

April 18, 2007

**Minutes of the
New Bern Historic Preservation Commission
April 18, 2007**

The New Bern Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) held its regular meeting on Wednesday, April 18, 2007, in the Planning & Inspections Department, 3rd Floor, 248 Craven Street.

Members Present: Dr. Joseph Klotz, Chairman
Mrs. Sarah Afflerbach, Vice Chair
Ms. Diane Filipowicz
Mrs. Sadaf Hassan
Mr. David Lancto
Mrs. Elisabeth Wilkinson
Mr. Jack Morton, Jr.

Members Excused: Mr. Marvin Mullinix, Jr.

Members Absent: Mr. Robert Gardner

Staff Present: Mrs. Annette Stone, AICP, City Planner
Mrs. Leigh Anne Friesen, AICP, Planner

The meeting was opened and roll call was taken. A quorum was reached. Chair Dr. Klotz briefly discussed the function and qualifications of the Historic Preservation Commission and its members. Witnesses were sworn in.

Witnesses Sworn: Buzz Mead, Richard Hoff, Jerry Hobbins, Emily Henson, Nancy Hollows, John Noto, Marjorie Preis, Andy Bayliss, Nikki Ingianni, Jerry Hobbins, Paula McElhennon, David Blythe, Richard Orr, Tripp Eure, Coleman “Sully” Sullivan, and others.

The Commission reviewed the minutes from the March 21st meeting. Mrs. Wilkinson moved to waive the reading of the minutes; Mr. Morton seconded. Motion passed unanimously. No changes were requested. Mrs. Wilkinson moved to approve the minutes as submitted with a second by Mrs. Hassan. The motion passed unanimously.

Old Business:

- 1. Consider amending COA for 241 Craven, owned by David Blythe, for new construction of a mixed-use building.**

Staff Comments: Staff Mrs. Stone reminded the Commission that this project, along with others that will follow, is a request to amend an existing COA. She then gave an overview of the project for the Commission. She noted that the applicant received a COA at the July 2006 regular meeting of the HPC, and now returns to fulfill the condition to return with scaled professional drawings, to include further architectural details and materials list.

April 18, 2007

Applicant's Comments: David Blythe, owner, noted the changes made to the design for the Commission.

Public Comments: *Jerry Hobbins*, 229 New Street, inquired about the colonnade and walkway finish. *Buzz Mead*, 517 Johnson Street, questioned the use of synthetic materials on the upper balconies. *Nikki Ingianni*, 210 New Street, questioned the COA issued for demolition of the early brick structure currently on the property. *Marjorie Preis*, 1203 National Avenue, inquired about documentation that will be required before demolition.

Discussion by the Commission: Mrs. Afflerbach recused herself from the discussion and voting. The discussion that followed included issues such as the cornice line definition, colonnade doorway definition, transom in-fill, use of alleyways, proposed parking deck entrance, balance of the fenestration, and the demolition of the concrete block addition at the rear.

Motion: Commissioner Lancto moved to amend the application including the demolition and new schematic, with the condition that the applicant review the entrance change as suggested. Commissioner Wilkinson seconded. The motion passed unanimously with no discussion.

2. Consider amending COA for 312 Avenue D, owned by Sean and Paula McElhennon, for a front porch alteration.

Staff Comments: Staff Mrs. Stone gave a brief explanation for the amendment, including some background on the project. She noted that the plans have changed from the original project that was approved. Applicant has installed turned pickets and replace post which were not included in the original application. She stated that concerning her recommendation she was on the fence: the turned posts were not typically seen on this type of house in the district after 1910, but this house was built c. 1920s. She felt the appropriateness was borderline.

Applicant's Comments: Paula McElhennon, owner, remarked that they did not intend to implement the design used in their original application. They thought they need only show an example of railings since that was the element they wanted to add.

Public Comments: *Jerry Hobbins*, 229 New Street, supports the application. *Marjorie Preis*, 1203 National Avenue, commented on the lack of understanding that still exists in the District regarding the HPC process. She requested that the Commission make them return to the original columns because the new design was too skimpy for the size of house. *Nancy Hollows*, 626 Hancock Street, concurred with Mrs. Preis, saying that despite the owners' good intentions, the columns are not appropriate for that age and style of house.

Discussion by the Commission: The discussion that touched on issues such as what the guidelines state, what the original application proposed, whether or not they would have approved the application originally if it proposed what now exists, appropriateness of turned columns and spindles for that style of house, fate of the original columns, lack of mention of columns in original application, numerous wrong assumptions on both sides, strength of documentation for the Tuscan-style columns, and the risk of continued erosion of the Historic Districts fabric and streetscapes.

April 18, 2007

Motion: Commissioner Filipowicz moved to deny the amendment. Commissioner Afflerbach seconded. The motion passed unanimously with no discussion.

3. Consider amending COA for 236 Middle Street, owned by Daynette Orr, for rear façade enhancements.

Staff Comments: Staff Mrs. Stone focused the Commission on the two main issues of this amendment: the rear balcony and posts. As per the original COA, applicant was requested to return with a detailed drawing of the final storefront design. In addition, applicant is requesting a change in the rear balcony design.

Applicant's Comments: Richard Orr, owner/builder, provided the Commission with a brief description of the project and requested changes.

Public Comments: *Nikki Ingianni*, 210 New Street, said it was hard to have a comment when the audience could not see the application being considered.

Discussion by the Commission: The Commission discussed topics including the rear public or private sidewalk, decorative columns (like current street lampposts), the need for shutter hardware to make shutters appear operational, number of bays on the rear, lack of design completion for the rear, the need to return with balcony handrails and column design, column details (size, style, material, width between, etc.), the original depth and design of the balcony, décor versus structure, entrance conflict between use of windows and shutters, the nature of the outboard railing, the Commission's desire to look at all the elements of the plan all together instead of piece-meal, question concerning what exactly the Commission is being asked to approve.

Motion: Commissioner Filipowicz moved to amend the application to approve the concept of lower columns instead of cantilevers, the extension of the balcony from four to seven feet, and the upper column concept. Commissioner Lancto seconded. The motion passed unanimously with no discussion.

4. Consider tabled application for a COA for 402 Dunn Street, owned by Craven Partners, LLC, for addition of a front porch.

Staff Comments: Staff Mrs. Stone reminded the Commission that this application needs a COA issued, as it was tabled last month. To reiterate, she noted that the applicants are working to repair and renovate the four structures on this parcel (402-408 Dunn St). The house in question is contributing to the District, c. 1912. They were approved for a roof material change at 402 Dunn Street during the January regular meeting. This application is also for 402 Dunn Street, but requests the addition of a façade-width porch.

The application was tabled last month because there were several issues to be addressed, including incorrect drawings, lack of documentation for appropriateness of roof design and replacement window application.

April 18, 2007

Regarding the replacement windows, Staff Mrs. Stone showed the Commission the proposed muntin submitted by the owners. She noted that while it is ½-inch thick, it is not three-dimensional, and proposes a “snap-in” application. She reiterated that a one-over-one design is not appropriate.

Staff reported that the owners have provided documentation regarding the strength of the glue adherence. However, the manufacturer did not provide documentation certifying that the window function would not be affected by the proposed muntin being installed on the exterior of the window.

Applicant’s Comments: Regarding the windows, Mr. Lancto disagreed that the muntin is not three-dimensional and talked about maintenance issues. He also showed a picture of the original wooden door at the property which will be returned to the front.

Public Comments: *Emily Henson*, 518 New Street, noted that the fenestration on the house is just as important as the porch on their other application. She admonished the Commission for their impending decision, as it may be scrutinized due to their relationship with Commissioner David Lancto. *Marjorie Preis*, 1203 National Avenue, suggested moving the treated one-over-one replacement windows to the rear of all the houses, and buy the appropriate windows for all other window needs. *Nancy Hollows*, 626 Hancock Street, commented on her appreciation for the Craven Partners’ rehabilitation, and noted how important facades are to historic structures. *Andy Bayliss*, 3023 River Lane, noted that intra-pane spacer bars are available and not required, so he was not sure why the method mattered.

Discussion by the Commission: Commissioner Lancto recused himself to represent the applicant. Topics included the small number of 4/12 pitch hipped roofs in Riverside, the lowest pitched roof that could accommodate a metal versus shingle roof, the appropriateness of stucco as an approved material, the history of the project (particularly the window replacement), what would be appropriate for the windows, the longevity of the proposed exterior muntin application, an appropriate interpretation of the guidelines relating to windows, and the lack of desire to forsake the rear of all the houses to mitigate the error in just one house.

Findings of Fact: Commissioner Afflerbach moved to approve the porch application congruous with the Historic Preservation Guidelines, citing Section 15-427 Certificate of Appropriateness required; Section 15-429 Review Criteria, citing the following guidelines: “Building Components: Foundations”, pages 24-26, guideline(s)#6 – 8 and “Building Components: Exterior Entrances & Porches”, pages 27-29, guideline(s) # 1, 5, 6, 10 and 14. Commissioner Hassan seconded. Motion carried unanimously with no discussion.

Statement(s) of Reason: (1) Applicant’s intent is to put back an original feature, as the National Register Inventory indicates the house originally had a one-story full façade front porch, (2) the applicant has revised the application to include a hipped versus shed roofed porch.

Condition(s): (1) Pitch of the porch roof shall be 3/12 and (2) the front door should be wood

April 18, 2007

Other remarks: Regarding the windows, Craven Partners representative David Lancto asked that the Commission not make a ruling on the windows until he had a chance to see whether or not the same manufacturer they are using makes simulated divided light two over two windows.

Motion: Commissioner Filipowicz moved to issue the COA, seconded by Commissioner Morton. Motion passed unanimously with no discussion.

New Business

1. Consider COA for 603 and 605 Hancock Street, owned by TAB Premium Built Homes, for new construction of single family homes.

Staff Comments: Staff Mrs. Stone showed the video and pictures of the site. The applicant appeared at a special called design review at the March regular meeting to preview house plans for these two properties. Floor plans were requested, and have been included in the application. As the special called meeting to be held at the April Design Review did not achieve a quorum, the applicant has returned to be heard at the April regular meeting.

Applicant's Comments: NONE

Public Comments: *Jerry Hobbins*, 229 New Street, does not want 601 Hancock Street to set a bad precedent in that its new windows do not have sills, do not all match, and the structure lacks consistency in its construction. He's confused as to where the front door is, questions the incorporation of the pre-existing curbing into the first house's design, has landscaping concerns, and a question about the proposed brick fencing versus the existing chain-link fence. *Nancy Hollows*, 626 Hancock Street, had a question about the setback of the porch from the sidewalk and where the steps will fall onto the sidewalk. She also inquired about how the new houses will address the smaller scale of the existing house at 607 Hancock. *Emily Henson*, 518 New Street, registered her approval of houses on this site. *Nikki Ingianni*, 210 New Street, inquired about the exact location of the new brick wall. *John Noto*, 221 New Street, questioned why wood versus cement board is not required on new construction.

Discussion by the Commission: Topics included the confirmation that 605 Hancock was to have the squared columns, the color of the various brick choices, the width of the house compared to the size of the columns on each house, the appropriateness of the varying column sizes at 605 Hancock, and compliments of the detailing on the existing house at 601 Hancock.

Findings of Fact: Commissioner Gardner moved to approve the 603 Hancock application congruous with the Historic Preservation Guidelines, citing Section 15-427 Certificate of Appropriateness required; Section 15-429 Review Criteria, citing the following guidelines: "New Construction", pages 44-49: "Placement", page 44-45 guideline(s)#1 – 6; "Building Height and Scale", guideline(s)#1 – 3; Amended "Materials", pages 46.1-47 guideline(s)#1, 3 – 5; "Details", pages 47-48 guideline(s)#1, 3 – 5; "Texture", pages 48 guideline(s)#1 – 2; and "Form and Rhythm", guideline(s)#1 – 4. Commissioner Wilkinson seconded. During the discussion, Commissioner Filipowicz noted that the "Materials" section cited is the "Amended" section. Motion carried unanimously.

April 18, 2007

Commissioner Lancto moved to approve the 605 Hancock application congruous with the Historic Preservation Guidelines, citing Section 15-427 Certificate of Appropriateness required; Section 15-429 Review Criteria, citing the following guidelines: “New Construction”, pages 44-49: “Placement”, page 44-45 guideline(s)#1 – 6; “Building Height and Scale”, guideline(s)#1 – 3; Amended “Materials”, pages 46.1-47 guideline(s)#1, 3 – 5; “Details”, pages 47-48 guideline(s)#1, 3 – 5; “Texture”, pages 48 guideline(s)#1 – 2; and “Form and Rhythm”, guideline(s)#1 – 4. Commissioner Wilkinson seconded. During the discussion, Commissioner Afflebach questioned the driveway plan and how it would tie into the garage. She asked that the condition be added to bring this back to Staff. This amendment was accepted by Commissioner Gardner, and the motion carried unanimously.

Statement(s) of Reason: The structure at 603 Hancock will be placed in general alignment with existing structures on the street and has a form and rhythm consistent with the neighborhood. The structure is two-story, three bays wide, center hall design. Materials include brick, smooth face cement board siding, metal roofing, composite three dimensional divided light windows, composite material. The roof includes a side gabled, with a gabled dormer and the rear sections are hip roof. Details included are shutters, columns, decorative window headers, two over two window sashes, corner boards, picketed railings. Proposed garages are in tertiary AVCs.

The structure at 605 Hancock will be placed in general alignment with existing structures on the street in keeping with the design and rhythm of other houses in the District. Materials include brick, smooth face cement board siding, metal roofing, composite three dimensional divided-lite windows, composite material. Details included are shutters, columns, decorative window headers, four over four window sashes, corner boards, picketed railings, raised paneled front door and $\frac{3}{4}$ litr door on second floor.

Condition(s): 603 Hancock—NONE; 605 Hancock—Applicant must return to Staff with a detailed driveway plan.

Motion: For both projects, Commissioner Wilkinson moved to issue the COA, seconded by Commissioner Morton. Both motions passed unanimously with no discussion.

2. Consider COA for 521 Hancock Street, owned by Elizabeth Fuller, for addition of a garage.

Staff Comments: Staff Mrs. Stone and Mrs. Friesen gave an overview of the application and rolled the video tape. The applicant appeared at the April Design Review to present preliminary plans for the garage, and noted several comments, some of which have been incorporated into the new design.

Applicant’s Comments: Architect Tripp Eure gave a project description and rationale. He addressed the detailing of the garage, and the list of materials. He noted that the paving material would change at the brick dividing wall from brick pavers behind it to a permeable paver to allow grass to grow through it as it approaches the existing drive. The garage door material is planned to be either wood or metal, and the applicant’s preference is for curved doors as would be found on a carriage house.

April 18, 2007

Public Comments: *Buzz Mead*, 517 Johnson Street, stated he is happy to have a new neighbor and is pleased with the design of the building. *Richard Hoff*, 210 Hancock Street, questioned if the height was slightly different from the existing accessory structure, but thought is looked good.

Discussion by the Commission: Topics included the difference in door styles on the storage portion of the garage versus the shed, appreciation for the exercise of drawing rectilinear garage doors, the preference for curved doors instead, the attractiveness of the structure, and the approval of either wood or metal doors.

Findings of Fact: Commissioner Wilkinson moved to approve the application congruous with the Historic Preservation Guidelines, citing Section 15-427 Certificate of Appropriateness required; Section 15-429 Review Criteria, citing the following guidelines: “New Construction”, pages 44-49: “Placement”, page 44-45 guideline(s)#1, 3, 6; “Building Height and Scale”, guideline(s)#1 – 4; “Materials”, pages 46.1-47 guideline(s)#1, 4; “Details”, pages 47-48 guideline(s)#1, 4; “Texture”, pages 48 guideline(s)#1 – 2; and “Form and Rhythm”, guideline(s)#1, 2, 4. Guidelines for “Fences and Garden Walls”, pages 57 – 58, guideline(s)# 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9 and “Driveways and Off-street Parking”, pages 59 – 60, guideline(s)#1 – 3, 5, 6, 9. Commissioner Hassan seconded. During the discussion, the question was asked if the brick will be reused onsite. Motion carried unanimously.

Statement(s) of Reason: Garage is appropriate for the area and takes appropriate cues from the existing accessory structure. Materials include brick, wood, metal, glass, and concrete. Proposed mechanical gate will match existing non-mechanical Johnson Street gate. Installation method will retain the existing brick columns.

Condition(s): (1) Applicant must retain onsite the bricks removed from the existing brick wall or donate the bricks to the New Bern Preservation Foundation salvage house, and (2) adhere to the driveway plan as submitted.

Motion: Commissioner Wilkinson moved to issue the COA, seconded by Commissioner Hassan. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Consider COA for 705 East Front Street, owned by Coleman Sullivan, for screened enclosure of an existing rear deck.

Staff Comments: Staff Mrs. Stone showed the video of the property and discussed the fact that the applicant appeared at the April Design Review to address some potential concerns about rear rooflines. The house is not contributing to the District, c. 1999.

Applicant’s Comments: Owner Coleman “Sully” Sullivan gave an additional description of the project. He noted that he would like to take architectural elements from several porches he’s seen in the District, and has included photos as documentation.

Public Comments: NONE

April 18, 2007

Discussion by the Commission: Discussion surrounded topics including the roof design being proposed, the new porch dimensions, type of decking, whether or not the porch roof would fall below the existing windows, the design of the roof, and the type of handrail design and material.

Findings of Fact: Commissioner Filipowicz moved to approve the application congruous with the Historic Preservation Guidelines, citing Section 15-427 Certificate of Appropriateness required; Section 15-429 Review Criteria, citing the following guidelines: “New Construction”, pages 44-49.2, “Building Height and Scale”, pages 45-46, guideline(s)#4; “Materials”, pages 46.1-47 guideline(s)#1 – 4; “Details”, pages 47-48 guideline(s)#1 – 4; “Texture”, pages 48 guideline(s)#1 – 2; and “Form and Rhythm”, guideline(s)#1 – 4.

Commissioner Afflerbach seconded. During the discussion, Commissioner Hassan confirmed that this motion included the proposed cupola atop the garage. Commissioner Filipowicz indicated that it did, and the motion carried unanimously.

Statements of Reason: (1) Project area impacts a tertiary AVC, (2) Materials and forms are consistent with those in the District, and (3) Proposed cupola is included in the proposed project.

Condition(s): NONE

Motion: Commissioner Afflerbach moved to issue the COA, seconded by Commissioner Hassan. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Consider COA for 314 Avenue B, owned by Stella Madison Properties, LLC, for demolition of a contributing structure.

Staff Comments: Staff Mrs. Stone asked the public remaining if there was a representative for owner Stella Madison Properties, LLC.

Applicant’s Comments: No applicant or representative was present.

Public Comments: *Buzz Mead*, 517 Johnson St, stated he and the Preservation Commission Board would review the application before the next meeting.

Nancy Hollows, 626 Hancock Street, updated the Commission on the bill currently in the NC Senate that would enable the City of New Bern to require a permit to demolish a contributing structure within a Historic District.

Discussion by the Commission: Decided to table the application as there was no application representative present.

Motion: Commissioner Morton moved to table the application, with a second by Commissioner Wilkinson. Motion passed unanimously.

April 18, 2007

There being no further business, Commissioner Lancto moved, and Commission Morton seconded that the meeting be adjourned. Motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Joe Klotz, Chairman

Annette D. Stone, AICP, Commission Administrator
