



46 **Motion:** Commissioner Morrison moved to find the application congruous with the guidelines citing  
47 section 15-422 (Certificate of Appropriateness acquired ), section 15-424 (review criteria) citing the  
48 following guidelines: Driveways page 88 items 1,2, and 8. Statement of reason is that the material is  
49 congruous with historic district guidelines. Commissioner Young seconded. Motion carried by  
50 unanimous vote.

51  
52 **B. 802 Pollock St. (David Stout)** to amend previously approved CoA to include concrete driveway  
53 instead of brick.

54  
55 Mr. David Stout stated that he would like to use concrete instead of brick for his driveway.  
56

57 **Public Comment:** None.

58  
59 **Staff Recommendation:** Mr. Robinson stated that according to the Guidelines on Driveways,  
60 pg. 88, guidelines 1, 2 and 8, the proposed material is congruous. Staff recommends approving  
61 the COA amendment.

62  
63 **Motion:** Commissioner Miller made a motion that the COA be found congruous with the historic  
64 district guidelines, specifically citing section 15-422 and 15-424 following guidelines Driveways  
65 page 88 numbers 1, 2 and 8. Statement of reason/findings of fact: It is congruous with materials  
66 allowable in the historic district and it is clearly stated that concrete is acceptable in the historic  
67 district guidelines. No second. Motion approved by unanimous vote.

68  
69 **Consideration of Applications:**

70  
71 **A. 218 Pollock St. (Joseph & Camile Klotz)** to include partial enclosure of an existing  
72 porch in the secondary AVC.

73  
74 **Staff Comments:** Staff Kevin Robinson introduced the application.

75  
76 Commissioner Miller stated that she is an adjacent property owner within 100' of the applicant  
77 and therefore must be recused. Commissioner Gray made a motion that Commissioner Miller be  
78 recused. Commissioner Griffith seconded. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

79  
80 **Applicant Comments:** Mr. Klotz presented photos and explained that he is requesting approval  
81 to partially enclose an existing side porch.

82  
83 **Public Comments:** None.

84  
85 **Staff Recommendations:** Staff Kevin Robinson reviewed recommendations and findings:  
86 **Staff submits the following Historic District Guidelines as appropriate to this application:**

87  
88 **Exterior Changes to Historic Buildings:**  
89 **Exterior Entrances and Porches, pages 34-36, guideline 7**

90

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

93  
94 The proposed enclosure is in the secondary AVC and is incongruous with design guidelines  
95 in location.

96  
97 Staff suggests the Commission deny the application for major exterior alterations at this time  
98 citing the aforementioned guidelines.

99  
100 Applicant stated that there are at least 4 other screened in porches within the Historic District in  
101 the secondary and primary AVC. The construction of the proposed is such that it is not attached  
102 to the house in anyway other than at the ceiling level and the floor level, so it doesn't interfere  
103 with any of the existing architecture.

104  
105 **Board Discussion:** Commissioner Young stated that he does not believe that the word enclosure  
106 in the guidelines encompasses screened in porches and stated that he would recommend  
107 approving the application. Commissioner Gray stated that she struggled with the notion of  
108 differentiating between enclosures and screened porches, however the guidelines do not  
109 distinguish between them. She stated her concern, should the board approve the COA, with the  
110 materials used for the door. Commissioner Morrison stated he shared the same concerns as  
111 Commissioner Gray.

112  
113 There was a lengthy discussion on whether or not screening in a space is technically an enclosure  
114 or not.

115  
116 **Motion:** Commissioner Morrison made a motion to find the application incongruous with the  
117 Historic District Guidelines citing section 15-422 & section 15-424 citing the following  
118 guideline, page 36 item number 7. Commissioner Gray seconded. Motion carried 5 yes and 1 no  
119 from Commissioner Young.

120  
121  
122 **B. 502 B Craven St. (Maurice D. Howland)** to include extension of existing driveway and  
123 construction of a shed in the secondary AVC.

124  
125 Commissioner Young stated that he is an adjacent property owner within 100' of the applicant  
126 and the former property owner, therefore he must be recused. Commissioner Gray made a  
127 motion that Commissioner Young be recused. Commissioner Miller seconded. Motion carried  
128 by unanimous vote.

129  
130 **Staff Comments:** Staff Kevin Robinson introduced the application

131  
132 **Applicant Comments:** Mr. Howland stated that he is requesting an extension of his existing  
133 driveway as well as construction of a small shed for the purpose of concealing unsightly trash  
134 cans. The shed will be made of the same cedar material as the house and painted to match the  
135 house.

136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180

**Public Comments:** None.

**Staff Recommendations:** Staff Kevin Robinson reviewed recommendations and findings:  
**Staff submits the following Historic District Guidelines as appropriate to this application:**

**Site & Setting:**  
**Driveways & Off-Street Parking, pages 87-88, guideline 5**

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

1. The proposed driveway extension is incongruous with design guidelines.

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

**Board Discussion:** The board discussed the guidelines and what is allowed. More than 50% of a back yard cannot be used for parking, however consideration could be given to a paved patio area for example. The applicant stated that his intent was never to use the area for parking vehicles, just for making it easier for ingress and egress of trash cans.

**Motion:** Commissioner Gray made a motion to continue the application until the next regular meeting. Commissioner Miller seconded. The motion carried by unanimous vote.

**Public Comments:** None

- C. **403 George St. (Craven County – Coastal Craftsmen)** to include replacement windows in the primary and secondary AVC.

**Staff Comments:** Staff Kevin Robinson introduced the application

**Applicant Comments:** None

**Public Comments:** None

**Staff Recommendations:** Staff Kevin Robinson reviewed recommendations and findings:  
**Staff submits the following Historic District Guidelines as appropriate to this application:**

**Exterior Changes to Historic Buildings:**  
**Windows & Doors, pages 26-30, guideline 4**

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

181 1. The proposed window replacement is congruous with design guidelines.

182  
183 Staff suggests the Commission approve the application for major exterior alterations at this time  
184 citing the aforementioned guidelines.

185  
186 **Board Discussion:** The board discussed how much of this was replacement in kind type work. It  
187 was observed that a lot of these windows are not original to the building. That being said the  
188 materials were less important because the historic fabric was already gone.

189  
190 **Motion:** Commissioner Eure made a motion to approve finding the application congruous with  
191 the Historic District Guidelines citing section 15-422 & section 15-424 citing the following  
192 guideline, page 28 guideline 4. Statements of reason: two of the sides are being replaced in kind,  
193 the windows on the west side are not original fabric and are being replaced with replacement  
194 windows, and the applicant has requested that the remainder return to a more historic appearance  
195 with sashes and how the lites are divided. We have photographic evidence that confirms their  
196 desire to do so. Commissioner Morrison seconded. Motion carried by unanimous vote.  
197 Commissioner Miller made a motion to issue a CoA. Commissioner Griffith seconded. Motion  
198 carried unanimously.

199  
200 **Public Comments:**

201  
202  
203 **Administrative Updates and Discussion:**

204  
205 Minor CoAs:  
206 314 Ave B Privacy fence in the tertiary AVC  
207 406 Hancock St privacy fence in the tertiary AVC  
208 201 Johnson St landscaping  
209 Bear Statue at Union Pt. Park

210 Demolition by neglect:  
211 402 Queen St – progressing on repairs 1118 N Craven Street Sadder Store - Mr. Robinson  
212 and Mr. Wilson have been working with Preservation Foundation representatives to determine if  
213 they might be given more time to get grant funding secured, and Mr. Wilson has required a letter  
214 from the engineer stating that the current preventative measures are sufficient to keep the  
215 building standing for another five to six months to hear about their grant application. Fees have  
216 been delayed until that time.

217 314 Ave. C - Chair Thompson suggested members view the house at 314 Avenue C (2  
218 doors from Maola) to determine if the HPC should petition the Building Inspector regarding  
219 demolition by neglect. It will be discussed at the next meeting. The house is currently under  
220 review by the Building Inspector for minimum housing code violations.

221  
222 Violations:  
223 323 Middle St Shed roof being re-installed

224  
225 Wilmington SHPO presentation on replacement materials & HPC meeting

226 -Wilmington less formal and meticulous  
227 -Board moves a lot more quickly

228  
229

230 There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

231 E. J. Thompson 17 JUN 15

232  
233 Tim Thompson, Chairman

234

[Signature] 6-18-15

Kevin Robinson, AICP  
City Planner