

RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
February 22, 2017

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Elizabeth Caliendo called the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Committee meeting to order at 4:03 p.m.

ROLL CALL

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

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

Staff Present: Tania Tully; Melissa Robb; Allison Evans; Francis P. Rasberry, Jr., Attorney

Minor Works

There were no questions regarding the Minor Work report.

The following is a list indicating persons in attendance and whether they were affirmed. Chair Caliendo administered the affirmation.

<u>Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address</u>	<u>Affirmed</u>
Brandy Thompson, 1100 Filmore St 27605	yes
Erin Sterling Lewis, 704 N Person St 27604	yes
Travis J Bailey, 1024 Dorothea Dr 27603	yes
JP Reuer, 113 Hillcrest Rd 27605	yes

REVIEW OF SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS

There were no objections to the approval of the Summary Proceedings without a public hearing. The committee reviewed and approved the following case 015-18-CA for which the Summary Proceeding is made part of these minutes.

- 2* From the National Register nomination for the North Blount Street Historic District: "The house at 417 North Blount, built in 1878 for Mrs. Betty Strange, is an excellent example of the eclectic, Victorian, middle-class home of the late 1870s." No mention was made of the landscape or individual landscape features in the nomination.
- 3* The property at 411 N Blount St includes the Andrews-Duncan carriage house at the rear. The primary residence was demolished previously.
- 4* No detailed information on the existing and proposed 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.
- 5* The two properties were previously owned by the state, with the buildings used for offices and the rear areas used for parking. The applicant provided photographs illustrating the mix of gravel, dirt and grass in the parking areas.
- 6* The proposal is to formalize and screen the rear parking area, with asphalt-paved parking flanking an asphalt driveway that runs across both lots. The applicant states that "the drive and parking asphalt will have aggregate rolled into the surface to better blend it into the historic setting."
- 7* An approved master plan COA (106-06-CA) of the blocks roughly bounded by Wilmington St, E Lane St, N Person St and E Peace St was previously approved by the COA committee with multiple renewals over the years. The applicant's proposal appears to meet the spirit of the approved master plan.
- 8* The applicant's proposal includes the addition of foundation plantings around the Higgs-Coble-Helms House, as well as adding screening plantings around the parking areas and planting seven new trees.
- 9* The two properties include nine trees over 8" in diameter that are subject to review, including two which are on or over the north property line at 421 N Blount St. All trees are proposed to be retained.
- 10* A tree protection plan was included in the application, and was prepared by a North Carolina licensed landscape architect.
- 11* A concrete sidewalk is proposed to lead to the Andrews-Duncan Carriage House. A concrete walk is proposed to connect the parking area behind the Higgs-Coble-Helms House to a 4' wide Chapel Hill grit path that leads to the front brick walkway.
- 12* The existing brick sidewalk parallel to Blount St and the brick front walkway leading to the Higgs-Coble-Helms House are not proposed to change.
- 13* The applicant provided information about the granite curb and brick sidewalk at the south end of the driveway on E North St, although the restoration of these elements is not included in the scope of this application.

Staff suggests that the committee approve the application with the following conditions:

1. That tree protection plans be implemented and remain in place for the duration of construction.

Decision on the Application

There were no objections to approval without an evidentiary hearing.

Mr. Thiem moved to approve the application, adopting the staff report as the written record of the summary proceeding on COA 015-18-CA. Mr. Fountain seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 8/22/18.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chair Caliendo introduced the public hearing portion of the meeting. The committee heard the following cases in the following order for which the Certified Records are made part of these minutes: 005-18CA and 014-18-CA.

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) 2/22/2018 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: Remove rear deck; construct rear addition; construct rear porch and patio

Amendments: Additional documentation was received with changes to the design and materials.

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.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

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; construct rear porch and patio
3.1	Decks	Remove rear deck
3.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Construct rear addition; construct rear porch and patio

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] provided a summary of the project. Staff suggested approval with conditions.

Support:

Applicant JP Reuer [affirmed], 113 Hillcrest, was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Reuer discussed the changes in the design that had been made since the last meeting, with an addition to the rear of the house without altering the front ridge height. He stated that the

reason they had chosen both the board and batten cladding and the casement windows was to differentiate the addition from the original portion of the house.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

There were no questions from the committee.

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

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

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

It's substantially different from the first proposal. [Caliendo]

They answered all the objections we had to the first design. [Davis]

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Mr. Davis moved that based on the information contained in the amended application and materials and in the evidentiary hearing, the Committee finds staff suggested findings from the Staff Report, A. (inclusive of facts 1-4), and B. (inclusive of facts 1-15), to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

B. Removing a rear deck and constructing a new covered deck/porch is not incongruous in concept 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 deck and stair which are being proposed for removal. The deck and stairs were approved via COA 033-11-CA.
- 2* The existing stairs and a portion of the deck extend several feet beyond the west wall of the house. The new deck/porch will not project beyond the side walls, and is designed with details that are more formal than those of the original deck.
- 3* Section drawings of the porch and railings were not provided.
- 4* A tree protection plan was not provided; however, the critical root zones of four trees were identified on the site plan. Nor were staging areas for construction materials identified.

C. Constructing a rear addition and constructing a rear porch and patio are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.6, 1.3.7, 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, and 3.2.12, 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 the gable perpendicular to the street, and a gabled dormer centered above the full façade porch.

- 2* A tree protection plan was not provided; however, the critical root zones of four trees were identified on the site plan. Nor were staging areas for construction materials identified.
- 3* Built area to open space analysis: The proposal will increase the built area to open space proportion from 31% to 34%. The application states that the lot is 6,544 SF. The footprint of the house (including the porch, stair and deck) is 2,005 SF. The proportion of built area to open space is 31%. The footprint of the house with the proposed addition (including the porch, stair and deck) will be 2,215 SF. The proportion of built area to open space will be 34%. (Note that the application includes a mathematical error, which staff corrected.)
- 4* Built mass to open space analysis: The proposal will increase the built mass to open space proportion from 33% to 36%. The application states that the lot is 6,544 SF. The footprint of the house (including the porch, stair and deck) is 2,005 SF. According to the Wake County Real Estate Data the existing outbuilding is 162 SF, bringing the total existing built mass to 2,167 SF. The proportion of built mass to open space is 33%. The footprint of the house with the proposed addition (including the porch, stair and deck) will be 2,215 SF. With the existing outbuilding the total proposed built mass is 2,377 SF. The proportion of built mass to open space will be 36%. (Note that the application includes a mathematical error, which staff corrected.)
- 5* Then proposed rear addition echoes the character-defining side gables including window and roof form.
- 6* The proposed addition extends the basement and ground floor by 8' – 8" to the rear. The roof of the second-floor addition is proposed to be a gable form with shed-roofed dormers in place of the existing hipped roof. The new roof ridge is raised to meet the ridgeline of the main house. The roof pitch matches the historic house.
- 7* The addition is proposed to match the existing cladding, with brick on the foundation and lapped wood siding on the ground floor. Stucco to match the existing is proposed for the rear gable ends. Roofing is proposed to match the existing asphalt shingles.
- 8* The second story addition is proposed to be clad with board and batten siding which is not found elsewhere on the house.
- 9* The existing windows are primarily four-over-one. The application notes that seven new windows are to match the existing and the sides of the dormer addition propose a grouping of three single-light wood casement windows. Details and specifications were not provided.
- 10* Window and door trim appears to match the historic windows; details were not provided.
- 11* The placement and configuration of the windows in the addition is similar to the historic house and not atypical for dormers.
- 12* There appears to be one new door leading into the new basement on the rear of the house, as well as what may be four sliding or French-style doors. No details were provided for doors.
- 13* Paint colors were not specified, nor were paint swatches provided.
- 14* The application does not include any information about changes in exterior HVAC or other mechanical equipment, nor screening for such equipment.

15* The application does not include any information about exterior lighting or gutters and downspouts.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

1. That a tree protection plan 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 prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture or a Licensed Landscape Architect that addresses the critical root zones and provides staging areas for construction materials;
 - b. Manufacturers' specifications for new windows, including section drawings.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. Rear porch sections including porch railing details;
 - b. Manufacturers' specifications for new doors, including elevation and section drawings;
 - c. Window and door trim;
 - d. Paint schedule and color samples from the manufacturer;
 - e. HVAC location and screening;
 - f. Exterior lighting;
 - g. Gutters and downspouts.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 8/22/18.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

014-18-CA 912 WILLIAMSON DRIVE
Applicant: ERIN STERLING LEWIS, AIA
Received: 1/8/2018 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 4/8/2018 1) 2/22/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: LANDMARK HISTORIC DISTRICT

Raleigh Historic Landmark: PHILIP ROTHSTEIN HOUSE

Nature of Project: Changes to previously approved multi-level side/rear addition: window configurations (COA 131-16-CA)

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- COAs mentioned are available for review.
- Minor Work COA (006-18-MW) approved the following; renewal of COA 131-16-CA and change in size of the northeast corner of the addition.
- The addition was approved in COA 131-16-CA. This application is only for the proposed changes to the windows configurations on the façade s.
- Some conditions from COA 131-16-CA remain to be met and are not part of this application. Most are to be reviewed by staff. The following are to be brought back to the commission; species and location of replacement trees and material specifications.
- Photographs of the historic house were not included in the application. They are attached to this staff report.
- The applicant provided drawings comparing the approved elevations with the newly proposed elevations. The Committee’s role is to address whether the proposed design meets the guidelines and is compatible with the historic house.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<i>Sections</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Description of Work</i>
3.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Changes to previously approved multi-level side/rear addition: window configurations

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] provided a summary of the project. Staff suggested that the proposed windows on the south elevation of the addition not be approved, and that the remainder of the application be approved with conditions.

Support:

Applicant Erin Sterling Lewis [affirmed], 1229 Courtland Dr, was present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Lewis highlighted the reasons for the fenestration changes on the facades.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Ms. Lewis pointed out a specific sentence under the Things to Consider as You Plan heading in section 3.2 Additions of the Design Guidelines: "To preserve a property's historic character, a new addition must be visually distinguishable from the historic building... *For example, it can be differentiated from the original building through a break in roofline, cornice height, wall plane, materials, siding profile, or window type.*" Given this guidance, Ms. Lewis stated they chose to alter the window type to differentiate the new addition from the historic house, a point that was important for the south elevation which staff recommended denying.

Mr. Davis asked for clarification on the west elevation drawings and how far down they are intended to go. Ms. Lewis provided an additional explanation on the drawings. Mr. Davis asked if the east elevation has a 14' ceiling height. Ms. Lewis confirmed it.

Ms. Caliendo asked staff for their reasonings for the recommendation of denial on the south façade window changes. Ms. Tully said the addition's form was already differentiated enough so that the windows should be more compatible with the historic house, including the horizontal break in the windows. The south windows were shown in a very different proportion than the historic windows on the south façade. Ms. Robb expanded on the differences, resulting in an overall bulkier appearance. The new proportions on the addition don't have the same subtle breakdown of elements as on the historic house.

Ms. Caliendo pointed out that some of the windows on the rear did not have a horizontal division. Ms. Tully replied that staff found the south façade to be the primary façade and the only place where the addition and historic house would be seen side by side.

Mr. Davis asked if the windows to the right of the original front door were 5'-4" wide. Ms. Lewis replied yes.

Ms. Lewis asked for clarification on what happens if the application were denied in part. Ms. Tully responded that if it were denied in part, the south façade that had previously been approved could be built as previously approved. Alternatively, the committee could approve portions of the application and make conditions for the approval of the south façade. Mr. Rasberry restated the options open to the committee.

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

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

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

It's the south façade windows that are an issue. [Caliendo]

I sort of buy both arguments. The one we approved with more divisions does reflect the historic house, and ties it together a bit more, but then it's an addition and it's different. [David]
The one thing to keep in mind is that you are not comparing the previously approved elevation to this proposal. Only look at what they are currently proposing. Does it meet the guidelines? [Tully]

I think the hyphen meets the guidelines. It helps distinguish the addition. [Davis]

I don't think it's inconsistent with the overall language of the house design. [Caliendo]

Yes, without looking at what was previously approved, I think it meets the guidelines. [David]

The addition is also set back from the front plane of the house. I don't think the proportions are significantly different than the original house. The horizontal division is not on several windows on the rear. [Caliendo]

I'm troubled with the four sections to the left of the front elevation. The blockiness and the height of the windows, it still troubles me. I would be disinclined to support the proposed height of the four sheets on the left. It emphasizes the height and that's troubling to me. [Fountain]

I think I see part of what Nick is talking about. The larger windows that are proposed do emphasize the blockiness of the addition. [Davis]

What doesn't help is that the top mullion is higher than the existing horizontal mullion on the top of the rest of the façade. If it were the same height it would be more deferential to the rest of the house. [Caliendo]

Having it more deferential is useful. [Fountain]

We could approve it and make that a condition. [Caliendo]

Fewer divisions within the window make it less busy. Call less attention to it. [David]

I agree about the vertical divisions. I think the upper horizontal should align with the horizontal across the doors. [Caliendo]

You're saying the fascia would be roughly the same height as the connector to give you a line across like that? [Fountain]

Yes. The bottom of the fascia. [Caliendo]

It feels like a significant redesign, like it's designed by committee to me. [David]

I think it's really just the height of the windows. [Caliendo]

It looks like the originally approved windows have it that low. [Tully]

They do. [Caliendo]

I see that line carrying all the way across. [Fountain]

Had we just gotten this and not the previous one, in looking at the other windows in the addition they do have the horizontal mullions going across them. Maybe we would have had a condition that they be designed differently if this was what we had to begin with. I think we talked about the windows before. [Davis]

Yes, we talked about the windows a lot in my recollection. [David]

Which is one of the reasons we brought it back. [Tully]

I can't tell where we're landing. [Caliendo]

I would be in favor of approving and letting staff talk to the applicant about the design of the south façade. Isn't that what you proposed, Tania? That staff could deal with any changes on this façade? [Davis]

Yes, based on what you're saying. It sounds like you might be leaning towards approving that window configuration but with a lower maximum height. [Tully]

So approving the division of the windows with the previously approved height? [David]

Yes. [Caliendo]

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 1-9), to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- D. The proposed windows in the approved addition are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 3.2.8, 3.2.9, 3.2.10; however, the design of the windows on the south façade is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 3.2.9 and the following facts:
- 1* The landmark ordinance states: "Those elements of the property that are integral to its historical, prehistorical, architectural, archaeological and/or cultural significance, or any combination thereof are as follows: The one-story residence; east, south, and west decks; concrete and steel pan stairs; rear porch and patio; paths; sloping topography; entry drive; stone retaining wall; trees; approximately 1.09 acre area of the original parcel."
 - 2* The 1958-59 Rothstein House was designated a Raleigh Historic Landmark in 2004. From the landmark designation report:
 - a. [The house] "is a prime example of International Style architecture "
 - b. "...the house's most spectacular effect is its Miesian floating appearance."
 - c. "...the house is sited on a slope facing south astride a one-acre lot, its eighty-foot length seeming to span the lot's width, yielding an imposing presence on the slope."
 - d. "To reinforce the façade 's strong horizontal lines, the roof's soffit and fascia are wide and its overhang is three feet. The deck, which wraps the house on the south, east, and west, is another important horizontal line."
 - e. "Like the front façade, the rear, north-facing façade has identical and equally strong vertical and horizontal lines..."
 - f. "The vertical lines of the body of the house are emphasized by grey painted tongue and groove wood sheathing punctuated by four bays of single pane windows and doors."
 - g. "Grounding the floating form to earth is its base-a brick masonry foundation, which one may glimpse under the decking and which suggests a lower level..."
 - 3* Plans and photos from the house's 1960 appearance in Architectural Record are in the landmark designation report.
 - 4* The addition is ell-shaped in footprint with the portion on the west side of the historic house oriented perpendicular to the historic house.
 - 5* The main level of the addition is at the level of the historic house and sits on top of a recessed basement level.
 - 6* Neither a north elevation nor plan drawings were provided. The north façade is the rear of the addition facing away from the historic house.

- 7* The application proposes the following window configurations on the approved addition:
- a. South elevation: The south façade is at the front of the house adjacent to the most significant façade of the historic house.
 - i. The proposed windows extend higher than the upper mullions of the windows on the historic house.
 - ii. The proposed façade has a bank of four windows without any horizontal mullions. The vertically-proportioned windows on the historic house have multiple divisions both vertically and horizontally, including the main bank of five. The proposed windows are wider in proportion than the windows on the historic house.
 - iii. The hyphen is proposed to be a single expanse of glass.
 - b. West elevation: The west façade of the addition could be considered the least significant. It is located along the west property line and facing away from the historic house.
 - i. The proposed windows stop short of the roofline and are rectangular rather than with angled top edges like on the historic house.
 - ii. The proposed windows are of different dimensions in width. Width dimensions were not provided for individual windows.
 - iii. The lower portions of the windows will be behind a retaining wall.
 - c. East elevation: The east façade of the addition is at the rear of the historic house facing the courtyard and perpendicular to the historic house.
 - i. The proposed windows are in two groups that terminate under the roofline and follow the angle. The windows include horizontal mullions that align with the roof of the hyphen. The proposed windows are wider in proportion than the windows on the historic house.
 - ii. The newly proposed grouping closest to the historic house is 11' wide in total and consists of a pair of sliding glass doors.
 - iii. The proposed group of windows farthest from the historic house consists of three windows. A portion of this group is obscured by the approved redesign of the rear most part of the addition. A plan view from the approved Minor Work COA is attached.
 - iv. A vertically proportioned narrow window is proposed on the east wall of the projecting ell. It appears that the top of the window aligns with the horizontal mullions of the other east elevation windows.
 - d. Courtyard elevation: This façade is at the rear of the lot and faces the historic house.
 - i. The proposed windows are set into a large "frame" that mimics the one on the front of the addition, thus bringing the lower edge of the windows off the ground by what appears to be 2', although specific measurements were not provided.
 - ii. One new window is proposed on the left side of this façade. It creates the appearance of a hyphen like the front of the addition.
- 8* The landmark designation report notes the balance between the predominant horizontal lines of the house with finer vertical lines in elements such as the windows and cladding. On the south façade, the proposed windows have proportions and a configuration that are in greater contrast to the historic house.

9* The new proposal notes that gutters with scuppers will be added. No details for these elements was provided.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

1. That the single pane of glass in the hyphen be approved.
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
 - a. Windows and doors in section and elevation, along with material descriptions;
 - b. Gutters and scuppers, along with material descriptions and/or samples.
3. That the windows on the south elevation of the addition conform to the height in the previously approved COA and to the vertical division in the current proposal.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 8/22/18.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Staff Presentation
 - a. Review of Applications in a Streetside HOD
2. Committee Discussion
 - a. Minor Work Tree Removals
 - b. Meeting Post-Mortem

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:41 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Melissa Robb, Preservation Planner