

Design Principles and Standards

Proposed replacement photos

Intro

- Photographs are important user-friendly tools useful for representing the exemplary choices one would expect in a document entitled *Design Standards*. By their very nature, photographs inescapably carry the history and stories behind the evolution of our historic districts. People new to the districts will naturally explore these neighborhoods looking for signs of congruity and incongruity that reflect the guidance they find in the document.

Page 26

Franklin-Rosemary district

The design of 313 North Boundary Street is not a good example of the new standards, and in fact, it conflicts with the design standards: The orientation to the street, placement of the garage, and orientation of volumes are contradictory. There are no architectural features of the house that reference the historic character of the neighborhood or the district as a whole. The development of North Boundary Street extension in the late 1990s is as a whole an aberration and should not be included in the Franklin-Rosemary Historic District. The architectural styles of the extension are so varied that it is difficult to find an exemplary structure for a replacement. There is no need for a photograph to support the well-written text that explains the history of the extension.



Page 26

Replacement

109 Campbell Lane

This house and the following two alternatives are also located in the North Boundary extension but have designs more congruent with the historic structures in the Franklin-Rosemary district.



Page 26 Replacement

117 Campbell Lane



Page 26 Replacement

303 North Boundary St.



Page 54 (top)

Garages & Accessory Structures

"The garage above is well-sited behind the main house and is subordinate in size and scale."



Page 54 (top)

Optional Replacement

Shows more context and provides greater sense of relative proportion.



Page 54 (bottom) Garages & Accessory Structures

Caption inaccurately describes this as “one of a number of early-twentieth-century, one-and-a-half-story garages in Chapel Hill.” There were no one-and-a-half-story garages in early-twentieth-century Chapel Hill. (source: Sanborn maps) This garage is located at 405 Ransom Street where there was a one-story garage in this spot as of 1925. [Source: Sanborn maps]



Page 54 replacement

The photo, of 603 East Franklin Street, shows a 1925 one-story garage in context. The photo illustrates the height, scale, and placement of early-twentieth-century garages and accessory buildings.

If desired, we can obtain photo taken from driveway where structure is not obscured by tree branch.



Page 54 replacement

Alternate



Page 54 replacement

Alternate



Page 54 replacement

Alternate



Page 72

Architectural Metals

This roof replacement was an After-the-Fact COA that was denied by the HDC because the roofing materials were not an in-kind replacement as was explicitly stated in the former Guidelines p.37 #2 and #5. Similar wording is present in the newly adopted Design Standards under Roof, Gutters and Chimney Standards on pg.81 #3.1.4 & #3.1.5



Page 72

Replacement

307 Hillsborough St.

The substitute photo of a house built in 1840 depicts a metal roof that was replaced with in-kind materials. And more typically in our historic districts, metal roofs are used on porches or on smaller additions as an accent feature. That is what this picture shows.



Page 72

Replacement

Alternate metal roof photo. House located at N. Boundary and Rosemary.



Page 85

Exterior Walls, Trim, & Ornamentation

“Streamlined surfaces and finishes are typical on Modernist-style buildings”

There are better, more interesting examples of modern architecture in our districts. In this photo, the railing looks unfinished.



Page 85

Alternate Replacement

119 Battle Lane

This photo depicts some of the more modern features, such as clear flat surfaces, simple lines, larger windows, minimal ornamentation, unlike those found in the districts' older home styles.



Page 111: New Construction

The photograph is misleading. It appears to illustrate the new construction of a house with a garage at the front. In fact, this is an eight-year-old photo of a garage addition at the back of the existing house at 226 Glandon Drive. The garage and secondary entrance addition was completed in 2014.



Page 111

Replacement

This house, at 521 Hooper Lane, was constructed on an empty lot in 1985 and renovated in 2019. It is an example of contemporary architecture that is sensitively sited, respectful of the setting, and incorporates traditional forms, scale, mass and appropriate orientation to the street while it blends well with neighboring properties.



Page 116

Building Scale, Proportion, & Form

The photos on this page show large houses in isolation. They do not illustrate congruent scale or compatibility. The newly constructed house on the left, which is on Gimghoul Road, does not replicate the scale of the early-twentieth-century house that stood on the site but merely mimics some of the features of its historic predecessor. The photograph on the right is of a new house on Glandon Drive.



Page 116

Replacement

This photo of a streetscape on North Street illustrates congruent scale and compatibility.



Page 119

Roof Form

This photo is cited for its roof form, but this project was denied a COA by the HDC. When there are many other examples of roof forms from COAs that were approved, it would be more consistent to use those instead.

The elongated home in this photo is quite unlike the pattern of home volumes found on North Street. Among the reasons for the HDC denial was its atypical length and massing on a narrow lot. It significantly altered the ratio of built mass to undeveloped lot area, which the new Standards discourage. The scale of the large accessory structure in relation to the primary structure is also contrary to the guidance in the Standards.



Page 119

Replacement photo

Front Gabled Roof on Mallette Street

This example of a well-kept front-gabled roof line on a cottage that has similar features to the bottom photo that was used. It is congruent with the top one as well. Note the front porches and the window in the front gable. It is similar in scale with the top photo on page 119.



Page 123

Doors & Windows

Identify this is as a sorority house. Identify all photos of sorority and fraternity houses as such.



Page 128

Garages, Carports & Accessory Structures

The caption incorrectly states that this new garage “mimics the form, height, scale, and roof pitch of early twentieth century outbuildings.” There were no one-and-a-half-story accessory buildings in Chapel Hill in the early twentieth century. This structure would violate early twentieth century zoning. The placement of the structure is close to the front of the main house and does not illustrate appropriate placement of a garage.

The photo is also a good example of how focusing exclusively on the front facade as seen from the street is misleading.



Page 128

Garages, Carports & Accessory Structures

Seen from the side and back, the new garage that houses three cars is attached to the 1922 garage.



Page 128

Replacement

The photo is of a one-story accessory structure built in the late-nineteenth or early-twentieth century. Originally a barn situated at the back of the main house, it became a garage described in the Sanborn map of the early 1920s as a one-story “auto house.” It remained in use as a garage throughout the twentieth century.

The replacement photo shows, better than the current photo, the traditional scale and location of accessory structures in relation to the primary structure. It also illustrates how the use of accessory structures in the districts has changed over time, in this case from pastoral barn to urban vehicle storage.



Page 129

Garages, Carports & Accessory Structures

1.5-and two-story garages are rather rare in all Chapel Hill Historic Districts. The standard of congruency is based on alignment with the historical one- or two-bay, one-story garages that were often located behind the home. In cases where the lot size was not deep enough, historic garages were diminutive in size and stature. To include what appears to be a two-story garage in height, exposed on this lot without mature trees to help reduce its scale, would be a misleading example to emulate. Historically there was no garage on the Kldder-Graham property. Photos in the Design Standards need to support what is written on p. 130 in #4.7.1, #4.7.2, and #4.7.3.



Page 129

Replacement

New one-story garage located behind the rear plane of a historic house that was originally built in 1840. The photo thus shows a newly-built accessory structure of traditional size in the traditional location relative to the main structure (4.7.2). This photo is more consistent with the guidance provided in the diagram shown on p. 128 than is the photo currently used.

307 Hillsborough St.



Page 129

Alternate Replacement

This photo more accurately describes how garages matched the features of the main house in color, siding, and roof form. This arrangement of home and garage is similar to the photo being used, both in right/left configuration and relative location, but in this case the garage is more clearly subordinate to the two story home. The depth of both lots seems similar as well.



Page 132

Additions

The photos on this page illustrate two additions: an addition to an addition that violates the principle illustrated by the drawing on the same page. The older addition is not differentiated from the original house.



Page 132

Replacement

The replacement photo is of a house (504 E. Franklin Street) built in 1814 with an addition on the west side of the house that was completed in 1966. The modern addition echoes a similar mid-nineteenth-century addition on the east side. This replacement photo illustrates the appropriate placement of an addition at the back of the house that is clearly differentiated from the original structure. It represents what the *Standards* describe as essential: an addition that does not overpower the original building, compromises neither its architectural integrity nor its history, and does not damage the setting. It is an example of how an historic property can remain in use for over two hundred years and of extending the useful life of a historic structure while providing modern comforts.



Alternate photo of addition to 504 E. Franklin
St.



Alternate photo of addition to 504 E. Franklin
St.



Cover photos

Bottom left: The existing photo depicts a very large new home in Gimghoul whose size is atypical in our districts. Above this photo is another large home and so it seems more important to show the diversity of properties that will be found inside the document.

Two possible photos of Bungalows might be used to replace the existing lower left photo. Either of these will illustrate more diversity in the architectural styles and sizes of homes found in all three districts. The front cover of the Design Standards is the place to represent this diversity as a means of introducing its contents. There are many Bungalow style homes in our historic districts so it seems important to take this opportunity to put one on the cover of the Standards document. The Old Tavern photo is included as a way to demonstrate history and perhaps could be used to replace the upper right photo. That design formatting can be worked out later.



Alternative cover
photo



Alternative cover
photo



Alternative cover photo

Log house at 415 Hillsborough St.



House at 206 N. Boundary St. built in 1840.
Cover should feature one or more truly
historic houses.



Cottage on South Boundary. Replacement for
photo of porch in upper right corner of cover.
The latter communicates very little.

