

RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
June 28, 2018

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, Don Davis, Sarah David, Nick Fountain,

Staff Present: Collette Kinane; Tania Tully; Francis P. Rasberry, Jr., Attorney

Approval of the May 24, 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 was one correction made to the Minor Work report, 9 cases were approved. There were no questions regarding the Minor Work report.

The following is a list indicating persons in attendance and whether they were affirmed. Ms. Elizabeth Caliendo administered the affirmation.

<u>Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address</u>	<u>Affirmed</u>
Barbara Wishy, 515 N Bloodworth Street, Raleigh	no
Tommy Harrill, 513 N Bloodworth Street, Raleigh	yes
Melissa Mason, 120 N Bloodworth Street, Raleigh	yes
David Cole, 1330 Mordecai Drive, Raleigh	yes
Meg Pritchard, 118 S Person Street, Raleigh	yes
Emily Sharpe, 2943 Wycliff Road, Raleigh	no
Ashley Cameron, 5 W Hargett Street, Raleigh	yes
Brandy Thompson, 1100 Filmore Street, Raleigh	no
John L Thomas, 5508 Swiftbrook Circle, Raleigh	no
Brooke Tate, 509 Burton Street, Raleigh	no
Henry Ward, 223 Elm Street, Raleigh	yes
Susan Iddings, 611 Polk Street, Raleigh	yes

REVIEW OF SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Collette Kinane presented an introduction of each summary proceeding case. Mr. Fountain moved to approve the agenda with the removal of the Administrative Review of Conditions for

193-07-CA, 1526 Tryon Road, Carolina Pines Hotel, Raleigh Historic Landmark. Mr. Davis seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS

There were no objections to the approval of the Summary Proceedings without a public hearing. The committee reviewed and approved the following cases: 080-18-CA and 086-18-CA; for which the Summary Proceeding is made part of these minutes.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – SUMMARY PROCEEDING

080-18-CA 520 N PERSON STREET
Applicant: JOHN THOMAS FOR GARDENER BY NATURE LLC
Received: 5/9/18 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 8/7/2018 1) 6/28/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT
Zoning: HOD-G
Nature of Project: Implementation of master landscape plan; remove and replace plantings
Amendments: None

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	Implementation of master landscape plan; remove and replace plantings

STAFF REPORT

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

- A. Implementation of a master landscape plan involving removing and replacing plantings is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3, 1.3.5, 1.3.7, 1.3.8, and the following suggested facts:
- 1* The property includes a ca. 1893 two-story Folk Victorian house with full-width front porch, as well as brick walkways and front stairs, and an asphalt driveway on the south side of the house.
 - 2* According to the applicant, the house was rehabilitated in 2009 (COA 005-09-CA and 087-09-CA) and a master landscape plan was developed and installed the next year.
 - 3* The application includes the removal of underperforming plants in the south section of the front yard and the planting of evergreen shrubs and groundcovers. No changes in hardscape are proposed.
 - 4* The front walk is proposed to be flanked by plantings.
 - 5* An ornamental Weeping Yaupon Holly is proposed to be removed and replaced with a Camellia Japonica. The holly is under the 8” diameter that requires review and approval for removal, according to the COA list of work.

Staff suggests that the committee approve the application.

Decision on the Application

There were no objections to approval without an evidentiary hearing.

Mr. Fountain moved to approve the application, adopting the staff report as the written record of the summary proceeding on COA 080-18-CA. Ms. David seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 12/28/18.

Decision on the Application

There were no objections to approval without an evidentiary hearing.

Mr. Fountain moved to approve the application, adopting the staff report as the written record of the summary proceeding on COA 086-18-CA. Ms. David seconded the motion; passed 4/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 12/28/18.

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: 079-18-CA, 081-18-CA, 082-18-CA, 083-18-CA, 084-18-CA, and 085-18-CA.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

079-18-CA 613 WILLS FOREST STREET
Applicant: DAVID COLE FOR INCLUSION STUDIO PLLC
Received: 6/12/2018 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 9/10/2018 1) 6/28/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: GLENWOOD-BROOKLYN HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: STREETSIDE HISTORIC OVERLAY DISTRICT (HOD-S)

Nature of Project: Addition of full 2nd story to existing 1 ½-story rear addition; roof alteration to rear of historic pyramidal roof

Amendments:

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its May 2 and June 4, 2018, meetings. Members in attendance were Mary Ruffin Hanbury, Curtis Kasefang, and David Maurer; also present were staff members Melissa Robb and Collette Kinane, and applicants David Cole, Eric Mitchell, and Madeleine McKenzie.

Staff Notes:

- Streetside HODs are "...established to provide for protection of the traditional development patterns of an area and to preserve historic resources found in it. The focus is on maintaining that character and on preserving those key character-defining features of individual historic resources within the district as viewed from the street right-of-way, excluding alleys..." (Section 5.4.2.A.1. of the Unified Development Ordinance)
- Section 5.4.2.B. of the Unified Development Ordinance governs the applicability of the COA process in Streetside HODs. Any addition to a building or structure that projects beyond an existing building's maximum front and side wall and roof plane envelope regardless of distance from the public right-of-way requires a COA. For the site, only the lot area between the public rights-of-way and the façade of the house are regulated. For the purpose of Streetside HODs, alleys are not public rights-of-way.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

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	Addition of full 2 nd story to existing 1 ½-story rear addition
3.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Addition of full 2 nd story to existing 1 ½-story rear addition; roof alteration to rear of historic pyramidal roof

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Collette Kinane [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report.

Mr. Francis Rasberry, the COA Committee attorney, stated that the applicant, as a representative of a corporate entity, must offer testimony and present the evidence of the case only, but not act as if he is an attorney by presenting arguments and examining witnesses and other actions such as an attorney makes.

Support:

David Cole [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Cole noted that the addition sits lower than the existing house and is not visible from the street. They aimed to fill in the gables in a sensitive way. They do not plan to adjust the historic house or slate and plan to maintain the street elevation.

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Davis asked how much taller the height of the proposed addition is to the existing structure.

Mr. Cole responded about 6" behind the chimney.

Mr. Davis stated that from the drawings it looked more than just 6".

Mr. Cole stated that he didn't have the drawings in front of him, so he didn't recall the exact dimension. Upon reviewing the drawings (A2.05 and A2.04), he stated that the dimension is 1'6".

Mr. Fountain asked for the dimensions from the peak of the roof to where it drops to the red line on page A2.05.

Mr. Cole stated that the change in distance is approximately 2'.

Mr. Fountain asked for clarification on an elevation drawing where there is a v-shaped gap and appears to be nothing there.

Mr. Cole responded that it's part of the roof and should have been filled in.

Mr. Fountain asked the applicant if he would like to comment on staff's comments.

Mr. Cole asked if he was allowed to do that based on the law that he is not a lawyer and representing an LLC.

Mr. Rasberry responded that he should state facts.

Mr. Cole stated that this design version treats the original façade as sensitively as possible. They went to DRAC and altered the design so that the original façade does not change.

Mr. Davis asked how far the second floor extends from the current.

Mr. Cole responded that on drawing C-001 there is a deck on the existing house and the second floor extends no further than the existing deck.

Mr. Davis asked how far is the existing deck?

Mr. Cole responded approximately 12'.

Ms. David stated that she understands what has triggered the COA in the streetside – is the Committee reviewing the whole project?

Ms. Tully responded yes and no – the Committee has already determined that the alley is not part of the right-of-way and that more leniency is given on the rear; but the project should be reviewed in full.

Mr. Fountain asked if it was the same with open space/built area?

Ms. Tully responded yes.

Mr. Davis asked, in looking at the guidelines, not having the addition overwhelm the house – does this still apply in streetside?

Ms. Tully responded yes.

Ms. Caliendo asked the applicant to respond to a question from staff in the comments as to whether cedar shake or asphalt shingles were specified.

Mr. Cole responded that cedar shakes would be used, same as on the previous addition.

Without objection Ms. Caliendo closed the evidentiary portion of the hearing.

Committee Discussion

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

Evidence wasn't provided to show other 2nd story additions to a one-story structure. [Caliendo]

The scale and massing is very solid and blocky. There is no articulation. There were photos of adjacent two-story structures, but not one story with a two-story rear addition. [David]

The design guideline about overpowering the original structure is key here. It's visually overpowering now. [Caliendo]

There is a non-congruent window type on the west elevation. They are too little and narrow and not traditional. [David]

That's sheet A2.07. [Tully]

The lack of fenestration on the addition – there are long stretches of weatherboards and no windows. [David]

That wouldn't be visible from the street. [Caliendo]

And it's behind the 50% line. [Davis]

Staff commented that five windows were narrower. [Caliendo]

Those windows are on the rear. To meet the design guidelines, it needs the mass broken up and the height addressed. [David]

The height is fine, but the front needs to appear less massive. [Caliendo]

Does the applicant wish to respond? [Caliendo]

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Mr. Cole requested to respond. With no objection, Ms. Caliendo reopened the public testimony.

Mr. Cole asked if the Committee could specify which façade is height problematic.

Ms. Caliendo responded that they were concerned about the front façade. She requested that the applicant bring evidence of other two-story rear additions to a one-story house.

Without objection Ms. Caliendo closed the evidentiary portion of the hearing.

Ms. David made a motion to defer the application to the next meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Davis; passed 4/0.

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

081-18-CA 118 S PERSON STREET
Applicant: AMY JONES FOR VINTAGE CHURCH
Received: 05/09/2018 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 08/07/2018 1) 06/28/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT
Raleigh Historic Landmark: TABERNACLE BAPTIST CHURCH
Zoning: HOD-G
Nature of Project: Install signage
Conflict of Interest: None noted.
Staff Notes:

- Ordinarily, review of a sign installation is eligible for minor work approval by staff. However, the amount of signage on the structure, in staff’s judgment, may not meet the *Guidelines*. According to the commission’s Bylaws and Rules of Procedure, Article XVI, “Staff will refer Minor Work projects to the commission for review if in staff’s judgment the change involves alterations, additions, or removals that are substantial, do not meet the guidelines, or are of a precedent-setting nature.”
- Section 1.8 of the *Guidelines* under Things to Consider As You Plan it states “New signage on commercial and institutional buildings should be compatible with and enhance the architectural style and details of the building facade and never obscure or damage significant building features or details.”

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
1.8	Signage	Install 12" tall by 66" wide wall sign

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Collette Kinane [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from staff comments.

Support:

Meg Pritchard [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Pritchard provided additional documentation to show examples of scale and to address the staff comment about rust. Ms. Pritchard stated that the church has a plan in place to monitor and clean rust. There are two other signs that were previously installed using the same material, neither has had issues with rust.

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Davis clarified that the applicant was not removing a sign.

Ms. Pritchard affirmed and stated that the application was to add another.

Ms. Caliendo commented that the other signs were approved through minor works.

Ms. David asked staff why this application was determined to require Committee review?

Ms. Tully responded that the amount of signage seemed to be too much in context of the building.

Mr. Fountain asked if the combined aggregate square footage of total signage compared to the surface square footage of the exterior was known?

Ms. Pritchard responded that she did not have those dimensions or the ratio to the exterior. On Person Street there is only one logo sign.

Ms. Caliendo stated that the missing component was a comparison to other structures and signage in the district.

Ms. Tully commented that another factor to consider is that the structure is a church, not a commercial building like a restaurant.

Ms. David stated that the proposed façade does appear “busy,” but that is not one of the guidelines.

Ms. Caliendo moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed.

Committee Discussion

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

It’s not obscuring the architectural features. The location may have been where another sign was previously located. It generally meets the guidelines. [David]

I do think it’s too much signage, but it’s not against the guidelines. [Davis]

Remember not to consider the content, just the material and location of the sign. [Rasberry]

Breaking it up helps the fenestration. [Fountain]

Add the monumental nature of the building as a fact. [Tully]

Guideline 1.8.3 says not to cover a large portion of the building. Due to the building’s size it’s not a large portion. [Caliendo]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Mr. Davis moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the evidentiary hearing, the committee finds staff position A. (inclusive of facts 1-9) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. Installation of a sign is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 1.8.2, 1.8.3, 1.8.4, 1.8.5, 1.8.7, 1.8.8, 1.8.11 and the following facts:

- 1* The face of the sign is proposed to be located on the west side of the E. Hargett Street entrance, below the pointed arch stained-glass window. The sign is proposed to be 12" high x 66" long.
- 2* There is currently signage of the same style located on both sides of the E. Hargett Street entrance, hanging in the entryway above the E. Hargett Street entrance, next to a side entry on the west side of the E. Hargett Street facade, on the S. Person Street side of the bell tower, and above and adjacent to the rear entry off S. Person Street.
- 3* Cor-Ten steel is a non-traditional signage material. It is designed to develop a rust-like appearance after years of exposure to weather. The weathering process can lead to "bleeding" or "runoff" that can discolor the structure.
- 4* The text of the sign is simple and easy to read and will be painted white. The logo and lettering are a painted wood underlayer that is visible through routed cut-outs in the metal. The logo is a blue shield on a white background.
- 5* The existing signage was approved in 2014 through COA 073-14-MW. These signs are made of Cor-Ten steel and wood.
- 6* Staff recently approved the addition of two signage panels (the URL and service times panels) through 071-18-MW (as shown in applicant photographs). This approved signage is the same style as the currently existing and proposed new signage.
- 7* In reviewing the photographs supplied by the applicant, it appears that the previous signage was not mounted through mortar joints as specified in the previous applications. However, since the structure is constructed of brick and stuccoed and scored to appear stone, it is possible that the signs were mounted through the brick mortar joints and not the false scored joints.
- 8* Given the monumental size of the building, the proposed signage does not cover significant square footage.
- 9* The proposed signs are multiple smaller signs that read as one sign.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Davis; passed 4/0.

Decision on the Application

Mr. Davis made a motion that the application be approved.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Davis; passed 4/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 12/28/18.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

082-18-CA 513 N BLOODWORTH STREET
Applicant: THOMAS HARRILL AND VALENTINA ZHUKOVA-HARRILL
Received: 5/14/18 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 8/12/2018 1) 6/28/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: Demolish existing 2-car garage and shed; construct 2-car garage; replace concrete driveway with brick driving strips; install brick patio; remove and replace tree

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its May 2, 2018, meeting. Members in attendance were Curtis Kasefang, and David Maurer; also present were staff members Melissa Robb and Collette Kinane, and applicants Thomas Harrill and Valentina Zhukova-Harrill.

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.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

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	Demolish existing 2-car garage and shed; construct 2-car garage; replace concrete driveway with brick driving strips; install brick patio; remove and replace tree
1.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Off-street Parking	Replace concrete driveway with brick driving strips; install brick patio
1.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	Demolish existing 2-car garage and shed; construct 2-car garage

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Collette Kinane [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report.

Support:

Thomas Harrill [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Harrill stated that he was appreciative of staff for their assistance. The COA process was an education, but he has appreciation for the work. The garage was damaged during a recent hurricane and, due to that damage, no contractors would take it on as a repair project. His goal is to age in place.

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Davis asked the height of the current garage.

Mr. Harrill responded that he did not know precisely, but he thought it was possibly 12'.

Ms. Caliendo asked if the proposed garage was 19' tall?

Mr. Harrill stated, yes – the rationale for the height of the new garage is due to the property's history of flooding. He would like an attic storage space in the garage that will be accessed by a pull-down stairwell.

Ms. Caliendo moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed.

Committee Discussion

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

We keep seeing historic garage after garage being removed. I wish the applicant was repairing. We've seen a lot of 1 ½ story garages – this one even has a small shed. They're like mini-houses. [David]

This one isn't 1 ½ stories. The eave height is almost maintained. Guideline 1.6.12 – if garage is deteriorated, maintain traditional height in the district. [Caliendo]

There is legitimate structural damage. [Fountain]

Guideline 1.6.5 addresses garages that are structurally unsound. [Caliendo]

The proposed design not as bad as others. [Fountain]

I'm convinced that the garage is deteriorated. [Davis]

Yes, but it needs to be the traditional size and scale. [David]

It's trending towards matching all new garages, not historic. [Davis]

How have we been assessing these garages? There is little doubt that the garage needs to come down, same as with the tree. Can we agree on no delay? The proposed is a true replacement structure. [Fountain]

Yes, I think the size is right with the eave. I think the addition on the rear is incompatible. [Caliendo]

But the existing garage already has a small shed on the rear. [Davis]
Oh, I see - the footprint is similar. [Caliendo]
The lot coverage is nearly the same. [Fountain]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Mr. Fountain moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the evidentiary hearing, the committee finds staff suggested finding A. (inclusive of facts 1-14) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-6) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Demolishing an existing 2-car garage and shed, and constructing a 2-car garage is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.5, 1.3.6, 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 1.6.5, 1.6.6, 1.6.7, 1.6.8, 1.6.11, and the following facts:
- 1* The subject property is within the original boundaries of Oakwood Historic District listed in the National Register in 1974. The application includes the following statements:
 - a. “=WA4009, 513 N. Bloodworth St. Douglass-Wheeler House c.1924. This Craftsman frame bungalow was built for William C. Douglass, who lived at 425 N. Bloodworth. He was an illustrious personal injury lawyer. He also served in the legislature in 1907-08, and became president of the N.C. Bar Association in 1926. This house was among three he had built on North Bloodworth in the 1920s. He sold this one to Spencer W. Wheeler, assistant trainmaster with the Seaboard Air Line Railroad. It is of one-and-a-half stories, and is veneered in brown bricks. It has a side-gabled saddle roof with deep eaves. Under the gable eaves are triangular knee braces; under the horizontal eaves are exposed rafter tails. The front porch is sheltered by a more shallowly pitched extension of the main roof. It is supported by four battered square-section posts on stone-capped brick piers, with a Craftsman-style slat balustrade. On the front is a wide shed dormer, sided in weatherboards, with two double windows. On the rear is a slightly narrower dormer. Most windows have four vertical panes in the upper sash and a single pane in the lower sash. There are many double windows. There is a Craftsman-style shallow rectangular bay window on the right side of the house, with a shed roof. There are stone-capped brick knee walls astride the front steps. There is a one-story projection in the rear, probably original. Beside it is a porch which was enclosed after 1950.”
 - b. “There is a saddle-roofed frame garage to the northwest of the house which was built c.1924.”
 - c. “There is a small shed behind the garage which was built after 1950.”
 - 2* The applicant proposes demolishing the garage, and provided evidence about the structural damage received during and after a hurricane.
 - 3* The applicant also proposes to remove a non-contributing metal shed that is behind the garage.
 - 4* A tree protection plan by an ISA-certified arborist was provided. The entirety of the new garage will sit within the critical root zone of a tree on the adjacent property. The tree protection plan does not address the impacts of construction on this tree.

- 5* The new garage is sited traditionally at the end of the driveway near the rear lot line.
 - 6* The proposed new garage and workshop is a 1 ½-story bungalow form that takes design cues from the historic house. The garage is deferential in scale to the historic house.
 - 7* The height of the house is 28'-5" at the roof ridge, while the height of the proposed garage will be 18'-10" from grade. The drawing labeled New Driveway Side Elevation of Garage illustrates the change in grade from the ridge of the house to the rear of the proposed new garage.
 - 8* The applicant provided evidence of other garages in the Oakwood Historic District.
 - 9* **Built area to open space analysis:** According to the applicant, the lot is 7,925 SF. The footprint of the house, garage, shed, driveway, patio, deck and walkways is 3,556 SF. The proportion of built area to open space is currently 45%. The footprint of all proposed built area, including the new garage, extended driveway and patio, is 3,809 SF. The proportion of built area to open space is proposed to be 48%.
 - 10* The applicant proposes providing paint colors for the garage and house in a separate application.
 - 11* Photographs and measured, scaled drawings for the existing garage were provided with the application, thus satisfying the requirement of documenting the building prior to demolition.
 - 12* Specifications and details for the windows were provided.
 - 13* Manufacturer's specifications for the garage vehicular doors were not included in the application.
 - 14* Specifications for the gutters and downspouts were not included in the application.
- B. Replacing a concrete driveway with brick driving strips, installing a brick patio, and removing and replacing a tree is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.5, 1.3.6, 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 1.5.1, 1.5.2, 1.5.3, 1.5.5, 1.5.6, 1.5.9, and the following suggested facts:
- 1* The existing concrete drive was originally concrete driving strips which were filled in with a concrete median strip at some point. The entire driveway has significantly deteriorated, according to the applicant.
 - 2* The proposed new driveway will be a brick strip configuration with a grass median. The strip driveway will terminate as a solid brick driveway/patio at the rear of the house.
 - 3* The property has an unusually large use of brick compared to the majority of the historic district. The house is one of the few original all-brick structures and includes a brick retaining wall that runs across the front of the house at the sidewalk, then along the south side of the side and rear of the property to the back property line.
 - 4* According to the applicant, the large double-trunk maple on the north side of the garage is damaged and is proposed to be removed. The applicant provided documentation from an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) attesting to the condition.
 - 5* A tree protection plan by an ISA-certified arborist was provided.
 - 6* The tree is proposed to be replaced with either a white birch or Japanese maple.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Davis; passed 3/1 (Ms. David opposed).

Decision on the Application

Mr. Fountain made a motion that the application be approved, with the following conditions:

1. That there be no demolition delay for the removal of the garage.
2. That there be no demolition delay for the removal of the maple tree.
3. That tree protection plans be implemented and remain in place for the duration of construction.
4. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard:
 - a. Revised tree protection plan that includes the adjacent tree and assesses the impact of multiple foundation types.
5. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. Manufacturer's specifications for garage vehicular door, showing both section and elevation views, and material descriptions;
 - b. Manufacturer's specifications for exterior lighting, and location on building;
 - c. Specifications for the gutters and downspouts, and location on building.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Davis. The motion passed 3/1 (Ms. David opposed).

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

Certificate expiration date: 12/28/18.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

083-18-CA 908 DOROTHEA DRIVE
Applicant: ANTHONY CASALETTO AND MELISSA MASON
Received: 5/9/18 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 8/7/2018 1) 6/28/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: Rear addition; rear deck; relocate front door; reconfigure front façade;
reconfigure screen porch; window alterations; change exterior paint colors

DRAC: An application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee at its May 7, 2018 meeting. Members in attendance were Curtis Kasefang and David Maurer; also present were Melissa Robb, Collette Kinane, and Tania Tully.

Amendments: None

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.4	Paint and Paint Color	Change exterior paint color.
2.6	Exterior Walls	Construct rear addition, Window alterations, relocate front door
2.7	Windows and Doors	Window alterations, relocate front door
2.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	Reconfigure front façade, relocate front door; reconfigure screen porch
3.1	Decks	Construct rear deck
3.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	Construct rear addition

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Collette Kinane [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report.

Support:

Melissa Mason and Ashley Cameron [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application.

Ms. Cameron provided new documents including: an updated floor plan, updated existing west elevation, updated existing north elevation, and a tree protection plan and strategy. She stated that, as included in the application, she believes that the front door was relocated from its original location and cited the central pediment and similar neighboring properties as evidence.

Ms. Mason added that denial of the front door relocation would negatively affect their renovation plan and that they believe the door was relocated when the west side of the front porch was enclosed. She stated that she recently has seen the Committee approve alterations to windows and doors and was surprised that there would be concern about their relocation of the door.

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

Responses and Questions:

Mr. Davis stated that the house next door has a pediment and is off-center. He thinks 1016 Dorothea is a mirror image of this property and has the door in the same location.

Ms. David stated that the placement of the porch posts reaffirms the door location.

Ms. Tully explained the reconsideration provision.

Mr. Davis noted that the addition on the rear is entirely within the guidelines.

Mr. Fountain stated that he is not convinced the columns are original.

Mr. Davis stated that a property down the street has similar columns.

Mr. Fountain asked if the property had a similarly odd alignment.

Mr. Davis said yes.

Ms. Caliendo moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed.

Committee Discussion

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

It's a good idea to defer and approve remainder. [Caliendo]

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Ms. David moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the evidentiary hearing, the committee finds staff suggested finding A. (inclusive of facts 1-17) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Construction of a rear addition; construction of a rear deck; reconfiguration of screen porch; and changing the exterior paint color are not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 2.4.2, 2.4.3, 2.4.4, 2.6.1, 2.6.2, 2.7.1, 2.7.5, 2.7.9, 2.8.1, 2.8.3, and the following facts:

- 1* The structure is described in the Boylan Heights National Register nomination as a c. 1924 “one-story Bungalow; pedimented gable with attached porch -extended to left. (Room added?).”
- 2* The applicant proposes removing a 1960s era shed addition and constructing a new addition of 330 SF to the rear. The addition will be clad in wood siding that matches the width and profile of the existing wood siding and will have matching corner boards.
- 3* The proposed addition and deck span the full width of the rear of the structure. The form of the addition is a cross gable that adds approximately 5’ across the full width. An additional 10’ is added through an elongated gable that is slightly wider than half of the main structure (~21’).
- 4* The addition will be discernible from the existing structure by maintaining the corner boards on the east and west facades.
- 5* The ridgeline of the addition is lower than that of the main body of the house. A standing seam metal roof is proposed to match the standing seam roof on the existing structure.
- 6* A note on the proposed elevations states, “All materials to match existing house in color, profile, and construction.” Written details on the metal roof are provided except that there is no note that the pans between the seams will be flat.
- 7* The windows on the addition are drawn to show flat trim on three sides and a sill on the bottom as is traditional. Specifications and details were not provided.
- 8* The applicant proposes full-light wood outswing French doors for the rear addition entry from the deck. The French doors will be flanked on either side by a matching, fixed door.
- 9* The proposed deck will be at the level of the main floor and measure 15’ by approximately 8’ (this measurement was not dimensioned on the proposed floor plan). It will fill the north-west corner of the structure.
- 10* The proposed addition and deck will increase the built mass by 27.3%.
- 11* The proposed floorplan shows the installation of a window on the right most side of the west façade; however, this window does not appear on the elevation drawing A\A2.1.
- 12* The existing windows are a combination of one-over-one, eight-over-one, and six-over-six double-hung wood framed. The proposed windows on the addition are Sierra Pacific simulated divided light six-over-one double-hung wood windows. One sixteen pane simulated divided light window is proposed for the west façade.
- 13* Paint colors were provided in the application.
- 14* The west side of the front porch was previously partially enclosed and screened at an unknown earlier date. The screened portion is located on the north. The applicant proposes the full enclosure of the partially screened room. There is a discrepancy between the drawings, floor plan, and existing condition photographs as to where the existing transition in design (where the screen is currently located) occurs. It is not shown in the north elevation or on the floorplans, but it can be seen on the existing west elevation and the existing condition photographs.
- 15* The addition and deck will add 480 SF to the building footprint, which will increase the impervious lot coverage to 33.7%. Currently, the impervious coverage is 1,990 SF or 29.2%. The application uses the language “impervious lot coverage,” which appears to be the built area.

16* The application includes a statement from an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) that includes instructions as to how tree protection could be implemented, but does not include a tree protection plan.

17* A plan identifying trees on the subject property and the root zones of trees on adjacent properties wasn't provided

The motion was seconded by Mr. Fountain; passed 4/0.

Decision on the Application

Ms. David made a motion that the application be approved, with the following conditions:

1. That tree protection plans be implemented and remain in place for the duration of construction.
2. That the metal roofing have flat pans with no striations or ridges.
3. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard:
 - a. Eave/soffit details;
 - b. Door and window trim;
 - c. Revised floor plan or west and north elevations (depending on which was accurate)
4. A site plan noting the locations and critical root zones of trees greater than 10" dbh on this property as well as the critical root zones from trees on adjacent properties.
5. A tree protection plan prepared by an ISA certified arborist that addresses the critical root zones and provides staging areas for construction materials.
6. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation or construction:
 - a. HVAC dimensions and associated screening;
 - b. Window specifications including sections and muntin profiles

The motion was seconded by Mr. Davis. The relocation of the front door, alteration of the front façade, and front window alterations was deferred until more evidence is obtained. The motion passed 4/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 12/28/18.

Responses and Questions:

Ms. Caliendo asked the applicant if she had better drawings or elevations of the Oakwood Street side.

The applicant had no additional drawings or elevations, just product specifications.

Ms. David stated she was concerned with the height and asked if the fence will be located on top of the berm, which will result in an even taller fence appearance.

Ms. Iddings responded that she will lower the fence height to 56". She would like the fence to be solid at the bottom, at least. She has seen evidence that a homeless person had lived in the rear of the lot.

Ms. Caliendo stated that she sympathized with the issue, but that the Committee cannot take statements like that into consideration.

Mr. Davis stated that the Guidelines state in 1.4.11 that street-side fences must be 65% open and 42" tall.

Ms. Caliendo added that they're not here to give design advice, but the applicant should note the Guideline that Don pointed out: 1.4.11.

Ms. David asked the applicants thoughts on a lower 42" fence.

Ms. Iddings stated that she was disappointed because neighbors have been allowed taller fences. She lives next door to a house with a 6' fence. She would prefer a topper that raises the height of the fence. The safety of her tenant's child is the main issue – she is worried they could climb over it.

Ms. David stated that 42" fence height is consistent with properties on corner lots.

Ms. Iddings mentioned a property at Bloodworth and Pace which features a very solid bottom and a very open top and is Japanese in style. The height is 56". She feels that she has proposed a fence that is more Victorian in design and in keeping with the style of the house.

Ms. David noted that the application in question is proposing a fence on top of a berm and will appear even taller.

Ms. Caliendo stated that she would like to see a drawing of how the proposed fence will look.

Ms. Caliendo closed the public testimony portion of the hearing.

Committee Discussion

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

I'll suggest we save her time if we defer and not deny. I'll give guidance on 1.4.11 – 42" or opacity could be interpreted as a choice, not both. If the fence is solid, it can be 42" maximum in height. If it's open, then it may be ok for it to be taller. Incorporate greenery to woven wire.

I'm very appreciative of your rehab work on this property. [Fountain]

I agree. A photo or drawing of a more solid shorter fence with a trellis that does not seem part of the fence may be ok with the Guidelines. [Caliendo]

Or we could approve that the wood fence be 42". [David]

We would need more specifics. [Caliendo]

Approve with the condition that the fence be 42" high with no trellis or defer and have the applicant return with a 42" fence with an open part. [David]

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Ms. Iddings requested to respond. With no objection, Ms. Caliendo reopened the public testimony.

Ms. Iddings implored that the Committee direct the applicant to approve and allow her to work with staff on design.

Mr. Fountain stated that he would prefer to defer the application.

Ms. Caliendo asked if the applicant was ok with a 42" wood fence height limit.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Mr. Davis moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the evidentiary hearing, the committee finds staff suggested finding A. (inclusive of facts 1-8) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

- A. Installing a wood privacy fence and gates, and installing a 48" welded wire metal fence is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.7, 1.4.8, 1.4.11; however, the height of the wood privacy fence, gates and arbor is incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.4.8, 1.4.11, and the following facts:
- 1* From the Special Character Essay of the Oakwood Historic District: "The compact nature of the neighborhood, along with the rolling land and the heavy tree canopy, creates an environment especially suited for the pedestrian. Sidewalks line both sides of most streets and houses huddle close to the walk, with front porches providing pause for interaction with neighbors. Recent years have seen the development of increasingly more private rear yard spaces as a counterpoint to the public front porches, with the erection of many privacy fences and outdoor decks."
 - 2* The application proposes the installation of fencing along the north property line and inset from the rear and south property lines, with connecting sections meeting the side walls of the house.
 - 3* Installation of a tall wood privacy fence on the side property line of a corner lot has been denied for previous COA applications, however an unusual lot configuration may be sufficient in this case to make it approvable. There is no rear neighbor behind the east side of the lot, and in fact the rear of the property backs up to a street.
 - 4* The application includes conflicting information about the design of the wood fence. It is referred to as 64" in height in several places, while a drawing of the proposed fence shows it as 62" tall.
 - 5* An arbor measuring 9' in height is proposed to rise above the 4' wide gate on the south side of the house. Tall arbors over wood fences are atypical of the historic district. The applicant provided photographs of other arbors incorporated into fencing, although no dimensions for the sample arbors were provided;

- a. 315 Oakwood Avenue – This property received a COA for fencing and other landscaping elements in 1989 (CAD-89-103) under a different set of Design Guidelines.
 - b. 610 E Lane Street – This property includes an ogee arch form arbor set behind the picket fence (which appears to be 42” in height). No COA was issued for this project.
 - c. 521 N East Street – This property received a COA for fencing and the arbor in 2012 (135-12-CA) under a different set of Design Guidelines.
 - d. 610 N Bloodworth Street – This property received a COA (088-15-CA) for the installation of the fence, gate and other landscape elements which were specifically designed around Japanese-influenced architectural details on the historic house.
- 6* The application includes conflicting information about the design of the wire fence. It is referred to as 42” in height in several places, while an email from June 5 describes the proposed fence as 48” tall. Drawings of the proposed welded wire fence were not provided; a photographic example of the type of wire was provided.
- 7* Wire fencing between wood posts is a traditional fencing material.
- 8* A tree protection plan by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture was provided.

The motion was seconded by Ms. David; passed 4/0.

Decision on the Application

Mr. Davis made a motion that the application be approved, with the following conditions:

1. That the wood fence be no taller than 42”.
2. That details and specifications for the exact design of the wood fence be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard.

The motion was seconded by Ms. David; passed 4/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 12/28/18.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

085-18-CA 223 ELM STREET
Applicant: HENRY C WARD
Received: 5/16/18 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 8/7/2018 1) 6/28/2018 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: HOD-G

Nature of Project: Implementation of master landscape plan; replacement of front walk; installation of a side yard walk; installation of retaining wall; and installation of a drainage system; remove crape myrtle tree

Amendments: Change in brick specification and drawings provided at hearing.

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.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

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	Implementation of master landscape plan; replacement of front walk; installation of a side yard walk; installation of retaining wall; remove crape myrtle tree; and installation of a drainage system
1.4	Fences and Walls	installation of retaining wall
1.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Off-street Parking	replacement of front walk; installation of a side yard walk
2.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	Install stoop at side entry

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff Introduction: Collette Kinane [affirmed] showed the location of the property on the map and noted highlights from the staff report.

Support:

Henry Ward (223 Elm Street) and Chad Smith (919 Tower, Garden Wanted) [both affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Ward brought additional documentation to address the width of the walk as it related to the front steps, the width of the secondary walk, the parking strip, evidence of other properties with brick paths and concrete steps, and gravel and brick samples.

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

Responses and Questions:

Ms. David asked the applicant's motivation for specifying gravel.

Mr. Ward responded that the gravel is driven by ongoing drainage issues. A retaining wall in the rear with box drains and the gravel should help to solve the issue. The desired function of the space is better solved by using gravel. He stated that he has every intention of softening the gravel with plantings.

Mr. Davis asked where the slabs were proposed.

Mr. Ward stated that the slabs have been changed to bricks in a basket weave pattern in the new documentation.

Ms. David asked whether he would prefer the Committee review the basket weave bricks or the slabs.

Mr. Ward responded the basket weave bricks.

Mr. Davis commented that there was already a lot of red brick in other properties on the block.

Mr. Ward stated that he would prefer less contrast with the concrete.

Mr. Davis asked if the parking strips were brick.

Mr. Ward said yes.

Mr. Fountain asked if the applicant thought that the proposed gravel would remain with the existing drainage issues.

Mr. Smith stated that the gravel relates to wash. It will serve to slow down the water as it flows across the site.

Ms. Caliendo closed the public testimony portion of the hearing.

Committee Discussion

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

There are gravel and color issues with this proposal. [Caliendo]

Grey bricks are closer to concrete than red bricks would be. [Davis]

Treat the proposed as a new substitute material. It could be precedent setting. [Tully]

Plenty of evidence of concrete steps and brick walks. [David]

Grey brick could be more in keeping because it would have been concrete or brown pavers, less red. [Davis]

If it's precedent setting, should it be denied? [David]

PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Mr. Ward requested to respond. With no objection, Ms. Caliendo reopened the public testimony.

Mr. Ward passed around Rumpled Ironspot brick sample.

Ms. Tully asked if the applicant was amending his application to replace the grey brick specification with the sample passed around.

Mr. Ward responded yes, he is amending the application.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Ms. David moved that based upon the facts presented in the amended application and the evidentiary hearing, the committee finds staff suggested finding A. (inclusive of facts 1-6) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-8) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the modifications and additions as listed below:

A. The implementation of a master landscape plan; removal of a crape myrtle tree; installation of retaining wall; and installation of a drainage system with a grading plan is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3, 1.3.7, 1.3.13 and the following facts:

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

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

- 2* The application mentions several items that were previously approved through two COAs: 119-15-MW (prune crepe myrtle trees; remove concrete steps walkway; install brick strip driveway; alter rear trellis; install 42" tall fence section; alter rear pond; change exterior paint colors; add front walk; relocate stone wall; relocate HVAC unit), 005-16-CA (Remove non-historic rear addition; construct new rear addition with porch; grade rear yard; remove trees; remove shed, pond and trellis). This application requests some changes in design and materials from those previously approved projects.
 - 3* A new painted brick stoop is proposed for the side entry door. The brick is proposed to be painted black to match the currently painted brick foundation.
 - 4* For the installation of the drainage system only the above ground elements are subject to review - locations were provided in the application. A drawing of the pop-up drain was provided in the application materials.
 - 5* A multi-stemmed crape myrtle in the rear yard is proposed for removal and will be replaced with six trees of unspecified type. The application does state that no caliper of the individual stems is greater than 8", however, the actual DBH of the crape myrtle is unspecified. Per the photographs included in the application, the crape myrtle combined DBH appears larger than 8".
 - 6* Per the applicant's submitted drawings and photographs, there are at least two maple street trees and one pecan tree adjacent to the driveway. No tree protection information was provided, nor was information provided about the critical root zones of adjacent trees that may be impacted by the construction of walls in the rear yard.
- B. The replacement of front walk and installation of a side yard walk is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3, 1.3.7, 1.3.13 and the following facts:
- 1* Red tone brick is predominant in the historic district.
 - 2* The Oakwood Special Character Essay states, "Public sidewalks are generally concrete; a few brick walks still survive. There is typically a tree lawn between the public sidewalk and the curb where street trees are planted."
 - 3* The applicant proposes the installation of gravel throughout the rear and side yards. The built area to open space ratio is 51.8%.
 - 4* The gravel front walk (perpendicular to the proposed brick front walk) is shown in the amended drawings as narrower than the width of the brick front walk.
 - 5* Per applicant, the design of the landscape intends for plant coverage to soften the appearance of the amount of gravel (i.e. the plantings will grow over or "spill onto the path").
 - 6* The existing front walk is concrete. The applicant proposes replacing the current concrete walk with brick, which would result in a brick walk adjoining two concrete steps. The application did provide evidence of other properties that feature a similar material change. Additionally, the proposed brick walk is shown in the drawings as wider than the current concrete stairs. Historically, the walk is no wider than the step side walls.
 - 7* The applicant provided a sample of the "decorative gravel" specified for back fill of the side yard walk. Grey toned gravel is typical of the district.

8* The application was amended to propose red tone brick.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Davis; passed 4/0.

Decision on the Application

Ms. David made a motion that the application be approved as amended, with the following conditions:

1. That there be no delay on the removal of the crepe myrtle tree.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Davis; passed 4/0.

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

Certificate expiration date: 12/28/18.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Committee Discussion
 - a. Meeting Post-Mortem

ADJOURNMENT

Without objection Ms. Caliendo moved that the meeting be adjourned. The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

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

Minutes Submitted by:
Melissa Robb, Preservation Planner
Collette Kinane, Preservation Planner