

RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
November 14, 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: Nick Fountain, Jeannine McAuliffe, Laurie Jackson, Jimmy Thiem, Travis Bailey

Staff Present: Tania Tully; Collette Kinane; Marilyn McHugh Drath; Francis P. Rasberry, Jr., Attorney

Approval of the Agenda with Changes

Ms. Jackson made a motion to move to the reading of the minutes to the end of the agenda and approve the agenda 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.

<u>Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address</u>	<u>Affirmed</u>
Michelle Bellerjeau, 515 Cutler Street, 27603	Yes
Frank Haynes, 518 S Boylan Street, 27603	Yes
Nicole Alvarez, 215 Haywood Street 27601	Yes
Amy Bullington, 4208 Union Street 27609	Yes

EVIDENTIARY HEARINGS

Chair Fountain introduced the evidentiary 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-0099-2019, COA-0110-2019, and COA-0111-2019. Case COA-0091-2019 was withdrawn by the applicant prior to the meeting and was not heard.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

COA-0099-2019 518 S BOYLAN AVENUE

Applicant: MICHELLE K BELLERJEAU

Received: 9/06/2019

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 12/05/2019

1) 10/24/19 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: GENERAL HISTORIC OVERLAY DISTRICT (HOD-G)

Nature of Project: Construct two dormers; remove skylights

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at the September 3, 2019, meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker, Sarah David, David Maurer, and Curtis Kasefang; also present were staff members Tania Tully and Collette Kinane, and applicants Michelle Bellerjeau and Frank Haynes.

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 two dormers
2.5	Roofs	Construct two dormers; remove skylights;

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Collette Kinane [affirmed] reviewed the case and provided photographs of the property, including views of where the proposed dormers will go and views of both side yards. Staff recommended that the committee approve with conditions.

Support:

Michelle Bellerjeau, designer, and Frank Haynes, owner [affirmed] were present to peak in support of the application.

Ms. Bellerjeau gave testimony on behalf of the owner, Mr. Haynes. She explained that the existing renovated space on the upper floor has no egress. Adding the dormers will improve egress and improve height in the bathroom which currently has a sloping ceiling. She said they would like to make the windows operable and to make the space usable.

Regarding the staff's comment on the tree protection plan, Ms. Bellerjeau described their deep respect for trees, and that only the trees on the front portion of the property, an area beyond the work zone, would be impacted. Referencing page AO.2, Ms. Bellerjeau pointed out where the materials would be laid down and that the trees in that area have no significant girth. She also

noted the hard surface in that area. Ms. Bellerjeau and Mr. Hayes stated that they did not feel there is a need to hire an arborist to confirm that the trees fall outside of the work zone. Ms. Bellerjeau also addressed staff's second comment and provided details from Marvin Window Company about shingle materials and stains. Ms. Bellerjeau and Mr. Haynes brought four samples for the committee's review, explaining their preference for the deep forest color. Ms. Bellerjeau explained that the proposed change of material and color is a helpful way to distinguish new additions from existing structures. She also stated that the intended dormer design is simple to not overpower the existing structure. Ms. Bellerjeau said that one of the most important things in historic renovation is a larger space for the muntins and a two-inch sill. Mr. Haynes said the proposed dormer design attempts to minimize the change to the house when viewed from the front.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Fountain asked if there were questions from the committee.

Mr. Thiem said he had a couple of questions, specifically on the tree protection plan. He asked if the applicant had one drawn up. Mr. Thiem was curious about where the material would be laid down since he did not see anything on the plan of where physical barriers would surround the work area. Ms. Bellerjeau asked if this just required her to add a line on the plan to indicate the orange fencing. Mr. Thiem informed her that that fencing is called a tree protection fence and then agreed that he thought that would help. Mr. Thiem explained that the committee typically asks for an arborist or landscape architect to create these plans, but if there was a way to put down a piece of fence before construction starts closer to the trees then the fence would likely be sufficient to satisfy the issue. Ms. Bellerjeau stated that they can resubmit sheet A.03 to reflect those fencing changes.

Mr. Fountain asked if the applicant would be willing to work with staff to modify these plans so they would not have to wait a month to show a new drawing. Ms. Bellerjeau replied that she could provide staff with the updated plan tomorrow. Mr. Thiem concurred that showing the addition would suffice and that a TPP would not be necessary.

Mr. Fountain asked if there were other questions.

Mr. Bailey asked about the siding on the dormers. He stated that they looked to match the existing dormers in the area. Ms. Bellerjeau returned to the last picture in her presentation, a blue house with an additional dormer on the front made of shingle and clapboard.

Mr. Bailed turned to Ms. Tully, stating that he knew the committee wants to make sure it will be clear what is new and what is existing, both in changing color and material. Ms. Tully explained that it is up to the committee---some additions are "matchy-matchy" and others are more differentiated. Mr. Haynes explained that one the reasons that they want to differentiate it is to set it off and because it would be aesthetically pleasing.

Ms. Bellerjeau explained that the darker color also would blend in with the roof a bit more whereas a lighter color might stand out. She said the applicant would be more than happy to supply more pictures and examples from the neighborhood.

Mr. Fountain asked for the plank to be passed around. Ms. Tully asked if the windows would be all wood or clad wood. Mr. Haynes replied that it would be all wood after getting clarification on what clad wood means.

Mr. Fountain asked if there were any further questions. Without objection, Mr. Fountain closed the evidentiary portion of the hearing.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

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

I don't see an issue with the difference in color; I tend to think it would differentiate it as a later addition that would be appropriate. [Jackson]

I like that it downplays it. Anything else? [Fountain]

With no objection from the Committee, Mr. Fountain closed the committee discussion portion of the meeting.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Mr. Thiem moved that based on the information contained in the application and materials in the evidentiary hearing, the Committee finds staff findings from the Staff Report A. (inclusive of facts 1-10) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Constructing two dormers and removing skylights are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 1.3.7, 2.5.10, and the following facts:
 - 1* From the National Register nomination for the Boylan Heights Historic District: "One-story Bungalow, hip roof with dormer; engaged one-story porch, full facade." The nomination form shows 1910 as the construction date and the status as contributing.
 - 2* The application shows the approximate locations of three trees on the property. A site plan labeled tree protection plan was provided and designates a material laydown area. The tree protection plan was not prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture or by a registered Landscape Architect. Typical tree protection methods (fencing, mulch, boards, etc) were not specified.
 - 3* Two new dormers are proposed: one on the north elevation with two eight-pane windows and one on the south elevation with two sets of paired eight-pane windows.
 - 4* The dormers are proposed to have shed-style roof forms that sit below the ridge of the historic roof. The front walls of the dormers are set back from the wall plane of the ground floor. Additionally, the new dormers are located beyond the historic front chimney.
 - 5* The new dormers do not compromise or damage the historic character of the hipped roof.
 - 6* Roof plan drawings were shown on the existing and proposed site plans.
 - 7* Photographs of other roof dormers in Boylan Heights were provided. Only two were labeled with an address:
 - a. 904 South Street – Received a COA (094-18-CA) for the addition of two dormers, one on each side.

- b. 1022 W South Street – The dormers appear to have been installed prior to the designation of Boylan Heights as a Historic Overlay District.
- 8* The windows in the dormers are proposed to be eight-pane wood casement windows in what appears to be the same size as the upper-sash of a window in the historic house. The windows nearly fill the height of the dormer wall which is typical of dormer construction in the district. Complete window specifications including section drawings showing all wood, standard profile were provided at the hearing.
- 9* The roofing and paint color for the dormers will match the existing building materials. The siding is proposed to be cedar shakes. Examples were provided of other properties that also have dormers sided in cedar shakes. It is not unusual for dormers on bungalows to have a different siding material. A sample was submitted and reviewed at the hearing.
- 10* Replacing the roof covering is a minor work item that are included here for administrative efficiency.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

1. That drawing A0.3 be removed and drawing A0.2 be revised to show tree protection fencing on each side of house with CRZs and approved by staff.

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

Committee members voting: Bailey, McAuliffe, Thiem, Jackson, Fountain.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

COA-0110-2019 130 N BLOODWORTH STREET

Applicant: NICOLE ALVAREZ

Received: 9/12/2019

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 12/11/2019

1) 10/24/2019 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: GENERAL HOD

Nature of Project: Construct 1 ½ story addition; demolish shed; remove deck; alter parking area; construct deck

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its September 3, 2019, meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker, Sarah David, Curtis Kasefang, and David Maurer; also present were Nicole Alvarez, applicant; Tania Tully and Collette Kinane, staff.

Staff Notes:

- Unified Development Code section 10.2.15.E.1 provides that “An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure or site within any Historic Overlay District...may not be denied.... However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to 365 days from the date of issuance.... **If the Commission finds that the building, structure or site has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark, it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal.**”
- COAs mentioned are available for review

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<i>Sections</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Description of Work</i>
1.3	Site Features and Plantings	Demolish shed; construct garage addition; alter parking area; remove deck; construct deck
1.5	Walkways, Driveways and Off-Street Parking	Alter parking area
1.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	Demolish shed
3.1	Decks	Remove deck; construct deck
3.2	Additions	Construct garage addition; construct deck
4.2	Demolition	Demolish shed

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Collette Kinane [affirmed] reviewed the case and provided photographs of the property, with views of the front, rear, and side facades. Ms. Kinane also provided closer views of the areas to be demolished and areas proposed to be constructed. Ms. Kinane explained that staff recommends that the committee discusses the appearance of the addition and the fenestration on the east side.

Support:

Nicole Alvarez [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Fountain asked to return to a photograph of the driveway and asked to see the property line.

Mr. Fountain stated that Ms. Alvarez is a member of the commission and asked whether she had any concerns. Ms. Alvarez replied no.

Mr. Raspberry asked if she was the owner of the property. Ms. Alvarez replied no. Mr. Raspberry asked if she understood that was appearing as a fact witness. Ms. Alvarez replied yes, provided her address, and explained that she was just there to answer questions. Mr. Fountain asked if the owners were okay with the staff comments. Ms. Alvarez said they were open to any feedback that would make the project better.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Fountain asked if the committee had questions.

Ms. Jackson wanted to clarify the staff suggestion to discuss the appearance of the addition as an attached garage.

Ms. Alvarez explained that before they went to DRAC, the proposed addition looked more attached and the applicant was attempting to decide which design would be better, quieter, more respectful. She explained that the owners had no plans to use the space as a garage, they wanted a separate structure that has a connection to the main dwelling that is as light as possible, adding glazing to keep it light. There is also a grading change so it is a bit tricky to figure out where to connect the proposed addition to keep the touch as light as possible. After meeting with DRAC, they decided on a half story modification.

Mr. Fountain asked how the connector would work after looking at the elevation.

Ms. Alvarez explained that there was a proposed window above a doorway and on the west elevation the section showed the connector better. It showed the doorway at a lower level that will have stairs for the half level to get to the main level of the house.

Mr. Fountain asked the committee if they had other questions.

Ms. Jackson said that she thought the proposed addition reads as more of an accessory structure even though it is attached. Although she had not seen the first version of the design, she said this version is a quiet and differential approach to the main house.

Ms. McAuliffe asked about the doors and if they were significant and where they would be located. Ms. Alvarez explained that they are proposed as carriage style doors with wood and some glazing on the top. Ms. McAuliffe asked about the size—she could not tell. Ms. Alvarez replied that she believed them to be four feet wide, but could provide confirmation later. Ms. McAuliffe inquired about the glazing. Ms. Alvarez answered that there would be glazing just at the top.

Mr. Fountain asked about the doors. Ms. McAuliffe concurred that she was concerned about how the doors will read.

Mr. Fountain asked about an item mentioned—a studio reformer. Ms. Alvarez explained that it was a specific item used in pilates and that the owner is a pilates instructor.

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

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

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

This has been coming up in various forms lately---the increased size of accessory structures. In one case, the garage was part of a new house construction. In hindsight our discussions have suggested that it was probably not the best decision lately. Having a garage that is integrated into the main home isn't normal for the neighborhood. Having said that the staff report says the "appearance" of the proposed garage, but we can't be responsible for what is going on inside. It isn't in keeping with guidelines. If we didn't have the double doors, and had another entryway that fit into the home as a typical door it might be better. I'm concerned that this will eventually become a garage---and then a garage attachment. The doors just read garage to me. I'm concerned that it will eventually become something else. [Thiem]

I recall some properties that because of zoning, the row houses were technically only separated by inches. So the concern here might be that it looks like a garage instead of a part of the house. [Fountain]

It might be less problematic if there was no concrete running right up to the addition. [Thiem]

It might be better if we could break up that concrete. [Fountain]

Regardless, if it looks like a garage, people will think we've approved an attached garage. [Thiem]

I agree, looking at the guidelines and the character of Oakwood. [Bailey]

I can reopen the public testimony portion. [Fountain]

Public testimony portion reopened by Mr. Fountain so the committee could gather additional information.

Mr. Thiem asked if the staff was supporting this application. Ms. Tully explained that, from staff's understanding, the garage-like appearance was intentional. She continued that it was a tough application and that was why staff wanted the committee to discuss it.

Ms. Alvarez added that at the end of the day, the client was excited because the larger doors make moving in the larger pilates equipment easier. Future owners could use it differently. Ms. Alvarez referred to an image provided in the supporting materials that showed a garage attached via breezeway and that it was entirely new construction.

Mr. Fountain asked if it was totally new. Ms. Tully replied yes.

Mr. Thiem explained that it is the idea that they have approved a garage---if it looks like a duck and quacks like a duck.

Ms. Alvarez replied that a teenager suite is also proposed in the new addition. For safety, the owners wanted it connected to the main dwelling. She added that she thought the owners would be open to altering the doors to make them look less like a garage door.

Ms. McAuliffe concurred that she agreed with Mr. Thiem---that as proposed, the addition reads like a garage. She was concerned that for precedent's sake, it looked like a garage. Ms.

McAuliffe thought it would be more appropriate for them to not read like garage doors.

Mr. Fountain inquired about the height of the doors. Ms. Alvarez replied that they were about eight feet. Mr. Fountain explained that on his property's addition, they placed standard doors but doubled them to tie in to the main property. Ms. Alvarez added that option would look more like French doors.

Mr. Thiem said it would not be typical for the pavement to run right up to the addition if it was not intended to be used as a garage. He questioned the committee on whether moving the doors to the other side of the proposed addition would be better.

Ms. Alvarez added that the owner could also add in a grass strip---that the applicant would be willing to submit something to that effect to staff.

Mr. Fountain clarified that would be something conditioned on the front doors not giving the impression of garage doors. Ms. Alvarez recapped that the options would be for the doors to stay in the same place and become French doors or to stay the same size and move to another side of the proposed addition.

Mr. Thiem asked if the staff was looking for anything in particular. Ms. Tully explained that staff would be comfortable with a condition that the addition not look like a garage and the proposal can be adjusted accordingly. In the event that the proposed modifications did not meet staff expectations, they could bring it back before the committee.

Ms. Jackson questioned why it was an issue that it read as a garage.

Mr. Thiem replied that attached garages were not consistent with the area. Some later versions in the area have carports or porte-cocheres and he appreciated the effort to make the addition as light as possible. He suggested that the easiest solution would be to just change the doors if it was not going to function as a garage.

Ms. Jackson followed up and questioned whether if they removed the connector, the committee would like it better. Mr. Thiem replied that yes, then the proposed addition would be just like any other accessory structure.

Mr. Fountain asked if there were any other questions before he closed the public hearing again.

Mr. Fountain recloses the public testimony portion and reopens the committee discussion.

I agree that attached garages are not typical in Oakwood. [Jackson]

Yes, they are atypical. [Tully]

So if I hear you, the motion is that if it's connected, it needs to not look like a garage, but with its use by the teenagers, the connector needs to stay. [Fountain]

The fenestration shouldn't mask the addition and give the appearance of a garage. It's also an issue with the hardscape that it gives the appearance that it is going into a garage. [McAuliffe]

When they replace the concrete there will be less after. That means the scale and width is inconsistent with the area. It's out of scale. [Thiem]

Maybe the applicant would like to decide what changes to make. [Jackson]

I thought some of the conditions might get at this. [Fountain]

We'd rather not defer. [Alvarez]

With no objection from the Committee, Mr. Fountain closed the committee discussion portion of the meeting.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Mr. Thiem moved that based on the information contained in the application and materials in the evidentiary hearing, the Committee finds staff findings from the Staff Report A. (inclusive of facts 1-6) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-23), to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Demolishing an accessory building is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.7, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, and the following facts:

- 1* The application includes pages from the "Inventory of Structures in The Oakwood National Register Historic Districts" Raleigh, North Carolina By Matthew Brown, Historian, Society for the Preservation of Historic Oakwood Researched and written from 2004 to 2015. That document describes the house as a Neoclassical Revival frame one-and-a-half-story and places the construction of the garage c.1940. The description notes that the garage has been 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 includes an estimated construction date of 1940, and classifies the garage as contributing.
- 3* The application states that no trees are proposed to be removed. A site plan was provided showing tree sizes, species and critical root zones. A tree protection plan was included on the proposed site plan. It is unclear who prepared the tree protection plan or if an International Society of Arboriculture-certified arborist or NC-licensed landscape architect reviewed the plan.
- 4* Photographs of the house and accessory structure were provided, including the east, west, and north sides of the accessory building. However, photographs of the south side of the accessory building were not provided.
- 5* Drawings of the house and accessory structure were provided, including the west, east and south sides of the accessory building. However, only a partial drawing of the north side of

the accessory building was provided. While the drawings include a graphic scale, the drawings were not dimensioned.

- 6* The application does not state whether any materials will be salvaged after demolition.
- B. Constructing a 1 ½ story addition, removing a deck, constructing a deck, and altering a parking area are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.4, 1.3.6, 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 1.5.1, 1.5.5, 1.5.6, 1.5.9, 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.6, 3.1.7, 3.1.8, 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; however, the appearance of an attached garage is incongruous with 1.66, 3.2.8, and 3.2.9, and the following facts:
- 1* Over time, the house has had several alterations, most of which appear to be prior to district designation. In 2017 a COA (064-17-CA) was approved to alter the east, north, and west porches.
- 2* The application states that no trees are proposed to be removed. A site plan was provided showing tree sizes, species and critical root zones. A tree protection plan was also provided. It is unclear who prepared the tree protection plan or if an International Society of Arboriculture-certified arborist or NC-licensed landscape architect reviewed the plan.
- 3* The property is a corner lot. The house faces N Bloodworth Street. There is a driveway to the rear yard located behind the house off of E Jones Street.
- 4* The proposed addition is at the rear of the house and will be minimally visible from the N Bloodworth elevation.
- 5* As shown in the elevations, the property slopes significantly from Bloodworth Street down to the rear property line. Topographic information was not provided.
- 6* The proposed addition is offset from the floor levels of the historic house. Due to the grade change from the front of the house to the rear of the addition, the first floor of the addition occurs mid-level to the basement of the historic house.
- 7* The addition is offset from the existing house and connected with a hyphen at the first floor of the historic house and an enclosed entry at the first level of the addition.
- 8* The design of the addition is intended to have the appearance of a garage.
- 9* The proposed addition is located in the southeast corner of the property and the end of a driveway, as garages are traditionally located.
- 10* As shown in the Jones Street side elevation, the roof ridge of the addition is lower than the roof ridge of the historic house. Dimensioned elevations were not provided; however, a graphic scale was included on each page.
- 11* The existing accessory building is located behind the historic house in the south east corner of the lot, set about 6' off both the south and east property lines.
- 12* The addition is proposed to be clad in wood siding with a 5" reveal to match the existing house, while the roofing is to be architectural shingles that match the existing roof. A metal shed roof is proposed for the entry. Paint is proposed to match the existing house.
- 13* Three styles of windows are proposed. Wood double-hung one-over-one windows that appear to be similar in size to those on the historic house will be installed as either single or paired units. Two undersized double-hung windows are proposed on the north elevation adjacent to the garage door and one undersized double-hung window is proposed on the west elevation. This window appears similar in size to a window located on the south elevation of the historic house. A large square window is proposed over the entry door in the hyphen. Specifications were not provided.

- 14* The paired undersized windows adjacent to the garage door appear out of scale and proportion with the proposed facade.
- 15* The large square window appears to be a similar size to the pane of glass in the entry doors. The proposed location and size are atypical to the historic district.
- 16* The north elevation shows a garage vehicular door with two glass lites. Specifications for the door were not provided.
- 17* **Built area to open space analysis:** According to the applicant, the lot is 6,782 SF. The existing square footage of the footprint of the house and shed was not given. The proportion of built area to open space is currently 62.4%. The square footage of the footprint of all the proposed built area, including the new garage was not given. The proportion of built area to open space is proposed to be 60%.
- 18* **Built mass to open space analysis:** According to the applicant, the lot is 6,782 SF. The proportion of built mass to open space is currently 41.3%. The proportion of built mass to open space is proposed to be 49.2%.
- 19* The application includes a map that highlights 11 other corner properties to illustrate the lot coverage. Photographs of four of the properties were provided. An analysis of the existing built mass or built area of these properties was not provided.
- 20* The application includes the removal of the deck located on the south façade. The deck is not historic.
- 21* The proposed alterations include the addition of a ~238 SF deck on the south side on the first level of the historic house in the space between the addition and the historic house. Materials were not specified. Detailed drawings of the deck railings were not provided.
- 22* Exterior lighting was not shown on the drawings, nor were specifications provided.
- 23* Gutters and downspouts were not shown on the drawings, nor were specifications provided.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

1. That there be no demolition delay for the removal of the accessory building.
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard:
 - a. full documentation of the accessory building with photographs of the south side and a measured, scaled drawings of all sides;
 - b. manufacturer's specifications for windows, showing both section and elevation views, and material descriptions;
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. elevation and section drawings of the deck railings;
 - c. manufacturer's specifications for exterior lighting, and location on the building;
 - d. specifications for the gutters and downspouts, and location on the building.
4. That the North elevation of addition be revised to remove garage doors and that the fenestration be compatible with a residential addition.
5. That there be a continuous landscape strip added along façade of the addition facing Jones Street.

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

Committee members voting: Bailey, McAuliffe, Thiem, Jackson, Fountain.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

COA-0111-2019 135 E MARTIN STREET

Applicant: AMY BULLINGTON FOR CLEARSCAPES

Received: 9/12/2019

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 12/13/2019

1) 10/24/2019 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: GENERAL HOD

Nature of Project: Install canopies; alter storefront; change exterior paint color

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>
2.4	Paint and Paint Color	Change exterior paint color
2.9	Storefronts	Install canopies; alter storefront
2.11	Accessibility, Health, and Safety Considerations	Alter storefront

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Collette Kinane [affirmed] reviewed the case and provided photographs of the property and explains what the proposed changes including the installation of canopies and alteration to the storefront and paint color. Ms. Kinane offered side views of the storefront.

Support:

Amy Bullington [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Bullington explained that she is the project architect. Mr. Raspberry asked the Ms. Bullington if she understood that she was appearing as a fact witness. Ms. Bullington replied yes.

Ms. Bullington gave a slide presentation and described the site as a highly trafficked corner. She provided context for the building and explained earlier site divisions that created two tenant suites. She described the movement of the entryway by 3 feet 9 inches to allow the second-floor tenant access to their space. Ms. Bullington explained that the property was last renovated in 2001 and used historic tax credits. New windows were installed at this time.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Fountain asks if the applicant had anything to say about the staff comments. Ms. Bullington said no, but that she was happy to answer questions.

Ms. McAuliffe asked about the awnings. Ms. Bullington replied that they were steel frame with solid steel.

Mr. Thiem asked to go back and look at 2001 photographs, specifically one with a recessed door. Ms. Bullington agreed that the door on the property is very deep. Mr. Thiem stated that he understood the typical recess of doors in this neighborhood to be quite substantial.

Mr. Fountain added that the recesses differ by use.

Mr. Bailey asked about the glass and framing that had been replaced and whether the transom was original. Ms. Bullington that it was called out as salvaged and to be replaced in the 2001 plan but it was unclear where the transom was salvaged from. Mr. Fountain added that it cannot be assumed to have come from this building. Ms. Bullington clarified that no, it came from somewhere in the building but unclear which part.

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

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

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

I'm not sure that we should be bound to decisions made in 2001. [Fountain]

I'm concerned that there aren't many examples of recessed doorways. I can only think of two other examples. It's unclear what the building's original purpose was. [Bailey]

We already know it was replaced, we just don't know if it was replaced with the same materials as the original. [McAuliffe]

I hesitate with the proximity to Moore Square and I'd be more comfortable if we could find older photographs of the original state. [Bailey]

For me, given what we know now, I feel like what's being proposed is appropriate and feel comfortable approving the proposal. [Thiem]

I hesitate to hold up the project based on speculation. [Fountain]

That's fine, but it's speculation either way---if the depth is original or was established in 2001. [Bailey]

Any new photos in the presentation what were not in the application? [Tully]

No. [Bullington]

With no objection from the Committee, Mr. Fountain closed the committee discussion portion of the meeting.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Ms. McAuliffe moved that based on the information contained in the application and materials in the evidentiary hearing, the Committee finds staff findings from the Staff Report A. (inclusive

of facts 1-9) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-6), to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Installing canopies is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.9.1, 2.9.9, 2.9.13 and the following facts:

- 1* The *Guidelines* "Special Character of the Moore Square Historic District" states that "The architectural scale of the district is pleasingly suited to the pedestrian. The vast majority of buildings in the district are simple, vernacular brick "shoe-boxes," two to three stories in height, narrow and deep. Past attempts to modernize the pedestrian level of the shops with aluminum panels and flat aluminum awnings contribute to a discontinuity that contrasts with the frequently related repetitive elements and details of the second and third floors of these buildings."
- 2* The subject property is within the boundaries of the Moore Square Historic District as listed in the National Register in 1985. The property is noted as contributing with a construction date of 1914.
 - a. The description of the building: "5 X 3 bay 5 shop front (original) 2 story comm. block. Brick trim around windows of 2nd floor."
- 3* The application proposes the installation of two steel canopies – one at the easternmost bay that wraps the corner facing Blount Street and E Martin Street and one at the westernmost bay.
- 4* Drawings were provided of the proposed canopies. The thickness of the structure of the canopies appears to be around 8 to 10 inches. Dimensioned elevations were not provided.
- 5* The steel canopy at the westernmost and easternmost bays will project into the right-of-way 2'3" and 3'3", respectively. A separate permit will be required for the encroachment.
- 6* *Guideline* 2.7.10 encourages the installation of fabric awnings where appropriate. The application states that fabric awnings were previously installed on the building and notes issues caused by the fabric awnings.
- 7* The canopies are proposed to be installed in such a way that does not damage or conceal historic fabric.
- 8* The canopies are proposed to be painted the same color as the trim to allow the canopies to blend in.
- 9* The application includes photographs of painted steel canopies at 237 S Wilmington Street, a non-contributing building. The canopies were approved through COA 042-10-CA.

B. Altering a storefront and changing paint color are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.4.1, 2.4.3, 2.4.5, 2.9.1, 2.9.4, 2.9.5, 2.9.7, 2.9.13, 2.11.1, 2.11.2, 2.11.3 and the following facts:

- 1* The entry of the westernmost bay storefront is proposed to be shortened by moving the door forward approximately 3'5". The application states that the alteration is to allow for greater ADA access to the 2nd level.
- 2* Photographs from a 2001 renovation are included. The photographs show a recessed entry and the applicant indicates that some previous alterations were made to this storefront.
- 3* It is unclear from the application how much of the storefront being altered is historic fabric.
- 4* The application proposes the salvage and reuse of the transom glass and entry door and installation of new, matching storefront glass.

- 5* The application includes the repainting of the building. Paint colors were not provided.
- 6* The change of exterior paint colors is classified as a minor work COA and is included here for administrative efficiency.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Thiem; passed 4/1 with Mr. Bailey dissenting.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

1. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard:
 - a. Revised elevation drawings that note the thickness of the canopy structure, height clearance, and heights of rod hangers;
2. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. Paint colors.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Thiem; passed 4/1 with Mr. Bailey dissenting.

Committee members voting: Bailey, McAuliffe, Thiem, Jackson, Fountain.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Approval of the September 26, 2019 Minutes

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

2. Committee Discussion

- i. Meeting Post-Mortem

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:39 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Senior Preservation Planner
Collette Kinane, Preservation Planner