

RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
March 22, 2018

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Don Davis called the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Committee meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

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

Present: Sarah David (arrived at 4:09), Don Davis, Nick Fountain, Jimmy Thiem

Alternate Present: John Hinshaw

Excused Absence: Elizabeth Caliendo

Staff Present: Tania Tully; Melissa Robb; Collette Kinane; Francis P. Rasberry, Jr., Attorney; Brenda Hunt

Approval of the January 25, 2018, Minutes

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

Minor Works

There were no questions regarding the Minor Work report.

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

<u>Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address</u>	<u>Affirmed</u>
Van Alston, 623 Donald Ross Dr, 27610	No
Keith Lunday, 709 Hinsdale St, 27605	Yes
Jason Renzaglia, 709 Hinsdale St, 27605	Yes
Matt Hobbs, 3108 Hillmer Dr, 27609	Yes
Dan Becker, 1807 Wills Ave, 27608	Yes
Meg McLaurin, 511 Hillsborough St, 27603	Yes
Rosalind Blair, 322 E Cabarrus St, 27610	No
Chrissy and Corbett Gupton, 514 Cole St, 27605	Yes
Bobby L Sanders, PO Box 25775, 27611	No

REVIEW OF SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Fountain to approve the agenda as amended. Mr. Thiem seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

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 023-18-CA for which the Summary Proceeding is made part of these minutes.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – SUMMARY PROCEEDING

023-18-CA 227 S WILMINGTON STREET
Applicant: CHRIS POST
Received: 1/26/2018 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 4/26/2018 1) 3/22/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: General Historic Overlay District (HOD-G)
Nature of Project: Remove chain link fence on rear patio; install 8' wrought iron fence with gate
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>
1.4	Fences and Walls	Remove chain link fence on rear patio; install 8' wrought iron fence with gate

STAFF REPORT

Based on the information contained in the application and staff's evaluation:

- A. Removing a chain link fence on the rear patio and installing an 8' wrought iron fence with gate is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.4.8, 1.4.10 and the following suggested facts:
- 1* According to the Moore Square Historic District National Register nomination form, the property is contributing to the district and was described as a 2-bay, 2-story commercial building constructed of brick.
 - 2* The building abuts the ramp for the Moore Square Station parking deck. The ground floor rear deck currently has a chain link fence with privacy strips on a short retaining wall on the property line. Metal chain link fencing is a prohibited material according to the Guidelines.
 - 3* The applicant proposes replacing the chain link fence with a commercial-grade metal fence and gate like the nearby metal fence/gate enclosure at the sidewalk edge. The neighboring 8' fence was installed by the City of Raleigh (COA 144-16-CA).
 - 4* The proposed metal fence will be 8' tall and less opaque than the current fence with its woven privacy strips.
 - 5* Metal is a traditional material for ornamental fences.
 - 6* The fence is proposed to be along the property line as is typical of fences.
 - 7* The applicant states the fence height is needed for public safety.

Staff suggests that the committee approve the application.

Decision on the Application

There were no objections to approval without an evidentiary hearing.

Mr. Hinshaw moved to approve the application, adopting the staff report as the written record of the summary proceeding on COA 023-18-CA. Mr. Fountain seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

Committee members voting: Davis, Fountain, Hinshaw, Thiem

Certificate expiration date: 9/22/18.

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: 022-18-CA, 024-18-CA, 025-18-CA, 027-18-CA and 032-18-CA. Prior to case 032-18-CA Mr. Davis was recused from the hearing; Ms. David made the motion to recuse Mr. Davis, Mr. Fountain seconded the motion; motion passed 4/0. After hearing case 032-18-CA Mr. Davis was recalled to the meeting upon a motion from Mr. Fountain which was seconded by Mr. Hinshaw; motion passed 4/0.

Ms. Robb stated that the application did not show any trees on the site plan, only in photos from the front of the house, so without more clear evidence a condition requiring a tree protection plan was included in the staff report. Ms. McLaurin stated it was another expense for her client, so she wanted more clarity. Ms. Robb explained that 8" DBH trees are regulated.

Mr. Thiem stated that he understood the only trees required to be covered in a tree protection plan are those on the owner's property. Mr. Rasberry said that trees in the neighborhood are a historic resource and that the committee can impose conditions to require the protection of trees which have critical root zones on a property, even if the tree trunk is not on that property. Mr. Thiem said he recalled previous cases in which trees outside of applicant's property lines were not included in tree protection plans. Mr. Davis added that they realized that neighbor trees should be protected. Ms. Tully clarified how staff reviews tree protection plans and what requires an arborist report by asking if there is direct impact to a critical root zone or if there is the chance of killing the tree due to construction activities. She said the commission has always looked at the root zones in the yard. Mr. Rasberry stated that the legal basis for the committee imposing conditions for tree protection is more appropriate when evaluating approval of an application, but more problematic in denial of issuance of a permit because of a neighbor's tree. He said if the committee is asking for an arborist report as a condition they have that authority vs. saving a tree being the lynchpin of a decision. Mr. Thiem asked to discuss what the committee has been doing regarding tree protection and requested that policy be discussed with staff at a later date.

Ms. McLaurin said she is happy with the staff report, but was concerned with the request for additional details regarding side dormers in Oakwood, as she believes the committee is familiar with the district. She stated they have brought new materials if the committee wants to see it. She said she can provide additional window details. Mr. Fountain said the window details can be worked out with staff.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Thiem asked about the drainage problem in the backyard, asking how the pipe comes out of the ground and to work with staff on the details for that piece of the application. Ms. McLaurin said that her intention was to have it come out at some point down the driveway.

Mr. Davis asked if the proposed dormer is wider than the one in the front of the house. Ms. McLaurin answered that is approximately one foot wider. Mr. Davis asked if it was also taller. Ms. McLaurin said it was slightly taller but the height would not be noticeable from the front of the house unless it were viewed from the third floor directly across the street.

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 didn't notice any trees on the property. Are there any trees in danger? [Hinshaw]

There were no drawings that showed any trees. [Robb]

I don't think there were even any neighbor trees affected. [Davis]

The back yard was pretty much open. The back area where the addition is going is pretty well disturbed. And based on the past and my experience with tree protection we haven't asked for tree protection if there were no trees. [Thiem]

I agree. There were no neighbor trees close. I thought it met all the guidelines for additions, and didn't see any issues. [Davis]

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Mr. Thiem 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 1-11 and 13-14), B. (inclusive of facts 1-3), C. (inclusive of facts 1-2), and D. (inclusive of facts 1, 2, 4, 5), to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- B. Constructing a 2-story rear addition is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 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:
- 8* The house is the middle of a trio of American Foursquare houses on the 600 block of E Lane St. The house to the west, 602 E Lane St, recently constructed a two-story addition on the rear (COA 021-17-CA).
 - 9* Currently there is a one-story shed-roofed addition on the back of the house. The proposal is to construct a two-story addition to replace it, with a small expansion in the total footprint.
 - 10* The addition will be inset slightly on both the east and west elevations with the intention of differentiating the addition from the historic house.
 - 11* The proposed cladding is fiber cement, matching the existing profile of the weatherboard. The application did not state if it would be installed with the smooth face out. Because of the inset the fiber cement siding and wood siding will not meet on the same plane.
 - 12* The drawings show that the eave, overhangs, trim, fascia, and soffits will match the existing materials.
 - 13* The proposed windows are wood windows to match the existing. Window specifications were not provided. Window trim is proposed to match the existing. Neither detailed drawings nor close-up photos of the existing trim were provided.
 - 14* Doors are proposed to be $\frac{3}{4}$ light with a lower panel and transom above. Door specifications were not provided.

- 15* The roof is proposed to be a gable form. Roofing is proposed to be asphalt architectural roofing shingles.
- 16* The side porch is proposed to include a hipped roof supported by squared wood columns that reflect the design of those on the front porch.
- 17* The rear porch includes a small balcony above it, again supported by squared columns. According to drawings, the handrail for the balcony is "to imitate front porch handrail (painted wood)." A section drawing for the railing was not provided.
- 18* One of the drawings shows brick landings at the new side and back doors, as well as a brick foundation. A brick sample was not provided.
- 19* The application does not include any information about exterior lighting or gutters and downspouts.
- 20* Paint colors were not specified.

C. Constructing a dormer on the west side is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.5.1, 2.5.10, and the following facts:

- 1* The proposed new dormer mimics details from the dormer on the front of the house; paired windows that appear to be the same dimensions, a hipped roof form, and matching siding and trim.
- 2* The applicant states the new dormer "would be slightly wider to have the bearing required on existing walls."
- 3* The character-defining hipped roof form is unaltered.

D. Inserting new windows on the east and west sides is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section 2.7.9, and the following facts:

- 1* One new window will be added on the west elevation on the second floor at the rear. It appears to match the other windows on that elevation. Window specifications were not provided.
- 2* One new window will be added on the east elevation on the first floor at the rear. It appears to match the other windows on that elevation. Window specifications were not provided.

E. Replacing rear patios and walkways, and altering the driveway is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.6, 1.3.8, 1.3.9, 1.5.1, 1.5.2, 1.5.5, 1.5.6, and the following facts:

- 1* A brick and slate patio, brick walkway and concrete patio are proposed to be replaced with brick patios and a gravel walk. Samples of the brick pavers and gravel were not provided.
- 2* The application states that the driveway will be shortened approximately 12' due to the addition of the side porch. The driveway is a concrete ribbon design with brick infill and concrete curbs flanking both sides.
- 3* Photographs of the rear yard were not provided.
- 4* A shallow retaining wall that does not appear to be historic is proposed to be removed from the rear of the house. A new retaining wall constructed of timber or masonry will be moved to a new location south of the proposed gravel walkway. Timber retaining walls are atypical in the historic district.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

1. That the fiber cement siding be installed with the smooth face out.
2. That specifications and details for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of the blue placard:
 - a. manufacturers specifications for new windows, including elevation and section drawings;
 - b. window trim;
 - c. eave detail drawing;
 - d. dormer details.
3. That specifications and details for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation/construction:
 - a. manufacturers' specifications for new doors, including elevation and section drawings;
 - b. section drawing for rear porch railing;
 - c. brick sample;
 - d. paint schedule and samples from paint manufacturer;
 - e. exterior lighting, gutters and downspouts, including locations on the elevations;
 - f. brick paver and gravel samples;
 - g. masonry sample for backyard retaining wall;
 - h. location and design of the retaining wall drainpipe outlet.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 9/22/18.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

024-18-CA 3108 HILLMER DRIVE
Applicant: MATTHEW HOBBS
Received: 2/05/2018 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 5/6/2018 1) 3/22/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Raleigh Historic Landmark: NATHANIEL CRABTREE JONES HOUSE

Nature of Project: Construct front porch with stone steps

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- The applicant has received approval for previous COA applications:
 - Minor Work Application (031-18-MW): Install landings and roof coverings for four doorways; construct porch for non-contributing garage
 - Major Work Application (150-15-CA): Construct 2-story rear addition; enclose side porch; rebuild porch wall with new windows; construct new front porch; alter roof covering; alter garage wall; construct driveway; grade front yard.
 - 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>
2.8	Porches	Construct front porch with stone steps

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Support:

Applicant Matt Hobbs [affirmed], 3108 Hillmer Drive, was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Hobbs explained the research conducted in designing the porch.

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, Mr. Davis closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

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

Excellent restoration. [Thiem]

Porch meets Design Guidelines. [Davis]

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

- F. Constructing a front porch with stone steps is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.8.1, 2.8.6, 2.8.10 and the following facts:
- 21* The 2-story Crabtree Jones House was first designated a Raleigh Historic Landmark in 1969. In 2013, to prevent demolition, a COA was approved (005-13-CA) to relocate the house to its current site (roughly 500 feet away).
- 22* In 2015, after the 2014 move, the house was re-designated a Raleigh Historic Landmark at 3108 Hillmer Drive.
- 23* A 20th century front porch was demolished prior to relocation. This COA fulfills one of the conditions of the 2013 COA.
- 24* The 2015 landmark designation report states: "Although the house has no front porch since the removal of a twentieth-century porch in anticipation of the move, physical evidence suggests and old photographs document the presence of earlier porches. Pilasters frame the front entrance and ghost marks indicate the former presence of a covered stoop or small entrance porch. Other ghost marks between the two stories of the center block show that a pedimented roof once sheltered the centermost entrance bay, and another set of marks indicates a full-width front porch at another time. During much of the twentieth century and until shortly before the house was moved, the house had a broad front porch." And "Documentary photos show that the Greek Revival-style front porch was replaced with a Picturesque-style single-story porch that sheltered the center three bays of the façade. The porch featured lacy sawnwork detailing and paired slender posts and was of a type commonly built in Wake County after the Civil War. That porch likely dates to around 1870. It was, in turn, replaced by another, likely in either the 1915 or 1922 remodeling. The twentieth-century porch was the full width of the two-story section with a hipped roof and had sturdy-looking squared columns." The application provides photos and descriptions of the front porch design and arrangement of three (3) nearby properties of similar style and design: White Oak Plantation (Clayton), the White-Holman House (Raleigh), and Ayr Mount (Hillsborough).
- 25* The proposed porch is appropriate in design to the first period of the house (ca. 1810).

- 26* A permanent porch is required to meet building code requirements and will protect the entrance and entry door from water intrusion.
- 27* The porch will be constructed of all exterior-grade wood and painted to match the house. Balusters will be square turned diagonally.
- 28* The foundation will be constructed of brick that matches the foundation of the house and laid in Flemish bond.
- 29* The front steps of the porch will be constructed of granite and are believed to be the original front steps to the house (per application).
- 30* The porch roof will be constructed of hand-formed standing-seam, double-crimped unfinished copper.

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

Decision on the Application

Ms. David made a motion that the application be approved. The motion was seconded by Mr. Fountain. The motion passed 5/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 09/22/18.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

025-18-CA 709 HINSDALE STREET
Applicant: JASON RENZAGLIA AND KEITH LUNDAY
Received: 2/7/2018 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 5/8/2018 1) 3/22/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: GLENWOOD-BROOKLYN HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: Streetside Historic Overlay District (HOD-S)

Nature of Project: Remove historic window; install salvaged historic window

Staff Notes:

- The applicants have received approval for previous COA applications:
 - Minor work application (183-17-MW): Remove vinyl siding; remove ramp and replace with steps at side of front porch; remove aluminum handrails from front steps
 - Major work application (174-17-CA): Construct 2nd story rear addition; replace roofing; restore/replace exterior materials in kind; replace windows and front door; restore chimney; replace mail box and light fixture, and install ceiling fan on front porch; install driveway; remove and replace shrubbery
- COAs mentioned are available for review.
- Streetside HODs are "...established to provide for protection of the traditional development patterns of an area and to preserve historic resources found in it. The focus is on maintaining that character and on preserving those key character-defining features of individual historic resources within the district as viewed from the street right-of-way, excluding alleys..." (Section 5.4.2.A.1. of the Unified Development Ordinance)
- Section 5.4.2.B. of the Unified Development Ordinance governs the applicability of the COA process in Streetside HODs. Changes within the first 50% of the depth of any existing principal building from the facade adjacent to a public right-of-way requires a COA. For the sake of this measurement the house runs from the front wall (not the front of the front porch) to the rear wall (also not including porches).
- Only one of the pair of windows is within the first 50% of the depth of the house. Although the application requests replacement of the pair, the Staff Report only addresses the window within the regulated area of the house.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<i>Sections</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Description of Work</i>
2.7	Windows and Doors	Remove window; install salvaged historic window

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Support:

Applicants Keith Lunday and Jason Renzaglia [affirmed], 709 Hinsdale St, were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Lunday provided copies of a 3-page document with additional information for the application. He pointed out that they were reusing original windows from the rear of the house and placing one of them within the front 50% of the house, essentially substituting one original window for another. He said they considered the pair of windows as one unit, with the majority of the pair behind the 50% line. Mr. Lunday also provided drawings with more accurate window dimensions than had been provided with the original application, as well as a photo of another house with a window extending below the height of kitchen cabinetry.

Mr. Renzaglia stated that they were preserving ten original windows, and not trying to put in new windows.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Fountain said this was not about windows deteriorated beyond repair, but really about the desire for different window dimensions. Mr. Lunday replied yes. Mr. Thiem asked if the windows would be reused elsewhere. Mr. Lunday answered they had no plans for that. Mr. Renzaglia added that they had no plans to use them any other place and they would be discarded. Ms. David said the committee has had lots of previous applications where the kitchen cabinetry is seen through windows, and it is not uncommon.

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]:

Do the dimensions of the proposed windows alter the character defining features of the façade.
[Davis]

That's what I'm trying to work out. If the original house had smaller windows would we have an issue? The shorter windows are a reflection of what's going on inside the house. We don't

regulate the inside. If the house was entirely regulated it would be different. Either way windows will be gotten rid of. [Thiem]

I thought about it with the previous application, and so much of that was about what was happening inside the house. We're regulating the outside and the only thing different about this one is we're only regulating the front half. I think it is a character defining element on that house. I'm troubled by switching them out. I struggled with this same issue on my house. I'm in support of staff. [Fountain]

We do have a lot of this even with showers and how the architect deals with it. It's on the 50% line and that gives me some hesitation. It's the spirit of the Streetside. [David]

That's the only new and different thing to me. How to apply it in the Streetside. [Fountain]

If it wasn't Streetside district there would be no question it would have to be kept. [David]

It's right on the 50% line. [Hinshaw]

I'm thinking along the same lines as Nick. The bay is more prominent than in the pictures when I went and looked at it. Short windows are not common in that location. Even though it's only half a window to me it's still fairly prominent. And it does hit that half-way point which is under our regulation. [Davis]

This won't change how I think about it. Just out of curiosity, let's say this is a long bank of windows and the windows closest to the street touched the 50% line, does that mean the entire bank of windows is regulated? [Thiem]

Staff's interpretation was in traditional construction it is a bank of windows not a single unit.

You have one double-hung window that's completely outside the 50% line and you have another that's divided, and the way it's constructed you have about an 8" mull with the weights on either side. It would be weird, but you could remove of the pair and be left with a single window. If you have a whole bank of them staff would interpret that one window that's in the 50% would be regulated, the rest not. [Tully]

Thank you. That helps a lot, and I thought that might be where this might lead. The one toward the back we don't regulate and they can take it out. [Thiem]

My thought is they could leave those originals and put up plantation shutters. Nobody's going to know that the stove or whatever is there. Just save the money on those windows and leave them alone. [Fountain]

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 1-4), to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- G. Removal of a historic window and installation of a salvaged historic window is incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.7.1, 2.7.11, and the following suggested facts:

- 31* According to the Glenwood-Brooklyn Historic Overlay District Inventory, the house was built circa 1928 and was classified as contributing. The architectural description from the report reads: "One-story frame Craftsman bungalow with vinyl siding and an asphalt-shingled front-gable roof. The porch has tapered wood posts on brick pedestals. Other features include a brick foundation and exterior side chimney, a parged interior flue, and 3/1 windows."
- 32* From Design Guidelines section 2.7 Windows and Doors, in the Things to Consider as You Plan section: "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."
- 33* The applicants propose removing one of a pair of 3-over-1 windows centered on the gable-end bump-out on the east side (left) of the house. The window is the same height as two windows that flank the fireplace towards the front of the house, but are narrower.
- 34* The applicants propose replacing the existing window with one of a pair of 3-over-1 windows of different dimensions that will be removed from elsewhere on the house. The "replacement" window appears to be nearly square and is much wider in proportion than the existing window.

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

Decision on the Application

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

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

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

027-18-CA 514 COLE STREET
Applicant: CORBETT AND CHRISSEY GUPTON
Received: 2/8/2018 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 5/9/2018 1) 3/22/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: GLENWOOD-BROOKLYN HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: Streetside Historic Overlay District (HOD-S)

Nature of Project: Construct detached garage; plant evergreen foundation screening

Staff Notes:

- The Glenwood-Brooklyn Historic District is a Streetside HOD.
- Streetside HODs are "...established to provide for protection of the traditional development patterns of an area and to preserve historic resources found in it. The focus is on maintaining that character...as viewed from the street right-of-way, excluding alleys..." (Section 5.4.2.A.1. of the Unified Development Ordinance)
- Section 5.4.2.B. of the Unified Development Ordinance governs the applicability of the COA process in Streetside HODs. The entirety of any new accessory building construction located in whole or in part in areas Sec. 5.4.2.B.2.b. through Sec. 5.4.2.B.2.d. requires a COA. The proposed garage is located within the area described in 5.4.2.B.b. – the lot area between the public rights-of-way and the facade of any existing primary building or structure. Both Cole Street and Wade Avenue are public rights-of-way.
- COA cases mentioned are available for review.
- Section 5.4.1.E.1. of the Unified Development Ordinance says, "The minimum and maximum setbacks within the -HOD-G and for Historic Landmarks shall be congruous with the setbacks of any typical well-related nearby building and structure within 1½ blocks and in the overlay district, and congruous with the character of the Historic Landmark, as set forth in the historic development standards below or as defined in the designation documents or nomination."
- Section 5.4.1.F.1. of the Unified Development Ordinance says "Buildings and structures shall be congruous with the height of typical well-related nearby buildings and structures in the overlay district, and congruous with the character of the Historic Landmark, as set forth in the historic development standards below or as defined in the designation documents or nomination.
- Section 5.4.2.H.3. of the Unified Development Ordinance says "The issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness shall not be prohibited in situations where, owing to special conditions affecting the structure (such as topography, availability of materials, and lot size) but not affecting the -HOD-G or Historic Landmarks generally, compliance with the historic development standards would cause an unusual and unnecessary hardship on the property owner beyond that which other property owners in the -HOD-

G or of Historic Landmarks would meet.” (5.4.2.B.2. makes this applicable to the HOD-S)

- An application for a detached garage on the same lot in a different location was denied in 2017 (COA 163-16-CA). The denied garage has not yet been demolished. This application is to be treated as though the house is the only existing building on the lot.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<i>Sections</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Description of Work</i>
2.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	Construct detached garage; plant evergreen foundation screening

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Support:

Applicants Corbett Gupton and Chrissy Gupton [affirmed], 514 Cole St, were present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Gupton stated that the current application was based on the comments from the previously denied application, including changing the garage orientation and adding some landscaping. She said it will be 16’ from the property line, and they propose planting a row of 6’ evergreens. Ms. Gupton stated they are amenable to the staff comments. She also provided new materials showing garage doors and shutters.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Ms. Gupton said that Dan Becker was present if there were questions.

Mr. Thiem asked if the trees indicated for planting were to be 6’ tall when planted. Ms. Gupton said yes. Mr. Thiem said that since the Streetside HOD required regulation of the property from both Cole Street and Wade Avenue, the applicants would need to provide a tree protection plan for the large trees, including fencing.

Mr. Hinshaw said he agreed with the staff recommendation.

Ms. Gupton asked if the decision and minutes from the last case could be part of the record. Mr. Raspberry replied that the Committee’s longstanding practice was to consider each case individually, just as cases in court are handled. The application would have needed to have

included any other evidence they wanted in the record. Ms. David said that there was nothing about the previous case that impacted the decision. Mr. Rasberry added that it was not germane to the issues in this case. Mr. Davis said that the earlier case is referenced in the staff comments, so it could be found if needed.

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 orientation and details meet the Design Guidelines. It's approvable. [David]
Most garages are behind the house in the rest of the district, but the topography created a hardship in this case. [Davis]
It's also common to see the offset from the house. [David]
It's hard to not see it as being at the rear of the house when you come down the driveway. [Fountain]
I think it fits the Design Guidelines. [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 1-14), to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- H. Construction of detached garage; planting of evergreen foundation screening 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, 1.6.12, and the following facts:
- 1* The 2-story frame house at 514 Cole Street, constructed in 2016 prior to district designation, is a non-contributing resource in the Glenwood-Brooklyn Historic District.
 - 2* The 2015 update of the district designation does not include an inventory of accessory buildings. The 2002 National Register Nomination does include an inventory.
 - 3* At the front of the garage, measuring from the level of the driveway, the proposed garage is 21 feet 9 inches in height to the top of the ridge. It is 26 feet wide and 24 feet deep.
 - 4* The application provides photos of multiple non-historic 2-level accessory buildings in the historic district. A single two-bay 1-story, historic garage was also included.
 - 5* The garage is roughly square in plan and rectangular in form. It has a symmetrical side gable roof with the 2nd level created through the use of dormers on both front and back. It is shorter than the main house.

- 6* The lot slopes down from Cole Street to a level area at the house, from which there is a steep drop to Wade Avenue. A level area is proposed at the garage floor with the lot continuing the steep drop on either side.
- 7* The application includes a section cut perpendicular to the street (A-B) that illustrates the relationship of the proposed garage to the grade at Cole Street. That drawing shows the floor of the garage as being roughly 12 feet lower than Cole Street. Based on this, the ridge of the garage is effectively 9'9" above Cole Street.
- 8* The application includes a section cut perpendicular to the garage (C-D) that illustrates the grade of the lot in relationship to of the proposed garage. That drawing shows that from the floor of the garage, the lot drops roughly 70 feet to the creek at Wade Avenue.
- 9* The garage is proposed to be located at the end of the driveway, a traditional garage placement. It is oriented orthogonally to the main residential structure on the lot.
- 10* All but one of the provided example garages are located to the rear of the main house and oriented at a right angle to the houses and the side property lines.
- 11* Most lots in Glenwood-Brooklyn are rectangular in shape – deep and narrow. 514 Cole Street is atypical in shape – roughly diamond shaped. It accesses Cole Street via a long driveway. The bulk of the lot sits at the rear of 506, 508, 510, and 512 Cole Street.
- 12* Proposed materials are to match the existing house: smooth faced fiber cement siding, wood double-hung windows, architectural shingles. The materials of the shutters and garage door were not provided.
- 13* The drawings show the general location and size of window and door trim: windows are drawn with trim on all three sides of the window with a sill at the bottom; section details of the windows were not included in the application; wood windows and doors are typical for the historic district.
- 14* Due to the grade of the lot, the rear of the garage has a 6-1/2-foot-tall concrete foundation wall. The finish of the foundation is unclear. It is proposed to be screened with evergreen plantings.
- 15* The garage will be located in the critical root zone of three hardwood trees.
- 16* There is an existing fill slope in the area where the garage is to be located. The ground area has already been disturbed previously.

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

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, 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. windows;
 - b. tree protection plan.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction or installation:
 - a. lighting.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 9/22/18.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

032-18-CA 325 E CABARRUS STREET
Applicant: MATT TOMASULO
Received: 2/23/2018 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 5/24/2018 1) 3/22/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: PRINCE HALL HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: General Historic Overlay District (HOD-G)
Nature of Project: Relocate existing house from 517 S West St; construct new foundation
Conflict of Interest: Mr. Davis was recused from the meeting.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<i>Sections</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Description of Work</i>
4.1	Relocation	Relocate existing house from 517 S West St; construct new foundation
3.3	New Construction of Primary Buildings	Relocate existing house from 517 S West St

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Mr. Rasberry disclosed that he has done some work with the City of Raleigh on the sale of this property to Preservation North Carolina.

Support:

Applicant Matt Tomasulo [affirmed], 215 Haywood St, was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Tomasulo stated that for the LG Rogers house he has been working with Preservation North Carolina on deed restrictions and covenants, as well as retention of exterior and interior features. He said that the house is modest but it fits the character of the small corner lot.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Thiem said when he looked at iMAPs and the drawings he was having trouble with the dimensions working out with setbacks. Mr. Tomasulo responded that the site has been surveyed now, and he has a site plan. He said that he would abide by the setback requirements, and felt it would all be resolved when reviewed with conditions submittals. Mr. Thiem stated that his concern was that the lot was too narrow for the house. Mr. Tomasulo replied that he had no worries about it fitting on the lot. Ms. Tully added that the standard 15' setback total does not apply in the Prince Hall Historic Overlay District. Mr. Thiem asked which of the distances would need to be reduced and what would staff's advice be. Ms. Tully answered that it would be determined by evaluating other corner lots in the district.

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

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

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

I think this is good work and we need to keep it going. [Fountain]

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Mr. Fountain moved that based on the information contained in the application and materials and in the evidentiary hearing, the Committee finds staff suggested findings from the Staff Report, A. (inclusive of facts 1-13), to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- I. Relocation of the house at 517 S West St and construction of a new foundation is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.7, 4.1.8, 3.3.1, 3.3.7, 3.3.8, 3.3.10, 3.3.12, and the following facts:
 - 35* The house to be relocated (517 S West St) is facing impending demolition to make way for new construction.
 - 36* Although not located in Prince Hall, the house dates to the district's period of significance and is architecturally compatible with the district. Sanborn Fire Insurance maps show a house with additions on the property at 517 S West St as early as 1914. The Special Character Essay states that "Houses are one and two stories and are generally modest. Most stand on brick foundations, have front porches, and historically had weatherboard exteriors."
 - 37* The house is a hip roofed one-story Folk Victorian cottage with a full front porch. There are several historic houses with hipped roofs in Prince Hall including 320 E Davie Street, 219 E Cabarrus Street, and 223 E Lenoir Street.

- 38* An iMAPS view of the area was provided by the applicant that shows the approximate location of the house on the site. Its location is proposed to adhere to the uniform setback on the block. A detailed site plan was not provided.
- 39* The house is proposed to sit at the narrow end of the lot facing Bloodworth Street, similar to the other buildings on the block. Photographs of the streetscape were not provided.
- 40* In its newly proposed location the house will maintain its historic orientation to the street.
- 41* Architectural drawings were provided showing both plan and elevation views of the existing house. Photographs were provided showing west and northwest views of the house.
- 42* Only the original, main block of the house and front porch is being moved to the new site.
- 43* The application proposes a brick foundation on the house and porch. Details were not provided. Material samples were not provided.
- 44* No details were provided in the application for a new stair and railing.
- 45* New asphalt shingle roofing is proposed.
- 46* The application did not include any information about the location of new HVAC equipment.
- 47* The site is currently a grassy lot. No trees or other landscape improvements are present on the site at 325 E Cabarrus Street.

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 details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of the blue placard for construction of the foundation:
 - a. A detailed site plan for 325 E Cabarrus St;
 - b. Foundation plan.
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of the blue placard for the move:
 - a. Move route including possible tree trimming needed within Prince Hall.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction/installation:
 - a. Final foundation design that is detailed to convey the appearance of the original pier locations;
 - b. Front walk;
 - c. Foundation brick face finish and color;
 - d. Front stair and railing;
 - e. HVAC size and location and screening, if needed;

- f. Paint color selections if different than the existing;
- g. Any other exterior changes required for the project not specifically addressed.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 9/22/18.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Administrative Review of Conditions
 - a. 151-17-CA, 408 E Lane St, Oakwood Historic District
After discussion the committee directed the staff to approve the conditions as submitted by the applicant.
2. Committee Discussion
 - a. Meeting Post-Mortem

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:27 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Melissa Robb, Preservation Planner