

**TOWN OF BEAUFORT
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
August 4, 2009 REGULAR MEETING
TRAIN DEPOT, 6:00 P.M.**

The Town of Beaufort Historic Preservation Commission held their regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, August 4, 2009, at 6:00 p.m. in the Train Depot at 614 Broad Street, Beaufort, N.C.

Board Members Present:

Mamre Wilson, Chairperson
Dan Krauthaim, Vice-Chairman
Wendy Davidson
Les Sadler
Gerharda Sanchez

Staff Members Present:

Kyle Garner, Town Planner
Debbie Graham, Admin. Support Assistant

Board Members Absent:

Fred McCune
Marnie Park

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Wilson called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

II. AGENDA APPROVAL

Member Sadler moved for the agenda to be approved as presented. Member Sanchez seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous.

III. MINUTES APPROVAL

Chairman Wilson stated she had given corrections to the Town Clerk via email. Member Sanchez moved for the minutes of the July 7, 2009 meeting be approved with corrections. Member Sadler seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous.

IV. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Wilson asked all those in attendance to join in the Pledge of Allegiance.

V. PUBLIC HEARING

Proposed Text Amendment to the HPC Guidelines 7.2.5 in which there is a scrivener's error needing correction. The word "incongruous" needs to be changed to "congruous."

Chairman Wilson read the background information provided on the Board Action Request sheet verbatim. The proposed language change to Section 7.2.5 Building Height/Scale on page 98 should read as follows:

7.2.5 If a contributing building was demolished or moved from the site, design the replacement building to be of similar height, scale, massing, and location as the previously existing building. Applications will have a heavy burden to demonstrate to the HPC that a replacement structure

with different height, scale, and massing as the previously existing building is *congruous* with the Historic District.

Chairman Wilson opened the Public Hearing for comments. With there being no comments, Chairman Wilson closed the Public Hearing.

Kyle Garner, Town Planner, pointed out that on the Board Action Request form, it states that a recommendation be made to the Board of Commissioners. That is an error as it goes no further than the HPC.

The members had some discussion regarding being sworn in for the discussion. Mr. Garner said that the members do not need to be sworn in for this as this is a typical item for consideration with a motion, a second, and then the discussion.

Member Krautheim made the motion to approve the Text Amendment. Member Sadler seconded the motion and the vote to approve the Text Amendment was unanimous.

Mr. Garner pointed out that each Commissioner should make this change in his or her guideline. Member Sadler requested that a separate page be made to list the changes made in the guideline book with referenced date of change.

V. ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS

Chairman Wilson explained the Historic Commission is a quasi-judicial body, which requires anyone presenting testimony to be under oath. Town Planner, Kyle Garner, administered the oath to the Commission members and anyone wishing to speak on any applications to be heard during the meeting.

Chairman Wilson entered the following documents into the record: (1) the Beaufort National Historic District Survey compiled by Ruth Little, 1997; (2) Beaufort, An Album of Memories by Jack Dudley; (3) the Beaufort Historic District Guidelines; (4) the Town of Beaufort Zoning Ordinance; (5) NC Building Code Chapter 34, Section 3407-1 on Historic Buildings; and (6) the Town of Beaufort Strategic Approach for Growth (Adopted 10/11/1999).

VI. ITEMS OF CONSIDERATION

1. Scott Hobgood – 304 Orange Street

Chairman Wilson opened the hearing.

Scott Hobgood was present at the meeting to answer questions regarding the application. Mr. Hobgood informed the members that the current homeowners, Walt Silva and Laura Benson, would like to add a dormer on the back of the existing garage building. He said that there was a minor situation in which the plan had to be revised from the information the members have in their packets. He said that the application was for a 23' roof but would need to be 32' because of the relocation of a load bearing wall. He said this would go across the entire length of the back of the garage and that one more window would be added to the roof. He approached the members and gave them new copies of the roof drawings.

Chairman Wilson asked Town Planner, Kyle Garner, if it was permissible at this point to make this adjustment in the roof plan. Mr. Garner stated that it was up to the Commission members to determine if

this adjustment is relevant to the application submitted. The members felt that it was acceptable to proceed.

Mr. Hobgood went on to explain the revision and let the Commission members know that all siding and trim would match the existing home; all windows would match the existing home; all roof shingles will match the existing home; and all paint and trim will match the existing home.

Member Sadler wanted to know if the homeowner or Mr. Hobgood had received approval from the Preservation NC for the addition. Mr. Hobgood said that he was unaware they needed the Preservation's approval. Member Sadler said the reasoning behind this is because the home was sold and the Preservation NC put a protective order on the home.

Patty Sigman, who resides at 310 Orange Street, is two doors to the north of this property. She said that she is here on behalf of the homeowner and the contractor. She said that she feels that the addition to the garage will be congruous with the existing neighborhood and supports this project wholeheartedly.

Chairman Wilson closed the hearing.

Chairman Wilson thought this was a great idea and would be more storage for the homeowner. She pointed out that the addition is not visible from Orange Street and that it would be difficult to see from Broad Street.

Member Krautheim had a question for Mr. Hobgood regarding the door and window on the plan. Mr. Hobgood explained that on the original drawing submitted, he did not draw the entire building. He said the new plan shows the existing door and the existing window for the bedroom and this is the difference.

Member Krautheim made the motion to approve the application for 304 Orange Street. Member Sanchez seconded the motion and all members were in favor.

Member Sanchez moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the roof addition at 304 Orange Street and Member Davidson seconded the motion based upon the following findings of fact:

1. Guideline 7.8.1 (pg. 102)—Additions to Historic Buildings Guidelines:

Where possible, locate new additions at the side or rear so that they have a minimal impact of the façade and other primary elevation of the affected building or adjacent properties.

2. Guideline 7.8.2 (pg. 102):

The overall proportions of a new addition should be compatible with the existing building in height, scale, size, and massing so as not to overpower it visually. A new addition should never be taller or wider than the original structure unless required by code or a non-aesthetic functional requirement. Observe the principal of "additive massing" where the original structure remains dominant and the additions are adjoining and smaller masses.

3. Guideline 7.8.3 (pg. 102):

The design elements of a new addition should be compatible with the existing building in terms of materials, style, colors, roof forms, massing proportion and spacing of doors and windows, details, surface, texture, and location. Contemporary adaptations of the original which clearly look like an addition and reflect the period of construction are encouraged.

Member Sanchez said she did not think that Guideline 7.8.4 applied in this situation.

4. Guideline 7.8.7 (pg. 102):

Rooflines of new additions should be similar in form pitch, and eave height to the roofline of the original building.

Member Sanchez added that her reason for approving the COA is the overwhelming evidence is that it is congruous with the existing structure. The vote for the Certificate of Appropriateness for the roof addition at 304 Orange Street passed unanimously.

Mr. Garner asked the Chairman if the applicant would need to wait for information from the Preservation NC before proceeding with the addition. Member Sadler said there is nothing in the guidelines to say that it was necessary nor was it necessary for the Town to police the Preservation's guidelines.

Chairman Wilson stated that they would receive the Certificate of Appropriateness within two weeks.

2. 412 Front Street – Jack Best - Signage

Chairman Wilson opened the hearing.

Member Davidson recused herself from the discussion of this application.

Jack Best and Wendy Davidson were present at the meeting to answer questions regarding the application. Mr. Best stated the sign is for his business located at 412 Front Street. Ms. Davidson said they are requesting two signs for two different sides of the building. She said there is a minor change in that the temporary sign has the phone number outside of the border, but the actual sign will have the phone number within the border as the illustration shows. She said the signs would have a white background, black lettering, and a black border. She said the signs are 6.25 square feet and will be flush mounted. The signs will be made of MDO signboard and painted. She said one would be installed on the side of the building on the boardwalk side and the other on the side of the building next to the door as there is no architectural feature known as a signboard frieze.

Chairman Wilson wanted to know if the signs would be located where the temporary signs are now located and Ms. Davidson replied that is correct.

Member Krautheim wanted to know about the three signs that he couldn't read on the photograph under the second floor set of windows and wanted to know if they were for First Horizon and Mystery Tours. Mr. Best said that there are three signs there, one for Mystery Tours, one for Home Mortgage, and one for Indigo Sky. Member Krautheim wanted to know if those businesses occupy the same building as Mr. Best. Mr. Best said that they are and that two of the businesses are upstairs and one is downstairs.

Ms. Davidson said that she is looking at the Signage information from the BHPC Guidelines, page 118, and in the first paragraph, second sentence, it reads "Signs are used to help identify businesses ... and provide direction and orientation to the traveler." She went on to read in the second paragraph, "For commercial building with a traditional storefront treatment, place signs in the designated signboard frieze above display windows." She said that since that particular architectural feature does not exist on the side of the building, the wording from the first paragraph best accommodates the placement of the signs on the building for the traveler to identify and provide direction, but most of all, to orient them to the location of the business as it serves no purpose for the sign to be with the other signs for the upstairs businesses.

Member Krautheim asked if the door services all the businesses in the back (of the building). Mr. Best said that the ramp door accesses all the businesses including the stairwell, but from the dock, the door goes directly into his business.

Being that there were no more questions or comments, Chairman Wilson closed the public hearing.

Member Krautheim wanted to get his bearings regarding the placement of doors on the building. Chairman Wilson said that there is no door on the front of the building, just on the back and the ramp is on the side.

Member Krautheim made a motion to accept the application based on the finding of fact including:

1. Guideline 8.6.1 (pg. 119)—Signage Guidelines:

Use traditional materials found in the district, such as wood and metal for new signage. Substitute materials that have the appearance of wood are allowed. Plastic signs, flashing signs, or portable mobile signs, except those listed in item 9, are not allowed in the historic district. Interior neon signs larger than 10' x 18' that are located within five (5) feet of a window or glass door on an exterior wall and are so placed as not to be seen from the outside are not allowed.

2. Guideline 8.6.2 (pg. 119)—Signage Guidelines:

Place signs so that they do not visually overwhelm the building or streetscape or damage or obscure character designing architectural details. Recognize that maximum signage allowances granted by the Beaufort Zoning Ordinance may be inappropriate in the context of the building or site under review.

4. Guideline 8.6.4 (pg. 119)—Signage Guidelines:

Neon colors or fluorescent colors on signs are not allowed.

5. Guideline 8.6.5 (pg. 119)—Signage Guidelines:

Use simple, clear graphics and lettering styles in sign design.

Member Sadler seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous to accept the application with four members in favor and Member Davidson abstaining.

Member Sanchez moved to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the two new signs at 412 Front Street. Member Sadler seconded the motion with four members in favor and Member Davidson abstaining.

Chairman Wilson stated that they would receive the Certificate of Appropriateness within two weeks.

3. Danny Batten – 125 Craven Street - Signage

Chairman Wilson opened the hearing.

Danny Batten was present at the meeting to answer questions regarding the application. Mr. Batten said that the application is for a freestanding sign at his business at 125 Craven Street. He said he had turned in two applications, and that he is requesting a sign in the middle of the two existing posts. Chairman Wilson wanted to know if he had received approval from the Board of Adjustment and Mr. Batten responded that he had.

Mr. Batten explained that the sign is a high density epoxy sign, sandblasted to look like wood, only lighter (in weight). He said that the sign posts themselves are somewhere between 32” and 34” apart and that he wanted to order a 33” sign and router the edges to make it fit. Mr. Batten stated that the colors of the sign are somewhat like the illustration provided, dark blue in the middle with lighter blue on the outside and that the round part of the outside has a metal border on it.

Chairman Wilson closed the hearing.

Member Krautheim said he was glad that the Board of Adjustments had approved the application. Member Sanchez said that she spoke at the meeting in favor of the sign.

Member Sanchez moved to approve the application for the freestanding sign. Member Sadler seconded the motion with a proviso to add to the fact of findings, Guideline 8.6.7.

1. Guideline 8.6.1 (pg. 119)—Signage Guidelines:

Use traditional materials found in the district, such as wood and metal for new signage. Substitute materials that have the appearance of wood are allowed. Plastic signs, flashing signs, or portable mobile signs, except those listed in item 9, are not allowed in the historic district. Interior neon signs larger than 10’ x 18’ that are located within five (5) feet of a window or glass door on an exterior wall and are so placed as not to be seen from the outside are not allowed.

2. Guideline 8.6.2 (pg. 119)—Signage Guidelines:

Place signs so that they do not visually overwhelm the building or streetscape or damage or obscure character defining architectural details. Recognize that maximum signage allowances granted by the Beaufort Zoning Ordinance may be inappropriate in the context of the building or site under review.

3. Guideline 8.6.4 (pg. 119)—Signage Guidelines:

Neon colors or fluorescent colors on signs are not allowed.

4. Guideline 8.6.7 (pg. 119)—Signage Guidelines:

Freestanding signs must be low-mounted and must not obscure pedestrian views. No more than one (1) freestanding sign shall be allowed per street frontage. Freestanding pole supports should be simple and unobtrusive in design.

Member Sadler requested that Mr. Batten keep the “One World Shop” banner portion of the sign below eye level.

Member Krautheim moved to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the freestanding sign at 125 Craven Street. Member Davidson seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous to approve the sign.

Chairman Wilson said that the Certificate of Appropriateness would come within two weeks.

VII. BOARD AND STAFF COMMENTS

Chairman Wilson wanted to thank Mr. Garner for getting the Rules of Procedures out to the members. She said that under Section 2.0, they need to add procedures for revision of the HPC Guidelines, and add procedures for Town Ordinances which may be in conflict with the HPC Guidelines. Mr. Garner stated

that he wanted everyone to receive a copy of the Rules of Procedures and that it would be an agenda item for next month's BHPC meeting.

Chairman Wilson said that she hopes that everyone reads the Rules of Procedures to see if there are any to adjust. She said that Member Sadler went over this last year and made changes and that she went through this and made changes and that is why both of their names are on it. She said that this was last updated in June 2008. Member Sadler suggested that members go to the website and print out a copy of the *Handbook for Historic Preservations Commissions in North Carolina*, a joint publication by the Preservation NC and Hope Shipp. He said that this is where most of the Rules of Procedures originated.

Chairman Wilson wanted to make sure that all members have a copy of the Town of Beaufort Ordinances. She stated that items have come up recently in which the Town Ordinance say one thing and the BHPC Guidelines say something else. A good example of this is that temporary signs are allowed in the Historic Downtown area for 30 days as per the Ordinance. The Ordinance is available on the Town's website.

A discussion was held regarding potential covenants on homes in Beaufort in lieu of the home on Orange Street discussed earlier. It was stated that the reason the house on Orange Street has the covenant was because it is a historic home and it was placed on the Preservation NC list to protect it. Another home in Beaufort was sighted as being a potential candidate for a covenant because the family at one time had planned to demolish the home. Member Sadler said that he would approach the family and speak to them about this issue.

Kyle Garner, Town Planner, said included in the items before the HPC next month, will be the Historic Board conference to be held in New Bern in late October. He said the plan is to get some registration information to members and to see how many might be interested in attending.

Mr. Garner also wanted to know who from the HPC would be joining members of the Planning Board in the subcommittee to study the signs in Beaufort. Chairman Wilson informed him that Member Sanchez and Member Sadler would be on the subcommittee.

A discussion was held in reference to allowing members of the other boards to attend the upcoming Historic Board conference. Members thought it would be helpful if possibly the chairs of the Planning Board and Board of Adjustment could attend. Mr. Garner thought a better idea was to challenge the HPC to hold a joint collaborative meeting in early 2010 to share information from the conference and other ideas with these boards.

A discussion was held on minor work housing projects. The first item was a commercial building on Front Street in which the stucco was replaced with the same texture and same color as the existing stucco.

A second item, the Hines house of 110 Ann Street, was also discussed. Mr. Garner informed members that the homeowner has decided not to demolish the structure but wants to replace damaged siding with hardiboard with the same white color as the existing siding. They will also be changing out the HVAC system with a fan outside and the HPC considered all of this as minor work. Mr. Garner stated that the Ann Street homeowner would be back before this board with the issue of replacing roof shingles as there are three different colors and three different types currently on the house.

The last minor work item is 116 Orange Street. The homeowner has sent a letter requesting to repair a stucco wall and two concrete pillars outside her home. The letter states that the material used will be the same color and finish as the existing. The members agreed that this is minor work for this project.

Another issue was brought up about the home at 116 Orange Street regarding the new fence the homeowner had installed. Apparently the pickets are on the homeowner's side of the property and the stringers are on the side of the adjoining neighbor. Member Krautheim said that this was done purposely as there is an agreement between the homeowner and the adjoining neighbor.

Lastly, a discussion was held regarding siding being a minor work. Member Sadler had a problem with this as the Guidelines specify what is considered a minor work and replacing siding is not on that list. Chairman Wilson said that what makes this a minor work is that they are only replacing damaged boards with hardiboard. Member Krautheim said that hardiboard won't match what is in place as it is 1/2" thick and the siding is 3/4" thick. Chairman Wilson said that all members were contacted and approved of this as minor work with Member Sadler being the only objector.

Lastly Mr. Garner asked that all members keep Mrs. Parks in their thoughts and prayers as Mr. Parks is not doing well. Chairman Wilson explained that hospice has come in to help the family.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Member Krautheim moved for the meeting to be adjourned. Chairman Wilson seconded the motion with all members being in favor. The meeting was closed at 7:10 p.m.

Mamre Wilson, Chairman

Debbie Graham, Administrative Support Specialist