

RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
 Minutes of the Meeting
 August 23, 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: Don Davis, Ian Dunn, Nick Fountain, Jeannine McAuliffe, Jimmy Thiem

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

Approval of the July 26, 2018 Minutes

Mr. Davis moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing and to adopt said minutes as submitted. Mr. Thiem 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. Fountain administered the affirmation.

Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address	Affirmed
Justin Boner, 504 E Jones St	yes
Michael Stuart, 501 Oakwood Ave	yes
David Cole, 1330 Mordecai Dr	yes
Corey and Stephanie Bates, 1304 Hillsborough St	
Al Smith, 125 Creekbrook Ct	
Troy Shaw, 1353 Rio Valley Dr	
Linda Ross, 414 E Pilot, #A3	
Tom Mukoyama, 211 S Wilmington St	yes
Mike Poupard, 501 E Lane St	yes
Sarah David, 500 Polk St	yes
Chris Crew, 306 Elm St	yes
Pamela Herndon, 3900 Barwell St	yes
Tonya Debnam, 3011 Debnam Farm	
Matthew Brown, 601 E Lane St	yes
Nathan Singerman, 912 Williamson Dr	yes
Amy Billings, City of Raleigh	yes
Eric Lamb, City of Raleigh	yes

Sylvester Percival, City of Raleigh	
Brian Dehler, HW Lochner	

REVIEW OF SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

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: 079-18-CA, 105-18-CA, 106-18-CA, 107-18-CA, 108-18-CA and 109-18-CA. Prior to case 109-18-CA Mr. Thiem was recused from the hearing; Mr. Davis made the motion to recuse Mr. Thiem, Mr. Fountain seconded the motion; motion passed 4/0. After hearing case 109-18-CA, Mr. Thiem was recalled to the meeting upon a motion from Mr. Davis which was seconded by Ms. McCauliffe; motion passed 4/0.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

079-18-CA 613 WILLS FOREST STREET
Applicant: DAVID COLE FOR INCLUSION STUDIO PLLC
Received: 6/122018 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/10/2018 1) 6/28/2018 2) 8/23/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: GLENWOOD-BROOKLYN HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: STREETSIDE HISTORIC OVERLAY DISTRICT (HOD-S)

Nature of Project: Addition of full 2nd story to existing 1 ½-story rear addition; roof alteration to rear of historic pyramidal roof

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at both its May 2 and June 4, 2018, meetings. Members in attendance were Mary Ruffin Hanbury, Curtis Kasefang, and David Maurer; also present were staff members Melissa Robb and Collette Kinane, and applicants David Cole, Eric Mitchell, and Madeleine McKenzie.

Staff Notes:

- 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. Any addition to a building or structure that projects beyond an existing building’s maximum front and side wall and roof plane envelope regardless of distance from the public right-of-way requires a COA. For the site, only the lot area between the public rights-of-way and the façade of the house are regulated. For the purpose of Streetside HODs, alleys are not public rights-of-way.

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	Addition of full 2 nd story to existing 1 ½-story rear addition
3.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Addition of full 2 nd story to existing 1 ½-story rear addition; roof alteration to rear of historic pyramidal roof

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:

Mr. David Cole, applicant, [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Cole provided a two-page handout of additional evidence including a 3D rendering of the view of the house from across the alley and photos of 1100 W Cabarrus St.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Ms. McAuliffe asked if the addition would be using the existing foundation. Mr. Cole answered in the affirmative. Ms. McAuliffe asked where the 50% review line for the house was. Mr. Cole pointed it out on the drawings.

Mr. Davis asked for clarification about the portion of the roof connecting the historic roof to the new addition and whether it was lower than the roof of the addition. Mr. Cole answered that the peak aligns behind the existing chimney and is to be 2' lower than the addition.

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]:

For the new members, this was deferred from June and has been to DRAC. [Fountain]
This new view on the alley side shows it is stepped back which helps with the appearance of the massing. There was no setback on the other side where it's still massive. [Davis]
The alley side is what is mostly seen. The new simulation shows that instead of seeing the side of the dormer you will see a sizeable triangle of siding. It's important with the scale and massing. [Fountain]

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Mr. Davis 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 1-14) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. An addition of a full 2nd story to an existing 1 ½-story rear addition, and a roof alteration to the rear of historic pyramidal roof are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines*

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* From the Historic Research Report for the Designation of the Glenwood-Brooklyn District as a Historic Overlay District: "C. 613 Wills Forest Street. S. Johnson Ferguson House. ca. 1911. One-story frame Queen Anne house with weatherboard siding and a slate-shingled hipped roof with a front cross gable with a lunette window. The porch has modern classical wood columns. Other exterior features include a foundation of brick piers with cinder block infill, an interior brick chimney, a decorative front window, and 2/2 windows. There appears to be a two-story camelback addition constructed since 2001."
- 2* The Sanborn Fire Insurance Map from 1914 shows what appears to be a one-story addition on the rear of the house. The map is included as staff evidence.
- 3* Over time, the house has had several additions to the rear of the structure which were added prior to designation of the historic district.
- 4* The proposed addition is at the rear of the house, and changes the existing 1 ½-story addition into a 2-story addition by raising and changing the roof form and by extending the walls to full height. The existing addition measures 22' at the roof ridge. The proposed addition has a roof ridge height of approximately 23'.
- 5* An example was provided at the hearing regarding the appropriateness of the proposed configuration of the house (a one-story historic house with a two-story rear addition) at 1100 W Cabarrus St in the Boylan Heights Historic District.
- 6* The size and scale of the proposed addition may be incongruous with Guideline 3.2.7: "Limit the size and scale of an addition in relationship to the historic building so that it does not diminish or visually overpower the building."
- 7* The massing and relationship of solids to voids of the proposed addition, especially on the west elevation, may be incongruous with Guideline 3.2.8: "Design an addition to be compatible with the historic building in mass, architectural style, materials, color, and relationship of solids to voids in the exterior walls, yet make the addition discernible from the original."
- 8* The size and scale of the proposed addition may be incongruous with Guideline 3.2.10: "It is not appropriate to construct an addition if it will detract from the overall historic character of the principal building and the site, or if it will require the removal of a significant building element or site feature."
- 9* The proposed addition extends the 2nd-story over the existing patio at the rear.
- 10* The windows in the new addition are 1/1 of the same or similar proportion to the windows in the historic house. A few existing windows beyond the front 50% of the house are proposed for removal as part of the proposed addition.
- 11* The addition is proposed to be smooth-faced fiber cement siding and wood windows, which are the same materials that are on the existing addition. Specifications were provided.
- 12* One existing door will be relocated on the south elevation.
- 13* The application states that a tree protection plan is not required as no trees meeting the threshold for protection are on the property. There are two large trees in the right-of-way in front of the house. A tree protection plan was not provided.
- 14* No landscape changes are proposed.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

1. That a tree protection plan for the trees in the right-of-way 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 COA blue placard:
 - a. A tree protection plan for the trees in the right-of-way prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture or by a North Carolina licensed landscape architect that addresses the critical root zones and provides staging areas for construction activity and material storage.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. Manufacturer's specifications for doors, showing both section and elevation views, and material descriptions;
 - b. Manufacturer's specifications for exterior lighting, and locations on building;
 - c. HVAC location and screening;
 - d. Gutters and downspouts, and locations on building.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 2/23/19.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

105-18-CA 536 E JONES STREET
Applicant: DAVID BRYANT
Received: 7/03/2018 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 10/01/2018 1) 8/23/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: GENERAL HOD

Nature of Project: Replace two front doors, one second floor balcony door, one rear door (all after-the-fact); alter second floor balcony railing

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- After-the-fact applications are reviewed as though the work has not been completed. As such, the doors already removed are referred to as being proposed for removal.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<i>Sections</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Description of Work</i>
2.7	Windows and Doors	Replace two front doors, one second floor balcony door, one rear door
2.8	Entrances, Porches, & Balconies	Alter second floor balcony railing

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Support:

David Bryant [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Bryant stated that, in regard to staff comment number 6, he found an invoice from when doors originally assessed and the repair/replacement was quoted at \$8,156. The company wouldn't quote a repair.

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Fountain explain that in after the fact applications the cost cannot be accepted as evidence, the *Guidelines* are an important feature, but he hears that Mr. Bryant couldn't get a quote on repair, that the doors were too far gone. Take us through the doors that were replaced.

Mr. Bryant explains door at alcove (on the right side of the house as viewed from the street) as being the most damaged, cracked the entire way vertically. There were five holes in the door from several door knobs and locks that were drilled and replaced over times. Patches would be required to replace large sections of the door. Near the hinges there were pieces missing, not possible to replace and retain integrity.

Mr. Fountain asked about the glass.

Mr. Bryant stated that no glass panes were left (of the original three). They had been replaced with plexiglass, chicken wire, and plywood.

Mr. Fountain asked about the door on the left side of the house (under the balcony).

Mr. Bryant stated that this door had less rot than the others, but had several metal bracings because the frame was broken and covered on interior. It had been kicked in at some point and parts had to be replaced.

Mr. Bryant continued with describing the state of the balcony door. The bottom of the door frame was rotted and soft to the touch.

Mr. Bryant stated that he looked for identical doors to replace them, but couldn't find any that were three panes of three panels. They would have had to have been custom doors. There was no way to replace them commercially.

Mr. Fountain asked why are we here after the fact?

Mr. Bryant responded that he did not think anyone would complain or care.

Mr. Davis asked about the comparable doors submitted by the applicant. Where are they from?

Mr. Bryant responded that examples are from throughout Oakwood.

Mr. Fountain stated that the Committee likes to have addresses to be able to double-check on whether they had COAs.

Mr. Thiem asked if the alcove addition is original to house.

Ms. Kinane responded that based on nominations, the alcove maybe added in 1930s but not original.

Mr. Fountain added that the addition would have occurred within the period of significance.

Mr. Davis asked if the spacing on the railing of the upper balcony was typical of the district.

Ms. Kinane stated that staff could not find any other examples similar.

Ms. Tully noted that there's a typo in B.2 of the staff report, it should read "atypical."

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

Committee Discussion

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

Doors with nine panes and two panels don't fit the character of house. They don't match the configuration of original doors. [DD]

I'm troubled that we don't have the locations of the other doors to compare with. [NF]

I have a question to staff – all original doors removed were not identical? [JT]

The three on the front were identical, I don't think the rear was. Based on the national register nomination, seemed that house had gone through significant renovation in the 1930s, so it's possible that all the doors were replaced at that time. [CK]

So, there's no evidence that these were original doors. [JT]

Note that the pane configuration of windows is 3 over 1, these doors matched. [DD]

I'd like to ask the applicant for addresses of precedent doors. [DD]

If we deny this, the applicant can't reapply for a year and will have to consider having custom doors built; however, if we defer, the applicant will get an opportunity to provide additional information. Do you understand that [to applicant]? [NF]

Understood. [DB]

I'm inclined to give the applicant an opportunity to provide additional information. I'd like to offer the deferment. [NF]

Another question for staff – is the replacement of the door normally minor work? [JT]

Yes. [CK]

How do you determine if it's an acceptable replacement? [JT]

We look at panel and pane configuration, style...[CK]

In short, staff would not be able to approve this as a minor work and it would be referred to you. [TT]

The argument that might be made is that this falls back to original design for house. [JT]

Mr. David made a motion to defer the application to allow the applicant to supply information of similar doors in Oakwood. Mr. Thiem seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

106-18-CA 601 ELM STREET
Applicant: MICHAEL STUART
Received: 7/06/2018 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 10/04/2018 1) 8/23/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: GENERAL HOD

Nature of Project: Demolish shed; construct garage; construct driveway; remove tree

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

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>
4.2	Demolition	Demolish shed
1.3	Site Features & Plantings	Remove tree; install driveway
1.5	Walkways, Driveways, & Off-street Parking	Install driveway
1.6	Garages & Accessory Structures	Construct garage

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Collette Kinane [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and presented views of the garage from Euclid and Elm Street.

Support:

Michael Stuart [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Stuart shared a presentation of his application and provided a handout of the presentation to each Committee member.

Mr. Stuart stated that he intends to replace the existing garage structure. The garage is in disrepair. The garage has been affected by erosion, water damage, rot, and termite damage. It’s

leaning to the right and has a tree growing into it. It's competing with the Ailanthus. Portions have rotted off and the metal is coming away from the structure. The proposed replacement garage is a 4-door 2-bay design, with a similar size, scale, and footprint of the existing. The proposed garage observes setback requirements. Mr. Stuart explained that he intends to put in grass driveway as well. He would like to source old double-hung windows to use in the structure and will rebuild the sash if necessary. He provided two examples of structures in Oakwood that have a similar shape and aesthetic at 210 Elm Street and 520 Polk Street. He also showed photographs of a bike storage shed at 213 N Bloodworth. He also discussed a true grid product for the driveway. It's made of cells that grass can be planted in. The cells are designed to protect the grass roots from driveway traffic – it should reduce compaction.

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Davis asked if there were good examples of the driveway material that they could look at? He expressed concern about grass viability.

Mr. Stuart responded that his driveway will not be a high traffic area and he doesn't know of any other examples.

Mr. Davis said that it might look like bottom picture, not top.

Mr. Thiem asked why there is a photo of two track driveway in the application?

Mr. Stuart stated that the included design was his original idea, but has since found the grid product.

Mr. Davis asked for staff's opinion on the metal walls. Is it original?

Ms. Kinane stated that in both Matt Brown's Oakwood Inventory and the draft nomination update, the garage is explained as having metal, with potential build date in 1920s.

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

Committee Discussion

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

True Grid is effective a minimalizing impaction. However, is the form of driveways in a traditional material and the fact that you can see them an important or historic feature? Is trying to disguise something that is part of fabric in accordance with Guidelines. We should be acknowledging the driveway exists. [JT]

I suppose dirt driveway exist, too. This material will be very different from concrete block pavers. If we wind up with grass but strips where driving in and out, you will see grid laid across grass. [NF]

I have a hard time approving the product without a sample. I think the solution is what we approve most of the time: concrete strips and grass in center. [DD]

Are there other examples of porous paver systems previously approved? [JT]

None. [TT]

What about a combination of concrete strips and this material under the adjacent grass? [JT]

I'm disinclined to go halfway. If the material used alone not appropriate, but allowed in combination? I don't think we can have both. [NF]

The new garage meets guidelines and is like the examples of other ones. What about tearing down original design? [DD]

I peeked around on my site visit and based on the evidence presented – if the building were preserved it would be a complete restoration. It would have to be recreated It doesn't justify a demolition delay. [JT]

If that's truly the case, there's no point of the 365-day delay. [DD]

With the recent experience we've had, we can tell the condition of this one is deteriorated. [NF]

Question of staff- has True Grid ever been approved as a minor work for grass areas? [JT]

No. [TT]

This is a situation is where you could see or not see the rings. Could it be implemented without a COA if it's not visible? [JT]

In theory, yes. If there was grass before and then there's grass after, then there's no change. However, if at some point you can see the plastic then you have a violation and it would be after-the-fact. [TT]

Can we reopen the hearing to hear from the applicant? [DD]

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

With no objection, Mr. Fountain reopened the public testimony.

Mr. Stuart said that if the driveway portion of the application is separated from the garage and the Committee wants to see a sample, he can put some in as a test to see how it wears. That part can be reviewed later.

Mr. Fountain stated that he has seen it on golf courses. The product does wear and doesn't look good when it does.

Mr. Stuart said that he's willing to do whatever is best.

Mr. Thiem added that part of this is about being true and honest about materials and reflecting the patterns that the neighborhood shows: in both form and materials. This product seeks to be something other than what you see. Are strips willing to be considered?

Mr. Stuart responded that there's no driveway currently, so this product would continue that look. But he is ok with strips if that is the preference of group. He would either use the product for all or not at all.

Ms. Tully added that the Committee could give him the option of future minor work for driveway, with options for materials.

Mr. Thiem stated that this is essentially a new driveway, no evidence of old driveway. The site currently reads as an accessory building with a lawn, not a garage and driveway.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Mr. Thiem moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the evidentiary hearing, the committee finds staff suggested finding A. (inclusive of facts 1-5), B. (inclusive of facts 1-10), and C. (inclusive of facts 1-6) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Demolition of an accessory building and removing a tree is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.5, 1.6.5, 4.2.3, and paragraph one on page 82, and the following facts:
 - 1* The subject property is within the original boundaries of Oakwood Historic District listed in the National Register in 1974. That nomination form does not contain an inventory list nor a clearly defined period of significance. 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 1910, and classifies the building as contributing. The structure is described as a "one-story garage with a hipped roof. It is clad in standing-seam metal and has two pairs of hinged garage doors."
 - 2* In Matthew Brown's Inventory of Structures in the Oakwood National Register Historic District, the garage is listed as contributing with a year built of ca. 1925. It is described as a "hipped-roofed two-car frame garage...It has a 5-V metal roof and is clad in 5-V metal."
 - 3* The applicant proposes demolishing the garage and provided several photographs that show the current condition of the structure. An assessment of the structural integrity of the structure by a preservation professional was not provided. Detailed drawings of the existing structure were not provided.
 - 4* The application includes an email from the applicant that states that one tree is proposed to be removed due to its proximity to the garage. A site plan was provided that shows the tree to be removed, but does not identify any other potential trees on the property that could be impacted by the project. An assessment of the health of the tree by an International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) certified arborist was not provided. A tree protection plan was not provided.
 - 5* Per applicant's presentation, detailed evidence was shown that the structure is deteriorated beyond repair.

- B. The construction of a garage is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section 2.8.1, 2.8.5, 2.8.6, and the following facts:
- 1* The proposed garage is sited in a similar location to the existing garage. The proposed location is sited traditionally near the rear lot line.
 - 2* The property is located on a corner lot. The garage doors will face Euclid Street. This is a common orientation for corner properties.
 - 3* The proposed garage is 20' x 20', 2' wider than the existing garage (18' x 20').
 - 4* The proposed garage is a one-story frame contemporary structure with wood lap siding. The garage is deferential in scale to the historic house.
 - 5* The form of the garage is a steep shed roof with clerestory windows on the rear of the structure (facing the north property line).
 - 6* Although not as common, shed roofed garages are seen in Oakwood. A historic example exists, though oriented differently, at 410 N Elm. The applicant did not provide any examples of garages with similar forms.
 - 7* The height of the proposed garage is 15' 8 ¾" to the top of the wall at the south elevation and 10' ½" to the top of the wall at the north elevation. The height dimension does not take into consideration the thickness of the roof.
 - 8* The applicant did not provide a built area to open space analysis or a built mass to open space analysis. However, based on the new footprint increase, the garage will add 40 SF of built mass – not a significant increase.
 - 9* No specifications for windows or doors were provided.
 - 10* No information was provided regarding exterior lighting, if any.
- C. Constructing a driveway is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.5, 1.3.6, 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 1.5.1, 1.5.2, 1.5.3, 1.5.5, 1.5.6, 1.5.9, and the following facts:
- 1* Constructing driveways is typically approvable by staff as a minor work but was included in this application for administrative efficiency.
 - 2* The applicant indicated that a driveway will be constructed. No site plan or dimensions were provided.
 - 3* From photographs of the property and an aerial, a non-historic double wide curb cut currently exists, but no existing driveway or parking area is evident.
 - 4* The example driveway provided in the application is not located in Oakwood.
 - 5* A driveway similar to the example provided that separates from one driveway into two-wheel strip parking areas was approved for 608 Oakwood Avenue through COA 125-13-CA. The installed driveway has brick wheel strips and concrete fill.
 - 6* From an aerial provided by the applicant, it appears there is one mature tree located in proximity to the proposed driveway that could be impacted by the installation.

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

Decision on the Application

Mr. Thiem made a motion that the application be approved, with the following conditions:

3. That a 365-day demolition delay be waived for the removal of the garage and the tree.
4. That a tree protection plan be implemented and remain in place for the duration of construction.
5. 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 measured, scaled drawings;
 - b. driveway plan and materials;
 - c. a tree protection plan
 - d. a replacement shade tree of 3" caliper minimum be planted, location to be arranged with staff.
6. 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. Manufacturer's specifications for the clerestory windows;
 - c. Manufacturer's specifications for exterior lighting, and location on building.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 02/23/19.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

107-18-CA 504 E JONES STREET
Applicant: JUSTIN BONER AND KIERNAN MCGORTY
Received: 7/09/2018 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 10/07/2018 1) 8/23/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Raleigh Historic Landmark: CAMERON-MAYNARD-GATLING HOUSE
Zoning: GENERAL HOD
Nature of Project: Demolish garage
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
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

<i>Sections</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Description of Work</i>
1.3	Site Features & Plantings	Demolish garage
1.6	Garages & Accessory Structures	Demolish garage
4.2	Demolition	Demolish garage

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Collette Kinane [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and photographs of the structure.

Support:

Justin Boner [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Boner stated that he didn't have too many comments. The Staff Report was straightforward. To provide a little history, several years ago we robbed siding form the garage to use on the primary structure. When we further investigated replacing the siding, it was not structurally sound. It has rot and termite issues. The foundation is insufficient and it needs a new roof. The garage is within three feet of a mature Japanese Maple.

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

Responses and Questions:

There were no questions for the applicant. Without objection Mr. Fountain closed the evidentiary portion of the hearing.

Committee Discussion

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

This garage is not in nearly as bad shape as others we've seen. I think the 365-day delay should be maintained. [DD]

The doors don't look original. The siding has been removed. [NF]

The shingles are a replacement issue. The siding should have been replaced. The building deserves an opportunity to be moved. [JT]

We neglected to add condition that a volunteer on commission should actively work with owner during delay period. [TT]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Ms. McAuliffe moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the evidentiary hearing, the committee finds staff suggested finding A. (inclusive of facts 1-9) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

D. Demolition of an accessory building is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.6.5, 4.2.3; however, demolition of an accessory building that contributes to the overall historic character is incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.3, 1.6.1, 1.6.2, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, and paragraph one on page 82, and the following facts:

- 1* The subject property is within the original boundaries of Oakwood Historic District listed in the National Register in 1974 and was designated as a Raleigh Historic Landmark in 2011. The designation ordinance states "In 1920 a west-facing wood-frame one-car garage was built at the east property line."
- 2* The garage is located in the rear yard along the east property line directly to the southeast of the house.
- 3* The application included historic photographs that show the garage on site in 1920.
- 4* The application includes Sanborn documentation that shows the garage in its current location in the 1914-1950 map. The Sanborn maps also indicate that the property has an extended history of outbuildings in the rear yard.
- 5* The applicant provided several photographs that show the current condition of the garage. The application describes foundation and rot issues and presents one photograph showing a

deteriorated sill plate. A professional assessment of the structural integrity of the garage was not provided. Detailed drawings of the existing garage were not provided.

- 6* The weatherboard on the north and south faces of the garage was removed during a previous project to repair deteriorated siding on the house. No COA was acquired for this alteration.
- 7* Photographs included in the application show that a mature Japanese Cedar tree is located in proximity to the garage. A tree protection plan was provided. The plan notes that all proposed work will be completed by hand to protect the cedar tree.
- 8* The application states that the applicants intend to salvage all reusable materials from the garage for use in future projects on the property.
- 9* A post-demolition site plan was not provided.

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

Decision on the Application

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

- 7. That a 365-day demolition delay be imposed.
- 8. That tree protection plans be implemented and remain in place for the duration of construction.
- 9. 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 measured, scaled drawings;
 - b. a post-demolition site plan.
- 10. That an RHDC appointed volunteer serve as a liaison to the property owner to assist the owner in reviewing all alternatives to demolition during the 365-day delay.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 02/23/19.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

108-18-CA 314 E CABARRUS STREET
Applicant: ZACH HOFFMAN / INSITU STUDIO
Received: 7/12/2018 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 10/10/2018 1) 8/23/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: PRINCE HALL HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: GENERAL HOD

Nature of Project: Construct wall; construct pergola and water feature; construct driveway;
install landscaping

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<i>Sections</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Description of Work</i>
1.3	Site Features & Plantings	Construct wall; construct pergola and water feature; construct driveway
1.4	Fences & Walls	Construct wall
1.5	Walkways, Driveways, & Off-street Parking	Construct driveway and walkway
1.6	Garages & Accessory Structures	Construct pergola

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Collette Kinane [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map, an aerial photo of the property, and noted highlights from the staff report. Staff recommendation was deferral to allow for more information from the applicant. She noted that eight envelopes from the adjacent property owners were returned for insufficient address.

Support:

Vasana Nolintha [affirmed] and Zach Hoffman [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Nolintha stated that they have worked to restore the house over two years and moved in about a year ago. They are thankful for the previous input of the committee.

Mr. Hoffman prepared a presentation to address staff’s comments. He stated that the presentation would review each of the main items in the application. Mr. Hoffman presented:
- an 8’ wide concrete driveway where a 5’ sidewalk currently exists with a 12’ curb cut. The driveway would be 24’ long and Mr. Hoffman noted seven other examples identified in area and stated that 312 Cabarrus, the property next door, was the best example.

- install front landscaping. This includes planting a street tree that was originally included in the initial project and was never planted. A Saucer Magnolia had been approved at that time. There are no trees currently in the front yard so a tree protection plan is not necessary. The tree would not be planted until after the driveway is complete.
- In the rear yard, this project seeks to define edges and provide a usable yard, privacy, and a small retaining wall. The right side of the house has a 4' drop in grade; while the rear drops approximately 5' to the daycare.
- The rear yard will include a wood framed shingle roof pergola next to a water feature.
- a 6' tall fence around 3 edges to provide privacy and a flat site for planting. The staff comments state that there are no 6' CMU walls, but there are 6' privacy fences. Mr. Hoffman noted 509 S Person Street, 312 Cabarrus Street, 420 S Bloodworth Street. Additionally, 6' tall CMU walls exist at 415 and 417 S Person Street. The proposed wall will only be visible from the backyard of the adjacent abandoned house.

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Fountain asked a question for staff regarding Guest House CMU wall and if there were topographical issues.

Ms. Tully responded that there are CMU walls on south side that are 42" tall and that are retaining in nature. Additionally, the fence going around daycare to the south is vinyl and was put in prior to designation as district.

Mr. Davis stated that concrete walls like that do not meet the *Design Guidelines*. The Guidelines are asking for traditional materials.

Mr. Hoffman responded that by their reading of the *Design Guidelines* parged walls could be allowable, just maybe not at that height. He stated that the client is open to a different material and different type of fence.

Mr. Fountain stated that staff had concerns about lack of detail, can you provide evidence of additional details?

Mr. Thiem asked if that included the pergola?

Ms. Tully responded that staff did not believe that there was enough information to make a recommendation.

Mr. Thiem asked about the concrete pad. It appears to be located at the rear of the site where it drops off or will it be built into the slope?

Mr. Hoffman stated that they set the fence back from the property line due to the grade change and to preserve existing trees. The concrete pad is to hold circulating pump for the water feature.

Mr. Thiem stated that the details as to how concrete pad handled will be necessary because it's a very steep slope. Is there information about the plant species for the native vegetation and will the pump and mechanicals be screened from view?

Mr. Hoffman responded that the native vegetation is already existing.

Mr. Davis asked about the metal gate, is it 6' tall? That is somewhat a traditional material?

Mr. Hoffman stated that at 520 N Bloodworth a 5' tall metal gate was recently approved. Without objection Mr. Fountain closed the evidentiary portion of the hearing.

Committee Discussion

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

Based on *Guidelines*, the height of the wall at rear seems appropriate, but concrete material does not. Because the pergola has a roof, it's a gazebo – we need additional details. I also want to see details on the concrete pad and mechanical equipment screening. [JT]

Mr. Thiem made a motion to defer the application to the next meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dunn; passed 5/0.

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

109-18-CA 211 S WILMINGTON STREET
Applicant: WILMINGTON STREET PARTNERS
Received: 7/12/2018 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 10/10/2018 1) 8/23/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: GENERAL HOD

Nature of Project: Install decorative wrought iron door handles on two front doors (after-the-fact)

Staff Notes:

- COAs mentioned are available for review
- After-the-fact applications are reviewed as though the work has not been completed.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<i>Sections</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Description of Work</i>
2.7	Windows and Doors	Install decorative wrought iron door handles on two front doors (after-the-fact)
2.9	Storefronts	Install decorative wrought iron door handles on two front doors (after-the-fact)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] provided a summary of the project. Staff offered no suggested decision on the application.

Support:

Mr. Corey Bates and Mr. Tom Mukoyama [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Bates provided a digital presentation to the Committee in which he stated the significance of the dragonfly design is that “Tonbo” is the Japanese word for dragonfly. He asserted that the area has had a tradition of installing attention grabbing elements such as murals, art glass, signage and three-dimensional pieces. Mr. Mukoyama stated that they wanted something unique and they have received positive feedback from their customers about the dragonflies.

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]:

They showed the spoon from Gravy and other items. Is it any different because it's a door handle? [Fountain]

I see it as a sculptural element, especially since Tonbo is dragonfly. There's nothing in the design guidelines that says something that's utilitarian can't be sculptural. [Davis]

I think a sculpture can be utilitarian as well. [Dunn]

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Mr. Davis 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 1-6), to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- B. The installation of door handles on front doors is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.7.7, 2.9.6, 2.9.8, and the following facts:
- 1* The entire storefront was replaced recently (COA 128-17-CA). As new construction, the design of the storefront is more contemporary than any other building on the block.
 - 2* Two new wood-framed full-lite doors were installed as part of the new storefront project.
 - 3* Two 4'-0" x 3'-0" custom door handles in the shape of dragonflies with what appears to be a darkened bronze finish are proposed. Metal is a traditional hardware material; however, door hardware of this scale and design is atypical of the Moore Square Historic District.
 - 4* The applicant provided photographs of other signage and sculptural pieces in the historic district. The most relevant examples to this case are:
 - a. 135 S Wilmington St (Gravy) features a large wood spoon mounted on a red panel adjacent to the front door (COA 134-10-MW);
 - b. 225 S Wilmington St (former Busy Bee Café) featured a large lighted sign mounted above the storefront which has since been removed (COA 012-11-MW);
 - c. 201 E Hargett St (Marbles Kids Museum) includes a sculptural assemblage of circles on the upper floor window near the front entry on Hargett St (COA 193-13-CA);
 - d. 225 S Wilmington St (former Busy Bee Café) features a honeycomb-inspired bike rack mounted on the sidewalk in front of the store (COA 033-14-MW);
 - e. 237 S Wilmington St (Beasley's Chicken + Honey) features barnyard animal shaped bike racks along Martin St (COA 072-12-MW);

- f. 201 E Davie St (Artspace) includes two wall murals on the west wall of the neighboring building at 220 Wolfe St, neither of which received a COA;
 - g. 224 S Blount St (The Pour House) has a mural sign painted above the door which did not received a COA.
- 5* Other photographs were provided;
- a. 310 S Blount St (entrance canopy for SkyHouse, 308 S Blount St) includes a sculptural metal grill over the parking entry. (It should be noted that this is not in a historic district, so no COA was required.);
 - b. 327 S Wilmington St (Cooper's Barbecue) has a pig sculpture outside their door on the sidewalk. (It should be noted that this is not in a historic district, so no COA was required.);
 - c. 201 S Wilmington St (Tattoo Supreme);
 - d. 207/209 S Wilmington St (Taz's);
 - e. 137 E Hargett St (The Remedy Diner);
 - f. 119 E Hargett St (Eye Care Center).
- 6* The photographs were labeled with addresses and labels below, but no other text to explain why these examples were chosen or how they relate to this application.
- 7* The word Tonbo means dragonfly in Japanese.
- 8* A sculptural object can serve a practical purpose.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Davis made a motion that the application be approved. The motion was seconded by Ms. McAuliffe; passed 4/0.

Committee members voting: Davis, Dunn, Fountain, McAuliffe.

Certificate expiration date: 2/23/19.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Administrative Review of Conditions
 - a. 131-16-CA, 912 Williamson Drive, Philip Rothstein House, Raleigh Historic Landmark: Mr. Nathan Singerman, 912 Williamson Dr, was present to speak regarding the conditions. During discussion about the removal of the stone retaining wall that had fallen, Committee members expressed concern about the applicant's request to remove it entirely. There was also discussion about the lack of adherence to the tree protection plan and the removal of five oak trees in the rear yard and four other trees in the front yard, none of which were approved through the COA process for removal. Mr. Davis moved that the case be deferred. Mr. Thiem seconded the motion; passed 5/0.
 - b. 041-18-CA, 501 E Lane St, Oakwood Historic Overlay District: Mr. Mike Poupard, 501 E Lane St, was present to speak regarding the conditions. Ms. Sarah David spoke as the RHDC member who acted as liaison to the applicant, discussing the efforts to finding alternatives to demolition that the applicant had taken over the months since the demolition delay was imposed. Others who spoke about the application were Chris Crew, Pamela Herndon and Matthew Brown. Mr. Thiem moved that the demolition delay be removed. Mr. Davis seconded the motion; passed 5/0.
 - c. 193-07-CA, 1526 Tryon Rd, Carolina Pines Hotel, Raleigh Historic Landmark: Mr. Eric Lamb, City of Raleigh Transportation Department, was present to speak regarding the conditions. After discussion, Mr. Thiem moved that condition 9 be changed to read "That the reconstructed stone wall is placed behind the utility easement (within 5'), consistent with the applicant's exhibit", and to change conditions 1 and 2 to be that the required replacement trees be planted in the permanent slope easement areas on City property and that a site plan be submitted to staff for review and approval that shows both tree removal locations and replacement locations and species. Mr. Davis seconded the motion; passed 5/0.
2. Committee Discussion
 - a. Meeting Post-Mortem

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:18 p.m.

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

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