deck; install new HVAC units
2.4	Paint and Paint Color	Change exterior paint color
2.7	Windows and Doors	Install storm windows
2.10	Sustainability and Energy Retrofit	Install new HVAC units
3.1	Decks	Construct rear deck
3.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Remove existing upper half-story rear addition; construct new 2 nd level rear addition over slightly enlarged existing 1 st level; install new HVAC units

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] provided a summary of the project. Staff suggested that the committee approve the application with conditions.

Support:

Applicant Mr. Roger Austin [affirmed], 2825 Barmettler St, was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Austin said it has been a smooth process working with staff and he didn't foresee any issues with the recommended conditions.

Opposition:

No one was present to speak in opposition to the application.

Responses and Questions:

Ms. David stated it is another good application. Ms. Tully added that it is an example of the new COA application process working well. Mr. Hinshaw said it was well done.

With no objection from the committee, Mr. Davis closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

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

Is that one addition original? It has a slate roof. [Davis]

I suspect the one-story ell is original, with all the other changes later. I like seeing the evolution of the house on the back. [David]

I like seeing them cleaned up. [Fountain]

Most people do. The evolution of the house is on display. It wears its heart on its sleeve. [David]

It gives a historic perspective to the building. [Hinshaw]

The proposed changes are also congruous and meet the guidelines, and I am happy to see the extended deadline period working so well. [David]

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Mr. Fountain 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 1-15), to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Removing the existing upper half-story rear addition, constructing a new 2nd level rear addition over a slightly enlarged existing 1st level, constructing a rear deck, installing new HVAC units, changing exterior paint color, and installing storm windows are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.6, 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 2.4.3, 2.7.5, 2.7.6, 2.10.8, 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.6, 3.1.7, 3.1.8, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.4, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.7, 3.2.8, 3.2.9, 3.2.10, 3.2.11, 3.2.12, and the following facts:
- 1* The house is a modest two-story with a broad front porch that wraps around to the west side. Since 1909 significant alterations to the house are illustrated on Sanborn Fire Insurance maps, including the addition of a second story between 1914 and 1950. The primary addition on the rear of the house is a 1 ½-story gable-end addition, with a wide dormer on the 2nd level west elevation, as well as a shed-roofed ground level addition on the west elevation. There is also a wood stair and landing at the 2nd level in the middle of the rear façade.
 - 2* The applicant proposes removing the upper half-story rear addition and the shed-roofed ground level addition, as well as removing and replacing the wood stair and landing.
 - 3* No analysis of built area/built mass to open space was provided by the applicant, although the existing and proposed site plans show only a nominal change in both measures.
 - 4* The second level addition is inset from the existing east wall, thereby maintaining the existing roof cornice on the east wall.
 - 5* The ridgeline of the hipped roof for the addition is lower than that of the main body of the house. The roof of the main body of the house is slate, while the addition's new roof is to be shingle, as all other roofs are currently.
 - 6* The proposed roof plan appears to have an error in how the proposed addition connects with the historic roof at the northeast corner.
 - 7* A statement on the drawings reads "New construction exterior materials shall match existing materials as closely as possible including brick foundation wall, wood siding and trim, shingle roof."
 - 8* The existing windows are primarily two-over-two double-hung wood framed. According to the application, windows on the addition are "to match existing as close as possible in materials, style and design." Window specifications were not provided.
 - 9* The drawings indicate that the exterior doors will either be reused or replaced with new doors. No replacement door specifications were provided.
 - 10* The proposed wood deck will be at the first-floor level and measure 13' x 17'. It will be infilling the northwest corner of the house, in approximately the same space as a concrete patio is now.
 - 11* A new set of rear stairs to the second level is shown with what appears to be modern deck rail detailing. The commission has found that inset pickets (or the appearance of) are more compatible with the historic character of the districts.
 - 12* The site plans show the critical root zones for the six large trees on the property, but no tree protection plan was provided. Staging areas for construction materials were not specified.
 - 13* The applicant states that new screening will be installed for the HVAC units on the east side of the house, described as "wood frame lattice painted to match house." No other details (such as height) or elevation/detail drawings were provided.

14* Paint colors were not specified, nor were paint swatches provided.

15* The applicant states that metal or aluminum storm windows will be added to all windows. Storm window specifications were not provided. Low profile metal and aluminum storm windows with a painted finish are commonly approved.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

1. That tree protection plans be implemented and remain in place for the duration of construction.
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard:
 - a. Window specifications including section drawings;
 - b. Eave/soffit details;
 - c. Door and window trim;
 - d. Revised roof plan;
 - e. A tree protection plan that addresses the critical root zones and provides staging areas for construction materials.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. Door specifications;
 - b. New roofing;
 - c. HVAC dimensions and associated screening;
 - d. Storm window specifications;
 - e. Stair railing;
 - f. Paint schedule and color samples from the manufacturer.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 7/25/18.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

005-18-CA 807 W SOUTH STREET
Applicant: JP REUER
Received: 12/8/2017 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 3/8/2018 1) 1/25/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: Remove rear deck; construct 2-story rear addition; alter roofline of existing house; construct new rear porch

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 JP Reuer, the applicant, and staff members Tania Tully and Melissa Robb.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- COAs mentioned are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
1.3	Site Features and Plantings	Construct rear addition; construct new rear porch
3.1	Decks	Remove rear deck
3.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Construct rear addition; alter roofline of existing house; construct new rear porch

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] provided a summary of the project. Pending Committee discussion of the house height and massing, staff suggested deferral to allow for a revised design to be submitted by the applicant and/or additional evidence to be submitted.

Support:

Applicant JP Reuer [affirmed], 113 Hillcrest, was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Reuer shared printed documents with the Committee, including a summary of the project and emails from neighbors in support of the project. He reviewed the summary page with goals, design constraints, design approach, and site and building statistics.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Fountain stated that the Committee has had applications that provide a lot more detail about lot coverage. The case made in this application could have been helped or hurt by providing that type of information. He mentioned that the Committee was trying to be more predictable in their decision making, but the applicant must provide the information.

Mr. Davis asked how much higher the building would go. Mr. Reuer responded that it would increase in height by 3 to 4 feet. Ms. David commented that raising the ridge more than 3 feet is a substantial difference. She said that raising the ridge and broadening the gable undoes the scale and mass of the house as a bungalow, and she doesn't believe that it meets guidelines 3.2.7 and 3.2.1. Mr. Reuer questioned if the Committee's concern was with the type of the form or if the issue was with the scale. Ms. David replied that it was the scale, that it detracts. Mr. Davis added that a house with an addition should show what was there originally, and that the original house is obscured by the changes. Ms. David interjected that it is a bigger version of the house, instead of a house with an addition. Mr. Reuer asked if the issue was that this approach does not have a distinction between the old and new. Ms. David responded yes, they look for more differentiation.

Mr. Reuer said they looked at perspective views to assess the impact of the scale, and that they were trying to strike a balance in scale using SketchUp and elevation views. He stated that he understood the distinction between the old and the new, but they found it led to a different form with an addition on the rear, but they found this less desirable. Mr. Reuer continued that he considered a shed roof, and that any other way of doing it would also require that its roof be taller than the original house.

Mr. Fountain mentioned that many applicants have studied the line-of-site from the street and if the rear addition is taller, but is not noticeably visible, that type of design usually works better. Mr. Reuer asked if he meant that another strategy with a larger volume on the back, but wasn't as noticeable from the street, might be a strategy. Mr. Fountain said they have seen that before, and thinking about it as a lawyer, evidence is key. He stated that the commission is trying to apply objectivity to their analysis and recommended that Mr. Reuer showcase what the house would look like when viewed from the sidewalk.

Mr. Davis commented that South St has seen the most additions lately with a lot of homeowners who have gone through the COA process and gotten approved. Ms. Tully agreed that in her ten years she's seen more additions on W South St than anywhere else. Mr. Davis continued that there are a lot of houses to look at where they got a COA and the historic house is still distinguishable.

Ms. Tully mentioned that staff would be able to provide examples of additions that have been approved on houses with side gables.

Mr. Davis stated that the windows under the original gable are tucked up close under the roof with modest proportions, which is what the house is all about. He said that the proposal is making the gable much bigger, which distorts what the original house looked like. Ms. David agreed.

Mr. Fountain said they have seen other examples with rear-facing gables added on side gables. Mr. Reuer asked if they were taller than the original. Mr. Fountain responded yes, or right at it. He advised setting it in on the back so the original house was still visible.

Ms. David added that she thought Mr. Davis was correct that it was about the distortion of the gable scale. Mr. Reuer responded that he was glad to hear that a taller cross gable on the rear might be acceptable.

Ms. Tully asked for a clarification from the Committee that if this application was deferred, should the applicant look at a different design or additional evidence to support the current proposed design. Ms. David responded that he could go either way, but she thought the upscaling of the gable end was difficult to approve.

Mr. Reuer asked the Committee to confirm his assumption that if they do a rear addition with a higher ridge than the original it would be acceptable as long as they paid attention to site lines. Ms. David responded that he would have a better chance with that. Mr. Davis added that they shouldn't go too much taller, overwhelming the house. Mr. Reuer explained the options they explored, and that it's about the balance, to which Mr. Davis and Ms. David agreed. Ms. David said not everything works for every house, particularly this low house.

Matthew Stevens [affirmed] asked the Committee how they could add on to the back of the house and still justify the open space ratio. He mentioned that he and his partner have seen many rear additions in the neighborhood, in the past, that are taller than the original and take up the entire lot. Ms. Tully replied that the new guidelines use different language to address that issue, providing more background for the change. Mr. Reuer replied that there is no rule of thumb as with building codes. Ms. Tully said there was no specific figure, but staff could pull examples of other applications with analysis of those ratios.

Mr. Reuer asked if the additional 3% to the building footprint would be acceptable. Mr. Fountain replied that the staff's comments concerned the lack of information, and that others have come in with applications that have also addressed increasing square footage. He stated that the Committee is trying to preserve the feel of the whole neighborhood and try to meet the needs of the occupants. Mr. Davis commented that they aren't able to make a hard rule because all lot sizes are different. Mr. Fountain continued that there are a lot of percentage calculations in recent minutes. Ms. Tully answered Mr. Reuer's original question saying that the built area

to open-space ratio doesn't look like an issue with this design, but that they will need evidence in the form of calculations.

Mr. Reuer asked the Committee if they had any additional suggestions. Mr. Fountain commented an architect friend of his told him that it's only in addressing challenges that creativity comes out. Mr. Reuer replied that you are trusting an architect.

Mr. Rasberry reminded the Committee that they cannot rely on the emails from neighbors as evidence of fact upon which to base their decision, since the property owners were not present.

Ms. David made a motion to defer the application to the next meeting; Mr. Fountain seconded it; motion carried 4/0.

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

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Committee Discussion
 - a. Application Completeness
 - b. Staff suggested a presentation on review of applications in the HOD-S be on the February agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:43 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner