

STAFF REPORT
RHDC Certificate of Appropriateness Committee: COA Application

Case Number: COA-0039-2026

Property Address: 907 W LENOIR ST

PIN: 1703360589

Zoning: R-10 w/ HOD-G

HOD/Raleigh Historic Landmark: BOYLAN HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Property Owner: NANCY LYNN

Applicant: NANCY LYNN

Project Contact: NANCY LYNN

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

Staff Notes

- COAs referenced in the staff report are available for review at request.
- Due to ongoing deteriorated conditions of the structure, representatives of the Boylan Heights Neighborhood Association (BHNA) previously requested the RHDC initiate a Demolition By Neglect case for the garage. Following the process defined in the zoning code, the RHDC voted 10-0 at their 12/10/2025 meeting to mail a letter to the listed property owner notifying them of the potential demolition by neglect of the garage. The notice letter provided 6 months for response, repairs, or other action to address existing deterioration, with a deadline of 7/10/2026. The property owner has submitted the current COA application in response to the communication they received regarding potential Demolition By Neglect concerns.
- The demolition of a structure cannot be denied but can be delayed for a period of up to 365-days in an effort to find a means of preserving the building. If the Commission finds that the building has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Historic Overlay District, it shall waive all or part of such period.

Certificate of Appropriateness Request

Demolish contributing accessory structure; construct rear fence

Application Attachments

- COA application form
- Written description
- Current site photographs
- Existing/proposed site plan drawings
- Specifications for: fencing

Property Description

0.21 acres; **Contributing 1922...** "One-story Bungalow; gable is perpendicular to the street; dormer; attached porch, full façade." See: "[Boylan Heights National Register of Historic Places Inventory](#)" (adopted as historic district report), page 23.

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, 1.3.2, 1.3.4, 1.3.7, 1.3.9	Demolish contributing accessory structure; construct rear fence
1.4	1.4.1, 1.4.8, 1.4.11	Construct rear fence
1.6	1.6.1, 1.6.5	Demolish contributing accessory structure
4.2	4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8	Demolish contributing accessory structure

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

Congruity Analysis

Per the Applicable Standards & Submittal Requirements:

Garage Demolition

1. A rear garage accessory structure is proposed to be demolished. (*Guideline 1.6.1 & 1.6.5*)
2. *Design Guidelines* Section 1.6 states “A number of original garages, carriage houses, storage buildings, and sheds have survived in Raleigh. Like other early site features, they contribute to the historic character of individual sites and a district as a whole. Such secondary structures are always deferential to the principal building in siting, size, and scale. In some cases the garage or the accessory building echoes the architectural style, materials, and details of the principal structure on the site. Others are more modest, vernacular structures.”
3. Although the 1984 Boylan Heights Historic District designation report does not include descriptions of any accessory structures in the neighborhood, it is staff’s professional assessment based on location, construction techniques, and materials that the garage was likely constructed within the district’s period of significance (1907-1930) and may be considered contributing to the special character of the district. (*Guideline 1.6.1*)
4. The garage is sited in a traditional location near the rear property line at the end of a linear driveway constructed of concrete strips. The garage has a solid rear wall that backs up to the adjacent alleyway and two open vehicle bays facing into the rear yard. An existing scaled plot plan was provided. (*Guideline 1.6.5 & 4.2.4*)
5. The garage structure is a simple form with a gable roof and a rectangular footprint measuring 16’-0” wide, 18’-0” long, and 20’-0” tall. The building is wood-framed with painted wood cedar shake siding and a dirt floor. Existing conditions photos of each side of the structure and site contextual photos were provided. Although scaled elevation drawing documentation are also typically required of primary contributing

structures proposed for demolition, this garage is simple in design and secondary in size and location on the lot. (*Guideline 4.2.2*)

6. The garage roof was replaced in 1989 when the City issued notice of unsafe building conditions and declared the accessory structure a public nuisance in accordance with the zoning code. They further documented that the structure, because of its condition, was dangerous to the health and welfare of the public with walls and roof system that had fallen in or were in danger of falling in. The City ordered that the structure be repaired, vacated and closed, or demolished. At that time, the contractor noted the poor condition of the garage and attempted to reinforce the underlying structural framing. No garage-related COAs have been filed for the property since that time and appear to be the most recent renovations made to the structure to date. (*Guideline 1.6.1, 1.6.5, & 4.2.1*)

Fencing

7. Following the garage demolition, a new fence line is proposed to be constructed to enclose the existing rear yard. A site plan marking the proposed fence location was provided. (*Guideline 1.3.1, 1.3.4, 1.3.9, 1.4.1 & 1.4.8*)
8. The new fence is proposed to match an existing section of rear yard fencing on the property. The fence will be constructed of wire panels and wood posts in a natural finish. A photo of the fence to be matched was provided. (*Guideline 1.4.8*)
9. *Design Guidelines* Section 1.4 states "Traditionally, utilitarian fences were constructed of vertical wooden slats or pickets, woven wire fencing mounted on wooden posts, or sometimes barbed wire." (*Guideline 1.4.8*)
10. The fence uses neighbor-friendly construction with structural components facing into the subject property. (*Guideline 1.4.8 & 1.4.11*)

Staff Concerns

Per the Applicable Standards & Submittal Requirements:

1. The existing garage appears to be a contributing structure to the special character of the historic district. *Design Guidelines* Section 4.2 states "Demolition of significant buildings, structures, sites, archaeological resources, objects, or trees is discouraged." Contributing structures may have an up to 365-day demolition imposed to investigate alternatives unless the building is found to no longer have significance or value to the district. This may be determined based on finding that the building has been too heavily altered from its original condition or is otherwise now deteriorated beyond repair. (*Guideline 4.2.1*)
2. A written structural engineering assessment evaluating existing conditions, the extent of building deterioration, and structural interventions required to bring the structure back into a stabilized state of repair was not provided. (*Guideline 4.2.1*)
3. Existing site photos appear to show that some historic windows, doors, or other building materials may currently be stored in the garage. *Guideline 4.2.3* states "Before demolition, work with the RHDC and other interested parties to salvage useable architectural materials and features." (*Guideline 4.2.3*)
4. Some regulated trees are located near the garage. A visual tree protection plan providing protective fencing, heavy machinery limitations, and other anti-compaction measures for nearby critical root zones was not provided. (*Guideline 1.3.7, 4.2.5 & 4.2.6*)

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 a 365-day demolition delay be imposed unless the Commission finds that the building has no particular significance or value toward maintaining the character of the Historic Overlay District.
2. That should the Commission find that imposing a demolition delay is appropriate, a RHDC appointed volunteer serve as a liaison to the property owner to assist the owner in reviewing all alternatives to demolition and/or salvage opportunities during the delay.
3. That a tree protection plan be implemented and remain in place for the duration of construction.
4. That any new post holes or grading work within a tree's critical root zone be dug manually and tree roots larger than 1" caliper that are encountered while digging shall receive a clean final cut using tools designed for the purpose, such as loppers. Roots larger than 2" shall not be cut without consultation and recommendation from an ISA-certified arborist.
5. That details and specifications for the following be provided to and approved by staff prior to issuance of the blue placard:
 - a. Visual tree protection plan prepared by an ISA-certified arborist or landscape architect, noting nearby critical root zones, protective fencing locations, and heavy equipment exclusion zones.