

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

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Nick Fountain called the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Committee meeting to order at 4:06 p.m.

ROLL CALL

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

Present: Don Davis, Ian Dunn, Nick Fountain, Jimmy Thiem

Excused Absence: Jeannine McAuliffe

Staff Present: Tania Tully; Melissa Robb; Collette Kinane; Chenetha Eason; Allison Evans; Francis P. Rasberry, Jr., RHDC Attorney

Approval of the October 25, 2018 Minutes

Mr. Davis moved to adopt said minutes as amended. Mr. Dunn seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

Minor Works

There were no questions regarding the Minor Work report.

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

<u>Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address</u>	<u>Affirmed</u>
Melissa Mason & Anthony Casaletto, 120 N Bloodworth St	yes
Charlie Queen & Allison Hutchins, 914 Dorothea Dr	yes
Sara Queen, 914 Dorothea Dr	yes
James Bailey, 405 E Franklin St	yes
Nick Hammer, 405 E Franklin St	yes
Ryan Armstrong, 516 N East St	yes
Jason Hancock, 516 N East St	yes
Ross Rosar, 411 N Person St	yes
Stephanie Schuller, 510 S Person St	yes
Cleve Pate, 510 S Person St	yes

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Thiem moved to approve the agenda as printed. Mr. Davis seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS

Chair Fountain introduced the public hearing portion of the meeting. The committee heard the following administrative review cases in the following order for which the Certified Records are made part of these minutes: 147-18-CA.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OF CONDITIONS – CERTIFIED RECORD

147-18-CA 914 DOROTHEA DRIVE
Applicant: CHARLES QUEEN AND ALLISON HUTCHINS
Meeting Date(s): 11/26/18

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: Construct rear addition with screened porch; construct retaining wall; remove rear deck and steps; remove tree.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes: This COA was approved 10/25/2018. Condition 6 stated that “a grading plan with provisions for the Tree Protection Plan be brought back to the Committee for review and approval.” These minutes reflect discussion about the materials submitted to meet that condition.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Support:

Sara Queen [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. She provided a new grading plan, tree protection plan, site plan, and new elevation drawings. Ms. Queen stated that they intended to minimize harm to the Critical Root Zones and grading. They have established a new approach for the rear yard and have eliminated the need for a retaining wall.

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Thiem thanked the applicants for their new plan. He expressed concern for the impact on the design of the addition. The new materials show proposed grading finished floor elevation at 273, but the plan has contact lines up to 274. By code, that makes the house below grade. If the house is wood, how will it be impacted?

Ms. Queen stated that she had additional detail drawings to help explain. She passed out a section detail drawing.

Mr. Thiem asked for the horizontal distance between 272 and 274. Ms. Queen stated that it's between 6-8'. Mr. Thiem asked if it would be easier if it didn't have a 2" gap. Ms. Queen responded that they would have to cut 16" into slope.

Mr. Thiem state that the primary tree roots are in the top 6-8" of soil. More grade adjustments could be made than shown in the drawings. You can work with staff on that point. The challenge is the tree protection plan, it's shown running in the middle of the grading area.

Ms. Queen stated that the grading will be the last piece of the work. The tree protection plan exists for construction. Want to protect neighbor's fence to west.

Mr. Thiem noted that provided a very limited construction area – located very close to the house. Ms. Queen responded that they would be happy to move the fence to provide a larger area, but they wanted to protect the trees.

Mr. Thiem asked if the Committee should wrap up the discussion, because he has questions for staff.

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

Committee Discussion

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

Having a tree protection fence in the area of disturbance – has that been done before? [Thiem]

It makes sense to protect a larger area during addition construction. [Davis]

Are there notes on plan? [Thiem]

You mean how the contractor would do it? [Queen]

Ok – add a note stating phase 1 and phase 2 with dimensions to tree protection plan. Can alter slope to 3:1, providing a steeper slope. [Thiem]

Work with staff to rewrite conditions. [Fountain]

Thank you again for bringing this back. [Thiem]

Decision on the Application

Mr. Thiem made a motion that the changes to the application and the condition be approved.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 04/25/19.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chair Fountain introduced the evidentiary hearing portion of the meeting. The committee heard the cases in the following order for which the Certified Records are made part of these minutes: COA-0155-2018, COA-0156-2018, COA-0157-2018, COA-0158-2018, COA-0159-2018, and COA-0160-2018.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

COA-0155-2018 908 DOROTHEA DRIVE

Applicant: ANTHONY CASALETTO

Received: 10/10/18

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 01/08/19

1) 11/26/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: Demolish accessory structure; install 12'X20' accessory structure

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

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
1.3	Site Features and Plantings	Install 12'X20' accessory structure
1.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	Demolish accessory structure; install 12'X20' accessory structure
4.2	Demolition	Demolish accessory structure

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Support:

Melissa Mason [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. She handed out additional materials including a letter from a neighbor, an inspection report, a shed proposal, anchor information, and a tree protection plan. She shared a presentation that gave detailed information about the proposed shed. She stated that the removal of the shed was supposed to

be included in the previous application but was accidentally left out. The Magnolia tree that was shown as one tree on the submitted plan is actually two, but both will be retained. Ms. Mason showed condition photos of the existing shed and a photo of the proposed shed. The new shed is to be located in the same place as the existing. No footings will be dug for the new shed. It will be faced in smooth fiber cement with 1"X4" smooth wood trim. There will be no exterior lighting. She stated that they are working on getting an updated arborist's letter. They request approval with conditions to continue progress on the house and noted that several other applications have been able to have tree protection plans approved as a staff condition.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Thiem asked about the leveling blocks mentioned in the application and where they will be located. Anthony Casaletto [affirmed] replied that they are square concrete blocks that will sit directly on the ground. Mr. Thiem stated that the leveling blocks will be set with runners on top, and then the building? Mr. Casaletto responded yes, they will build on top of the runners. Mr. Dunn asked for an explanation on how the augers will work. Mr. Casaletto stated that the augers are an anchor for winds up to 100 mph. Mr. Dunn asked if they work separately from the blocks. Mr. Casaletto replied yes. Mr. Davis asked how far down the augers will be placed. Ms. Mason responded 30".

Mr. Thiem asked if the shed will have the shutters and cupola as shown in the photograph. Mr. Casaletto responded no.

Mr. Davis asked if they intend to use barn doors. Mr. Casaletto stated that they will not be using barn doors. Mr. Davis noted that the application specifically mentions barn doors. Mr. Casaletto responded that they will be using the doors included in the presentation.

Mr. Fountain asked when the next COA meeting will be. Ms. Tully responded December 27. Without objection Mr. Fountain closed the evidentiary portion of the hearing.

Committee Discussion

Are we prepared to make a decision? [Fountain]

I'm not sure I have clarity that we have documents to relay what is proposed. Conflicting information in the presentation and report. I'm inclined to go with staff regarding the tree protection plan. No critical root zones are shown. The shed is on one side, while the other side is staging. Magnolias are trapped in the middle. [Thiem]

We have approved proposals with the condition of a tree protection plan in the past, but now we're taking it more seriously. [Davis]

We missed the opportunity to have measured, scaled drawings of the shed. We would need to eliminate part B. [Thiem]

We provided a survey and checked dimensions. [Mason]

We ask for elevations, but it no longer exists. [Thiem]

Was it contributing? [Fountain]

No, but we still require drawings, it's the delay that's impacted by contributing/non-contributing. [Tully]

The staging area should be included. Can we reopen the hearing to the applicant? [Thiem]

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Mr. Thiem stated that he originally thought the application was to install a pre-built structure; but based on the presentation it appears that now you are going to build a structure and need a staging area. What is the condition of the Fig tree?

Ms. Mason responded that the tree is large and gangly. It's doing well but could be trimmed back. Mr. Thiem asked for the size of the tree. Ms. Mason responded that the arborist said that it wasn't included.

Mr. Thiem asked if the applicants wanted to keep the Fig. Ms. Mason responded yes. Mr. Thiem stated that the east side needs to be protected, so the Fig could be removed from the tree protection plan to allow for space for the staging area.

Mr. Dunn asked how long it will take to build the shed. Mr. Casaletto stated 3 days.

Mr. Thiem stated that the tree protection fencing should come straight to the house, that way the Fig will be included in the zone. The applicants should work with staff to edit the plan but should still get an arborist involved in protection measures. Use mulch and plywood to protect the Fig.

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

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) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-13) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Demolishing an accessory structure is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.6.5, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, and the following suggested facts:
 - 1* In the National Register of Historic Places nomination for the Boylan Heights Historic District, the garage/shed is not mentioned in the description or identified as contributing.
 - 2* The applicants propose to demolish the existing accessory structure. No information or detailed photographs were provided that show the current condition of the structure. An inspection report was provided at the hearing and described in the applicant's presentation. Detailed drawings of the existing structure were not provided.
 - 3* The application states that the shed was approved for removal in COA 083-18-CA. The shed was not included or mentioned in the application.

- 4* The existing shed is 18'X19', or 342 sq. ft. It is a gable roofed structure with what appears to be a shed roofed addition to the side. It is constructed primarily of vertically installed corrugated metal.
 - 5* The age of the shed is unknown. The 1950 update to the Sanborn Fire Insurance Survey indicates that a shed was present in the opposite corner. The size and shape of the structure shown on the survey indicates that the existing structure was built after the survey.
- B. The construction of a shed is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section 1.3.8, 1.3.9, 1.3.12, 1.6.6, 1.6.7, 1.6.8, 1.6.9, 1.6.10, 1.6.11, 1.6.12, and the following suggested facts:
- 1* The proposed shed is sited in a similar location to the existing shed. The proposed location is sited traditionally near the rear lot line.
 - 2* The proposed accessory structure is 12' x 20', 6' narrower than the existing shed.
 - 3* The proposed shed is a one-story frame structure with vertical hardiplank siding. The applicants do not propose to have any battens in conjunction with the vertical siding. This is atypical.
 - 4* A photographic example of the general appearance was provided; detailed drawings were not.
 - 5* The gable-end shed is deferential in scale to the historic house. The form is a traditional shed style.
 - 6* The windows are to be aluminum clad. Specifications were provided, trim details were not.
 - 7* The proposed doors are centered six-panel wood doors. Specifications were not provided.
 - 8* Built area to open space analysis: The lot is 6,984 SF. The existing footprint is 2,297 SF; the new footprint will be 2,195 SF. The proportion of built area to open space is currently 32% and will decrease to 31%.
 - 9* The shed will be painted to match the existing structure.
 - 10* The shed is proposed to sit on concrete leveling block. An insignificant amount of excavation is required.
 - 11* There are two large Magnolia trees immediately adjacent the shed. The trees are not proposed for removal.
 - 12* A tree protection plan was provided, however the letter from the certified arborist does not address the removal of the existing shed or construction of the new shed. The letter is dated from June and is related to the construction of the addition.
 - 13* The construction of the shed is estimated to take 3 days.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That tree protection plans be implemented and remain in place for the duration of construction.
2. That there be no demolition delay for the removal of the shed.

3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard for the shed:
 - a. A revised tree protection plan prepared by a certified arborist or registered landscape architect that addresses the removal and construction of the shed.
 - b. Construction documents for the proposed shed that accurately convey the final exterior appearance;
 - c. Window trim details.
4. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. Door specifications and details.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 05/26/19.

with a new 1100 square foot addition. The new addition would have a roofline below the historic roof. Mr. Hancock said there is one tree in the driveway and no way to put up a fence on the driveway side, so they will cover with 12" of mulch during construction.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Davis asked for the square footage of the historic house. Mr. Armstrong replied that the total historic house was 1205 square feet, not including the addition being removed, and the planned addition was 1100 square feet. Mr. Davis asked if that meant they were doubling the size. Mr. Hancock said yes.

Mr. Thiem asked if they were using the driveway for construction access. Mr. Hancock replied yes. Mr. Thiem stated they expect the tree protection plan to show critical root zones, and that he was concerned about the 24" tree on the south side of the front yard. He asked for the tree protection fencing to be installed along the sidewalks and the concrete retaining wall. Mr. Hancock responded that other than the paint crew who would be coming in at the end of the project, there was no need for anyone to be in the front yard. They will fence off the whole front yard.

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]:

I think it meets the guidelines with the side inset and lower roof lines. I'm concerned that it is the same size as the historic house, but I think it will look like an addition. [Davis]

The built area of 24% of is good for the area, and not a significant increase. [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 1-15) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- B. Removing a previous addition, removing a deck, constructing a new addition, painting a structure, and replacing the roof are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines*

sections 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.6, 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 1.3.9, 2.5.1, 2.5.7, 2.5.8, 2.6.1, 2.6.2, 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: "This North Carolina Victorian cottage was built for William Carter Stronach, a merchant, banker and developer who lived at 601 N. Bloodworth St. He rented it to Thomas N. Bryant and his family; Bryant was a butcher with a stall in the City Market. His wife Martha kept dairy cows, and his daughter Pattie was a seamstress. Stronach sold the house to the Bryants in 1882. The original house is two rooms deep, with a hipped roof. The roof ridge is parallel to the front of the house, then extends perpendicularly rearward on both sides. The roof was originally sheathed in wooden shingles. The front porch has a hipped roof supported by coupled and tripled slender square-section posts, with sawnwork ornament between them, and a sawnwork balustrade. The partially glazed front door has a transom. Most windows are four-over-four. A shed-roofed addition was made to the northern part of the rear between 1950 and 1990. The house was restored by Pamela Davison and Martin Baumgardner in c.1975-1980. There is a saddle-roofed frame one-car garage to the northeast of the house, built in c.1940. It is clad in metal."
- 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 trees located on the property. 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 inset from the existing house by about four feet on the north and south facades. The addition will be attached to the rear of the historic house where an existing addition currently exists. This is a traditional location to add to a historic house.
- 6* As shown in the side elevations, the roof ridge of the addition will attach under the eaves of the historic house. The elevations were not dimensioned.
- 7* A detail drawing of the eave details was provided. The proposed eave construction will match the existing.

- 8* The addition is proposed to be clad in smooth fiber cement siding – the application notes that the siding is proposed to have a 6” reveal to match the historic structure.
- 9* The roofing is proposed to be architectural shingles. Specifications were not provided.
- 10* The structure is proposed to be painted. Specifications were not provided.
- 11* The foundation of the addition is proposed to be CMU with a brick veneer to match the aesthetic of the historic house. Brick samples were not provided.
- 12* One-over-one wood double hung windows are proposed. A half-light or full-lite wood door is proposed for the rear elevation. Specifications were not provided.
- 13* **Built area to open space analysis:** According to the applicant, the lot is 10,890 SF. The footprint of the house is 1,844 SF. The proportion of built area to open space is currently 17%. The footprint of all the proposed built area is 2,595 SF. The proportion of built area to open space is proposed to be 24%.
- 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. Dunn; passed 4/0.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

1. That tree protection plans 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. Window specifications including a section drawing;
 - b. That the tree protection plan be revised and submitted to staff. The tree protection plan must be prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) or by a North Carolina licensed landscape architect and must address the critical root zones of all trees over 8” DBH and provide 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. Door;
 - b. Roofing;

- c. Paint color samples;
- d. Exterior lighting including location on the building;
- e. Gutters and downspouts including location on the building.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Dunn: passed 4/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 5/26/19.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

COA-0157-2018 405 E FRANKLIN STREET

Applicant: JAMES AND RACHEL BAILEY

Received: 10/10/2018

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 01/08/2019

1) 11/26/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: Demolish house and garage; remove 3 Willow Oak trees; seed and straw parcel

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.**”
- The boundary of the HOD runs through the garage proposed for demolition. Only the portion of the garage in the HOD is subject to review.

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 house and garage

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. James Bailey and Mr. Nick Hammer [both affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Bailey stated they had the same problem as the previous applicant and he had emailed to staff just prior to the meeting a new tree protection plan with critical root zones marked for two trees proposed for removal in the district boundary.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Thiem stated he was concerned about their definition of the critical root zone (CRZ). The arborist's calculation was inaccurate, and the given diagram shows an area they want to protect and are calling it a critical root zone. The plan shows a smaller area than what the RHDC would call CRZ.

Mr. Bailey asserted it wasn't their original intention to demolish the house but based on the inspection and engineer's evaluation they need to demolish it due to rampant mold. The house is non-contributing to the district. Mr. Hammer added that everyone is in agreement regarding the demolition and they were present to answer questions.

Mr. Davis asked why they are removing the willow oaks. Mr. Hammer replied it was based on the probable driveway location and their concern that the CRZ limits the buildable area to 40%. The existing grading and retaining wall require the driveway to be in the same location as existing.

Mr. Davis asked if the new house will go further back on the property. Mr. Hammer responded they are more concerned with the width of the house and how the trees affect that. They would probably have parking and a garage similar to the rest of the neighborhood. Mr. Davis asked if the house was not intended to go back further on the lot, what was the purpose in removing the trees. Mr. Hammer responded that there were visible roots around the house and he was concerned with damaging the roots during demolition of the house. Mr. Fountain said if they didn't put a demolition delay on the house, they could design a new house during the 365-day demolition delay on the trees. Mr. Hammer replied they didn't want to be stuck with limited options.

Mr. Thiem asked if the plan was to demo the house, wait for the demolition delay for the trees and then build, or to demo it all and build together. Mr. Hammer replied the latter. Mr. Thiem said the challenge for the committee was making a decision and not having new plan for the site. He asked why tear trees down if they *might* get damaged. He asked staff if the tree removal proposal could be modified later if the new site plan didn't need them to be removed. Ms. Tully affirmed that. Mr. Thiem stated the committee was trying to preserve the tree canopy and asked if the applicants were willing to work with the committee on the trees if they knew the delay could be removed later. New replacement trees would need to be a minimum 3" caliper. Mr. Hammer agreed the priority would be to save the trees if possible.

Mr. Bailey asked what would happen if the house design didn't allow for saving the trees. Mr. Thiem replied they could bring in a schematic design for approval with just the location and footprint of the new house if they would like to do that. Mr. Hammer said it sounded like the best-case scenario was to approve the demo of the house now and start the clock for the demo delay for the trees while they work on the new design for the house.

Ms. Tully stated she did receive the arborist's letter in her email. Mr. Thiem said he wants the new tree report submitted back to the committee for the CRZ, and that a tree protection plan needed to be in place prior to the house demolition.

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]:

There is a distinct line. We can approve the house demolition without a delay. [Fountain]
I believe there is a member of the public here who may be interested in commenting on the application. [Robb]

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Ms. Melissa Birdsong, 811 N Bloodworth St, [affirmed] said the Willow Oak tree canopy was shared with the back of her property. She wanted to see due diligence to protect the trees in the best possible way. She also wanted to understand which specific trees are to be removed. Mr. Bailey responded that they want to keep the feeling of Oakwood, and especially the trees. The best-case scenario is that all trees will remain. If they have to come down, he wants to start the clock now.

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

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION (2)

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

It appears there are seven trees in that row, which is an additional fact. [Fountain]
We need an updated tree survey and tree protection plan. [Thiem]

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Mr. Dunn 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 1-8) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

C. Demolition of the house and garage is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* section 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5; however, removal of three trees is incongruous according to *Guidelines* section 1.3.5, and the following facts:

16* Three Willow Oak trees are proposed for removal: a 22", 28", and a 30" diameter, all located along the west property line of the site. An arborist's letter was provided; however, the letter did not include an assessment on the health of the trees.

17* A tree protection plan was provided for the remaining trees on the site. The plan states that the critical root zones were provided on the arborist letter. The letter provided, however, did not mention the trees not proposed for removal.

18* No replacement trees were proposed for the three trees proposed for removal.

19* 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. "WA6760 (NC) 405 E. Franklin St. Vernon C. Huff House c.1947 This Colonial Revival cottage was built by building contractor Vernon Huff for his own family's home. It remains in the family as of 2014. The house is sided in asbestos shingles. It has a side-gabled saddle roof with no eaves. There is a gabled projection on the leftward part of the front, and a porch on the rightward part of the front. The porch has a hipped roof supported by X-patterned fretwork posts. There is a large picture window on the porch. There is a double window on the gabled projection. There is an original gabled section behind the main block. On the left side of the house is a nearly-flat-roofed section added in the 1950s. It has a large picture window on the front of it, flanked by six-over-six windows. There is a shed at the northwest corner of the lot, built in 1970 according to tax records. There is a carport in front of the shed built in 1975 according to tax records."

20* 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.

21* The applicant states that the building is structurally unsound. A statement from a professional structural engineer was provided to support the statement.

22* The application does not present any evidence that the applicant has fully documented the buildings with photographs and drawings and deposited these materials with RHDC for storage.

23* The garage is partially located within the boundaries of the Oakwood Historic District. Information on the garage was not included in the application (except for a notation on the site plan), but it should be considered as part of this application.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

4. That a 365-day demolition delay not be put into place for the garage and house.
5. That a 365-day demolition delay be implemented for the removal of the three Willow Oak trees.
6. That the replacement trees be 3" caliper or greater shade trees.
7. That prior to the issuance of the blue placard a revised tree protection plan be submitted to the COA Committee for review and approval.
8. That prior to the issuance of the blue placard the following be provided to and approved by staff:
 - a. full documentation of the buildings with photographs and drawings;
 - b. location and species of replacement trees.
9. That a tree protection plan be implemented and remain in place during demolition of the house.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 5/26/19.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

COA-0158-2018 411 N PERSON STREET

Applicant: ROSS ROSAR

Received: 10/10/2018

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 01/08/2019

1) 11/26/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: GENERAL HOD

Nature of Project: Construct second-story rear addition; remove utility chimney; remove tree

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its October 29, 2018, meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker, Curtis Kasefang, and Mary Ruffin Hanbury; also present were Ross Rosar, applicant; 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 second-story rear addition, Remove Tree
2.5	Roofs	Construct second-story rear addition; remove utility chimney
2.6	Exterior Walls	Construct second-story rear addition
2.7	Windows and Doors	Construct second-story rear addition
3.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Construct second-story rear addition

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Support:

Ross Rosar [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. He stated that he started the process of owning the house 4 years ago. While looking at the site plan, he realized the tree is actually located on city property. Ms. Tully stated that he will need to obtain a vegetative impact permit to request removal of the tree.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Fountain thanked the applicant for the additional information. He asked if the tree was there before the house was moved. Ms. Tully responded yes. Mr. Fountain asked if any assessment of tree occurred at that time. Ms. Tully responded no.

Mr. Thiem noted that the site survey shows some remnant curbing and a new parking lot is going in – what is the plan for the rear yard. Mr. Rosar responded that the plan is to remove the remnant curbing. He will return with a new COA application in the future that includes the driveway plan and rear yard.

Mr. Dunn stated that the application notes an intention to reuse the rear window, but it's not seen on the proposed drawings. Mr. Rosar responded that the plan is to elongate the vertical frame to match the size of the other windows. Mr. Dunn said he's not sure how that could be achieved. Mr. Rosar stated that his in-laws did something similar at their home. Or he can accommodate the same size in the new addition. The plan is to reuse as much as possible. Without objection Mr. Fountain closed the evidentiary portion of the hearing.

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

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 finding A. (inclusive of facts 1-21) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- D. Constructing a second-story rear addition and removing a utility chimney are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.6, 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 1.3.9, 2.5.1, 2.5.7, 2.5.8, 2.6.1, 2.6.2, 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; however, removing a healthy tree **is** incongruous according to *Guidelines* section 1.3.5 and the following facts:
- 24* Though located in the Blount Street Historic District, the property is included and described in 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. The property was included noting that it would be included in Oakwood at a later date, it was included in Blount Street instead. That document describes the house as a: "Queen Anne frame two-story built for Lizzie O. Watson at 530 N. Wilmington St. The first resident was H. Harold Hume, the state horticulturist and an instructor at N.C. State University. The house has a steeply-pitched hipped roof which was originally sheathed in wooden shingles. There is a flush gable on the leftward part of the front, and another on the forward part of the right side of the house.

There is a shallow two-story recess under the leftward part of the front gable. The porch has a hipped roof supported by four turned posts with a spindlework frieze and a square-section balustrade. The porch has a gable over the entrance. The front door has a transom. Most windows are two-over-two. There is an original one-story gabled ell on the rear. The porch along the south side of ell was enclosed between 1909 and 1914. The house was moved in 2008 to 411 N. Person St. by Mike Blake for LNR Properties, as part of the Blount Street Commons project.”

- 25* The house was relocated to the parcel through COA 079-07-CA.
- 26* The application states that one tree is proposed to be removed. The tree was present when the house was relocated to its current site. Due to the siting of the house, the tree is directly in front of the entrance to the house (in front of the location of future entry steps) and is in the right-of-way. The entry and steps will be included in a future application. A site plan was provided showing the tree size and critical root zone. There are no other trees located on the site.
- 27* A replacement tree was not specified.
- 28* There is a parking lot that crosses the rear portion of the property. This parking lot will be removed as part of future work.
- 29* The proposed addition is at the rear of the house. This is a traditional location for an addition.
- 30* The proposed addition adds a second level to a previous rear addition. The addition is inset from the historic house, preserving the rear corners. This is a traditional method to add to a historic house.
- 31* As shown in the perspective drawings and elevations, the roof ridge of the addition will be lower in height than the roof ridge height of the historic house.
- 32* The application states that the eaves, trim, and attic vent will match existing (the application mistakenly identifies the eaves as the water table). Detailed photographs of the existing eaves and trim were provided.
- 33* The elevations were dimensioned, but it is unclear what units the measurements indicate.
- 34* The addition is proposed to be clad in wood siding to match the existing wood siding.
- 35* A new roof is proposed for the new addition and the existing house. Specifications were not provided.
- 36* Paint is proposed to match the existing house.
- 37* Wood paneled doors with glazing are proposed for the North and South facades. Specifications were not provided.
- 38* Wood double-hung two-over-two windows that match the existing windows are proposed in the new addition. No specifications were provided. Two original windows, one from the rear of the house and one on the existing addition, are proposed to be relocated to the new addition.
- 39* The window trim is proposed to match existing. Detailed photos of the existing windows and trim were provided.
- 40* Clerestory windows that were added to the south face of the addition are proposed to be removed and replaced with siding woven into the existing siding.
- 41* Exterior lighting was not shown on the drawings, nor were specifications provided.

- 42* Gutters and downspouts were not shown on the drawings, nor were specifications provided.
- 43* A utility chimney located on the southern façade is proposed for removal. This is typically approvable through a minor work and was added to this application for administrative efficiency.
- 44* The property owner is required to obtain the proper permits required by the City of Raleigh.

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

Decision on the Application

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

10. That there be no delay for removal of the tree.
11. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard:
 - a. Detailed construction drawings for the addition, noting trim, eaves, and standard dimensions;
 - b. Windows.
12. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. Doors;
 - b. Roofing material and color;
 - c. Gutters and downspouts, and location on the building, if any;
 - d. Exterior lighting, and location on the building, if any.
13. That a 3" caliper shade tree be planted as a replacement tree. The tree may be included as part of a future hardscape plan submitted as a future COA application.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 06/26/19.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

COA-0159-2018 510 S PERSON STREET
Applicant: STEPHANIE SCHULLER
Received: 10/10/2018 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 01/08/2019 1) 11/26/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: PRINCE HALL HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: General HOD

Nature of Project: Partially demolish structure; construct new building

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its October 29, 2018, meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker, Curtis Kasefang, and Mary Ruffin Hanbury; also present were Stephanie Schuller, applicant, Cleve Pate; 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.**”

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	Construct new building
3.3	New Construction	Construct new building
3.5	Non-residential new construction	Construct new building
4.2	Demolition	Partially demolish structure

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Support:

Ms. Stephanie Schuller and Mr. Cleve Pate [both affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Schuller said that she purchased the property in 2007 and had made changes over time, and she passed around pages representing a new design for their

application. Mr. Pate stated they had previous meetings to review drafts of the design, and they had made some revisions since last week where staff's concerns were how it would fit in with the neighborhood. The proposed building is now all brick.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Fountain asked staff if they had seen the new drawings when writing the staff comments. Ms. Tully responded no, these were new drawings.

Mr. Fountain asked where the boundaries of the district are. Ms. Tully said this is right in the middle. Mr. Fountain asked when the apartments to the north of the site were constructed. Ms. Tully responded about 2012, prior to district designation. Mr. Thiem said he was unclear on the neighborhood context, with multifamily buildings on both ends of the block. Ms. Tully responded that she would recommend the applicants bring evidence that a commercial building in the center of block is not incongruous in Prince Hall. And, since most of the commercial buildings are one- and two-story, that a taller building is appropriate. Mr. Thiem said he was struggling with the pattern and context, and whether a three-story building was appropriate. Mr. Fountain agreed that what the applicants need to provide is more about the context.

Mr. Pate said they initially tried to include features similar to the building on the right, but that DRAC guided them to a simpler commercial form with historic window openings. Mr. Fountain asked if this was the first non-residential project in Prince Hall since designation. Ms. Tully replied it was. Mr. Davis said this street is starting to have a downtown street façade in the middle of the district. His concern was that it would start to look like the Blount Street district, and they need to think about what would happen to the character with this project. He continued that there are few small-scale bungalows left. Ms. Tully added that usually her guidance is that if you're pushing the envelope in one direction, keep everything else traditional.

Mr. Thiem stated the context here is fuzzy, and that part of it is addressing the scale of the site. He continued that most of the commercial construction is one- and two-story; they don't have much three-story commercial in the district. The applicants need to provide examples that support their case. Ms. Schuller said there were no other three stories other than the Prince Hall building. Mr. Fountain added they will keep in mind that it's a mixed-use neighborhood, and the applicants need to demonstrate there is precedence for the height. He said the purpose in deferring was to allow the applicants to understand what they should bring back. Ms. Schuller responded they she probably won't do this if she can't go up to three floors. Mr. Thiem asked if she has addressed the parking requirements. Ms. Schuller replied yes.

Mr. Davis asked for clarification on the railing above the rooftop, and they need to provide examples and more clarity.

Mr. Thiem offered that sometimes stepping back an upper level could be something to consider. Mr. Pate responded that they had looked at that earlier and he agreed the context is confusing. Mr. Fountain said they should use the Prince Hall boundary map to find evidence to support their case.

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]:

I think brick is appropriate. I'm looking for the strategy for the three-story piece, and for the three different window treatments for three different stories. [Thiem]

I agree. [Dunn]

I think a patio on the second floor is incongruous. [Davis]

We need more detailed drawings, and to see if there's a way to minimize the actual height. Also height examples in the district. [Fountain]

Mr. Thiem made a motion to defer the application. The motion was seconded by Mr. Davis; passed 4/0.

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

COA-0160-2018 213 E SOUTH STREET

Applicant: PEDRO GARCIA

Received: 10/10/18

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 01/08/19

1) 11/26/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: PRINCE HALL HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: Remove side porch; construct side porch; convert door to window; install new door opening

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- 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>
1.3	Site Features and Plantings	Remove side porch; construct side porch
2.6	Exterior Walls	Convert door to window; install new door opening
2.7	Windows and Doors	Convert door to window; install new door opening
2.8	Entrances, Porches, & Balconies	Remove side porch; construct side porch

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Support:

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Davis asked if additional work is being completed on the front of the house. Ms. Kinane responded yes, the applicants have an approved minor work for several items. Mr. Davis asked for details about the minor work application. Ms. Kinane reviewed minor work 174-18-MW, which includes replacing windows, alterations to the front porch, and painting the structure.

Mr. Thiem stated that the windows shown in the drawing caught his attention. He would like to point out that the windows shown on the drawing are not part of the approval.

Mr. Davis added, for the installation of the door, note 2.7.9 – the alteration is not on a character-defining façade.

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 1-8) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-6) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

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

- E. Removing a side porch and constructing a side porch are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.6, 1.3.8, 1.3.12, 2.8.1, 2.8.9, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, and the following facts:
- 6* In the Historic Overlay District report for the Prince Hall Historic District, the property is described as a: "One-story, two-bay frame house with vinyl siding, an asphalt-shingled gable roof, a front porch with replacement roof, metal supports on brick pedestals, and a metal balustrade, 6/6 windows, and a picture window. Cornice returns and water table remain." It is identified as contributing.
 - 7* The applicants propose to remove the existing side porch and entry. Photographs detailing the current condition of the porch were provided.
 - 8* The existing porch is located at the rear of the property and, based on Sanborn Fire Insurance surveys, appears to be a later addition.
 - 9* The existing porch and stairs are oriented toward the rear of the property. The proposed porch is oriented towards the street.
 - 10* The proposed porch is moved further south along the west façade into the historic part of the house. This is a traditional location for a side entry.
 - 11* The new porch appears to be in the location of an existing HVAC unit. No information is provided as to the new location of the unit.
 - 12* No information was provided on the height or design details of the porch railing. The image provided is for deck construction, not appropriate for side porches.
 - 13* A shed roof is proposed above the side entry. Dimensions and materials were not provided.
- F. Converting a door to window and installing a new door opening are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section 2.6.2, 2.6.8, 2.7.2, 2.7.9, 2.7.11, 1.6.6, 1.6.7, 1.6.8, 1.6.9, 1.6.10, 1.6.11, 1.6.12, and the following facts:
- 14* The existing side porch door is proposed to be converted to a window to match the existing windows. The windows were approved for replacement through minor work COA 174-18-MW. All but two windows were already replacement windows. The windows on the front façade were not included in the Minor Work COA.

- 15* No information was provided as to how the siding would be installed in the space around the new window.
- 16* A door is proposed to be installed with the proposed side porch. The location is on a side façade of the structure, but it is located within the original form of the historic house.
- 17* Specifications were not provided for the proposed new side door or the replacement of the front door.
- 18* No information was provided as to if any exterior lighting will be installed.
- 19* The windows shown on the elevation were not drawn to scale or correct.

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

Decision on the Application

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

- 9. That the siding be woven in to the existing siding where the door is to be removed.
- 10. That the porch railings have the appearance of inset pickets.
- 11. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard:
 - a. Measured, scaled drawings of the existing and proposed design of the west facade;
 - b. Materials and specifications for the porch roof and roofing materials;
 - c. Detail and section drawings of the porch railing.
- 12. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. HVAC unit new location;
 - b. Doors;
 - c. Exterior lighting, and location on building, if any.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 05/26/19.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Deferred Applications
 - a. 149-18-CA, 212 ½ BLOUNT ST, 116 & 205 E HARGETT ST, 117 ½ E MARTIN ST, Moore Square Historic District: After discussion about the applicant's request to defer the item, Mr. Fountain moved to defer the application until the April 2019 COA Committee meeting; Mr. Thiem seconded the motion; passed 4/0.
2. Mr. Davis moved to adopt the Findings of Fact for case 128-18-CA, 809 Brooklyn Street, as amended; Mr. Dunn seconded the motion; passed 4/0.
3. Committee Discussion
 - a. Meeting Post-Mortem

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:16 p.m.

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

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