

**THE TOWN OF BEAUFORT
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
February 3, 2009**

The Town of Beaufort Historic Preservation Commission held a special meeting on Tuesday, February 3, 2009 at 6:00 p.m. in the Train Depot at 614 Broad Street, Beaufort, NC. Chairman Mamre Wilson presided.

Board Members Present:

Mamre Wilson, Chairman
Dan Krautheim, Member
Marnie Park
Les Sadler
Gerharda Sanchez
Wendy Davidson
Fred McCune

Staff Present:

Nathan Rhue, Code Enforcement Officer
Laura Babcock, Deputy Town Clerk

I. CALL TO ORDER.

Chairman Wilson called the meeting to order.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

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

III. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN.

Member Sadler nominated former Chairman Wilson to remain as Chairman. Member Krautheim seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

Member Park nominated Member Krautheim to remain as Member Krautheim. Member Davidson seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

IV. AGENDA APPROVAL.

Chairman Wilson introduced the Commission and Nathan Rhue, Code Enforcement Officer and Deputy Town Clerk, Laura Babcock.

Member Park moved that the agenda be approved as presented. Member Krautheim seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES .

Member Sanchez moved that the commission approve the minutes with the recommended changes. Member Davidson seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

VI. ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS.

Chairman Wilson explained that the Historic Commission is a quasi-judicial body, which requires anyone presenting testimony to be under oath. Deputy Town Clerk Laura Babcock 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; (2) Beaufort, An Album of Memories by Jack Dudley; (3) the Beaufort Historic District Guidelines; (4) the Town's Zoning Ordinance; (5) NC Building Code, Chapter 34, Section 3407-1 on Historic Buildings; and (6) the Town of Beaufort's Strategic Approach for Growth (Adopted 10/11/1999).

VII. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION.

1. Richard Mountcastle/Gerry Sadler-300 Ann Street.

Chairman Wilson opened the hearing.

Mr. Sadler suggested that presentation be presented page by page of proposed work:

Roof:

Mr. Sadler proposed to replace the existing asbestos and wood shake shingles; he stated that "Dusk Grey" Lamarite slate composite shingles were proposed yet the applicant is requested that a GAF CamelLock fiberglass shingle be used instead with a color of "Welch Grey". Chair Wilson agreed with this change.

Mr. Sadler requested that the roof of the storage shed located on the east side of the house be raised in order to provide more headroom inside. Member Sadler questioned if the height of the new roof would tie back into the existing roof line of the house. Mr. Sadler said that it would and that new wood siding would be installed to cover the void that would be created.

Doors:

Mr. Sadler requested that the 3/0 Full view entrance door located on the east side of the home be replaced with a new 3/0 Full view Anderson vinyl clad door w/o grilles. Mr. Sadler stated that he didn't have a picture of the existing door but that the design would be the same and that only the material would change. He showed the Commission where the proposed door would be located.

Mr. Sadler also requested that the existing 3/0 wood raised panel door located on the utility area on the east side of the house be relocated to the North side and replaced with a 3/0 six panel fiberglass exterior door. Member Krautheim questioned the location of the door to be

relocated as to where it would be and if, due to the roof being raised, would the door be raised as well. Mr. Sadler confirmed the location of the door and that it would be raised.

Windows:

Mr. Sadler proposed that 11 fixed wood windows on the one story section on the back of the house be replaced with Anderson double hung vinyl clad windows without grilles. Also, in this same area, he proposes to change the height of the windows in order to raise them off the floor. He noted that the height would change 18 inches and the new window measurements are 30"x60". Member Sadler questioned the "vinyl clad" and asked if this was the same as the "shiny vinyl" that is seen on many replacement windows. Mr. Sadler said it was not and that it would appear as painted wood. Member Sanchez questioned why the windows would not have grilles. Mr. Sadler said that it was in order to match the existing windows found in the older portion of the house.

Mr. Sadler is also proposing the 3 window located on the west side of the house in the kitchen area be replaced with Anderson double hung vinyl clad windows. He explained that due to the interior cabinets that block the existing windows that the height of the windows be changed as well.

Cupola:

Mr. Sadler requested that a new cupola be installed on the roof of the one story section of the house. He stated that it would be constructed of wood with shingled roof to match the house and have 4 new fixed windows installed. Mr. Sadler stated that the purpose was to provide additional light in the area of the house. Member Sanchez stated that the guidelines prohibit new cupolas quoting Guideline 6.1.4 and 6.1.5. Member Sadler asked if documentation existed that showed the cupola ever existed. Mr. Sadler said no and Mr. Mountcastle confirmed that there was no documentation. Mr. Sadler explained that cupolas did exist in the neighborhood but not on this house.

Chimneys:

Mr. Sadler requested that 2 existing chimneys be removed. He noted that these chimneys are not operational and they serve no purpose. Mr. Sadler stated that one chimney is a metal chimney that is located on the one story section of the house and the other concrete chimney is located on the east side of the house beside the storage room.

Miscellaneous:

Mr. Sadler wanted to include this information on his application in order to inform the board of everything that he was planning to do. He stated that these were maintenance issues but wanted the Commission to be aware of what he was doing. Member Sadler asked if the green trim that is found along the house would be painted as well when the exterior was repainted. Mr. Sadler confirmed that everything would be replaced and painted as is.

Chairman Wilson asked if anyone in the audience wanted to make any comments regarding this project. No comments were made.

Chair Wilson closed public hearing.

Member Davidson stated that she is in favor of all that is requested with the exception of the cupola because there is no evidence of this architectural feature.

Member Sanchez noted that she is in favor of all that is requested with the exception of the cupola. She stated that the guidelines prohibited the installation and suggested that skylights be installed. Mr. Mountcastle said that if that was an approved item he would consider that. They were informed that the cupola was requested and that if skylights were preferred the applicant needed to bring the proposal to another meeting.

Member Krautheim stated that he is in favor of all that is requested with the exception of the cupola due to the guidelines prohibiting this architectural feature.

Member Sadler stated that he is in favor of all that is requested with the exception of the cupola. He stated that not only do the guidelines prohibit, the design and placement does not match the style of house that exists.

Member Park stated that she is in favor of all that is requested with the exception of the cupola.

Member Krautheim moved that the board approve the application from Gerry Sadler for the property located at 300 Ann Street with the exception of the cupola based on following findings of fact. Member Sadler seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

- *Replace eleven (11) fixed wood windows on rear of house; three (3) wood double-hung on West side;*
- *Replace 3/0 full view door on East side of one story; replace 3/0 wood raised panel door on East side utility area;*
- *Replace asbestos and wooden shake shingles on roof;*
- *Raise shed roof located on east side of house; and*
- *Remove two (2) chimneys.*

1. Guideline 6.4.3 (pg.66)—Window and Door Guidelines:

Use replacement windows and doors that match the existing historic elements as closely as possible. Wood windows should be replaced with wood windows. If replacement windows or doors are required, consider first replacing only the deteriorated element, such as a single sash or door, rather than the entire frame or unit. Any new replacements shall match the original in all dimensions, materials, and detailing as closely as possible

2. Guideline 6.4.5 (pg. 66)—Window and Door Guidelines:

Replacement of historic windows and doors for the sole purpose of improved thermal performance is not appropriate. Wood, or appropriately painted metal storm windows and doors should be used.

3. Guideline 6.4.6 (pg. 66)—Window and Door Guidelines:

Tinted glass is not appropriate in the historic district in any area visible from public view. Energy-saving or “low-E” glass may be used only if it is not tinted.

4. Guideline 6.4.7 (pg. 66)—Window and Door Guidelines:

New windows must match original in overall size and opening area and should have three dimensional muntins with either true divided lights (TDL) or three dimensional grilles on both the interior and exterior sides (SDL). Snap-in grilles or grilles between glass are not appropriate for windows visible from public view.

5. Guideline 6.1.3 (pg. 48)—Roof Guidelines:

New roofing materials should be compatible with either the existing or original roofing material. Match the historic material as closely as possible in color, shape, size, and texture. Asphalt or fiberglass-asphalt shingles are acceptable substitutes for standing-seam tin, wood shingles, or metal shingles. Any distinctive patterns of shingles or slates shall be retained and/or replicated exactly. Galvanized standing-seam with a large “agricultural” ridge, usually for ventilation, is not acceptable in the historic district. Instead, use standing seam metal with a crimped edge.

6. Guideline 6.1.4 (pg. 48)—Roof Guidelines:

Retain historic roof-top features such as ornamental eaves, cornices, rake-boards, dormers, gables, chimneys, finials, cresting, steeples, belfries, cupolas, and railings that add to the overall architectural character of a structure. All original and significant later features should be preserved and restored, rather than removed. The design of any new roof features should be based on documentary evidence and are compatible with both the building and surrounding buildings.

7. Guideline 6.1.5-Roof Guidelines:

Contemporary or non-historic roof features may be installed on areas of the roof not seen from the public view or on other non-character defining secondary roofs. Included are skylights, roof-mounted vents, dormer, chimneys, antennas, and solar collectors. These are not permitted when their installation or later removal would damage or destroy a significant roof feature. In certain instances, new dormers may be permitted on side or rear elevations if their design is compatible with the building and the roofline.

8. Guideline 6.1.8-Roof Guidelines:

It is not appropriate to create a false sense of historical development by making changes to roofs, such as adding conjectural features lacking insufficient historical, pictorial, or physical documentation.

9. Guideline 6.1.9 (pg. 49)—Roof Guidelines:

Avoid altering the existing roof pitch or introducing a new roof pitch.

Member Davidson moved to grant Gerry Sadler/Richard Mountcastle a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior changes for 300 Ann Street. Member Krautheim seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

Member Park made motion to deny request for cupola addition. Member Krautheim seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

2. Carteret County Administration-Courthouse Square.

Chairman Wilson open public hearing.

Bill Zaist represented the County and proposed to install a new generator and enclosure for the Administration and Courts buildings. He stated that due to power surges and in case of a disaster, the County wanted to upgrade the existing generator. Mr. Zaist explained that in order for the unit to be hidden, they are proposing to build an addition to house the generator and this addition would be constructed of brick and be built as presented.

Member Davidson asked about the noise that the generator would generate and if it would overly disturb the neighbors. Mr. Zaist stated that it would be tested weekly and it would be like any tractor or construction equipment running.

Chairman Wilson asked if any in audience wanted to speak regarding this case. No comments were made.

Chairman Wilson closed the public hearing.

Member Krautheim commented that the brick addition was appropriate instead of having only a stainless steel box sitting by the building.

Member Sadler commented that the existing building was not a contributing structure within the district.

Member Krautheim made motion to approve the application from Carteret County Administration for a brick enclosure to house their generator based on the following findings of fact. Member Sanchez seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

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 on the façade and other primary elevation of the affected building or adjacent properties.
2. Guideline 7.8.2 (pg. 102)—Additions to Historic Buildings Guidelines:
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 principle of “additive massing” where the original structure remains dominant and the additions are adjoining and smaller masses.

3. Guideline 7.8.3 (pg. 102)—Additions to Historic Buildings Guidelines:

The design elements of a new addition should be compatible with the existing building in terms of materials, style, color, 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.

4. Guideline 7.8.4 (pg. 102)—Additions to Historic Buildings Guidelines:

Additions should be constructed so that they can be removed from the original building in the future without irreversible damage to significant features.

5. Guideline 7.8.8 (pg. 102)—Additions to Historic Buildings Guidelines:

Foundations should be similar to or compatible with the existing foundations in material, color, detailing, and height.

6. Guideline 6.2.2 (pg. 55)- Wood Siding, Trim, and Ornament Guidelines:

Preserve and repair existing wood elements wherever possible. Use preservation techniques which encourage repair (such as epoxies, splicing, and patching where applicable) rather than wholesale replacement.

7. Guideline 6.3.8 (pg. 59)-Brickwork and Masonry Guidelines:

When replacing damaged brick or stone, use replacements that match the original units as closely as possible.

Member Krautheim made motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to Carteret County Administration for exterior changes located at Courthouse Square. Member Davidson seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

3. Paul Geer-330 Front Street.

Chairman Wilson opened the hearing.

Paul Geer presented the Commission with a request to replace the existing fixed dock at 330 Front Street with a wood floating dock. He stated that they want to replace the dock with the intent that it would make getting on and off boats a lot easier.

Member Krautheim commented that, being this area services bigger boats, the pilings used would need to be strong enough. Mr. Geer stated that the strength of the pilings would not be a problem.

Chairman Wilson asked if any in audience wanted to comment on this case. No comment was made.

Member Davidson moved that the commission approve the request from Paul Geer for the installation of wooden floating docks for property located at 330 Front Street based on the following findings of fact. Member Sanchez seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

1. Guideline 8.7.1 (pg. 121)—Docks, Piers, and Boardwalks Guidelines:

Use a design that is simple, functional, and utilitarian. Traditional docks were built of post-and-lintel construction, using wood pilings, cross-members, and decking. Avoid the use of railings or other non-historic features that extend above the deck floor line, unless required by law for safety reasons. Avoid lighting fixtures that are too prominent or that are not utilitarian and functional in appearance.

2. Guideline 8.7.2 (pg. 121)—Docks, Piers, and Boardwalks Guidelines:

Built in features such as pavilions, gazebos, screened rooms or other types of roofed structures such as boat sheds are not appropriate.

Member Krautheim moved that the commission grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to Paul Geer for dockage located at 330 Front Street. Member Sadler seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

4. Alma Tilghman/Lemuel Stroud-311 Turner Street.

Chairman Wilson asked if a representative was present to present this case. No one was present.

Member Park moved that the commission table this item until the March regular meeting. Member Sadler seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

5. Bryan Verch/Beverly Woodhall-110 Middle Lane.

Chairman Wilson asked if a representative was present to present this case. No one was present.

Member Krautheim moved that the commission table this item until the March regular meeting. Member Sanchez seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

VII. BOARD COMMENTS.

Member Krautheim asked for update regarding storefront of establishment on corner of Queen St. and Turner St.

Mr. Rhue informed the commission that the owner has been contacted and he has stated that he would be applying for his COA at the March meeting and it was also confirmed that the existing glass is not tinted, as speculated earlier, but is indeed clear glass.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT.

There being no further business, Member Krautheim moved the Board adjourn. Member Park seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

Mamre Wilson, Chairman

Laura Babcock
Deputy Town Clerk