# Minutes of the
# New Bern Historic Preservation Commission
# February 18, 2015

The New Bern Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) held a regular meeting on Wednesday, February 18, 2015, in the second floor courtroom of City Hall, 300 Pollock Street.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Members Present:** | Tim Thompson, Chair | Tripp Eure, Vice-Chair |
| | Jim Morrison | Nancy Gray |
| | David Griffith | Mickey Miller |
| | Cheri Moyers | John Young |
| | | Jerry Walker |

**Members Excused (E)/Absent (A):**

**Staff Present:** Kevin Robinson, AICP, City Planner
Bradleigh Sceviour, Planner

The meeting was opened and roll call was taken. A quorum was present.

January minutes were considered for approval. Reading of the minutes was waived. Corrections were made. Commissioner Gray moved and Commissioner Morrison seconded that the minutes be approved with amendments. The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

Witnesses were sworn in.

Chairman Thompson outlined the new procedure for HPC processes in light of the recent ordinance update.

**Consideration of Applications:**

A. **1015 N Craven St. (David Prohaska)** to include roof replacement, enclosure of rear porch, new porch stoop and shed roof, replacement windows and roofing in the primary, secondary and tertiary AVC.

**Staff Comments:** Staff Kevin Robinson introduced the application and Mr. David Prohaska.

Kevin Robinson also noted that the applicant had submitted application materials after the deadline and inquired if there was any objection to including the new information for consideration in the application. There was none.

**Applicant Comments:** Mr. Prohaska presented a set of plans with details about his proposed changes: he stated that he planned to remove the damaged rear roof and replace it, to raise the height of the roof during that process, to enclose the back porch and install a new stoop also in the rear of the building, to replace the damaged front porch roof, to install new wood windows,

to remove the back second story window and to replace the front and rear doors. He also stated that all revisions suggested to him during design review had been made.

**Public Comments:** None

**Public Comments were closed.**

**Staff Recommendations:**

Staff submits the following Historic District Guidelines as appropriate to this application:

**Exterior Changes to Historic Buildings:**

**Roofs, pages 17-20, guidelines 1-2,4-6,10-11; Wood-Walls Trim & Ornamentation, pages 21-25, guidelines 1-4,8;Windows and Doors, pages 26-30, guidelines 1,3-4, 8; Exterior Entrances and Porches, pages 34-36, guidelines, 8**

**Statements of Reason,** based on the information contained in the application, Staff's judgment is:

1. The proposed porch enclosure and roof repair/alterations are congruous with design guidelines in location, design and materials.

2. The proposed enclosure is in the tertiary AVC and will have little impact on the most visible, character defining features of the home.

3. The proposed windows, doors and other materials are congruous with design guidelines

**Staff suggests the Commission approve the application for major exterior alterations at this time citing the aforementioned guidelines and with the following conditions.**

- Staff to approve of roofing material and window model of approved dimensions and materials

**Board Discussion:**

Chairman Thompson asked if anyone had issues with completeness of the application. Commissioner Young asked if the applicant had information on the gauging of the metal roof. Applicant stated that he had and it was in the new information. Chairman Thompson asked if anyone had issues with the removal and raising of the rear roof. Commissioner Griffith stated that he believed it was incongruous with the guidelines and thought it was demolition of historic material. He stated that repair and replacement in kind was possible and shouldn't be overlooked. Chair Thompson inquired about Commissioner. Griffith's opinion about the second story

window, he had no problem with removal. Commissioner Morrison stated that the proportions of the building would not change and that the application was in keeping with the guidelines. He also inquired about the downspouts. Mr. Prohaska said it was aluminum. Commissioner Miller stated that discretion should be used and that the proposed changes kept the spatial relationship and the pitch the same and so she was in favor of the proposed changes. Chair Thompson asked for comment on enclosing the back porch. Vice-Chair Eure asked if anything had changed from the last time they had a discussion on the back porch. Mr. Prohaska stated it had not. Vice-Chair Eure said that the proposed enclosure provided a sense of the historic features of the house in a way that would be obvious in the future. Chair Thompson next inquired about the front porch stoop, removing the existing metal roof and replacing it with shingles and removing the existing windows. Commissioner Gray noted that it was two over two windows where appropriate. Mr. Prohaska says the only window not two over two is the one in the rear over the kitchen sink. Chair Thompson then asked for comment on replacing the back and front doors with new wood doors.

**Motion:** Commissioner Morrison made a motion to find the application congruous citing Section(s) 15-422 Certificate of Appropriateness required; Section 15-424- Review Criteria, citing the following guidelines: Exterior Changes to Historic Buildings, Roofs pages 17-20 guidelines 1-2, 4-6 and 10; Wood Walls Trim and Ornamentation, pages 21-25, guidelines 1-4 and 8; Windows & Doors, pages 26-30 1, 3-4 and 6; Exterior Entrances and Porches, pages 34-36 guideline 8; and Additions to Historic Buildings page 74 guidelines 1 and 4 and cited the following statements of reason: The proposed porch proposed porch enclosure and roof repair and alterations are congruous with design guidelines in location design and materials. The proposed enclosure is in the tertiary AVC and will have little impact on the most visible character defining features of the home. Proposed windows doors and materials are congruous with design guidelines. Also that staff will approve downspout and gutter material samples at a later time. Commissioner Moyers seconded the motion. The result of the vote was 7-2 with Commissioner Gray and Commissioner Griffith opposed.

Motion to issue CoA made by Commissioner Miller and seconded by Commissioner Morrison. Vote was 7-2 with Commissioner Gray and Commissioner Griffith opposed.

**B.** **<u>420 Craven St.</u> (John & Willie Rosamond – GO Architectural Design)** to include removal of existing rear deck and construction of foundation and covered porch with metal roof in the tertiary AVC.

**Staff Comments:** Kevin Robinson introduces the applicants.

**Applicant Comments:** Sarah Afflerbach from GO Architectural Design showed a video of the property as it exists at the time of the application. She talked about the history of porch enclosures on this house. The intent is to pour a foundation and replace the existing deck with an enclosed porch. The roof would be altered to fit over the new enclosed porch. Sarah Afflerbach also noted that the lot within the guidelines for lot coverage and that the material specifications are enclosed.

**Public Comment:** No public comments were made.

**Staff Recommendations:**

Staff submits the following Historic District Guidelines as appropriate to this application:

**New Construction and Additions:**

**Additions to Historic Buildings, pages 73-74, guidelines 1-6,8-10,14,16**

**Decks on Historic Buildings, Page 75, guideline 6**

**Statements of Reason,** based on the information contained in the application, Staff's judgment is:

1. The proposed enclosed porch is congruous with design guidelines in location, design and materials.

2. The proposed enclosure is in the tertiary AVC and will have little impact on the most visible, character defining features of the home.

**Staff suggests the Commission approve the application for major exterior alterations at this time citing the aforementioned guidelines.**

**Applicant Comments:** None

**Board Comments:** Commissioner Morrison asks why staff chose decks on historic buildings rather than exterior entrances or porches. Mr. Sceviour stated because the deck is on a historic building. Commissioner Morrison stated that in the new section you must also comply with all the guidelines in the historic section. Kevin Robinson stated that there was nothing in any of the sections that was incongruous. Commissioner Morrison agreed . Vice-Chair Eure commented on how the concerns with the roof from the design review were addressed adequately in the updated plans.

**Motion:** Commissioner Morrison makes a motion to find the application congruous with the Historic Preservation Guidelines, citing Section(s) 15-422-Certificate of Appropriateness required; Section 15-424-Review Criteria, citing the following guidelines: Additions to Historic Buildings, pages 73-74, guidelines 1-6,8-10,14,16; Exterior Entrances and Porches, page 36, guideline 8, 9, and 13. Statements of reason: The proposed enclosed porch is congruous with design guidelines in location, design and materials, and the proposed enclosure is in the tertiary AVC and will have little impact on the most visible, character defining features of the home. Commissioner Gray moved to issue a CoA seconded by Commissioner Miller. Motion passed unanimously.

**Public Comments:** None

C. **<u>237-243 Craven St.</u> (Chris Straight – GO Architectural Design)** multiple alterations including a garden wall, fence and gate in the primary and tertiary AVC, new exterior doors, patio pavers, covered seating area etc., as well as enclosing garage in the secondary AVC.

**Staff Comments:** Kevin Robinson introduced Mr. Straight and Sarah Afflerbach as his representative and outlined the project area. All three buildings involved are contributing structures.

**Applicant Comments:** Sarah Afflerbach showed an orientation video to the board of the project area. They are proposing to cover a portion of the outdoor space in between the main buildings. Also there would be a gate at the property line along the street. The covered area would be set back and there would still be the gap between the buildings so as somebody might walk along the street they would still experience Craven Street as it is now. A restaurant would go in the empty building on one side of the project site, and doors would be opened in both Confluence, the currently empty building and Prohibition. This would create an accessible outdoor space for both. The building along the back of the lot would be used as a commercial kitchen to service both Prohibition and the new restaurant. Sarah Afflerbach mentioned several other gates in town that are of a height similar to the proposed gate. Additionally a ramp would be installed alongside the proposed restaurant building for handicap access. The covered roof structure would attach to the rear wall and not put any weight on the side walls. There would be a gutter system along the roof that would run out into the street. Sarah Afflerbach stated she would like to use a festive light string that is currently not allowed but is similar to those found in other historic districts. Additionally the covered roof structure would have a Plexiglas screen along the front. Mr. Straight thanked everyone for their time and talked about the kind of inviting space he wants to bring to downtown.

**Staff Recommendations:**

Staff submitted the following Historic District Guidelines as appropriate to this application:

**<u>Exterior Changes to Historic Buildings:</u>**

**Windows and Doors, pages 26-30, guidelines 5(2); Exterior Entrances and Porches, pages 34-36, guidelines, 6,12,13; Accessibility and Life Safety, pages 45-46, guidelines, 3,4,5;**

**<u>New Construction and Additions:</u>**

**Commercial New Construction Placement of Structures, pages 57-58, guidelines, 1,4,5,6; Commercial New Construction Building Scale & Proportion page 59, guidelines, 2,4,7; Commercial New Construction Materials, pages 60-61, guidelines 1,4; Commercial New Construction Details, page 62, guidelines 1,2,5; Commercial New Construction Texture, page 63, guidelines, 1,2; Commercial New Construction Form and Rhythm, page 64, guidelines, 1,2,5;**

**Design Guidelines for Site and Setting:**

**Fences & Garden Walls, pages 82-83, guidelines, 4, 5, 6;**

**Statements of Reason,** based on the information contained in the application, Staff's judgment is:

1. Proposed new construction is congruous with design guidelines in location, design and materials.

2. The proposed fence height is not congruous with cited design guidelines, however it is in congruous with the style, placement and height of several other fences/walls in the commercial areas of downtown.

3. The proposed new exterior entrances and accessibility alterations are congruous with design, guidelines in location, design and materials.

**Staff suggests the Commission approve the application for major exterior alterations at this time citing the aforementioned guidelines.**

**Board Comments:** Chair Thompson asks about completeness. Commissioner Miller asks if there are all the property owners on board for this. Mr. Robinson says that they are. Commissioner Miller also asks why demolition is checked off on the application. Sarah Afflerbach states it was checked due to removing a portion of the masonry wall. Chair Thompson, asked if there are any zoning issues that would derail this project? Mr. Robinson stated the lighting is a minor issue, however the building code would have a substantial impact if they do not gain easements. Chair Thompson asks if there was a building in the empty space in the past 50 years. Mr. Robinson believes the garage in the back is an addition and doesn't know if there was something there before. Chair Thompson notes that the addressing of the two buildings in the historic register implies there may have been a structure in between. Commissioner Young asks if it's considered a permanent structure due to the difficulty of removing permanent structures with the guidelines. Sarah Afflerbach states it is somewhere in between but will be designed to remove easily in the future. Commissioner Morrison states that without the structure becoming 50 years old the demolition rules in the guidelines don't apply. Commissioner Morrison says that the best description for this structure he could find was a pavilion. He also notes that while other historic districts have approved pavilions he could not find mentions of them in their guidelines. He also notes that the structure in front of the convention center is essentially the same thing. He notes that the guidelines state that new

construction allows us to fill in gaps in the urban fabric and that he thinks it is a good idea that the guidelines support it. Chair Thompson notes windows and doors guidelines page 29 with regards to new openings in the primary AVC are not appropriate but that this is not in the primary AVC. Commissioner Gray agrees that the doors and windows are the biggest impact on the historic fabric and that could cause the biggest problems. Sarah Afflerbach states that it could just be bricked back up and also notes that the building was approved to be torn down completely in the past. Commissioner Miller states that doors and windows guideline 10 points us kind of toward the accessibility guidelines and wonders if we are following them. Commissioner Morrison states that the guideline dealing with adaptive reuse and accessibility retrofitting states that it should be done in the secondary and tertiary AVC which this does. Kevin Robinson states that we have done a number of accessibility projects and that they are usually in the secondary and tertiary AVC. Chair Thompson asks about the 7' fence and if it is justifiable under the accessibility and life safety guidelines. Commissioner Morrison says that the fence height is not unusual and also there is a night time security concern. Kevin Robinson states that the fence height guidelines lend themselves more towards the residential areas of the historic district. Commissioner Morrison asks if we recently approved a fence like this. Kevin Robinson says that the easement next to Wells Fargo bank has an 8' fence that was recently approved and that several other examples in the area exist. Vice-Chair Eure is uncomfortable with describing it as new construction and would much rather described it as an accessory structure. Commissioner Griffith concurs and brings up the issue of building a new building 20' back that doesn't come up with an accessory structure. Commissioner Walker finds more issues that aren't really concerned with HPC such as storm water runoff. Commissioner Miller asks why Vice-Chair Eure feels more comfortable describing it as an accessory structure. Vice-Chair Eure responds that an accessory structure is his description for anything that doesn't have a good description in the guidelines. Commissioner Morrison asks if the commercial new construction guidelines don't apply and only the ones for accessory structures because the commercial new construction section says structures and also provides a lot more guidance. Vice-Chair Eure says that the commercial new construction guidelines provide guidance to keep buildings at lot lines in areas where it is traditional to do so and so accessory structures guidelines get away from a lot of issues. Commissioner Young says that he feels more comfortable calling this an accessory structure also. Commissioner Miller asks if there is enough detail about the gate and fence and doors in the application. Kevin Robinson says that there should be pictures of the proposed doors and Sarah Afflerbach points out that they are in the second sheet. The commission asks about the Plexiglas and Sarah Afflerbach talks about taking it out of the design if the Plexiglas isn't well liked.

**Motion:** Commissioner Morrison moved to find the application congruous with the Historic Preservation Guidelines citing section 15-422 Certificate of Appropriateness required; section 15-424-Review Criteria, citing the following guidelines Exterior Changes to Historic Buildings Windows and Doors pages 26-30 guidelines 5 in the second section. Exterior Entrances and Porches pages 34-36 guidelines 6, 12 and 13. Accessibility and Life Safety pages 45-46 guidelines 1-5 New Constructions and Additions Commercial New Construction Placement of Structures pages 57-58 guidelines 1, 4-6 Commercial New Construction Building Scale and Proportion page 59 guidelines 2, 4, 7. Commercial New Construction Materials, pages 60-61

guidelines 1, 4. Commercial New Construction Details page 62 guidelines 1, 2, 5. Commercial New Construction Texture page 63 guidelines 1, 2 Commercial New Construction Form and Rhythm page 64 guidelines 1, 2, 5. Outbuildings and Accessory Structures page 84 guideline 5. Design Guidelines for Site and Setting Garden Fences and Walls pages 82-83 guidelines 4-6. Additionally Lighting page 89 guideline 6. Also citing the aforementioned statements of reason with the addition of the security purposes of the fence. The applicants should also come to staff for approval of outdoor refrigerator/freezer unit, and the condition that the Plexiglas will not be applied in the open eaves area. It should also be noted that while we can't define the structure in terms of the specific names in the guidelines it is not incongruous based on the guidelines referred to and other structures in the area. Additionally it should be noted that while it is not a temporary structure, it is an easily removed structure. Commissioner Young seconded the motion. The vote is8-1 with Commissioner Walker being the lone dissenter.

Commissioner Miller moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness, Commissioner Young seconded the motion. The vote is 8-1 with Commissioner Walker being the lone dissenter.

**Administrative Updates and Discussion:**

411 Johnson Street. Minor CoA for previously approved gutters and downspouts.
802 Pollock Street extended CoA.
No demolition by neglect updates this month but probably some next month.
Finner House is going to be getting off the demolition by neglect list.
Dryborough expansion of the downtown National District has a boundary fairly well figured out. A draft will be available in the next couple of months.
HPC ordinances passed the previous Tuesday.
There is a preservation conference in Atlanta coming up that there are scholarships are available for.

**Other Business:**

Chair Thompson and Commissioner Morrison are working on updating the rules of procedure. Vice Chair Eure, Commissioner Gray, and Chair Thompson are meeting the upcoming week to work on the new guidelines and the roll out for them.

**Public Comments:**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

Tim Thompson, Chairman

Kevin Robinson, AICP
City Planner