

**Minutes of the
New Bern Historic Preservation Commission
June 18, 2008**

The New Bern Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) held its regular meeting on Wednesday, June 18, 2008, in the City Hall Courtroom, 2nd Floor, 300 Pollock Street.

Members Present: Diane Filipowicz, Chair
Peter Adolph, Vice-chair
Jack Morton, Jr.
Jay Heck
Rich Frye
Sadaf Hassan
Bradley Cummins

Members Excused/Absent: Karen Britton

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

The meeting was opened and roll call was taken. A quorum was reached. Chairwoman Filipowicz discussed the function and qualifications of the Historic Preservation Commission and its members. Witnesses were sworn in. The Commission reviewed the minutes from the May meeting. Commissioner Adolph, with a second by Commissioner Heck moved to waive the reading of the minutes. Commissioner Morton moved to approve the minutes as presented with a second by Commissioner Heck. The motion passed unanimously.

Witnesses Sworn: Charles Francis, Carolyn Peterson, Gerry Lancto, Bill Moore, Laura Lindsey, Jackie Novak, Britt Warren, Buzz Mead, Mark Cooper, Ann Frye, and others.
, and others.

Old Business

- 1. Consider tabled application for a COA for 509 Pollock Street, owned by Michael and Marty Gunhus, for addition of a rear portico.**

Staff Comments: Staff Annette Stone noted that this application was initially tabled at the May HPC meeting for the applicant to revise design on rear stairs. Building does contribute to the District, c. 1882 / 1925.

Applicant's Comments: Project architect Charles Francis described the revisions of the exit stair, noted the more traditional design (including a bottom rail and newel posts).

Public Comments: NONE

Discussion by the Commission: Commissioner Filipowicz recused herself. Discussion included the material, and the acknowledgement that the applicant made the modifications the Commission requested.

Findings of Fact: Commissioner Morton 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: “Exterior Entrances and Porches”, pages 27-29, guideline(s)#5, 6, 9, 14. Commissioner Heck seconded.

Discussion on the Motion: NONE

Statement(s) of Reason: (1) Proposed project impacts a tertiary area of visual concern; (2) Proposed materials include wood, brick, metal; (3) Design of open porch as proposed takes cues from the original window hoods.

Condition(s): NONE

Motion: Commissioner Filipowicz moved to table the Certificate of Appropriateness application, with a second by Commissioner Cummins. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Consider amending COA for 508-1/2 and 510 George Street, owned by Peterson Partners, for vinyl replacement windows.

Staff Comments: Staff Leigh Anne Friesen showed a video of the subject property while Staff Annette Stone described the project. Property owner received approval at the August 2007 meeting for changes to these structures. Upon installing vinyl replacement windows on these structures, they re-appeared before the Commission in November 2007 to request keeping the windows and were denied. They are now appearing again to ask for an amendment to keep just the vinyl windows at the secondary and tertiary areas of these two structures. Houses are contributing to the District, c. 1940.

Applicant’s Comments: Carolyn Peterson asked to keep the tertiary vinyl windows, owing to the fact that they will not be seen from the public right-of-way. She noted that these houses were not listed in Peter Sandbeck’s 1988 inventory, “The Historic Architecture of New Bern & Craven County, North Carolina”. She talked about the eyesores that these properties had been and the improvements they had made to them.

Public Comments: *Buzz Mead*, 517 Johnson Street, spoke in favor of the amendment, noting that they are on the fringe of the renovated part of the Historic District, the project has much improved the block, the request involves a tertiary area, and they offer much needed affordable housing in the District. He believes approving vinyl windows in a tertiary area of a contributing structure will not set a precedent for other requests, and believes even with vinyl windows, the project is an improvement. *Mark Cooper*, 307 Middle Street, has a contract on 508½ George, and is excited about the opportunity to buy a home downtown. He speaks in favor of the

amendment, noting the improvement on the block is such that he previously would avoid it during his downtown walks. *Laura Lindsey*, 202 S Glenburnie Rd, spoke in favor of the amendment, saying that they owners are making a contribution to the neighborhood. *Ann Frye*, 406 Queen Street, spoke against the amendment, saying that the location of the vinyl windows should not matter. The properties are either in the District or not, and contributing or not. She believes a positive decision would set a precedent that would eventually spread to all sides of structures.

Discussion by the Commission: The Commissioners discussed issues such as the importance of applying the guidelines as written, the fact that the window guidelines are clear and do not indicate different treatment of the areas of visual concern, the importance of using the District as a teaching tool regarding what is appropriate, the fact that the applicant was approved for wood windows only from the first meeting, and the quality of the project otherwise.

Motion: Chairwoman Filipowicz called for a roll call vote to approve or deny the amendment, as requested by the applicant. All Commissioners voted against the amendment.

3. Consider tabled application for a COA for Bear Plaza, owned by City of New Bern, for addition of public restrooms

Staff Comments: Application was withdrawn to have time for design work with adjacent property owners.

New Business

1. Consider COA for 1116 National Avenue, owned by Bill and Angela Moore, for landscaping to front yard.

Staff Comments: Staff Leigh Anne Friesen rolled the video tape on the property while, Staff Annette Stone described the project. The owner presented this plan to Staff Annette Stone. Based on the Landscaping Guidelines, Staff could not approve the application, and has therefore passed it on to the Commission for review.

Applicant's Comments: Owner Bill Moore discussed his rationale for wanting to increase the amount of landscaping in his front yard. He said it was necessitated by the new driveway and removal of a tree which has left a large dirt patch that needs cover. He has reviewed the landscaping criteria and believes the proposal to be an appropriate improvement to the neighborhood. Asserted that rocks in gardens are seen around town, and doesn't see why his river stones should be a problem. He stated he did not have luck growing grass in the dirt patch, and doesn't want brick.

Public Comments: NONE

Discussion by the Commission: Discussion included the height of the rock wall, the design and materials for the garden, the likelihood of grass growing on the bare site, whether or not the design was overwhelming or out of character for the area, the traditional uses of landscaping, the inappropriateness of such a formal plan for a front yard, the lack of examples of frequent use of

stone, the increased appropriateness for this treatment in the side or rear yard, level of permanency of the treatment, and the use of such landscaping to buffer residential from commercial.

Findings of Fact: Commissioner Morton moved to deny the application as incongruous with the Historic Preservation Guidelines, citing Section 15-427 Certificate of Appropriateness required; Section 15-429 Review Criteria, citing the following guidelines: “Landscaping”, pages 53-56, guideline(s)#5 – 8, 12. Commissioner Adolph seconded. Six commissioners voted in favor of the denial. Commissioner Frye voted against it. Motion carried.

Discussion on the Motion: NONE

Statement(s) of Reason: (1) Ratio of grassy lawn to other elements is small; and (2) Rock is not appropriate material.

Condition(s): NONE

2. Consider COA for 408 Dunn Street, owned by Craven Partners, Inc., for wooden replacement windows and front porch addition.

Staff Comments: Staff Leigh Anne Friesen showed the video of the property. Staff Annette Stone gave some background on the project, along with a description of the current request. Applicant plans to add the same porch treatment to this structure as applied to 402 Dunn Street. Replacement windows are proposed to be one-over-one thermal pane windows. Building does contribute to the District, c. 1913.

Applicant’s Comments: Owner Gerry Lancto reviewed the window treatments for the first two houses they renovated on this block. 402 Dunn Street was the applied window grill treatment; 404 Dunn was window restoration. They did not want to do another restoration, and are therefore requesting one-over-one wood windows for 408 Dunn. She asked for cooperation from the Commission on the good work they are doing for this neighborhood. She read the project proposal, emphasizing that their plans would be most energy efficient. She noted that as there is no photo-documentation of these houses as built, no proof exists that they had two-over-two windows originally. Partner Laura Lindsey asserted that the window design would not impact the project, and if they had to choose between replacement windows and the porch, they may not do a front porch.

Public Comments: *Ann Frye*, 406 Queen Street, spoke against the one-over-one window replacement as the predominant type of window on the house is two-over-two.

Discussion by the Commission: Points of discussion included what window designs other houses of this era have, the fact that two-over-two windows would be the most likely type of windows for this house, and the clarification that both the windows and the porch are projects up

for discussion with this application.

Findings of Fact: Commissioner Frye 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: “Exterior Entrances and Porches”, pages 27-29, guideline(s)# # 1, 5, 6, 10 and 14; “Windows and Doors”, pages 20-23, guideline(s)# 1 – 6. Commissioner Morton seconded.

Discussion on the Motion: NONE

Statement(s) of Reason: (1) Project impacts a primary area of visual concern; (2) National Register Inventory indicates the house originally had a one-story full façade front porch; (3) Proposed porch will be build exactly as built for 402 Dunn Street; and (4) Existing windows are double hung, two-over-two.

Condition(s):

Windows should be two-over-two in design, three-dimensional grilles on both sides with a shadow bar in between if thermal-paned glass is used.

Porch will be built exactly as the new porch at 402 Dunn Street, with a 3/12 pitch roof and handrails to match proportion and design.

Motion: Commissioner Frye moved to issue the Certificate of Appropriateness, with a second by Commissioner Adolph. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Consider COA for 410 Metcalf Street, owned by Steve and Jackie Novak, for addition of a rear screened porch.

Staff Comments: Staff Annette Stone briefed the Commission on the project, as Staff Leigh Anne Friesen showed the project video. This applicant came before members of the HPC at the June Design Review. Building does contribute to the District, c. 1890-1895.

Applicant’s Comments: Owner Jackie Novak presented the application. She noted that the drawings were updated with the requests made by the Commission members at the June Design Review.

Public Comments: NONE

Discussion by the Commission: Discussion on the item included topics such as the location of the porch with respect to the driveway, the relationship between the screens and the louvers, the materials, the need for the frieze of the screened and front porches to align, the replication of the front porch spindles on the screened porch, the location of the porch stairway and door, and the quality of the updates provided.

Findings of Fact: Commissioner Frye 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: “Exterior Entrances and Porches”, pages 27-29, guideline(s)#1 – 4. Commissioner Adolph seconded.

Discussion on the Motion: Commissioners Filipowicz and Cummins requested to add the conditions listed below.

Statement(s) of Reason: (1) Project impacts secondary and tertiary areas of visual concern; (2) Proposed materials include brick foundation, wood columns and metal roofing; and (3) Proposed roof design is hipped.

Condition(s):

Cornice and Frieze of porch should be collinear with that of the front porch.

Existing wooden door to be removed must be retained onsite or in storage for use by a future owner.

Western screened porch pickets will be have same design as that of the front porch

Motion: Commissioner Morton moved to issue the Certificate of Appropriateness, with a second by Commissioner Heck. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Consider COA for 213 New Street, owned by Bob and Karen Whitmore, for addition to an accessory structure.

Staff Comments: Staff Annette Stone spoke briefly about the project, while Staff Leigh Anne Friesen showed video footage of the site. Contractor Britt Warren appeared at the June Design Review meeting to discuss this project. Building does not contribute to the District.

Applicant’s Comments: Contractor Britt Warren gave a project description and details on materials to be used. Upon question, Mr. Warren noted that the proposed height of the structure is 22’2” (per the drawing labels), and that the house’s height is well over 30’. He also noted that the roof is not proposed to exceed the soffit of the main house. The pitch of the roof is to be around 4/12, which would be closer to the screened porch roof pitch than that of the house.

Public Comments: NONE

Discussion by the Commission: Topics of discussion included the materials to be used, the orientation of the structure to the main house, the stairway design, the proposed height of the structure, the house’s height, the fact that the proposed mass and scale is very appropriate to the house and neighborhood, the pitch of the roof, and the use of the structure.

Findings of Fact: Commissioner Morton 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-

New Bern Preservation Commission Minutes
June 18, 2008

49: “Building Height and Scale”, guideline(s)#1 – 4; “Materials (Revised)”, pages 46.1-47 guideline(s)#1 – 4; “Details”, pages 47-48 guideline(s)#1 – 4; “Texture”, page 48 guideline(s)#1 – 2; “Form and Rhythm”, page 49, guideline(s)#1 – 4. Commissioner Adolph seconded.

Discussion on the Motion: NONE

Statement(s) of Reason: (1) Project impacts a tertiary area of visual concern; (2) Proposed materials include cement-board siding and asphalt shingles; (3) Existing roof design is gable; (4) Proposed design is hipped; and (5) The structure will be two stories and is 22’ 2” in height.

Condition(s): Six-over-six appropriate wood windows will be used to match those on the rear of the main house.

Motion: Commissioner Heck moved to issue the Certificate of Appropriateness, with a second by Commissioner Morton. The motion passed unanimously.

Miscellaneous

Staff Annette Stone discussed the Historic District Guidelines update. She noted that the Rules and Procedures of the Commission will appear in the new guidelines. Commissioners wondered if the City should increase the cost of hardcopy Guidelines since \$10 no longer covered the printing costs. She said the goal is to have the final public hearing on the draft Guidelines by August 15.

With no further business, Commissioner Adolph made a motion to adjourn that was accepted.

Diane Filipowicz, Chair

Annette D. Stone, AICP
Commission Administrator