Nature of Project:
Construct addition; remove trees

APPLICANT:
ANDY LAWRENCE
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – STAFF REPORT

COA-0058-2019 122 PERQUIMANS DRIVE
Applicant: ANDY LAWRENCE
Received: 05/15/19               Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 08/13/19 1) 6/27/2019 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Raleigh Historic Landmark: OWEN AND DOROTHY SMITH HOUSE
Nature of Project: Construct rear addition; remove 4 trees
DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its April 1 meeting. Members in attendance were Jenny Harper, David Maurer, and Mary Ruffin Hanbury; also present were Andy Lawrence, applicant, Collette Kinane and Tania Tully, staff.

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

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>Construct rear addition; remove 4 trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Fences &amp; Walls</td>
<td>Construct rear addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>Construct rear addition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STAFF REPORT

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

A. There is insufficient information for staff to provide a recommendation. The applicable sections of the Guidelines are 1.3.6, 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 1.4.1, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.4, 3.2.6, 3.2.7, 3.2.8, 3.2.9, 3.2.10, 3.2.11. Suggested facts:

1* The landmark ordinance states: “Those elements of the property that are integral to its historical, prehistorical, architectural, archaeological and/or cultural significance, or any combination thereof are as follows: The 1959 Modernist house of wood and stone and the approximately 1.64 acre upon which it sits. It combines shed, flat, and low-pitched gable
roofs over a modified L-plan...The dwelling rests on a stone foundation and a brick-and-concrete-block basement on a wooded parcel. The house perches high above the street. Its exterior includes board-and-batten siding and Wake County stone. Glass is also used in abundance: fixed window walls occur in conjunction with large sliders, sliding glass doors, and clerestory awnings...At the west end, a flat-roofed room projects forward and slightly modifies the L-plan... On the rear, the eave is shallower and landscaping replaces a loggia. Together, the wings partially enclose a back garden of gravel and landscaping. Low stone walls edge other sections of the back garden, and stone steps in a south wall lead up to the wooded acreage that buffers the outdoor space from surrounding houses...”

2* From the landmark designation report:

- [The house] “is an excellent and intact example of the humanist strain of Modernism”
- [The screened porch] elevation and the south side of front wing effectively form the back of the house. The former has board-and-batten siding and fixed windows that reach nearly to the ground; the wing houses the more public living spaces. The deep eave of the shed roof shelters a bluestone-floored loggia as at the front. The south side of the front wing—the bedroom wing—combines board-and-batten siding with smaller bands of windows. Those are set at the eave to afford more privacy to the rooms within. The eave here is more shallow and landscaping replaces a loggia.
- “…the wings partially enclose a back garden of gravel and landscaping. Low stone walls edge other sections of the back garden, and stone steps in a south wall lead up to the wooded acreage that buffers the outdoor space from surrounding houses.”
- “The house and its parcel display exceptional architectural integrity, with very few changes since construction”
- “Houses with Modernist design from the mid-twentieth century are locally rare. Intact examples like the Owen Smith House are significant as representatives of an important architectural trend in the post-war period.”

3* The addition is proposed on the rear (south) side of the house connected to the historic house with a glass hyphen. Exact dimensions were not provided. Using the provided drawing scale, the hyphen appears to be about 20’ long.
4* The approximately 14’ wide hyphen connects to the house at the historic eave. A portion of the roof may be reworked to create the connection. Details and specifications for this connection were not provided.

5* The addition is proposed in the location of a raised garden bed. No information was provided on any grading or excavation that may be required.

6* The addition is built around a serpentine stone wall that delineates the formal garden space from the wooded yard. The stone wall is a historic landscape feature. While elevations were provided to show how the stone wall will be incorporated into the design; evidence was not provided to detail how the wall will be protected during construction or how the building’s foundation will be incorporated into and around the wall.

7* There are 3 Maple trees and 1 Pine tree proposed for removal to accommodate the addition. Two in the footprint of the addition and two are within 5 feet of the west and south elevations of the addition. An arborist report was provided. There are several trees noted in the arborist’s report that are not included on the site plan. The arborist’s report provides Critical Root Zone (CRZ) calculations that are incorrect.

8* The lot contains a number of other trees. A partial tree protection plan was provided for only the area around the addition.

9* The addition is proposed to be located fully behind the historic house.

10* An elevation was not provided to show how much of the addition will be visible from the front of the house. The highest point of the addition’s roof appears to be approximately 6’ above the highest point of the west wing of the historic house.

11* Elevation drawings of the addition that include the entire historic house are not included in the application. The provided drawings show only the adjacent portion of the historic house making an analysis of the congruity difficult.

12* The materials for the body of the addition were not specified, with the exception of board and batten siding to match the siding on the historic house.

13* The addition has 2’ overhangs. The proposed overhangs appear to be slightly shorter than the overhangs on the historic house.

14* The window openings on the historic house are placed close to the eaves when along a flat roof or fill the slope. The windows in the proposed hyphen fill the slope similar to the
historic house. The remaining proposed windows are placed in the center of the elevation and appear too small proportionally. No window specifications were provided.

15* The roof form is an asymmetrical low-pitched broken gable. The slope is proposed to match the slope of the roof on the historic house and will meet the historic house to form a valley.

16* Sightline drawings were not provided to show the potential visual impact of the addition from the front of the house. Similar studies from oblique angles at the rear of the property were provided.

17* The application states that the adjacent parcel on Glenwood Avenue will be used for staging and materials storage. This parcel is located outside of the landmark boundaries. No drawings were provided to show the path between the parcels and any impact to trees along the path on the landmark property.

18* Built area to open space analysis: The lot is 72,709 SF. The footprint of the existing original house is 4,739 SF; including the front porch loggia, carport, covered walk, covered terrace, and screened porch it is 5,175 SF for an original proportion of built area to open space of 7.12%. The proposed addition increases the total square footage to 6,509 SF. The applicants state the proportion of built area to open space is 8.95%. However, the driveway and rear gravel patio does not appear to have been included in this calculation.

19* Built mass to open space analysis: The lot is 72,709 SF. The footprint of the existing original house is 4,739 SF; including the front porch loggia, carport, covered walk, covered terrace, and screened porch it is 5,175 SF for an original proportion of built area to open space of 7.12%. The proposed addition increases the total square footage to 6,388 SF. The proportion of built mass to open space is 8.78%.

20* Downspouts are noted on the elevations, but gutters were not. Downspouts are proposed to match existing.

21* Exterior lighting is proposed for the three doors located on the addition. No specifications were provided.

Staff suggests that the Committee defer the application until the following information is provided:

• Elevation or site line drawing that shows the visibility of the addition from the front of the house and the driveway;
• Elevation drawings that show the full extent of the historic house;
• Dimensioned drawings;
• Detail drawings indicating how the roof of the addition will be connected to the roof of the historic house;
• Detail drawings indicating how the stone wall will be incorporated into the design and information on how the wall will be protected during construction;
• Grading or excavation details (if necessary);
• Window specifications;
• Material specifications;
• Correctly calculated CRZ;
• Updated Tree Protection Plan that identifies the rear path to be used for construction access and impact to any trees greater than 9” DBH.

Staff Contact: Collette Kinane, collette.kinane@raleighnc.gov
Photo 1: View of Screen Porch

Photo 2: View of Loggia
Photo 3: View of stone wall and raised garden bed

Photo 4: View of stone wall
Photo 5: View of proposed addition connection area

Photo 6: Detail view of stone wall
Photo 9: Area of proposed addition

Photo 10: View of top of raised bed
Photo 11: View from steps towards house

Photo 12: View from steps towards screen porch
Photo 13: View of wooded path for proposed construction access

Photo 14: View of beginning of wooded path from property line
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Project: Addition and Renovation to the Anderson Residence
122 Perquimans Drive, Raleigh, NC 27609

Project Description

The proposed project is an addition to the existing Mid-Century Modern residence with the new construction on the back (south) side of the existing structure adjacent to the existing bedroom. The addition creates a courtyard area while respecting the existing house and landscape features.

1. The proposed project is to be designed to include the following:
   a. Master Bedroom and Bath Suite
   b. Guest Bedroom
   c. Guest Bathroom
   d. Laundry work area near the existing bedrooms.

2. The project will include design considerations for the following:
   a. Recognizing the Historic Designation of the Mid Century Modern National Landmark Residential Design
   b. The selected location for the addition will need to work with the existing landscaping and curvilinear stone wall.
   c. The view to the house from the public way is unaltered.
   d. For construction the building area can be accessed from the rear (south) of the house minimizing impact on the existing landscaping.
   e. The exterior materials of the addition will match the existing house in dimensions and color.
   f. Connection to the existing house and site is created by construction of a room that is a minimalistic glass connector altering very little of the historic fabric.

3. An Arborist report and letter in included in the submittal and the Tree Protection plan has been included in the set of drawings. The plan was developed in collaboration with Jared Kibble, ISA Certified Arborist #SO-75344. There is currently no general contractor involved in the project and a pre-construction meeting will be scheduled with the contractor to review the final installation and preparation of tree protection and site access.

4. Staging Areas: The parcel shown on the survey that is not part of Landmark Property will be used for larger staging and unloading of materials allowing minimal impact on the root zone of trees on the site.
5. Exterior lighting: Recessed soffit lighting will be used above doors (3) of the addition. The specific recessed LED fixture has not been specified at this point in the project.

6. The existing stone landscape wall has been preserved and incorporated into the design of the addition. The stonework is exposed in the new “glass connector”.

ARCHITECT: Olive Architecture, PLLC

Andy O. Lawrence, AIA
This form can be submitted in person or via USPS at the above address.

| Applicant name: Andy O. Lawrence, AIA Olive Architecture |
| Mailing address: 436 N. Harrington Street, Suite 140 |
| City: Raleigh | State: NC | Zip code: 27603 |
| Date: May 13, 2019 | Daytime phone #: 919 836 9934 |
| Email address: andy@olive-arch.com |

| Minor work (staff review) – one copy |
| Major work (COA committee review) – ten copies |
| Additions > 25% of building sq. footage |
| New buildings |
| Demolition of building or structure |
| All other |
| Post approval re-review of conditions of approval |

| Office Use Only |
| Transaction #: |
| File #: |
| Fee: |
| Amount paid: |
| Received date: |
| Received by: |

Property street address: 122 Perquimans Dr

Historic district: NA

Historic property/Landmark name (if applicable): Owen and Dorothy Smith House

Owner name: Jonathan Wellons Anderson Revocable Trust

Owner mailing address: 122 Perquimans Drive, Raleigh, NC 27609
For applications that require review by the COA Committee (major work), provide addressed and stamped envelopes for owners for all properties with 100 feet on all sides of the property, as well as the property owner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owner Name &amp; Address</th>
<th>Property Owner Name &amp; Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WELLONS, ELMER J III 3126 GLENWOOD AVE RALEIGH NC 27612-5007</td>
<td>SCHENK, JEFFREY SCHENK, TANIA MALIK 124 PERQUIMANS DR RALEIGH NC 27609-9938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLDING, JOHN H HEIRS JOHN HOLDING JR - EXECUTCR 1408 KERSHAW DR RALEIGH NC 27609-6204</td>
<td>ANDERSON, ANNETTE H 100 PERQUIMANS DR RALEIGH NC 27609-9938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITTLE, JAMES C III LITTLE, ANN M 112 PERQUIMANS DR RALEIGH NC 27609-9938</td>
<td>HUNTER, R MERRILL HUNTER, MARYLIN B 3025 RANDOLPH DR RALEIGH NC 27609-6541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODGSON, GRACE TRUSTEE 128 PERQUIMANS DR RALEIGH NC 27609-9938</td>
<td>CAMPBELL, DONALD B CAMPBELL, ANN E 105 PERQUIMANS DR RALEIGH NC 27609-9937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY CLUB HILLS INC 6020 CREEDEMOOR RD RALEIGH NC 27612-2209</td>
<td>ANDERSON, JONATHAN W ANDERSON, MA CARLOS III 3134 GLENWOOD AVE RALEIGH NC 27612-5007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I understand that all major work applications that require review by the Raleigh Historic Development Commission’s COA Committee must be submitted by 4 p.m. on the date of the application deadline; otherwise, consideration will be delayed until the following committee meeting. An incomplete application will not be accepted.

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 □

Office Use Only
Type of work: ___________________

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>3.2</td>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>addition of a bedroom suite to the existing residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Fences and Walls</td>
<td>preserving a stone landscape wall and incorporating it into the proposed addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>the loss of historic property is minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.6</td>
<td>location</td>
<td>the addition is located at the rear of the house</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>Office Use Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attach 8-1/2&quot;x11&quot; or 11&quot;x17&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>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Work (staff review) – 1 copy</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Work (COA Committee review) – 1 copy (10 copies will be required after initial staff review).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Written description.</strong> Describe clearly and in detail the nature of your project. Include <strong>exact dimensions</strong> for materials to be used (e.g. width of siding, window trim, tree species, etc.)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Description of materials</strong> (Provide samples, if appropriate)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Color Photographs</strong> of existing conditions are required. Minimum image size 4&quot; x 6&quot; as printed. Maximum 2 images per page. Photos should be of each side of the house, fully show the yards, and include streetscapes.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Paint Schedule</strong> (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Site Drawings.</strong> Required for projects that include any addition, demolition, fences, walls, or other landscape work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Plot plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• showing relationship of buildings, additions, sidewalks, drives, trees, property lines, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tree survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• include size, species, and critical root zone for each tree over 8&quot; diameter when measured 4' above ground level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tree protection plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• include material staging area, construction access, limits of disturbance, location of tree protection fencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grading plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dimensions shown on drawings and/or graphic scale (required)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 11&quot;x17&quot; or 8-1/2&quot;x11&quot; reductions of full-size drawings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Architectural Drawings</strong> showing existing and proposed work (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plan drawings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elevation drawings showing the façade(s). For additions, deck, and porches, include the grade.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dimensions shown on drawings and/or graphic scale (required)</td>
<td>✓</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Stamped envelopes</strong> addressed to all property owners within 100 feet of property, on all sides of the property, as well as the property owner (required for Major Work). Use the <strong>Label Creator</strong> to determine the addresses.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>Fee</strong> (See Development Fee Schedule)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 10A: Photographs

Owen and Dorothy Smith House, 122 Perquimans Drive, Raleigh, Wake County
Façade, view S

Owen and Dorothy Smith House, 122 Perquimans Drive, Raleigh, Wake County
West and of facade view SW
Owen and Dorothy Smith House, 122 Perquimans Drive, Raleigh, Wake County
East end of facade, view SE

Owen and Dorothy Smith House, 122 Perquimans Drive, Raleigh, Wake County
Carport and covered walk, view F
Owen and Dorothy Smith House, 122 Perquimans Drive, Raleigh, Wake County
Foyer, view NW

Owen and Dorothy Smith House, 122 Perquimans Drive, Raleigh, Wake County
Living room and dining room (at left behind fireplace wall), view NE
05/24/19

To whom it may concern:

I have reviewed the proposed renovation plan for 122 Perquimans Drive Raleigh, NC 27609 and would like to approve and comment on the steps being taken to mitigate damage to the root zones of the mature trees in the landscape.

- The large White Oak (DBH 32"), Maple (DBH 10"), and smaller Red Oak (DBH 16") located at the right of the property will be the most impacted during the construction process. The critical root zone of White Oak is 8’. The critical root zone of the Maple is 3’. The critical root zone of the Red Oak is 4’. This is the area of no disturbance by trenching, excavation, or compaction.

  The proposed plan does not interfere with these critical root zones, but only the secondary root zones. In these secondary root zones, only a small percentage of each tree will be impacted by the addition. Because of the proposed plan to bring in materials through the back of the property, there will be little to no compaction or disturbance to the remainder of the root zones of these trees. Mulch will be added to the surface of these trees to reduce any foot compaction that may occur.

- The Maple (DBH 10") located at the back center is the only larger tree (above 8" DBH) that needs to be removed for the completion of this project. This tree is estimated to be younger than the original construction of the house and landscape plan, making it a volunteer of the natural area. This location is also best suited for the addition, as it preserves the mature Oaks throughout the property and only requires the removal of one Maple.

- The 2 Red Oaks (DBH 23” and 26") located at the back left are well outside of the construction and impact area. Based on the new material route and material staging area, little impact will be made on the critical or secondary root zones of these trees.

A path will be made through the back natural area from the adjoining property to bring in materials and equipment to the site. All debris will be staged in the natural area, well outside of the critical and secondary root zones of the trees in question. Mulch will be added to the root zones of the Hemlocks at the front right to reduce any foot traffic compaction in this area. Please reach out with any questions.

Thank you,

Jared Kibbe
ISA Certified Arborist  #50-7534A
Arborist Representative – Raleigh, NC
ANDERSON RESIDENCE ADDITION
122 PERQUIMANS DRIVE

SHEET LIST
A000  SITE SURVEY
A050  EXISTING SITE PLAN
A100  SITE PLAN
A111  FLOOR PLAN
A200  BUILDING ELEVATIONS
A900  PERSPECTIVES
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
Anderson Residence Areas

Existing Heated
- Basement: 1353
- Main Floor: 3340
- **TOTAL**: 4793

Existing Unheated
- Porch Front Loggia: 237
- Carport: 564
- Covered Walk: 256
- Covered Terrace: 254
- Screened Porch: 478
- **TOTAL**: 1789

Footprint Total: **5182**

Proposed Addition
- Heated: 1213
- Unheated: 11
- **TOTAL**: 1224

Footprint Increase: **25.70%**

Site Total Area: 7270
- Original Built %: 7.12%
- Proposed Built %: 8.95%