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INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District:  OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning:  HOD-G
Nature of Project:  Implementation of master landscape plan; replacement of front walk; installation of a side yard walk; installation of retaining wall; and installation of a drainage system; remove crape myrtle tree
Amendments:  None
Staff Notes:

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

• COAs mentioned are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Site Features and Plantings</td>
<td>Implementation of master landscape plan; replacement of front walk; installation of a side yard walk; installation of retaining wall; remove crape myrtle tree; and installation of a drainage system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Fences and Walls</td>
<td>installation of retaining wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Walkways, Driveways, and Off-street Parking</td>
<td>replacement of front walk; installation of a side yard walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Entrances, Porches, and Balconies</td>
<td>Install stoop at side entry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STAFF REPORT

Based on the information contained in the application and staff’s evaluation:
A. The implementation of a master landscape plan; removal of a crape myrtle tree; installation of retaining wall; and installation of a drainage system with a grading plan is not incongruous in concept according to Guidelines 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3, 1.3.7, 1.3.13 and the following suggested facts:

1* In Matthew Brown’s Inventory of Structures in the Oakwood National Register Historic District, the property is described:

“WA4142  223 Elm St. Wilkinson-Wishy House 1899  This Queen Anne gable-front-and-wing frame cottage and the similar house at 225 Elm were built by contractor L. M. Hamilton for Thomas B. and Katie Wilkinson. He was a dry goods salesman and minor developer. Her father Thomas B. Moseley managed the project. The Wilkinsons and Moseleys lived around the corner on E. Jones St. This house has a front-gabled section on the right and a side-gabled wing on the left; the roof ridges are of the same height. The roof is steeply pitched, and was originally sheathed in wooden shingles. The gables have scalloped siding and hexagonal attic vents. There is a porch in front of the side-gabled wing. Its roof comprises two slopes projecting from the main roof slopes. The porch roof is supported by two Tuscan columns with a Chinoiserie balustrade. The front door has a transom. Most windows are two-over-two. There is an original ell behind the side-gabled wing. There was an original porch beside it, which was enclosed prior to 1950. The house was converted to three apartments in c.1965. An addition was made behind the original ell, probably at the same time. The house was returned to a single unit as part of a restoration by Barbara Wishy in c.1979-80. There is a tiny shed behind the house built in c.1990. There is a stone retaining wall at the front of the property which probably dates to the 1920s.”

2* The application mentions several items that were previously approved through two COAs: 119-15-MW (prune crepe myrtle trees; remove concrete steps walkway; install brick strip driveway; alter rear trellis; install 42” tall fence section; alter rear pond; change exterior paint colors; add front walk; relocate stone wall; relocate HVAC unit), 005-16-CA (Remove non-historic rear addition; construct new rear addition with porch; grade rear yard; remove trees; remove shed, pond and trellis). This application requests some changes in design and materials from those previously approved projects.

3* A new painted brick stoop is proposed for the side entry door. The brick is proposed to be painted black to match the currently painted brick foundation.
4* For the installation of the drainage system only the above ground elements are subject to review - locations were provided in the application. A drawing of the pop-up drain was provided in the application materials.

5* A multi-stemmed crape myrtle in the rear yard is proposed for removal and will be replaced with six trees of unspecified type. The application does state that no caliper of the individual stems is greater than 8”, however, the actual DBH of the crape myrtle is unspecified. Per the photographs included in the application, the crape myrtle combined DBH appears larger than 8”.

6* Per the applicant’s submitted drawings and photographs, there are at least two maple street trees and one pecan tree adjacent to the driveway. No tree protection information was provided, nor was information provided about the critical root zones of adjacent trees that may be impacted by the construction of walls in the rear yard.

B. The replacement of front walk and installation of a side yard walk is not incongruous in concept according to Guidelines 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3, 1.3.7, 1.3.13, however, the installation of grey bricks and gravel may be incongruous according to Guidelines 1.3.8 and the following suggested facts:

1* The application proposes the use of grey techo bricks for the previously approved brick strip driveway. Grey bricks are atypical of the historic district. The proposed techo Victorien paver is described on the manufacturer’s website as an “interlocking concrete paver possessing strength and durability… Vehicular & pedestrian friendly. This pavement is also de-icing salt resistant, withstands harsh climates and comes with a transferable lifetime warranty. The Victorien is also available in a permeable application.”

2* Red tone brick is predominant in the historic district. However, the applicant did provide two examples of properties in the district that have grey bricks installed: Oakwood Cemetery and 114 N Bloodworth Street. Oakwood Cemetery is not within the Historic Overlay District. The bricks on Bloodworth Street either predate the district or were installed without a COA. Evidence was not provided to show that the use of techo brick meets the guidelines.
3* In addition to the driveway, the grey techo bricks are specified for the front walk, side yard walk, and the devil strip (the space between the sidewalk and the street). The techo bricks specified for the side yard walk are larger, square panels that are more industrial and modern in design. Per the manufacturer’s website, the Industria Slab is “A contemporary slab, intended for commercial and municipal pedestrian use, Industria’s strength (sic) edges will give each project a modern and exclusive appearance.”

4* The Oakwood Special Character Essay states, “Public sidewalks are generally concrete; a few brick walks still survive. There is typically a tree lawn between the public sidewalk and the curb where street trees are planted.”

5* The applicant proposes the installation of gravel throughout the rear and side yards. The built area to open space ratio was not provided for gravel coverage, however it is clear from the drawings that the built area is substantial increase.

6* The gravel front walk (perpendicular to the proposed brick front walk) is shown in the drawings as equaling or exceeding the width of the brick front walk. This is atypical. The gravel walk should be subservient to the brick front walk.

7* Per applicant, the design of the landscape intends for plant coverage to soften the appearance of the amount of gravel (i.e. the plantings will grow over or “spill onto the path”).

8* The existing front walk is concrete. The applicant proposes replacing the current concrete walk with brick, which would result in a brick walk adjoining two concrete steps. The application did not provide evidence of other properties that feature a similar material change. Additionally, the proposed brick walk is shown in the drawings as wider than the current concrete stairs. Historically, the walk is no wider than the step side walls.

9* No evidence or description was provided for the “decorative gravel” specified for back fill of the side yard walk. Grey toned gravel is typical of the district.

10* The proposed brick strip driveway features a decorative triangular treatment where the strips should meet the sidewalk. This is atypical of the historic district. The brick strips should meet the sidewalk without joining together.
Staff suggests deferral to allow for a revised design to be submitted by the applicant and/or additional evidence to be submitted.

If the committee chooses to defer the application, staff suggests the following additional information be required to be submitted:

- A tree protection plan that will be implemented and remain in place for the duration of construction and that addresses the critical root zones on the property and adjacent properties and provides staging areas for construction materials.
- Analysis of built area to open space and built mass to open space for both the existing conditions and the proposed alterations.
- Evidence of other locations in the historic district that feature concrete steps and brick walks and a review of the walks that are wider than the adjacent steps.
- Sufficient evidence for the grey techo brick was not provided. Staff encourages a red-tone color more compatible with the historic district.
Raleigh Historic Development Commission – Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Application

Development Services
Customer Service Center
One Exchange Plaza
1 Exchange Plaza, Suite 400
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Phone 919-996-2495
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☐ Minor Work (staff review) – 1 copy
☐ Major Work (COA Committee review) – 10 copies
☐ Additions Greater than 25% of Building Square Footage
☐ New Buildings
☐ Demo of Contributing Historic Resource
☐ All Other – landscaping
☐ Post Approval Re-review of Conditions of Approval

For Office Use Only
Transaction #
File # 085-18-CA
Fee
Amount Paid
Received Date
Received By

Property Street Address 223 Elm St Raleigh NC 27601

Historic District Oakwood

Historic Property/Landmark name (if applicable)

Owner's Name Henry C. Ward

Lot size 0.13 ac (width in feet) 52 (depth in feet) 105

For applications that require review by the COA Committee (Major Work), provide addressed, stamped envelopes to owners of all properties within 100 feet (i.e., both sides, in front (across the street), and behind the property) not including the width of public streets or alleys (Label Creator).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Property Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>519 E. Jones St</td>
<td>225 Elm St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521 E. Jones St</td>
<td>227 Elm St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525 E. Jones St</td>
<td>216 Elm St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214 Elm St</td>
<td>226 Elm St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218 N. East St</td>
<td>602 E. Lane St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516 E. Lane St</td>
<td>218 Elm St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518 E. Lane St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221 Elm St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I understand that all applications that require review by the commission's Certificate of Appropriateness Committee must be submitted by 4:00 p.m. on the application deadline; otherwise, consideration will be delayed until the following committee meeting. An incomplete application will not be accepted.

Type or print the following:

Applicant: Henry C. Ward
Mailing Address: 223 Elm St
City: Raleigh  State: NC  Zip Code: 27601
Date: 5/16/18  Daytime Phone: 919.427.0280
Email Address: henry@lodenproperties.com with cc: to gardenwanted@gmail.com
Applicant Signature: [Signature]

Will you be applying for rehabilitation tax credits for this project?  ☑ Yes  ☐ No
Did you consult with staff prior to filing the application?  ☑ Yes  ☐ No

Design Guidelines: Please cite the applicable sections of the design guidelines (www.rhdc.org)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Page</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Brief Description of Work (attach additional sheets as needed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See attached additional sheets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Office Use Only
Type of Work: 41
**Minor Work Approval (office use only)**

Upon being signed and dated below by the Planning Director or designee, this application becomes the Minor Work Certificate of Appropriateness. It is valid until _______________. Please post the enclosed placard form of the certificate as indicated at the bottom of the card. Issuance of a Minor Work Certificate shall not relieve the applicant, contractor, tenant, or property owner from obtaining any other permit required by City Code or any law. Minor Works are subject to an appeals period of 30 days from the date of approval.

Signature (City of Raleigh) ___________________________ Date ______________________

---

**TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attach 8-1/2&quot; x 11&quot; or 11&quot; x 17&quot; sheets with written descriptions and drawings, photographs, and other graphic information necessary to completely describe the project. Use the checklist below to be sure your application is complete.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor Work (staff review) - 1 copy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Work (COA Committee review) - 10 copies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Written description.</strong> Describe clearly and in detail the nature of your project. Include exact dimensions for materials to be used (e.g. width of siding, window trim, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of materials (Provide samples, if appropriate)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Photographs of existing conditions are required. Minimum image size 4&quot; x 6&quot; as printed. Maximum 2 images per page.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paint Schedule (if applicable)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plot plan (if applicable). A plot plan showing relationship of buildings, additions, sidewalks, drives, trees, property lines, etc., must be provided if your project includes any addition, demolition, fences/walls, or other landscape work. Show accurate measurements. You may also use a copy of the survey you received when you bought your property. Revise the copy as needed to show existing conditions and your proposed work.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drawings showing existing and proposed work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Plan drawings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Elevation drawings showing the façade(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Dimensions shown on drawings and/or graphic scale (required)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ 11&quot; x 17&quot; or 8-1/2&quot; x 11&quot; reductions of full-size drawings. If reduced size is so small as to be illegible, make 11&quot; x 17&quot; or 8-1/2&quot; x 11&quot; snap shots of individual drawings from the big sheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stamped envelopes addressed to all property owners within 100 feet of property not counting the width of public streets and alleys (required for Major Work). Use the Label Creator to determine the addresses.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Fee (See Development Fee Schedule)** | | | | | |
Description of work for 223 Elm Street:

1.3 / 1.4
Repair existing retaining wall – [see drawings and details A, B, C, D and E]

Repair existing 2’ retaining wall partially demolished during renovation (previously approved). Use existing stone material currently onsite to recreate similar look at corner and extend back toward house 5’. Use black Belgian cobbles to create area of wall and steps due to not enough existing material on hand. Install black cobble edge along back side of existing wall to help stabilize hill. Patch and repoint deteriorated grout in existing wall sections.

1.3/1.5
Brick strip drive and gravel parking area - [see drawings and detail G and O]

Install brick strip drive (previously approved) using grey techo bricks in a basket weave pattern. Material set on compacted abc base with edging and polymeric sand. Upper gravel area for overflow parking and storage. Black cobble edge in mortar bed with rebar cross reinforcement. Gravel to be 78m from moncure quarry (just north of Sanford).

1.3/1.5
Replace existing front walk – [see drawings and detail F]

Remove existing cracked concrete and replace with grey techo paver in a basket weave pattern. Edge closest to street finish with a mortared black cobble edge for height transition and reinforcement of back side of existing concrete steps leading to street. Brick work to be set on abc base and snap edge with polymeric sand for joints.

1.3/1.4/1.5
Side Area Walk, Stoop and Retainer – [see drawings and details J and K]

Install square techo pavers along side of property for access. Pavers to be set on abc base and back filled with decorative gravel. Install brick stoop (painted) at side entry door, finished in a basket weave pattern. Install 2.5 – 3’ retaining wall, 5’ off property line to help with access, water flow and possible future garden storage. Brick skin to match foundation and to be painted.

1.3/1.4
Rear low retainer and steps – [see drawings and detail L and M]

Install approx. 12” tall brick retaining wall (painted) along rear of property for access, water diversion and function. Steps installed between existing columns (unpainted and to match existing brick work of wall) to deal with grade change, water diversion and access.

1.1
Remove existing Crepe Myrtle – remove multi-stem branching tree (no caliper larger than 8”) to address significant swale along back and side of property. Replace canopy with 6 new small upright trees as shown on plan.
1.3 Install drainage and underground work – [see drawings and detail N]

Install drain system to deal with water issues from upper properties and new renovation. Grade rear and side areas to help sheeting. Include stubs for gutters if installed in future. Goal is to re-route water flow to help adjacent neighbor downhill and make rear space functional.

1.1 Repair existing devil strip access – [see drawings and detail H]

Replace dilapidated devil strip access with grey techo brick in basket weave pattern. Install black cobble edge. Current brick is a trip hazard.
Popular layout options:

- Basket Weave
- 45° Herringbone with Border
- 45° Stretcher Bond
- Stretcher Bond
- Mixture of Sizes
- Stack Bond
- 45° Stack Bond
- Herringbone
- Stretcher Bond
- Mixture of Sizes
techo paver (victorien)  $2\frac{3}{8} \times 4\frac{1}{4} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$

& shale gray
techo power bloc industria slab

2 3/8 x 23 5/8 x 23 5/8

- shape example
painted brick

SW 7070 cyberspace
techo block  industria slab

- color example (shale gray)
black cobble examples
5" x 5" x 5"
5" x 5" x 9"
5" x 9" x 11"
front walk repair

F

H
Side garden

1 0
side garden drainage & retaining & path

J K
Drainage (rear garden swail + crape myrtle) removal
drainage / down spout
devil strip repair H
Examples of grey bricks in Oakwood:

Oakwood Cemetery

112/114 Bloodworth Street
Collette,

Please see notes below in RED and related attachments related to the COA application for 223 Elm Street. This is the first of three emails. Two more will follow. Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

-Henry

From: Kinane, Collette <Collette.Kinane@raleighnc.gov>  
Sent: Thursday, May 24, 2018 3:37 PM  
To: Henry Ward <henry@lodenproperties.com>; gardenwanted@gmail.com  
Cc: Robb, Melissa <Melissa.Robb@raleighnc.gov>  
Subject: COA Meeting - Thursday, June 28, 2018 - 085-18-CA (223 Elm Street) - Initial Staff Comments

Henry -

Thank you for submitting a Major Work Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) application. Your application has been placed on the June 28, 2018, agenda of the COA Committee of the Raleigh Historic Development Commission. The meeting will be held at 4:00 p.m. in the City Council chamber.

Based on what was submitted, the agenda will describe the request as follows. Please let staff know if this is inaccurate.

Landscape Master Plan

Thanks for submitting such detailed and precise drawings! In preparation for completing the report, staff has made an initial review of your application regarding clarity and completeness and has the following questions, comments, and suggestions:

1. Please provide details of the fire pit and storage areas that are noted on the drawing. If you are not ready to proceed with these two items, please remove them from the drawings. **Removed.**
2. Similarly, is the grill area built-in? **No.** If not, please remove this from the drawing. Items such as standard grills, trashcans, and furniture, which are not a part of the landscape, should not be shown on the drawings. Additionally, please remove the dining table shown on the drawings as well. If these items will be placed on a pad of any material, please show the pad noting the material without the furniture/removable items drawn in.
3. Please provide drawings and/or manufacturer’s specifications as to what the pop-up daylighting will look like. **Attached.**
4. Please submit digital photographs of the current conditions of the landscaping. **Will send in separate email.**
5. The extent of the detail on your proposed plan was excellent, could you also provide a drawing of the existing conditions in similar detail? Additionally, please provide an annotated version of your proposed plan that details what is existing and what will be new. **Attached.**
6. Please provide samples, manufacturer’s specifications, and/or a photograph of all proposed materials (pavers, bricks, etc). I believe these were included in the prior submittal. Please advise if you need anything else.

Staff has also made an initial review for adherence to the Design Guidelines and offers the following guidance and examples of the type of evidence included in successful applications.

1. Grey bricks are atypical of the historic district. Please provide evidence that this material is present elsewhere in the district or evidence that helps make the case that grey bricks will meet the guidelines and fit with the neighborhood character. Will send in separate email.

2. Please provide the built area to open space ratio for the proposed gravel coverage. Can you clarify this calculation?

3. The proposed gravel walkway in the front yard seems slightly over-scale and would be atypical of the district. Please provide a dimensioned drawing of the proposed changes. Attached.

Any amendments or additional documents must be received via email by 4:00 pm Monday, June 4, 2018, to guarantee inclusion in the staff report. Please include all current recipients of this message.

A few additional notes regarding the process:

- The agenda, information letter, and staff report will be sent via email June 15.
- A sign will be posted on the property June 15. The applicant is required to returned the posted sign to Planning either at the public meeting or within 3 business days following the public meeting.
- City policy requires that any presentations must be emailed to staff prior to meetings in Council Chambers and may not be loaded from non-employee flash drives. The deadline for providing staff with a presentation is 10:00 am, Tuesday, June 26. Most COA applications do not need a formal presentation.
- If any documents are brought to the meeting at least 10 sets of copies should be provided.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,
Collette

---

Collette R. Kinane
Preservation Planner II

Raleigh Urban Design Center
One Exchange Plaza, Suite 300 | Raleigh, NC 27601
919-996-2649 | raleighnc.gov
future plantings will be placed close to 
gravel edge, "spilling" onto path, thus 
creating a softer 
line and a 
more slender 
path than 
how it looks 
on layout 
plan.

123 ELM ST. 
front gravel path detail
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existing concrete steps

compacted "abc" (4" min.)
basket weave paver

black cobble

mortar

existing concrete steps

cement footer w/ epoxy rebar (12" o.c.)


Compact. Sub grade


G

basket weave paver
top soil & turf

compacted "abc"

w/ snap edge & 12" spikes

Compacted Sub grade


scale: 1/2" = 1'-00"
**Diagram J:**
- Decorative gravel
- Snap edge w/ spikes
- Square techo paver (industry)
- Comacted "abc" (4" min.)
- Compacted sub grade
- 6" concrete footer w/ 1/4" rebar epoxy connector to foundation wall
- Scale: 1" = 1'-0"

**Diagram H:**
- Cobble edge
- Basket weave paver
- Compacted sub grade
- 4" compacts "abc" base
- Scale: 1" = 1'-0"

**Diagram H1:**
- Stoop detail
- Scale: 1/2" = 1'-0"
bricks (painted)

12" CMU (all cores filled)

decorative gravel

compacted "abc" (4" mix.)
techo paver

10" concrete footer
w/ 1/2" rebar
- vertical 24" o.c.
- horizontal 12" o.c.

decorative gravel

compacted sub grade

scale: 1/2" = 1'-00"