

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

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Nick Fountain 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: Sarah David, Don Davis, Nick Fountain, Jeannine McAuliffe, Jimmy Thiem

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

Approval of the June 28, 2018 Minutes

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

Minor Works

There were no questions regarding the Minor Work report.

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

<u>Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address</u>	<u>Affirmed</u>
Imogen Hoyle, 404 Oakwood Avenue	yes
Preston Lesley, 612 N Boundary Street	no
John and Rachel Lee Hazelton, 410 N East Street	yes
Ashley Morris, 306 Pell Street	yes

REVIEW OF SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Thiem moved to approve the agenda as amended. Ms. David 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 092-18-CA for which the Summary Proceeding is made part of these minutes. Ms. David moved to approve the summary proceeding as presented. Mr. Davis seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – SUMMARY PROCEEDING

092-18-CA 612 N BOUNDARY STREET
Applicant: SHELBY KESSLER
Received: 6/13/2018 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/11/2018 1) 7/26/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: GENERAL HOD

Nature of Project: Install 6' tall fence in rear; repaint exterior; install gutters and down spouts;
install storm windows; replace asbestos siding with wood siding

Amendments: None.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<i>Sections</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Description of Work</i>
1.4	Fences and Walls	Install 6' fence
2.4	Paint and Paint Color	Repaint Exterior
2.5	Roofs	Install gutters and downspouts
2.6	Exterior Walls	Replace asbestos siding with wood siding
2.7	Windows and Doors	Install storm windows

STAFF REPORT

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

- A. The installation of a 6' tall fence, installation of gutters and down spouts; installation of storm windows; and replacement of asbestos siding with wood siding are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 1.4.8, 2.4.3, 2.5.8, 2.6.2, 2.6.6, 2.6.10 and the following suggested facts:

1* 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 describes the house thusly: "=WA6643 612 North Boundary St. Fallon-Watkins House c.1937 This Craftsman frame bungalow was built for J. J. Fallon Florists. Fallon's greenhouses were on the land along Watauga St. from N. Boundary St. to Polk St. This house was built as the residence for the superintendent of the greenhouses. The last superintendent was Carl Watkins, who lived here from 1957 until his death in 2005. After the greenhouses were razed in 1986, Carl and his wife Lois bought the house. Their son sold the house in 2012. The house has a front-gabled saddle roof. There are exposed rafter tails under the horizontal eaves. A fascia board was later added. The front porch has a hipped roof supported by four battered square-section

posts on brick piers, with a square-section balustrade. The front door has three vertical windowpanes. Most windows have three vertical panes over a single pane. There is an exposed chimney on the left side, between two small windows. The house was sided in asbestos shingles in c.1955. After 1950 a garage was added to the back of the house.”

- 2* The *Design Guidelines for Raleigh Historic Districts* states on page 14 that “Fences and walls were common site features in Raleigh’s early neighborhoods...” and “Utilitarian fences and walls served to secure boundaries...and to provide visual privacy. They were generally used in rear yard locations and were not usually visible from the street. Traditionally, utilitarian fences were constructed of vertical wooden slats or pickets...”
- 3* The proposed wood fence is located in the rear yard along the property line as is characteristic of the district. The application states that the fence will be constructed in a box design matching the fence on an adjacent property, 616 N Boundary Street.
- 4* The commission typically requires that fences be constructed with structural members facing inward; the shadow-box fence design has the same appearance on each side.
- 5* The fence at 616 N Boundary Street was either installed prior to designation as a district or without a COA.
- 6* The committee has approved numerous 6’-tall wood privacy fences throughout the historic districts.
- 7* Wood is a traditional fencing material.
- 8* No information is included regarding surface finish treatment for the fence, if any.
- 9* Per aerial photographs of the property, it appears a tree may be located on or very near to the rear property line and may result in roots impacted by the proposal; no information is included in the application regarding how tree roots will be treated if they are encountered during the digging of fence post holes.
- 10* A tree protection plan was not provided.
- 11* For administrative efficiency, this application includes several projects that are typically approvable as minor works: installation of gutters and downspouts, repainting existing house, removing the existing asbestos shingles and replacement with 5” horizontal exposed wood lap siding, and installation of storm windows. It additionally includes several routine maintenance items described as repair and replace that do not require COA approval: repair and replace fascia board, and repair and re-glaze existing sashes.
- 12* The application did not provide manufacturer’s specifications on the proposed gutters and downspouts or the installation locations.
- 13* The application did not provide manufacturer’s specifications for the proposed storm windows.

Staff suggests that the committee approve the application with 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. A tree protection plan that addresses applicable critical root zones and provides staging areas for construction materials;
 - b. Manufacturer's specifications for storm windows.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction/installation:
- a. Proposed locations and installation for gutters and downspouts;
 - b. Manufacturer's specifications for gutters and downspouts.

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 092-18-CA. Mr. Davis seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 01/26/19.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chair Fountain 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: 091-18-CA and 093-18-CA.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

091-18-CA 410 N EAST STREET
Applicant: JOHN AND RACHEL HAZELTON
Received: 6/13/2018 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/11/2018 1) 7/26/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: GENERAL HOD

Nature of Project: Construct addition; reconstruct rear room; remove aluminum windows, change siding

Amendments:

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its July 2, 2018, meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker, Curtis Kasefang, and Mary Ruffin Hanbury; also present were John Hazelton, applicant; Tania Tully and Collette Kinane, staff.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- COAs mentioned are available for review

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<i>Sections</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Description of Work</i>
1.3	Site Features and Plantings	Construct rear addition
2.5	Roofs	Construct rear addition; reconstruct rear room
2.6	Exterior Walls	Construct rear addition; reconstruct rear room; change siding
2.7	Windows and Doors	Construct rear addition; reconstruct rear room; remove aluminum windows
3.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Construct rear addition

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Collette Kinane [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report.

Support:

Ashley Morris, John Hazelton, and Rachel Hazelton [all affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application.

Ms. Morris stated that the intent of the application is to bring the house back to its historic nature. It was “modernized” – wrapped in aluminum siding, columns, and trim and the windows were replaced with aluminum windows. It is their intent to repair the siding under the aluminum siding and they accept the staff conditions to consult staff if more than 50% of any one side is damaged. The deck room at the rear of the property was enclosed but it was not originally constructed up to standards, it was originally just a porch.

Mr. Fountain asked if the applicant had any comments about the staff report.

Ms. Morris stated that they were fine with all comments and are ok with coming back if the windows are different than expected.

Mr. Fountain asked if Mr. and Ms. Hazelton had anything to add. Mr. Hazelton responded no, Ms. Morris covered everything.

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

Responses and Questions:

Ms. David stated that she lived three houses down from the subject property and has no prejudice or bias toward the proposed project. Ms. David questioned the alteration of a window on the driveway side that is proposed to be located closer to the rear wall.

Ms. Morris responded that the existing elevation has three windows.

Ms. David suggested that she suspects the current window placement is likely close to original. When the siding is removed the applicants will be able to find that is the case.

Ms. Morris asked the applicants if they were ok with moving the window away from the corner. Mr. and Ms. Hazelton responded yes.

Mr. Thiem stated that tree protection plan did not include information about how the concrete in the rear yard will be removed.

Ms. Morris responded that she imagines that the concrete will be removed by hand. The tree protection plan will be in place.

Mr. Thiem stated that he would like to take imagining out of the question and would like the applicant to guarantee that the concrete will be removed by hand.

Ms. Morris stated yes, they will commit to hand removing the concrete.

Mr. Thiem stated that the tree protection plan notes a laydown area on the concrete that will impact the roots of adjacent trees. This should be part of the tree protection plan. The tree protection plan should be modified to protect trees and prevent equipment laydown. The fence should be moved out to protect the entire critical root zone.

Ms. Morris stated that the majority of material laydown will be in the driveway.

Mr. Thiem stated that the activity is occurring in an area that is normally included in the tree protection zone. Activity will move into the protected zone and then the protection fence will disappear, and then construction equipment will be active in the protected area.

Ms. Tully recommended modifying condition 3a to include location.

Ms. David asked about the fate of the lighthouse in the front yard.

Ms. Hazelton responded that the lighthouse will be moved to the backyard and will be retained. It still works.

Without objection Mr. Fountain closed the evidentiary portion of the hearing.

Committee Discussion

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

It meets the guidelines. [Davis]

Crepe Myrtles are very healthy. I recommend the tree protection area around them be enlarged. [Thiem]

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

A. Constructing an addition; reconstructing a rear room; removing aluminum windows, and changing siding are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.6, 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 2.5.1, 2.6.1, 2.6.11, 2.7.7, 2.7.11, 2.7.13, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.4, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.7, 3.2.8, 3.2.9, 3.2.10, 3.2.11, 3.2.12, and the following suggested facts:

1* 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 describes the house as a Victorian gable-front-and-wing frame cottage, c.1887, with a rear ell that was possibly added by 1909, and a kitchen wing that was connected or

enclosed by 1914. Several additional alterations have occurred over time. In the 1960s, the house was “modernized:” sided in aluminum and the original windows were replaced by aluminum windows.

- 2* 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 reaffirms the information included in Matthew Brown’s inventory, and classifies the building as contributing.
- 3* The application states that no trees are proposed to be removed. A site plan was provided showing tree sizes, species and critical root zones. A tree protection plan was also provided.
- 4* The proposed addition is at the rear of the house.
- 5* The proposed addition is at the same level as the historic house. The addition is offset from the existing house by a three-sided deck that serves as a spacer that will preserve the gable end of the house. The addition will be attached to the previously enclosed kitchen wing and porches.
- 6* As shown in the side elevations, the roof ridge of the addition will be lower in height than the roof ridge height of the historic house. The elevations were not dimensioned.
- 7* The addition is proposed to be clad in wood siding to match the existing wood siding found underneath the aluminum siding – the application notes that this is guessed to be 4.5” reveal wood siding - while the roofing is to be architectural shingles that match the existing roof.
- 8* Paint is proposed to match the existing house.
- 9* The foundation of both the addition and the rebuilt kitchen wing and enclosed porches will be painted brick to match the existing.
- 10* Full lite French doors are proposed for the rear elevation and the proposed side deck. Specifications were provided.
- 11* Three styles of windows are proposed. Wood double-hung two-over-two windows of two different sizes are proposed to replace the current aluminum windows. The elevations show windows of a comparable size to the style of the house, but the application notes that the actual window size will be determined when the framing is uncovered during the project. The applicant intends to install windows that fit the original opening, if possible. The windows will be installed as either single or paired units. Two smaller wood casement windows are proposed on the north facade, appearing to be the same dimensions as the top portion of the double-hung windows. Specifications were provided.
- 12* **Built area to open space analysis:** According to the applicant, the lot is 8,639 SF. The footprint of the house is 3,297 SF. The proportion of built area to open space is currently 38%. The footprint of all the proposed built area is 3,700 SF. The proportion of built area to open space is proposed to be 43%.
- 13* The application includes analysis of the existing built area to open space ratios of properties in the immediate neighborhood showing a range of 25% to 62%
- 14* Exterior lighting was not shown on the drawings, nor were specifications provided.

15* Gutters and downspouts were not shown on the drawings, nor were specifications provided.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That should a contractor/craftsman with experience rehabilitating historic buildings provide evidence that more than 50% of the original wood siding is deteriorated beyond repair on any given side the entire side may be replaced provided that:
 - a. The condition assessment be provided to and approved by staff;
 - b. That the new siding match the original wood siding in design, dimension, detail, texture, pattern, color, and material;
 - c. That the new siding specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to removal of the existing wood siding.
2. That tree protection plans be implemented, remain in place for the duration of construction, and be revised to note that the concrete in the rear yard will be removed by hand, the critical root zone of the red maple be enlarged, and the critical root zone of the crepe myrtles be increased to 12' by 12' around each tree.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. Should the original window framing remain intact and alter the size or location of the specified windows in the application, provide new specifications to staff
 - b. Manufacturer's specifications for exterior lighting, and location on the building;
 - c. Specifications for the gutters and downspouts, and location on the building.

Ms. David agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 5/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 01/26/19.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

093-18-CA 404 OAKWOOD AVENUE
Applicant: IMOGEN HOYLE AND LLOYD MILLER
Received: 6/13/2018 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/11/2018 1) 7/26/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: GENERAL HOD

Nature of Project: Demolish accessory building; construct rear addition

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its June 4, 2018, meeting. Members in attendance were David Maurer and Mary Ruffin Hanbury; also present were Imogen Hoyle, applicant; Melissa Robb and Collette Kinane, staff.

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.**”
- COAs mentioned are available for review

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<i>Sections</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Description of Work</i>
1.3	Site Features and Plantings	Demolish accessory building; construct rear addition
3.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Construct rear addition
4.2	Demolition	Demolish accessory building

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report.

Support:

Ms. Imogen Hoyle, applicant, and Ms. Ashley Morris, architect, [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Hoyle explained the need for more space in their house since they now have a child. Mr. Fountain asked if she had any questions about the staff comments, and Ms. Hoyle responded no.

Opposition:

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

With no objection from the Committee, Mr. Fountain closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

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

The addition is problematic for me. Is it an accessory building attached to the house or an extension of the house with a garage? I'm seeing a garage in a house, but there is no precedence for that in Oakwood. I'm also having a hard time with the connection being above grade. I can't think of any others in the district. The southwest corner of the addition is close to two trees that require protection. In the past we have required the foundation to address the protection of nearby tree root systems. Is this a slab on grade? There is a lack of information about the heights, and it looks like there's no way to accommodate an adapted floor system. [Thiem]

It looks like there are four or five courses of brick. Can it be a slab on grade? [Fountain]

We should call the architect up to discuss. [Thiem]

There are examples of garages incorporated into the lower level of houses at 412 Oakwood Avenue and at 624 N East Street. This feels like a big addition. We've seen a number of historic garages being torn down to be replaced with larger garages. I'm concerned with the demolition and with the scale of the addition. It's not taller than the existing house, but it is a two-story addition to a one-story house. [David]

It's a non-contributing garage. As for the size, it's not overwhelming because it's lower than the existing house. [Davis]

The grade does conceal the height. [David]

The grade is favorable for this. [Fountain]

This has the massing of a two-car garage and is only a one-car garage because it has one door. Otherwise, it's the size of a two-car. [David]

Look at 630 N Blount St. I'm concerned with bringing suburbia to our historic districts. How big is too big? This pattern concerns me. [Thiem]

Is it about the lot coverage or the long building along Bloodworth? The lot coverage is on page 35 of the application. [Fountain]

Mr. Thiem made a motion to reopen the public hearing portion of the meeting; the motion was seconded by Mr. Davis; passed 5/0.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Mr. Fountain asked if the foundation was to be a slab on grade. Ms. Morris said the tree protection plan includes notes about using piers and a raised slab, and that is their plan. Mr. Thiem asked how the grade was verified. Ms. Morris described her process for obtaining the measurements on site. Mr. Thiem stated that he was concerned with what would happen during construction if the numbers were not accurate. Ms. Morris replied that she had built in some cushion to help account for any issues. Mr. Thiem asked staff what the process would be if there needed to be changes during construction. Ms. Tully responded that it could be handled as a minor work application.

Mr. Fountain said there was a 3'-8" difference in the roof ridge heights of the house and the addition. Mr. Thiem asked if the slab for the garage and the residence were the same elevation. Ms. Morris responded yes, but they could adjust with a raised slab if needed. Mr. Thiem asked if a step could be added. Ms. Morris confirmed that it could.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Mr. Davis moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the evidentiary hearing, the committee finds staff suggested findings A. (inclusive of facts 1-8) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-21) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Demolishing an accessory building is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.6, 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, and the following facts:
- 1* 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 describes the house as a Victorian gable-front-and-wing frame cottage, and places the construction of the garage c.1930. It has been altered over time to a shed with a carport and porch.
 - 2* 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 includes an estimated construction date of 1950, and classifies the building as noncontributing.

- a. The description of the building: "There is a garage near the southeast corner of the lot, facing North Bloodworth Street, built ca. 1930. It has been converted to a shed. A shed-roofed carport was added to its north side ca. 1955, and a shed-roofed lattice porch was added to its south side ca. 1955."
- 3* A Sanborn map was included in the application showing the house without any outbuildings. It is labeled 1904, but is in fact from 1914.
 - 4* The application states that no trees are proposed to be removed. A site plan was provided showing tree sizes, species and critical root zones. A tree protection plan was also provided.
 - 5* No change is proposed to the existing gravel driveway.
 - 6* Photographs of the property and its buildings were provided, including the west side of the accessory building. However, photographs of the south, east and north sides of the accessory building were not provided.
 - 7* Drawings of the property and its buildings were provided, including the west, east and south sides of the accessory building. However, a drawing of the north side of the accessory building was not provided.
 - 8* The application does not state whether any materials will be salvaged after demolition.
- B. Constructing a rear addition is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.6, 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.4, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.7, 3.2.8, 3.2.9, 3.2.10, 3.2.11, 3.2.12, and the following facts:
- 1* Over time, the house has had several additions to the rear of the structure which were added prior to designation of the historic district, all of which appear to be prior to district designation. In 2003 a COA (079-03-MW) was approved to alter the rear (southwest) porch.
 - 2* The application states that no trees are proposed to be removed. A site plan was provided showing tree sizes, species and critical root zones. A tree protection plan was also provided.
 - 3* The proposed addition is at the rear of the house, and will not be visible from the Oakwood Avenue elevation.
 - 4* As shown in the application, Bloodworth Street slopes significantly from Oakwood Avenue down to Lane Street.
 - 5* The majority of the proposed addition is at the same level as the historic house. Due to the 8'-3" grade change from the front of the house to the rear of the addition, the addition includes a lower level with a single-stall garage. The addition is offset from the existing house with a hyphen at the level of the historic house, and a covered walkway at the lower level.
 - 6* As shown in the Bloodworth Street side elevation, the historic house measures 18'-3" at the roof ridge from the front ground plane. The addition's rear roof ridge measures 21'-9" from the rear ground plane. Given the substantial grade change, the rear roof ridge is 3'-8" below the front roof ridge.
 - 7* The existing accessory building is located in the corner of the lot, very near both the south and east property lines (exact distances were not provided). The proposed addition lines up more directly behind the historic house, leaving approximately 15' between the addition

and the rear property line and approximately 12' between the addition and the east property line.

- 8* The application states "the new addition is a simplified version of the original building."
- 9* The addition is proposed to be clad in wood siding with a 4.5" reveal to match the existing house, while the roofing is to be architectural shingles that match the existing roof.
- 10* Paint is proposed to match the existing house.
- 11* Two French doors on the southwest porch are being replaced with Wood double-hung windows.
- 12* Two styles of windows are proposed. Wood double-hung four-over-four windows that are slightly shorter than those on the historic house will be installed as either single or paired units. Several smaller wood casement windows are proposed as well, appearing to be the same dimensions as the top portion of the double-hung windows. Specifications were provided.
- 13* Three new doors are proposed; one wood full-lite door leading to the porch on the east elevation, and two wood half-lite doors with three raised panels on the ground floor on the east and west sides. Specifications were provided.
- 14* The western elevation shows a garage vehicular door with four glass lites. Specifications for the door were not provided.
- 15* **Built area to open space analysis:** According to the applicant, the lot is 8,276 SF. The footprint of the house and shed total 2,217 SF. The proportion of built area to open space is currently 27%. The footprint of all the proposed built area, including the new garage is 2,598 SF. The proportion of built area to open space is proposed to be 31%.
- 16* The application includes analysis of the existing built area of properties in the immediate neighborhood showing a range of 22% to 59% (built area to open space).
- 17* The proposed addition includes a 258 SF porch on the east side on the second level, a portion of which is covered. The application shows a wide range of examples of side porches and decks in Oakwood.
- 18* The side porch is proposed to be constructed with either cypress, redwood, pressure-treated lumber or Trex decking.
- 19* According to the application, the porch railings "that reflect the materials and the proportions of the building and the district will be used." Detailed drawings of the porch railings were not provided.
- 20* Exterior lighting was not shown on the drawings, nor were specifications provided.
- 21* Gutters and downspouts were not shown on the drawings, nor were specifications provided.

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

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, with the following conditions:

1. That there be no demolition delay for the removal of the accessory building.
2. That tree protection plans be implemented and remain in place for the duration of construction.
3. That at the southwest corner of the addition within the critical root zones of two trees, the foundation be constructed with piers and/or a raised slab.
4. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard:
 - a. full documentation of the accessory building with photographs of the south, east and north sides, and a measured, scaled drawing of the north side;
5. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. manufacturer's specifications for garage vehicular door, showing both section and elevation views, and material descriptions;
 - b. elevation and section drawings of the porch railings;
 - c. manufacturer's specifications for exterior lighting, and location on the building;
 - d. specifications for the gutters and downspouts, and location on the building.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 1/26/19.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Committee Discussion
 - a. Meeting Post-Mortem

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. David moved that the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Davis seconded the motion; passed 5/0.
The meeting was adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

Nick Fountain, Chair
Certificate of Appropriateness Committee
Raleigh Historic Development Commission

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