Nature of Project: Remove chain-link fence; install fence with horizontal pickets; remove six trees; plant four replacement trees

APPLICANT: JULIE MANLY AND ROB LYNN
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – STAFF REPORT

COA-0081-2019  216 E LENOIR STREET
Applicant: ROB LYNN AND JULIE MANLY
Received: 10/30/2019  Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 1/28/2020  1) 9/26/2019  2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: PRINCE HALL HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: GENERAL HOD
Nature of Project: Remove chain-link fence; install fence with horizontal pickets; remove six trees; plant four replacement trees

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 &amp; Plantings</td>
<td>Remove six trees; plant two trees; Remove chain-link fence; Install fence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Fences and Walls</td>
<td>Remove chain-link fence; Install fence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STAFF REPORT

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

A. Removing of a chain-link fence and installing a fence are not incongruous in concept according to Guidelines 1.3.7, 1.4.7, 1.4.8; however, the installation of a fence with horizontal pickets is incongruous according to Guidelines 1.4.8 and the following suggested facts:
1* The applicant provided a tree survey identifying the species of trees located on the property.
2* Location: The applicant proposes replacing existing chain-link fencing on the south and east property lines. No change in fence location is proposed.
3* **Material:** Wood is a traditional fencing material. The proposed fence will have a natural finish.

4* **Height:** The proposed new fence height is 6’.

5* **Configuration:** The committee has regularly found that 6’-tall wood privacy fences are congruous with the character of the historic districts when installed in rear and side yards (except for corner lots). The proposed fence and gate locations are characteristic of the district.

6* **Design:** The existing fencing is chain-link. The proposed replacement fence design is a horizontal board design. It is proposed to have a natural finish. Traditionally, fences were constructed with neighbor friendly design, with structural members facing inward; the proposed fence design will be built with the pickets on the outside. Fences in Raleigh neighborhoods traditionally had vertical pickets. To date the committee has not found horizontal pickets congruous with the character of any of the historic districts.

7* The application states that no similar styles exist in Prince Hall.

B. Removing six trees and planting four replacement trees is not incongruous in concept according to Guidelines 1.3.5; however, the removal of a healthy tree is incongruous according to Guidelines 1.3.1, 1.3.5, and the following suggested facts:

1* The application proposes the removal of six trees on or near the south property line. Five trees were identified as Paper Mulberry and one is a Hackberry.

2* The applicant provided a tree survey identifying the species of trees located on the property with the DBH and CRZ of those trees noted. The CRZ is not drawn to scale.

3* The applicant included an aerial image of the existing tree canopy coverage. Removal of the six trees would eliminate the existing canopy coverage for this property.

4* The application indicates that the trees are invasive, have root damage, and are overgrown with English Ivy. Photographs of the trees were provided, but no information on structural integrity was provided. An assessment on the health of the trees from an International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) certified arborist or NC-licensed landscape architect was provided. The arborist did not state that the trees were dead, diseased, or dangerous.

5* Two Maple trees and two Forest Pansy trees are proposed to be planted as replacement trees. The applicant included the mature spread dimensions to demonstrate replacement canopy coverage.
Staff suggests that the Committee deny the horizontal pickets on the fence, and approve the application with the following conditions:

1. That there not be a delay for the removal of the four trees on the property line that are grown into the chain-link fence
2. That there be a 365-day delay on the 19” DBH Hackberry and the 13” DBH Paper Mulberry, located on the east property line.
3. That any new post holes be dug manually and tree roots larger than 1” caliper that are encountered while digging the fence post holes shall receive a clean final cut using tools designed for the purpose, such as loppers.
4. That a revised fence design be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard form of the COA.

**Staff Contact:** Collette Kinane, collette.kinane@raleighnc.gov
Applicant name: Weathervane Properties, LLC  
Mailing address: 547 East Jones St.  
City: Raleigh  
State: NC  
Zip code: 27601  
Date: 07/16/19  
Daytime phone #: 919-830-0616  
Email address: roblynn.raleigh@gmail.com

Applicant signature:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor work (staff review) – one copy</th>
<th>Office Use Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major work (COA committee review) – ten copies</td>
<td>Transaction #:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions &gt; 25% of building sq. footage</td>
<td>Fee: ___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New buildings</td>
<td>Amount paid: ___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of building or structure</td>
<td>Received date: ___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>Received by: ___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post approval re-review of conditions of approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Property street address: 216 East Lenoir St.  
Historic district: Prince Hall District  
Historic property/Landmark name (if applicable):  
Owner name: Julie Manly  
Owner mailing address: 547 East Jones St.

---

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>Andrew &amp; Diana DePompa</td>
<td>809 E. Hargett St, Raleigh, 27601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangle Green Properties</td>
<td>P.O. Box 721, Morrisville, NC 27560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Moore</td>
<td>217 E. 50th St., Raleigh, 27601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricky ESLAVA</td>
<td>3404 Apache Dr, Raleigh, 27609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Manly</td>
<td>547 E. Jones St, Raleigh, 27601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 total - See attached
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

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>1.3/22</td>
<td>Site/Planting</td>
<td>Tree Removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4/24</td>
<td>Fences/Walls</td>
<td>Remove existing fence / install new.</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 ______________
Section 1.3 Site/Planting
On January 22, 2019 each of the six trees on the rear of property were evaluated by John Sugg, a Certified Arborist with Treefull Communities, LLC. (report included) Mr. Sugg determined that all but one of the trees are of the invasive, non-native species Paper Mulberry. The voluntary trees and their trunks have grown into the chain-link fence. He states in his evaluation, “the fact that these trees have grown into the fence and are invasive renders them useless”.
All of the six trees are overgrown with English Ivy and have root damage. Mr. Sugg concluded, “They should be removed so that more desirable trees can be planted.
We propose to plant four replacement trees, two Maple and two Forest Pansy. A replacement drawing with mature size and canopy is included in the application.
January 22, 2019

Rob Lynn  
Weathervane Properties, LLC  
106 N East St  
Raleigh, NC 27601-1112

This tree assessment has been conducted at the request of Rob Lynn with Weathervane Properties in response to trees growing along the fence-line at the rear periphery of 216 East Lenoir Street in Raleigh, North Carolina.

Upon my investigation of the six subject trees, all but one were found to be of the invasive, non-native species Paper Mulberry (*Broussonetia papyrifera*) and the remaining tree (flagged as #3) is Hackberry (*Celtis occidentalis*). All trees are voluntary (not planted) and their trunks have grown into the chain-link fence in most cases. Three are overgrown with English Ivy and most of them have root damage from site excavation as well as some additional damage from severe pruning. The fact that these trees have grown into the fence and nearly all of them are invasive species renders them useless. As such, they should all be removed to allow for removal and/or replacement of the existing fence and so that more desirable trees can be planted toward the center of the rear of the property depending on available space.

If there are future concerns or questions regarding these or other trees on the site, please contact me promptly.

John Sugg, CA  
[Signature]

Tree Risk Assessment Qualified

“Providing an Accurate Assessment of Our Green Resources”
All diameter measurements taken at 4.5' from ground level
The Maple Tree grows to 60-75' and a spread of 40-50' at maturity.
The Forest Pansy grows to 20-30' and a spread of 25' at maturity.
Section 1.4 Fences and Walls

The property currently has a chain link barbed wire fence on the east and south sides of the Property. We seek permission to remove the existing and install 140 LF of 6’ H horizontal board fence with ½ inch spacing between boards. Attached you will find a photo of proposed style as well as drawing with highlighted areas of installation. Currently there is no comparison fence located in the Prince Hall district with the limited number of residential properties. We feel a horizontal fence would be aesthetically fitting to the concrete block building as well as the iron railings with horizontal cabling.
Remove 145 LF of existing commercial chain link fence – no wood.

Install 140 LF of 6' Skyline fence – no gates c. ½” space between horizontal boards.

Tree removal by others before fence work begins.

Neighbor's Fence
DO NOT TOUCH

Pickets will be installed on the OUTSIDE of the fence unless otherwise noted. Any requests to change sketch must be documented with the office in addition to the installers. This sketch is part of the contract with Big Jerry's Fencing, LLC.
Proposed 6' Horizontal Slat Fencing on Property Line.

1. Install 4' Mulch Blanks.
2. Place plywood or sod over mulch in areas where construction traffic may scatter mulch, as needed.
3. No heavy equipment.
4. Hand excavate footings.
5. Cut all roots larger than 1" dia. with ban or reciprocating saw.
6. Water entire area during tree during periods of drought for 1 year after construction is complete.
7. All construction material to be stored outside of marked areas.

PIRCE PROTECTION:
Plastic Orange Mesh Construction Fencing attached to steel posts. Min. 6' CG or avoid rooting w/ posts.

216 E LENOIR STREET

PROPOSED SITE & TREE PROTECTION PLAN
SCALE: 1" = 1'-0"
8/8/2016
TightLines Designs