

**RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**  
**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE**  
Minutes of the Meeting  
October 26, 2017

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Elizabeth Caliendo called the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Committee meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

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

Present: Elizabeth Caliendo, Sarah David (arrived 4:05), Don Davis, Nick Fountain, Jimmy Thiem

Staff Present: Tania Tully, Melissa Robb, Allison Evans, Francis P. Rasberry, Jr., Attorney

**Approval of the September 28, 2017 Minutes**

Mr. Fountain moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing and to adopt said minutes as submitted. Mr. Davis seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

**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. Ms. Francis P. Rasberry, Jr., Attorney administered the affirmation.

<b><u>Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address</u></b>	<b><u>Affirmed</u></b>
John Siebert, 206 E Franklin Street 27604	Yes
Mark Riedeman, 506 Cole Street 27605	Yes
Charles Holden, 217 Dexter Place 27605	Yes
Ellis Payne, 2840 Plaza Place Suite 100 27612	Yes
Tom Mukoyama, 2840 Plaza Place Suite 100 27612	Yes
Toby Coleman, 150 Fayetteville Street 27601	Yes
Ted Van Dyk	Yes

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Mr. Davis moved to approve the agenda as printed. Mr. Fountain seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Chair Caliendo introduced the public 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: 128-17-CA, 152-17-CA, and 153-17-CA.

**DRAFT**

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

128-17-CA      211 S WILMINGTON STREET  
Applicant:      TED VAN DYK  
Received:      7/13/2017      Meeting Date(s):  
Submission date + 90 days: 10/11/2017      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.
- At the meeting the applicant provided revised drawings on 11" x 17" paper which replace those shown in the presentation packet.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report. Staff recommended approval with conditions.

Support:

Mr. Ted Van Dyk, Mr. Toby Coleman, Mr. Tom Mukoyama and Mr. Ellis Payne [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Coleman pointed out aspects of the project that are important to the applicants; the project is for a renovation of a non-historic building, the applicants are spending a great deal of money with a goal to open the business by the end of the year, and all the project team members and property owner were present.

Mr. Van Dyk distributed copies of amended application materials on 11" x 17" paper for each committee member. He reviewed a slide presentation and highlighted that the historic building façade has been gone for decades. In the façade design presented this month, there were a number of changes; the front door was walnut; the tiles were primarily 6" x 12", except for the 12" x 24" tiles around the second floor windows; the glass is vision clear; he provided both

section and elevation drawings that showed the tile pattern proposed; and they added an 8" metal cornice at the top.

Mr. Van Dyk reviewed the materials proposed which were shown on a large sample board available for review. He showed a perforated metal for the HVAC screen on the roof, similar to a screening material on the Moore Square parking deck behind the subject property. Mr. Van Dyk stated that the storefront had been recessed 1'-8" for the majority of the ground floor, while the doors were recessed 3', a typical detail for downtown buildings. He also pointed out the walnut full-lite doors which are like those found at the nearby Busy Bee, and that he had provided specifications for the only lighting that will be on the storefront.

Mr. Payne stated that his purpose was to highlight some of the economic information about the project and property. He addressed the original condition of the building, the costs of rehabilitation, and some of the internal work that had already been done.

Mr. Tom Mukoyama said that he is eager to get the business active in the building.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Davis asked for clarification on the elevation rendering and the dimensioned elevation drawing. Mr. Van Dyk provided the clarification. Mr. Thiem asked if the drawings that had just been submitted matched those that were in the committee's review packs. Mr. Van Dyk confirmed that they matched.

Ms. Caliendo asked if the applicant had any evidence that supported the design with asymmetrical windows on the second floor since the applicant's examples were all symmetrical second floor elevations. Mr. Van Dyk asked if that made it incompatible. He said that the building next door also has an asymmetrical first floor and if you look at the building as it is today, the overall composition of the new design is similar with an accent on the entry. One of his goals was to differentiate the new façade from the older buildings around it. Ms. Caliendo stated that she appreciated the reduction in tile size from the previous application, and asked for a description of the Schluter strip shown in the drawing. Mr. Van Dyk responded that the Schluter strip provides a clean metal edge that captures both edges of the adjacent tiles and that they've found it to be helpful in creating a higher quality tile installation. It can be the same color as the grout and it is flush with the tile.

Mr. Thiem asked if the lighting spec sheet satisfied the staff recommended condition for lighting specs. Ms. Robb answered that it did.

Mr. Coleman stated that the staff report recommends approval with conditions, and asked that conditions 1.a to 1.c be reviewed by staff rather than having to go back to the committee for approval. Mr. Van Dyk summed up by reviewing the materials shown on the sample board.

With no objection from the committee, Ms. Caliendo closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

### COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:

I think the redesign addresses our concerns. I still have some concerns about the tile on the second floor but I'm willing to accept the point that it distinguishes the new from the old. The tile size on the second floor is not as important as on the first. I think the grey being set off fits in with the guidelines. [Davis]

I think it would be more compatible if it was the same size as the tan. [Caliendo]

The goal of creating a two-story look to match the district has been met. Asymmetry is more traditional on the first floor than the second, but I don't think that makes it incompatible.

[David]

Calling out the structural column adds to the design. [Fountain]

We should have as a condition that the metal edge trim is the same color as the mortar. Are we okay with staff approving all the conditions? [Caliendo]

I think staff can approve it from here. [Davis]

### FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Mr. Thiem moved that based on the information contained in the application and the evidentiary hearing, the committee finds staff suggested finding A. (inclusive of facts 1-21) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-3) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

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; also, the storefront design and materials proposed are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.6.7, 2.7.7, 2.9.6, and the following 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 walnut 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 walnut 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 2<sup>nd</sup> floor windows are now closer in design to the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 2<sup>nd</sup> level punctured by large windows. The use of tiles over the entire façade, lack of muntins, and framed 2<sup>nd</sup> level differentiates it from the nearby historic facades.
- 18\* 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 walnut 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\* 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 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.
  - 3\* It is common for mechanical equipment to be placed on commercial building rooftops; traditionally these were unscreened.

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

#### DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

1. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by the staff prior to issuance of the blue placard:
  - a. Final elevation and roof plan drawings;
  - b. Doors;
  - c. Walk-in cooler;
  - d. Mechanical equipment;
  - e. Rooftop screening materials.
2. That the Schluter metal trim edge match the mortar.

Ms. David agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 4/1. (Caliendo opposed.)

Committee members voting: Caliendo, David, Davis, Fountain, Thiem.

Certificate expiration date: 4/26/18.



APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

153-17-CA      503 E JONES STREET  
Applicant:      JOHN SIBERT  
Received:      9/14/2017      Meeting Date(s):  
Submission date + 90 days: 12/13/2017      1) 10/26/2017    2)    3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Raleigh Historic Landmark: HECK-LEE HOUSE

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: Remove rear addition; construct rear addition; alter addition roof; construct side porch with fireplace; add new brick walk; install fencing

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its October 2 meeting. Members in attendance were Curtis Kasefang, Jenny Harper and David Maurer;; also present were Robert Riedlinger, John Sibert, Melissa Robb, and Tania Tully.

Staff Notes:

- The applicant received conditional approval at the September 28 COA meeting for the removal of a water oak tree and accessory building, as well as construction of a new accessory building (138-17-CA).
- COAs mentioned are available for review.
- The staff evidence includes a keyed drawing labeling the parts of the building mentioned in the report.
- Raleigh City Code Section 10.2.15.E.1. states that “An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure or site within any Historic Overlay District or Historic Landmark 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

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
1.3	Site Features and Plantings	Add new brick walk; construct side porch with fireplace
1.4	Fences and Walls	Install fencing
1.5	Walkways, Driveways and Off-street Parking	Add new brick walk
2.5	Roofs	Alter addition roof
2.8	Entrances, Porches and	Construct side porch with fireplace

3.2	Balconies Additions to Historic Buildings	Remove rear addition; construct rear addition
-----	---	---

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Ms. Melissa Robb [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report. Staff recommended approval with conditions.

Mr. Francis Rasberry, the COA committee attorney, stated that the applicant’s representative must offer testimony and present the evidence of the case only, but not act as if he is an attorney.

Support:

Mr. John Sibert [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Sibert stated that the project involved the two rear additions to the house which are not historic. The existing house has shiplap siding, while the extensions have HardiePlank lapped siding. He pointed out that they have aligned the edge of the new screen porch with the edge of the front porch. He also said they are raising the backmost roof to match the new addition.

Opposition:

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

Responses and Questions:

Ms. David asked staff for details on a similar case on Pace Street with an outdoor fireplace. Ms. Tully responded that there was a rear outdoor kitchen that didn’t get approved and the applicant had to come back. The chimney in that case was on the side wall. Ms. David asked if the committee approved the exterior chimney in that case. Ms. Tully answered yes.

Mr. Davis said the application was thorough, and that he had no questions. Mr. Thiem discussed the pecan tree that was proposed to be removed. He asked that since most of the addition was going on top of the existing patio and the pecan tree is not close to the house where the critical root zone would be impacted, is there something driving the removal of the tree? Mr. Sibert replied that his client wanted to withdraw that part of the request. Ms. Tully responded that she was not sure if he could do that since he was not the applicant. Mr. Rasberry stated that the condition regarding the pecan tree can be imposed by the committee.

With no objection from the committee, Mr. Davis closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

## COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:

I don't see anything that causes me concern. They've aligned the extension with the front porch. I think the site modifications are appropriate to the conditions. [Thiem]

I didn't vote in favor of the Pace Street outdoor fireplace. I suppose it falls in line with all of the 1½-story garages now. [David]

But it's on the back of the house. I look at it like the modern equipment like satellite dishes that can be placed in the rear. [Davis]

I'm reluctantly willing to approve one more outdoor chimney. [David]

It's very straightforward and meets the guidelines. [Davis]

## FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Ms. David moved that based on the information contained in the application and the evidentiary hearing, the committee finds staff suggested finding A. (inclusive of facts 1-4), B. (inclusive of facts 1-5), C. (inclusive of facts 1-7), D. (inclusive of facts 1-12) and E. (inclusive of facts 1-17) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Installation of fencing is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section 1.4.8, and the following facts:
- 1\* The current wood fencing along portions of the east and west sides of the lot connects to the house at the rear of the original footprint, as well as running along most of the length of the north property line. Wood picket fencing was approved for installation in 1987 (MWD-87-033).
  - 2\* The new 36" tall iron fencing is proposed along the sidewalk on both N. East Street and E. Jones Street, as well as alongside the existing brick drive. There is an existing hedge along N East Street; it is not known on which side of the hedge the fence is proposed.
  - 3\* Iron fencing is not uncharacteristic in the Oakwood Historic District, and can be seen across the street at 504 E. Jones Street, the Cameron-Maynard-Gatling House, where it also borders the sidewalk on two sides of the property.
  - 4\* No gates are proposed for the new fencing.
- B. Adding a new brick walkway is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 1.3.8, 1.5.5, 1.5.6, and the following facts:
- 1\* The property currently has brick walkways, patio and driveway.
  - 2\* The proposed walkway arcs from the northeast corner of the new screened porch to the northwest corner of the master bedroom.
  - 3\* No detailed photographs were provided of the existing walkways. No sample brick material was provided.

- 4\* Along with its neighboring Heck houses, this lot is one of the larger parcels in the historic district.
- 5\* Built **area** to open space analysis: According to the plot plan, the lot is 23,606 SF. The applicant states that the built area (labeled “impervious” on the plot plan), including the house, newly approved garage, walkways, patio and driveway is 4,712 SF. The proportion of built area to open space is approximately 20%. After the proposed project the built area will be 5,395 SF, an increase of 683 SF. The proportion of built area to open space will be approximately 23%.
- C. Alteration of an addition roof is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.5.1, 2.5.7, 2.5.10, and the following facts:
- 1\* From the National Register of Historic Places nomination for the Heck Houses: “The Heck Houses, 218 North East Street and 503 and 511 East Jones Street are a Second Empire-style trio located on spacious contiguous city lots in northeast Raleigh. The houses are not identical, but are close variations on one charmingly eclectic formula. Each is a one-and-one-half story L-shaped frame structure set on a common bond brick foundation with a wrap-around porch, a full-height mansard roof and a two-and-half-story corner mansard tower. Each house has a rear free-standing kitchen, now joined to the main block and partially obscured by frame additions.” The house was built between 1872 and 1875, according to the nomination.
- 2\* The house has multiple sections built over the years, with the mansard-roofed historic house to the south, a flat-roofed modern kitchen addition north of that, a flat-roofed enclosed former breezeway north of the modern kitchen, and a rebuilt gable-roofed structure modeled on the historic kitchen and maid’s house at the north end of the assembled sections. See staff evidence for a graphic key that matches this breakdown.
- 3\* From the *Inventory of Structures in the Oakwood National Register Historic Districts*, by Matthew Brown, former Historian, Society for the Preservation of Historic Oakwood, 2004-2015: “At some point between 1881 and 1909 a porch was built connecting the (historic) kitchen to the main house. This porch was enclosed at some point between 1914 and 1950.”
- 4\* A COA was issued in 1986 for the “renovation of infill area between main house and dependent building”. The infill area was a breezeway prior to this project, according to the application.
- 5\* The former breezeway has a flat roof that is lower than the flat roof on the modern kitchen. The proposal calls for bringing the lower roof up to match the modern kitchen roof to provide for increased ceiling height inside.
- 6\* No specifications were provided for the roof on the former breezeway.
- 7\* A skylight is shown on the roof plan. No specifications were provided for the skylight.
- D. Construction of a side porch with a fireplace is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 1.3.8, 2.8.6, 2.8.7, 2.8.9, and the following facts:
- 1\* The house retains its historic front porch which wraps around to the east side of the house.
- 2\* Built **mass** to open space analysis: According to the plot plan, the lot is 23,606 SF. The applicant states that the built mass, including the house and newly approved garage is 11%

built mass to open space. After the proposed project the built mass will be 3,667 SF, an increase of 1,104 SF. (The applicant shows a built mass increase of 512 SF on the plot plan submitted.) The proportion of built area to open space will be approximately 16%.

- 3\* The new screened side porch is designed to extend east from the rebuilt kitchen/maid's house. The east wall of the screened porch lines up with the east side of the front porch.
- 4\* The new screened porch will be attached to a portion of the house that is not historic (see E.1 below), and set back approximately 110 feet from East Jones Street.
- 5\* A detailed drawing of the screened porch was provided. The new porch framing elements and posts will be simplified versions of the historic front porch.
- 6\* Screened porches have been approved in recent years at 411 N East St (176-16-CA), 215 N East St (029-15-CA), 600 N Boundary St (103-15-CA) and 511 Oakwood Ave (087-15-CA).
- 7\* The screened porch will be covered with a metal roof that matches what is on the rebuilt kitchen/maid's house. Specifications were provided.
- 8\* Paint colors which appear to match the existing house were provided, however the details on how the screened porch will be painted were not.
- 9\* A two-sided fireplace is planned to be shared between the screened porch and new brick walkway.
- 10\* Outdoor fireplaces/fire pits have been approved recently in Oakwood at 608 Oakwood Ave (125-13-CA) and 323 Pace St (167-15-CA).
- 11\* The applicant's bird's eye view drawing shows the brick used for the walkway will also be the flooring for the screened porch.
- 12\* No sample brick material was provided.

E. Removal of a rear addition and construction of a new rear addition is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.7, 3.2.8, 3.2.9, 3.2.10, 3.2.11, and 3.2.12; however, the removal of a mature pecan tree is incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 1.3.7, and 3.2.4, and the following facts:

- 1\* An arborist report was provided that advises the removal of a pecan tree "located at the back of 503 E Jones Street", however there was no indication of its location on a site plan. No photos of the tree were provided. No replacement tree was proposed.
- 2\* No tree protection plan was provided for the remaining trees on the property.
- 3\* The Library of Congress holds a set of 1967 Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) drawings from a group of students from North Carolina State College, shown as staff evidence with this report. These drawings include a note about the rear accessory building: "Kitchen and maid's house are reconstructed."
- 4\* The applicant's intention is to raise the roof height the rebuilt kitchen/maid's house rather than removing and rebuilding it.
- 5\* Page 15 of the application erroneously labels the rear elevation as proposed; it is existing and is the current rear of the rebuilt kitchen/maid's house.
- 6\* The new rear addition is rectangular in form with a gable roof that is perpendicular to and extends from the rebuilt kitchen/maid's house.
- 7\* The architectural detailing on the proposed addition is simple, in contract to the elaborate Heck-Lee House. Detailed drawings were not provided.

- 8\* Paint colors which appear to match the existing house were provided.
- 9\* The scale, proportion and size of the double-hung windows on the east and west sides of the addition are similar to others on the house.
- 10\* New windows will be wood double-hung windows. Specifications and details were not provided.
- 11\* The north addition for the master bedroom will have a door with a transom on the north wall that appears similar to the existing door on the east side of the former breezeway (without a transom). Door specifications were not provided.
- 12\* The north addition for the master bedroom will also have a grouping of three doors on the north wall with a series of transoms above. Groupings of doors on the rear of new additions are commonly approved in the Oakwood historic district.. Door specifications were not provided.
- 13\* The proposed north addition will be covered with a metal roof that matches what is on the rebuilt kitchen/maid's house. Specifications were provided.
- 14\* Skylights are proposed on the north addition. Specifications were not provided.
- 15\* Siding specifications were not provided.
- 16\* The proposed north addition will take the place of an existing brick patio.
- 17\* A light fixture spec was provided, but there was no indication on the elevation drawings where they would be installed.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Thiem; passed 3/0.

#### DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

1. That there be a 365-day demolition delay for the removal of the Pecan tree.
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 issuance of the blue placard:
  - a. A tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the ISA or by a licensed landscape architect; the plan should also include protection of perimeter trees from construction activity and material storage.
  - b. Location and species of replacement tree;
  - c. New windows;
  - d. Eave construction for the addition;
4. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
  - a. Siding ;
  - b. Details on screened porch painting;

- c. Roof specs for the former breezeway;
- d. Skylights;
- e. New doors;
- f. Lighting location;
- g. Brick sample for fireplace;
- h. Fence material description;
- i. Fence gates (if any);
- j. A detailed drawing of the new walkway, including brick pattern;
- k. Brick sample for walkway and screened porch floor.

Mr. Thiem agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 3/0.

Committee members voting: David, Davis, Thiem.

Certificate expiration date: 4/26/18.

DRAFT

## OTHER BUSINESS

### 1. Committee Discussion

- a. The committee discussed of the poor application drawings that are consistently being provided. The issues included lack of dimensions, no tree protection plans, too small to read, amount of new information being provided at the hearing. The committee guided staff to be stricter with the submittal requirements so as to avoid confusion and the need to defer at the meeting.

## ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:03 p.m.

Elizabeth Caliendo, Chair  
Certificate of Appropriateness Committee,  
Raleigh Historic Development Commission

Minutes Submitted by:  
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner

DRAFT