

**Minutes of The
New Bern Historic Preservation Commission
September 25, 2019 – 5:30 P.M.**

The New Bern Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) held its Regular Meeting on Wednesday, September 25, 2019, in the second-floor courtroom of City Hall, 300 Pollock Street.

Members Present: Tripp Eure III, Vice-Chair
James Bisbee
Peggy Broadway
Christian Evans
Dr. Joseph Klotz
Ellen Sheridan
James O. Woods, Jr.

Members Excused (E) / Absent (A): Dr. Ruth Cox, Chair (Excused)
George Brake (Excused)

Staff Present: Matthew Schelly, AICP, City Planner, Historic Preservation Administrator

Others Present: none

1. OPENING OF MEETING WITH ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chair Eure at 5:30 p.m. and roll call was taken by Staff Schelly. A quorum was present.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

No minutes were presented.

Vice-Chair Eure explained the HPC and the quasi-judicial hearing process and Staff Schelly swore in witnesses. The following is the oath that all witnesses took for presenting in front of the Board:

“Do you swear to tell the truth to the best of your knowledge?”

3. OLD BUSINESS

Consider applications for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following:

- A. **215 Pollock St.** – Continued from the previous meeting, to include a request to replace roofing damaged by time and Hurricane Florence. This is an after-the-fact COA.

Staff Comment

Staff Schelly provided a review of the application, stop work order, internal review documents, Historic Preservation District Guidelines excerpt, and staff photos. The existence of a staff recommendation was indicated.

Applicant Comment

Neither the applicant nor any official representative presented themselves.

Before beginning proceedings with this agenda item Commissioner Klotz asked to be recused from the Commission during these proceedings. **Commissioner Sheridan moved to recuse Commissioner Klotz, and it was seconded by Commissioner Woods. The motion passed unanimously.**

Public Comment

One member of the public spoke in favor of the application.

One member of the public inquired as to the nature of the issue.

Board Discussion

Referring to the staff photo of the roofing, Commissioner Woods, pointed out the roofing appears like it is corrugated, and that is not acceptable, according to the Guidelines. Commissioner Eure recited Guideline 4.5.4. Commissioner Bisbee asked for clarification that the “flush ridge” requirement speaks to the ridge cap and the installed roofing does include a ridge cap. Commissioner Eure clarified that the ridge cap is installed on top of the seam. Commissioner Eure also pointed out that the seams are not the required rolled seams. Commissioner Broadway inquired as to whether the applicant was aware of the meeting. Nobody could answer this.

Motion

Commissioner Woods moved to not issue a Certificate of Appropriateness and find the application Incongruous with New Bern’s Code of Ordinance sections 15.411 – 15.429 and New Bern’s Historic District Guidelines based on the following specific guidelines and findings of fact:

Roofs

4.5.4

Findings of Fact, based on the information contained in the application are:

1. The project is an after the fact approval.
2. The newly installed roof is not completely flat without corrugation.
3. The newly installed roof does not have flush ridge and hip flashings.
4. The proposed project is incongruous with the Guidelines, specifically 4.5.4 which states “Pans shall be completely flat without corrugation.” and “flush ridge and hip flashings” are to be provided.

Commissioner Bisbee seconded the motion.

Motion passed with none Opposed.

Commissioner Woods moved that Commissioner Klotz be allowed to rejoin the board.
Seconded by Commissioner Brake. Passed unanimously.

4. **NEW BUSINESS**

Consider applications for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following:

- A. **510 C Pollock St.** - to include installation of a fence, salvaged from a historic property, in a non-primary AVC.

Staff Comment

Staff Schelly provided a review of the application, staff photos, and internal review documents. The existence of a staff recommendation was indicated.

Applicant Comment

Rodney Hayes, representing the New Bern Garden Club, spoke as the applicant. She presented additional descriptive information and projected printed photos onto the screens.

Public Comment

Nobody spoke.

Staff Recommendation

Staff Schelly submitted the following Historic District Guidelines, Statements of Reason, and Recommendation as appropriate to this application:

Fences and Garden Walls

2.5.1, 2.5.2

Statements of Reason, based on the information contained in the application are:

1. The proposed project is within the non-primary Area of Visual Concern;
2. The fence is a historic fence similar to the fence at another location on the overall property;
3. The proposed project is not incongruous with guidelines.

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

Board Discussion

Vice-Chair Eure asked if the Commissioners have any questions for the applicant.

Vice-Chair Eure indicated, in view of the context of the proposal, and his familiarity with the existing fence on site, and the testimony that the proposed fence is the same as the existing fence, he is satisfied with an approval but with the condition that a photo of the proposed fencing be provided to staff for record keeping.

133 **Motion**

134 **Commissioner Woods** moved to find the application **Not Incongruous** with New Bern's
135 Code of Ordinance sections 15.411 – 15.429 and New Bern's Historic District Guidelines
136 based on the following specific guidelines and findings of fact:

137
138 **Fences and Garden Walls**

139 2.5.1, 2.5.2

140
141 **Findings of Fact** are:

- 142 1. The fence is a historic fence similar to the fence at another location on the
143 overall property;
144 2. The proposed project is not incongruous with guidelines;

145
146 **With the following Condition:**

147 A photo of the proposed fence is provided to Staff for record keeping.

148
149 **Commissioner Bisbee seconded the motion.**

150 **Motion passed** with none Opposed.

151 **Motion to issue the COA by Commissioner Klotz, seconded by Commissioner Wood**

152 **Motion passed** with none Opposed.

- 153
154 B. **209 Change St.** - to include changing the approval of a relocated door and frame to a new
155 door and frame in the tertiary AVC. This is an amendment to an existing COA.

156
157 **Staff Comment**

158 Staff Schelly provided a review of the application and staff illustration. The existence of
159 a staff recommendation was indicated.

160
161 **Applicant Comment**

162 Gary Peterson, representative for the applicant, spoke about the application.

163
164 **Public Comment**

165 Nobody spoke.

166
167 **Staff Recommendation**

168 Staff Schelly submitted the following Historic District Guidelines, Statements of Reason,
169 and Recommendation as appropriate to this application:

170
171 **Windows, Doors, and Openings**

172 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.3

173
174 **Statements of Reason**, based on the information contained in the application are:

- 175 1. The proposed project is within the Tertiary Area of Visual Concern;
176 2. The door includes true divided lites between panes;
177 3. The proposed project is not incongruous with guidelines;

179 **Staff recommends the Commission approve this amendment to the previous**
180 **CoA approval for major exterior alterations at this time, citing the**
181 **aforementioned guidelines.**
182

183 **Board Discussion**

184 No Discussion.
185

186 **Motion**

187 **Commissioner Klotz** moved to find the application **Not Incongruous** with New Bern's
188 Code of Ordinance sections 15.411 – 15.429 and New Bern's Historic District Guidelines
189 based on the following specific guidelines and findings of fact:
190

191 **Windows, Doors, and Openings**

192 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.3
193

194 **Findings of Fact are:**

- 195 1. The proposed project is within the Tertiary Area of Visual Concern;
196 2. The door includes true divided lites between panes;
197 3. The proposed project is not incongruous with guidelines;
198

199 **Commissioner Woods seconded the motion.**

200 **Motion passed** with none Opposed.

201 Vice-Chair Eure pointed out this was an amendment to a previously approved CoA, so no
202 new CoA is necessary.
203

- 204 C. **203 S. Front St.** - to include remodeling the rear portion of the building, the rear patio, and
205 rear lawn area of the Convention Center.
206

207 **Staff Comment**

208 Staff Schelly provided a review of the application, internal review forms, and staff
209 illustration. The existence of a staff recommendation was indicated.
210

211 **Applicant Comment**

212 David Griffin, representative for the applicant, spoke about the application with some
213 additional details.
214

215 **Public Comment**

216 Two members of the public spoke in favor of the application.
217

218 **Staff Recommendation**

219 Staff Schelly submitted the following Historic District Guidelines, Statements of Reason,
220 and Recommendation as appropriate to this application:
221

222 **Waterfront Modifications**

223 2.9.3, 2.9.4

224 **Design Principles**

3.1.5

Modifications

3.2.1, 3.2.2

Additions

3.3.3

Statements of Reason, based on the information contained in the application are:

1. The proposed project is within the Primary Area of Visual Concern;
2. The promenade is not diminished by the design and the design includes lighting that is not overly ornate;
3. The design does not attempt to create a false sense of historical development and the materials and design are compatible with the materials and design of the exiting building;
4. The proposed project is not incongruous with guidelines.

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

Board Discussion

Vice-Chair Eure requested a review of the drawings in the application at full screen so the Commissioners could see the inspiration photos. Mr. Griffin added explanations regarding the various plan elements and materials and fielded some questions about the use from the audience. Commissioner Bisbee asked Mr. Griffin to confirm the sculpture and bench will remain or be relocated back to their original location before the storm. Commissioner Klotz asked about landscaping. Mr. Griffin indicated the Landscape Plans will be finished this week and sent to Staff Schelly. Vice-Chair Eure suggested this submittal be a condition of approval. Commissioner Broadway asked about the settings for wind on the shade sails. Mr. Griffin indicated the Convention Center will be able to set the wind speed that would trigger retracting the sails. Commissioner Broadway asked about the structures for the shade sails.

Motion

Commissioner Woods moved to find the application **Not Incongruous** with New Bern's Code of Ordinance sections 15.411 – 15.429 and New Bern's Historic District Guidelines based on the following specific guidelines and findings of fact:

Waterfront Modifications

2.9.3, 2.9.4

Public & Open Spaces

2.2.1

Accessory Structures

2.6.3

Design Principles

3.1.5

Modifications

3.2.1, 3.2.2

271 **Additions**

272 3.3.3

273
274 **Findings of Fact are:**

- 275 1. The proposed project is within the Primary Area of Visual Concern;
276 2. The promenade is not diminished by the design and the design includes
277 lighting that is not overly ornate;
278 3. The design does not attempt to create a false sense of historical
279 development and the materials and design are compatible with the
280 materials and design of the existing building;
281 4. The proposed project is not incongruous with guidelines.
282

283 **With the following Condition:**

284 The applicant is to send a landscaping plan to staff for approval and record.
285

286 **Commissioner Bisbee seconded the motion.**

287 **Motion passed** with none Opposed.

288 **Motion to issue the COA by Commissioner Evans, seconded by Commissioner**
289 **Wood**

290 **Motion passed** with none Opposed.
291

- 292 D. **203 S. Front St.** - to include a new visual screen around the HVAC equipment for the
293 Convention Center.
294

295 **Staff Comment**

296 Staff Schelly provided a review of the application and internal review form. The existence
297 of a staff recommendation was indicated.
298

299 **Applicant Comment**

300 David Griffin, representative for the applicant, spoke about the application with some
301 additional details. He indicated they would prefer the artificial ivy option proposed, but
302 will accept the alternative.
303

304 **Public Comment**

305 One member of the public had one question unrelated to the application.
306

307 **Staff Recommendation**

308 Staff Schelly submitted the following Historic District Guidelines, Statements of Reason,
309 and Recommendation as appropriate to this application:
310

311 **Utilities**

312 2.3.1

313
314 **Statements of Reason**, based on the information contained in the application are:

- 315 1. The proposed project is within the Secondary Area of Visual Concern;

- 316 2. The proposed construction will screen the mechanical equipment from
317 public view;
318 3. The proposed project is not incongruous with the Guidelines;
319

320 **Staff recommends the Commission approve this application for major exterior**
321 **alterations at this time citing the aforementioned guidelines with the condition that**
322 **the option with the artificial ivy NOT be used.**
323

324 **Board Discussion**

325 Commissioner Evans asked about photos of plants to be used in front of the screen. Griffin
326 said he brought none. Commissioner Woods asked about photos of the paneling in the
327 alternative option. Griffin said he brought none; they are still figuring out an appropriate
328 material and, depending on the HPC decision, will provide an image of the material, which
329 will most likely be louvers. Commissioner Sheridan asked about the plantings dropping
330 leaves near the mechanical equipment. Griffin also mentioned the problem of leaves on
331 sidewalks. Commissioner Bisbee what the issue is with using plastic ivy. Vice-Chair Eure
332 explained he has two issues with it: it is a plastic fence, which is not allowed; and Guideline
333 5.5.4 for contemporary materials states that [potion omitted] “similar types of
334 contemporary materials that imitate historic materials are not appropriate in the district.”
335 Commissioner Bisbee asked if there seemed to be three options. Commissioner Sheridan
336 indicated she understood that one option was to soften the screening with live plants in the
337 ground. Commissioner Klotz stated he liked the idea of a solution with both a non-ivy
338 screen at the equipment and then plants in front of the screen to soften the screen. Griffin
339 mentioned there is already some planting in front of the existing screen. Commissioner
340 Woods said he is “a louver guy.” He then expressed concerns about vegetation that would
341 cover the area and grow as fast as it would need to grow and be evergreen. Commissioner
342 Broadway expressed the concern that allowing the artificial ivy could lead to other property
343 owners wanting to do the same.
344

345 **Motion**

346 **Commissioner Klotz** moved to find the application **Not Incongruous** with New Bern’s
347 Code of Ordinance sections 15.411 – 15.429 and New Bern’s Historic District Guidelines
348 based on the following specific guidelines and findings of fact:
349

350 **Utilities**

351 2.3.1

352 **Landscaping**

353 2.4.3, 2.4.4

354 **Modifications**

355 3.2.1
356

357 **Findings of Fact are:**

- 358 1. The proposed project is within the Secondary Area of Visual Concern.
359 2. The proposed project is not incongruous with the Guidelines.

360 3. Some combination of physical structure – metal or other material – to
361 screen the utilities combined with some form of landscaping to soften the
362 overall effect.
363

364 **With the following Condition:**

365 Plan be brought back to Staff for disposition; no artificial ivy shall be used; louvers
366 are to be used for screening at the utilities; landscaping is to be used to soften the
367 overall appearance and need not be as tall as the louvers, providing softening in
368 general.
369

370 **Commissioner Bisbee seconded the motion.**

371 **Motion passed** with none Opposed.

372 **Motion to issue the COA by Commissioner Evans, seconded by Commissioner**
373 **Bisbee**

374 **Motion passed** with none Opposed.
375

- 376 E. **211 King St.** – to include replacing a modern exterior French door with 2 new windows
377 on the Tertiary AVC and replacing a louvered wall surface with wood siding on the
378 Secondary AVC.
379

380 **Staff Comment**

381 Staff Schelly provided a review of the application, internal review form, and staff photos.
382 The existence of a staff recommendation was indicated.
383

384 **Applicant Comment**

385 John Audilet, representative for the applicant, spoke about the application with some
386 additional detail.
387

388 **Public Comment**

389 No comments.
390

391 **Staff Recommendation**

392 Staff Schelly submitted the following Historic District Guidelines, Statements of Reason,
393 and Recommendation as appropriate to this application:
394

395 **Modifications**

396 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.4

397 **Windows, Doors, and Openings**

398 4.3.1, 4.3.2
399

400 **Statements of Reason**, based on the information contained in the application are:

- 401 1. The proposed project is within the Secondary and Tertiary AVCs;
402 2. The proposed construction will replace incongruous elements with
403 congruous ones;
404 3. The proposed project is not incongruous with the Guidelines.
405

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

Board Discussion

None

Motion

Commissioner Woods moved to find the application **Not Incongruous** with New Bern's Code of Ordinance sections 15.411 – 15.429 and New Bern's Historic District Guidelines based on the following specific guidelines and findings of fact:

Modifications

3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.4

Windows, Doors, and Openings

4.3.1, 4.3.2

Findings of Fact are:

1. The proposed project is within the Secondary and Tertiary AVCs;
2. The proposed construction will replace incongruous elements with congruous ones;
3. The proposed project is not incongruous with the Guidelines.

Commissioner Sheridan seconded the motion.

Motion passed with none Opposed.

Motion to issue the COA by Commissioner Evans, seconded by Commissioner Bisbee

Motion passed with none Opposed.

Commissioner Bisbee left the meeting prior to the next item.

- F. **416 – 418 Broad St.** – to include infill construction of 8 new townhouse units in 2 new 3-story buildings; parking and internal garages to be located and accessed from the rear of the buildings.

Staff Comment

Staff Schelly provided a review of the application, internal review form, and staff photos. The existence of a staff recommendation was indicated. Schelly also indicated the changes to the façade design that were made as a result of the comments by the HPC members at the Design Review meeting.

Applicant Comment

Sarah Afflerbach, representative for the applicant, spoke about the application with some additional detail, emphasizing the desire to create a Federalist style building.

Public Comment

One member of the public had a few questions for the applicant regarding: the easement, roof access, sizes of the units, purchase of the units.

Staff Recommendation

Staff Schelly submitted the following Historic District Guidelines, Statements of Reason, and Recommendation as appropriate to this application:

Development Pattern

2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3

Utilities

2.3.1 through 2.3.7

Landscaping

2.4.3, 2.4.4

Parking

2.7.1 through 2.7.5

Design Principles

3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.4, 3.1.5

Infill Construction

3.4.1 through 3.4.4

Foundations

4.1.3

Windows, Doors, and Openings

4.3.1, 4.3.3

Entrances

4.4.3, 4.4.4

Roofs

4.5.1, 4.5.6

Masonry

5.1.4 through 5.1.6

Metals

5.3.3

Paint

5.4.2

Contemporary Materials

5.5.1 through 5.5.4, 5.5.6

Statements of Reason, based on the information contained in the application are:

1. The proposed project is a 3-story infill project on a block with one-, two-, and three-story buildings on both sides of the street;
2. The overall proportion and massing of the building along Broad Street is similar to the building at the SW corner of Broad and Middle Streets;
3. The proposed materials are congruous with the materials in the immediate area;
4. The Broad Street façade design needs more detail and other elements of visual interest;

- 496 5. The proposed project is mostly, but not entirely, not incongruous with the
497 Guidelines, however modifications according to the conditions indicated
498 below, would make it not incongruous.
499

500 **Staff recommends the Commission approve this application for major exterior**
501 **alterations at this time citing the aforementioned guidelines with the following**
502 **conditions:**

- 503 a. The buildings shall use details to articulate the façade and openings
504 within the façade. Consideration should be made from the discussion
505 in the Guidelines regarding articulating the base, middle, and top of
506 facades; the details that express but reinterpret traditional building
507 details.
508 b. The base, body, and edges of the facades shall be detailed to create
509 texture and visual interest.
510 c. Parking shall be screened from the remainder of the 409 Middle Street
511 (parking lot) property.
512

513 **Board Discussion**

514 Vice-Chair Eure requested the Commission develop a concurrence on the type of
515 development pattern for this site: either “dense fabric” or “tight weave.” Commissioner
516 Sheridan stated it is a “core” project. Commissioner Klotz indicated he considers the site
517 to be part of the tight weave pattern, referencing the Alison Platt design for Broad Street.
518 Commissioner Woods indicated he considers the site to be part of the dense fabric pattern
519 but will go with the majority. Commissioner Broadway asked the applicant about the
520 building setback and the setback for the Fireman’s Museum.
521

522 Commissioner Evans asked about the façade for the rear building. Commissioner
523 Broadway asked Commissioner Woods if he is more satisfied with the design. He stated
524 he is since the units are set back farther, it does not seem so massive, it blends better with
525 the Museum, and better window treatment.
526

527 Vice-Chair Eure guided further discussion by using the CoA Evaluation Worksheet. When
528 he reached the section on Scale, Mass, and Rhythm, he indicated the mass seemed fine to
529 him and the one-story building is really the outlier. Commissioner Evans added that the
530 detail of the rear building looks more appealing than other apartment buildings in town and
531 the façade of the front building is in keeping with the Museum and ties into Broad Street
532 and the downtown. Commissioner Klotz looks at this as a residential building on the 2-
533 story side of Broad Street. He also was previously concerned about the mass, but the
534 increased setback in the units had made a big difference. Ms. Afflerbach pointed to the St.
535 Luke’s and the Family Life Center on Broad Street, both of which are not in the downtown
536 core. Commissioner Klotz also considers that the blocks behind the project are primarily
537 residences. However, that said, he is more comfortable with the design since the changes
538 have been made. Ms. Afflerbach also pointed out that the entire block only has one house
539 on it.
540

Regarding rhythm, Commissioner Sheridan wrestled with the proportion of the balcony in the second story relative to the rest of the building, perhaps making the horizontal slightly stronger for that element.

Commissioner Woods asked for clarification of the slanted surfaces on the rooftop. Ms. Afflerbach indicated the slanted surface will be metal roofing. Other materials there will be Hardiboard siding and membrane roofing. The parapet is high enough so that no handrail will be needed.

Other materials on the building will be vinyl windows with 3D grills, aluminum railing, Fipon detailing over the windows on the front, ground faced concrete masonry that will give the appearance of a stone material, concrete walks, fiberglass doors, metal garage door on the back.

Commissioner Broadway asked about future owners building a gazebo on the roof. Ms. Afflerbach stated that any future structures on the roof would require HPC approval. Most anything up there would not be seen since the parapet wall is 36 inches higher than the roof.

Multiple persons had a discussion with reference to a screen or fence for the parking areas that are accessed over the easement. It was discovered that the new pavement on the easement would be a continuation of the pavement on the rest of the 400 Middle Street property. There is a landscaping area proposed for the area to the south of the easement.

Motion

Commissioner Woods moved to find the application **Not Incongruous** with New Bern's Code of Ordinance sections 15.411 – 15.429 and New Bern's Historic District Guidelines based on the following specific guidelines and findings of fact:

Development Pattern

2.1.1 through 2.1.3

Utilities

2.3.1 through 2.3.7

Landscaping

2.4.3, 2.4.4

Parking

2.7.1 through 2.7.5

Design Principles

3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.4, 3.1.5

Infill Construction

3.4.1 through 3.4.4

Foundations

4.1.3

Windows, Doors, and Openings

4.3.1, 4.3.3

Entrances

4.4.3, 4.4.4

Roofs

4.5.1, 4.5.6

Masonry

5.1.4 through 5.1.6

Metals

5.3.3

Paint

5.4.2

Contemporary Materials

5.5.1 through 5.5.4, 5.5.6

Findings of Fact:

1. The proposed project is a 3-story infill project on a block with one-, two-, and three-story buildings on both sides of the street;
2. The overall proportion and massing of the building along Broad Street is similar to the building at the SW corner of Broad and Middle Streets;
3. The proposed materials are congruous with the materials in the immediate area;
4. The proposed project is not incongruous with the Guidelines.

With the following Condition:

A landscaping plan be brought back to Staff for approval.

Commissioner Evans seconded the motion.

Motion passed with none Opposed.

Motion to issue the COA by Commissioner Evans, seconded by Commissioner Woods

Motion passed with none Opposed.

- G. **415 & 417 S. Front St.** – to include expansion of the rear deck, roof over the rear deck, and construction of a louvered fence in the Tertiary AVC.

Staff Comment

Staff Schelly provided a review of the application and authorization form for Sarah Afflerbach to represent the applicant. The existence of a staff recommendation was indicated.

Applicant Comment

Sarah Afflerbach, representative for the applicant, spoke about the application with some additional detail. Ms. Afflerbach stated that the louvers could be removed but probably will not be removed.

Public Comment

One member of the audience asked where the project was located.

633
634 **Staff Recommendation**

635 Staff Schelly submitted the following Historic District Guidelines, Statements of Reason,
636 and Recommendation as appropriate to this application:
637

638 **Accessory Structures**

639 2.6.1

640 **Decks and Patios**

641 4.6.2, 4.6.3

642 **Accessibility and Life Safety**

643 4.7.2
644

645 **Statements of Reason**, based on the information contained in the application, in
646 Staff's judgment are:
647

- 648 1. The primary structure is not a contributing resource in the district;
- 649 2. The proposed project is a deck that is disconnected from the structure;
- 650 3. The roof structure and louvered fence is to be constructed of wood;
- 651 4. The ramps are not in the Primary AVC;
- 652 5. The proposed project is not incongruous with the Guidelines.
653

654 **Staff recommends the Commission approve this application for major exterior**
655 **alterations at this time, citing the aforementioned guidelines.**
656

657 **Board Discussion**

658 Vice-Chair Eure pointed out that acoustical performance has nothing to do with the
659 Guidelines, the project is an accessory structure in a Tertiary area, and there are two types
660 of roofs: a flat sloped roof for the deck and a standing seam roof for the walkways to the
661 deck.
662

663 **Motion**

664 **Commissioner Sheridan** moved to find the application **Not Incongruous** with New
665 Bern's Code of Ordinance sections 15.411 – 15.429 and New Bern's Historic District
666 Guidelines based on the following specific guidelines and findings of fact:
667

668 **Accessory Structures**

669 2.6.1

670 **Roofs**

671 4.5.4

672 **Decks and Patios**

673 4.6.2, 4.6.3

674 **Accessibility and Life Safety**

675 4.7.2
676

677 Based on the following **Findings of Fact**:
678

1. The primary structure is not a contributing resource in the district;
2. The proposed project is a deck that is disconnected from the structure;
3. The roof structure and louvered fence is to be constructed of wood;
4. The ramps are not in the Primary AVC;
5. The proposed project is not incongruous with the Guidelines.

With the following Condition:

The metal roofing be installed according to the Guidelines.

Commissioner Klotz seconded the motion.

Motion passed with none Opposed.

Motion to issue the COA by Commissioner Klotz, seconded by Commissioner Woods

Motion passed with none Opposed.

- H. **311 Bern St.** – to include roofing replacement, front porch floor replacement, and landscaping removal, in the Primary AVC; siding repair in the Secondary AVC; and removal and enlargement of the rear porch in the Tertiary AVC. **Some of these are after-the-fact CoA items.** This was a Prevention of Demolition by Neglect property that was sold to this new owner.

Staff Comment

Staff Schelly provided a review of the application and former Prevention of Demolition by Neglect documents. The existence of a staff recommendation was indicated.

Applicant Comment

Katherin Askew, the owner, spoke about the application with some additional detail, including items finished, in progress, and planned, such as: black architectural asphalt roofing shingles, front porch decking will be 3-inch tongue & groove, considering a front picket fence, currently replacing the siding with the same German siding, and planning on enlarging the rear porch floor about 3 feet.

Public Comment

A next-door neighbor, Ms. Kingsbury, supports the project, and has a question about how to ensure fire safety of wood homes. Vice-Chair Eure answered that the Chief Building Inspector is familiar with this project, a Building Permit would be required, and they will be inspecting the project. He also explained what the Prevention of Demolition by Neglect process entails.

Board Discussion

Vice-Chair Eure pointed out that the height and design of the fence is still undetermined and suggested a condition of approval include that the fence design come back to staff.

Staff Recommendation

Staff Schelly submitted the following Historic District Guidelines, Statements of Reason, and Recommendation as appropriate to this application:

725
726 **Modifications**

727 3.2.1 through 3.2.5

728 **Walls, Trim, and Ornamentation**

729 4.2.1, 4.2.2

730 **Entrances**

731 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.4

732 **Roofs**

733 4.5.1, 4.5.2, 4.5.3

734 **Wood**

735 5.2.1, 5.2.2

736 **Paint**

737 5.4.1 through 5.4.4, 5.4.9

738
739 **Statements of Reason**, based on the information contained in the application, in
740 Staff's judgment are:

- 741
742 1. The project elements are located in the Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary
743 AVCs.
744 2. The alterations done and proposed adhere to the aforementioned guidelines.
745 3. The proposed project is not incongruous with the Guidelines.

746
747 **Staff recommends the Commission approve this application for major**
748 **exterior alterations at this time, citing the aforementioned guidelines.**
749

750 **Motion**

751 **Commissioner Wood** moved to find the application **Not Incongruous** with New Bern's
752 Code of Ordinance sections 15.411 – 15.429 and New Bern's Historic District Guidelines
753 based on the following specific guidelines and findings of fact:

754
755 **Fences**

756 2.5.1, 2.5.2

757 **Modifications**

758 3.2.1 through 3.2.5

759 **Walls, Trim, and Ornamentation**

760 4.2.1, 4.2.2

761 **Entrances**

762 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.4

763 **Roofs**

764 4.5.1, through 4.5.3

765 **Wood**

766 5.2.1, 5.2.2

767 **Paint**

768 5.4.1 through 5.4.4, 5.4.9
769

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

- 772
- 773 1. The project elements are located in the Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary
 - 774 AVCs.
 - 775 2. The alterations done and proposed adhere to the aforementioned guidelines.
 - 776 3. The proposed project is not incongruous with the Guidelines.
- 777

778 **With the following Condition:**

779 The proposed fencing and photos of nearby fencing be submitted to the Staff for
780 their approval.

781

782 **Commissioner Klotz seconded the motion.**

783 **Motion passed** with none Opposed.

784 **Motion to issue the COA by Commissioner Evans, seconded by Commissioner**
785 **Broadway**

786 **Motion passed** with none Opposed.

787

- 788 I. **202 Johnson St.** – to include construction of a new carport over an existing driveway in
789 the Secondary AVC.
- 790

791 **Staff Comment**

792 Staff Schelly provided a review of the application and the authorization form for Sarah
793 Afflerbach to represent the owner. The existence of a staff recommendation was indicated.

794

795 **Applicant Comment**

796 Tabatha Catz, the owner, and Sarah Afflerbach spoke about the application with some
797 additional detail, including descriptions of the existing and proposed roofs.

798

799 **Public Comment**

800 John Phaup, of Johnson St., has no objection to a carport, but is concerned it could be
801 blown away. Sarah Afflerbach indicated the plans would be approved and built to code,
802 and Ms. Catz indicated the construction would be done by a professional contractor.

803

804 **Board Discussion**

805 Commissioner Evans asked that the roofing material be specified. The applicant
806 responded that it would be a standing seam roof.

807

808 **Staff Recommendation**

809 Staff Schelly submitted the following Historic District Guidelines, Statements of Reason,
810 and Recommendation as appropriate to this application:

811

812 **Accessory Structures**

813 2.6.1, 2.6.2

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

- 816 1. The project is located in the Secondary AVC.
817 2. The design adheres to the aforementioned guidelines.
818 3. The proposed project is not incongruous with the Guidelines.
819

820 **Staff recommends the Commission approve this application for major**
821 **exterior alterations at this time, citing the aforementioned guidelines.**
822

823 **Motion**

824 **Commissioner Evans** moved to find the application **Not Incongruous** with New Bern's
825 Code of Ordinance sections 15.411 – 15.429 and New Bern's Historic District Guidelines
826 based on the following specific guidelines and findings of fact:
827

828 **Accessory Structures**
829 2.6.1, 2.6.2
830

831 **Findings of Fact are:**

- 832 1. The project is located in the Secondary AVC.
833 2. The design adheres to the aforementioned guidelines.
834 3. The proposed project is not incongruous with the Guidelines.
835

836 **Commissioner Woods seconded the motion.**

837 **Motion passed** with none Opposed.

838 **Motion to issue the COA by Commissioner Klotz, seconded by Commissioner**
839 **Woods**

840 **Motion passed** with none Opposed.
841
842

843 **5. ADMINISTRATIVE UPDATES AND MINOR WORKS**
844

845 A. **514 Broad St.** – HVAC mini-split lines
846

847 B. **214 Pollock St.** – siding replacement in-kind
848

849 C. **Tree removals** –
850

- 851 i. 520 & 519 New St – permitted and removed
852 ii. 219 Hancock St. – permitted, not yet removed
853 iii. 403 Queen St. – dead, removed without permit
854 iv. 3 other inquiries

855 D. **Trent Court Removal from Local Historic District** – to be submitted to HPC at next
856 Regular Meeting in October
857

858 E. Comments about getting files to the HPC members
859

860 6. DEMOLITION BY NEGLECT UPDATES

861
862 None at this time.

863
864 7. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENTS

865
866 There was no further public comment at this time.

867
868 8. ADJOURN

869
870 With nothing further to discuss Vice-Chair Eure entertained a motion to adjourn.
871 Commissioner Klotz made the motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Woods. The
872 motion passed unanimously.

873
874 The meeting was adjourned at 8:48 p.m.

875
876
877
878
879

880 Dr. Ruth Cox, Chair or
881 Tripp Eure, Vice Chair
882

875
876
877
878
879

880 Matthew Schelly, AICP
881
882