Minutes of the
New Bern Historic Preservation Commission
December 12, 2012 (Approved 1/16/13)

The New Bern Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) held its regular meeting on Wednesday, December 12, 2012, in the second floor courtroom of City Hall, 300 Pollock Street.

Members Present:

Rich Frye, Chair	Tim Thompson, Vice Chair
Peggy Broadway	Mickey Miller
Peter Adolph	Jan Giordano
Richard Parsons	Nancy Gray

Members Excused (E)/Absent (A): NONE

Staff Present: Kevin Robinson, AICP, City Planner
Bernard George, AICP, Planning Division Manager
Leigh Anne Friesen, AICP, Volunteer

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

New Business

1. Consider a Certificate of Appropriateness application for 712 New Street (Shannon & Corrine Corr) for new single family construction.

Staff Comments: Staff Kevin Robinson described the project's history and discussed the Staff Recommendations. Chairman Frye then reviewed the Part II application's score sheet.

Applicant Comments: Shannon and Corrine Corr, 611 New Street, described their general renovation plans for the house.

Public Comments: *Nancy Hollows*, 4438 Rivershore Drive, said she thinks the design is of appropriate size and proportion, but asks the Commission to carefully consider the type of window requested.

Discussion by the Commission: The Commissioners discussed issues including the necessity of architecturally certified drawings and why the house is moved off the side property line.

Finding(s) of Fact: Commissioner Thompson 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: "Residential New

Construction", pages 65-72: Placement of Structures, guideline(s)#1-6, Building Scale and Proportion, , guideline(s)#1-4, Materials, guideline(s)#1-4, Details, guideline(s)#1-5, Texture, guideline(s)#1-2, and Form and Rhythm, guideline(s)#1-4 . Commissioner Gray seconded the motion. Upon a call for a vote, the Commissioners voted as follows: Adolph (score sheet vote of 12); Broadway (11); Giordano (15); Frye (11); Gray (14); Miller (14); Parsons (11.5); Thompson (14). Motion passed.

Statement(s) of Reason: (1) The physical attributes of the new structure including placement, building scale/height, materials, details and textures, and form and rhythm meet the criteria for approval and (2) The site planning and improvements including landscaping, driveways, off-street parking, exterior lighting, and utilities meet the criteria for approval.

Condition(s): NONE

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

2. Consider a Certificate of Appropriateness application for exterior alterations, including the demolition and redevelopment of a single family residential structure at 1115 N. Craven St (Tarheel Associates).

Staff Comments: Staff Kevin Robinson talked briefly about the project, gave history of the project, and discussed John Wood's tour of the building.

Applicant Comments: Applicant Lucien Vaughn of Tarheel Associates, discussed the project overview, and stated he respectfully disagreed with John Wood's recommendation that the building can be saved from demolition.

Public Comments: *Stevie Bennett*, 1312 National Avenue, asked the Commission to allow the demolition to improve neighborhood appearance; *Marjorie Preis*, 1203 National Avenue, asked the Commission to allow the demolition in order to revitalize North Craven Street; *Harold Seavers*, 1111 North Craven Street, asks the Commission to allow the demolition to improve property values on the street; *Brett Parkhurst*, 1109 North Craven Street, also asks the Commission to approve the demolition to improve property values; and *Nancy Hollows*, 4438 Rivershore Drive, said the property is scraps of its former self, lacks rhythm and architectural integrity, no unique style nor superior craftsmanship.

Discussion by the Commission: The Commissioners discussed issues including the intent of the regulation of contributing structures, and the importance of preserving the accurate history not what we wished was the history.

Part I vote: Upon a call for a vote, the Commissioners voted as follows: Adolph (score sheet vote of 2.5), Broadway (2), Giordano (2), Frye (3), Gray (1.5), Miller (2), Parsons (3), and

Thompson (4.5). Demolition of the structure is thereby provisionally approved, pending approval of the redevelopment plan.

Part II Consideration

Applicant Comments: Applicant Lucien Vaughn discussed changes to the initial plan to include fencing, the site plan, and the landscaping plan.

Public Comments: *Stevie Bennett*, 1312 National Avenue, asked about the location of the fence; *Brett Parkhurst*, 1109 North Craven Street, said the Gingko street tree in question is inappropriate for the area and he doesn't approve of the wire fence. He asked that the Commission not allow the "usurping" of existing driveway; *Nancy Hollows*, 4438 Rivershore Drive, asked about moving the structure back on the lot a bit to lower the dominance of such an elevated structure; *Marjorie Preis*, 1203 National Avenue, confirmed it was ok for the public to ask questions during the Public Comment time.

Discussion by the Commission: The Commissioners discussed issues including why the building doesn't align with the side property lines, the need for a vegetative hedge with the wire fence, the building height as compared to neighboring houses, the size of the front setback, the alignment of the front steps, salvage and reuse plans, the need for staggered walls on the front steps, as well as the roof material and style.

Finding(s) of Fact: Commissioner Miller 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:

"Demolition of Buildings", pages 96-100, guideline(s) 1-6; "Residential New Construction": Placement of Structures, guideline(s)#1-6, Building Scale and Proportion, , guideline(s)#1-4, Materials, guideline(s)#1-4, Details, guideline(s)#1-5, Texture, guideline(s)#1-2, and Form and Rhythm, guideline(s)#1-4 . Site and Setting: pages 77-89; Landscaping, guidelines 1-16; Driveways and Off-Street Parking, guidelines 1-13; Exterior Lighting, guidelines 1-10; and Utilities, guidelines 1-8. Commissioner Adolph seconded the motion. During discussion on the motion, Commissioners asked about the need to specifically state salvage of the mantle in the house. Upon a call for a vote, the Commissioners voted as follows: Adolph (score sheet vote of 13), Broadway (11), Giordano (15), Frye (11), Gray (9), Miller (13), Parsons (11), and Thompson (14). Motion to approve the Redevelopment Plan thereby passed.

Statement(s) of Reason: (1) The physical attributes of the new structure including placement, building scale/height, materials, details and textures, and form and rhythm meet the criteria for approval and (2) The site planning and improvements including landscaping, driveways, off-street parking, exterior lighting, and utilities meet the criteria for approval.

Condition(s):

- Wire fencing must be screened with vegetation;
- Owner must document structure and recycle salvageable materials;

- Front steps will have terraced side walls as is congruous with other houses in the area;
- The existing mantle in the house shall be reused unchanged, or removed and donated to the New Bern Preservation Foundation.

Motion: Commissioner Giordano moved, and Commissioner Adolph seconded, to approve the issuance of a COA. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Consider a Certificate of Appropriateness application for exterior alterations, including the demolition of the commercial structure at 313 E. Front St. (Sarah Afflerbach) and redevelopment as multiple single family residences.

Staff Comments: Staff Kevin Robinson reviewed the project history and asked the Commission to waive the demolition review for this property as it is not a contributing structure. The Commission discussed the merits of the case and whether or not a waiving of the review was appropriate, given that the structure is arguably older than 50 years in age.

Applicant Comments: On behalf of the owner, Applicant/Architect Sarah Afflerbach asked that they be subject to the demolition review, though she did not believe they are legally required.

Public Comments: *Nancy Hollows*, 4438 Rivershore Drive, clarified some confusion about the ordinance. She stated she didn't think the structure was Part I worthy, but did think it was important to be consistent in the application of Part I; *David Preis*, 1203 National Avenue, believes the guidelines are clear to say buildings over 50 years in age are subject to review; Stevie Bennett, 1312 National Avenue, spoke on behalf of Mandi Johnson, owner of 205 Broad Street. Both individuals cited procedural errors when asking that the case not be heard at this meeting.

Discussion by the Commission: Commissioner Miller disclosed that she is neighbor to this project, but didn't feel she needed to recuse herself.

Part I vote: Upon a call for a vote, the Commissioners voted as follows: Adolph (score sheet vote of 1), Broadway (2), Giordano (2), Frye (2), Gray (2), Miller (2), Parsons (2), and Thompson (2). Demolition of the structure is thereby provisionally approved, pending approval of the redevelopment plan.

Part II Review

Applicant's comments: Mrs. Afflerbach described the location and project plans, and promised to return with a planting plan and rooftop trellis design.

Public comment: *Jerry Hobbins*, 229 New Street, compliments the arrangement of the building on the site and asks the Commission to have vision about the proposal and to approve; *John Ward*, 1400 Green Springs Road, wants to increase the tax base and bring more residents downtown. He feels this project would anchor the block and asks the Commission to approve the

project; *Nelson McDaniel*, 214 New Street, says it is important to return residential uses to Broad Street, and thinks the mass and scale of the proposed structure is appropriate for the location. He disagrees that the Broad Street setbacks are of issue; *Lorelei Schaffhausen*, 511 Metcalf Street, agrees that New Bern needs more residents downtown, but thinks the scale is too large. She worries about the impact on the historic skyline of New Bern; *Nikki Ingianni*, 210 New Street, agrees with the demolition of the existing building and the desire to bring more people to live downtown, but is concerned about the details of the building and the lack of neighborhood character in the design. *Stevie Bennett*, 1312 National Avenue, again mentioned procedural errors as well as her belief that the application is incomplete. She also questioned the drawings' scale; *John Haroldson*, 5309 Trent Woods Drive, thinks the proposal is a wonderful addition that will bring more residents downtown, that the setback concern is inconsequential, and asks the Commission to approve the project. *Nancy Hollows*, 4438 Rivershore Drive, is excited about the project, but does have concern over the setbacks and their impact on the streetscape, lack of balconies on Broad Street side, incongruous nature of lack of windows on the first floor, true "grade" of the property with respect to final height, and the importance of all areas of visual concern on such a highly visible structure.

Commission Discussion: The Commissioners discussed issues such as the need for more information such as a clarification on the amount of infill dirt to be introduced to the site and a separate list of materials and samples of the items proposed for use. The member also requested a South Elevation, more information about the location of HVAC units, and single versus double windows as per current drawings. They also confirmed the applicant's "60 days" could start over.

Motion: Commissioner Miller moved to table the application until a Special Called Meeting on January 9th, seconded by Commissioner Thompson. All Commissioners voted in favor of the motion. Motion passed.

4. Consider a Certificate of Appropriateness application for exterior alterations to the single family residential structure at 213 Hancock St. (Richard Parsons) to include reconstruction of stoop porch and door on secondary area of structure.

Staff Comments: Staff Kevin Robinson described the project to the Commission.

Applicant Comments: Owner Richard Parsons produced photo documentation of his project's history and gave a description of his plans.

Public Comments: *Nancy Hollows*, 4438 Rivershore Drive, praised the research that went into this project.

Discussion by the Commission: Commissioner Parsons recused himself from the discussion and vote. The Commissioners discussed issues including why the rear of the current structure was once the front door, the orientation of the stairs, and the desire to reopen the door for use.

Finding(s) of Fact: Commissioner Thompson 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: "Standards for Restoration", pages 13-14, guideline(s)#1-10; and "Standards for Reconstruction", page 14, guideline(s)#1-6; Wood Walls, Trim and Ornamentation, pages 26-27, guidelines 1-6; Windows and Doors, pages 28-32, guidelines 1-4; and Exterior Entrances and Porches, page 36. Commissioner Broadway seconded the motion. Upon a call for a vote, all Commissioners voted in favor of the motion. Motion passed.

Statement(s) of Reason: (1) Proposed alterations represent a previously existing feature of the property and should serve, once complete, as an excellent example of historic reconstruction and restoration; and (2) Applicant provides clear documented evidence of materials to be preserved and maintained and application adheres to all guidelines for reconstruction.

Condition(s): The Commission recommends approval of a variance for less than the required setbacks to accommodate this project.

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

5. Consider a Certificate of Appropriateness application for exterior alterations to the single family residential structure at 1109 N Craven St. (Brett Parkhurst) to include a newly constructed deck and screened porch in tertiary portion of structure and entry posts, wall and fence in primary area.

Staff Comments: Staff Kevin Robinson described the project to the Commission.

Applicant Comments: Owner Brett Parkhurst discussed the project.

Public Comments: *Stevie Bennett*, 1312 National Avenue, complimented Mr. Parkhurst on the completeness of his application and materials list; *Nancy Hollows*, 4438 Rivershore Drive, commended the owner on his practical plan and inquired if rear latticework would be plastic or wooden. She also inquired about the location and design of the proposed fence; *Harold Seavers*, 1111 North Craven Street, supports the plan.

Discussion by the Commission: The Commissioners discussed issues including the fence location, height and design; the lighting plan; and whether or not the screened porch would be painted.

Finding(s) of Fact: Commissioner Gray 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: "Decks on Historic Buildings", pages 75, guideline(s)#1-16; and "Additions to Fences and Garden Walls", pages 82-83,

guideline(s)#4-6, 8, 11-12. 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: (1) Deck and porch alterations are to a tertiary portion of the structure and should not diminish any important visual aspects of the home; (2) Design and materials of proposed alterations are of similar materials and meet the criteria for approval; (3) Fence, posts and wall are of appropriate materials; (4) Alterations appear to fall completely within the applicant's property and within required setbacks, however further verification may be necessary.

Condition(s): Any changes in the project should come back to Staff.

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

6. Consider a Certificate of Appropriateness application for exterior alterations to the commercial structure at 316 S Front St. (New Bern Area Chamber of Commerce) to include addition of shed roof to tertiary portion of structure.

Staff Comments: Staff Kevin Robinson gave Staff recommendations and described the project to the Commission.

Applicant Comments: Applicant gave a description of the project.

Public Comments: NONE

Discussion by the Commission: NONE

Finding(s) of Fact: Commissioner Thompson 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: "Commercial New Construction Materials", pages 60-61, guideline(s)#1-4; and "Texture", page 63, guideline(s)#1-3; "Form and Rhythm", page 64, guidelines1-2; and "Exterior Entrances and Porches", page 36. 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: (1) Building is not a contributing structure and subject site has little architectural detail of historical significance to the District; (2) Proposed alterations are only viewable, for the most part, in the tertiary portion of the property; and (3) Design and materials including columns, shingles, and siding of proposed alterations are permissible and are found throughout neighboring buildings.

Condition(s): Any changes in the project should come back to Staff.

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

Miscellaneous

1. Administrator's Report on Minor CoA's: various
2. Demolition by Neglect report by Chief Building Inspector, Johnny Clark
    a. Queen Street – contractor bids
    b. 1411 National Ave – will present at the January 9th meeting
    c. 221 East Front St – case reopened due to a complaint
    d. New Bern Hotel
3. Enforcement: 406 Avenue A sent a letter regarding out of compliance fence
4. Additional issues
    a. Change of ordinance regarding "N.C."
    b. Separating demolition requests from redevelopment requests
    c. Adding an application "Completeness checklist"
    d. Need to reduce the amount of paper used in the process
    e. Need to uphold Certified Local Government (CLG) status
    f. Continuing Education reports needed from Commissioners
    g. Wilmington Infill information packets

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

Rich Frye, Chairman

Kevin Robinson, AICP
City Planner