

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

135-13-CA      516 EUCLID STREET  
Applicant:      LOUIS CHERRY AND MARSHA GORDON  
Received:      8/23/2013      Meeting Date(s):  
Submission date + 90 days: 11/21/2013      1) 9/9/2013      2)      3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Zoning: R-10

Nature of Project: Construct new 2-story house; construct new 2-story accessory building and associated driveway; remove trees; construct front walkway.

Amendments: Detailed drawings, adjacent building heights, and photos of materials were provided by the applicant and are attached to these comments.

DRAC: This application was reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee (DRAC) on August 28, 2013. Present were Jerry Traub, David Maurer, Erin Lewis, and Curtis Kasefang. Also present were Marsha Gordon, Louis Cherry, and Tania Tully.

Conflict of Interest: Per his request, Ms. Caliendo moved to recuse Mr. Alphin from the case. Ms. David seconded, motion passed 4/0. Mr. Alphin left the room. Ms. David disclosed that she is on the Oakwood listserv, realizes there's been a lot of chatter, but dutifully hit delete.

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	construct driveway
2.3	Site Features and Plantings	construct new 2-story house; construct new 2-story accessory building and associated driveway; remove trees
2.5	Walkways, Driveways, and Offstreet Parking	construct driveway; construct front walkway
2.6	Garages and Accessory Structures	construct new 2-story accessory building
4.3	New Construction	construct new 2-story house; construct new 2-story accessory building

STAFF COMMENTS

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

- A. Construction of new 2-story house; construction of new 2-story accessory building and; removal of trees is not incongruous in concept according to *Guidelines* sections 2.1.1, 2.3.5, 2.3.7, 2.6.6, 2.6.8, 2.6.9, 4.3.1, 4.3.4, 4.3.5, 4.3.6, 4.3.7, 4.3.8, 4.3.9, 4.3.10, 4.3.11; however the use of hardi panels, slate cladding, and stained wood siding may be incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 4.3.9, 4.3.10. Raleigh City Code Section 10.2.15.E.1. states that "An

application for a certificate of appropriateness authorizing the demolition or destruction of a building, structure or site within any Historic Overlay District...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 [district], it shall waive all or part of such period and authorize earlier demolition or removal."

- 1\* Euclid Street, unlike most of Oakwood, does not have sidewalks.
- 2\* The application proposes the removal of 13 small, but regulated trees and 3 larger trees including a walnut and Chinese elm to accommodate the new construction; two dogwoods and a Gingko tree are proposed as replacements.
- 3\* The *Guidelines* suggest replacement of removed trees with similar or identical species.
- 4\* Three existing trees along the east property line appear to be retained; a tree protection plan was not included in the application.
- 5\* The siting of the house is as follows. Front (north) yard area is 2'6" at the front porch and 6'8" along the body of the house. Rear (south) yard area is approximately 21'-3" except for the garage which is approximately 6'. East yard area is 9'8". West yard area is 32'-9" to house and 12'6" at the garage. Similar yard setbacks can be found occasionally on similarly situated lots in the historic district, such as the property at 405 N. East Street, which has a rear setback of 3.8', a side (south) setback of 3.6', and front setback of 6.9'. The house immediately across the street at 515 Euclid Street was approved in 2008 (040-08-CA) with similar setbacks.
- 6\* The setbacks along Euclid Street vary.
- 7\* The existing lot is 5,227 SF; proposed lot coverage including garage, driveway and porches is about 44%, which is not uncommon in Oakwood.
- 8\* The garage is set back to the rear of the lot and is of lower height and a simpler version of the architectural detailing of the main house; it is attached to the house via the screened-in porch.
- 9\* The open stair access reduces the mass of the 480 square feet, two story (20' to the ridge) accessory structure.
- 10\* The proposed building height is approximately 24' to the ridge and is within 10% of the height of the nearby and adjacent buildings. According to the Certified Record of 040-08-CA 530 N East Street is 25' to the ridge; 515 Euclid Street was approved to be 26' to the ridge; 523 Euclid Street is approximately 22'. The amended application states that the two adjacent structures on East St, 528 N East St and 526 N East St are 19' 9" to ridge and 25'9" to ridge respectively.
- 11\* The proposed building has a rectangular form with a low pitched gable roof with wide eaves; is a common form found throughout the district.
- 12\* The application includes photographic examples of homes built between 1872 and 1946 of varying ages and styles.
- 13\* The proposed main part of the house will be two stories (24' to the ridge) and yield 2,100 square feet of heated space. Because of the orientation of the lot, the house is sited with the long face of the home fronting on Euclid St; the front door is oriented to be side-facing, which is atypical, but not unheard of in Oakwood. The orientation of is a direct response to the site geometry and is counterbalanced by the front-facing porch.
- 14\* The majority of the windows proposed are vertical in orientation and grouped together in banks; a horizontal window is proposed on the front façade and a larger corner window

spanning two stories is also proposed. The large corner window is proposed as an expression of the new technology available today.

- 15\* Proposed materials of the new construction include painted smooth hardi-panel; horizontal cypress siding, stained; standing seam metal roof, light gray; slate cladding; and aluminum clad wood windows; the amended application included an eave detail and photos of completed projects using the proposed materials.
  - 16\* Unpainted wood is a modern material that has been used in the historic district in the construction of informal decks, and for fences. The horizontal cypress siding is a major visual element of new house. During the period of Oakwood's historic significance, wood elements of residential buildings, including siding, were painted to protect them from the elements.
  - 17\* In 2006 the use of an informal 2-story unpainted stair on a formal painted porch addition was determined to create a disharmonious composition incompatible with the special character of the building and the historic district. (194-06-CA 114 N. Bloodworth Street)
  - 18\* Unpainted horizontal wood siding was approved in Oakwood on a new addition at the rear of 208 Linden Avenue, but has not yet for the main material of a new house.
  - 19\* Smooth-faced fiber cement siding has been approved for use on detached new construction as horizontal siding; large panels such as proposed has not yet been approved in Oakwood.
  - 20\* Staff is unaware of any instance where slate has been used as cladding on a building in Oakwood.
  - 21\* The amended application states that the proposed new construction will have aluminum-clad wood windows with a metallic aluminum exterior finish that will match the aluminum proposed for the curtain wall metal framing at the corner window.
  - 22\* Thus far, the commission has only approved the use of wood windows on new construction.
  - 23\* Evidence regarding the compatibility of the proposed new materials was not included in the application.
  - 24\* Photovoltaic panels are proposed on the rear roof; solar panels have been approved in locations not visible from the street; details and specifications were not included in the application.
- B. Construction of new driveway and front walkway is not incongruous in concept according to Guidelines sections 2.5.5, 2.5.6; however a solid concrete driveway and slate front walkway are incongruous according to *Guidelines* section 2.5.5.
- 1\* The application shows conceptual locations of proposed landscape elements; details and specifications are not provided.
  - 2\* The front walkway is proposed to be slate; concrete is the predominant material for front walks. In 2009 the committee denied replacing a concrete walkway with flagstone (085-09-MW; 603 N Boundary Street) in part because staff surveyed 323 front walks in Oakwood. Of those front walks 73% are concrete; 21% are brick, 4% are stone, and 1% are some other material.
  - 3\* The proposed concrete driveway is wide enough for two cars.
  - 4\* The new driveway is proposed to be solid concrete; in 2006 a solid concrete driveway was denied at 105 N. Bloodworth Street (037-06-CA) in part because as noted in the *Guidelines* appendix essay describing the special character of Oakwood, "Driveways themselves are most often gravel or concrete ribbon strips, squeezing beside the house to access the rear

yard, and pushing the house close to the opposite side-lot line” and no special circumstances were indicated for constructing a solid driveway in that location.

- 5\* The application included photographs of existing solid concrete driveways in Oakwood. The examples on Leonidas and Watauga as well as 617 Polk were part of the Oakwood Green subdivision approved in the 1990s under a previous set of Design Guidelines. There is no COA on file for the driveway at 612 Polk Street; based on staff photos it was constructed after designation of the district, but prior to 1998. 327 Oakwood was approved for drainage reasons with a COA. Not all examples were researched by staff.
- 6\* Solid surface driveways have been accommodated through the use of a combination of concrete ribbon strips and brick infill.
- 7\* The proposed driveway includes wheelchair friendly ramp onto the front porch.

**Pending the committee’s determination regarding the materials of the new construction**, staff suggests that the committee approve the amended application waiving the 365 day demolition delay for removal of the trees, with the following conditions:

Staff is not offering suggestions regarding the proposed new materials.

1. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
  - a. Tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture or a landscape architect licensed by the NCBLA.
  - b. Windows
2. That the following details and specification be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
  - a. Standing seam metal roofing;
  - b. Photovoltaic panels;
  - c. Siding materials.
3. That the front walkway be concrete with a water washed finish.
4. That a separate COA application(s) be provided for the proposed landscaping.
5. That the driveway not be solid concrete with the details and specification be provided to staff prior to installation.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY

#### Support

Louis Cherry [affirmed], owner and architect, and Marsha Gordon [affirmed], owner, were present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Cherry spoke to an electronic presentation that is hereby included in the minutes by reference.

Mr. Shackleton: So you’ve had the opportunity now to read the staff comments. Would you like to tell us know about your project and reply to, respond to any staff comments?

Mr. Cherry: Sure, yea. I have prepared a presentation and I’d say the remarks are presented to you and to the group since there’s been so much discussion I think it bears talking about our

bigger intentions. I am an architect and have been practicing in Raleigh since 1983, most of my work has been community based. Burning Coal Theatre right down the street is a project I've worked on. It's been really focused on designing for communities and how to things fit. We've chosen to live in Oakwood and have been living over at 421 N Bloodworth for over a year. Because of the eclectic diversity of architecture and the spaces, but mostly because of the people. I mean, it is a community of engaged passionate people which you'll see evidence of here tonight.

You would not find a bigger defender of preserving the historic character of Oakwood and the stock of historic buildings in Oakwood than myself and Marsha. But what we're proposing to build is a new home on one of the three or four remaining open lots in the community. And why do we want to do that. We want to be part of that neighborhood; we're renting there now. We want to put down our roots there.

And we want to build a really good Oakwood house. We really are into the spirit of what Oakwood is about. We want to build a house that honors the historic buildings by doing something that is new and compatible, new and sympathetic, but is not just a watered down historic copy, which I think has more integrity. Oakwood is not stuck in time; it's a vital living growing neighborhood/community.

The document that we submitted lays out in detail how we believe we meet the Guidelines. I really want to do today with this presentation is summarize the intentions and our approach to the house. This is an important project. It is very important to us and we understand the importance to the community as well. It is definitely our intention to make a house that will contribute to the character of what makes Oakwood great and it has evolved over decades of existence. In each of those periods of evolution the new style was new and different and we have to have to acknowledge this that it not an isolated point in time. (Indicates to staff to go to first slide)

The Guidelines begin at section 1.1. by stating that "that change is an important element in the city's evolution, indicating a healthy, vital neighborhood and reflecting the pride of residents in their community." Section 4.3 further states: "The success of new construction within a historic district does not depend on direct duplication of existing building forms, features, materials, and details. Rather, it relies on understanding what the distinctive architectural character of the district is. Infill buildings must be compatible with that character. Contemporary design generated from such understanding can enrich the architectural continuity of a historic district." So how do we understand the distinctive character and build a building that is clearly of its time and yet enriches the architectural continuity of the historic district. The guidelines lay out the qualities of what makes the structures compatible.

Slide

Myrick Howard, of Preservation NC is recently quoted regarding a new building in Oakwood "I feel very strongly that new buildings in Historic Districts need to reflect the architecture of their period of construction. If a building comes in and fits from a form and scale standpoint it can stylistically be much more variable and still fit in." Oakwood has buildings from 1880s, 1920s, 1940s up to the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The key Myrick had also said is for buildings to be in line with the size, height, and setback from the street. Architectural diversity is the key to

Oakwood's character. These are houses with district personality and style. The contributing structures live side by side with the non-contributing structures from the 40s through today. The reserved box forms of the Federal style could hardly be more different than 2<sup>nd</sup> Empire Victorian home. With the distance of time we may see these as more similar in style because they are old historic, but stylistically each was very different and each in its day was modern as each change occurred. I think it's important to refer to the appendix of the guidelines where the special character of Oakwood is described. "...lots are small and narrow, especially between Bloodworth and East streets, and the houses are generally tightly spaced and often located close to the side lot lines. This dense grouping of buildings, which are also set close to the sidewalk, gives a certain intimacy and rhythm to the neighborhood."

Slide

"A wide range of architectural styles and building types are nestled within this tree-shaded setting. Many of the prominent buildings within the district are of recognizable "high style" architecture. Still, befitting its heritage as Raleigh's early middle-class neighborhood... most of the dwellings in Oakwood are more simple, vernacular interpretations of these styles: frame construction covered with weatherboard using standard building parts available from local millwork and lumber suppliers."

Slide

"Thus Oakwood, which contains Raleigh's only intact 19th century neighborhood, is also a surprisingly diverse neighborhood of long-term change. Its evolution is painted across a broad canvas, diversity borne of architectural and topographical variety..."

So, what we are proposing is building a building of today. It is an interpretation, much in the spirit as stated here, a contemporary translation of a vernacular tradition; built with the qualities that are important to maintain the historic character of Oakwood. We've all seen the effects of tearing down modest homes and rebuilding over-scaled grotesquely detailed so called McMansions. That's the real threat to historic Oakwood and a large reason why the guidelines are in place and being very effective to preserving that character.

Our proposal is a modest home, scaled with respect sized and respects buildings.

Slide with picture of lot.

So to give a little context to our project. We are proposing a new home on an empty lot and it's important to know that the guidelines deal very differently from new construction than compared to adding to or modifying existing construction. We appreciate the preservation of historic homes and appreciate the effort many people have to go through to make the changes. It is a different set of issues.

The lot is small and a somewhat unusual shape It is .12 acres, measures 100' wide by 50' deep. We are proposing a two story house 2,100 SF at 24' and a garage studio with 480 SF and a ridge height of 20 feet.

Slide

It's on Euclid Street. That's an unusual street. It's one of the very few streets in Oakwood without sidewalks. It was only paved in 1965. It's one block long, there is really no through traffic and it's an unusual lot shape being very wide and shallow rather than long and deep like most of the lots in Oakwood are. Euclid is very diverse. It's mostly noncontributing houses.

The house on the corner of East and Euclid is an 1883 house on corner as is the house on opposite corner. Most houses built in the 20s and 30s, and then new construction most recently in 2008.

Our proposal we believe fits well within the development patterns along Euclid Street.  
Slide

This can be further studied by comparing us to the house across the street, 515 Euclid, which has a similar lot condition. That is .11 acres compared to our .12 acres. The 515 is 2,439 of heated SF, compared to our 2,580 with our studio and house. And then the setback 13'11" from the curb to the house at 515 and ours is 14'8" from back of curb to house. The heights is 26' versus 24'. We feel like we are compatible with all of those factors.

Slide

So, our design as I've stated is a contemporary interpretation of traditional vernacular building forms. So what this really means is that it's based upon and inspired by historic architecture but its expressed in the materials, building technologies, and some design language of today that makes it clearly of its day.

Slide

It is of modest size, compatible in scale and massing. Like the best homes of Oakwood we seek a design that has personality and spirit. A ribbon of vertical windows animates the front façade. There is an accent of a bay window into the dining room space and large glass element enclosing and highlighting the stairs. These design elements are really contemporary analogs to the turrets, bays, dormers and other architectural elements found on historic structures. These impart its architectural character. Our front porch is a generous welcoming engagement with the street in the neighborhood. It is a truly useful outdoor room. Our garage is definitely deferential in that it is setback and lower in height. The home is designed [as you can see in the image on the lower right] for universal access. You can pull a car into the drive, or is accessible from the street with a fully integrated ramp with first floor being fully accessible as well.

Slide

We also recognize that it's important to build sustainable. Our house will incorporate many of the energy and environmental features we are proposing are electricity be generated and housed on our south facing roof slope which is not visible from the street. We have optimum window orientation facing primarily north / south ... glazing. We are proposing geothermal heat pumps to use the constant earth temperature to create efficient heating and cooling and we'll be building to very high level levels of energy efficiency of the basic structure.

Slide

The materials that we're proposing are an 8" cypress siding, tongue and groove, stained a medium stain. We feel this is expressive of the...architecture and it is also a soft kind of natural expression I think will actually fit nicely into the neighborhood. We're proposing Hardie panels used as an accenting material that would be painted a gray that provides a base for the siding. We are proposing aluminum clad windows with a dark painted finish. We have sort of gone back and forth on a window finish. We understand that there have been, I guess, discussions about approving aluminum windows. We feel like it's a very durable contemporary expression of how windows are made today. It's a question of durability and performance. We feel like the dark painted will be the most attractive and expressive of roots of house. Our garage doors are a double hinge door and will be a painted wood door. We also, I did not list here, are proposing that we use slate on our front porch and our steps and our walkway to the street and also on the front columns that support the front porch roof.

Slide

So, in summary I want to state that we feel it's an honor and a privilege to contribute to the architectural heritage of Oakwood. We've tried very hard to make a house, that we believe fits – a house that meets the design guidelines but also in time, we hope, would be seen as an example of an Oakwood home, with its eclectic architectural spirit and a home that has grace, personality, and style. Thank you.

Mr. Shackleton: So, if you are here to speak in support of this application would you please raise your hand. Let's start over here and work our way around. Would you, the applicants, please have a seat for a moment? You'll have a chance to come back up. When you come up to speak please introduce yourself for the record and be as brief as possible. Also please don't just repeat what someone else has said. This is not a vote. So, it does not get approved or disapproved based on the number of comments. It's just a direction to a point on the Guidelines.

Support:

Curtis Kasefang [affirmed]: I live at 519 Polk Street. I was the chair of the commission for 4 years, on the COA committee for 6. I am currently on the DRAC, the Design review Advisory Committee. I'm an Oakwood resident; actually this structure is about 150' from my property line so it's quite tightly in my neighborhood. A couple of things to add beyond what you've heard. Euclid Street is a one block street between Elm and East, as you know. This is probably one of the least prominent locations in Oakwood. It's, I think, on that level, whatever happens on this street is relatively low impact. When I was reviewing this app as part of my DRAC participation, I stepped through the 4.3 guidelines. I found each one compatible with the guidelines. The possible exception I found were the stained wood and hardiepanels, as well as the horizontal window in the corner on the front. After that I did a windshield survey of Oakwood to see what was to be had of the windows. After I hit 9 horizontal windows, including the one across the street at 515, I stopped. There are clearly lots of windows in that physical orientation. As to the stain, at 601 Leonidas the entire second story and outbuilding are stained wood. That was approved by the commission as part of new construction in that area in the in 80s. It's also worthwhile noting that the whole area being new construction in the historic district, very few of the houses are direct extractions of Oakwood style. They are more 80s views of historic styles. Also, in terms of stain at I noticed that at 613 Polk there is a very visible wood fence that crosses over into Latham St. That has a stained wood finish. Again, it's very very prominent. Plus we have the decks and doors throughout Oakwood that are stained finish.

As far as Hardiboard, we know the commission has approved hardiplank, smooth face on new construction throughout the historic districts. Hardiboard is sort of different, a different animal here to a certain degree, although it is pretty darn analogous to stucco. It is more like modern stucco, cementitious material, crisp edges. So I think it should be looked at in that, in contrast to a modern material like EIFS which lacks definition, has a pebbly texture with voids. This is more true to the historic finish with that smooth cement surface.

Similarly the aluminum clad wood windows with a painted finish. Modern material, modern construction of a window. Nice crisp edges which is common throughout the district with windows and doors. And in that way I think it is a compatible material for a new construction. I would not say so on a historic structure because of the guidelines emphasis on using historic materials, but on new construction where it is echoing a look and feel it is an interesting way to go.

I do also concur with the staff suggestions regarding hardscape and the solid driveway. In terms of following the special character of Oakwood I think it needs to be broken up in some fashion as opposed to a sea of concrete.

Given all this I recommend that commission does find that this proposed design is not incongruous with the guidelines section 4.3 and subsections.

Barbara Wisby [affirmed]: Very much for this project.

Deborah Smith [affirmed]: Together with my husband I own 528 N. East Street, immediately adjacent to 516 Euclid. I don't know that I can follow Curtis very well, but I did want to speak in full support of this project being an immediately adjacent neighbor. Think it is an exciting project. As far as the guidelines, I think it absolutely contributes to interest and depth of district. I believe very much that the house follows what the guidelines say as far as several key factors, respect diversity, density, and relationship of houses to the street. I think Louis already painstakingly discussed that and I agree with his analysis of all of that. I think that the scale and mass is appropriate for the street and I have no qualms. It is both an honor and privilege to have a property next to this new contemporary house in the neighborhood. I wanted to express my full support for this project.

Peter Rumsey [affirmed]: I reside at 515 N. Bloodworth. I don't need to repeat and you requested that I don't repeat things that have already been said. I would simply add my affirmation to what's been said before. I do want to emphasize as someone who has been actively engaged in collecting oral histories of Oakwood, and as a realtor who is constantly in our city looking at the evolution of neighborhoods. I am struck by the very essence of Oakwood which is its diversity. That diversity among both housing type, housing character, has given us what we have today which is the strength of Oakwood the people that are the match of its diversity. People matching the big house the little house; the this house and that house. I think this in a constructive way really continues that historic and that legacy of Oakwood as contributing to that diversity of a neighborhood. It is our DNA that helps us replicate ourselves over time. I think this, in contrast to what I have seen in a number of communities, including elsewhere in Raleigh, where you have what is called faux Victorian. You have then, what may be the worst of the absence of diversity.

So, as you struggle with the question, not unlike the Supreme Court dealing with questions of elements taste, you have to look at what is your legal responsibility, which is looking at the question of its contributing to the neighborhood and reflecting upon the guidelines which say that the structures are not to be replicating the existing structures. So, I stand very strongly in favor of this project.

I would not speak to specific things such as a driveway, but I think those are secondary and could certainly be negotiated with the architect and proposed owners of this. But I think the very concept of our being able, you being able, to recognize the direct contribution this makes to the legacy and character of Oakwood which is mirroring the best of the architecture of the various periods of time. I welcome your careful consideration and I welcome my neighbors' careful consideration of your job and our job in this process. I appreciate what you are doing here.

Chris Crew [affirmed]: Good afternoon, Chris Crew, 306 Elm Street. I've been an Oakwood resident for 37 years now. It is my home. I'm very interested in this project. I like all kinds of architecture. I think this is a good design. My neighbors, as you're aware, if you've seen anything on the listserv. There's been a lot of conversation on this. Has looked through this application and in my profession I review applications; this is one of the best applications that he has seen prepared. I think almost all of the points in section 4.3 of the guidelines have been addressed successfully in the application.

Friday afternoon I was wondering what in the world anybody who is opposed to it could say about it. I found it. It hinges on an error in the application on the site plan in that the scale at the bottom of the site plan does not match the dimensions of the house from the street. The dimension is written 14'8, but if you measure that with the scale it is only 12'. Why is that important to this question? It's the only thing I could find to say against this application, which I support. This one little feature leads back to 4.3.2 and the final clause in that which says significant district vistas and views are retained. If you go down to East Street and travel south to the intersection of Boundary and East Street, you will past Euclid on your left. If you turn your attention down Euclid Street you can see the fence that currently defines this lot. What I wondered is, and I can't tell from the application, is will you be able to see this house from any detail from East Street when you're making that trip.

The defining character of Oakwood is late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century architecture, principally Victorian, Arts and Crafts, and Craftsman style houses. On East Street this street, on this particular the block I'm talking about, there is an unbroken vista and view of Victorian and Craftsman style houses. If, as I suspect, you can see this house, that breaks that line, that does something to that vista and view, is it significant enough to deny the application? I don't know. So the question I have of the architects and designers in the room is do you think you will be able to see this house as you make that trip. If you can't I'm 100% in support of the applicant, if you can I'm still 99% in favor of it because I think it is good and distinctive architecture. If we try to trap Oakwood in every specific period of architecture we end up with Old Salem or Williamsburg, which isn't even the real deal, but is reproductions. I think there is always the question of in 50 years, in 75 years from now, what will represent the good architecture of this period. [Inaudible sentence] That concludes my comments. I hope someone will address my direct question.

Gene Conti [affirmed]: I live at 400 Polk Street and I have lived there since 2001. I will echo a lot of the comments and do it very briefly Mr. Chairman. There is a clear distinction between renovating and building a new structure I Oakwood. I happen to own one of the remaining

empty lots right next to my house so if I ever was to sell or build, I would be very conscious of context and the block I live in and the houses surrounding me. Euclid Street is a very different situation from 400 block of Polk. The houses are different as you've seen. Chris raised an interesting question with the views and I'm interested in your response. Everything I read in the design guidelines, and I read them yesterday just to refresh my memory, this design is consistent in size and mass and height and everything with all the other houses around it. It is not out of bound with size. It is different because it's being built in 2014. Oakwood is an old neighborhood, a historic neighborhood, but it's always refreshing itself. As the guidelines say, it has been built lot by lot over an extended period time, since 1875 when my house was built. Lot by lot, buildings have been built consistent with the architecture, style and preference of the people at the time they were built. And as Peter Rumsey said, and I'll close with this, the real watchword of Oakwood is diversity. And this is diverse from a lot of other things in Oakwood. But it is certainly not out of bounds and not inconsistent with the guidelines that talk about size and mass and height and the things that make a difference in terms of how people would view this house in the context of where it's built. I would finally say that if Louis Cherry brought this house to me and said he was going to build it on the lot next to me I'd say you're crazy Louis because this house is designed for the lot where it's put. So if you're going to design a house for my lot I want you to design a house that makes sense for the lot next to me. My lot is very square, 40x40 or something like that - .08 acres. Louis, I'm sure would design a house in the context of that block, but he would do in in a 2014 design. Something that's going to reflect modern materials sustainability, green design; all the things he's built into this design.

Eddie Coleman [affirmed]: I live at 425 N Bloodworth Street where my wife and I live in a home that was built in 1872 as a Victorian, which I understand in 1905 was converted to a more classical or Federal style structure, when you could do that back in the day. Prior to that we have lived from 1984-2000 in the little house where you just approved the ipe porch furniture. I drove by this street and down Euclid 3 or 4 or 5 times a day. I can tell you for 29 years this lot has been a mosquito breeding ground. If there is any street in Oakwood that is diverse and reflects the unconventionality and reflects that there are aren't Victorian homes and there are not Federal homes and there are a few craftsman style home, its Euclid Street. Euclid is a very different animal. I want to say that I haven't read one word of the listserv because all these people pro and con are my drinking buddies and I don't want anybody mad at me. We're all friends and we love one another. This is a great example of children in that we fight and then make up. I believe that this is rather than a divergence from a concept of evolution in a neighborhood from Italianate to Victorian to Craftsman. I believe this is a continuation of that evolution, of diversity of those great important things like the sociability of the front porch and the welcoming nature of it. Lastly, you guys have a hard job. I've been before these committees from Winston-Salem, to Raleigh, New Bern and Beaufort and you have a thankless job. So I want say thank you and bless your hearts and thank you for your efforts.

Matthew Brown [affirmed]: I live at 601 E. Lane Street. Thank you all for your volunteer service to the citizens of Raleigh. I'm also an Oakwood board member so I've heard a lot of earfuls about it. The main concern is the precedent. People, especially after there was an addition to another house in Oakwood that was very modernist in its nature, people are afraid that the rules have been thrown out and we'll be inundated with modernist houses. I understand this

concern and I share it, however I believe that each application has to be judged on its own merits.

This particular design although it is mostly modernist in its aesthetic, it has a lot features that tie it to the historic architecture of Oakwood. Starting with the roof. Traditional saddle roof, which is the most common roof form in Oakwood. A lot of the Modernist houses have flat roofs and gull wings or single plane. This is a traditional saddle roof with a deep overhang. It's clad and standing seam metal which is a historic material for roofs in Oakwood. There are 25 houses in Oakwood that have or historically had standing seam metal roofs. And that's just the main roof. There are a couple of hundred that have standing seam metal porch roofs. By contrast most other new houses in last 30 years have 3 tab asphalt fiberglass shingles which are not a historic material. Some even have these things they call architectural shingles, which didn't come out until the 1990's. In that way the standing seam metal roof is more historic than any other of the new houses. I know it is a shallower pitch than most Oakwood roofs, no doubt, but there are a couple that have pretty close to a shallow pitch roof. One's 541 Jones, the airplane bungalow, and one of them is 412 New Bern which is another Craftsman style house.

Another thing is the siding. People are concerned that it's not your regular ship lap. That true. It is horizontal wood siding, but it's not your regular ship lap. However it is wood, whereas a lot of the other houses have fiber cement board (hardieplank) siding. At least this is wood. Some people are concerned about it being stained. Well, there are 23 houses in Oakwood that have now or historically had part of their siding stained. These were contributing structures. They were in the form of stained wooden shingles popular during late neoclassical revival and in the craftsman period. There are 23 in the National Register district; I think 18 in the city district. A lot of these wooden stained shingles have since been painted, which is kind of a shame because if you paint them one time you can never stain it again. But originally and historically there was stained shingle siding.

Another thing is the windows. It's certainly not typical fenestration, but there are a number of examples of grouped vertical windows in Oakwood, and the fact that they have black sashes is worth noting. The black sash was the most common color during neoclassical revival period which is one of Oakwood's most important periods. Dark sashes, sometimes black were also popular in the Queen Anne period, and in the vernacular NC houses and farmhouses. There were a lot of black sashes. Whereas a lot of these other new houses have white or light colored sashes. Those are not historical to Oakwood. The white sashes, there were a few of them in Craftsman period, but most of them didn't come in until the colonial house after World War II. It didn't get to Oakwood until after World War II. So in that way these black sashes are more historic than these other new houses with light colored sashes.

One other thing which is hard to quantify, is that this is a fine design with fine materials. You can't find that language guidelines, but one of the salient characteristics of Oakwood is that these were fine designs with fine materials. They were not sharecropper shacks or mill houses. There were made of heat of yellow pine, slate, tern metal leaded glass. They were built by highly skilled craftsmen and were meant to last forever if well taken care of. The designs were either from plan books or those locally produced were done in a period when aesthetics were supreme. Whereas a lot of the houses now in the new subdivisions are made with cheap

materials and unskilled labors and will not last for 30 years, using a design some builder put together. Who knows how long they will last.

I do not envy your task because it is a tough question. I hope I'm not wrong because a lot of my friends disagree with me and I may be wrong, but if I'm not I believe this would be a beautiful addition to Oakwood.

Tania Tully [affirmed]: Matthew, before you go can you explain to the commissioners how you know some of this information about how many houses have this, that and the other. I know what you've been up to, but I don't think they do.

Matthew Brown: I've been doing a lot of research because I am putting together the National Register inventory for Oakwood. I've done deed research for every house and I've done a directory search so I know when every house was built. I've gone to every one and catalogued its characteristics. I have this huge document so all I have to do is match single siding checked it off or standing seam metal and I come to each one. I have also checked each one live to verify my info was correct. Thank you very much,

Scott Shackleton: Do we have anyone else in support? So, let's start again on this side and if you'd like to speak in opposition we'll go around this way.

Opposition:

Joy Weeber [affirmed]: [A document with her comments was distributed to the committee and staff, noting that she will be providing an abbreviated version given the previous comments] I love at 530 N. East Street, which abuts Euclid Street. I have a garage and the south side of house is I think is contributing to the streetscape. I had been told there were only two contributing houses on Euclid Street that could be used in my assessment of the new construction being proposed. So I chose to expand it from 525 and 527 Euclid because my house has been contributed to that streetscape for 106 years. Maybe even before it was a street, when it was Stronach Alley.

Some of the language in what you have before you maybe come from limited range of evaluation elements. I spend some time talking about 528 and 526, which you can read. Also the thing that struck me on the 2<sup>nd</sup> page down at 4.3.6 is that I'm very concerned based on my limited exposure to the design of this house and perhaps my perhaps erroneous understanding that the contributing structures on the street itself were to be considered in remarks today in apropos to the new construction guidelines. That I could not really see fenestration of the windows on this design having any relationship to the contributing structures of the street, including my house and 528 and 526 East Street both of which are houses that were built within the last hundred years. It was not my understanding that 515 Euclid would be used in its windows as a means of establishing contributing structures to the historic nature of historic Oakwood. So, perhaps some of my comments that are in here are not really quite appropriate anymore as I've heard things being said. I was limiting my purview to what I see on my street. I was looking at the fenestration of the windows and doors as having sashes of windows and

doors didn't see any reference to that kind of historic precedent in the treatments of the windows on this design.

I really have to say that I take exception to my street, even if my side where I use, not being that significant to the historic nature of Oakwood. Because, certainly as if you can see this construction from East Street, because of the difference in scale. I live at the corner where that scale is set in terms of looking at the historic nature of my block which is the 500 block of N East Street. And I'm not quite sure I understand how 515's window treatments can be called upon to justify these more modern windows treatments across the street, when perhaps my erroneous reading of the guidelines states that the older contributing structures are the ones that need to be referenced. I am confused on that one so my so my remarks might be erroneous. I'm not sure how much detail about the fenestration of windows was included in application. It was told to me that it was the one weak point in application. So I focused on what I focused on its surrounding neighborhood, its surrounding structures and fame up with my conclusions.

I also rolled around neighborhood looking at orientation of roof lines, many of which have far steeper pitches than the roof lines that are drawn on this. Most of the time those roof lines that are different are tucked into and reminiscent of the major roof lines, say the front porch roof lines of 525 and 527. They tuck into and under the eaves of the roof lines as do many others in the neighborhood. But I didn't scan whole neighborhood, just my street. I made a rude remark in my comments which I won't repeat about the front porch. The three different roof lines of the façade of this house strike me as jarring and I do not have Matthew's encyclopedic knowledge of the orientation of buildings in the neighborhood, but given what exists on my street. I consider Euclid my street since I park my wheelchair accessible van there and go in and out of my house on that side of the street. The roof lines don't in pitch refer to the roof lines of the other structures on the street, including mine and 528 N East Street nor 526.

I realize that I cannot report what other neighbors have said to me, as homeowners of contributing structures, but suffice it to say that there is great concern about our property values with the introduction of a modernist building.

The other thing with the fenestration of windows with various subdivisions, I was going strictly on my assessment of the windows based on contributing structures which would be 525 and 527 Euclid, the two structures next to Gail's house, and my house 528 and 526 N East Street. Those are my concerns there.

But I find it interesting that there is much being said about enhancing neighborhood perhaps aesthetically, yet since the city just received a 15,000 grant to assess the economic contributions of historic preservation to the economic development of the city as we learned of it in our neighborhood newsletter, if it would be premature to posit that making such a large departure from the nature of new construction in Oakwood could not hurt the economic impact of such a design on our property values or its impact on tourist dollars tourist dollars spent in our neighborhoods. We don't know. Has anyone done research on what the introduction of modernist architecture in traditional neighborhoods and quasi- traditional neighborhoods and what is the affect? We've sunk a lot a lot a lot of money to bring our houses into some previous definition of what is appropriate in our neighborhood. And we are being asked on a statement

of faith that this structure's not going affect our property values. I beg to question that. I don't know. I've not done any research on that.

So I would posit that viewing this application strictly on the technical elements such as roof slope or other details separate from the neighborhood's assessment of its acceptableness or its capacity to enhance the historic nature of our neighborhood that we've all chosen to honor with our dollars that it could most distinctly affect our property values. I'd prefer to have research confirming that it won't affect our property values prior to this committee approving its construction. Thank you.

Helen Tarp [affirmed]: I don't live in Oakwood. I live at 611 Monroe Drive which is down the hill from Oakwood. I thought you might want to hear from someone who doesn't live in Oakwood, but values its existence. I've been a little confused by the comments earlier about the diversity of Oakwood. Oakwood is not diverse. Come down the hill to my neighborhood and you'll find diverse. Or go to Mordecai. I think Oakwood is a very valuable thing to all of Raleigh and we should think very carefully before introducing something into it that will stick out like a sore thumb. I know that's not in the guidelines. Having watched them build new construction over the last 15 years that does fit and does have a contributing; that really contributes to the whole of Oakwood, I just can't understand why you would approve something like this and I hope that you don't. Thank you.

David Nightingale [affirmed]: I live at 407 E. Jones Street. As a homeowner of historic Oakwood for almost a decade I, of course, see the COA process a vital component of the RHDCs mission which is to identify, preserve, protect, and promote Raleigh's historic resources. I feel that the proposed new home at 516 Euclid violates the mission of RHDC and COA guidelines on many points and should be referenced. I do feel that it was a well put together application and the house is wonderful itself. I just do not think it fits the guidelines for Oakwood. There are a lot of open lots outside Oakwood where it would be wonderful.

As Chris mentioned earlier, the vista under 4.3.2, the vistas. The site of this house might be visible East Street and even though it is Euclid, which everyone seems to think is not an important street, it does connect to East Street, one of Raleigh's most historic streets. It is one of the original boundaries of the city. And it must be said that it is from the intersection of Euclid and East only 250' to the intersection of East and Boundary and there is a city park there, city kitty bus stop, there is a store there now. So there will be a lot of people trafficking the area. I think the historic vista could be interrupted if they could see this hose heading southbound on East Street.

4.3.6 Roofs. The roofing of this house has many unconnected roofs which is unlike any other homes. The gabeling is distinctly different and I find this incongruous. The form: the main entry of the house is on the side of the house per the lot. It appears to be a connecting feature of two different buildings which chops the house into smaller segments and is connected by a small covered entry. I don't find this compatible to any other homes on Euclid or in the area.

4.3.7. The façade. It appears to have three different facades as opposed to one which is inconsistent with other homes on Euclid.

4.3.9 Windows and doors. People go on about the windows and doors, not to mention window placement. But I do find the choice of aluminum windows is not consistent with surrounding homes all of which are wooden.

4.3.10 Materials. The wood siding is an issue in some respects. As noted in their application there is no prominent use of unpainted wood siding in the historic Oakwood area or on Euclid. I personally find there is no evidence that natural wood is similar to natural stone as expressed in the application. I don't find the aesthetic the same. In historic Oakwood there are over 700 homes and I can only think of one that is a fully stone house. All other natural stone is used I think for landscaping features. I don't see the comparison between the two and don't see it as compatible or a justification for using the natural Cyprus siding. I also find that according to the CO A guidelines cypress could be said to be an incompatible use as siding since in 4.1 cypress is clearly identified as decking material. Decking material is an inappropriate use as siding material I would think. As far as the cement reinforced paneling there is no panel used in historic Oakwood. Hardiplank has been used when it matched the form of the plank siding but paneling without trim is also not found in Oakwood and therefore is incompatible. I also find that the slate cladding on front entry incongruous.

4.3.11 compatibility issue. I find that the application cherry picked several different architectural ideas to justify this design on Euclid. Euclid is a different street. I has a lot of diversity as it has been assessed, but the selection is from the whole of Oakwood and not just Euclid and does not directly relate to the use of similar materials building features and details typical existing buildings along street scape or block of Euclid. This selection of examples does not help design a compatible building for this area of Oakwood. Amalgamation of ideas does not make this design appropriate for an historical area per the RHDC guidelines. I urge you to re-read the mission statement this infill design is not compatible to historic Oakwood's character per the guidelines therefore inappropriate and on many points goes against the guidelines as there set out. I think by allowing this house, and it is well thought out in this area, will forever open Pandora's Box to precedent. I hope you have a good evening and thank you for your time.

Agnes Stevens [affirmed]: I live at 512 E Lane and I too want to thank you all for doing this job and I hope to never have a proposal before you again. I have had one in the past so I appreciate the importance of what you're doing and the thoughtfulness of approach. What I want to speak to you about now is the concern about precedent being set here.

I object to the proposed new construction at 516 Euclid. In my reading it defies the RHDC design guidelines on numerous fronts. David touched on many of them. I believe that if this body allows this structure to be built as proposed it does set the precedent for building a building of any shape, made of any material, and a multitude of facades, or roof lines to be built in Oakwood. To me it puts at risk historic designations official and perceived by tourists, future homeowners, and investors and that come to our neighborhood every day expecting us to maintain our standards. Specifically I think the application should be declined based on 4.3.11, that we design new building so that they are compatible with but discernible from historic buildings in the district. This proposed design while very attractive and appealing for another

neighborhood is in very sharp contrast with what you see in most of Oakwood and certainly in contrast to the contributing structures in Oakwood. It's not compatible with contributing structures. For that reason alone I think it should be denied.

Ellen Nightingale [affirmed]: I live at 407 E. Jones Street. I value the significance undertakings of the RHDC and your mission which I quote is to identify, preserve protect, and promote Raleigh's historic resources. As a resident of historic Oakwood I also value the significant undertaking of my Oakwood predecessors who fought against our destruction, protected our architectural treasures, and continue to preserve its integrity with pride. We welcome new neighbors and new construction but feel like this application does not meet the RHDC guidelines for new construction within a historic district and is disrespectful to those who comply with the guidelines for the greatest common good. Most people in this room have had COA's approved by this board. I take issue with it being said it's just Euclid it's a side street that it's non-conforming. The guidelines apply to all property not some. The greenest house is the one that already exists.

I take note with guidelines 4.3.6 that states "Design new building to be compatible with surrounding buildings that contribute to the overall character of the historic district in terms of height, which we've addressed, size and scale, massing and proportion. And we've addressed those, but not form and roof shape. I think I take the biggest issue with. The house proposed is not in any way compatible with its neighbor's on Euclid or anywhere else in Oakwood. It has multiple unconnected nearly flat roofs, unlike neighboring pitched and gabled roof lines.

4.3.7 Designed proportion of building's front façade to be compatible with the front façade of surrounding historic buildings, it clearly does not on Euclid or in Oakwood. The reason the lot is oriented that way, I think is important to note, is because it's supposed to be a back yard. I think it's important to preserve the open lots we have. We have saved historic buildings and moved them. SPHO has done so in the last 10 years and I am proud to know our neighborhood is doing that. So I think just filling in an open lot like it doesn't matter, it's just an open lot - I think it does matter. Saving open lots for public space and for historic moves is important. I also take issue with aluminum clad windows versus use of wooden double hung windows. I know they still make them—this committee required me to have them two years ago.

The proposed design for these reasons is not compatible with other buildings in Oakwood. Shopping for random elements and materials and mixing them together does not make a home compatible to the historic district. I believe it's a great house that should to be built outside of the historic overlay.

I am also the Candlelight Co-chair for the neighborhood. This year we have a targeted goal of \$100,000; people come from all over to see our historic neighborhood. I do believe that there is an economic impact to be considered. I am also the Garden Club president. Women literally fly in from all over the country to sit in historic yards and beautiful open lots. I am also concerned with how this will affect historic events and vistas we all enjoy and use. Thank you very much.

Jerry Nowell [affirmed]: I live at 312 E. Jones Street. My great grandfather came home the Civil War moved into Oakwood, served as sheriff of Wake County. I've a tremendous number of

relatives in the past who have lived in Oakwood; they all moved out. I moved back 8 years ago. It is something I've always wanted to do – get back to my roots. I'm so thrilled and proud that the neighborhood had been preserved as much as possible. Much has been said about the diversity of the homes in Oakwood and they are certainly diverse. Who can argue against diversity? But if you think about it, the decision to make it a historic neighborhood was in part an attempt to arrest evolution, that growing diversity. The rest of Raleigh changes with styles and fashions as they come and go. Almost all of Raleigh is available for that. Oakwood had a unique character that people wanted to preserve. I absolutely love the design of this home. I used to own a contemporary furniture store, I love contemporary design and maybe one day I will live in a house like that, but I'll build it somewhere other than in Oakwood because it is not appropriate for the neighborhood. People are already there who have devoted so much time, energy, and money into preserving the value of Oakwood should not have to watch it slip away and lose its character with a home that does not fit. Thank you.

Gail Wiesner [affirmed]: I did write out some comments so that you will hear less here because I realize there will be so many people speaking. [distributed to the committee, applicants, and staff] Jerry brought up something that is my main premise which is that all the homes that are "diverse" were all built before we received our historic designation. Since that time we have fought and this commission and staff have fought, to keep this neighborhood the same in character. Unless you feel that does not fall in your purview please see page 3, a copy of the legislation which the state created so that these commissions could be created. What does it say? The feel and association of neighborhood will be preserves.

Now, many of the people who support modern architecture in historic districts are architects, and people that have a personal interest in it. I realized that the creativity of architects knows no bounds and you want to be able to show off your skills with a gorgeous home like this. However, too many people are drinking that Kool-Aid and forgetting what the original mission of historic preservation is: number 1, we're going to preserve the homes we have; number 2, for a district, not an individually designated home, but a district we're going to preserves the character, the feel, of the neighborhood. Yes these materials have been discussed—some of the features have been discussed. Saying that a particular material is similar to another one that was used does not make it the same. It is different. I said that a mouse and an elephant both have 4 legs and grey fur but that doesn't mean they should mate. Yea there's some gray fur on this house and it may have four legs but it is an elephant and not a mouse. It doesn't belong in the historic district. I have a lot in North Hills that I would love to see this house on, it would fit in perfectly.

The city has an asset here. Raleigh does not have a lot of tourist attractions and this is a big one. People come here to see the particular type of neighborhood that we have had for the last 40 years. They don't come to see modern homes they have different tours for that. There are tours for modern homes. People come to the teas at the Oakwood Inn to soak in ambience. It's nostalgia; it's a desire of the past. This was not all a neighborhood of fine materials; this was a blue collar neighborhood: shop keepers, teachers, low income people who rented out rooms to survive. Yes, we do have different examples of architecture.

I am probably only person here who's built a new house in the neighborhood. When I built my new home, every single detail, the windows, doors, the shape of it. It is only about 2,100 SF by the way. It started off quite a bit smaller. Dan Becker dictated every single detail of that home and it cost me it cost me \$35,000 and an extra 4 months to get this done, at a time when the banks were cutting off money. You know what, I look back on it and I say don't care because I can say that I did the very best I could to fit the neighborhood, accommodate my neighbors, I really care what my neighbors think. And I think I did a good job, if not I'm going to blame it all on Dan. He dictated every detail, I can show you the original plan, it was a little box to begin with - no dormer. It was totally different. That's beside the point.

The thing is that it is important to consider overall feel of the neighborhood. And I happen to think that Euclid is one of the most important streets in the neighborhood. Everyone walks their dogs back there. Joy and I had our homes on the tour with thousands of people through there. That tour is important economically and socially for Oakwood. We don't want to mess up the asset that the city has, we don't want to lose attraction for the tour, the garden tour or the other functions in the neighborhood. I like having people walking through with guides oohing and ahhing.

As far as the excuse of not wanting to copy. What about Neoclassical, colonial revival, etc. Copying has been a long strong architectural tradition, that's nothing new. The only thing it says in the guidelines is that you can't exactly replicate another house, or try to make it look as if it is historic. It has to fit the character; it has to fit the style. Each of these little details, that you must reference are important. You have a hard job to keep it objective and that makes it easier. Unfortunately the subjective door has already been opened. I know you don't want a lot of repetition, but you do have to consider how many people do want the neighborhood a certain way. That's important. We all have to live there. Some of you live there. Yes there are a few renegades who are tired of the same old same old. But most of us don't feel that way, we moved into the neighborhood because it's the way that it is and we don't want it changed. And if you want to take a poll you can, but I can tell you right now that there are many people who couldn't attend. Either they had to work. I met with Milton Dixon before I came. [Mr. Shackleton interjects that the commission cannot consider what somebody told her.] I am just pointing out that it is really important. You don't want to hear the same things over and over, but the numbers do count is what I'm trying to tell you.

The financial, the social, the emotional welfare of every single person who is really vested in the neighborhood will be affected by this big change. I can tell you as a realtor that the bestselling ones are those fakey neighborhoods. Look at Bedford, Heritage. You go to Heritage you have to have a certain color sign to put your house on sale. Those are the most popular neighborhoods and do you know why? Most people are not renegades; most people want the comfort of similar and community and collegiality in their neighborhood. They do not want to be in a neighborhood where people can put anything they want. They like restrictive covenants and some of them are much stricter than what we have to deal with. We can do anything we want to on the inside. Make the inside as modern as you want, but keep the outside that keeps the character that was created when this district was created. Yes, Jerry, you hit the nail on the head. That's what everyone is ignoring here. Thank you very much, I appreciate your time.

Tim Metcalf [affirmed]: I live at 524 Euclid so I would be your neighbor. I wish we were starting off on a better note. With that I will say that I love your design, it's great. I'll agree with everyone else - not for my neighborhood not for my street. I've lived there for 20 years, and just paid off my house last month. Euclid Street means something to me. That said, it is all emotional. I do feel like that way you pointed out the guidelines that seem to be incongruous. That the proposal seems to be incongruous with the guidelines.

I have some questions. When you talk about 365 days if you find that a particular structure - are you questioning whether the site is contributing to the character? Tania Tully interjects that that reference is specifically referring to the tree removal.

OK. I won't repeat what other folks have said; they've covered it pretty well. I want to give you some idea. Some things that were said I take exception with. One person said it was a sparsely traveled road. It's not, I live on it; it's a cut through. We have all the dog walkers and about 150 people who run through on Monday nights. DO they avoid Euclid? They do not; they use it; they like it. That's a significant road.

Vista and view, as has been stated, not sure if it's that you're not driving up it, this will change my vista and view and that of my neighbors. I will drive by it every single day as I turn into my driveway. It's important to me. There was talk about its size and density, but no one has mentioned how it covers 44% of that lot. It looks like it covers a lot more than that. Relative to other structures, mine included. I have a small 1,100/1,200 SF house that sits on three times that land. I have one of the biggest lots in Oakwood. That's a neighboring yard. This was meant to be a back yard, not meant for a house.

The money in question. I said I paid off my house, what I am going to do with my money now? The next thing is I'm going to fix my house up. I've got to get it painted, get a new roof. But am I scared to invest a fair amount of money? Yes I am. My house was a rental, a duplex before I bought it. Bless Dan Becker's heart whoever mentioned him. I walked with Dan Becker through my house, which used to be a duplex. I had to open it up to make it a single family house. There were requirements placed on me when I bought the house. I got this big thick document and I thought this big thick document would protect me for all time from something like this. I thought that the mission of the RHDC would actually be upheld throughout all these years. Up until now, it has been. I'm beginning to wonder if we are losing sight of original mission was.

Someone mentioned and I agree with the cherry-picking comment. The application is good. It is one of the best spin jobs I've ever seen. One of the pieces of application, Leonidas for the concrete driveways. Someone commented that those were done and approved in 1980s. Staff points out that it was done in 1990s - you might want to check that. It was under a previous set of guidelines. The cherry picking, we really have to go look at each reference and look and see if that is how they are representative and if they really are being used in the application.

Bruce Miller [affirmed]: I live at 406 E Lane. I have lived there for 35 years. I am not here to speak as a resident; I am here to speak as a tour guide. I see Oakwood through thousands of eyes. That's my retirement job; I've been doing it for 5 years. I work for Triangle Glides, We

have put 30,000 people on tours through Raleigh. I daresay half of those on a Segway tour of Oakwood. Most of those folks are not architects. Most of those folks cannot look at that house and say that is compatible with what they see in the rest of the neighborhood. Most of those folks don't use words like fenestration.

I know you can't take as testimony what people comment to us, so I'll just tell you what Triangle Glide presents of Oakwood based on what we've learned people seem to appreciate about Raleigh. I find people appreciate the stopping of the 1972 freeway. A proposal then seen as progressive and what was in vogue throughout the county. The other thing I think people find impressive is the sheer magnitude and coherence of Oakwood neighborhood. Is diverse, it is diverse but within a continuum. Many who come to us are used to seeing American foursquares or Queen Anne's in their own cities, often a few isolated examples interspersed often with other homes and buildings from late periods. Oakwood they see as meaningful because it is a generally coherent district of not isolated and dispersed houses, but some 600 homes harmoniously reflecting a 50 year period of history protected by generations of residents and city supported by city leaders who understood the significance of such a community exceptional in its composition increasing in rarity and value in each passing year. One thing I have never heard from a single guest paying to see Oakwood, you need modernist buildings here which interpret earlier styles in a contemporary way. Parenthetically, as I hear many people speaking about the technicalities of the house, I am reminded of the old story about the blind people that felt a different part of the elephant and couldn't describe the whole creature - as the house for instance. I have seen this district through thousands of eyes. To chip away at the historic character the essence of Oakwood lot by lot and house by house is to ultimately destroy this unique Raleigh landmark as surely as that freeway would have done. And it would counter the efforts of decades of folks within and without the district to preserve the rare architectural harmony for future generations to enjoy.

Will Hillebrenner [affirmed]: I live at 411 North East Street. Not only do I live there, but I have been in the process of deconstruction of the front. I am a newcomer to the neighborhood, have only been here a little over 2 years working on this property. As a fellow engineer and fellow designer, I've been through the process of designs - product designs, patent designs. As a designer you want your design to stand out. You want it to jump out to peoples on the shelves. I also love this look, but we are not here for Certificate of Popularity. We're here for a Certificate of Appropriateness. I think one of the issues I see is the letter of the law versus spirit of the law in the guidelines. If we had a computer go through and check off the boxes, the setbacks and heights, this house would pass. But we don't have a computer program, we have you guys, and I think that's where the spirit of the law comes in. I ask that you give it some feel points and whether or not it does fit in. It could be worse. One of the things I asked on the listserv is if this is acceptable, what is not? I'm glad I came to this meeting because I did learn a lot. But I will say I am opposed to it. Thank you.

Scott Shackleton: Have we gotten everyone, besides Mr. Kitchener, we gotten everybody who wants to speak in support or opposing. So now we have on behalf of an organization.

Barry Kitchener: My name is Barry Kitchener, I live at 624 North East Street; I am also the President of the Society for the Preservation of Historic Oakwood (SPHO). Some of what I'm

going to say we heard before. I am also going to paraphrase from my prepared statement. It's kind of interesting. I heard from several people today about comments about Euclid – where it's a primary street or a secondary street. When I agreed to be President of Oakwood it was for all of Oakwood whether it be Euclid or Jones. Everybody has the same rights. It's just kind of amazes me that there was even a discussion of siting or how important it is. Euclid is just as important as Jones Street. Eighteen months ago 516 Jones Street was major discussion. Now eighteen months later we're discussing 516 Euclid. Similarity is that they have same numbers.

I'd like to start by reading two statements that appear many places. The first one Article II of Bylaws under purposes paragraph 3: "To protect Oakwood from any decisions or acts of public officials or private persons that would threaten the residential and historic character of the neighborhood." The next quote is from the Raleigh Historic Development Commission, your mission statement on the front page of the webpage: "The mission of the Raleigh Historic Development Commission is to identify, preserve, protect and promote Raleigh's historic resources..."

The COA Application for 516 Euclid Street references architectural philosophy. The applicant makes reference to many different homes in Oakwood, concerning windows, doors, roof shape, etc. The concern of SPHO is that a small part of each home is referenced. The proposed house violates Section 4.3 of the New Construction Guidelines, especially subsections, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11. The house is obviously of a modernist design with a modernist shape, massing details and materials. If section 4.3 can be construed to allow a modernist house in this district, then it may allow almost anything.

Getting back to what I was saying earlier, in the application there is mention of each individual architectural component. But nowhere in this particular application all of those individual pieces are being combined into one structure. RHDC guidelines 4.3.6 through 4.3.11 the word compatible is used to describe design. The dictionary definition of compatible is agreeable or in harmony. It is the position of SPHO Board of Directors, speaking on behalf of the majority of the neighborhood that design of the structure at 516 Euclid Street is not compatible with surrounding buildings. The case being presented by the applicant of 516 Euclid makes reference and comparison of many architectural elements individually, but in this request all of these elements are being incorporated into one property. To paraphrase: The sum of the parts does not always equal the whole.

Approval of this house as designated sets a dangerous precedent. Past history has shown that once a COA is approved, any design elements that are approved from the Guidelines go from Guidelines to "law." I'm not sure what the correct term is, but when a COA is approved it goes into the record and can be referenced at any future hearings. Again, any future COA can reference this. I'm speaking as the President of Oakwood and the board of directors as opposing the application as it exists. Thank you.

Scott Shackleton: Would the applicants please come back up. Let's take a five minute break.

BREAK

Scott Shackleton: I wanted to let you know that the reason we took the break is two-fold. First some of us needed one and Tania is a PC, not a Mac and she's using Mac. Not to start another controversy, but she needed to make some space to continue recording.

Thank you all for your comments. Regardless which side of the fence you're on. Procedurally now the application has a chance to respond to any comments and/or ask clarifying questions of anyone who spoke. If that's appropriate, then members of the committee have the opportunity to question and comment. Clear up the key decision making points that will be looking at, misconception, things we can and can't consider in making our decision.

Support:

Louis Cherry: I guess a couple of points are important to respond to. One is the importance of Euclid Street. We are choosing to live on Euclid Street, so clearly we think it's the most important street. To me it's not about importance, it's that each place in Oakwood is a microcosm and has a unique character. To point out and respond to these is what I think the design would do. It is not about diminishing the importance, but addressing immediate character.

Another point, and some folks may disagree is that what we're preserving is a certain building style within a certain period of time. And we are not talking about that. That's a preservation mission and what we are proposing doesn't diminish that in anyway that I can see. It seems, to me ultimately the disagreements have to do with people's taste and style. To the point of anything goes - that is not true. That what the design guidelines deal with - scale, setback, the overall characteristics that shape how people experience buildings and experience public space. Those are all well considered in the guidelines. Anything doesn't go. You can't build a walled fortress in Oakwood. You can't build many things. It's fairly constrained in its overall shape and form. It's within that shape and form that style comes in. Style is not what's being legislated, I believe. Most preservationist would say to build something with contrast. If there's contrast there's no distinction. I believe this is very much in the spirit of the guidelines. Those were general response to themes I heard with the objections. As to the staff comments I don't have a problem with any of those. We certainly are happy to address those comments and are fully on board.

Scott Shackleton: Do you have questions for anyone else? Comments or questions from members of the committee?

Sarah David: I have a question. Across the façade, is that a water table?

Lewis Cherry: No, that's an unavoidable rendering artifact. There should be no line.

Marsha Gordon: There will be no line on the house.

Sarah David: Are the windows single pane?

Lewis Cherry: Yes, they are not divided lights.

Elizabeth Caliendo: What's the floor to floor height of garage?

Lewis Cherry: 10'

Elizabeth Caliendo: And the columns on the end? What are they made of?

Lewis Cherry: Those are made of square steel tubes.

Scott Shackleton: Other committee questions.

Fred Belledin: Are we opening this up just to the applicant or some of the others who made comments?

Scott Shackleton: Committee questions to anyone would be okay.

Fred Belledin: There were some questions raised about the context in which we are evaluating the project, whether it's Euclid Street only, contributing building only or a broader neighborhood. I think we have some opinions here, but since we're talking about precedent if our previous commission members are willing I would like to get some perspective (I think we have two here, Curtis and Matthew) on how you have seen the commission deal with that in years prior when you were sitting, if that makes sense. The second part of that question is that there has been discussion on how new construction is evaluated versus additions or renovations to existing structures. I'd like to get both your perspectives on how that has been done in years past.

Curtis Kasefang: in terms of evaluating a proposed change in context, the closer neighborhood is obviously the most important. The further you go out for there, the less the structure is part of the overall context to me. Things further out are less important. That said, when you are looking at a district like Oakwood which has such a diversity of styles you often have to look further and to ask what's similar. The modernist house on Elm Street is perhaps the closest modernist structure. It's certainly a very interesting precedent. You look close in and then you look at the broader context. If need be you look a little further if necessary. The special character essay defines how the overall context.

As far as material selections on renovations versus additions versus new construction, I see it as a priority. If it is a renovation or repair on an existing historic structure, that is the highest standard you have to follow. My house has a slate roof that is falling off and I need to put it back on with a slate roof; a window repair would have to be fixed with real wood. I would need to be completely unable to repair it before being able to replace it. If we were looking at an addition on a structure, it's my belief that then you're looking at compatible materials and extreme similarity of fenestration and proportions. The guidelines talk about making the addition subservient to main structure, although that has not always been followed. Material wise, we have only ever approved on the addition what would go on main structure. New construction has more latitude. It's a new building of its time, not having a clash between modern materials and historic materials. I think all of that has its roots Secretary of the Interior's guidelines. There are also more practical issues with materials such as different rates of expansion. When you connect a modern material and a historic material they can destroy themselves over time. This is another rationale for that. Does that answer your question?

Fred Belledin: As a frame of reference for the group, you were on COA committee starting...

Curtis Kasefang: ...for 6 years, ending a couple of years

Tania Tully: I think it was three years ago.

Curtis Kasefang: 3 years ago

Fred Belledin: So from 2004-2010

Curtis Kasefang: We heard many nasty cases over the years, with some very hard decisions. We were here at 11:00 at night. It was an interesting time.

Fred Belledin: Matthew do you care to weigh in on your perspective from the time you sat on the COA committee?

Matthew Brown: I don't think I can add to what Curtis said.

Fred Belledin: Barbara were you ever on the COA committee?

Barbara Wishy: A long time ago; it doesn't count. It was before guidelines.

Scott Shackleton: Other questions.

Fred Belledin: I've got some question for folks. How many vacant lots are left in Oakwood? Anyone?

Matthew Brown: You mean now or when someone splits off the side lot or back lot.

Tania Tully: Right this second. Buildable lots, vacant,

Various folks from in the audience: I heard someone say 3. I heard 4.

Curtis Kasefang: It's an interesting question because if it is a vacant lot question I do believe it is 2-3. But there is also the question of non-contributing structures that could be torn down and replaced.

Matthew Brown: there would be I think, at least 7 vacant lots. They might be along Watauga. I bet you could make 4 easily by cutting off the back.

Tania Tully: There is a subdivision to be reviewed at end of agenda because of a case several years ago, the City Code was changes so that all proposed subdivisions in Historic Overlay District or landmark, now, instead of just being approved administratively, as it was, it now must come through the COA committee of RHDC in order to get a recommendation on whether or not they think a lot being created would create a lot would result in a building being put in an incongruous location. The lot I was thinking of, I think is the lot off of Jones Street, which then would have fronted onto Moseley. While it is interesting to think of larger lots that could be split off, I think in the context of this discussion it isn't what he's asking. For your future reference, if you do have a larger lot that is going to be subdivided. This was the case where there are already two lots and has been for some time. Subdivision now hat to come through the commission so we can avoid someone being legally allowed to put a house in a place where the commission probably wouldn't have approved one.

Curtis Kasefang: That has its roots in Hayes Barton where there are paper lots that are unbuildable. That was the root of that change though.

Various folks from in the audience: various vacant lots are mentioned from the audience.

Fred Belledin: So, for the purpose of tonight's conversation, a handful.

Scott Shackleton: Other questions? One of the things I will address, the importance of Euclid we've just recently clarified. There were several comments about or concerns about economic impact and while I understand and appreciate that that is important to everyone that lives in the district whether you are for or against it, economic decisions are important in the area where you live. That's not a guideline so we cannot consider that. I just want to make sure we clarify that. Are there any other issues that were consistent threads of concern that we can't consider or that we need to clarify that I am missing?

Sarah David: Somebody mentioned, asked us to look at the spirit of the law, and we can't act on that.

Tania Tully: You can't but that's where your interpretation of the guidelines comes in, is under that 4.3.11. Anywhere it says compatible. That's why these kinds of decisions are not staff level; it's not prescriptive. It's based on, to that extend you have to abide by the design guidelines, but...

Sarah David: That's what I mean.

Scott Shackleton: And the balance, but in considering the factors, we have the interests of the preservation of the district and also, but we can't willy nilly say what citizens that paid for the lot can do outside of the guidelines, we have to be very specific. There has to be a guideline that says this. That is what enables the guidelines, that legislation just for the record.

Gail Wiesner: I just want to make sure you read the part about feeling and association!

Scott Shackleton: Yes, I did read that.

Gail Wiesner: Not just fenestration?

Scott Shackleton: Yes.

Fred Belledin: I actually have one other question for staff. Are there any COA cases you can recall when the issue of vista was discussed in context of residential settings?

Tania Tully: Not since I have been here, but not to say that it hasn't. I would have to attempt to probe other minds. It's not something that's come up since I've been here I 6 ½ years.

Scott Shackleton: OK. Any other questions? If not van I have a motion to close the public portion of the hearing?

Ms. Caliendo moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be closed. Ms. David seconded; motion carried 4/0.

#### Committee Discussion

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

Fred brought up vista, which is an important consideration. Another consideration that is significant in staff comments is material use. They seem to be the two biggest, well material issues is the biggest in staff comments. [Shackleton]

Do we want to go guideline by guideline? [David]

Yes [Belledin]

Looking at 4.3.1. Site new construction to be compatible with surrounding buildings, so we have the word compatible, that contribute to the overall character of the historic district in terms of setback, orientation, spacing, and distance. Comments on that. [Shackleton]

To me it is compatible with most of those items on this list. Orientation with long side to the street is pretty much just like one across from it, but overall on Euclid and in the district it's rare. [David]

But it does fit the lot. [Shackleton]

It does fit its lot, but the lot was a back yard. But in terms of purely its orientation to the street it is different from other houses. [David]

Any other comments on that? [Shackleton]

4.3.2 Design new construction so that the overall character of the site, site topography, character-defining site features, trees, and significant district vistas and views are retained. [Shackleton]

In terms of trees it's obviously a wooded lot now there are three larger trees proposed to be removed and one to be put back. Question is it significantly different from other lots in Oakwood? No, from my perspective, people tore out trees to build houses. In terms of the vista how are you evaluating character? Are you looking at vista in terms of every existing lot's condition or are you looking at vista as a broader concept. A street lined with trees and houses

on either side. Historically in the cases that I've been a part of we've never looked at individual lot unless it's a major lot that terminates a nexus. This is a lot on the street. My personal opinion is that it is inconsistent, not incongruous. [Belledin]

Adding a house to a lot on a street, is congruous. [David]

4.3.3, Evaluate in advance and limit any disturbance to the site's terrain...archaeological resources doesn't really apply in this situation that we know of. [Shackleton]

4.3.4, Protect large trees and other significant site features from immediate damage. That was addressed in staff comments as a condition which the applicant has said they don't have a problem with a tree protection plan for the trees that will be retained. [Shackleton]

We don't usually get into landscaping, but are there Gingko trees elsewhere? [Belledin]

I have one [Caliendo]

Simply because we're replacing a different species. [Belledin]

4.3.5, Conform to the design guidelines found in Section 2 regarding site and setting in developing a proposed site plan. So that speaks to plantings, residential character, where contemporary equipment goes such as solar collectors, which the applicant has indicated solar collectors that go on the back which we have approved before. Protecting of trees we've talked about. [Shackleton]

Some of the comments about the front walkway in terms of material and driveway in terms of scale are applicable. [Belledin]

Yes, the driveway as proposed is incongruous as well as the slate walk. [David]

I agree [Shackleton]

4.3.6, Design new buildings to be compatible with surrounding buildings that contribute to the overall character of the historic district in terms of height, form, size, scale, massing, proportion, and roof shape. That seems to be a significant one for the design of this house and a lot of the comments seem to relate around that so I think it would be good to go through each of those characteristics individually. [Shackleton]

Height is proposed to be between... height is pretty well covered in application with the heights around it. [Shackleton]

Do we evaluate the garage differently since we're considering it a secondary structure? [Caliendo]

Typically an accessory structure is subservient to main structure. [Shackleton]

This is lower and set back. [David]

I think in terms of the overall district it seems out of scale as a garage but it's also connected so I doesn't know if there's a connected garage in Oakwood. [Caliendo]

That is unusual. There probably is somewhere, connecting garages in Oakwood. [David]

We can reopen if you want. [Shackleton]

No, it was just a question for staff. I can't think of an example off the top of my head. [David]

We can circle back to this. [Belledin]

Form of the house? [Shackleton]

It is compatible in that it's a rectangle. I have other problems with other parts, but not this. [David]

I want to point out procedurally that you have the option of considering the garage separately or together. It depends on how you perceive it. [Tully]

Size [Shackleton]

Size is fine. It's bigger than a lot of things on Euclid, but it's within the context of the greater district. [David]

Scale? [Shackleton]

I don't think it's out of scale. Its scale is congruous with the with overall neighborhood [David]

I think the roof slope helps bring down that scale. [Caliendo]

We can jump to roof shape and come back to massing and proportion. There were some comments about the pitch. Some of the opposition felt that the pitch was not compatible.

[Shackleton]

There is the Craftsman house right around the corner on the 500 block of Elm that has a very low pitch. It's not the most common, but not unheard of. [David]

I think that's an important part of context as well. On cases like this you have to expand beyond the houses on the immediate sides in terms of the context in a neighborhood like Oakwood because there is because there is such diversity in Oakwood and if you respond to just what is immediately next to it you lose the diversity of architecture. [Belledin]

Were there any other comments on roof shape, pitch. [Shackleton]

It specifically says roof shape, not pitch. I feel slope and shape is different [Caliendo]

Massing. [Shackleton]

I think the massing is incongruous in terms of the way it's put together with the breezeway putting it together with garage. You do see that. There's a house on East Street around the 400 block of east street where, and there are many houses like this, where you see roof go down because it's covering a breezeway or connection and it pops back up where there's an attached kitchen that was detached. But to have it turned to the side. You normally only see that when you look down the side of a house. [David]

The orientation is different; the front is the long side. [Caliendo]

Proportion? [Shackleton]

I feel the same way about the proportion. It goes together with massing in my mind. I feel like if the house was turned around so the house was with the gable end facing the street, no one would think much about it. I think it's the width. [David]

I think that's going to lead us into the next guideline which is .7, proportion of the front facade to be compatible with the front facade proportion of surrounding historic buildings.

[Shackleton]

I mean its incongruous. [David]

What about the house across the street? [Belledin]

That one is incongruous too. With the historic district. It's a new building and I wasn't on the commission then. Y'all weren't privy to my wisdom then. [David]

Spacing, placement, scale, orientation, proportion, and size of window and door openings in new construction are to be compatible with the surrounding buildings that contribute to the special character of the historic district. [Shackleton]

Overall I don't have a problem with most of the windows on the building. The one on the corner, the two story height window does seem incompatible with historic district. [Caliendo]

The tall narrow windows and asymmetrical placement were definitely evocative of Queen Ann houses, I even think the corner windows are evocative of some of the houses, the purple house on corner of East and Euclid, but usually you only saw those on offset windows on the sides of houses. [David]

I did like that reference, but when I scale it on the drawings, just the upper portion of that window is nine feet tall. [Caliendo]

The door facing the driveway and garage seems pretty suburban to me and not in character with Oakwood. The front door faces the side. [David]

Window and door materials: material, subdivision, proportion, pattern, and detail. [Shackleton]  
Things can be compatible and not the same. [David]

I think the interesting thing, historic houses are considered important because they were technology of their time. They had small panes of glass because that was the size easily obtained. You can have compatible scale and proportion and detail without emulated those. We've not approved aluminum yet for windows in historic districts. Part of the challenge is that new construction is viewed in different light than renovation to or even additions to historic structures. That being said, I'm not in favor of a free pass because it's new. There's the durability question and the compatibility questions. If it's a painted finish on aluminum rather than anodized finish, it is more evocative of painted wood windows [Belledin]

Agree [David]

My reservation is that it would set a precedent as we have not approved it before. [Caliendo]  
I have the same reservation. [Shackleton]

Select materials and finishes for proposed new buildings that are compatible with historic materials and finishes found in the surrounding buildings that contribute to the special character of the historic district in terms of composition, scale, module, pattern, detail, texture, finish, color, and sheen. [Shackleton]

That's where the bulk of my questions are with this application. It is an interesting precedent. For me, the context in which we view it is important. We need to view new construction different then the way we view historic renovations and additions to historic structures. That being said we want to understand what they reflect will provide them some latitude, but also ties back to the district and neighborhood. Can you complete a modern building of its time with painted Cypress as opposed to a clear finish Cypress? That would be my train of thought. But does it recall something traditional? We are used to stucco with a painted finish. Having a metal roof is consistent. Are shingles comparable to siding? It is an interesting question because siding is not typically stained in our part of the world. [Belledin]

601 Leonidas, is that cedar shakes or what? [Caliendo]

Look at photo in presentation on upper level. [Tully]

Does the type of wood matter? [Caliendo]

Does the location matter? We have approved clear finished siding located at the rear of the house on an addition. It was subservient. This would be the reverse. [Belledin]

Here (601 Leonidas ) it is on the house, not the whole house, not the trim. [David]

Last is "design new buildings so that they are compatible with but discernible from historic buildings in the district." This is certainly discernible. The definition of what's compatible is the discussion. [Shackleton]

So what I'm hearing is that there are some site issues, the question is the massing and orientation a consideration or not, and obviously the material question. Do we have enough information on all these or do we need additional information? [Belledin]

Does anyone feel that more information would be necessary? [Shackleton]

I for instance he don't feel massing is incompatible. I spent a lot of time driving around this weekend. We might want to get more information on "sideways houses." Are there other examples besides across the street. [Belledin]

Yes, it obviously fits the shape of its lot, but its lot is not part of the normal way that Oakwood was developed mostly. I just can't think of a lot like this. And this house really emphasizes the back of the house, hyphen to garage/kitchen. It just reads like the side of a house. If it was turned gable forward, it would be straight forward. I do think there's room for modernist houses in the historic district. They got a whole lot really right, but this is my sticking point. There's not much you can do about it because of the lot. It is a long house and it is emphasized by that garage and entry. [David]  
I agree. [Shackleton]

So we have gone through 4.3. that's where the proportion is compromised. Is there anything [Shackleton] I don't know if that answers your question Fred.

There seem to be three areas or sticking points that may need more conversation. [Belledin]  
But do we need more information? [Shackleton]

I don't think so. [David]

I'm not sure what else we need. Is there anything Fred, you think needs more information? [Shackleton]

The massing issue maybe. As I said, I don't have an issue with the massing. I think it was done in a sympathetic way. But if there is a concern I'm not sure how, other than it being a matter of opinion, how you address that short of evaluating other existing conditions. It is a context based guidelines. [Belledin]

Let's put that aside and talk about the material issues. [Shackleton]

The roof's easy. [Belledin]

I'm good with the roof. [Shackleton]

Personally I think the slate is easy for the opposite reason. I think the slate is inconsistent with the neighborhood. [Belledin]

I agree. [Shackleton] I agree. [Caliendo]

And the two in-betweens for me are the siding because, not because its wood, because of the finish, and the question of the use of hardipanel and how we apply the material guidelines to them. [Belledin]

What about windows? [Shackleton]

And then the windows. [Belledin]

I agree with Elizabeth on the precedent of the windows. [Shackleton]

This is new construction. I don't think if we were to approve the use of aluminum windows for new building there would be flood of rubber stamps for replacement windows. I don't see that happening [David]

If we take the premise of aluminum as a material of its time, for free standing new construction. Assuming we are looking at an aluminum clad window with similar profile to wood window, and we're looking at painted finish similar to wood window, dark finish in terms of profile there are some different characteristics but to him arguable that they're consistent, and for new construction, appropriate for its time. I'm not suggestion you can't tell the difference, you can, but it's not a dominant characteristic. [Belledin]

I want to interrupt your conversation right now. What are you basing those comments on, as far as the profile not being that different is it based on what was brought today or your knowledge? [Tully]

That's a good question. I'm assuming we would need to the actual window proposed and compare the aluminum clad window with a comparable wood window. [Belledin]  
They do have a sample here today if you want to see it. [Tully]  
I can see from here. [David]  
Assuming we're looking at an aluminum clad wood window that would be a very similar profile to a wood window. The painted finish would be similar. [Belledin] [Inaudible]

What about the unpainted or stained wood siding? [Shackleton]

Matthew Brown: Do you mind reopening? I think one of my comments was misunderstood  
Let's see if the committee wants to reopen. [Shackleton]

Mr. Belledin moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be reopened. Ms. Caliendo seconded; motion carried 4/0.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY (2)

Matthew Brown: When I was talking about the wooden shingles I was not talking about on roofs. These are on the sides of contributing houses. There are 23 contributing structures with stained wood siding.

Scott Shackleton: I got it.

Matthew Brown: There are 23 contributing structures with stained wood siding.

Scott Shackleton: You had a question I forgot.

Sarah David: Tania are there any other attached garages?

Tania Tully: A few unusual ones. As a rule they are detached.

Marsha Gordon: There is one on Elm a block away, a 1920s house but with a screened in porch connecting to garage.

Tania Tully: The garage was built prior to designation district but after period of significance.

Curtis Kasefang: There is one under a house, a high Victorian.

Louis Cherry: In regards to massing and proportion, I think this is being acknowledged, but there is effectively no way to build on that lot very differently. The size of this lot can only accommodate a two story building. This is about as short a 2-story building can be built. No way style to make different.

Sarah David: The height is fine. It's the orientation that's my biggest concern. It's the long wrong side of the house facing the street. On Euclid and in historic district it's the short side facing the street. I understand it is a function of the lot.

Scott Shackleton: Please respond to Sarah's point about that same issue, where the garage meets one story part of house. That seems to accentuate that issue.

Louis Cherry: It's not that long. It's not a very big house. It's 46 feet long. That move of creating the porch element is as if you turned it sideways. Because that is really the only way I could see to make it a generous porch. We looked at having it separately, but it flows better with the connector. It makes it more integrated. It makes it shorter dimensionally.

Marsha Gordon: also allows us to put some landscaping between that structure and the adjacent lot some greenery and space instead of a structure that goes all the way to the lot line.

Curtis Kasefang: You have to remember that you're running under state legislation, that says you have to approve unless you have reason to deny. You have a lot that is buildable.

Jerry Nowell: About the orientation of the lot. The way it sounds is that we must make it fit the lot because the lot dictates that, when in fact it's just an unbuildable lot.

Sarah David: I don't think we can tell someone it's an unbuildable lot.

Tania Tully: No, you cannot say its unbuildable.

Sarah David: It is a backyard.

Curtis Kasefang: One of the reasons for the COA committee approving subdivisions is that in NC there is a supposition that you have a right to build.

Jerry Nowell: So the orientation frankly doesn't matter because that's the only way you can get a home on the lot. So there's no reason to say anything about orientation at all.

Gail Wiesner: That is incorrect, because you could build 1000 SF house. You're presuming it as to be a house of this size to be buildable.

Elizabeth Caliendo: I have a material question. The hardiepanel, are those joints just flush? There is no reveal?

Louis Cherry: It's a rainscreen design so it's just...

Elizabeth Caliendo: And the joint between the siding and hardiepanel?

Louis Cherry: It's about 1/8" The joints will be flush.

Scott Shackleton: Any more questions or comments before we close?

Marsha Gordon: I want to mention and reiterated that we spent so much time on that side by side comparison across the street because it is a recently approved new construction with similar orientation and massing with a garage structure.

At Mr. Shackleton's suggestion Ms. David moved that the public hearing portion of the meeting be reclosed. Mr. Belledin seconded; motion passed 4/0,

#### Committee Discussion (2)

So, we're back to, we were on materials when... [Shackleton]

In terms of the finish on the wood, I just don't see that much difference between a stained wood or if they just it painted brown [David]

I think the fact that there are 23 examples in Oakwood with stained wood siding is important. [Caliendo]

I agree. [Belledin]

I'm ok with the wood. What about the hardiboard? Someone, I don't remember who, commented that it may be reminiscent of stucco? They're both cement [Shackleton]

I think the fact that the joints are flush, there's no batten or anything coming off of the face of that. [Caliendo]

There were a couple of examples of that, of stucco, in the application. Is material important in that case? That it is a cement product versus, say, EIFS which is a synthetic stucco with a style of its own? Just thinking about how we'll frame the facts. [Belledin]

How are you with the columns? And the slate wrapped...[Shackleton]

It's just a flat material. It bothers her more on the columns than on the inset. [Caliendo]

I don't see a tie to a precedent for the slate. Stone and masonry yes, it's used here and there, but slate is a very different language. [Belledin]

How are the steel columns on the new garage. [Shackleton]

To me come back to the question of are we evaluating new construction compared to additions to historic structures? I adhere to the National Park Service philosophy, which is that new

construction is different. To me is not on the front and it's relatively light and delicate, doesn't stand out. Personally don't find it incongruous. [Belledin]

Where are we? [Shackleton]

The garage? The guidelines treat it as separate and detached. [David]

As Tania said, I think it can be treated attached or detached. [Belledin]

I keep going back to the issue of the proportion. The problem with the proportion seems to be accentuated by the garage the way it is. Even if we allow for house across the street as congruous as well, the difference is that seems like one unit where this seems spread more to me. [Shackleton]

Right. [David]

It is architecturally a catch-22. If you make it all under one roof it's going to read as a larger structure. [Belledin]

Right. [Shackleton]

I'd argue that the roof lines are broken down. [Belledin]

They are. [Shackleton]

The interesting thing is that if you look at this in terms of scale and massing relative to that it comes down to style and taste.

It's almost the same house as across the street; it's just a different style. [David]

Yes. [Shackleton]

Which page is that picture on? [Shackleton]

Three. [Belledin]

Are we at a point where we need to start drawing some conclusions? [Shackleton]

I don't think you've addressed the material of the windows sufficiently. [Tully]

To me the extension of that would be we've begun on additions, to allow isolated incidents of new materials, such as synthetic window sills. The question is does the fact that this is new construction create enough of a bridge, enough of a different condition, that if you are applying that same logic of allowing the use of a new material because of durability because it is in the context of new construction it is ok. Or not. Tania raises a good point; we need to make that decision based on a fact associated with the case that ties back to the guidelines. [Belledin]

So, the fact is its new construction. But the guideline, if you're making that argument would you? [Shackleton]

We should probably open it back up to see that window. We could then tie back to that the overall profile is similar enough. [Belledin] Things we had pointed out, whether pro or con,

Mr. Belledin moved that the public testimony portion of the hearing be reopened. Ms. Caliendo seconded; motion carried 4/0.

### PUBLIC TESTIMONY (3)

Gail Wiesner: Since you opened it up, while you're looking at that, my house has wood windows, and the house on the corner of Oakwood and East has wood windows.

Louis Cherry: It's the same profile, but it's got this cladding that doesn't rot, it's the same depth of the sash as the wood.

Tania Tully: One thing that is different with this clad window than what was shown to you a couple cases ago for the DHIC product is this, the way it is meeting flush, whereas the DHIC window had a lap. Which is one of the reasons I think you had a problem with it before. One of the things I pointed out whether pro or con is where it goes from the sash to the glass is sort of a flat shelf as opposed to the putty profile, if that matters to you. Is this the kind of lack of trim it would have?

Louis Cherry: It wouldn't have a brick mold. It would be identical to what you see only in black.

At Mr. Shackleton's suggestion Ms. Caliendo moved that the public hearing portion of the meeting be reclosed. Ms. David seconded; motion passed 4/0,

### Committee Discussion (3)

This is a conundrum, because I think you can make a legitimate case either way. It falls within the grey area of interpretation. If we're going to consider approving it, I think the black is important as it minimizes any difference you're going to get. If you have an aluminum window that matches the profile of a comparable window, it has a smooth finish without any raised ridges that meet at the corners, it has a profile similar to wood and the fact that it has a dark finish minimizes any other differences. Most importantly it is in new construction. Those are the facts of this case, if we want to consider them. [Belledin]

This isn't an issue that says they can or can't build the house. They could build the house with wood windows. [Shackleton]

Correct. [Belledin]

What did we do with the garage? [Shackleton]

We came back to materials. [David]

I would say the one difference, Sarah you talked abo the similarity with the house across the street with the difference in style. There is a difference I think with the massing, because the garage is much higher and across the street it is detached. [Shackleton]

There are two story garages in Oakwood and other two story outbuildings. There's a barn on Polk Street and a barn behind the Heck House on East Street. [David]

For me, it's not that it's 2-story. It's the way that it contributes to make the whole thing seem more massive. [Shackleton/Caliendo]

Anyone want to start trying to put together some sort of motion? Fred? [Shackleton]

### Findings of Fact

After discussion on an initial motion seconded by Ms. David, Mr. Belledin made an amended motion that based upon the facts presented in the application and the public hearing, the committee finds staff comments A. (inclusive of facts 1-24) and B. (inclusive of facts 1-7) to be acceptable as findings of fact, with the following modifications and additional facts:

Modify Comment A:

Striking the following: “the use of hardi panels, slate cladding, and stained wood siding may be incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 4.3.9, 4.3.10”

Adding the following: “the use of aluminum clad wood windows may be incongruous according to *Guidelines* sections 4.3.9, 4.3.10”

Adding the following facts to comment A:

25\* Over the history of Oakwood houses appear to have been constructed in character of the time of which they were built.

26\* Standing seam metal existed in Oakwood on at least 28 examples of existing houses.

27\* Stained wood wall shingles existed historically in Oakwood on more than 20 examples.

28\* The hardiepanel siding is proposed only for free standing new construction. It has a smooth painted finish, with minimal 1/8” reveal joints to appear near contiguous, and is of cementitious construction.

29\* The overall size and scale of the house is consistent with immediate context of Euclid and the variation of style is consistent with the diversity of styles that exist throughout the broader context of Oakwood.

30\* Citing the Oakwood Special Character Essay: “Developed primarily during a fifty-year period from 1880-1930, the Oakwood Historic District has the most diverse collection of architecture among Raleigh’s historic districts... It developed incrementally, bit by bit, often lot by lot... A wide range of architectural styles and building types are nestled within this tree-shaded setting... This pattern of random development, a hallmark of Oakwood, has led to a surprising diversity of scale within even small areas of the district, as larger, two-story homes are flanked by one-story cottages... Because the neighborhood did develop in a lot-by-lot pattern, interspersed among the earlier dwellings are later “infill” styles from the late 1910s through the early 1930s, such as the Four-square and particularly the bungalow. Following a lull during the Depression and World War II, a few 1950s Federal Housing Administration (FHA) ranch-style houses were built, designed to meet federal specifications for mortgage insurability. Then, beginning in the mid-1980s, a number of new construction projects were built under the commission’s design review procedures... Thus Oakwood, which contains Raleigh’s only intact 19th century neighborhood, is also a surprisingly diverse neighborhood of long-term change.”

31\* There appear to be only a handful of remaining vacant lots in Oakwood.

32\* The dark trim was common on Neoclassical Revival and Craftsman architecture during period of significance.

Ms. David accepted the changes. The motion passed 3/1 [Mr. Shackleton opposed].

Mr. Belledin moved to reopen the public hearing. Ms. Caliendo seconded; motion passed 4/0.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Jerry Nowell: Two points. I’m the one that made suggestion that making it a historic district arrested evolution. You made a fact that it is not the case. This is a justifiable interpretation, but not the only. There is a lot of diversity within the historic period. Who know what Oakwood looks like in 100 years. Over time, piece by piece. It has been interesting to listen to architectural justifications for design. If you hold up this up to everyone who walks by, the

only people who will find it compatible will be architects. It is dramatically different. We can make each element fit, but it's not making it compatible as a whole. You will come to a justifiable end, but it's not compatible.

Curtis Kasefang: The fact that you came to a non-unanimous vote is not a bad thing. In discussion three of you seemed in favor of aluminum windows and things turned. Also, if we were talking about the Jeff Davis house, on Elm Street we would be having the same conversation even though most of us now consider it compatible.

Gail Wiesner: Most of us don't.

Lewis Cherry: Given a new very energy efficient well detailed building that you can do with new construction, any technical review would find wood windows remarkably not in sync with well detailed technically resolved building.

Tim Metcalf: Back earlier case, the discussion where you had planters as porch. The 1950s house, she use the word, it's an anomaly for Oakwood. There's diversity in Oakwood, yes. Diversity is over period of time in the historic context. I'd love you to reread that piece of the design guidelines that defines the period of district. They are defining it as a period of time, and that's part of your charge. You bought into the anomaly as applied to this situation, what is compatibility? Are we going to say that this is an anomaly? To me that is the opposite from compatible.

Ellen Nightingale: Under that vein and the 6 open lots in Oakwood are we going to collect more architectural diversity that might fall in that period of time? Are we going to come up with a dome home, a modular home, a log home?

Sarah David: If someone builds on an open lot tomorrow it's not going to look like your house or my house.

Ellen Nightingale: It can look like any house.

Sarah David: No, it can't, it has to meet the guidelines with setbacks and scale.

David Nightingale: The Guidelines talk about the contemporary home. I'd ask Peter, if you go onto the Fonville-Morrissey website would you be able to find a home that looks like this for same in Raleigh? It is really a contemporary home in the area?

Peter Rumsey: If I were to list this house today I would list it is contemporary and other. I would call it modern, these are all subjective terms.

David Nightingale: Do any houses being built today look like this?

Peter Rumsey: Yes.

Gail Wiesner: Logic. The lots that were filled in prior to this becoming a historic district represented by time of building. Since this has been a historic district for 40 years, that has stopped. My house is new construction but now there's a new one that has been built on the corner of Oakwood and East Street and also complied with the historic district for the past 40 years. What is suddenly different from what the other many predecessors that you've had that have made every single application for new construction conform with the character and feel and ambiance of the district?

Tania Tully: I'd like to respond as staff. The commission reviews as applications as they are applied. This is the first application like this that has ever been applied for in the historic district that I am aware of.

Gail Wiesner: You're wrong. My application was very very different. I had to endure 4 months of nitpicking for every single reveal. Everything was changes and had to have a precedent. Why is this suddenly different? I'd like to hear what you read again.

Scott Shackleton: This is a good think for anyone in Oakwood to read. Pages 84-87 of the guidelines is the special character of the Oakwood district.

Gail Wiesner: I've read this many times over before coming here. I'm saying that your interpretation has suddenly changed from the last 40 years. Why yours is different I can only assume is that it has become a fad to mix the ultra-modern with the old, just like tearing down houses in the 1970s was a fad. I understand that your point of view as an architect you're going like why don't you want this because its technically superior. It's an historic district. There are many reasons that trump those wonderful characteristic. Unfortunately, if you want to live in a historic district you don't come in and change it. Contemporary, in art, means that someone is living at the time. You are grossly misinterpreting those words. Historic districts do get arrested. Architects have come along and...

Scott Shackleton: I'm not an architect. I a CPA.

Gail Wiesner: Now, not all have gone along with it. Historic districts have succumbed to modern things, and it's a big controversy right now. I've called and spoken to a lot of people including at the secretary of the interior. When you designate an individual building you have to maintain that building as closely as possible to the way it exists right now. We're a whole neighborhood needs to be treated like a landmark. It's not easy, but for 40 years that's what's been done. Even if we go by your new rules, we don't have to have an ultra-modern house. This is not taste. Most people like the house a lot. But it does not belong in Oakwood.

Scott Shackleton: Thank you for your input.

At Mr. Shackleton's suggestion, Mr. Belledin moved to close the public hearing; the motion was seconded by Ms. David; passed 4/0

### Decision on the Application

Following discussion on an initial motion made by Mr. Belledin and seconded by Ms. Caliendo, Mr. Belledin made an amended motion that the application be approved in part and continued in part with the material of the windows to be continued, and waiving the 365 day delay for the removal of the trees, with the following conditions.

1. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to the issuance of permits:
  - a. Tree protection plan prepared by an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture or a landscape architect licensed by the NCBLA.
2. That the following details and specification be provided to and approved by staff prior to installation:
  - a. Standing seam metal roofing;
  - b. Photovoltaic panels;
  - c. Siding materials.
3. That the front walkway be concrete with a water washed finish.
4. That a separate COA application(s) be provided for the proposed landscaping.
5. That the driveway not be solid concrete with the details and specification be provided to staff prior to installation.

Ms. Caliendo agreed to the changes. The amended motion passed 3/1 (Mr. Shackleton opposed).

Committee members voting: Belledin, Caliendo, David, Shackleton.

Certificate expiration date: 3/9/13.

DRAFT