

RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
January 23, 2020

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Nick Fountain called the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Committee meeting to order at 4:02.

ROLL CALL

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

Present: Nick Fountain, Laurie Jackson, Jimmy Thiem, Travis Bailey

Alternate Present: John Hinshaw

Excused Absence: Jeannine McAuliffe

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

Approval of the Agenda

Mr. Fountain recommended altering the agenda to move case COA-0165-2019 (111 E North Street) to be heard prior to case COA-0160-2019 (501 E Lane Street A). Mr. Hinshaw made a motion to approve the agenda as adjusted. Mr. Thiem seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

Approval of the December 12, 2019 Minutes

Mr. Hinshaw moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing and to adopt said minutes as submitted. Ms. Jackson 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>
Ashley Morris, 306 Pace Street, 27604	Yes
Taylor Roberts, 506 Cleveland Street, 27605	No
Laura Willer, 2602 Lewis Farm Road, 27604	Yes
Mike Poupard, 1005 Collins Drive, 27609	Yes
Cydney Clemons, 6401 Castlebrook Drive, 27604	Yes
Chrissy Mastrangelo, 2310 Bedford Avenue, 27607	Yes
Jeff Mastrangelo, 2310 Bedford Avenue, 27607	Yes
Chad Griffith, 706 Tower Street, 27607	Yes
Lindsey Tomlinson, 2401 Van Dyke, 27607	Yes
Chris Crew, 306 Elm Street, 27601	Yes
Matthew Brown, 401 N Person Street, 27601	Yes
Don Munford, 3312 Landor Road, 27609	Yes
Matthew Roberts, 214 Tunstall Ave, 27502	Yes

Ivan Bailey, 3030 Cambridge Pl, 20007
Ken Bowers, 704 N East Street, 27601
Brooke Tate, 115.5 E Hargett St, 27601
Emily Rothrock 821 Wake Forest Rd, 27603

Yes
No
Yes
Yes

SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS

There were no objections to the approval of the Summary Proceedings without a public hearing. The committee reviewed and approved the following cases COA-0158-2019 and COA-0163-2019 for which the Summary Proceedings is made part of these minutes.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – SUMMARY PROCEEDING

COA-0158-2019 506 CLEVELAND STREET

Applicant: ASHLEY MORRIS FOR PELL STREET STUDIO
Received: 12/02/2019 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 03/01/2020 1) 1/23/20 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: GLENWOOD-BROOKLYN HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: STREETSIDE HISTORIC OVERLAY DISTRICT (HOD-S)

Nature of Project: Alter roof form; alter bay window

Amendments:

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- Streetside HODs are "...established to provide for protection of the traditional development patterns of an area and to preserve historic resources found in it. The focus is on maintaining that character and on preserving those key character-defining features of individual historic resources within the district as viewed from the street right-of-way, excluding alleys..." (Section 5.4.2.A.1. of the Unified Development Ordinance)
- Section 5.4.2.B. of the Unified Development Ordinance governs the applicability of the COA process in Streetside HODs.
 - Changes within the first 50% of the depth of any existing principal building from the facade adjacent to a public right-of-way requires a COA. For the sake of this measurement the house runs from the front wall (not the front of the front porch) to the rear wall (also not including porches).
 - Additions that project beyond an existing building's maximum side wall envelope regardless of distance from the public right-of-way also require a COA.
 - Changes to the lot area between the public rights-of-way and the facade of any existing primary building or structure also require a COA.
 - Change in color is not a regulated exterior alteration.
- Work items shown in this application that are not subject to review include construction of a rear addition, changes made to the existing house behind the 50% line (such as the deck and door alterations on the east/right side), and alterations to the walkway in the side and rear yard.
- The staff report is based only on those items subject to review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<i>Sections</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Description of Work</i>
2.5	Roofs	Alter roof form; alter bay window
2.6	Exterior Walls	Alter bay window
2.7	Windows and Doors	Alter bay window

STAFF REPORT

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

- A. Altering the roof form and altering a bay window are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.5.1, 2.5.7, 2.5.10, 2.6.1, 2.6.8, 2.6.11, 2.7.1, 2.7.11; and the following suggested facts:
- 1* The Historic Research Report for the Designation of the Glenwood-Brooklyn District describes the property as a: "One-story frame Victorian house with weatherboard siding and an asphalt-shingled gable roof. The front porch has ornate modern metal supports. Other features include a brick foundation and interior chimney, a transom over the entry, and 6/6 windows." The report indicates ca. 1915 as the construction date and the status as contributing.
 - 2* The application proposes the alteration of a low gable roof over a projecting bay window.
 - 3* The gable roof form is proposed to be altered to a shed roof form. Materials are proposed to match existing.
 - 4* The projecting bay window and low gable roof appear to be part of a later addition/alteration to the historic house.
 - 5* The eave of the altered bay window is proposed to be 2" shallower than the historic eave to differentiate the alteration.
 - 6* The large picture window in the projecting bay is proposed to be replaced with two wood double-hung windows. The double-hung windows will match the rough opening dimensions of the picture window to maintain the trim and siding and proportionally match the existing double-hung windows. Window specifications were provided.
 - 7* Roof plan drawings were provided for the existing and proposed designs.
 - 8* Photographs of adjacent neighboring properties were provided.

Decision on the Application

There were no objections to approval without an evidentiary hearing.

Mr. Thiem moved to approve the application, adopting the staff report as the written record of the summary proceeding on COA-0158-2019. Mr. Hinshaw seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 07/23/20.

Staff Contact: Collette Kinane, collette.kinane@raleighnc.gov

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – SUMMARY PROCEEDING

COA-0163-2019 704 N EAST STREET

Applicant: KENNETH BOWERS

Received: 12/05/19

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 03/04/20

1) 1/23/20 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: General HOD

Nature of Project: Construct screened porch; remove deck

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<i>Sections</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Description of Work</i>
1.3	Site Features and Plantings	Construct screened porch; remove deck
3.2	Additions	Construct screened porch

STAFF REPORT

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

- A. Constructing a screened porch and removing a deck are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.6, 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.4, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.7, 3.2.8, 3.2.10, 3.2.11, 3.2.12; and the following suggested facts:
 - 1* 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, the house is a Craftsman frame bungalow, ca. 1928: “The house has a side-gabled saddle roof, with exposed rafter tails under the horizontal eaves. There are two gabled projections on the front of the house...Most windows are six-over-one. On the rear was originally a small gabled ell and a tiny back porch. In 1997 this was subsumed into a larger gabled projection...”
 - 2* The application proposes construction of a screened porch at the rear of the existing house. An existing deck is proposed to be removed.
 - 3* The existing deck is approximately 10’x23’. It is located off-center, in line with the south wall of the house.
 - 4* The proposed screen porch is approximately 19.5’x16’. The porch and stairs are proposed to be centered on the rear of the house with a roughly 6’ setback from the north and south walls.
 - 5* **Built area to open space analysis:** According to the application, the lot totals 5,285. Calculations and a ratio for existing built area were not provided. The proposed addition adds 312 SF for a total proposed built area of 2,148 SF. The proposed built area is 41%. The

existing deck is only slightly smaller in size, thus the increase in built area should be marginal.

- 6* The Design Guidelines refer to not substantially increasing the **original** built area to open space. Calculations were not provided for the property's original area mass. A driveway was approved in 2004 (017-04-MW), an addition was approved in 1996 (167-96-CA), and a deck was approved in 1993 (MWD-93-041).
- 7* **Built mass to open space analysis:** According to the application, the lot totals 5,285 SF with an existing built mass of 1,396 SF. The existing built mass to open space is 26%. The proposed addition adds 312 SF for a total proposed built mass of 1,708 SF. The proposed built area is 32%, this results in an increase of 6%.
- 8* The Design Guidelines refer to not substantially increasing the **original** built mass to open space. Calculations were not provided for the property's original area mass. An addition was approved in 1996 (167-96-CA).
- 9* The proposed porch roof is a gable form that mimics the slope of the existing roof. The stairs accessing the rear yard are not included under the porch roof, resulting in a gable that is offset from the main roof form. The roof covering is proposed to match the existing shingles.
- 10* The proposed porch is designed to be structurally self-supporting.
- 11* The proposed porch is to be framed with treated lumber and painted to match the house. Tubular metal rods are proposed for the railing.
- 12* Horizontal wood slats are proposed to screen the structure underneath the porch.
- 13* According to the application text, the screening for the porch is to be on the inside of the porch framing. A section drawing of the screened porch was provided.
- 14* The application notes that siding will be repaired and replaced as needed as a result of the removal of the existing deck. It is not indicated how new siding will be incorporated with the existing.
- 15* A tree survey identifying trees greater than 8" DBH on the property was provided. A plan identifying locations for materials storage and refuse staging was provided. A tree protection plan was not provided. The application states that no trees will be disturbed as a result of the project.
- 16* Gutters and downspouts are indicated on the elevations and are proposed to match existing.
- 17* Exterior lighting was not shown, nor were specifications provided.

Staff suggests that the committee approve the application with the following conditions:

1. That the materials staging plan be revised to show tree protection fencing parallel to the north and east property lines.
2. That tree protection plans be implemented and remain in place for the duration of construction.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. Exterior lighting including location on the building, if any.

Decision on the Application

There were no objections to approval without an evidentiary hearing.

Mr. Hinshaw moved to approve the application, adopting the staff report as the written record of the summary proceeding on COA-0163-2019. Mr. Thiem seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 07/23/20.

Staff Contact: Collette Kinane, collette.kinane@raleighnc.gov

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-0140-2019, COA-0143-2019, COA-0141-2019, COA-0165-2019, COA-0160-2019, COA-0167-2019, and COA-0168-2019.

Due to the similar nature and location on the same parcel, cases COA-0160-2019, COA-0167-2019, and COA-0168-2019 were reviewed as one case. The three cases each have an individual Certified Record; however, the discussion and decisions are identical.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

COA-0140-2019 325 POLK STREET

Applicant: MATT ROBERTS FOR MHROBERTS PA

Received: 10/28/2019

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 01/26/2020

1) 12/12/2019 2) 1/23/2020 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: General HOD

Nature of Project: Master landscape plan including: alter walkways; install stone steps; install fence; install patio; install water feature; install new planting beds; alter deck

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- COAs mentioned are available for review.
- Changing plantings in existing beds is considered routine maintenance and no COA is required.
- Changes made to the initial staff report appear in bolded text.
- The following amended materials were provided: an existing conditions plan; photographs of the side and rear yards and existing landscape features; stone stair drawing; labeled photographs of nearby brick front walks; and updated built area calculations.

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	Master landscape plan including: alter walkways; install fence; install patio; install stone steps; install water feature; install new planting beds
1.4	Fences and Walls	Install fence; install stone steps
1.5	Walkways, Driveways, & Off-Street Parking	Alter walkways

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Collette Kinane [affirmed] reviewed the case and provided photographs of the property. She explained that the property was in the Oakwood Historic District and the COA is for a master landscape plan and a deck alteration. Ms. Kinane stated that staff recommends the committee approve the application with conditions.

New materials provided by the applicants were passed around to committee members.

Support:

Matthew Roberts [affirmed], landscape architect, presented their application to the committee. He stated that he helped design the plantings, walkway, and landscape plan. He felt that the proposed design was in keeping with the neighborhood.

Mr. Fountain asked if he had any other thoughts to staff's recommendations. Mr. Roberts said no, he thought the recommendations were all very appropriate and he has tried to address them.

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 any other questions from the committee for the applicants.

Ms. Jackson inquired about the new additional information provided. Mr. Roberts explained that the new photographs brought in today are of the deck. He said he was also asked for topographic plans to address any grading issues. He commented that he designed the landscape to keep a 2% to 4% slope to help shed water appropriately in the rear.

Mr. Fountain asked if there were other questions. Many of the things could be worked out with staff or could be a condition of approval.

Mr. Thiem said he had no comments.

Mr. Fountain asked if there was anything else from the applicant.

Mr. Ivan Bailey, the homeowner, addressed the committee. He said he was at the meeting in case there were any questions specifically addressed to him.

Mr. Hinshaw asked him if there was anything that would injure the big oak in the rear yard. Mr. Bailey replied that they loved that tree and would be careful with it.

Mr. Fountain asked if others wished to be heard or if there were any other questions. 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]:

We can make a motion [Thiem], I'll second [Hinshaw].

I have a question for you about fact number nine. It says details were not provided to reflect grade. Should we strike that or leave it? [Tully]

Discussions about some minor language choices in the facts. [Tully, Thiem, Fountain, and Hinshaw]

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 suggested finding A. (inclusive of facts 1-17)

and B. (inclusive of facts 1-7), to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Installing a master landscape plan including: altering walkways; installing a patio; installing a water feature; and installing new planting beds is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3, 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 1.3.9, 1.3.13, 1.4.11, 1.5.1; and the following facts:
- 1* According to 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 house was constructed in 1896 and is a Queen-Anne frame two-story. The description also notes: "In the yard on the left side of the house is a large white oak tree estimated to be over 250 years old as of 2012." There were two large trees on either side of the house. It is unclear which tree the description refers to specifically, but one large tree near the Polk and Bloodworth intersection was removed by February 2016 (approved through COA 032-15-MW) and the other large tree closer to 319 Polk was removed by July 2018 (no COA on file).
 - 2* Built area to open space analysis: Built area to open space calculations were provided. The included survey includes calculations for impervious area. The lot is 11,020 SF. Built area totals 4,565 SF. The existing built area to open space is 41%. The proposed built area adds 384 SF, resulting in a 45% built area to open space percentage. This is a 4% increase in built area.
 - 3* The Design Guidelines refer to not substantially increasing the original built area to open space. Calculations were not provided for the property's original built area.
 - 4* A plan locating existing trees was provided.
 - 5* The proposed patio is designed to extend west from an existing deck and will be located towards the northwest corner of the property. Blue stone is proposed as the patio material.
 - 6* The discrepancy in the 'Project Phase 1' and 'Concept Plan with Hand Features' drawings regarding the deck stair access direction has been corrected. Photographs were provided that illustrate that the deck stair access now faces north. The previous drawing showing stair access facing south was accurate prior to alterations that took place last year. The alterations to the deck were not approved via a COA. This alteration is included in this application as an after-the-fact project.
 - 7* A brick seat wall with a bluestone cap is proposed on the west side of the patio. The proposed seat wall is interrupted in the middle by a semi-circle water feature. A perspective drawing of the seat wall and water feature was provided. The seat wall is proposed to be 18" tall and 16-18" wide.
 - 8* A photograph labeled "possible alternative water feature" was included in the amended application materials. It is unclear if a change in design is being proposed for the water feature.
 - 9* The application indicates that there is a change in grade from the front yard to the side yard and proposes the installation of stone steps in the west yard where a stone wall exists. A not-to-scale sketch of the proposed steps was provided. The historic nature of the stone wall is not indicated. Photographs of the existing wall were provided.
 - 10* The proposed steps will abut the stone wall and appear to be designed in such a way that the steps would be removed at a later date without damaging the stone wall.

- 11* The concept plan drawing appears to indicate the installation of stone steppers in the east yard beginning at the end of the extant brick walk and leading to the driveway. The proposed material was not noted.
 - 12* The application proposes the removal of the existing concrete front walk and replacement with brick to match the existing minor walkways and foundation.
 - 13* Photographs were provided of other brick front walks in Oakwood. Photographs of 406 Polk (045-06-CA), 401 Polk, 502 Polk, 516 Polk, 510 Polk (MWD-90-079), and 500 Polk were provided. Except for 406 and 510 Polk as noted above, the provided examples feature brick walks that are either original to the house or pre-date the historic district.
 - 14* Three new planting beds appear to be proposed in the front and side yards: at the south west corner along the sidewalk on Polk Street, between two existing beds along the sidewalk on Bloodworth Street, and along the existing stone wall.
 - 15* The beds along the front yard adjacent to the public sidewalk are proposed to be planted with a mix of large and low shrubs that range in height, per included example photographs. Shrubs in front yards in the historic district are traditionally lower in height to maintain an open yard appearance. Guideline 1.4.11 suggests that the shrubs should be kept at a maximum 42" height to be congruous with the character of Oakwood.
 - 16* A rose garden is proposed in the lawn located to the southwest of the house. Four rectangular boxes are indicated for the rose garden. It is unclear if these are raised beds.
 - 17* The written description notes that three holly trees will be planted along the rear property line. The three trees are indicated on the planting plan as black dots.
- B. The installation of a metal fence is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.9, 1.4.8, 1.4.10, 1.4.11, and the following facts:
- 1* *Location*: The applicant proposes installing a fence along the side and rear property lines at the north west corner of the property to the existing stone wall on the west property line and the top of the driveway on the north property line.
 - 2* *Material*: The proposed fence is black wrought iron or aluminum; metal is a traditional fencing material.
 - 3* *Height*: The application states that proposed fence height is 5'-6'.
 - 4* *Configuration*: The proposed fence location is characteristic of the district.
 - 5* *Design*: The proposed fence is a pressed spear style picket. The design is traditional and simple. Traditionally, fences were constructed with neighbor friendly design, with structural members facing inward; the example fence design has the same appearance on each side. Specifications were not provided.
 - 6* Two gates are shown on the plan: one single gate at the top of the proposed stone steps and one double gate at the end of the driveway. No details were provided on the design or dimensions of the gates.
 - 7* The committee has regularly found that fences up to 6' in height are congruous with the character of the historic districts when installed in rear and side yards (except for corner lots).

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

Decision on the Application

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Mr. Thiem and seconded by Mr. Hinshaw, Mr. Thiem 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. Detailed drawings of the rose bed, including sections and materials;
 - b. Gate details, including design and dimensions;
 - c. Final design of the water feature;
2. That the shrubs along the sidewalk be kept pruned to a maximum height of 42 inches.

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

Committee members voting: Hinshaw, Bailey, Fountain, Jackson, Thiem

Certificate Expiration Date: 7/23/2020

Staff Contact: Collette Kinane, collette.kinane@raleighnc.gov

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

COA-0143-2019 1024 W SOUTH STREET

Applicant: EMILY ROTHROCK FOR SITE COLLABORATIVE

Received: 10/28/2019

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 01/26/2020

1) 12/12/2019 2) 1/23/2020 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: General HOD

Nature of Project: Construct garage; construct covered walkway; install driveway; remove and replace tree; relocate fence and retaining wall; relocate walkway; alter patio

Amendments: After the December meeting, the application was amended. The design of the garage was substantially changed from an attached garage addition to a free-standing garage connected to the house by a covered walkway.

Conflict of Interest: Ms. Jackson noted that she is employed by the same firm as one of the project architects, but had not worked on this project or had any conversations about it with her co-worker. Ms. Jackson stated she could be objective.

Staff Notes:

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

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<i>Sections</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Description of Work</i>
1.3	Site Features and Plantings	Construct garage; construct covered walkway, install driveway; remove and replace tree; relocate fence and retaining wall; relocate walkway; alter patio
1.4	Fences and Walls	Relocate fence and retaining wall
1.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Off-Street Parking	Install driveway; remove and replace tree; relocate walkway
1.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	Construct garage; construct covered walkway, install driveway; remove and replace tree
3.2	Additions	Construct garage, construct covered walkway

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Collette Kinane [affirmed] reviewed the case and provided photographs of the property, reminding the committee about the property and application. Ms. Kinane explains that staff recommends that the committee discuss the fiber cement shakes and the increase in built mass. Pending the results of that discussion, staff suggests approving the application as amended with conditions.

Support:

Emily Rothrock [affirmed] presented the application to the committee. Mr. Fountain asked the applicant to tell the committee what was new from the last meeting.

Ms. Rothrock said they had taken the committee and staff's comments into consideration and had obtained a site survey and had updated the plans to reflect this new information. New plans were distributed to staff and committee members.

Ms. Rothrock explained that they worked to provide a detached structure with a covered walkway that can accommodate the needs of the homeowner but also address staff's previous comments. She highlighted that new information about minor design alterations and built mass was included on the cover sheet.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Fountain, speaking of the site summary, asked a question about the bottom line that said 54%. He asked about the calculations of that number since the walkways was temporary. He asked if that meant that 21% should be subtracted from that number. Ms. Rothrock replied yes, subtract the area of the walkway. Ms. Rothrock explained that the number was broken down to show that the proposed ramp structure is designed in such a way that if it was later removed, the garage would still function. She added that the ramp is a temporary addition.

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

Mr. Thiem expressed confusion about the temporary walkway—asking if it was a ramp or a covering. Mr. Fountain explained to Mr. Thiem—who was absent during the applicant's first appearance before the committee—that the homeowner was ill and this ramp is designed to accommodate his needs. Mr. Thiem thanked Mr. Fountain and the other committee members for adding this background for him.

Mr. Fountain also added that at the last meeting there was a lot of concern about the absence of attached garages in the area. He said this revised plan addresses the concerns raised at the last meeting.

Ms. Tully stated that the guidelines don't generally speak to temporary issues, but that the committee had made determination before, although usually conditioned. One example was a sign on Blount Street, which had a condition that once it was no longer needed the sign would be removed. There was also another example about an access easement in Boylan Heights that had conditioned that if it was no longer needed, it could be removed. She summarized that the committee had found ways around this 'temporary' issue in the past.

Mr. Thiem thanked Ms. Tully for that additional clarification. He said he absolutely wanted to support an accommodation for accessibility, but due to his absence last month, was concerned

about the extent of the structure since it was atypical of what they have done before. He said he trusted staff's guidance on the matter.

Mr. Fountain asked if there were other questions.

Mr. Hinshaw asked about the fiber cement shakes and whether the committee has dealt with them before. Ms. Tully and Ms. Kinane answered that this was the first time they've dealt with them on an accessory structure. They have been approved on new construction, but not on accessory structures with a historic property.

Mr. Thiem asked about having to deal with the building codes later. Mr. Fountain asked if he was referring to the walkway or the fiber cement shakes. Mr. Thiem clarified that he was discussing the walkway. Ms. Brooke Tate, project architect [affirmed], said the walkway was technically separate and could be removed in the future and that it was not an issue with the building code.

Mr. Fountain asked if there were any other questions or discussion.

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 seems like a reasonable way to address these concerns, but we may have to modify the language of the findings. [Fountain]

Can the language changes suggest that this is a temporary measure and is tied to the current residents' ownership of the property? [Thiem]

This could be a potential condition, that the walkway gets removed if the property changes hands. Raspberry can speak to the legality of that. [Tully]

I just want it to be clear that we're approving this because of special circumstances. [Thiem]
The condition that removal is expected with a change of ownership likely sets a bad precedent, but we could want to indicate how this is a special circumstance. [Raspberry]

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

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

When Mr. Hinshaw moved to make a decision on the application, committee members discussed some language modifications for the findings of fact. Concerns were raised by Ms. Jackson about language being included to reflect the special accommodation of current occupants and Mr. Fountain and Mr. Thiem, along with staff, found an appropriate solution to reflect these concerns with the legal guidance of Mr. Raspberry.

Mr. Hinshaw moved that based on the information contained in the application and materials in the evidentiary hearing, the Committee finds staff findings A. (inclusive of facts 1-25) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-5) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Constructing a garage; constructing a covered walkway, removing and replacing a tree; and installing a driveway 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, 1.5.5, 1.5.6, 1.5.9, 1.6.6, 1.6.7, 1.6.8, 1.6.11, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.4, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.7, 3.2.8, 3.2.9, 3.2.11, 3.2.12; and the following facts:
- 1* According to the “National Register of Historic Places Inventory-Nomination Form” for the Boylan Heights National Register Historic District, the house was constructed in 1921 and is a Craftsman bungalow.
 - 2* The garage is proposed in the rear yard with the garage doors addressing the alley and at the end of a proposed concrete driveway.
 - 3* Garages in Boylan Heights are typically located at the rear of the lot adjacent to the alley and not attached to historic houses.
 - 4* The proposed garage is a gable-roofed 1-car garage that is significantly lower in height than the main house. The footprint is approximately 16’x24’.
 - 5* The garage is proposed to connect to the historic house through a covered walkway.
 - 6* The covered walkway is 5’ wide and approximately 113’ long. Materials were specified: composite decking, standing seam metal roof, and wooden structure. A section drawing was provided. Manufacturer’s specifications for the metal roof were not provided.
 - 7* An existing window on the south elevation is proposed to be converted to a door to allow access through the covered walkway.
 - 8* The walkway will be constructed in such a way that it could be removed at a later date, as an accommodation for the health needs of the current occupant.
 - 9* The size and scale of the garage is not atypical of newly constructed garages in the district. The design features are similar to that of the main house which is often seen in historic accessory buildings.
 - 10* The proposed garage door is 10’, a typical width for a 1-car garage.
 - 11* The materials of the garage are proposed to match the house; however, the gable ends are proposed to be filled with fiber cement shakes. Fiber cement shakes have previously only been approved for use on new construction of primary structures.
 - 12* The garage doors are proposed to be solid-wood with glass panels in the top portion. Specifications were provided; however, the hardware has not yet been selected.
 - 13* Two 6-over-1 windows are proposed on the east façade of the garage. These windows are simpler than the 8-over-1 windows on the historic house. Specifications were provided.
 - 14* The windows are shown with a picture frame trim rather than the traditional casing and sill as has found to be congruous.
 - 15* The application states that the proposed addition “works with existing grade and alley.” Topography is included on both the existing conditions and the proposed improvements plot plans.
 - 16* The built area of the existing conditions is approximately 2,850 square feet; the lot is 6,498 square feet; the lot coverage is approximately 43.9%. The proposed built area is 3,796 SF, the new lot coverage would be 58.4%. The increase in built area is 946 SF or 14.5%.
 - 17* The Design Guidelines refer to not substantially increasing the original built area to open space. Calculations were not provided for the property’s original built area. A screened porch addition was approved in 2000 (094-00-CA).
 - 18* The application includes existing built area percentages for neighboring properties. The percentages range from 30.5% to 56.8%.

- 19* The built mass of the existing conditions is approximately 2,129 square feet; the lot is 6,100 square feet; the lot coverage is approximately 32.8%. The proposed built area is 2,853 SF, the new lot coverage would be 43.9%. The increase in built mass is 724 SF or 11.1%.
 - 20* The application includes existing built mass percentages for neighboring properties. The percentages range from 24.7% to 51.1%.
 - 21* The Design Guidelines refer to not substantially increasing the original built mass to open space. The property's original built mass was 1,620 SF or 24.9%. A screened porch addition was approved in 2000 (094-00-CA).
 - 22* Two photographs of alley-facing garages in Boylan Heights were included in the application. Addresses were not provided. Staff identified the top photographs as 503 Cutler Street. The attached garage was approved along with construction of a new house through 121-15-CA. The location of the garage was approved in part, due the existence of a historic retaining wall immediately adjacent to the alley.
 - 23* A concrete driveway is proposed to provide access to the garage from the alley. The concrete is proposed to match the appearance of the existing concrete sidewalk and curb cuts along West South Street. The alley is gravel.
 - 24* One 16" DBH Pecan tree located on the rear property line is proposed for removal. A 2" River Birch is proposed as a replacement.
 - 25* A plan locating trees greater than 8" DBH and a tree protection plan were provided.
- B. Relocating a fence, retaining wall, and walkway are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 1.3.9, 1.4.1, 1.4.2, 1.5.1, 1.5.5, 1.5.9; and the following facts:
- 1* The application proposes the relocation of the existing fence and gate to allow for the proposed driveway. The relocated fence runs along the northwest line of the driveway to the stone walkway.
 - 2* A serpentine stone retaining wall creates the patio area and landscaped beds in the rear yard. The landscaping was approved through COA 094-00-CA.
 - 3* The application proposes the relocation of the stone retaining wall. The proposed configuration is angular and creates a rectangular patio/lawn space. It appears that some grading infill will be required to relocate the wall closer to the house.
 - 4* The existing patio is proposed to be removed and relocated closer to the rear of the historic house. This is a typical location for a patio. The stones from the existing patio are proposed to be reused to form the new patio and walkway.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the tree protection plan be implemented and remain in place for the duration of construction.
2. That there be no demolition delay for removal of the tree.
3. That the windows have a sill.

4. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. Manufacturer's specification for the metal roof
 - b. Final fence and gate elevation and section drawings, if any design changes are made;
 - c. Garage door hardware

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

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

Certificate Expiration Date: 07/23/2020

Staff Contact: Collette Kinane, collette.kinane@raleighnc.gov

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

COA-0141-2019 2310 BEDFORD AVENUE

Applicant: CHRISTINE MASTRANGELO

Received: 10/28/2019

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 1/26/2020

1) 01/23/2020 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OBERLIN VILLAGE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: GENERAL HISTORIC OVERLAY DISTRICT (HOD-G)

Nature of Project: Construct addition; relocate existing deck; remove fencing; alter driveway

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at the November 25, 2019 meeting. Members in attendance were Elizabeth Caliendo, Don Davis, and Mary Ruffin Hanbury; also present were staff members Tania Tully and Collette Kinane, and applicant Cydney Clemons and Brandy Thompson. An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at the January 6, 2020 meeting. Members in attendance were: Dan Becker, Sarah David, Jenny Harper, and David Maurer; also present were staff members Tania Tully and Collette Kinane, and applicants Cydney Clemons and Chrissy Mastrangelo.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<i>Sections</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Description of Work</i>
1.3	Site Features and Plantings	Construct addition; relocate existing deck; remove fencing; alter driveway
1.4	Fences & Walls	Remove fencing
1.5	Walkways, Driveways, & Off-Street Parking	Alter driveway
3.1	Deck	Relocate existing deck
3.2	Additions	Construct addition

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Collette Kinane [affirmed] reviewed the case and provided photographs of the property, highlighting where the proposed addition would exist. Staff recommends that the committee approve the application with conditions.

Since new information was handed out as Ms. Kinane was introducing the case, Mr. Thiem asked Mr. Fountain if the committee could have a minute to look at the new material. Mr. Fountain replied that they should hear from the applicant first and then decide if time is necessary.

Support:

Cydney Clemons [affirmed], project architect, presented their application to the committee. She said the materials handed out were in response to staff comments and that staff had seen them on Tuesday. Ms. Tully clarified that no, the staff had not seen them, and was not allowed to look at them at that point. Mr. Rasberry asked Ms. Clemons if she understood she was acting as a fact witness. She said yes, she understood.

Mr. Fountain asked Ms. Clemons to tell the committee about the project and address staff comments. Ms. Clemons explained that the project is an addition to house, an expansion of the kitchen, that's why it is on the front of the house. The wall steps back a small bit to allow corner board to keep shadow line and the roof to maintain a similar hipped form. It will be low and deferential to the main structure. There is some fencing on rear deck would be removed, some paving would be removed, and some of the shrubs that will be removed would be replaced. As for staff comments, she said they provided some historical evidence of precedent for vinyl windows and wider driveways---partially for accessibility reasons. They also had the property surveyed and have provided an updated site plan that is more current and included reference to the only tree in vicinity---a pecan.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Bailey asked if a COA has ever been issued to replace wood with vinyl. Ms. Tully replied that not since the 1970s under the current design guidelines.

Ms. Jackson asked for clarification on the historic research report for the Oberlin Village designation and whether structures were identified as contributing despite having vinyl windows. Ms. Tully explained that in both Oberlin and Prince Hall, many of the structures had been altered. To determine whether a building was contributing or not, it needed to meet roughly 3 of 5 established character-defining features.

Ms. Jackson inquired whether vinyl windows were non-contributing---that they would have been replacements. Ms. Tully said the report does not get into that level of detail, especially if the period of significance for the district runs into the 1970s.

Mr. Thiem commented that the applicant had made miscalculation when calculating the CRZ, nothing major, but it was measuring radius and not diameter.

Ms. Clemons asked about wood composite and whether it had been approved for some window replacements. Ms. Tully answered that it had not, at least in Raleigh. She added that it was worth making the case for it, but that it had not been approved as of now.

Ms. Clemons then clarified that there had been a miscommunication about that option between the applicant, herself, and a product representative. Ms. Tully added that it might have been on a National Register property, but not in a Raleigh historic overlay district.

Ms. Lily Tomlinson, a neighbor and general contractor, made a statement to the committee. She said there's a case for the vinyl windows since they were installed before the home was in a

historic district, so forcing them to replace the windows with wood would not match---this would potentially make the property mismatch unintentionally.

Mr. Fountain agreed that with the two new historic overlay districts, that was something to think about.

Mr. Fountain asked if there were other questions.

Ms. Clemons said they were concerned about the driveway expansion. Staff said they would approve with conditions if not paved, but clients would like to pave it. Photos of the driveway show the one side by the fence as a tripping hazard. The applicants would at least like to pave that strip for accessibility reasons. They would be willing to accept that the other side's expansion would have to be in a different material.

Mr. Thiem asked for clarification. He wanted to know if they meant that one side would be concrete and the other would be gravel. Ms. Clemons replied yes, gravel or something else that's approved. Mr. Thiem said the committee does not often get into design. He commented that the driveway looks extremely tight, but they can work with staff to fix that.

Mr. Jeff Mastrangelo, the owner, mentioned that he had a bigger vehicle and had been parking it in the grass for the last few years.

Mr. Fountain asked if there were other questions.

Ms. Jackson asked about the setback of the kitchen addition and for a certain detail image. Ms. Clemons said it was in the new packet, A105 is the plan detail. Ms. Jackson asked if she knew what the depth was---where the studs are offset. Ms. Clemons said that pending field verification, they intend for the existing wall to step in and allow space for the corner board and for the gutter to run the length.

Mr. Fountain asked if there were other questions.

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]:

It is interesting and challenging because of the way this district is laid out, having to deal with a driveway issue. Are there precedents for this? [Thiem] 2210 Bedford. [Fountain]

Discussion on whether Tower Street is within the district [Tully, Jackson, and Clemons]

How much of the determination should be site versus building? [Thiem] Maybe 10% site. [Tully]

Since period of significance ended in 1970, different issues for us to deal with than in Oakwood or Boylan. [Thiem] Yes, the character of this area and the period of significance would incorporate the rise of car culture. [Tully]

Staff's interpretation of the guidelines will always be on the stricter side until determined otherwise. [Tully]

Due to additional question posed by the committee, Mr. Fountain reopened the public testimony portion of the meeting.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Ms. Mastrangelo stated that last summer she broke her ankle on the side of the driveway the committee is discussing. She said that not having that one side paved is a safety issue for her and her children.

Mr. Thiem said that within the context of this neighborhood, converting this driveway into a side-by-side is very congruent and that the width for the city standard is 8 feet, or 17 feet for a side-by-side. He said he was unsure how a different material would maintain congruity with the site and suggested that the committee looks at the little throat piece. He stated that he did not want to see any erosion issues. Ms. Tully added that if they decided to approve, they should change the conditions of the driveway expansion to incorporate new language.

Mr. Fountain asked if there was a finding that said the property was non-contributing. Ms. Kinane said yes, fact number 1.

Mr. Fountain asked if there were other questions or topics for discussion.

Mr. Rasberry wanted to speak to Mr. Thiem's comment on this being new and different. He reminded the committee that the legal standard is whether a proposal is congruous with the special character of the district. He wanted to underscore that the legal standard is not assessing congruity with the design guidelines but with the historic overlay district.

Mr. Thiem offered that in this district, there is a long period of significance and that there were lots of different things in this neighborhood. Mr. Hinshaw added that he felt the real significance of this district is cultural history, not architectural history.

Mr. Fountain, after asking about other questions, closed the public hearing and resumed the closed committee discussion.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION (2)

I think there is a question about our final determination on the vinyl windows. [Thiem]

Since the property is non-contributing and already has these windows, we want to preserve the character. [Fountain]

This makes sense for a non-contributing building. It might differ for an accessory building. [Bailey]

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

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

After Mr. Thiem made an initial motion on this application, Ms. Tully suggested that staff add a fact about the district's period of significance under section B. Mr. Fountain agreed, stating that

an eighth fact was needed to recognize that the utilization of automobiles was more common in this district than other, older historic districts.

Mr. Thiem moved that based on the information contained in the application and materials in the evidentiary hearing, the Committee finds staff findings A. (inclusive of facts 1-17) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-8), to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Constructing an addition, relocating a deck, and removing a fence are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.6, 1.3.7, 1.4.1, 1.4.10, 1.4.11, 3.1.1, 3.1.4, 3.1.6, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.6, 3.2.7, 3.2.8, 3.2.9, 3.2.10, 3.2.11; and the following facts:
 - 1* The "Historic Research Report for the Designation of the Oberlin Village Historic District" describes the house thusly: "The two-story hipped-roof frame house with an inset two-story porch was constructed for the Mastrangelos in 2014 on the footprint of an early 20th century house. Windows have 6/6 vinyl sashes." The report classifies the house as non-contributing.
 - 2* Photographs illustrating the changes to the structure over time were provided.
 - 3* The application notes that there are a variety of built forms in the Oberlin Village historic district and that much of the neighborhood's significance lies in its cultural history and with notable persons associated with the neighborhood's establishment. The period of significance for Oberlin Village is defined as 1873 to 1970 and is tied to the establishment and decline of the community identity of the neighborhood.
 - 4* The application proposes the construction of a 254 SF one-story addition on the east side of the house.
 - 5* The addition extends the wall plane of the front wall of the house. A reveal at the existing corner board is proposed to provide differentiation from the existing house. The depth of the reveal was not provided.
 - 6* The front of the addition is proposed to be screened with foundation shrubs.
 - 7* The description notes that the height of the addition and the topography of the site will minimize the visual scale of the addition from the street.
 - 8* The addition is proposed to be clad in fiber cement siding and painted to match the house. Architectural detailing (trim and corner boards) are proposed to match existing.
 - 9* The proposed roof form is hipped, similar to the existing roof form. Materials will match existing. Architectural details (fascia, eaves, and trim) will match existing.
 - 10* Roof plan drawings were not provided for either the existing or proposed designs.
 - 11* To facilitate construction of the addition, the existing deck is proposed to be relocated further to the north. The dimensions and design will remain the same.
 - 12* The application provides an evaluation of overall width and house-to-lot-width ratios. The majority of well-related properties have a house-to-lot-width ratio range from 71-75%. The proposed addition would increase the house-to-lot-width ratio from 53% to 71.9%.
 - 13* Photographs of other properties in Oberlin Village with a house-to-lot-width ratio in the 70% range were provided:
 - a. 2208 Bedford Avenue - 75% house-to-lot-width ratio.
 - b. 710 Chamberlain Street - 72% house-to-lot-width ratio.
 - c. 2312 Bedford Avenue - 75% house-to-lot-width ratio. This contributing house is immediately to the west.
 - d. 2208 Roberts Street - 71% house-to-lot-width ratio.
 - e. 2211 Roberts Street - 72% house-to-lot-width ratio.

- f. 2210 Bedford Avenue – 72% house-to-lot-width ratio. This non-contributing property has a similar one-bay addition on the side of the property.
- 14* Photographs of the variety of architectural styles on Bedford Avenue and Van Dyke Avenue were provided.
- 15* Windows are proposed to match existing. The existing windows are vinyl and were installed on existing non-contributing structure prior to district designation.
- 16* One section of privacy fencing at the head of the driveway is proposed to be removed to construct the addition.
- 17* Information on trees with critical root zones located in the area of construction was provided. A tree protection plan was not provided. The correct CRZ for the 15" pecan is 18.75' in radius, not diameter.
- B. Altering a driveway is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section 1.5.5, 1.5.7, 1.5.10; and the following facts:
- 1* The existing driveway is a single-car width concrete driveway that extends beyond the front wall of the house.
- 2* The proposed location of the addition requires that a portion of the driveway be removed.
- 3* The existing driveway is proposed to be doubled in width in front of the proposed addition. Materials are proposed to match existing.
- 4* A two-car width concrete driveway is typical for properties in residential historic districts.
- 5* The Committee has previously approved double-width driveways where the second space is not concrete or paved.
- 6* Evidence was provided to illustrate congruity with residential driveways in the Oberlin Village Historic District.
- 7* No changes to the existing curb cut are proposed.
- 8* The period of significance for Oberlin Village is defined as 1873 to 1970. The utilization of automobiles was more common in this district than older historic districts because the period of significance extends through the rise and establishment of car culture.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the siding be installed smooth side out.
2. That the driveway expansion may be concrete or paved.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the COA blue placard:
 - a. Manufacturer's specifications for windows, showing both section and elevation views, and material descriptions.
 - b. A tree protection plan.
4. That the "throat" of the driveway may be redesigned, if necessary, in consultation with staff.

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

Committee members voting: Hinshaw, Bailey, Fountain, Jackson, Thiem

Certificate Expiration Date: 07/23/2020

Staff Contact: Collette Kinane, collette.kinane@raleighnc.gov

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

COA-0165-2019 111 E NORTH STREET

Applicant: DON MUNFORD

Received: 12/05/2019

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 03/04/2020

1) 1/23/2020 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Raleigh Historic Landmark: ANDREWS-DUNCAN HOUSE

Historic District: BLOUNT STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: General HOD

Nature of Project: Master landscape plan; install arbor; install fence; install new planting beds; install screening plants; install walkways; install site lighting

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- The “Special Character of Blount Street Historic District” description contains: “...well maintained and generous landscapes...granite street curbing throughout the neighborhood...[an] open spatial quality and character...side and rear yards are not segmented by privacy fences to the extent of the other residential districts, which also contributes to the feeling of spatial openness. Even though the Executive Mansion grounds are encircled by a high fence, the design of the fence with its simple wrought iron panels is transparent enough that it provides the necessary security without markedly detracting from the sense of open space in the district.”
- This parcel is located within the Raleigh Historic Landmark boundary of the Andrews-Duncan House but has been subdivided since Landmark designation. The parcel is now associated with the Howell House, a historic house located to the southwest of the Andrews-Duncan House.
- 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	Master landscape plan; install arbor; install fence; install new planting beds; install screening plants
1.4	Fences and Walls	Install fence; install screening plants
1.5	Walkways, Driveways, & Off-Street Parking	Install walkways
1.7	Lighting	Install site lighting

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Collette Kinane [affirmed] reviewed the case and provided photographs of the property and its boundary lines and which portions of the site are no longer part of the property. Ms. Kinane explained that the property is a Raleigh Historic Landmark---the

Andrews-Duncan House. She said that staff recommends that the committee should approve the application with conditions.

Support:

Laura Willer [affirmed], landscape designer, presented their application to the committee. She explained that she had prepared the plan for Don Munford, the client and owner. After looking over the conditions and staff recommendations, she stated that they were generally okay with staff's comments. They would, however, like clarification on the matter of screening and what is permissible.

Ms. Willer explained that in the landscape plan, the screening was functionally serving as privacy fencing, but that they were certainly willing to scale it back. Before making changes though, Ms. Willer wanted a clear idea of what was possible and what plantings would be approved. She mentioned that she was using the Merriman Wynn House as inspiration and that it has a lot of evergreen screening in the front and on the sides.

Don Munford, the owner, also spoke in support of the application. He said the project was a labor of love and his aunt was part of the process of getting the house a Raleigh historic marker in 1939. He said the area is currently in disrepair and when he saw the property for sale, he wanted to purchase it and make it into a park. He said they have tried to abide by historic standards when renovating the associated house.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Before starting the public testimony portion, Mr. Fountain wanted to give staff a moment to discuss green screening. Ms. Tully answered that the design guidelines treat fencing and plant screening in the same way. They both address issues of height and opacity. She told the committee they could think about it as a fence made out of vegetation.

Mr. Thiem posed a question unrelated to the plant material. He was curious about the location of the path from the lawn to the street. He commented that it seemed like an odd place and he had not often seen a lot of connections to the corner. He asked whether the applicant would be open to the path going to the sidewalk and not the corner. Ms. Willer said they would be open to that. They had designed it like that because they liked the path curving down. Mr. Munford added that he thought it would be accessible and appealing to people walking by but could change that.

Mr. Thiem said they could also create two connections, one on each side.

Mr. Fountain asked the staff about the drawing and whether the groups of arborvitae would be tall and would that matter. Ms. Tully answered that they were arborvitae and magnolia and that they would grow to about 48 inches.

Mr. Thiem asked if the setback on the plan matched the house. Ms. Willer replied yes.

Mr. Thiem imagined that in a neighborhood, someone putting up a 15-foot hedge between two houses would be incongruous. He said 6 feet is already hard to see over so the extra 9 feet do not matter as much. He added that the case presented by the Merriman Wynn house provides a different way of looking at the house. He felt that the committee had made an error in that case,

but said he understood that the question going forward is about the density of the plant material.

Ms. Willer asked if she could make a comment. She stated that on the back side of the property, by the Andrews-Duncan House, they were not intending to make one continuous hedge but wanted some vegetation as a backdrop for the arbor. She said they were happy to change the plants and remove the green giant arborvitae, but they felt pretty strongly about the screening on the middle of the house.

Mr. Thiem replied that the magnolias are fine and was surprised at how big the giant arborvitae can get. He asked if they would be willing to select different plant material to reduce the setback from the street. Mr. Munford agreed. He offered that one reason for the green giant arborvitae that the view from the house is into an ugly parking lot.

Mr. Thiem offered a compliment to Ms. Willer on her design of a white garden. She thanked Mr. Thiem and explained that it would work as a neutral backdrop when the property was used as event space.

Ms. Jackson wanted clarification on the property's name. Ms. Willer explained that the property has had several names, the staff are calling it the Howell House, the owner is referring to it as the Henry Clay Oak House. Mr. Munford added that historically the whole block was part of the Andrews-Duncan House. Ms. Tully further clarified that the owner is changing it to match the historic plaque.

Ms. Willer posed another question for the committee about the emerald arborvitae and whether that was too much as well. She wondered whether it would be okay on the front side. Mr. Thiem discussed the plantings and the general character of the place and that hollies might add a greater level of transparency. He said he felt strongly that everything in front of that setback line should be reduced. Ms. Willer asked if he even meant the front side. He replied that he was not concerned about the canopy trees—just about the ground level stuff.

Ms. Jackson said that she wanted to add a comment about the special character of the Blount Street district. She said they may want to keep some of that open quality on the eastern side of the property and that spatial openness was one of the special characteristics of the Blount district.

Mr. Thiem commented that he would like to see the lawn area clarified on the plan.

The committee asked if others would like to speak.

Matthew Brown, an area resident approached the podium to speak about this application. He said he appreciated what Mr. Munford has done to the property and his efforts to beautify the corner. He added that as far as the sidewalk connecting at the corner, he said there is a similar corner connection in Oakwood.

Mr. Fountain asked if anyone else would like to speak.

Opposition:

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

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]:

People who use the space will determine where the sidewalk should be. [Hinshaw]

Related questions about the magnolias—how opaque are they? [Hinshaw] This is a shorter variety. [Thiem]

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 A. (inclusive of facts 1-13) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-7), to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Installing a master landscape plan, including: installing new planting beds; an arbor; walkways; and site lighting is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 1.3.9, 1.3.13, 1.4.11, 1.5.5, 1.5.6, 1.5.10, 1.5.11, 1.7.4, 1.7.5, 1.7.6, 1.7.11; however, the density and height of the plantings along the northern and eastern edges is incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 1.3.2, 1.3.4, 1.4.11 and the following facts:
- 1* The “Henry Clay Oak” that previously stood on the parcel was removed in 1991 due to disease and weather damage.
 - 2* The parcel is currently a vacant grassy lot with approximately three paved parking spaces located on the western edge. Although the parcel is associated with the Howell House via ownership, it remains visually and historically connected to the adjacent Andrews-Duncan House.
 - 3* The proposed landscape plan includes an oval lawn on the interior of the parcel surrounded by a bed of trees, shrubs, perennials, and annuals. Photographs and mature dimensions of each proposed plant were provided.
 - 4* The landscape design adjacent to the public sidewalk is proposed to be planted with a mix of large and low shrubs and trees that range in height, per included example photographs. Shrubs in front yards in the historic district are traditionally lower in height to maintain an open yard appearance. Guideline 1.4.11 suggests that the shrubs should be kept at a maximum 42” height to be congruous with traditional neighborhood character.
 - 5* It is unclear from the application where the proposed plantings sit in relationship to the Andrews-Duncan House.
 - 6* An elevation showing the density of the proposed plantings immediately adjacent to the street was included; however, no illustrations for other parts of the plan were provided.
 - 7* The height and density of the proposed plantings are functionally servicing as privacy fencing. The commission has only found privacy fencing to be congruous in the historic districts when on rear and side yards (not corner side yards) and at a maximum of 6’ tall
 - 8* The application includes a statement of design intent that provides a historic context for some of the proposed design elements.
 - 9* The lawn and paths are proposed to be edged in brick. The brick is proposed to match the existing brick at the Howell House.
 - 10* A wooden arbor is proposed on the north side of the lawn. The proposed arbor is 6’ wide, 3’ deep, and 7’ tall. Arbors are traditional garden features.

- 11* Two pea gravel paths are proposed to be installed. One leading from the parking area to the lawn on the western side of the parcel, and the other beginning at the sidewalk intersection at the southeast corner and leading northwest to the lawn. Gravel color was not specified.
 - 12* The application includes a proposed lighting plan. Low voltage lighting is proposed along the pathways and around the lawn area. The arbor is also proposed to be internally lit. A photograph of the proposed lighting style was included.
 - 13* Photographs of the Merrimon-Wynne House (500 N Blount Street) and William Peace University Campus (15 E Peace Street), other designed landscapes in the Blount Street district, were provided. The Merrimon-Wynne landscape was approved through COAs 107-13-CA, 147-13-CA, 133-15-CA, and 046-16-MW. One landscaping plan was filed for William Peace University, CAD-91-044, for the parking area at the corner of E Peace and Blount Streets.
- B. The installation of a fence is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* 1.3.9, 1.4.8, 1.4.10, 1.4.11, and the following facts:
- 1* *Location*: The applicant proposes installing a fence along the east, north, and south property lines of the Howell House side yard.
 - 2* *Material*: The proposed fence is black wrought iron or aluminum with brick column posts; metal and brick are traditional fencing materials.
 - 3* *Height*: The application states that proposed fence height is 42".
 - 4* *Configuration*: The proposed fence location is characteristic of the district.
 - 5* *Design*: The proposed fence is a Quad finial style picket with 16" wide brick column posts. The design is traditional and simple. Traditionally, fences were constructed with neighbor friendly design, with structural members facing inward; the fence design has the same appearance on each side. Photographs of the proposed fence and gate design were provided.
 - 6* Two gates are shown on the plan: one gate at the entrance from the parking area and one gate at the east entrance. The gate is proposed to match the design of the fence with a decorative arch.
 - 7* Photographs of the existing fence at William Peace University (15 E Peace Street) was provided as a similarly designed example. The fence was extended along Blount Street through COA CAD-91-044.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the shrubs along the sidewalks be kept pruned to a maximum height of 42 inches.
2. That the height of the plantings the eastern edge of the property, between Blount Street and the front wall of the Andrews-Duncan House, be a maximum height of 6', with an exception to the 2 or 3 specimen evergreens that may be planted in this area.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:

a. Gravel color.

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

Committee members voting: Hinshaw, Bailey, Fountain, Jackson, Thiem

Certificate Expiration Date: 07/23/2020

Staff Contact: Collette Kinane, collette.kinane@raleighnc.gov

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

COA-0160-2019 501 E LANE STREET A

Applicant: MICHAEL POUPARD FOR GRAYSON HOMES LLC

Received: 12/03/2019

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 03/02/2020

1) 01/23/2020 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: General HOD

Nature of Project: Construct new house; install driveway; plant trees

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its January 6, 2020 meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker, Sarah David, Jenny Harper and David Maurer; also present were Mike Poupard, applicant, David Kenoyer, and Collette Kinane and Tania Tully, staff.

Conflict of Interest: Mr. Rasberry stated that he had worked with the applicant, Mr. Poupard, on the subject property's subdivision process, but had not been involved with or discussed the historic nature of the properties.

Staff Notes:

- The demolition of the church formerly on the site was approved with 041-18-CA. The case is available for review.
- The subdivision of 501 E Lane Street has been approved by City Council through case S-48-18. New addresses for each parcel have not been provided.
- During the hearing, cases COA-0160-2020, COA-0167-2020, and COA-0168-2020 were discussed at the same time, the discussion and motions included in each Certified Record are identical.

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; install driveway; plant trees
1.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Off-street Parking	Install driveway
3.3	New Construction	Construct new house

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Collette Kinane [affirmed] reviewed the case and provided photographs of the vacant site with notes on how the site was subdivided.

Ms. Kinane explained that although these are three separate COAs and proposed residences, they occupy a single site. She asked the committee if they would prefer to look at these three applications separately or collectively. Mr. Fountain answered that they would be reviewed collectively and the committee can refer to them as properties A, B, and C as necessary. Ms. Kinane identified A as the corner, B as the middle, and C as the easternmost property.

Mr. Fountain asked if the parcels were of identical dimensions or if the corner lot was wider. Ms. Kinane answered that they differed in size and the corner lot is slightly wider. Mr. Bailey inquired whether the City Council had divided the property or if they still legally had the same address. Ms. Kinane answered that the property has been officially subdivided; however, the new addressing had not shown up on iMaps yet.

Ms. Kinane explained that staff suggests deferring the application until further information is provided. Importantly, staff suggests the committee should look for evidence of congruity with the character of Oakwood and nearby properties. The additional information that staff thinks the Committee should receive prior to making a decision includes:

- 1) Manufacturer's specifications for windows, showing both section and elevation views, muntin profiles and material descriptions.
- 2) Detailed drawings and/or specifications for the following:
 - a) Roof material;
 - b) Exposed rafter tails;
 - c) Trim at windows, doors and transitions between materials;
 - d) Brick specifications/sample for the color, size and bond pattern;
 - e) Paint and stain color swatches from paint manufacturer;
 - f) Doors, showing both section and elevation views, muntin profiles and material descriptions;
 - g) Porch railings showing both elevation and section views;
 - h) Porch screening material for the full edge of the rear porch;
 - i) Soffit construction;
 - j) Exterior lighting including locations on the building;
 - k) Finish specifications for the gutters and downspouts, and location on the building shown on elevation drawings;
 - l) Porch ceiling materials and finish;
 - m) Species and size details for new trees.
 - n) Master landscape plan

Support:

Mike Poupard [affirmed], of Grayson Homes, was present to gather feedback from the committee. He identified himself as the developer and builder for the project and would welcome any comments and suggestions from staff and committee on the three proposed applications (COA-0160-2019; COA-0167-2019, and COA-0168-2019).

Mr. Fountain asked if he had any comments or questions about staff's notes. Mr. Poupard replied no, nothing negative. He understood what needs to be done but would like to hear the committee's ideas and different perspectives. Mr. Poupard stated that he accepted the staff's recommended deferral and was appearing tonight to gather any additional comments that staff or the committee would like to offer.

Mr. Fountain commented that the applicant should look over all the additional information and materials that staff felt important for the committee to possess before making a decision. Mr. Poupard acknowledged this comment and said they would be well prepared for the next meeting.

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Fountain asked if there were any questions for the applicant. He said feedback might be helpful and save sometime next month.

Mr. Thiem wanted to clarify one issue that staff noted. He wanted to confirm that staff wanted the committee to look at the context of the proposed buildings and how they relate to the street, and whether they were consistent for the neighborhood. Mr. Poupard stated that they could provide a rendering. Mr. Thiem said they wouldn't necessarily need front views, that they were more concerned about setbacks relative to other properties.

Mr. Fountain said they needed to think about height in relation to other structures and for precedents in Oakwood, for properties that are nearby. Mr. Poupard said that on the block there were lots of one-story residences and across the street there were many two-story structures. He said he noticed a lot of height variation when driving around the area. He stated that the proposed properties would be two stories. Mr. Fountain commented that there are two-stories that don't dominate over one-stories.

Mr. Hinshaw added that while visiting the site he noticed that there might be some grading issues. Mr. Poupard explained that any perceived grading issues would probably be from the removal of the older properties and that the crew might have missed something in the backfill, acknowledging that they could have done better with that. Any issues would be resolved when the new houses were finished.

Mr. Fountain asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. Thiem said he had a question for staff, or maybe the committee. He had read that to preserve a historic district's character any new construction must be visually distinguishable. It can take design cues from existing properties but should not imitate them. He expressed concern that the new properties might appear as copies of historic houses. He said he was struggling to envision how these houses distinguished themselves as unique buildings but be modern in scale.

Ms. Tully added that they should consider whether "distinguishable" was intended as something that was distinguishable for a lay person or a design professional. Mr. Thiem said knowing more about those differences would be helpful. Ms. Tully explained that materiality would be a way to assess whether something is distinguishable. In this case, the use of fiber cement on new properties. Mr. Thiem asked if material selection alone then would be enough to distinguish older properties from new construction. Ms. Tully replied yes.

Mr. Fountain asked Ms. Jackson if she saw anything in the application. She replied that she thought the applicant was well on their way.

Mr. Fountain asked the committee if there was anything else.

Ms. Kinane suggested that some other guests in attendance might like to speak.

Mr. Fountain asked if there was anyone in the audience to speak in favor or in opposition to the applications.

Matthew Brown, community resident, spoke in support of the applications. He thanked the committee for their service to historic preservation and the detailed staff analysis. In his opinion, the proposed design meet the Design Guidelines and do not appear as faux historic. The proposed developments seem to take their design cues from the early twentieth century. One of the properties—B—has features from the Arts and Crafts and Mediterranean Revival styles. The third property, C, appears to have one and a half stories which transitions nicely to the adjacent property. He added that he agreed with the staff finding that the solid concrete driveway is not generally considered congruous and can hope that design element can be modified. He said other than that, the proposed designs are pretty good.

Mr. Poupard asked if he could say one more thing. He asked about a comment made on the roof of property C and whether it would blend in more with a different pitch. He asked if that would be preferred by the committee and staff or whether it would be shot down. Mr. Thiem replied that his question goes to his earlier comment about not matching something in the neighborhood. Ms. Jackson said she thought that roof would fit for new construction. The attention of the applicant to the context of the neighborhood and its variation in story heights, was in her perspective, a positive and would encourage the applicant to stay in that route instead of deviating. Ms. Tully added that there was evidence in this neighborhood of varying heights and that would come into play here.

Another nearby resident of the proposed project, Chris Crew of Elm Street, also spoke in support of the development. He complimented staff on the write up and generally stands in support of this application. He expressed his surprise that only three of their neighbors were in attendance tonight. Mr. Crew explained that the previous building was massive and that the proposed designs of the new projects are generally in keeping with the scope and scale of that part of the neighborhood. He added that he would like to see more details on the finishes but suggested approving with conditions. He finished by stating that the neighbors would appreciate seeing something go on with this property.

Opposition:

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

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

Decision on the Application

Mr. Thiem made a motion to defer the application. The motion was seconded by Ms. Jackson; passed 5/0.

Committee members voting: Hinshaw, Bailey, Fountain, Jackson, Thiem

Staff Contact: Collette Kinane, collette.kinane@raleighnc.gov.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

COA-0167-2019 501 E LANE STREET B

Applicant: MICHAEL POUPARD FOR GRAYSON HOMES LLC

Received: 12/03/2019

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 03/02/2020

1) 01/23/2020 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: General HOD

Nature of Project: Construct new house; install driveway; plant trees

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its January 6, 2020 meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker, Sarah David, Jenny Harper and David Maurer; also present were Mike Poupard, applicant, David Kenoyer, and Collette Kinane and Tania Tully, staff.

Conflict of Interest: Mr. Rasberry stated that he had worked with the applicant, Mr. Poupard, on the subject property's subdivision process, but had not been involved with or discussed the historic nature of the properties.

Staff Notes:

- The demolition of the church formerly on the site was approved with 041-18-CA. The case is available for review.
- The subdivision of 501 E Lane Street has been approved by City Council through case S-48-18. New addresses for each parcel have not been provided.
- During the hearing, cases COA-0160-2020, COA-0167-2020, and COA-0168-2020 were discussed at the same time, the discussion and motions included in each Certified Record are identical.

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; install driveway; plant trees
1.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Off-street Parking	Install driveway
3.3	New Construction	Construct new house

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Collette Kinane [affirmed] reviewed the case and provided photographs of the vacant site with notes on how the site was subdivided.

Ms. Kinane explained that although these are three separate COAs and proposed residences, they occupy a single site. She asked the committee if they would prefer to look at these three applications separately or collectively. Mr. Fountain answered that they would be reviewed collectively and the committee can refer to them as properties A, B, and C as necessary. Ms. Kinane identified A as the corner, B as the middle, and C as the easternmost property.

Mr. Fountain asked if the parcels were of identical dimensions or if the corner lot was wider. Ms. Kinane answered that they differed in size and the corner lot is slightly wider. Mr. Bailey inquired whether the City Council had divided the property or if they still legally had the same address. Ms. Kinane answered that the property has been officially subdivided; however, the new addressing had not shown up on iMaps yet.

Ms. Kinane explained that staff suggests deferring the application until further information is provided. Importantly, staff suggests the committee should look for evidence of congruity with the character of Oakwood and nearby properties. The additional information that staff thinks the Committee should receive prior to making a decision includes:

- 1) Manufacturer's specifications for windows, showing both section and elevation views, muntin profiles and material descriptions.
- 2) Detailed drawings and/or specifications for the following:
 - a) Roof material;
 - b) Exposed rafter tails;
 - c) Trim at windows, doors and transitions between materials;
 - d) Brick specifications/sample for the color, size and bond pattern;
 - e) Paint and stain color swatches from paint manufacturer;
 - f) Doors, showing both section and elevation views, muntin profiles and material descriptions;
 - g) Porch railings showing both elevation and section views;
 - h) Porch screening material for the full edge of the rear porch;
 - i) Soffit construction;
 - j) Exterior lighting including locations on the building;
 - k) Finish specifications for the gutters and downspouts, and location on the building shown on elevation drawings;
 - l) Porch ceiling materials and finish;
 - m) Species and size details for new trees.
 - n) Master landscape plan

Support:

Mike Poupard [affirmed], of Grayson Homes, was present to gather feedback from the committee. He identified himself as the developer and builder for the project and would welcome any comments and suggestions from staff and committee on the three proposed applications (COA-0160-2019; COA-0167-2019, and COA-0168-2019).

Mr. Fountain asked if he had any comments or questions about staff's notes. Mr. Poupard replied no, nothing negative. He understood what needs to be done but would like to hear the committee's ideas and different perspectives. Mr. Poupard stated that he accepted the staff's recommended deferral and was appearing tonight to gather any additional comments that staff or the committee would like to offer.

Mr. Fountain commented that the applicant should look over all the additional information and materials that staff felt important for the committee to possess before making a decision. Mr. Poupard acknowledged this comment and said they would be well prepared for the next meeting.

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Fountain asked if there were any questions for the applicant. He said feedback might be helpful and save sometime next month.

Mr. Thiem wanted to clarify one issue that staff noted. He wanted to confirm that staff wanted the committee to look at the context of the proposed buildings and how they relate to the street, and whether they were consistent for the neighborhood. Mr. Poupard stated that they could provide a rendering. Mr. Thiem said they wouldn't necessarily need front views, that they were more concerned about setbacks relative to other properties.

Mr. Fountain said they needed to think about height in relation to other structures and for precedents in Oakwood, for properties that are nearby. Mr. Poupard said that on the block there were lots of one-story residences and across the street there were many two-story structures. He said he noticed a lot of height variation when driving around the area. He stated that the proposed properties would be two stories. Mr. Fountain commented that there are two-stories that don't dominate over one-stories.

Mr. Hinshaw added that while visiting the site he noticed that there might be some grading issues. Mr. Poupard explained that any perceived grading issues would probably be from the removal of the older properties and that the crew might have missed something in the backfill, acknowledging that they could have done better with that. Any issues would be resolved when the new houses were finished.

Mr. Fountain asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. Thiem said he had a question for staff, or maybe the committee. He had read that to preserve a historic district's character any new construction must be visually distinguishable. It can take design cues from existing properties but should not imitate them. He expressed concern that the new properties might appear as copies of historic houses. He said he was struggling to envision how these houses distinguished themselves as unique buildings but be modern in scale.

Ms. Tully added that they should consider whether "distinguishable" was intended as something that was distinguishable for a lay person or a design professional. Mr. Thiem said knowing more about those differences would be helpful. Ms. Tully explained that materiality would be a way to assess whether something is distinguishable. In this case, the use of fiber cement on new properties. Mr. Thiem asked if material selection alone then would be enough to distinguish older properties from new construction. Ms. Tully replied yes.

Mr. Fountain asked Ms. Jackson if she saw anything in the application. She replied that she thought the applicant was well on their way.

Mr. Fountain asked the committee if there was anything else.

Ms. Kinane suggested that some other guests in attendance might like to speak.

Mr. Fountain asked if there was anyone in the audience to speak in favor or in opposition to the applications.

Matthew Brown, community resident, spoke in support of the applications. He thanked the committee for their service to historic preservation and the detailed staff analysis. In his opinion, the proposed design meet the Design Guidelines and do not appear as faux historic. The proposed developments seem to take their design cues from the early twentieth century. One of the properties—B—has features from the Arts and Crafts and Mediterranean Revival styles. The third property, C, appears to have one and a half stories which transitions nicely to the adjacent property. He added that he agreed with the staff finding that the solid concrete driveway is not generally considered congruous and can hope that design element can be modified. He said other than that, the proposed designs are pretty good.

Mr. Poupard asked if he could say one more thing. He asked about a comment made on the roof of property C and whether it would blend in more with a different pitch. He asked if that would be preferred by the committee and staff or whether it would be shot down. Mr. Thiem replied that his question goes to his earlier comment about not matching something in the neighborhood. Ms. Jackson said she thought that roof would fit for new construction. The attention of the applicant to the context of the neighborhood and its variation in story heights, was in her perspective, a positive and would encourage the applicant to stay in that route instead of deviating. Ms. Tully added that there was evidence in this neighborhood of varying heights and that would come into play here.

Another nearby resident of the proposed project, Chris Crew of Elm Street, also spoke in support of the development. He complimented staff on the write up and generally stands in support of this application. He expressed his surprise that only three of their neighbors were in attendance tonight. Mr. Crew explained that the previous building was massive and that the proposed designs of the new projects are generally in keeping with the scope and scale of that part of the neighborhood. He added that he would like to see more details on the finishes but suggested approving with conditions. He finished by stating that the neighbors would appreciate seeing something go on with this property.

Opposition:

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

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

Decision on the Application

Mr. Thiem made a motion to defer the application. The motion was seconded by Ms. Jackson; passed 5/0.

Committee members voting: Hinshaw, Bailey, Fountain, Jackson, Thiem

Staff Contact: Collette Kinane, collette.kinane@raleighnc.gov.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

COA-0168-2019 501 E LANE STREET C

Applicant: MICHAEL POUPARD FOR GRAYSON HOMES LLC

Received: 12/03/2019

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 03/02/2020

1) 01/23/2020 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: General HOD

Nature of Project: Construct new house; install driveway; plant trees

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its January 6, 2020 meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker, Sarah David, Jenny Harper and David Maurer; also present were Mike Poupard, applicant, David Kenoyer, and Collette Kinane and Tania Tully, staff.

Conflict of Interest: Mr. Rasberry stated that he had worked with the applicant, Mr. Poupard, on the subject property's subdivision process, but had not been involved with or discussed the historic nature of the properties.

Staff Notes:

- The demolition of the church formerly on the site was approved with 041-18-CA. The case is available for review.
- The subdivision of 501 E Lane Street has been approved by City Council through case S-48-18. New addresses for each parcel have not been provided.
- During the hearing, cases COA-0160-2020, COA-0167-2020, and COA-0168-2020 were discussed at the same time, the discussion and motions included in each Certified Record are identical.

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; install driveway; plant trees
1.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Off-street Parking	Install driveway
3.3	New Construction	Construct new house

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Collette Kinane [affirmed] reviewed the case and provided photographs of the vacant site with notes on how the site was subdivided.

Ms. Kinane explained that although these are three separate COAs and proposed residences, they occupy a single site. She asked the committee if they would prefer to look at these three applications separately or collectively. Mr. Fountain answered that they would be reviewed collectively and the committee can refer to them as properties A, B, and C as necessary. Ms. Kinane identified A as the corner, B as the middle, and C as the easternmost property.

Mr. Fountain asked if the parcels were of identical dimensions or if the corner lot was wider. Ms. Kinane answered that they differed in size and the corner lot is slightly wider. Mr. Bailey inquired whether the City Council had divided the property or if they still legally had the same address. Ms. Kinane answered that the property has been officially subdivided; however, the new addressing had not shown up on iMaps yet.

Ms. Kinane explained that staff suggests deferring the application until further information is provided. Importantly, staff suggests the committee should look for evidence of congruity with the character of Oakwood and nearby properties. The additional information that staff thinks the Committee should receive prior to making a decision includes:

- 1) Manufacturer's specifications for windows, showing both section and elevation views, muntin profiles and material descriptions.
- 2) Detailed drawings and/or specifications for the following:
 - a) Roof material;
 - b) Exposed rafter tails;
 - c) Trim at windows, doors and transitions between materials;
 - d) Brick specifications/sample for the color, size and bond pattern;
 - e) Paint and stain color swatches from paint manufacturer;
 - f) Doors, showing both section and elevation views, muntin profiles and material descriptions;
 - g) Porch railings showing both elevation and section views;
 - h) Porch screening material for the full edge of the rear porch;
 - i) Soffit construction;
 - j) Exterior lighting including locations on the building;
 - k) Finish specifications for the gutters and downspouts, and location on the building shown on elevation drawings;
 - l) Porch ceiling materials and finish;
 - m) Species and size details for new trees.
 - n) Master landscape plan

Support:

Mike Poupard [affirmed], of Grayson Homes, was present to gather feedback from the committee. He identified himself as the developer and builder for the project and would welcome any comments and suggestions from staff and committee on the three proposed applications (COA-0160-2019; COA-0167-2019, and COA-0168-2019).

Mr. Fountain asked if he had any comments or questions about staff's notes. Mr. Poupard replied no, nothing negative. He understood what needs to be done but would like to hear the committee's ideas and different perspectives. Mr. Poupard stated that he accepted the staff's recommended deferral and was appearing tonight to gather any additional comments that staff or the committee would like to offer.

Mr. Fountain commented that the applicant should look over all the additional information and materials that staff felt important for the committee to possess before making a decision. Mr. Poupard acknowledged this comment and said they would be well prepared for the next meeting.

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Fountain asked if there were any questions for the applicant. He said feedback might be helpful and save sometime next month.

Mr. Thiem wanted to clarify one issue that staff noted. He wanted to confirm that staff wanted the committee to look at the context of the proposed buildings and how they relate to the street, and whether they were consistent for the neighborhood. Mr. Poupard stated that they could provide a rendering. Mr. Thiem said they wouldn't necessarily need front views, that they were more concerned about setbacks relative to other properties.

Mr. Fountain said they needed to think about height in relation to other structures and for precedents in Oakwood, for properties that are nearby. Mr. Poupard said that on the block there were lots of one-story residences and across the street there were many two-story structures. He said he noticed a lot of height variation when driving around the area. He stated that the proposed properties would be two stories. Mr. Fountain commented that there are two-stories that don't dominate over one-stories.

Mr. Hinshaw added that while visiting the site he noticed that there might be some grading issues. Mr. Poupard explained that any perceived grading issues would probably be from the removal of the older properties and that the crew might have missed something in the backfill, acknowledging that they could have done better with that. Any issues would be resolved when the new houses were finished.

Mr. Fountain asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. Thiem said he had a question for staff, or maybe the committee. He had read that to preserve a historic district's character any new construction must be visually distinguishable. It can take design cues from existing properties but should not imitate them. He expressed concern that the new properties might appear as copies of historic houses. He said he was struggling to envision how these houses distinguished themselves as unique buildings but be modern in scale.

Ms. Tully added that they should consider whether "distinguishable" was intended as something that was distinguishable for a lay person or a design professional. Mr. Thiem said knowing more about those differences would be helpful. Ms. Tully explained that materiality would be a way to assess whether something is distinguishable. In this case, the use of fiber cement on new properties. Mr. Thiem asked if material selection alone then would be enough to distinguish older properties from new construction. Ms. Tully replied yes.

Mr. Fountain asked Ms. Jackson if she saw anything in the application. She replied that she thought the applicant was well on their way.

Mr. Fountain asked the committee if there was anything else.

Ms. Kinane suggested that some other guests in attendance might like to speak.

Mr. Fountain asked if there was anyone in the audience to speak in favor or in opposition to the applications.

Matthew Brown, community resident, spoke in support of the applications. He thanked the committee for their service to historic preservation and the detailed staff analysis. In his opinion, the proposed designs meet the Design Guidelines and do not appear as faux historic. The proposed developments seem to take their design cues from the early twentieth century. One of the properties—B—has features from the Arts and Crafts and Mediterranean Revival styles. The third property, C, appears to have one and a half stories which transitions nicely to the adjacent property. He added that he agreed with the staff finding that the solid concrete driveway is not generally considered congruous and can hope that design element can be modified. He said other than that, the proposed designs are pretty good.

Mr. Poupard asked if he could say one more thing. He asked about a comment made on the roof of property C and whether it would blend in more with a different pitch. He asked if that would be preferred by the committee and staff or whether it would be shot down. Mr. Thiem replied that his question goes to his earlier comment about not matching something in the neighborhood. Ms. Jackson said she thought that roof would fit for new construction. The attention of the applicant to the context of the neighborhood and its variation in story heights, was in her perspective, a positive and would encourage the applicant to stay in that route instead of deviating. Ms. Tully added that there was evidence in this neighborhood of varying heights and that would come into play here.

Another nearby resident of the proposed project, Chris Crew of Elm Street, also spoke in support of the development. He complimented staff on the write up and generally stands in support of this application. He expressed his surprise that only three of their neighbors were in attendance tonight. Mr. Crew explained that the previous building was massive and that the proposed designs of the new projects are generally in keeping with the scope and scale of that part of the neighborhood. He added that he would like to see more details on the finishes but suggested approving with conditions. He finished by stating that the neighbors would appreciate seeing something go on with this property.

Opposition:

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

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

Decision on the Application

Mr. Thiem made a motion to defer the application. The motion was seconded by Ms. Jackson; passed 5/0.

Committee members voting: Hinshaw, Bailey, Fountain, Jackson, Thiem

Staff Contact: Collette Kinane, collette.kinane@raleighnc.gov.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Committee Discussion
 - i. Meeting Post-Mortem

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:28pm.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Collette Kinane, Preservation Planner