

45 Materials”, page(s) 68-69, guideline(s)#1, 3. Motion seconded by Commissioner Gray. Motion
46 passed unanimously.

47

48 **Statement(s) of Reason:** (1) The proposed alterations are congruous with the guidelines for
49 new construction.

50

51 **Condition(s):** Proposed Hardi-board will be smooth textured.

52

53 **Motion to extend the COA:** Commissioner Eure moved to extend the COA for another 12
54 month period, start date effective immediately, seconded by Commissioner Griffith. All
55 Commissioners voted in favor of the motion. Motion passed.

56

57 **2. Proposed major exterior alterations to 216 Middle St. (Michael Lentz) to include**
58 **replacement of windows in primary/tertiary AVC, install concrete slab and wood deck in**
59 **tertiary AVC.**

60

61 **Staff Comments:** Staff Kevin Robinson reviewed the project. Later he reviewed the Staff
62 Recommendations.

63

64 **Applicant Comments:** Applicant/owner Michael Lentz discussed his project. He noted that
65 with respect to replacement of some of the rear windows, because it was a replacement in-kind,
66 he has moved forward with this part of the project. He has decided to repair rather than replace
67 the original front windows.

68

69 **Public Comments:** NONE

70

71 **Discussion by the Commission:** Commissioner Gray disclosed that while the applicant is her
72 former son-in-law, as she has no financial interest in the project, she would abide by the
73 Commission’s wishes regarding recusing herself from the hearing. The Commissioners agreed
74 that her recusal was unnecessary. They discussed issues including the function and purpose of
75 the stack pipe beside one of the project windows, what would be painted as part of the project to
76 exclude masonry not already painted, nature of proposed wall at the rear of the structure, and
77 concerns of inaccuracies on the application regarding scale, window locations, deck height, etc.

78

79 **Condition(s):** Accurately scaled drawings submitted should address the scale and location of
80 cooler among other issues cited by the Commission. Chief Building Inspector Clark noted that
81 the project would require a survey plot plan.

82

83 **Motion:** Commissioner Parsons moved to table the project until the next regular meeting,
84 pending accurate drawings, seconded by Commissioner Morrison. All Commissioners voted in
85 favor of the motion. Motion passed.

86

87 **3. Proposed major exterior alterations to 505 Middle St. (Temple B’Nai Sholem) to include**
88 **replacement of column bases in primary AVC.**

89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132

Staff Comments: Staff Kevin Robinson reviewed the project. Later he reviewed the Staff Recommendations.

Applicant Comments: Applicant Bill Siegendorf addressed the Commission regarding the Temple’s project. He noted that he was aware that Staff is recommending denial of the use of composite material and proceeded to plead his case with the Commission. He noted that the avoidance of continual replacement of rotten wooden columns is his goal and that the composite replacement columns would match existing in appearance and design.

Public Comments: *Joe Klotz*, 218 Pollock Street, supports the application considering the request just involves the base of the columns and could therefore be considered “limited use” of synthetic material as allowed for by the guidelines.

Discussion by the Commission: The Commissioners concluded the application was in need of the Preservation Guidelines cited by the applicant to be included as evidence in the submitted application as well as signed statements from the experts cited in the application, but was nevertheless complete enough to move forward for consideration. They asked the applicant his desire: either to table until he can submit further evidence as requested by the Commission to aid his case, or to move forward with the hearing based on the current information provided. The Commissioners discussed issues including suggestions to better preserve the existing and future wooden bases, specifically increasing the proposed draining vent at the bottom of the column, the last date of column repair/replacement, the state of similar columns in the Historic Districts, references in the guidelines to use of synthetic material on columns, the structural challenges of creating a new air vent at the bottom of a load-bearing column, the manner by which the column is rotting (inside-out) as it relates to further ventilation needs, how the type of wood impacts preservation, the level of deterioration of these columns as opposed to other columns in New Bern, the fact that this area is a primary area of visual concern, and the need to consider the preservation guidelines submitted by the applicant in future revisions of the guidelines.

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: “Exterior Entrances and Porches”, page(s) 34-36, guideline(s)#1, 2, 4. Motion seconded by Commissioner Eure. Motion passed unanimously.

Statement(s) of Reason: (1) The materials proposed for replacement are not congruous with the guidelines and are inconsistent with the existing materials on this contributing structure.

Condition(s): NONE

4. Proposed major exterior alterations to 512 George St. (Earl Dion Hicks) to include removal of existing kitchen and construction of two story addition in tertiary AVC.

133 **Staff Comments:** Staff Kevin Robinson informed the Commission that this applicant has
134 requested to postpone this hearing until the next regular meeting.

135
136 **5. Proposed major exterior alterations to 217 Middle St. (John Watson) to include**
137 **installation of balcony and replacement of existing windows with doors in the primary**
138 **AVC.**

139
140 **Staff Comments:** Staff Kevin Robinson reviewed the project. Later he reviewed the Staff
141 Recommendations.

142
143 **Applicant Comments:** Applicant John Watson described the project and added additional
144 comments regarding the guidelines, page 50, guideline #7. He also previewed a future project.

145
146 **Public Comments:** NONE

147
148 **Discussion by the Commission:** The Commissioners discussed issues such as the definition of
149 a “new storefront”, the inappropriateness of adding conjectural or inaccurate features to the front
150 of a storefront, the inappropriateness to adding balconies on historic structures where no previous
151 documentation exists (guidelines, p 36, #10), the sensitivity of the primary AVC, the fact that
152 “balconies” can be congruous, but not on a building that has never had one. They also cited the
153 guidelines, pg 29, #10.

154
155 **Finding(s) of Fact:** Commissioner Parsons moved to find the application incongruous with the
156 Historic Preservation Guidelines, citing Section 15-427 Certificate of Appropriateness required;
157 Section 15-429 Review Criteria, citing the following guidelines: “Windows and Doors”, page(s)
158 29, guideline(s)#10, “Exterior Entrances and Porches”, page(s) 36, guideline(s)#10, and
159 “Historic Commercial Building Facades”, pages 49-51, guideline(s)#1,6. Motion seconded by
160 Commissioner Miller. Upon the discussion, Commissioner Parsons noted the applicant’s
161 beautiful work, but held that a balcony where none existed previous was incongruous with the
162 guidelines. Motion passed unanimously.

163
164 **Statement(s) of Reason:** The proposed alterations are in the primary AVC and represent an
165 architectural element that was not present historically on this contributing structure and is
166 incongruous with the guidelines.

167 **Condition(s):** NONE

168
169 **6. Proposed major exterior alterations to 1110 National Ave. (Emmit Giddings) to include**
170 **replacement of shingle/metal roof and removal of porch addition in tertiary AVC.**

171
172 **Staff Comments:** Staff Kevin Robinson reviewed the project. Later he reviewed the Staff
173 Recommendations.

174
175 **Applicant Comments:** The applicant gave a description of the project and showed some
176 pictures of existing conditions.

177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220

Public Comments: *Bill Moore*, 1116 National Avenue, stated that we was in favor of the project and the work being done on the house to improve it.

Discussion by the Commission: The Commissioners discussed issues including the definition of “variegated” shingle color, the mention of “darker palate” shingle colors in the guidelines, and a clarification of “three-tab” shingles.

Finding(s) of Fact: Commissioner Eure 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: “Roofs”, page(s) 17-20, guideline(s)#1, 5-6. Motion seconded by Commissioner Parsons. Motion passed unanimously.

Statement(s) of Reason: (1) The proposed alteration is congruous with the guidelines; (2) The existing porch is poorly constructed and not original to the house.

Condition(s): A darker palate of non-variegated shingles shall be used.

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

7. Proposed major exterior alterations to 317 Middle St. (C.R. Francis Architecture P.A.) to include replacement of damaged entry walk tile in primary AVC.

Staff Comments: Staff Kevin Robinson reviewed the project. Later he reviewed the Staff Recommendations.

Applicant Comments: Applicant/Architect Charles Francis described the project. He discussed the replacement tile options as the original tile is no longer manufactured. He passed around a proposed tile sample and withdrew his initial request for granite tile. He confirmed that concerns about accessibility issues will be dealt with.

Public Comments: NONE

Discussion by the Commission: The Commissioners discussed issues including the grout color.

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: “Historic Commercial Building Facades”, pages 49-51, guideline(s)#1,4. Motion seconded by Commissioner Eure. Motion passed unanimously.

Statement(s) of Reason: (1) Original tile entranceway has become heavily cracked due to deterioration of the foundation underneath; (2) Replacement-in-kind is necessary, however

221 similar replacement materials cannot be found; (3) proposed hexagonal option is consistent with
222 tile found throughout the commercial district during the era of historical significance of this
223 property.
224

225 **Condition(s):**

- 226 • Tiles used shall be one-inch porcelain hexagonal through-body tiles with gray grout to
227 match existing; and
- 228 • Applicant shall document original materials and salvage any existing materials in
229 reasonable shape for re-use elsewhere
230

231 **Motion:** Commissioner Miller moved to issue the COA, seconded by Commissioner Parsons.
232 All Commissioners voted in favor of the motion. Motion passed.
233

234 **8. Proposed major exterior alterations to 218 Pollock St. (Joseph Klotz) to include**
235 **installation of brick drive in primary and secondary AVC.**
236

237 **Staff Comments:** Staff Kevin Robinson reviewed the project. Later he reviewed the Staff
238 Recommendations.
239

240 **Applicant Comments:** Applicant/owner Joe Klotz discussed his project. He said he plans to
241 use reclaimed brick similar to the existing walkway for the proposed drive. The bricks will be
242 anchored in sand, not cement, so as to be removable.
243

244 **Public Comments:** NONE
245

246 **Discussion by the Commission:** Commissioner Miller asked to be recused as she is a property
247 owner within 100 feet. Commissioner Parsons moved and Commissioner Gray seconded that
248 Commissioner Miller be recused. Motion passed. The Commissioners discussed issues and
249 cautioned against the use of reclaimed brick that hasn't been made strong enough for walkways
250 and driveways.
251

252 **Finding(s) of Fact:** Commissioner Schaible moved to find the application congruous with the
253 Historic Preservation Guidelines, citing Section 15-427 Certificate of Appropriateness required;
254 Section 15-429 Review Criteria, citing the following guidelines: "Driveways and Off-Street
255 Parking", page(s) 87-88, guideline(s)#1-5, 8. Motion seconded by Commissioner Griffith.
256 Motion passed unanimously.
257

258 **Statement(s) of Reason:** (1) Driveway and walkway materials, location, and design are
259 congruous with the guidelines and within the District.
260

261 **Condition(s):** NONE
262

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

265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308

10. Proposed major exterior alterations to 222 Change St. (Tripp Eure) to include installation of storm drainage in secondary/tertiary AVC, and garden wall, fencing, screening of mechanical systems and enclosure of porch in tertiary AVC.

Staff Comments: Staff Kevin Robinson reviewed the project. Later he reviewed the Staff Recommendations.

Applicant Comments: Applicant/Architect Tripp Eure discussed his project. He brought a supplemental letter of clarification, discussed project locations and proposals.

Public Comments: NONE

Discussion by the Commission: Commissioner Eure was recused by unanimous approval of a motion to recuse by Commissioner Parsons, seconded by Commissioner Gray. The Commissioners concluded the application was complete. They discussed issues including the necessity of tree removal and a question by Chief Building Inspector Johnny Clark regarding whether the space is “conditioned” space that would need to meet “habitable” regulations.

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: “Fences and Garden Walls”, page(s) 82-83, guideline(s)#4-6; “Utilities”, page(s) 47-48, guideline(s)#1; “Landscaping”, page(s) 77-80, guideline(s)#1-5, 12; “Decks on Historic Buildings”, page(s) 75, guideline(s)#6; “Windows and Doors”, page(s) 27-30, guideline(s)#6; “Residential New Construction: Building Scale and Proportion”, page(s) 66, guideline(s)#2; “Residential New Construction: Details”, page(s) 70, guideline(s)#3-4; “Additions to Historic Buildings”, page(s) 73-74, guideline(s)#5; and “Exterior Entrances and Porches”, page(s) 34-36, guideline(s)#8 . Motion seconded by Commissioner Parsons. Motion passed unanimously.

Statement(s) of Reason: (1) The porch is a new addition and proposed alterations are congruous with the guidelines; (2) Proposed wall is an extension of an already existing features and is congruous in design and materials; (3) HVAC is elevated to meet flood plain requirements, and is appropriately located, plus screening, as proposed, is required; (4) All other proposed materials, design and location are congruous with the Historic District guidelines.

Condition(s): NONE

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

Other business

1. Demolition by Neglect updates

- a. 402 Queen Street: 10am hearing to amend existing order on 9/26/2013

