

**Minutes of the
New Bern Historic Preservation Commission
April 18, 2012**

The New Bern Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) held its regular meeting on Wednesday, April 18, 2012, in the second floor courtroom of City Hall, 300 Pollock Street.

Members Present: Jack Morton, Jr. Richard Parsons
 Peggy Broadway Bradley Cummins
 Rich Frye, Vice-chair Peter Adolph, Chairman
 Karen Britton

Members Excused (E)/Absent (A): Johnny Harrison (E); Tim Thompson (E)

Staff Present: Michael Avery, AICP, Planning and Inspections Director
Leigh Anne Friesen, AICP, Volunteer

The meeting was opened and roll call was taken. A quorum was present. Commissioner Parsons moved and Commissioner Morton seconded that the reading of the minutes be waived and approved as written. The motion passed unanimously. Witnesses were sworn in.

Witnesses Sworn: Eric Remington, Katherine Adolph, Steve Wynn, Will White, Terry Startzman, Jerry Hobbins, Bobby Patterson, Paul Mills, Debbie Mills, and others.

New Business

1. Consider application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Trent Court located on Franks Drive for landscaping to include installation of a type “C” Broken Screen on two landscape islands behind Buildings R and S.

Staff Comments: Staff Mike Avery reviewed the new plans and recognized the applicant.

Applicant Comments: Eric Remington of Ward and Smith, PA was present to represent the Housing Authority. He addressed the new drawings and described the new plans. In addition, he discussed dimensions and parking spaces.

Public Comments: *Katherine Adolph*, 901 Pollock Street, is a member of the Housing Authority Board, but tonight speaking as owner of the City Laundry Building and property adjacent to the parcels in question. She asked that the HPC approve the proposed plan, as it meets the appropriate requirements. She appreciates the HPC and the Housing Authority working together with them to bring the properties into compliance. She does, however, hope that the roots systems of the ornamental trees proposed will not disrupt the nearby sewer lines or other underground systems.

Discussion by the Commission: Commissioner Adolph recused himself from the discussion and vote. The Commissioners discussed issues including whether this is a new or old business agenda item, whether or not a correct application is on file, and said the application was a vast improvement in the vegetation and delineated parking.

Finding(s) of Fact: Commissioner Morton moved to find the amendment application congruous with the Historic Preservation Guidelines, citing Section 15-427 Certificate of Appropriateness required; Section 15-429 Review Criteria, citing the following guidelines: “Driveways and Off-street Parking”, pages 87-88, guideline(s)#9. Commissioner Parsons seconded the motion. Upon a call for a vote, all Commissioners voted in favor of the motion. Motion passed.

Statement(s) of Reason: The proposal represents satisfactory mitigation of prior actions that were not in compliance with the guidelines.

Condition(s): NONE

Motion: Commissioner Parsons moved to issue the COA, seconded by Commissioner Broadway. All Commissioners voted in favor of the motion.

2. Consider application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for 222 Change Street for demolition, exterior alterations, new construction, and landscaping.

Staff Comments: Staff Mike Avery showed the Commission the additional views of the project and offered a brief description.

Applicant Comments: Applicant Steve Wynn, 207 Pollock Street, was present to represent the owners. He addressed various previous concerns of the Commissioners.

Public Comments: *Will White*, 226 Change Street, had a concern about the western side of the property and the potential encroachment on an existing easement of the current design. He presented several diagrams pointing out the existing easement and the plan of the current design. He also was concerned about setback violations, and wondered who should the project owners have to see first, the Board of Adjustment or the HPC. *Terry Startzman*, 212 Change Street, thinks the front loading design is preferable to the side loading of the steps. *Jerry Hobbins*, 229 New Street, thinks the visual effect of the front façade is too busy with the lattice work and double run stairs. *Ben Parrish*, 217 Change Street, had the same concerns as Mr. Startzman. He also asked if the house couldn't be moved back far enough to front-load the stairs. He asked if the stairs could encroach on the sidewalk and what the effect would be of recessing the first step into the porch.

Discussion by the Commission: The Commissioners discussed issues including how the HPC's decision impacts the Board of Adjustment's decision and vice-versa, the role of the HPC in advocating for a project with another Board, how the FEMA issues impact the project regarding height, the single-versus double-run stairs, the need for more accurately scaled drawings with respect to the stairs, the recommendation to leave the shutters off the attic, the need to add the chimney to the drawing, the possibility of “water-skirting” siding to lessen the visual impact of the foundation height, the need for the drawings to indicate crawlspace access, the total number of front stairs, the shape of the proposed planting bed, the need for the drawing to state the height to the ridge of the house after elevation, the issue of the potential easement encroachment as not part of the purview of the HPC, and the possible actions the Commission could take on the application, given the information still needed on the drawings.

Finding(s) of Fact: Commissioner Parsons moved to find the amendment application incongruous with the Historic Preservation Guidelines, citing Section 15-427 Certificate of Appropriateness required; Section 15-429 Review Criteria, citing the following guidelines: “Demolition of Buildings”, page 100, guideline(s)#1-5; “Additions to Historic Buildings”, pages 73-74, guideline(s)#1-15; “Residential New Construction”, page 70, guideline(s)#1-5; “Landscaping”, pages 79-80, guideline(s)#4-10. Commissioner Cummins seconded the motion. Upon a call for a vote, all Commissioners voted in favor. Motion passed.

Statement(s) of Reason: The drawings as submitted are insufficient to approve the project.

Condition(s): (1) Applicant must submit new drawings showing the following: scaled front steps, the removal of shutters from the front attic vent, the retained chimney, proposed height to the ridge of the house after elevation, the crawl space access point and foundation flood vents; and (2) Applicant can submit the same application with updated drawings for the next meeting with no assessment of an additional fee.

3. Consider application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for 600 Broad Street for new construction to include additional parking and landscaping.

Staff Comments: Staff Mike Avery noted the location and description of the project.

Applicant Comments: Applicant/Architect Bobby Patterson, 3540 Clemmons Road, Clemmons, NC described the location of the project as the corner lot at Broad and Metcalf Streets. The applicant would like to make the corner an improved parking lot. He described the plans. A right turn exit only access to Metcalf Street is proposed. He further discussed parking lot use and plans. Mr. Charles Buck later spoke to the use of parking lot attendants to direct the higher volume flows of traffic.

Public Comments: Paul Switzer, 407 Metcalf Street, notes two main issues with the project, (1) stormwater runoff and (2) Metcalf Street access. First, he wondered how close the 20 foot right of way is to the adjacent property line. He’s concerned with runoff into his much lower property and would prefer a pervious surface. He said he had no objection to the 15 extra parking spacing as he believes the church does need more parking, but secondly, the egress poses several problems. He stated that the proposed access point is the third curb cut, the northernmost on the church’s property. He asked if there was not an alternative access point, as the street is very narrow. Since there’s parking on the street it is (a) very difficult to see when pulling out; and (b) makes the street essentially “one-way” when all the cars are pulling out of the parking lot. *Johnny Clark*, Chief Building Inspector, noted that if any of the spaces were required to be handicapped, it would necessitate an impervious surface.

Discussion by the Commission: The Commissioners discussed issues including pervious pavers, the advantage of a “ground base” of gravel with grass over it, whether heavy trucks or busses would be using the new parking lot, whether an egress to Broad was an option, the possibility of the parking lot causing a bottleneck, the possible need for parking buffers on either side of the egress to improve the line of sight when exiting onto Metcalf Street, and the recommendation of staff to deny this application and keep the original parameters of the first COA for this location.

Finding(s) of Fact: Commissioner Parsons moved to find the application incongruous with the Historic Preservation Guidelines, citing Section 15-427 Certificate of Appropriateness required; Section 15-429 Review Criteria, citing the following guidelines: “Driveways and Off-street parking”, pages 87-88, guideline(s)#9-13. Commissioner Cummins seconded the motion. Upon a discussion, Commissioners talked about whether the use is temporary, whether the design is appropriate, the solidness of asphalt, and the nature of the previous COA at this location that stated it should be landscaped such that no parking could occur. After the discussion, Commissioner Parsons withdrew his motion and Commissioner Cummins his second, and made another motion to approve the application as congruous, contingent on a set of conditions. Commissioner Frye seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Statement(s) of Reason: (1) The proposed design and materials are compatible with the above-stated guidelines.

Condition(s):

- Foundation of the lot shall be gravel substrate with grass cover
- The hedges shall not be over 36” tall.
- There shall be no egress to Metcalf Street.

Motion: Commissioner Parsons moved to issue the COA, seconded by Commissioner Broadway. All Commissioners voted in favor of the motion. Motion passed.

4. Consider application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for 406 Avenue A for exterior alterations to include removal of trees and shrubs impacting the sewer line and installation of a wood fence, gate, and ground cover.

Staff Comments: Staff Mike Avery described the project to the Commission.

Applicant Comments: NONE

Public Comments: NONE. Commissioner Parsons recommended that the applicant add a bottom dogboard to the fence.

Discussion by the Commission: The Commissioners discussed issues including the need for this project to happen.

Finding(s) of Fact: Commissioner Parsons moved to find 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: “Landscaping”, pages 77-79, guideline(s)#2, 5; and “Fences and Garden Walls”, pages 82-83, guideline(s)#4-6. Commissioner Morton seconded the motion. Upon a call for a vote, all Commissioners voted in favor of the motion. Motion passed.

Statement(s) of Reason: (1) Tree removal is appropriate based on a professional assessment by Dr. Tom Glasgow with the NC Extension service; (2)The fence and gate are appropriate (finished side to face out).

Condition(s): NONE

Motion: Commissioner Parsons moved to issue the COA, seconded by Commissioner Britton. All Commissioners voted in favor of the motion.

Old Business

1. Consider an addendum to a Certificate of Appropriateness for 607 Pollock Street for exterior alterations to include addition of a window for the second floor bathroom, modification of the existing second floor porch, and the use of the approved kitchen extension for a screened in porch.

Staff Comments: Staff Mike Avery described the project to the Commission, and noted it had been presented at a Design Review.

Applicant Comments: Paul and Debbie Mills, owners, discussed the project.

Public Comments: NONE

Discussion by the Commission: The Commissioners discussed issues including the use of v-crimp tin versus standing seam, whether the window trim would be replicated for the proposed half window, the use of the reclaimed window, why the room needs a half window, the recommendation not to destroy historic fabric when doing the project, the need for the replacement window to be trimmed out like the others, and the recommendation for the window to be the same width as the other windows and to determine its depth by the tub height/requirements.

Condition(s):

- Window shall be wood;
- Window shall be the same width as other windows surrounding, tops shall be flush, and bottom shall be determined by the tub requirements;
- The roof shall be standing seam to match the rest of the house; and
- The trim shall match that of the other windows on the house.

Motion: Commissioner Parsons moved to issue the COA, seconded by Commissioner Cummins. All Commissioners voted in favor of the motion.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

Peter Adolph, Chairman

Michael Avery, AICP
Planning and Inspections Director