

RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
April 26, 2018

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Elizabeth Caliendo called the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Committee meeting to order at 4:00 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; Collette Kinane; Francis P. Rasberry, Jr., Attorney

Approval of the February 22, 2018 and March 22, 2018 Minutes

Mr. Fountain moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing and to adopt said minutes as submitted. Mr. Davis seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

Minor Works

There were no questions regarding the Minor Work report.

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

<u>Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address</u>	<u>Affirmed</u>
Tonya Debnam, 3011 Debnam Farm, 27610	No
Kellan Moore, 2504 Laurelcherry St, 27612	No
Edna Ballentine, PO Box 26252, 27611	No
Mike Poupard, 1005 Collins Dr, 27609	Yes
Eric Halter, 2504 Laurelcherry St, 27612	No
David Nicolay, 1301 Courtland Dr, 27604	No
Don Becom, 308 N East St, 27601	No
Alice Smith, 125 Creekbroad Ct, 27529	No
Pamela Herndon, 3900 Barwell Rd, 27610	Yes
Wanda Dixon, 5424 Advantis Dr, 27610	No
Peter Jelenevsky, 512 Oakwood Ave, 27601	No
Kent Kilpatrick, 807 McCulloch St, 27603	Yes
Angela Kilpatrick, 807 McCulloch St, 27603	Yes
Erin Sterling Lewis, 704 N Person St, 27604	Yes

REVIEW OF SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Fountain 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 044-18-CA for which the Summary Proceeding is made part of these minutes.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – SUMMARY PROCEEDING

044-18-CA 511 E. JONES STREET
Applicant: DAVID NICOLAY
Received: 03-22-2018 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 06-20-2018 1) 04-26-2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Raleigh Historic Landmark: HECK-WYNNE HOUSE

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: Remove 5 Leland Cypress trees, plant 5 Camellias; remove Hackberry tree;
remove Mulberry tree

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.”

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	Removal of 5 Leland Cypress trees, planting of 5 Camellias; removal of Hackberry tree; removal of Mulberry tree

STAFF REPORT

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

- A. Removal of five (5) Cypress trees and replacement with Camellias is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.5, and the following suggested facts:
 - 1* The trees proposed for removal are 5 Leyland Cypress trees located in the east side yard between the property line and the driveway.
 - 2* The application includes a report from an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA). It is the arborist’s opinion that “tree form” pruning and an “inherently weak root system” have contributed to the trees’ “decisive lean...toward...the east.”

- 3* The application proposes to replace the removed trees with 5 camellias. Camellias have been cultivated in the south since 1741 (Middleton Place, Charleston).
- B. The removal of a hackberry tree and the removal of a mulberry tree are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.5, and the following suggested facts:
- 1* A report prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) was provided.
- 2* The Mulberry tree is a double stem (12" dbh and 23" dbh) and located at the end of the driveway near the northeast corner of a recent addition. The arborist's report states that the tree exhibits die back and decay. Removal of decayed portions will result in a lack of good structure and branch conflict.
- 3* The triple stem Hackberry tree is located off the east edge of the driveway and is stated to have multiple decay, infrastructure, and structural issues. Additionally, the root system of the tree is causing the brick driveway to heave.
- 4* Replacement trees are not proposed. The application includes evidence of the dense tree canopy in the yard before and after tree removal and a comparison of the tree canopy of adjacent properties.

Staff recommends that the committee approve the application, without placing a 365-day demolition delay.

Decision on the Application

There were no objections to approval without an evidentiary hearing.

Ms. David moved to approve the application, adopting the staff report as the written record of the summary proceeding on COA 044-18-CA. Mr. Fountain seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 10/26/18.

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: 026-18-CA, 041-18-CA, and 043-18-CA. Prior to case 043-18-CA Mr. Davis was recused from the hearing; Mr. Fountain made the motion to recuse Mr. Davis, Ms. David seconded the motion; motion passed 4/0. After hearing case 043-18-CA, Mr. Davis was recalled to the meeting upon a motion from Mr. Fountain which was seconded by Ms. David; motion passed 4/0.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

026-18-CA 807 MCCULLOCH STREET
Applicant: KENT KILPATRICK
Received: 02-08-2018 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 05/09/2018 1) 04/26/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: Construct reconfigured rear addition with second story and wraparound porch; remove/replace/add windows; remove second door on front elevation; change exterior paint colors

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its December 22, 2017 and January 29, 2018 meetings. Members in attendance were Dan Becker, Jenny Harper, Curtis Kasefang, and David Maurer, ; also present were Melissa Robb and Tania Tully.

Staff Notes:

-

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
2.4	Paint and Paint Color	Change exterior paint colors
2.5	Roofs	Change porch roof material
2.7	Windows and Doors	Remove/add/replace windows; remove second door on front elevation
3.2	Additions	Construct rear addition

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 approval with conditions.

Support:

Applicant Kent Kilpatrick [affirmed], 807 McCulloch Street, was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Kilpatrick stated that he reviewed the staff conditions and agreed with the comments.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Ms. David asked if Mr. Kilpatrick had any idea when the existing additions were constructed. Mr. Kilpatrick estimated in the 1950s or 60s. Ms. Robb added that there were no files of any previously approved COA applications.

Mr. Davis asked if the smaller windows were intended to be fixed. Mr. Kilpatrick answered that there were a combination of fixed and awning types.

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]:

There was a tree protection plan referred to in the staff report, but I didn't see it. [Thiem]
We handed it out just now and had emailed it earlier today when we found it had inadvertently been left out of the packet. [Robb]

The side addition is from 1927 according to the staff report. [David]

I'd like to know more about the size of the window labeled C on the west side. [Davis]

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Mr. Kilpatrick stated that the windows there were being changed are to the rear and face the back yard of the neighbor. The window is to be just the top half of a double-hung window since it is a bathroom. Mr. Davis said the design guidelines say not to shrink windows.

Mr. Fountain asked for clarification on the east side addition, and whether it would have originally been a one-story addition. Ms. David said it was likely a sleeping porch and could date to the 1920s. Mr. Davis said the windows looked like they might not be original to the porch.

Mr. Thiem asked about the storage unit and pile of gravel in the back yard, and what the applicant's intention was for it. Mr. Kilpatrick stated his plan was to keep the storage unit there during construction and remove it later, while he had no plans for the gravel. Mr. Thiem said it was important that the tree protection plan be prepared by an ISA-certified arborist or licensed landscape architect, as required in the design guidelines. He stated the footings might need to

be designed around the tree protection zone and that he was concerned that the trees in the back yard and neighbor's yard would be impacted by the construction, especially if it were used as a staging area since the large trees would not be able to support that kind of activity. Ms. Caliendo said it could be made a condition. Mr. Thiem responded that the tree protection plan should be reviewed in the public hearing setting, and that he could not support it being submitted for staff review.

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

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION (2)

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

It sounds like we're leaning towards deferring this. [Caliendo]

I see lots of fenestration changes, including the porch door removal and adding a window on the porch. We need more evidence about the sleeping porch windows which may be historic.

There are three windows being removed on the east elevation. [David]

We should defer it and ask the applicant to provide more evidence about the windows and the tree protection plan and footings that take into account the trees. We need to see how it's proposed to be done, and what historical research can be found. [Fountain]

The applicants should bring more detailed information about windows proposed to be removed. [David]

I'd rather defer it than deny. [Fountain]

I'm looking for evidence about the condition of each window being removed, especially if the sleeping porch windows are double-hung. [David]

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (3)

Angela Kilpatrick [affirmed], 807 McCulloch Street, said that the sleeping porch windows are double-hung windows mounted sideways. The house had been converted to a triplex at some point, so it had been butchered over the years, and the windows were not in good shape. Ms. David said it's possible the sleeping porch windows dated to the 1927 addition, and that she needed to see evidence of the condition and that they were either beyond repair or not original. Ms. Kilpatrick asked who could help figuring this out. Mr. Fountain said they should talk to staff. Ms. Caliendo said that if the windows were in such obvious disrepair photos may work.

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

Mr. Fountain made a motion to defer the application; Ms. David seconded it; motion carried 5/0.

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

041-18-CA 501 E LANE STREET
Applicant: MIKE POUPARD FOR GRAYSON HOMES
Received: 3/13/2018 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 6/11/2018 1) 4/26/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: Demolish building; remove trees

Staff Notes:

- 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

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
1.3	Site Features and Setting	remove trees
4.2	Demolition	demolish building

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] provided a summary of the project, including revisions to the suggested conditions from the original staff report. Staff suggested approval 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 Mike Poupard [affirmed], 1005 Collins Drive, was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Poupard provided copies of three new documents for the Committee,

including a structural assessment, a document labeled "Preliminary Drainage Assessment Report", and a letter from an arborist. He spoke about issues with settlement of the building, sinkholes and storm water drainage. Mr. Poupard also stated that there would be significant costs to rehabilitate the building, and that he does not want to delay the demolition as there is mixed evidence about whether the building is contributing to the district or not based on the period of significance.

Mr. Fountain asked for clarification on the location of the storm drain, which Mr. Poupard described as from southwest to northeast.

Mr. Thiem asked what is intended for the future use of the site. Mr. Poupard responded that it would be subdivided into two or three lots with either single family houses or duplexes. Mr. Thiem and Mr. Poupard discussed issues with the location of the storm drain line. Mr. Thiem pointed out that any new structures would be impacted by the site conditions.

Ms. Pamela Herndon [affirmed], 3900 Barwell Road, stated that she is in support of the application. She said they have been in the building for ten years and have spent a lot to sustain it. Ms. Herndon said that the church cannot afford to spend more on the building, and they will have to find somewhere else to go.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Thiem stated that he appreciated the arborist report that stated the large sycamore has significant issues which he agreed with, but there was no tree protection plan provided from an arborist to protect the two trees in the corner of the site. He said it is likely a 25' radius no construction zone would be sufficient to protect the critical root zone, which needs to be in a tree protection plan.

Ms. Caliendo asked staff to explain sections A.4 and A.5 in the staff report. Ms. Robb explained that the original survey records of Oakwood were slim, and that Matthew Brown from the Society for the Preservation of Historic Oakwood wrote a description of the property in 2014 and included the non-contributing status from an earlier National Register nomination, based on the understanding that it was built in 1939. She said a more recent draft update of the district survey reclassifies the property as contributing, with new information that it may have been constructed around 1900 and moved to the site in 1939. Ms. Robb read additional facts from the report. Ms. Tully added that there will be a formal determination when the report is finalized, but not in time for this case. She said that according to the UDO, the building must be found to have no significance or value in order to waive the demolition delay period, and that the burden of proof is on the applicant. She said that whether the building is contributing or not does not have to be the deciding factor. Mr. Thiem asked if she could elaborate on value. Ms. Tully responded that she generally describes it as when you drive through a neighborhood

does the building fit in. She said it is up to the Committee to weigh the evidence and comments from the applicant to assess it. Mr. Thiem said it is not uncommon to have small commercial and non-residential buildings in residential historic districts like Oakwood, which is different from suburban neighborhoods developed in the 1950s and 60s. He asserted that these small buildings are part of the social context of the neighborhood. He said he finds the value in the religious use of the building in the neighborhood, regardless of its architectural character.

Mr. Rasberry expanded on the language in the UDO and state statute, saying the design guidelines disfavor demolition, but demolition may not be disallowed per state statute. He said the committee may impose a delay of up to 365 days, and it is up to the discretion of the Committee if they impose the maximum delay or some portion of it. Mr. Rasberry stated it is a discretionary call, and neither the statute nor guidelines have any criteria for evaluating, so they must use reasonable consideration in weighing the evidence. He continued that it is not whether it is contributing or not, but about whether the resource has significance or value toward the character of the district or it has no particular significance or value. If it is found to have no significance or value, the statutory requirement kicks in that the Committee waive some or all of the potential demolition delay period. If significance or value has been found the statute does not require waiving the delay.

Mr. Fountain said the structure has economic value and that helical piers or the like could be used to stabilize the structure. He continued that economic value is not the test, but as Mr. Thiem said it has significance to the character of the neighborhood. He said that he understood they didn't have the power to deny demolition, but he would look separately at the addition.

Mr. Thiem asked if the addition was contributing. Ms. David responded that from the National Register perspective it would all be considered one building, and that either it is all contributing or all not contributing.

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

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

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

I agree with the consultants that it's contributing. It's a late 19th Century/early 20th Century rural church building that was moved at some point. It's different from others in Oakwood, like some of the wood frame commercial buildings. There's no evidence that it is without value. The evidence shows the front corner is sinking. What happens during the demolition delay? Is there some way we can work with the owners to find alternatives? A delay is meant to find a successful outcome for the building, not punish the applicant. [David]
Here's a technical question; If the soil problem is a result of the pipe and a structural failure, then substantial work will be required to accommodate the building during the process. My

guess is the estimate was done as if there were no building on the site. It appears that retaining the structure would be difficult, if the intention would be to keep it structurally sound for renovation. [Thiem]

Is the City paying for it? [Davis]

The document has not attribution and it is not on City letterhead, and while it's not a question of believing the information, it needs to be legally defensible. [Tully]

That's one of the reasons for the revised conditions. That we will work to explore alternatives during that delay. [Caliendo]

We can impose the demolition delay for now. The applicant can come back later if there is additional evidence and we can modify the delay period. [Fountain]

I'd be interested if the owner is interested in being involved in retaining the building. The whole building is considered contributing, even though the addition is outside the date. When I walked around the building I saw that the addition has is a lower occupied basement level. The foundation for that goes deeper than the original soil borings at 3' below. [Thiem]

If someone applied to demolish just the addition, that could be found to have no value and then there would be no delay. [Tully]

We let people demolish non-historic additions. [David]

Staff discussed the property with other potential buyers, and we told them in all likelihood the Committee would approve the demolition of the 1950s portion. [Tully]

If the owner was willing to look at other options and retain the original portion I could see modifying the delay time. [Thiem]

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 1-11), to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

B. Demolition of the building and removal of two trees is incongruous according to *Guidelines* section 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, and the following facts:

- 1* Two trees are proposed for removal; a 52" diameter sycamore southeast of the front walk and a 9" diameter tree (species not identified) in the northwest corner of the site.
Information regarding the health of the trees was not provided. The proposal to remove the trees presumes the demolition of the building.
- 2* A tree protection plan was not provided for the 18" diameter sycamore and 11" diameter oak in the northeast corner of the site.
- 3* No replacement trees were proposed for the two trees proposed for removal.
- 4* The application includes pages from the "Inventory of Structures in The Oakwood National Register Historic Districts" Raleigh, North Carolina By Matthew Brown, Historian, Society for the Preservation of Historic Oakwood Researched and written from 2004 to 2015. That document includes the following statements:

- a. "Those built 1939 or later are listed as non-contributing (NC), following the designation in current National Register documents, which designation accords with the judgment of the author of this inventory."
 - b. "=WA6848 (NC) 501 E. Lane St. Raleigh Christian & Missionary Alliance Church c.1939 This Colonial Revival vernacular frame church building was built for the Raleigh Christian & Missionary Alliance Church. It has a front gabled saddle roof with shallow eaves. Most windows are six-over-six. The Colonial Revival classroom building was added in c.1949. It is veneered in brick. It has a side-gabled saddle roof with shallow eaves. The front door has a transom. This became the First Original Free Will Baptist Church of Raleigh in 1958, then the Civitan Club in 1966, then the Boys Club of Wake County in 1969, then the Praise Temple Apostolic Faith Church in 1978, then the Remnant of Christ Fellowship Church in 2010."
- 5* The subject property is within the original boundaries of Oakwood Historic Districts listed in the National Register in 1974. That nomination form does not contain an inventory list nor a clearly defined period of significance. The Commission has generally used the mid-1930s as the end date. A draft update of the nomination, including an inventory list is under review by the State Historic Preservation Office. That draft document describes this property as follows:
- a. "501 E Lane Street; Historic name: Raleigh Christian & Missionary Alliance Church; SSN: WA6848; Form: Single-nave; Year built: ca. 1939; Stylistic influences: No Style; Contributing Status: Contributing"
 - b. "This vernacular frame church building appeared on this site ca. 1939. However, the building's architecture and materials suggest that it may have been constructed ca. 1900 and moved to this site ca. 1939. It has a front-gabled saddle roof with shallow eaves. Most windows are six-over-six and small in scale. The front entrance has a pair of six-panel wood doors. A tall brick chimney rises from the roof toward the building's rear. The church's simple appearance is consistent with the primitive church movement that emerged in North Carolina ca. 1900, primarily in rural communities. On this site, though, the first city directory entry appears in 1948 and lists the Raleigh Christian Alliance Church at 503 E. Lane Street (later the known as the Raleigh Christian & Missionary Alliance Church). The Colonial Revival classroom wing adjoining the church's east side likely was constructed ca. 1949, and it is visible on the 1950 Sanborn Map. This wing is veneered in brick. It has a side-gabled saddle roof with shallow eaves. The front door has a transom. The church became the First Original Free Will Baptist Church of Raleigh in 1958, then the Civitan Club in 1966, then the Boys Club of Wake County in 1969, then the Praise Temple Apostolic Faith Church in 1978, then the Remnant of Christ Fellowship Church in 2010."
 - c. The district's period of significance is defined as between 1867 and 1941.
- 6* The applicant states that the building is not suitable for repurpose and that the foundation and footings are faulty. Evidence is not provided to support the statement.

- 7* A letter stamped by a Professional Engineer evaluated the bearing capacity of the soil for a residential foundation as inadequate without additional support such as pylons or helical piers.
- 8* The site is transected by a stream and has had sinkholes.
- 9* The application proposes to salvage architectural elements such as siding, transoms and brick fireplaces for use in a proposed new building or building(s)
- 10* The application does not present any evidence that the applicant has fully documented the building with photographs and drawings and deposited these materials with RHDC for storage.
- 11* The application does not present any evidence that the applicant has worked with RHDC and other interested parties to find an alternative to demolition.
- 12* The applicant has failed to meet their statutory burden of presenting sufficient convincing evidence that the property has no significance or value.

The motion was seconded by Ms. David; passed 4/1. (Thiem opposed.)

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, with the following conditions:

1. That a 365-day demolition delay for the building and trees be imposed, with an effective date of April 26, 2018 to April 25, 2019. No demolition delay will be imposed for the removal of the 52" sycamore.
2. That tree protection plans be implemented and remain in place for the duration of construction for the 18" sycamore and 11" oak.
3. That prior to the issuance of the blue placard the following be provided to and approved by staff:
 - a. full documentation of the building with photographs and drawings;
 - b. location and species of replacement trees;
 - c. tree protection plan for the 18" sycamore and 11" oak.
4. That an RHDC member be appointed as liaison to the applicant during the delay period to explore alternatives to demolition.
5. That the application be revisited on the August COA Committee agenda to update the Committee on the alternatives to demolition and the demolition delay.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 10/26/18.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

043-18-CA 325 E. CABARRUS STREET
Applicant: MATT TOMASULO
Received: 03/14/2018 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 06-12-2018 1) 04/26/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: PRINCE HALL HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: DX-3-DE, HOD-G

Nature of Project: Place 1-story historic house onto vacant lot with new rear addition; construct new foundation; construct new walkways; construct driveway; install fences; plant trees.

Amendments: Applicant provided additional materials including: an accurate plot plan, updated and detailed plans, the move route, and an existing foundation photo.

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its April 2 meeting. Members in attendance were Curtis Kasefang, Jenny Harper, and Mary Ruffin Hanbury; also present were Collette Kinane, Melissa Robb, and Tania Tully.

Conflict of Interest: Mr. Davis was recused from the hearing.

Staff Notes:

- This application supersedes COA 032-18-CA.
- COAs mentioned are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
1.4	Fences and Walls	construct new side and rear yard fence
1.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Off-street Parking	construct new front walk; side walkway; driveway
2.5	Roofs	reconstruct roof
2.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	reconstruct front porch, construct new side porch
3.3	New Construction	place 1-story historic house with new rear addition and porch onto vacant lot; construct new foundation
4.1	Relocation	place 1-story historic house with new rear addition and porch onto vacant lot

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Collette Kinane [affirmed] provided a summary of the project and showed the location of the property on the map.

Support:

Matt Tomasulo [affirmed], 215 Haywood St, was present to speak in support of the application. Matt provided additional materials to satisfy some of the recommended staff conditions. Due to the short timeframe, he did not have some information at the time of application. The structure is threatened by demolition, he will move, renovate, and add approximately 100 SF as an addition. He distributed annotated drawings, a foundation plan, existing foundation photo, and the move route as evidence. No tree trimming will be required along move route. He plans to try to incorporate details from the parts of the structure that will be removed. Any structural item that cannot be reused for this project will be donated to Preservation North Carolina. Matt questioned condition 2a of 033-18-CA that required a foundation with piers and setback curtain, he proposed a solid brick foundation. New photos show that the current foundation is painted brick piers with CMU curtain. Matt requests that the foundation be similar to other recently moved houses in the area. They are currently labeling all pieces now and selectively removing some pieces.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Thiem said that the updated drawings address how the structure will fit on the site and relative to grade.

Ms. David stated that, regarding the foundation, she sees where staff is coming from but would prefer a full foundation that is flush, as it will be modern and will show that the house has been moved. The house is a good fit for the lot and neighborhood.

Ms. Caliendo said that Ms. David makes a good point about the foundation.

Without objection, Ms. Caliendo closed the evidentiary portion of the hearing.

Committee Discussion

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

Ms. David made a good point and the application has addressed several conditions. [Caliendo]

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 findings A. 1-23 and B. 1-6 to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

C. Placement of 1-story historic house with new rear addition and porch onto vacant lot is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 2.8.1, 2.8.9, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.3, 3.3.5, 3.3.6, 3.3.7, 3.3.8, 3.3.9, 3.3.10, 3.3.11, 3.3.12, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.8 and the following facts:

13* The structure to be relocated is facing impending demolition to make way for new construction. Although not currently located in Prince Hall, the house (Folk-Victorian; ca.

1930) dates to the district's period of significance and is architecturally compatible with both the district and the particular streetscape surrounding its intended new site.

- 14* 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."
- 15* The relocated structure will be a hip roofed one-story Folk-Victorian style structure with a full front porch, commonly found in the Prince Hall historic district. The front porch will have a shallow pitched hip roof and restored architectural details. 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.
- 16* The application includes a photographic view from the street corner that illustrates the height of adjacent structures.
- 17* The site is currently a grassy lot with no trees or other vegetation on the lot.
- 18* A dimensioned plot plan locating the house on site is included in the application. The house will face S Bloodworth Street
- 19* According to the un-dimensioned lot coverage map, the house appears to be sited similarly to adjacent properties on the block and across the street, but the house does sit marginally closer to the street than other houses on the block face (this could also be attributed to a slight change in topography on the northern end of the block). The house is centered between the side lot lines.
- 20* Information regarding the move route was not included.
- 21* The lot is ~2,976 SF. The footprint of the proposed building with addition and porches is ~1,500 SF, for a proposed building mass of ~50.4% of the lot. [Wake County Tax and Deed Records; scaled drawings]
- 22* With a COA approved addition, the house at 422 S Bloodworth Street has a built area of ~51.7% [COA 029-16-CA]. According to the built area map submitted by the applicant, the lot at 321 E Cabarrus Street has a built mass of approximately 55%. And 318 E Cabarrus Street has a built mass of approximately 56%.
- 23* The form of the house in the is that of a cross hip house with a set-back gable addition, an inset side porch has a low-pitched roof that echoes the pitch and style of the front porch roof. This is a traditional form for adding onto a house. The inset portion near the historic house and lower side roof break up the appearance of the mass. The pitch of the gable extension is similar to the historic house.
- 24* The application includes an example of an addition onto a similar one-story structure at 322 E Cabarrus Street within the historic district.
- 25* The proposed porch facing E Cabarrus Street has railings and decorative details that reflect the original details of the front porch. Detailed drawings, including the orientation of the flooring, were not provided.
- 26* The application proposes a brick foundation on the house and porches. Details were not provided. Material samples were not provided.
- 27* The provided perspective sketches and the lot coverage map include the house approved for relocation in March under COA 032-18-CA.

- 28* All existing materials, including windows and doors on the historic house are to be rehabilitated/restored.
- 29* The roof will be deconstructed for the move and reconstructed when places back on site, exactly as shown in current photos.
- 30* The eaves of the new portion appear to be similar to those on the original structure. The proposed overhang eaves are vented hardie-soffits, while all rake soffits are non-vented hardiesoffit. Detailed drawings and gutter information were not provided.
- 31* The proportions of the new windows match those of the historic house and have the same number of lights. The windows on the new portion have a regular and symmetrical arrangement similar to the historic house.
- 32* The new part of the building is proposed to have new wood windows with simulated divided lights and aluminum clad wood doors. Details and section drawings were included.
- 33* The proposed windows are two-over-two casement windows with minimal trim and a sill.
- 34* Skylights are proposed and shown on the roofing plan and north ("right") elevation. Details were not provided.
- 35* The siding of the new part of the house is proposed to be wood that matches the existing in style and exposure.

D. Construction of new walks; addition of a side/rear yard fence is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 1.4.8, 2.4.8, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, and the following facts:

- 1* The front walk, positioned slightly to the left of center, extends from the public sidewalk straight to the front of the house, a characteristic location as documented on the lot coverage map. Details and specifications were not provided.
- 2* A side walkway will extend from E Cabarrus Street to a side porch.
- 3* New concrete walks in the historic districts are typically water washed to expose the surface aggregate in emulation of the surface texture of historic concrete walks; this was specified.
- 4* The proposed 72" high wood privacy fence is located in the side yard, set behind the front wall of the house, and extends around the northwest corner of the property. Due to the location of the driveway and the double frontage of the lot, the fence is set behind the wall of the house facing E Cabarrus Street.
- 5* New HVAC units will be needed; no information regarding the location or screening was provided.
- 6* Two trees are proposed to be planted in the front yard; species are not provided.

Additional materials provided at the hearing included: an accurate plot plan, updated and detailed plans, the move route, and an existing foundation photo.

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

Decision on the Application

Ms. David made a motion that the application be approved as amended, with the following conditions:

1. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction/installation:
 - a. Foundation brick face finish and color;
 - b. Walkways;
 - c. Eave construction;
 - d. Side stair and railing;
 - e. Skylights;
 - f. Gutters and downspouts
 - g. HVAC size and location and screening;
 - h. Paint color selections if different than the existing;
 - i. Tree species.
 - j. Any other minor exterior changes required for the project not specifically addressed.

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

Committee members voting: Caliendo, David, Fountain, Thiem

Certificate expiration date: 10/26/18.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Administrative Review of Conditions
 - a. 131-16-CA and 014-18-CA, 912 Williamson Drive, Philip Rothstein House:
Erin Sterling Lewis, 1229 Courtland Drive, was present to speak regarding the conditions. After discussion, Ms. David moved the staff to approve the materials submitted for review as submitted by the applicant; Mr. Thiem seconded the motion; passed 4/1. (Caliendo opposed.) After further discussion about the windows on the south elevation of the addition and reviewing an elevation drawing dated 12/22/16 submitted by the applicant, Ms. Caliendo moved to modify condition 3 from COA 014-18-CA to read "That the windows on the south elevation of the addition be no more than 4" higher than the datum line on the existing house, and that the applicant supply a revised elevation drawing showing this revision, using the level of detail and clarity of the drawings labeled A1.1 and A1.2 dated 4/4/18." Ms. David seconded the motion; passed 5/0.
2. Committee Discussion
 - a. Meeting Post-Mortem

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Caliendo moved that the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Davis seconded the motion; passed 5/0. The meeting was adjourned at 5:38 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Melissa Robb, Preservation Planner
Collette Kinane, Preservation Planner