

RALEIGH HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
April 1, 2013

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Scott Shackleton 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: Will Alphin, Elizabeth Caliendo, Miranda Downer, Kiernan McGorty, Scott Shackleton

Staff Present: Tania Tully, Martha Lauer

Approval of the March 4, 2013 Minutes

Ms. McGorty moved to waive the reading of the minutes for the hearing and adopt said minutes. Mr. Alphin seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

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. Kiernan McGorty, Notary Public, administered the affirmation.

<u>Visitor's/Applicant's Name and Address</u>	<u>Affirmed</u>
Erin Sterling, 218 Snow Avenue 27603	Yes
Joyce Phillip, 708 N Bloodworth Street 27604	Yes
Edna Rich-Ballentine, 219 E Cabarrus Street 27610	Yes
Jenny Harper, 312 E Cabarrus Street 27610	Yes
Randall Scott, 218 N East Street 27601	Yes
Heather Scott, 218 N East Street 27601	Yes
Drew Robinson, 113 S Wilmington Street 27601	Yes
Jennifer McDaniel, 520 N Bloodworth Street 27604	Yes
Rosalind Blair, 322 E Cabarrus Street 27601	No
Gregg Warren, 113 S Wilmington Street 27601	Yes
Gil Johnson, 221 S Wilmington Street 27601	Yes
Matthew Griffith, 111 Longview Lake Drive 27610	Yes

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. McGorty moved to approve the agenda as amended. Mr. Alphin seconded the motion; passed 5/0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chair Shackleton 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: 027-13-CA, 030-13-CA, 034-13-CA, 035-13-CA, 036-13-CA, and 033-13-MW.

COA 004-13-MW was pulled from the agenda.

Ms. McGorty moved to allow continued deferral of COA 008-13-CA. Ms. Caliendo seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Ms. McGorty moved to recuse Ms. Downer from COA 033-13-MW. Ms. Caliendo seconded; motion passed 5/0. At the conclusion of the hearing, Ms. McGorty moved to readmit Ms. Downer. Ms. Caliendo seconded; motion passed 4/0.

DRAFT

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

027-13-CA 707 N EAST STREET
Applicant: TOM AND HEATHER CAMPBELL
Received: 3/12/2013 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 6/10/2013 1) 4/1/2013 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: Remove aluminum siding; paint house exterior; master landscape plan to include: new 5' fence, low rear deck, rear flagstone patio, widen driveway.

Amendments: Additional information was provided March 31, 2013 and is attached to these comments.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes: Staff photos are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	master landscape plan to include: new 5' fence, low rear deck, rear flagstone patio, widen driveway
2.4	Fences and Walls	new 5' fence
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	widen driveway
3.4	Paint and Paint Color	paint house exterior
3.6	Exterior Walls	remove aluminum siding
4.1	Decks	low rear deck

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application, in staff's judgment:

A. Implementation of master landscape plan to include: new 5' fence, low rear deck, rear flagstone patio, widen driveway is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* section 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.4.8, 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.9, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.1.8.

1* The rear of the yard is currently a non-historic mix of widely spaced concrete pavers set in pea gravel and brick paths. The proposal is to replace all current hardscape with a low wood deck and flagstone patio; it does not appear as though the lot coverage will change significantly.

- 2* There are trees on adjacent properties whose roots may be impacted by the proposal; the deck design is intended to minimize impact; details were not included in the application.
 - 3* A 5' tall wood privacy fence is proposed for the north and west property lines and extending from the house to the north and south fences; wood gates are proposed in two locations; the gates will be the same design as the fence panels.
 - 4* The privacy fence is proposed to have horizontal slats; fencing in the Oakwood Historic District has traditionally had vertical pickets.
 - 5* The commission typically requires that fences be constructed using "good neighbor design" with structural members facing inward; details of the fence construction were not included in the application.
 - 6* Photographs of possible patio and deck designs are included with the application; drawings specifying the exact proposal were not included.
 - 7* The amended application states that the patio will be Pennsylvania bluestone in the irregular pattern.
 - 8* The driveway is proposed to be widened by 2 ½ feet towards the front yard; the amended application states that no additional paving will be installed and that the new slope will be grass as it is currently.
 - 9* The proposed rear deck is 8'x10' will sit about two steps off the ground and have no railing; the drawing shows a set of steps off of the south side; the photo illustration shows a platform deck with steps all the way around; construction/design details were not included.
 - 10* The amended application states that deck will sit on piers set in concrete.
- B. Removal of aluminum siding; painting of house exterior is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 3.4.3, 3.6.10.
- 1* Removal of aluminum siding is approvable as a minor work and is included here for administrative efficiency.
 - 2* Paint colors were not included in the application.

Staff suggests that the committee approve the amended application, with the following conditions:

1. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
 - a. Deck design/construction drawing(s).
2. That the fence have vertical pickets and be constructed utilizing good neighbor design with the proposed design be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.
3. That fence and deck footings be dug by hand and located to avoid damage to tree roots; roots larger than 1" caliper will be cut cleanly using proper tools such as loppers.
4. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
 - a. Patio layout drawing;
 - b. Paint colors.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Due to illness the applicants are unable to attend the meeting. Staff advised the committee, based on correspondence with the applicant, to proceed with hearing the case.

Opposition: Joyce Phillip [affirmed], owner of the adjoining property at the rear of the lot was present with questions and concerns regarding the trees and shrubs. Ms. Phillip stated that her main concern is the location of the fence. The back of her house has tall ligustrums about 8' plus an oak tree on the property line. She wants to make sure that these items are not harmed by the fence installation. Mr. Shackleton noted that in staff comments the third suggested condition is the requirement that the applicant hand dig to avoid damaging roots.

Ms. Phillip mentioned the aluminum shed that isn't addressed and noted it appears to be right up against where fence would be. She stated that she would like to see a line of where the fence would go before they install. She stated her observation that the roots of the trees go onto the applicant's property.

Tania Tully [affirmed] stated that as best as she can tell they are not proposing to remove shed and as for where exactly the property line is, that is a civil matter. She noted that from the commission's standpoint whether it's one foot in from the property line or exactly on it doesn't matter. Finding that line is a civil matter. What you could do is have a condition if you chose to have them indicate how the fence will be located behind the shed.

Ms. Phillip showed the commission photographs of the trees and shrubs as seen from her yard. Mr. Shackleton requested that she email the photos to staff after the meeting so they can be included as part of the record.

Ms. Caliendo asked if the scale seems in keeping.

Ms. Tully stated that there was no example showing other styles like the horizontal fence in the historic district. She commented to the committee that since the applicant gave prior notice of their absence they may choose to state on the record that they are okay with the applicant submitting a second request for reconsideration on a specific item.

Ms. McGorty asked staff to make sure the applicant is aware of the issue with the property line since they're not here. She also noted that if the bushes have been acting as fence, some of them may be on applicant's property.

Mr. Alphin asked if the siting of fence be bundled in for the reconsideration request. Ms. Tully said that if there is a concern about a particular tree, the commission can request that the applicant have an assessment done on the potential harm to the tree. Another suggestion would be to require that no root greater than 3 inches may be cut.

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

Ms. Tully distributed photographs of the property taken by staff.

At Mr. Shackleton's suggestion Ms. McGorty moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Ms. Downer seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
The applicant may ask for reconsideration without waiting if they don't agree with the conditions. [Shackleton]

Findings of Fact

Ms. McGorty moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-10) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-2) to be acceptable as findings of fact.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
 - a. Deck design/construction drawing(s).
2. That the fence have vertical pickets and be constructed utilizing good neighbor design with the proposed design be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation.
3. That fence and deck footings be dug by hand and located to avoid damage to tree roots; roots larger than 1" caliper will be cut cleanly using proper tools such as loppers.
4. That no root greater than 3" in diameter be cut without consulting a licensed arborist and approved by staff.
5. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
 - a. Patio layout drawing;
 - b. Paint colors.

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

Committee members voting: Alphin, Caliendo, Downer, McGorty, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 10/1/13.

DRAFT

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

030-13-CA 520 N BLOODWORTH STREET
Applicant: JENNIFER MCDANIEL
Received: 3/13/2013 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 6/11/2013 1) 4/1/2013 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: Construct new 1-1/2 story garage; extend driveway; remove fence; remove tree; plant new tree

Amendments: Revised drawings and additional information was provided March 29, 2013 and is attached to these comments. In an April 1, 2013 email the request was amended to include removal of a non-historic shed.

DRAC: This application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee (DRAC) on March 27, 2013. Present were Jerry Traub, David Maurer, and Curtis Kasefang; also attending were Jennifer McDaniel, Alan Harrison, and Tania Tully.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes: Staff photos are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Construct new 1-1/2 story garage; extend driveway; remove tree; plant new tree
2.4	Fences and Walls	remove fence
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	extend driveway
2.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	Construct new 1-1/2 story garage; remove non-
4.3	New Construction	historic shed

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application, in staff's judgment:

- A. Construction of new 1-1/2 story garage; is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.8, 2.6.6, 2.6.8, 2.6.9, 4.3.1, 4.3.4, 4.3.6, 4.3.7, 4.3.8, 4.3.9, 4.3.10, 4.3.11; however the size and scale of the garage **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 4.3.6.

- 1* The house at 520 N Bloodworth Street, constructed in the 1940s, is a non-contributing resource in the Oakwood Historic District; the 1-story frame house has an 881 square foot footprint including front and rear stoops; the proposed 1½-story garage has a 528 square foot footprint.
 - 2* One tree is proposed for removal to accommodate construction of the garage; several trees remain on the property including one immediately to the rear of the garage; a tree protection plan was not included in the application.
 - 3* The garage is proposed to be slab on grade; the applicant stated that no excavation will be required for installation of the garage, but that fill will be brought in for leveling.
 - 4* The location and orientation of the garage is not unusual in the Oakwood Historic District; it is located at the end of the driveway.
 - 5* The height of the proposed garage is 22 feet to the ridge, plus an approximate 8" foundation; the existing house is 20 feet tall; the lot sits 3½ feet above the sidewalk; accessory buildings are typically deferential to the main building.
 - 6* The proposed garage has a symmetrical gable roof with the 2nd level created through the use of dormers.
 - 7* Two bay garages have been approved in Oakwood at 415 Elm Street (035-08-CA) and 608 Oakwood Avenue (212-07-CA).
 - 8* The amended application indicates the use of traditional sloped soffits; this overrides the boxed soffit detail included in the initial application.
 - 9* The drawings show the general location and size of window and door trim; details and specifications were not included in the application; wood windows and doors are typical for the historic district.
 - 10* Proposed materials in the amended application are asphalt shingles, smooth-faced fiber cement siding with a 5" reveal, and smooth faced Ameritec trim.
 - 11* In the amended application, windows are proposed to be 1/1 double hung to match the design of the existing house; specifications were not included in the application.
 - 12* The application specifies steel garage doors with wood grain embossed texture; the committee has not yet approved the use of steel garage doors; substitute materials have only been approved with paintable smooth surfaces.
- B. Extending of driveway; removal of fence; removal of tree; planting of new tree; removal of non-historic shed is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.5, 2.3.7, 2.4.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.5, 2.5.6, 2.5.9, 2.6.1; Raleigh City Code Section 10-2052(a)(2)c.5.i. states that "An application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure, or site within the district may not be denied....However, the authorization date of such a certificate may be delayed for a period of up to three-hundred sixty-five (365) days from the date of approval... If the Commission finds that the building, structure, or site has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Overlay District, it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal."

- 1* One tree is proposed for removal to accommodate construction of the garage; several trees remain on the property including one immediately to the rear of the garage; a tree protection plan was not included in the application.
- 2* The amended application indicates a preference for the installation of shrubs in the front yard rather than a replacement tree; the committee has approved a donation to the NeighborWoods tree planting program in lieu of tree replacement when there is sufficient tree coverage on the subject property.
- 3* The fence and shed being removed are non-historic.
- 4* The driveway is proposed to be extended and culminate in a 15'x22' concrete pad in front of the garage; a drawing was not included in the application.
- 5* The surface texture of the concrete pad was not included in the application; the committee typically requires a water-washed finish.

Pending the committee's determination regarding the size and scale of the garage, staff suggests that the committee approve the amended application, with the following conditions:

1. That the garage doors have a smooth paintable surface.
2. That the windows and person-doors be wood.
3. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
 - a. NeighborWoods donation;
 - b. Windows and trim;
 - c. Garage doors;
 - d. That a tree protection plan for the construction site and adjacent trees be prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture or Landscape Architect registered with the NCBLA.
4. That the following details and specifications be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
 - a. person door and trim;
 - b. trim details;
 - c. driveway extension and concrete pad.
5. That all new concrete have a water-washed finish.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Jennifer McDaniel [affirmed] was present to speak in support of the application.

Mr. Shackleton asked if the applicant was okay with the staff recommendations. Tania Tully [affirmed] noted to the applicant that the only new item was the garage door. Ms. McDaniel said that there were no surprises.

Ms. McGorty asked if the garage has some other purpose. Ms. McDaniel said that she wants to get two cars off street and that it also gives room over top of garage for resale purposes. She

stated that the house is very small and that behind the house she has a vision of an English garden feel.

Mr. Shackleton noticed that staff comments state that the garage is 22 feet and house is 20 feet and asked if from a staff perspective there is a concern about scale. Ms. Tully said yes, primarily before the redesign design came in, because it is a small house. She did note that it is a noncontributing house. She said that she was looking at it in context with the historic district as a whole rather than in comparison to the house. That's where staff came down on it.

Mr. Alphin expressed concern about fact 3 and asked if that is that something the builder has told the applicant. Ms. McDaniel confirmed, also noting that the garage will look shorter because the house is up and the yard slopes down. They will have to fill to level for the garage. Mr. Alphin said to make sure the builder's plans get conveyed to the arborist for tree protection.

Ms. McGorty asked if in fact 7, 2-bay means two car. Ms. Tully confirmed.

Ms. Caliendo asked if the previously approved garages have a second story room. Ms. Tully said that one of them did, but it wasn't full height, and doesn't recall others.

Ms. Caliendo asked if the driveway will span the width of garage; if the applicant will back out. Ms. McDaniel said yes, the concrete will start after the driving strips end.

Ms. McDaniel talks about the garage doors noting that they are steel doors with a carriage house look. She commented that with the actual grain from even 5' back, you can barely see it at all. She noted that the manufacturer said that the grain helps in construction of steel doors, which are a lot more efficient. She said she has to go with wood grain to get the efficiency she wants. She distributed pictures of the doors.

Ms. Tully commented that the committee has had this discussion with fiberglass doors on Elm Street and made them remove them. The discussion has been had with Hardi as well.

Ms. McGorty asked about the house on Lane that the commission we approved Hardiplank for the addition (Agnes Stevens). She wanted to know if they approved any doors being of different material. Ms. Tully said no, the doors were wood.

Ms. McDaniel noted that the siding was fiber cement, 5" reveal, smooth side and the garage would have a wood person-door.

Ms. McGorty noted that the committee is already making a distinction on noncontributing property with regard to the garage size and asked if that factors into the material question. Ms. Tully said it is staff's opinion, no, because the same discussion would be occurring for new house construction.

Mr. Shackleton noted that the size was addressed by yard sloping down.

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

At Mr. Shackleton's suggestion Ms. McGorty moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Mr. Alphin seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Committee Discussion

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

The issue is the doors. [Shackleton]

The size is also a concern. [McGorty]

This is outscaled compared to other things in district. [Caliendo]

Agrees with Ms. Caliendo and wants to talk about it. When you look at it, it almost looks as if there are two residential structures on property because of the height of it. [McGorty]

Being a noncontributing feature it is the tiniest house and someone could add second story on it. [Alphin]

The fact that the garage is so far back on the lot it makes it look secondary [Downer]

The dormers are too large for an accessory building. If the outside wall of the dormer was pushed back and the dormers were smaller, it would help it appear accessory. I think a few more tweaks in terms of scale would help. [Caliendo]

So height might be okay if dormers adjusted. [Shackleton]

No, the roof height should be lowered as well. [Caliendo]

How much does noncontributing nature of property trump typical conditions. [McGorty]

This is a strange situation. It's not a particularly big garage but...[Alphin]

It may have helped to see the other garages that have been approved. When you look at the guidelines the garage doesn't maintain the traditional height of garages of district, not just compared to house. [Caliendo]

I'm inclined to agree, EC. [McGorty]

Ms. Tully reminded the committee that they can always defer for more information.

Do we want more info on other garage heights? [Shackleton]

That would definitely help. It is very visible from East Street as well. Also, see 2.6.5. [Caliendo]

This would also allow the applicant to find a smooth garage door that is well insulated.

[Alphin]

Decision on the Application

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Ms. Caliendo and seconded by Ms. McGorty, Ms. Caliendo made an amended motion that the application be deferred to allow for gathering of additional information regarding previously approved two bay garages in the district from staff and additional evidence from the applicant that supports her case.

Ms. McGorty agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 5/0.

Committee members voting: Alphin, Caliendo, Downer, McGorty, Shackleton.

DRAFT

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – STAFF COMMENTS

034-13-CA 520 S PERSON STREET

Applicant: IN SITU STUDIO

Received: 3/15/2013

Meeting Date(s):

Submission date + 90 days: 6/13/2013

1) 4/1/2013 2)

3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: PRINCE HALL HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: RB, DOD

Nature of Project: Construct 2 new 3-story rowhouse buildings with associated parking and landscaping

Amendments: Additional drawings were provided by the applicant March 27 and 28, 2013 and are attached to these comments.

DRAC: This application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee (DRAC) on August 27, 2012 and March 27, 2013. Present were at the March meeting were Jerry Traub, David Maurer, and Curtis Kasefang; also attending were Drew Robinson and Tania Tully.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- Staff photographs are available for review.
- City code section 10-2052(d)(3) states “Buildings and structures shall be congruous with the height of well-related nearby buildings and structures in the Historic Overlay District. In general, this height is within ten (10) per cent of the height of these well-related buildings and structures.”
- The application references the Shaw dormitories across the intersection; these are outside of the district and in staff’s judgment irrelevant to the discussion.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.1	Public Rights-of-Way and Alleys	
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	Construct 2 new 3-story rowhouse
2.4	Fences and Walls	buildings with associated parking
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	and landscaping.
4.3	New Construction	

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application, in staff's judgment:

- A. Construction of 2 new 3-story rowhouse buildings is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.2, 2.3.9, 2.3.11, 4.3.2, 4.3.6, 4.3.9, 4.3.10, 4.3.11; however the setback,

windows, height , façade proportion **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 4.3.1, 4.3.6, 4.3.7, 4.3.8.

- 1* The site is vacant and contains no trees; remnants of retaining walls and steps from previous structures remain and will be removed.
 - 2* The application does not include information regarding setbacks generally within the historic district.
 - 3* From the application, it appears as though the new buildings will sit forward of the adjacent historic house on S Person Street.
 - 4* The proposed new 3-story buildings are rectangular with flat roofs; except for a non-contributing building at the other end of the same block, these would be the largest buildings in the historic district.
 - 5* Examples of buildings with flat roofs are provided; flat roofed buildings of various character and heights are scattered throughout the district.
 - 6* Examples of buildings of various heights are provided; it is unclear from the application if the proposed buildings are within 10% of the height of the Masonic Temple – the tallest building in the district.
 - 7* Although three stories in height, the proportion of the facade of the building has the appearance of a large 2nd level atop the first level.
 - 8* Proposed windows are varied in size and proportion and seemingly random in placement; there is no known precedent for this arrangement.
 - 9* The proposed materials are brick for the lower level and hardi panel for the 2nd and third levels, except for horizontal wood siding in the 2nd and 3rd level inset.
 - 10* The proposed colors are grey, brick red, and brown wood; the darkness of the grey is uncertain and may play a role in the apparent mass of then building.
 - 11* The detailed wall section notes the use of vinyl windows; the committee has only approved the use of wood windows, even in new construction.
- B. Installation of parking and landscaping is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.1.2, 2.1.5, 2.3.2, 2.3.9, 2.3.11, 2.4.8, 2.5.5, 2.5.10.
- 1* The Prince Hall Historic District is one of mixed residential, institutional, and commercial character, including a fair amount of off-street parking.
 - 2* The site will be graded to remove contaminated soil; the resulting ground level will be about a foot lower than the existing.
 - 3* Trees and plantings are proposed in accordance with City Code buffer requirements; in order to accommodate planting trees in the public-tight-of way, it appears as though the sidewalk is being shifted.
 - 4* An illustrative site plan is included; details and specifications for landscaping and hardscaping were not included in the application.
 - 5* The site plan indicates the following proposed changes: a low retaining wall along the north side of the property; new curb cut and driveway apron; courtyard; sidewalk relocation and more; there is insufficient information for staff to make a suggestion.

Pending the committee's interpretation of the *Guidelines* regarding the following:

- **Window size, pattern and orientation;**
- **Shifting of sidewalk location;**
- **Well-related and nearby buildings;**
- **Set back;**
- **Height;**

staff suggests that the committee approve the amended application, with the following conditions:

1. That no solid portion of the new building extend beyond the forward most portion of the adjacent house on S Person Street.
2. That elevation drawings for the final building design be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits.
3. That specifications and details for the following be provided to an approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
 - a. Windows;
 - b. Doors.
4. That specifications and details for the following be provided to an approved by staff prior to installation:
 - a. HVAC equipment and location;
 - b. Material samples;
 - c. Postal facilities.
5. That a detailed master landscape plan be submitted as a separate COA application at a later date.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tania Tully [affirmed] reminded the committee and others in the room that this is the neighborhood's opportunity to speak to the *Design Guidelines* and the character of the district. Historic overlay designation is a partnership between the commission and the community on what is character defining. This is an important precedent setting case.

Support: Erin Sterling [affirmed], Greg Warren [affirmed], and Matt Griffith [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Warren began with a brief historic of DHIC's role in the community making the following points:

- DHIC is a non-profit affordable housing agency that is 39 years old and was created by the City of Raleigh.
- Its initial focus was downtown Raleigh.
- They developed Carlton Place just north of this property 6 or 7 years ago.
- Also developed Parkworth single family development 15 to 20 years ago.
- Greatest imprint in the city is quality design. DHIC has won 5 Sir Walter Raleigh Awards.

- They didn't push the easy button on this project. Felt like it was time to bring contemporary design into the HODs. It is a good challenge for contemporary design to also be compatible.

Ms. Sterling spoke to a PowerPoint presentation making the following comments:

- The Prince Hall HOD is unique because it probably has the most variety of form and building types. The design is reacting to those realities.
- This case did get public input through DRAC and a CAC meeting, met with members of UDC and planning staff, and went through Appearance Commission courtesy review.
- They conducted a thorough context analysis of Prince Hall before designing. They looked at porches, single family, multifamily, flat roofs and pitched roofs. Siding over brick, repeated window modules, subtractive porches, flat roofs on larger buildings, sixteen foot width.

(Mr. Griffith interjected that they uses adjacent properties to HOD for context as much as those within the HOD.)

- The illustrative site plan is the oldest drawing of the submittal; they are working with Cline Design on the full site plan; it shows the City required buffers.
- The project was initially 11 units, because that's what site allows.
- DHIC committed to 10 units in order to break the structure up and create an open space.
- The new site plan shows that they also pushed back the building from Lenoir with a planter to pay attending to how it addresses neighborhood.
- Given size and program of the buildings, setbacks etc. made it a challenge.
- The building will also be moved a bit back off of Person Street to address the building to the north.
- Porches and face of building relating to building to the north. There is a huge vegetative buffer as required by city.

(Mr. Griffith interjected that there is a slight shift in the sidewalk to provide a larger buffer between street and sidewalk and allow for thriving trees. It doesn't have to be that way.)

- In the building sections is where you begin to see they've done as much as they can to create as much depth and texture along the street (right).
- In the hardline elevations you can see the north and south elevations, the longer side of building, and the rear of building.

(Mr. Griffith interjected regarding the comment on size and placement of windows. He noted that the front and rear elevations have only three window sizes and the current configuration shows mirroring for more variety. The side elevation is very similar to the side of house where you have stairs and random patterns of windows. The big window is at the landing of the stair.)

- Presented pictures of thin homes (yellow shotguns) closely located together, with brick stoops
- Provided examples of how a pitched roofed structure can live comfortably next to flat roofed structure
- Photos of subtractive porches essentially protected on three sides.
- The design of the building inspired in part by a daycare building on E Cabarrus Street.

- The protruding windows help do pushing and pulling common in the HOD; the brick building along Wilmington Street was shown as an example.
- Showed a photo of Prince Hall, a 3 story building with corner entry and how it begins to open up; 4 corners of their building are opened up.
- They paid attention to the fact that windows on bottom level are different than upper levels.

(Mr. Griffith interjected that Prince Hall is significantly taller than the proposed buildings which are 35 feet tall.)

- That finished floor elevations are actually very similar to the finished floor elevations of the house to the north.

Mr. Griffith noted that the peak of the roof on the house to the west is just a little shorter than their structures.

Ms. Tully asked if the sidewalk and planting strip will be switched from what is being shown in the rendering. Ms. Sterling confirmed.

Ms. Sterling noted that materials of the buildings are brick, hardiplank, and wood siding

Mr. Alphin asked what the applicants thought about the vinyl window comment. Mr. Warren said that the style would be difficult to find in wood. He said that he is assuming the requirement for wood is to get a historic appearance and that preference doesn't translate here. Mr. Griffith said that unclad wood windows would require maintenance and in a three story building would be a weak link. Mr. Alphin asked if it would be vinyl clad. Mr. Griffith said no, vinyl.

Opposition: Jenny Harper [affirmed] said that her back yard will overlook the project. She pointed out the fabulous buildings that were demolished years ago and that she is heartbroken to see that happen, but excited to see reuse on the now vacant lot. She noted her appreciation of the thoughtful application. She stated that the district is very unique. Ms. Harper said that her concern mirrors staff concerns. She noted that she is not opposed to modern design in neighborhood and is open to the opportunity for sustainable development. She stated that the massing may be off and that she has a big concern with the vinyl windows setting a negative precedent coming out of the gate. That is a material that she wouldn't want to see on infill.

Edna Rich-Ballentine [affirmed], a lifetime resident, said that her concerns are different. Ms. Rich-Ballentine she had parking concerns. She noted that the condos up the street put in parking only for one car and everybody over there has two. She asked if there would be children and noted a need for playground space. Ms. Rich-Ballentine also noted that the corner of Lenoir and Person is prone to vehicular accidents that involve cars running off the road and into people's porches. She pointed out that the brick piece there now is not as tall as it used to be. She asked what affordable housing is for Raleigh.

Mr. Alphin noted that parking concerns and playground concerns aren't the purview of the commission. Mr. Shackleton said that the commission has no authority to regulate that.

Mr. Griffith pointed out that there is room for two cars, one in the building and one behind in driveway.

Ms. Tully said that if a playground was proposed its design would be reviewed, but that the commission can't say whether or not there needs to be one.

Mr. Alphin asked if they applicants are clear on where they are suggesting installation of the HVAC unit. Is it under overhang? Mr. Griffith said it would be under the porch.

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

At Mr. Shackleton's suggestion Ms. McGorty moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Mr. Alphin seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Committee Discussion

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

Windows are an issue. [McGorty]

Unfortunately it's never been approved. [Alphin]

Brought up valid point. [McGorty]

Appears to me that wood windows are coated with paint that has vinyl in it. Seems like there could be larger issues than the windows. [Alphin]

Jenny's concern with the window is not this building but the precedent. Structure motion in a way that allows it only for new construction, modern style. [Shackleton]

Ms. Tully: If you chose to go that route, you could require that the condition need to come back to them not to staff.

It is a contemporary building of this time. We have improved technology now and it seems we should use technology of our day. Multifamily component. [Alphin]

Ms. Tully: a bit concerned- the discussion about the styling is ok, but the number of units doesn't affect whether or not a project meets guidelines. Is it scale of building? Is it that it's contemporary? in this specific district?

Wants to have multifamily in there. Duplexes are different kind of multifamily. [McGorty]

Shifting of sidewalk location? Yes . Addresses how it's related to nearby buildings and height. [Shackleton]

Amend fact #A3 new buildings are aligned with historic house? Yes [Caliendo]

Fact #6, public testimony stated that the height is significantly below [Alphin]

Multifamily. Fact 12, it's ten units. [McGorty]

Strike second half of fact #8. [Alphin]

Findings of Fact

Mr. Alphin moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comments A. (inclusive of facts 1-11) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-5) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following modifications and additional facts:

Changing comment A to read as follows:

A. Construction of 2 new 3-story rowhouse buildings is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.2, 2.3.9, 2.3.11, **4.3.1**, 4.3.2, 4.3.6, **4.3.7**, **4.3.8**, 4.3.9, 4.3.10, 4.3.11;

Changing facts 3* and 6* to read as follows:

3* From the application, it appears as though the new buildings will **align with** the adjacent historic house on S Person Street.

6* Examples of buildings of various heights are provided; **testimony was provided that the new buildings will be shorter than** the Masonic Temple – the tallest building in the district.

Adding fact 12* to read as follows:

12* The proposed work is a 10-unit project.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Downer; passed 5/0.

Decision on the Application

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

1. That no solid portion of the new building extend beyond the forward most portion of the adjacent house on S Person Street.
2. That elevation drawings for the final building design be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of permits.
3. That specifications and details for the following be provided to an approved by the committee prior to issuance of permits:
 - a. Windows;
 - b. Doors.
4. That specifications and details for the following be provided to an approved by staff prior to installation:
 - a. HVAC equipment and location;
 - b. Material samples;
 - c. Postal facilities;
 - d. Lighting;
 - e. signage.
5. That a detailed master landscape plan be submitted as a separate COA application at a later date.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Downer; passed 5/0.

Committee members voting: Alphin, Caliendo, Downer, McGorty, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 10/1/13.

DRAFT

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

035-13-CA 221 S WILMINGTON STREET
Applicant: ROBERTA FOX / GIL JOHNSON FOR CITY OF RALEIGH
Received: 3/18/2013 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 6/16/2013 1) 4/1/2013 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: MOORE SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: BUS, DOD

Nature of Project: Install printed vinyl textile mural to brick wall

Amendments: Additional information was provided by the applicant March 28, 2013 and is attached to these comments. The application was amended to include installation of new panels within the approved grid.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- In December 2012 staff approved a minor work (143-12-MW) for the alterations underway at the site.
- A test panel was installed March 26, 2013 and observed by staff.
- Staff photos are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.8	Signage	
3.6	Exterior Walls	Install printed vinyl textile mural to brick wall

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application, in staff's judgment:

- A. Installation of printed textile mural to brick wall is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 2.8.3, 2.8.8, 3.6.11; however, the use of vinyl adhesive **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 2.8.7 and 3.6.10.
- 1* Various murals have been approved by the committee including those at 11 S. Blount Street (COA 124-02-CA) and 1000 Fayetteville Street (COA 022-04-CA).
- 2* In 2009, at 137 S Wilmington Street (COA 243-08-CA) the committee approved the use of vinyl lettering on a primary sign; the committee determined that vinyl lettering is a plastic material that is the modern-day equivalent of painted lettering.
- 3* The application states that art installation will be "a printed vinyl textile which is adhered directly to the brick wall. This heavy duty vinyl is intended for signage and art installations

in heavy-use commercial areas and has been shown to be durable, resistant to vandalism, and will not harm the substrate.”

- 4* A traditional painted mural would be reviewed as a change in exterior paint color.
- 5* The mural will be coated with an anti-graffiti coating which will reduce the shininess of the surface.
- 6* The existing wall is painted brick; the mural can be painted over.
- 7* The mural does not attempt to create a false historical appearance, will be located on a non-character-defining wall, and will not obscure any character-defining architectural details.
- 8* The initial installation of the mural includes placeholders for future images.

Pending the committee’s interpretation of the *Guidelines* regarding the use of vinyl, staff suggests that the committee approve the amended application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Gil Johnson [affirmed], with the City of Raleigh was present to speak in support of the application. He made the following comments about the proposed material:

- It is heat treated to adhere to the surface.
- Will be covered with low matte anti-graffiti coating.
- It is a new material that has been out about 6 months.
- The images selected are from the City’s Art on the Move program.
- New panels can overlay damaged ones and it would not be noticeable.
- The material is ½ the thickness of a sheet of paper.
- The location is a high traffic area, very visible.

In response to a question from Mr. Alphin, Mr. Johnson noted that the product has a 10 year warranty and that if it holds up as promised, they will leave it up there. Ms. McGorty asked if images would be rotated out. Mr. Johnson said that they would fill in the blanks first and perhaps would rotate some out later, if needed.

Mr. Alphin asked about the preparation of the masonry. Mr. Johnson said that the wall was recently repainted.

Mr. Shackleton pointed out that the staff comments indicate that they address use of vinyl over paint. Ms. Caliendo note that the wall is painted brick and that the underlying texture of the brick will remain. Mr. Alphin noted that the material has ten year warranty.

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

At Mr. Shackleton’s suggestion Ms. McGorty moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Ms. Downer seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

Findings of Fact

Mr. Alphin moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-8) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following additional facts:

9* Material is heat treated to adhere to substrate, in this case painted brick.

10* Material has a 10 year warranty.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Caliando; passed 5/0.

Decision on the Application

Mr. Alphin made a motion that the application be approved as amended.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Caliando; passed 5/0.

Committee members voting: Alphin, Caliando, Downer, McGorty, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 10/1/13.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

036-13-CA 218 N EAST STREET
Applicant: RANDALL AND HEATHER SCOTT
Received: 3/20/2013 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 6/18/2013 1) 4/1/2013 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: Change previously approved COA 147-12-CA. Reduce size of 2nd level addition; add 196 SF ground floor addition; expose and restore a portion of mansard roof; add railing; add door.

Conflict of Interest: None noted.

Staff Notes:

- The COA file and staff photos are available for review.
- Sanborn Fire Insurance maps are available for review.
- The landmark ordinance states “This is one of a trio of nearly identical houses built on contiguous lots between 1872 and 1875 in the Second Empire style of domestic architecture. All three houses combine harmoniously the hallmarks of this style, such as complex massing and mansard roofs with Eastlike-style ornamentation and Stick-style exterior articulation of walls and roof ribs.”

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	add 196 SF ground floor addition
3.5	Roofs	reduce size of 2 nd level addition; expose and restore a portion of mansard roof
3.7	Windows and Doors	add door
3.8	Entrances, Porches, and Balconies	add railing; add door
4.2	Additions to Historic Buildings	reduce size of 2 nd level addition; add 196 SF ground floor addition

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the application, in staff's judgment:

- A. Reduction of size of 2nd level addition; addition of 196 SF ground floor addition; exposure and restoration of a portion of mansard roof; addition of railing; addition of door is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.6, 2.3.8, 3.5.1, 3.5.6, 3.7.9, 3.8.9, 3.8.10, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9.

- 1* There are no trees that may be impacted by the addition.
- 2* The lot is 34,848 square feet; the existing house footprint is 2,881 square feet; the proposed 1st level addition is 196 square feet.
- 3* In January 2013 the committee approved COA 147-12-CA to remove and rebuild existing non-historic additions with small increase in size; this application significantly reduces the size of the 2nd level addition and exposes the historic mansard roof form.
- 4* The addition proposed not to be rebuilt is non-historic; likely constructed in the late 1940s according to Sanborn Fire Insurance maps.
- 5* A new door is proposed for the rebuilt addition to allow access to a new rooftop balcony; specifications were not included in the application.
- 6* The proposed rooftop balcony is at the rear of the house and below the roof; black metal railings are visually unobtrusive.
- 7* The application states that the balcony railing is proposed to be made of custom wrought iron in order to differentiate new balcony from existing ground level porches with wooden railings; the photo rendering illustrated wood railings that match the existing; details were not included in the application.
- 8* The additions are at the rear of the house in inconspicuous locations.
- 9* The 1st floor addition will not extend beyond the width of the existing bump out.
- 10* The proposed 1st floor addition will be structurally self-supporting and be attached to the rearmost portion of the house; one wall of historic fabric will be lost; however the wall is a secondary elevation.
- 11* Based on Sanborn Fire Insurance maps the rearmost portion of the house was constructed between 1909 and 1914.
- 12* The 1st floor addition is proposed to be an extrusion of the existing room, with details, materials, and colors to match the existing.
- 13* The applicant confirmed via email that the new will be differentiated from the old by retaining a corner board at the location of the extruded addition.

Staff suggests that the committee approve the amended application, with the following conditions:

1. That specifications and details for the following be provided to an approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
 - c. Windows.
2. That specifications and details for the following be provided to an approved by staff prior to installation:
 - d. Balcony railing
 - e. Door.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Randall and Heather Scott [affirmed] were present to speak in support of the application. Ms. Scott verbally amended the application to change the request to a wooden balustrade on the balcony per the request of the SHPO.

Mr. Alphin asked about exterior lighting. The Scott's indicated they weren't sure.

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

At Mr. Shackleton's suggestion Ms. McGorty moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Mr. Alphin seconded; motion carried 5/0.

Committee Discussion

The following points were made in discussion [speaker indicated in brackets]:
We should change facts 6 and 7 to reflect wood balustrades. [Downer]

Findings of Fact

Ms. Downer moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-13) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following modifications:

Change the following facts to read as indicated:

- 6* The proposed rooftop balcony is at the rear of the house and below the roof.
- 7* The amended application states that the balcony railing is proposed to be wood; details were not included in the application.

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

Decision on the Application

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

1. That specifications and details for the following be provided to an approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
 - a. Windows.
2. That specifications and details for the following be provided to an approved by staff prior to installation:
 - a. Balcony railing
 - b. Door;
 - c. Lighting.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Caliendo; passed 5/0.

Committee members voting: Alphin, Caliendo, Downer, McGorty, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 10/1/13.

DRAFT

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

033-13-MW 521 N EAST STREET
Applicant: AHREN RITTERSHAUS
Received: 3/15/2013 Meeting Date(s):
Submission date + 90 days: 6/13/2013 1) 4/1/2013 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: Install solar panels on south and west sides of roof; install attic fan

Amendments: Additional information was provided March 28, 2013 and is attached to these comments.

Conflict of Interest: Ms. Downer requested recusal as an adjacent property owner. Ms. McGorty moved to recuse Ms. Downer. Ms. Caliendo seconded; motion passed 5/0.

Staff Notes:

- Installation of solar panels is typically approvable as a Minor Work, however in staff's judgment a portion of the change does not meet the Design Guidelines and per the by-laws has been referred to the COA Committee for review.
- The file for COA 085-12-MW is available for review.
- Staff photos are available for review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3.5	Roofs	Install solar panels on south and west sides of
3.10	Utilities and Energy Retrofit	roof; install attic fan

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on the information contained in the amended application, in staff's judgment:

- A. Installation of solar panels on the roof; installation of attic fan is not incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 3.5.11, 3.10.3, 3.10.11; however, installation of solar panels on the south facing roof **may be** incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 3.5.11, 3.10.11.
- 1* The frame house is 2 stories tall with a low-sloped asphalt shingled hip roof. It sits close to the street at the level of the sidewalk and street.
- 2* The solar panels on the south roof may be prominently visible from the street, south of the house.

- 3* The application states that "During the spring, summer, and fall, very little if any of the array will be visible from the street to the south because of the presence of numerous trees along the sidewalk." The *Design Guidelines* do not make reference to seasonal foliage.
- 4* The solar panels will be flush roof mounted on the secondary south (side) and west (rear) roof faces.
- 5* The solar panels are black with black frames, and black mounting clips; the existing roof is dark asphalt shingles; the 4 to 5" deep panels will be flush mounted and have 2" clearance above the roof; the electrical conduit will run into the attic through the roof and therefore will not be visible on the roof.
- 6* The dimensions of a single module are 65" x 40" and the south roof is proposed to have 16 panels with the total array dimensions of 16'5" x 26'7"; the west roof is proposed to have 10 panels with the total array dimensions of 10'10" x 19'11" there is no information regarding use of smaller arrays.
- 7* The proposed product will have an anti-reflective coating; a photograph of a recent installation was provided by the applicant.
- 8* The proposed solar fan is on the rear roof plane.
- 9* A solar array was approved by the committee in 2012 at 511 Oakwood Avenue (COA 085-12-MW). The application was approved in part because the panels would not be prominently visible and were set back from the street.

Pending the committee's determination on whether the south roof is prominently visible from the street, staff suggests that the committee approve the installation of a solar array and solar fan on the west roof.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Tania Tully [affirmed] noted that the applicant expected the committee to hear the case in his absence.

Ms. Caliendo commented that the panels will be pretty visible from the south side. She noted that she walked by the installation on Oakwood Avenue and that the panels were barely visible.

Ms. McGorty asked how many panels are on that south side.

Mr. Shackleton commented on the color of the panels. He noted that they have antireflective coating and the roof is black and they're black and even though you can see them they'll be subtle.

Mr. Alphin noted that they are very low profile on roof, not tilted, and on an asphalt shingle roof.

There was some discussion of foliage.

Mr. Shackleton noted that he considered the solar panels to be HVAC units.

Ms. Caliendo said that she is not opposed to it on the west side, but opposed on south side because its highly visible when you walk on that south side.

Committee Discussion

There was no discussion following the public hearing.

Findings of Fact

Ms. McGorty moved that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comment A. (inclusive of facts 1-9) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following modified fact:

Changing fact 2* to read:

2* The solar panels on the south roof **are not** prominently visible from the street, south of the house.

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

Decision on the Application

Ms. McGorty made a motion that the application be approved as amended.

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

Committee members voting: Alphin, Caliendo, McGorty, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 10/1/13.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Committee Discussion
 - a. Application Completeness
 - b. Meeting Post-Mortem
2. Design Guidelines Update

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Scott Shackleton, Chair
Certificate of Appropriateness Committee,
Raleigh Historic Development Commission

Minutes Submitted by:
Tania Tully, Preservation Planner

DRAFT