

**RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**  
**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE**  
Minutes of the Meeting  
March 28, 2019

**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: Tania Tully; Melissa Robb; Collette Kinane; Francis P. Rasberry, Jr., Attorney; Lu-Ann Monson

**Approval of the February 23, 2019 Minutes**

Ms. Tully stated that in compiling the February 23 minutes it was noted that there was no second to the final decision for the application for 308 S Boylan Avenue (Montfort Hall), COA-0013-2019. Mr. Fountain moved to approve the application as amended with conditions. Mr. Davis seconded; passed 3/1 (Mr. Thiem opposed). Ms. McAuliffe moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing and to adopt said minutes as amended. 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. Nick Fountain administered the affirmation.

<b><u>Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address</u></b>	<b><u>Affirmed</u></b>
James Bailey, 107 Cooke Street, 27601	yes
Rachel Bailey, 107 Cooke Street, 27601	no
Nick Hamner, 415 N Boundary Street, 27604	yes
Sara Pascucci, 526 Euclid Street, 27604	yes

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Mr. Thiem moved to approve the agenda as printed. Mr. Dunn 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: COA-0016-2019 and COA-0017-2019.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

COA-0016-2019 405 E FRANKLIN STREET

Applicant: JAMES AND RACHEL BAILEY

Received: 02/06/2019

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 05/07/2019

1) 03/28/2019 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: General HOD

Nature of Project: Construct new house with porte cochere and side and rear decks; expand driveway; plant trees

Staff Notes:

- The demolition of the existing house was approved with COA-0157-2018. The case is 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 new house with porte cochere and side and rear decks; expand driveway; plant trees
1.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Off-street Parking	Expand driveway
3.1	Decks	Construct side and rear decks
3.3	New Construction	Construct new house with porte cochere

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report. Since insufficient information was provided in the application for staff to offer a suggestion regarding approval, staff suggests that the Committee defer the application to allow the applicant time to provide additional information and evidence.

Support:

Mr. Nick Hammer [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Hammer reviewed the application and new materials for the Committee to review in a digital presentation. No hard copies were provided.

Mr. Hammer stated that the project was an example of the Design Guidelines helping inform their design decisions, especially the retention of important site features and the resulting

massing of the building. He continued with the site plan showing how the house was pushed to the east to protect seven trees near the west property line, and showing the parking had to be on the front based on the retention of the trees. Mr. Hammer stated the building footprint was increased modestly compared to the existing house by adding 10' on the back. He addressed the tree protection plan and said an arborist was brought in early to advise. Mr. Hammer pointed out that the design of the roof forms with the sloping 90% to the west was done partly to direct water to the trees.

Mr. Hammer reviewed evidence of neighborhood precedents used in the design; a portion of the front pushed forward, a recessed porch/entry, an eyebrow that covers the porch and carport, and a roof feature that changes direction for differentiation. In response to the staff report, he reviewed the percentage of lot coverage and building height in relation to adjoining properties. Mr. Hammer said that Guidelines 3.3.7 and 3.3.11 were the two most important in driving features in the design of the proposed home, especially the rooflines; he stated there are plenty of examples of multiple roof styles on a single house in Oakwood where there are many one-of-a-kind rooflines that make it what it is.

Mr. Fountain asked if they had addresses of the houses in the photographs since they need to consider nearby and well-related properties. Ms. Tully noted that the Committee generally considers those that are 1½ blocks from the subject property. Mr. Hammer said he felt the argument for the design still holds in the district as a whole, regardless of the 1½ block limit.

Mr. Hammer addressed Guideline 3.3.9 and the placement and grouping of windows on the east side which were modified from the original application. He also said that for the carport they had studied other precedents and that one discernable difference was that the carport is wide enough for two cars which is appropriate for a house constructed now, since the use of cars is so different to what was common when Oakwood was first built out. He also pointed out that on the street there is no parking allowed at any time. Mr. Davis noted that all the porte cocheres in Oakwood are one-car wide.

Mr. James Bailey was affirmed and stated that he agreed that there are no examples of two-car porte cocheres, but that if any of those had been built when people owned two cars they would likely be wider.

#### 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 areas on the tree protection plan labeled "limited disturbance" and why there was no tree protection fencing. Mr. Hammer responded this was a zone the arborist worked with early on in developing strategies for the property. Mr. Thiem recommended alterations to the tree protection plan for clarity. He also stated that he observed a retaining wall on the east side of the property running farther back than shown. Mr. Thiem asked who

owns it, and said the wall is failing which could compromise the wall during construction of the house since it is proposed to be closer to the property line. Mr. Hammer responded that they were aware of it and are having discussions with a structural engineer.

Mr. Thiem noted that he observed the existing walk that runs from the street to house was not included in the new site plan; this is a traditional pattern in the neighborhood. Mr. Hammer responded that their plan is to abandon it and to install a walkway from the driveway to the front porch which is also traditional. He noted that the steps at the front property line are in similar shape to the retaining wall they're in. Mr. Thiem asked when the period of significance ended for the district. Ms. Tully answered the new draft report gave early 1940s as the end date. Mr. Thiem said the emphasis on cars came with post-war home construction. After further discussion, Mr. Hammer said they could restore the original walkway. Ms. Tully noted that section of the Design Guidelines was added in anticipation of post-war homes being included in the period of significance.

Mr. Dunn asked for more information about the exposed rafter tails, including their spacing and function. Mr. Hammer said they would be functional. Mr. Davis asked if they were only on that one section. Mr. Hammer affirmed that. Mr. Fountain asked how the carport was to be supported. Mr. Hammer provided more explanation of the drawings.

Mr. Davis stated the application was pushing the guidelines with a two-car porte cochere and the asymmetrical roof. He said the samples provided are recognizable styles, but this design goes beyond that. Mr. Hammer responded that the Craftsman style was the primary influence and he believed they presented a compatible design.

Mr. Fountain stated the Committee would benefit from staff's analysis of the amended materials. Mr. Davis asked about materials including the broom-finished concrete driveway, stating that a water-washed finish was more common. Ms. Robb clarified the difference. Mr. Hammer responded they would have no problem with that. He reviewed elements of the proposed driveway and carport.

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's a lot here. We need time to consider it and would benefit from staff input. [Fountain]

There are areas of concern identified by staff. [Davis]

It's not that bad where I stand. [Fountain]

You will just want to make sure the decision is defensible. [Tully]

I don't agree with the post-war arguments. Two-car porte cocheres are not found. The traditional pattern is a single-width driveway beside the house. With a wider porte cochere you're expanding the parking and pavement area, so I'm challenged to support the two-car porte cochere. For the existing sidewalk connection to the street there's no evidence to support its removal. I do appreciate the attention paid to the tree protection plan. [Thiem]

With the architectural elements they meet the guidelines, and are mostly successful. For the width of the 2-car porte cochere, it's unique in that there's no street parking. And secondly there's the issue with the roof form. With their argument the roof is lacking a corner feature to justify it. The hierarchy is not right. I generally support the roof form, but would more so if there was a feature on the northeast corner. Maybe a roof or fenestration change with corner windows. [McAuliffe]

The street makes a difference and the trees are worth protecting. Could something be done with details to break up the two-car porte cochere? Something to break up the space. I'm concerned about the massing on the east side as it relates to the neighboring house. I would like to see how overpowering that is to the one-story house next door, on the page 14 elevation. [Fountain]

I had initial reservations about the carport, but could concede those because of the street parking. I like the roofline. It's key influence when I looked at it was "half of a Craftsman roofline". I have no problem with that. [Dunn]

I agree with most of what's been said. The two-car carport doesn't meet the Guidelines. They need to find a place for the other car without having it two cars wide. Regarding the roofline, the other asymmetrical samples show something relating to it below. With the windows on the east side, they're not standard, but could meet the Guidelines by making it look like an addition. I'm less concerned with the height, especially compared with the two-story next door. [Davis]

There is parking on the south side of the street, just not in front of the house. The porte cochere is 32' deep when a standard garage is about 18-20'. The question is how to make it less dominant, if it were pulled back, maybe to 24' that would make it less dominant. [Thiem]

Mr. Thiem made a motion that the hearing be reopened. The motion was seconded by Ms. McAuliffe; passed 5/0.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Mr. Hammer said it's funny that the feature roof needed more of a feature when we were trying to tone it down. We did a façade study and decided on a one-story rear portion in consideration of the neighbors to the east. Regarding the carport it sounds like lessening the volume or reducing to one car might be acceptable.

Mr. Bailey said regarding the roofline it sounds like we can get a little more detail on the roof, so we can move forward. Ms. McAuliffe responded that from their photos when there was

something different on the roof, you would be looking for a special feature for the corner. There's an opportunity for something creative there.

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

Mr. Thiem made a motion to defer the application to allow the applicant time to provide additional information and evidence:

1. calculations of built mass to open space and built area to open space based on the area of the lot within the district boundaries;
2. the proposed footprint compared to neighboring houses;
3. the height of other well-related nearby buildings;
4. the roof shape;
5. the window placement, orientation and proportions on the east elevation;
6. the size and proportions of the porte cochere;
7. and driveway design and materials.

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

Mr. Thiem stated there were a few items to address since there was no existing conditions drawing of the site; the existing sidewalk was not shown, and the east retaining wall needs to be shown and addressed, especially about ownership.

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

Staff Contact: Melissa Robb, [melissa.robbs@raleighnc.gov](mailto:melissa.robbs@raleighnc.gov)

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

COA-0017-2019 526 EUCLID STREET

Applicant: LOU PASCUCCI

Received: 2/06/19

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 05/07/19

1) 03/28/2019 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: Construct addition; construct retaining wall

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at the March 4, 2019 meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker, Sarah David, and Curtis Kasefang; also present were Ashley Morris, architect; and Collette Kinane and Tania Tully, staff.

Staff Notes:

- COA cases mentioned are available for review.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
1.3	Site Features and Plantings	Construct addition; construct retaining wall
3.2	Additions	Construct addition

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Support: Sara Pascucci [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Pascucci stated that they worked with Ashley Morris to provide additional information as requested in the staff report. She handed out a photograph of the retaining wall, a tree protection plan, and a proposed driveway side elevation.

Ms. Pascucci explained that the proposal is to add a master bedroom to back of house, slightly larger than 200 sf. The materials will be consistent with the existing house. The existing retaining wall will be moved further back and the materials reused. The roofline in the rear will be changed from a shed to a continuation of the larger gable; it will be set below the roofline and not visible from the street.

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



### Responses and Questions:

Mr. Theim stated that they had the disadvantage of not having the info provided in advance. He expressed concern over the clarity of the tree protection drawing and noted that the tree protection fencing was not really obvious on the page. He stated that the drawing needs to be graphically enhanced.

Ms. Kinane noted that the applicant provided black and white copies to the Committee while the original is in color. She had one color copy available for review.

Mr. Theim stated that the contractor often gets a photocopy, so they would likely experience similar confusion. He added that preserving the Hackberry and Photinia are likely to be unsuccessful. The lay-down area including dumpster is located in the root area of both. He asked if the arrows were the proposed locations of replacement trees.

Ms. Pascucci stated yes.

Mr. Theim stated that the replacement trees be 3" caliper each. He asked about construction access.

Ms. Pascucci stated that they had permission to access back yard through the church property located behind them.

Mr. Theim asked if it was an alley.

Ms. Pascucci responded no, it is a driveway.

Mr. Theim stated that, by pushing the retaining wall back, the addition will be 2-3' below grade. He asked how grading will be addressed and, specifically, how will water will be addressed.

Ms. Pascucci stated that she was unsure, all information was conveyed to the architect.

Ms. McAuliffe made a motion to excuse Don Davis. Mr. Theim seconded; motion carried 4/0.

Ms. McAuliffe stated that new additions should be discernable from the existing house. On the east façade it appears as a continuation of the existing house. Differentiation would be easy to achieve with an inset or change. Both sides are visible from the street.

Mr. Fountain noted that the property is not a contributing structure, but differentiation still may be a good idea.

Ms. Tully suggested the addition of a corner board.

Ms. McAuliffe mentioned that on the new elevations – east and west – the windows don't match.

Ms. Pascucci stated that there have been several additions. The living room has newer windows that mirror those that are in the back of the house. The existing windows do not have mullions. There is an inconsistency in the submittal.

Ms. Tully added that the *Design Guidelines* section on additions states if a property is non-contributing, it's more about the district as a whole.

Mr. Fountain closed the evidentiary hearing.

### Committee Discussion

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

Are we inclined to defer? [Fountain]

A tree protection plan is provided. My only concern is that it is clearly graphically illustrated. It should be reproducible. And if staff is okay working with the applicant on the existing landscape, I'm okay with staff working with them (grading/drainage). [Theim]  
If it looks like you're going to make a decision instead of deferring, we have prepared suggested conditions. [Kinane]  
If the roofline and siding of a non-contributing structure do not need to be demarcated per the *Guidelines*, I think it's ok. [McAuliffe]  
I agree. [Dunn]  
I am pleased that dumpster will come in from the back. [Fountain]  
I'm good with the removal of the Hackberry. [Theim]

### Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Mr. Theim moved that based upon the facts presented in the application, the revised drawings, and the testimony provided during the evidentiary hearing, the committee finds staff suggested finding A. (inclusive of facts 1-10,12-13) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Constructing an addition and a retaining wall and the removal of two trees are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.6, 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 1.3.13, 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 facts:
- 1\* The application includes a page 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 states it was constructed c. 1948 and is non-contributing to the historic district: "This Colonial Revival cottage was built by carpenter Jasper Capps, who lived in the house at the corner of Euclid and Elm, for his son Jack, who sold it to Isaac Dickens, pastor at the Emmanuel Pentecostal Holiness Church at the corner of Polk and Elm. The house has a side-gabled saddle roof with no eaves. There is a gabled projection on the leftward part of the front, and a porch beside it. Both are original. The porch has a shed roof supported by two turned posts, which are probably not original. Most windows are six-over-six. There is a picture window on the porch. There is an exposed chimney on the right side of the house. There are additions on the rear of the house, and a bumpout on the left side added in 2003."
  - 2\* The applicant proposes the construction of an addition on the rear façade. The proposed addition squares off the southeast corner in between two previous additions. This is a typical location for an addition.
  - 3\* The application states that the rear yard will require grading where the addition is proposed to be construction. No details were provided on the extent of grading beyond the footprint of the addition.
  - 4\* A retaining wall is proposed for the rear yard. No drawings or details were provided on the retaining wall.
  - 5\* **Built mass to open space analysis:** According to the applicant, the lot is 7,971 SF. Sanborn maps from 1914-1950 show approximately 1,599 SF of built area on a 13,416 SF lot, with a

ratio of built area to open space of 12%. The existing built area is 2,231 SF, with a ratio of built area to open space of 27%. The proposed built area is 2,360 SF, with a ratio of built area to open space of 29%.

- 6\* The application notes that the mass to open space proportions are fairly high on this section of Euclid and the proposed ratio is in the middle range. The application included photographs of neighboring properties and an analysis of built area to open space on those properties to support the above statement.
- 7\* The existing roof is a side-gable form with shed roof porch and a shed roof addition with cross gable screened porch on the rear. There are no eaves.
- 8\* The proposed addition over-frames the existing rear roof as an extended cross-gable. 6" eaves are proposed. Details were not provided.
- 9\* Three 6-pane wood casement windows are proposed for the rear façade. These windows appear to match the existing rear façade window. Specifications were provided.
- 10\* Two new low-profile skylights are proposed in the addition. Specifications were provided.
- 11\* A tree protection plan was provided in the application materials and the locations of trees identified.
- 12\* No details were provided on exterior lighting, if any.
- 13\* Two trees – a 16" DBH Hackberry and a 9" DBH Photinia - are proposed for removal due to their condition as stated in an ISA-certified arborist's assessment.
- 14\* Construction access will be granted from a driveway located to the south of the property.

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

#### Decision on the Application

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

1. That a tree protection plan be revised, approved by staff, 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. Retaining wall;
  - b. Topography, including grading around the addition;
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to construction or installation:
  - a. Eave details;
  - b. Exterior lighting, if any;
4. That two 3" caliper replacement trees be installed in the locations shown on the tree protection plan;
5. That the 365-day delay be waived for the two trees.

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

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

Certificate expiration date: 9/28/19.

Staff Contact: Collette Kinane, [collette.kinane@raleighnc.gov](mailto:collette.kinane@raleighnc.gov)

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Committee Discussion
  - a. Meeting Post-Mortem

**ADJOURNMENT**

5:55 p.m.

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

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