Nature of Project:
Removal of non-historic storefront features; construction of new storefront
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – STAFF REPORT

128-17-CA 211 S WILMINGTON STREET
Applicant: TED VAN DYK
Received: 7/13/2017
Submission date + 90 days: 10/11/2017
Meeting Date(s): 1) 8/24/2017 2) 9/28/17 3) 10/26/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: HOD-G
Nature of Project: Removal of non-historic storefront features; construction of new storefront; installation of rooftop mechanical equipment; installation of rear cooler unit.
Amendments: Additional documentation was received with changes to the façade design and materials.

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its August 7, 2017, meeting. Members in attendance were Dan Becker, Mary Ruffin Hanbury, Curtis Kasefang and David Maurer; Ted Van Dyk represented the applicant; also present was Roberta Fox.

Staff Notes:
- COAs mentioned are available for review.
- This case was deferred from the September 28 COA meeting to allow for design revisions reflecting input from the COA Committee.
- Changes to this report reflecting the amended application for the October 26 COA Committee meeting are shown in bold.
- The applicant provided revised drawings on 11” x 17” paper which replace those shown in the presentation packet.

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>2.6</td>
<td>Exterior Walls</td>
<td>Removal of non-historic storefront features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Windows and Doors</td>
<td>construction of new storefront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Storefronts</td>
<td>Removal of non-historic storefront features; construction of new storefront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Sustainability and Energy Retrofit</td>
<td>Installation of rooftop mechanical equipment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STAFF REPORT

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

A. The removal of non-historic storefront features and construction of a new storefront are not incongruous in concept according to Guidelines sections 2.6.7, 2.7.7, 2.9.6; however, the
storefront design and materials proposed may be incongruous in concept according to Guidelines sections 2.6.7, 2.7.7, 2.9.6, and the following suggested facts:

1* The Moore Square district is noted for its concentration of early twentieth century commercial architecture, according to the Special Character Essay for the district: “The architectural scale of the district is pleasingly suited to the pedestrian. The vast majority of buildings in the district are simple, vernacular brick ‘shoe-boxes’, two to three stories in height, narrow and deep. Past attempts to modernize the pedestrian level of the shops with aluminum panels and flat aluminum awnings contribute to a discontinuity that contrasts with the frequently related repetitive elements and details of the second and third floors of these buildings.”

2* From the 1983 National Register nomination for the Moore Square Historic District, the building at 211 S Wilmington (then known as 213 S Wilmington) was built prior to 1914 based on the Sanborn map of that year. As of 1983 it was a store named Daniels and its façade had been completely altered by that time and was found to be non-contributing to the district.

3* From the Storefronts section of the Design Guidelines under the Things to Consider as You Plan heading (pg 56): “If an inappropriate storefront has completely replaced the original storefront, a new storefront based on accurate documentation of the original is preferred. If accurate documentation is not available, then a new design compatible with the building in scale, size, material, and color is appropriate.”

4* Like many of its neighbors on Wilmington Street, the building is only accessible from the street-level entry doors. It has party walls on both the north and south, while its rear façade on the east side has blocked window openings on both the first and second floors.

5* The applicant’s proposed design recesses the ground floor storefront nearly the full width of the building. Historic façades often recessed the entry doors of commercial buildings between display windows that met the sidewalk, but later alterations in the mid-twentieth century often recessed larger areas of the façades, sometimes angled, as can be seen at 217 S Wilmington, now known as Blalock’s Barber & Beauty Salon.

6* The original façade included three doors, with two recessed between display windows and one on the far right providing access to the upper floor. The only door that remains in the
original location is the one on the far right. The two original retail shop doors and display windows were all changed during a circa 2012 renovation per COA 034-12-MW.

7* The proposed retail shop door extends the full height of the ground floor and is proposed to be glass in a solid frame. **It is proposed to be mahogany wood.**

8* The door to the second story has been replaced with a glazed door with a sidelight. Historically, entry doors were either fully or partly glazed, and included glazed transoms to bring diffused daylight into the building. **The door and sidelight are proposed to be mahogany wood; specifications were not provided.**

9* The existing upper level of the façade is clad with a ribbed metal material that has entirely blocked the windows and covers the parapet. It appears likely that the original features of the façade were removed in their entirety to accommodate the metal material, as it appears to be on the same plane as the neighboring buildings, while the original façade featured projecting cornices and engaged columns. Certainly, the three uppermost projecting elements (a central temple form and two flanking towers with pyramidal roofs) were removed at some time.

10* The proposed upper level is designed as a frame that is on the same plane as the neighboring building and that surrounds recessed planes of the façade.

11* The new storefront design is asymmetrical, with the façade divided vertically by a dark “column” set roughly 1/3 of the way from the right side. **This column wraps a structural column behind it.** From historic photos, the original façade was divided vertically by three towers with recessed panels inset between them. The original design emphasized the verticality with every element of the façade.

12* The new façade is also divided horizontally, with projecting bands above the first and second floors. A narrow cornice detail is near the top of the façade. All other elements of the façade are recessed.

13* The ground floor windows are proposed to be a contemporary storefront system, with a continuous span of fixed windows that are set in metal frames and raised above the sidewalk. As with the front doors, the windows rise nearly the full height of the ground floor. From historic photos, it appears the ground floor windows were large sheets of glass
set above bulkheads of unknown material. The height of the historic windows is unclear from the photos, since the façade originally included awnings over the windows.

14* The second floor windows are proposed to be a contemporary storefront system, with three sets of sliding glass doors that are set in metal frames. They are topped with metal panels set in black metal frames that are designed to mimic transom windows. The original second story featured punched openings with two arched windows and two French doors topped by fanlights. Some specifications were provided for the new windows, but lacking section drawings and color samples.

15* There is a disconnect between the section drawing and elevation drawing of the proposed new elevation. The section drawing labels spandrel glass approximately 5 feet below the cornice, but the elevation drawing shows it as “gray” without a material description, although the drawing appears to be a stucco-like material.

16* The application states that the proposed storefront has 35% transparency and the nearby buildings are at 27% and 29%. The amount of glass has been reduced from the previous design, while the window frame dimensions have been increased in width and the windows have been separated with a gray material (see A.15). The 2nd floor windows are now closer in design to the 2nd floor windows at 217 S. Wilmington St., with framed windows set into a neutral background.

17* The proposed storefront design is a traditional design by having a highly glazed first level storefront and more solid 2nd level punctured by large windows. The use of tiles over the entire façade, lack of muntins, and framed 2nd level differentiates it from the nearby historic facades.

18* It is unclear from the application if the glass will be clear. Windows and doors in Moore Square are now and have historically been clear.

19* Common materials on historic commercial buildings in the district include brick, stone, glass and wood, with some ornamental metal.

20* Façade materials are shown on the elevation drawings as (in order from top down) black metal, tan porcelain tile, black porcelain tile, an undefined “gray” material (see A.15), tube steel, glass, and mahogany doors. The proposed tiles are 6”x12” in a running bond pattern. This is larger than, but similar to the 4”x8” brick used on adjacent historic
buildings. Neither specifications nor material samples were provided for the new materials.

21* No specifications were provided for exterior lighting.

B. The installation of rooftop mechanical equipment and installation of a rear cooler unit are not incongruous in concept according to Guidelines sections 2.10.3, 2.10.8, and the following suggested facts:

1* The changes to the rear façade include the installation of an aluminum panel designed to hide a walk-in cooler on the narrow roof of the first floor. It is unclear if the middle and left window openings will be restored with new windows, although the window on the right side will be converted to a door that opens to the cooler. Neither specifications nor material samples were provided for the aluminum panel.

2* The roof plan shows a variety of mechanical equipment that is screened from the rear. Neither specifications nor material samples were provided for the screening.

3* It is common for mechanical equipment to be placed on commercial building rooftops; traditionally these were unscreened.

Staff recommends approval with conditions.

1. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by the committee prior to issuance of the blue placard:
   a. Final elevation and roof plan drawings;
   b. Material samples;
   c. Windows including the spandrel glass and window sections.

2. That the glass be clear.

3. That the mechanical equipment screening be minimal and/or semi-transparent so as to avoid the appearance of a rooftop addition.

4. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard:
a. Doors;
b. Walk-in cooler;
c. Mechanical equipment;
d. Rooftop screening materials.

5. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
   a. Lighting
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RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Office Use Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transaction #: 521717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File #: 128-17-CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee: $147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Paid: $147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Date: 7/13/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received By: AC4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

- 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
- Post Approval Re-review of Conditions of Approval

---

**Property Street Address:** 211 South Wilmington Street

**Historic District:** Moore Square

**Historic Property/Landmark name (if applicable):** N/A

**Owner's Name:** Tulsi Ventures, LLC  Attn: Nick Malai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot size</th>
<th>(width in feet) 30</th>
<th>(depth in feet) 58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

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>Please see accompanying list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**WWW.RALEIGHNC.GOV**

**REVISION 08.29.16**
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: Ted Van Dyk, AIA New City Design Group

Mailing Address: 1304 Hillsborough Street

City: Raleigh   State: NC   Zip Code: 27605

Date: July 13, 2017   Daytime Phone: 919 831 1308

Email Address: ted@newcitydesign.com

Applicant 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>2.6</td>
<td>Exterior Walls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Windows and Doors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Storefronts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please see accompanying Descriptions and Illustrations
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 ____________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT</th>
<th>TO BE COMPLETED BY CITY STAFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Minor Work** (staff review) – 1 copy
  - **Major Work** (COA Committee review) – 10 copies

1. **Written description.** 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.)

2. **Description of materials** (Provide samples, if appropriate)

3. **Photographs** of existing conditions are required. Minimum image size 4" x 6" as printed. Maximum 2 images per page.

4. **Paint Schedule** (if applicable)

5. **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 the property. Revise the copy as needed to show existing conditions and your proposed work.

6. **Drawings** showing existing and proposed work
   - [ ] Plan drawings
   - [ ] Elevation drawings showing the façade(s)
   - [ ] Dimensions shown on drawings and/or graphic scale (required)
   - [ ] 11" x 17" or 8-1/2" x 11" reductions of full-size drawings. If reduced size is so small as to be illegible, make 11" x 17" or 8-1/2" x 11" snap shots of individual drawings from the big sheet.

7. **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.

8. **Fee** *(See Development Fee Schedule)* $147
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Real Estate ID</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Mail Address 1</th>
<th>Mail Address 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17037811</td>
<td>0059331</td>
<td>RALEIGH CITY OF</td>
<td>222 W HARGETT ST</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27601-1316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17037812</td>
<td>0057476</td>
<td>209 RETAIL PARTNERS LLC</td>
<td>PO BOX 1030</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27602-1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17037821</td>
<td>0036100</td>
<td>TURNER, STUART R</td>
<td>216 S WILMINGTON ST</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27601-1434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17037821</td>
<td>0147797</td>
<td>RALEIGH CITY OF</td>
<td>222 W HARGETT ST</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27601-1316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17037822</td>
<td>0026430</td>
<td>G&amp;S EMPIRE LANDLORD LLC</td>
<td>133 FAYETTEVILLE ST STE 600</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27601-2911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17037823</td>
<td>0077435</td>
<td>G&amp;S EMPIRE LANDLORD LLC</td>
<td>133 FAYETTEVILLE ST STE 600</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27601-2911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17037831</td>
<td>0061551</td>
<td>FARMAH, RAM</td>
<td>106 BECKFORD RD</td>
<td>CARY NC 27518-6476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17037831</td>
<td>0018578</td>
<td>BLALOCK, LUTRINO BOWDITCH, SHANDERL NA BLALOCK</td>
<td>217 S WILMINGTON ST</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27601-1433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17037831</td>
<td>0003728</td>
<td>DEEPJAVA PROPERTY CO LLC</td>
<td>2300 WHITE OAK RD</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27608-1456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17037832</td>
<td>0026429</td>
<td>TULSI VENTURES LLC</td>
<td>1052 KENNICOTT AVE</td>
<td>CARY NC 27513-8450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17037832</td>
<td>0018368</td>
<td>HORWITZ, PHILLIP</td>
<td>PO BOX 6</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27602-0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17037832</td>
<td>0011367</td>
<td>JT HOBBY &amp; SON INC</td>
<td>PO BOX 18506</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27619-8506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17037833</td>
<td>0067035</td>
<td>HORWITZ, PHILLIP S</td>
<td>PO BOX 6</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27602-0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17037833</td>
<td>0040343</td>
<td>HORWITZ, PHILLIP S</td>
<td>PO BOX 6</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27602-0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17037842</td>
<td>0071477</td>
<td>MASO LLC</td>
<td>8117 WINDSOR RIDGE DR</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27615-4720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17037842</td>
<td>0071480</td>
<td>FRENCH TRONE BLDG INVESTMENT S LLC</td>
<td>112 E HARGETT ST STE 200</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27601-1455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17037850</td>
<td>0038118</td>
<td>RALEIGH CITY OF</td>
<td>PO BOX 590</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27602-0590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: RHDC  
Ms. Tania Tully  
Date: July 13, 2017  
Project: 211 South Wilmington Street.  
Subject: Project Description and Guideline References

Tania and Members of RHDC,

Thanks for considering the proposed reconstruction of 211 South Wilmington Street's façade.

The new restaurant will constitute nearly one million dollars in new investment on Wilmington Street, while maintaining the scale and character of the historic fabric.

We hope that RHDC will find it to be a positive addition to the Moore Square Historic District. We offer the following work description and illustrations for your review:

Project Description: Complete new storefront for the new building. New tenant will be a 2 story noodle bar. Design intent is to honor the Moore Square Historic District, while bring a contemporary interpretation to the aesthetic. As a restaurant and night spot, appearance and attractiveness, and connection between inside and outside are important.

Relevant Guidelines and Method of Conformance:

2.6 Exterior Walls:
Since the façade has been completely missing for decades, and the building is non-contributing. Our approach is to use durable materials, propositions and relationships that are compatible with, but do not ‘match’ surrounding fabric. For example, we have incorporated a ‘cornice’ element that echoes cornice line on the original façade, as well as on 217 S. Wilmington Street. 
Please see accompanying illustration 1 for visual reference.

2.7 Windows and Doors:
.7 Windows: There are numerous styles and scales of windows within the District. Interestingly, the original façade had large windows that were floor to ceiling on the second floor, with Juliet Balconies. We have created fenestration that honors the scale of nearby window units, while the operable nature of the second floor fenestration pays respect to the unusual nature of the original second floor windows. We have ‘gathered the windows in similar fashion to 217 S. Wilmington to offer harmony and scale in keeping with nearby façades.
Lastly, we have evaluated neighboring buildings for transparency vs. opacity. The current design stands at approximately 35% transparent. This compares to 27% and 29% for the two neighbors to the South. Note that a 1960’s era photo of 217 S. Wilmington showed larger windows than the current units, and so nudged up to 44% transparent.
Please see accompanying illustrations 2 and 3 and 5 for reference.

Doors: there are many styles, material, and sizes of doors in the District. Doors typically face the street and are prominent and obvious. Many buildings, including the adjacent Raleigh sandwich shop, and the many incarnations of this building, have secondary doors to the second floor.
We have carefully reflected these traits in the entry door, and large adjacent clear glass panel, on the façade.
Doors (con’t):
We have also made close comparison to the scale of the entry elements at 219 S. Wilmington, the building adjacent to the north, and echoed the scale of the composition. Please see illustration 4 for reference.

2.9 Storefronts: Although storefront in the district are typically ‘ stylistically and visually tied to the street facade, it is usually differentiated from the upper façade by large display windows flanking the main entry and by a change in materials’. ‘Storefronts with recessed entrances also incorporate an exterior ceiling area and an extension of the sidewalk often surfaced by decorative ‘floor tiles.’

The storefront design echoes the ‘two part’ composition of other facades on the street. The strong tan surround at the second floor respects both the proportions and rhythm of its’ neighbors, and also crates both a cap and ‘awning’ type ledge between the ground floor and second floor. A strong vertical element near the front door, which rises through both the first and second floors, pays respect to the more vertical composition of the original façade while keeping in scale with neighbors.

The storefront is also recessed approximately 18" from the face of the second floor, and will feature a decorative wood ceiling and tile surface at the exposed floor.

The operable glass storefront on the ground floor sits on a ceramic tile base. Please refer to illustration 6 for reference.

Materials:
The proposed façade is composed of clear glass, frosted glass, metal trim (cornice and window frames) and ceramic tile, all of which were materials that are found within the District, and could have been found during the period of significance.

Summary:
The façade of 211 S. Wilmington Street has been lost for many decades. The building is a non-contributing structure. So, what to do?

A single photo showing a portion of the original, taken in the early 60's, judging by the vehicle visible in h photo, shows that the building was a bit of an outlier, even in its’ original condition. The towers, spires and unique fenestration set the building apart and called attention to itself through this rather showy expression. (See accompanying photos)

Our proposal seeks to offer a similarly striking yet compatible addition to the 200 block of South Wilmington Street. The above mentioned strategies offer scale, modules, and visual cues that harmonize with neighboring structures and the broader district, while offering a functional, attractive, and appropriate personality for the new use.

We have made reference, both explicitly and through like and kind scale, composition, and grouping of elements, to create a new façade for this building that is clearly of the 21st century, does not copy other buildings or pretend to be ‘old’, is instead respectful and compatible with its surroundings while establishing its’ own identity and place in time.
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