

STAFF REPORT
RHDC Certificate of Appropriateness Committee: COA Application

Case Number: COA-0038-2026

Property Address: 415 E EDENTON ST

PIN: 1703990425

Zoning: R-10 w/ HOD-G

HOD/Raleigh Historic Landmark: OAKWOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT

Property Owner: ETHAN BRISSETTE & MOLLY FLYNN

Applicant: ETHAN BRISSETTE

Project Contact: ETHAN BRISSETTE

Received: 03/11/2026

Complete date + 180 days: 09/23/2026

Meeting Date(s): 1) 04/23/2026 2) 3)

Staff Contact: Erin Morton Pugh, erin.morton.pugh@raleighnc.gov

Certificate of Appropriateness Request

Remove 4 trees

Application Attachments

- COA application form
- Written description
- Current site photographs
- Contextual streetscape photographs
- Tree canopy aerial photographs
- Existing tree information
- Existing/proposed site plan drawings
- Written arborist report

Property Description

0.12 acres; **“Contributing ca. 1909...** “Built about 1909, this two-story frame Queen Anne house... the sidehall plan house has a high hipped roof with a slightly-projecting wing at the southeast corner that has a pedimented gable. Across the front and half of the south elevation is a hipped porch with turned posts... At the rear of the building is a hipped, one-story wing. ...Contributing, Garage, rear of 415 E. Edenton St. – One-story, gable-roofed frame garage contemporary with house.” See: [“Oakwood National Register of Historic Places Inventory”](#) (adopted as historic district report), page 57.

Standard of Review

The COA Committee shall not refuse to issue a certificate of appropriateness except for the purpose of preventing the construction, reconstruction, alteration, restoration, moving or demolition of buildings, structures, appurtenant features, outdoor advertising signs or other significant features in the -HOD-G, -HOD-S or for Historic Landmarks, which would be incongruous with the special character of the district or Landmark. See: N.C. Gen. Stat. [§ 160D-947\(a\)](#) and UDO [10.2.15.D.4E](#).

Applicable Guidelines

<i>Sections</i>	<i>Applicable Guidelines</i>	<i>Description of Work</i>
1.3	1.3.1, 1.3.5, 1.3.6	Remove four trees

See: [Design Guidelines for Raleigh Historic Districts and Landmarks](#) (2017)

Congruity Analysis

Per the Applicable Standards & Submittal Requirements:

1. Four regulated trees on the property are proposed to be removed. Existing conditions site photos and a site plan marking the location of the trees proposed for removal were provided. (*Guideline 1.3.1 & 1.3.5*)
2. One diseased Sycamore tree on the property was previously approved for removal in 2015 via minor work COA with the planting of a replacement tree (COA 008-15-MW). (*Guideline 1.3.5*)
3. An existing site plan with complete existing tree information, marking the location, species, and size of all trees on the subject property and adjacent right-of-way was provided. Based on the site plan contextual site photos provided, it appears the majority of regulated trees on the lot are concentrated in the rear yard and proposed for removal. A 15" Riverbirch in the side yard and a non-shade-providing 15" Magnolia screening shrub in the front yard are proposed to remain. (*Guideline 1.3.1, 1.3.5, & 1.3.6*)
4. An aerial photograph showing the existing tree canopy was provided. A marked version shows the portion of tree canopy proposed to be removed. (*Guideline 1.3.1 & 1.3.5*)
5. A written report and marked tree conditions photos from an ISA-certified arborist were provided. The report outlines potential future risks posed by some of the trees on site due to their existing growth conditions. The report specifically cites broken limbs on the 18" Elm as evidence of a diseased or dying tree and the likely root area of the large 48" Willow Oak as evidence that the neighboring historic structure at 103 N East St may be damaged. (*Guideline 1.3.1 & 1.3.5*)
6. The arborist report additionally recommends removal of a 16" Hackberry tree adjacent to a non-historic fence line and a 15" Elm tree exhibiting signs of lean due to its position as an understory tree below the 18" Elm proposed for removal. (*Guideline 1.3.1 & 1.3.5*)
7. *Guideline 1.3.1* states "Retain and preserve the building and landscape features that contribute to the overall historic character of a landmark or district, including trees..." The Oakwood Special Character Essay, which helps to define the overall historic character of the district, states "A heavy, largely deciduous tree canopy shelters the neighborhood, shading the streets and buildings." (*Guideline 1.3.1*)
8. *Guideline 1.3.5* states "Replace a seriously diseased or severely damaged tree or hedge with a new tree or hedge of a similar or identical species of appropriate scale. It is not appropriate to remove healthy, mature trees." (*Guideline 1.3.5*)

Staff Concerns

Per the Applicable Standards & Submittal Requirements:

1. All but one regulated shade-providing tree on the property is proposed to be removed. The removal may significantly impact the existing mature tree canopy, which is part of the special character of the Oakwood Historic Overlay District. (*Guideline 1.3.1 & 1.3.5*)

2. Some healthy trees are proposed for removal. The application states that one of the trees proposed for removal is damaging a historic resource. No photo evidence clearly demonstrating the tree is actively damaging historic resources was provided. The application did provide photos of a regulated tree growing in close proximity to a non-historic fence and of cars on the premises presumably damaged due to dropping tree debris. However, the fence and cars are not a historic resource for the purposes of determining congruity of the request. (*Guideline 1.3.1, 1.3.3, & 1.3.5*)
3. One replacement tree is proposed. Information on the replacement tree species and site plan marking the location was not provided. Typically, replacement trees of a similar species, mature size, and canopy coverage are required to be planted on a one-to-one basis somewhere on the subject property unless evidence is provided to demonstrate that the district's immediate surrounding mature canopy will not be significantly impacted by the proposed tree removal. (*Guidelines 1.3.1, 1.3.4, 1.3.5, & 1.3.7*)

Potential Conditions

Based on the congruity analysis, staff concerns, and previous similar applications, the following conditions are suggested for consideration by the Committee, should the Committee choose to approve the application:

1. That the 16" Hackberry tree remain.
2. That replacement trees of a similar species, mature height, and canopy coverage to each of the trees being removed be planted on a 1:1 basis somewhere on the property.
3. That the following materials and specifications be submitted to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard:
 - a. Site plan marking replacement tree species locations;
 - b. Replacement trees specifications, including species and mature dimensions.