



Town of Beaufort NC

701 Front St. - P.O. Box 390 - Beaufort, N.C. 28516
252-728-2141 - 252-728-3982 fax - www.beaufortnc.org

Town Of Beaufort Historic Preservation Commission Regular Meeting MINUTES 6:00 PM Tuesday, June 4, 2019 - 614 Broad Street, Beaufort

1. Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance

Acting Chair Poling called the meeting to order and asked all in attendance to join in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Oath of Office

The Oath of Office was given to JOYCE C. MCCUNE recently appointed by the Town Commissioners to serve a three year term which will expire in 2022.

3. Roll Call

The Secretary called roll and declared a quorum present. Commission members present included Laura Chadwick Sicklin, Nancy Francis-Heckman, Joyce McCund, Heather Poling, John Stephens, Robert Terwilliger and Janet Woodward.

Others in attendance included Planning Director Kyle Garner, Code Enforcement Official Jeremy Ganey, Board Secretary Debbie Graham, Town Attorney Arey Grady, Town Commissioner Ann Carter and Town Commissioner Mariana Hollinshed.

4. Agenda Approval

A motion was made to approve the amended agenda which was amended to include the Election of Officers. The motion was made by member Stephens and seconded by member Francis-Heckman and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

5. Minutes Approval

There were several changes to both the May 7 and May 21 sets of minutes.

Member Francis-Heckman asked that corrections be made to the May 7th minutes on pages 2 and 5. Secretary Graham pointed out the email correction that had been sent out regarding the May 21st minutes. Member Terwilliger made a motion to accept both the May 7th and the May 21st minutes as amended. Member Francis-Heckman seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

6. Election of Officers

Member Woodward made a motion to nominate ROBERT TERWILLIGER as Chair as she was impressed with him during her time on the Commission, she likes how concise he is with his remarks, she likes his respect for the Board and for applicants and she thinks he would make an excellent Chair.

Attorney Grady stated that the acting chair had asked him to run this part of the meeting. He asked for a motion to open the nominations for Chair. The motion was made by member Terwilliger and seconded by member Francis-Heckman and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

Attorney Grady said that a motion had been made for chair and stated that a second was not necessary in this process. He then asked if there were any other nominations. Acting Chair HEATHER POLING asked that her name be submitted as Chair as she has been doing the job for the last several months.

Attorney Grady asked if there were any other nominations for Chair and hearing none, entertained a motion and second to close the nomination period. Member Terwilliger made the motion and member Chadwick Sicklan made the second.

Attorney Grady asked the Secretary to call the roll and then, each member should state the last name of the person they wished to vote for as the Chair of the Commission. By a vote count of 5 in favor of Terwilliger (Chadwick Sicklin, McCune, Stephens, Terwilliger, Woodward) to 2 in favor of Poling (Francis-Heckman, Poling), ROBERT TERWILLIGER was elected as the Chair of the BHPC.

Attorney Grady asked for a motion, second and a vote to open the nominations for Vice Chair. The motion was made by member Poling and seconded by member Francis-Heckman and the vote unanimous in favor of the motion. HEATHER POLING asked that her name be submitted for Vice Chair.

Attorney Grady asked if there were any other nominations for Vice Chair and hearing none, asked for a motion and a second to close the nomination period. Member Poling made the motion and member Francis-Heckman made the second. Attorney Grady declared HEATHER POLING would remain as Vice Chair by acclamation as she was the only nominee. He then turned the meeting back to the Chair.

7. New Business/Administration of Oaths

Chair Terwilliger gave an overview of the BHPC to those in attendance. He stated that the Historic Preservation Commission is a quasi-judicial board and our decisions are made based on the testimony provided during the meeting as well as the materials submitted to the Commission by the applicants. He stated that the members of the Commission make every effort possible not to have conversations on items for consideration outside of the jurisdiction of the meeting to make sure everything is fair and just on what is brought before them. He added that there are several documents that the Commission uses in the aid of their decisions and they are: the *Beaufort National Register Historic District Comprehensive Survey (A Resurvey of the 1970 Survey)* compiled by Ruth Little, 1997; *Beaufort, An Album of Memories* by Jack Dudley; the *Design Guidelines for the Beaufort Historic District & Landmarks (1994, Revised 2008)*; the *Town of Beaufort Land Development Ordinance* (adopted 2013); the 2012 NC Building Code Chapter 34, Existing Buildings and Structures, Section 3409 on Historic Buildings; and the *Town of Beaufort Comprehensive Plan Update*, Prepared by the East Carolina Council of Governments (adopted 2012). The Chair stated that these documents are available on the Town of Beaufort's website and he encourages all citizens and future applicants to look them over for their value on historical material.

A. Case 19-14 - 126 Turner Street to Install 2 New Hanging Signs to Replace Existing Signs

Chair Terwilliger opened the public hearing for Case 19-14, to install two new hanging signs to replace existing hanging signs.

Member McCune stated that she needed to recuse herself as she is on their Board. Vice Chair Poling made the motion to recuse member McCune and member Francis-Heckman seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

Also at this point it was noted by Planning Director Kyle Garner that the oath had not been administered to those wishing to speak during the items before the Commission. The secretary was called to give the oath to all those who wished to speak on the three items for consideration during this meeting.

Chair Terwilliger asked the applicant(s) to step forward and to discuss their item.

Patricia Suggs, Beaufort Historical Association, was representing Ruth Cecil at the meeting. She stated that a complete application had been submitted to the BHPC and she brought in the signs for the Commission to view and to consider.

Member Woodward was not in favor of the font used on the signs which was called Avante Garde. She felt that the font was too modern and not in keeping with the historic district. She did like the colors used on the signs. Ms. Suggs reminded the Commission that she is representing the Cecil's in their absence and stated that it was suggested that they make the sign ahead of time and bring them to the meeting. Mr. Garner stated that the applicants were asked to bring in a sample of

the new signs on other material such as foam core board. Mr. Garner stated that Mr. Finch said that they would have the signs manufactured prior to this meeting.

Vice Chair Poling asked if they were going to consider adding a sandwich board sign. Mr. Garner stated that a sandwich board sign had been approved for this property in 2015 and that information was included in the staff report.

The secretary was called to swear in Marianna Hollinshed. Ms. Hollinshed pointed out the ancient Celtic origin of the typeface and logo.

Member Woodward restated her objection to the typeface saying that others on Turner Street are using an old English type face and something more modern on the Brewhouse, but it is not avante garde. Ms. Suggs said that there is a sign on the side entrance of the building for the Historical Association's gift shop and that sign has similar lettering style to these signs.

Chair Terwilliger stated that there are some concerns here and entertained a motion for congruity.

Vice Chair Poling made a motion to approve the signage as presented and gave the following information for the findings of fact for Case 19-14 for 126 Turner Street, to install two hanging signs to replace existing signs:

*Guideline 8.6.1: 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' by 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. **The material for the signs is congruent as presented.***

*Guideline 8.6.2: 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. **Based on the testimony given during the public hearing on this item we find that this to also be congruent.***

*Guideline 8.6.3: Signs on commercial buildings are preferred to be located in a signboard frieze located above the display windows. In this location the sign serves as a boundary between the upper and lower façade. **The new signs are replacing signs and based on the location of the signs, they are congruent with this guideline.***

*Guideline 8.6.5: Use simple, clear graphics and lettering styles in sign design. **Based on the evidence presented, this guideline is congruous with the signs as submitted.***

Member Francis-Heckman seconds the motion on the findings of fact and the vote

was 5 in favor of the motion (Chadwick Sicklin, Francis-Heckman, Poling, Stephens, Terwilliger) and 1 against (Woodward).

A motion was made and seconded to issue the COA and the vote was 5 in favor of the motion (Chadwick Sicklin, Francis-Heckman, Poling, Stephens, Terwilliger) and 1 against (Woodward) and so the COA will be granted.

Vice Chair Poling made a motion to reinstate member McCune. Member Francis-Heckman seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

The Chair closed the public hearing on this item.

B. Case 19-15 - 113 Turner Street to Add a Sign on an Existing Sign Bracket; to Replace Existing Awnings with Copper Awnings; and to Replace Exterior Lights by the Front Door

The Chair opened the public hearing for Case 19-15, 113 Turner Street, to add a sign on an existing sign bracket; to replace existing awnings with copper awnings; and to replace exterior lights by the front door.

Andy Birmingham was present for the application and Mr. Birmingham stated that they are renting the existing space and wish to make the changes which are largely due to hurricane damage.

Member Stephens questioned the size of the hanging sign, which is four feet, and he said that it would be wider than a sheet of plywood. He added that none of the other blade signs, as he called them, were this large and he felt that this is going to cause others to want to make their blade signs larger.

Member McCune asked if they were keeping the sign on the side of the building. Mr. Birmingham said they would be removing that sign.

Member Francis-Heckman questioned the store's size and the sign that is further down the brick work on Turner Street. Mr. Birmingham stated that the store goes all the way to the electric panel on Turner Street.

Member Chadwick Sicklin went by the store and asked Mr. Birmingham to hold the lantern up beside the door to get some idea of the scale. She added that she feels the larger bracket is too large and they should use the smaller bracket for the lanterns. Mr. Birmingham said they are looking to put things in place that will stay after the next hurricane. Member Woodward asked if member Chadwick Sicklin felt the lanterns size was appropriate. Member Chadwick Sicklin stated the lanterns will work.

The Chair asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak on this item and hearing none, turned to the Commission for discussion and the findings of fact. The Chair stated that based on the testimony given tonight, and the evidence and record before us, he motioned that the BHPC conclude that the application submitted by Mr. Birmingham meets the *Design Guidelines* which were submitted

in the staff report:

Guideline 6.9.5: The preferred material for awnings is fabric although wood or metal awnings may be allowed on a case-by-case basis if there is a clear historic precedent. New awnings should be compatible with the building in size, scale, form and color.

Guideline 6.7.2: Determine the building's style and period and consult with the HPC or reference sources for the most appropriate paint colors. Use paint colors that are appropriate for the style and period of the subject property and that accentuate the building's architectural features.

Guideline 8.4.1: Unless original fixtures already exist, choose fixtures that are simple and unobtrusive and complement the building or site.

Guideline 8.4.2: Choose lighting sources that generate a soft white light instead of a more intensive yellow or orange light. Metal halide bulbs will achieve the desired effect instead of sodium vapor or fluorescent light sources.

Guideline 8.4.3: Avoid placing fixtures in areas that will obscure or damage character-defining architectural elements or site features.

Guideline 8.6.1: 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" by 18" that are located within five (5) feet of a window or glass door on an exterior wall and are so placed as to be seen from the outside are not allowed. INTERNAL GLASS MOUNTED SIGNS ARE NOT SUBJECT TO BHPC REVIEW.

Guideline 8.6.2: 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.

Guideline 8.6.3: Signs on commercial buildings are preferred to be located in a signboard frieze located above the display windows. In this location the sign serves as a boundary between the upper and lower façade.

Guideline 8.6.5: Use simple, clear graphics and lettering styles in sign design.

Vice Chair Poling seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

Chair Terwilliger made a motion stating that based on the foregoing findings of fact, that the BHPC concludes the proposed project is congruous with the special

character of the historic district as a whole and that a COA be issued with the following condition – that the smaller brackets be used as discussed during the meeting for this project. Vice Chair Poling seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

The Chair closed the public hearing on this item.

C. Case 19-16 - 208 Cedar Street for the Demolition of Existing Structures; to Remove Several Existing Trees; and to Install Fencing, Landscaping and Parking

The Chair opened the public hearing for Case 19-16, 208 Cedar Street, for the demolition of existing structures; to remove several existing trees; and to install fencing, landscaping, and parking.

Vice Chair Poling stated she needed to be recused from this item as they have a business here. Member Francis-Heckman made a motion to recuse the vice chair and Chair Terwilliger seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

Mike Baldwin, Baldwin Consultants from Greenville, NC, gave the following information on this project:

- Demo the two non-historic buildings at 208 Cedar Street - one building is cinder block building with no roof and the other is a deteriorated single-family home
- Remove some palm trees and nuisance vegetation
- Install fencing and a parking lot
- Site facing Cedar Street used to be a gas station and the fuel canopy was removed some time ago – the remaining building is the office building and bathrooms
- House was built in 1984 according to the Carteret County Tax records and is in great disrepair
- The outside of the home looks like T-1-11 or particle board and the majority of the outside board is rotten
- The inside of the home is in bad shape with sagging floors and holes in the ceilings
- He does not feel that the buildings have any historic character to salvage
- The site facing Cedar Street used to be completely impervious at one time (completely paved) and the plan is to install a parking lot, fence, lighting and landscaping as per the Land Development Ordinance (LDO)
- A site plan has been prepared by their architect based on the LDO
- The lighting has been a big issue and they have an electrical engineer working on this because of the height of the pole for lighting because what they have found is 12 feet tall which does not meet the standards outlined in the LDO
- He described the lamps that will be use on the poles and some are single loaded, some double loaded and some triple loaded lights on the poles
- Back lot will be a charging station for electric cars
- He feels this will be a good neighbor for the surrounding properties as it is

- usually pretty quiet
- The color of the fence will be Sherwin Williams 7006 Extra White and does not have a gloss finish

Member Stephens thanked him for the presentation. He thought the lights in the parking lot appeared to be 10 feet high. His major concern is the egress from the parking lot going north through the existing driveways onto busy streets. Mr. Baldwin spoke about some turnouts provided as well as the NCDOT putting in white outs at the turnouts. Member Stephens felt that pedestrians would traverse through the vegetation and mulch into the busy street even though precautions were being taken with DOTs white outs.

Planning Director Kyle Garner said that member Stephens had brought up an excellent point and he felt that something can be worked out with the design however, this is not the purview of this Board and wanted them to move on.

Member Francis-Heckman reminded the Board of the items before them - the two physical structures to be removed, the trees to be removed and the new fencing and landscaping.

Mr. Garner added that a condition could be made on this item to address member Stephens concerns regarding pedestrian traffic during the deliberations on this item. He added that they are compliant with State and Federal guidelines and the American with Disabilities guidelines and that what will be put in on Cedar Street, as far as white outs, will be put in by the State with Federal monies.

Member Francis-Heckman asked about the zoning of the property. Mr. Garner said that most of it is zoned B-1 (General Commercial) however the rear portion is zoned residential and that is why they want the charging stations there because charging stations are allowed in the residential zoning district.

Member Chadwick Sicklin asked about the picket fencing style. Mr. Baldwin said the fence will not be picket as there will be no gaps between the boards. Member Chadwick Sicklin asked about the fence height. Mr. Baldwin stated that they will have six foot and four foot sections.

Member McCune asked if the six foot fence would step down to the four foot fence. Mr. Baldwin said that the fence doesn't go on the side of the property where the sidewalks are located but it does go east to west and some to the south of the property.

Member McCune stated that once the buildings are demolished, the three lots they are combining is going to make this parking lot a zig zagging lot. She also asked if there was photographic evidence of the house that is being demolished as the BHPC's Guidelines state it should be collected by the Commission and she wanted the house documented as per their guidelines.

Member Francis-Heckman asked them to take care in clearing the lots should they discover any artifacts in the soil disturbance. Mr. Baldwin assured her that they would.

Member Woodward asked if there had been any response from any adjacent property owner. Mr. Garner stated he could not testify and give those comments even if he had heard from any adjacent property owner.

Chair Terwilliger asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this item.

Dick DeButts, Orange Street, is concerned over the process and procedures. He feels that this application has many issues that are beyond the scope of the BHPC and that it should go before the Planning Board for a complete site plan review first. He stated that the Town issued a press release on the hotel project on April 18, 2019, which stated that *"a complete site plan will be submitted for review by town staff of all infrastructure plans to include site layout, stormwater, utilities, parking, landscaping, buffering, trash, fire connections and access points."* He asked that the Town follow their own policies and procedures. Mr. DeButts added that the driveways onto Orange and Moore Streets presents several problems as these are driveways from a commercial lot dumping into a residential neighborhood. His concern is safety for Orange Street and the heavy truck traffic that flows up and down the street several days a week. He added that on weekends people park on Orange Street and then walk downtown which creates more unsafe conditions. He feels with the addition of the 100 room hotel, the pedestrian traffic on Orange Street will more than double. He feels that there are too many driveways, three with the possibility of a fourth, on Cedar Street and that this could easily be addressed. Mr. DeButts said that the residential lot, 319 Orange Street, and the zoning of that property needs to be addressed by the Planning Board. He added that the Land Development Ordinance (LDO) allows for "a charging station" and they are proposing seven stations on this lot with the possibility of 14 automobiles parked in this area. He added if there is the possibility to have outlets at the charging stations, then golf carts could be thrown into the mix of vehicles in this area. He said that the R-8 zoning district does not allow for a parking lot and this is setting a terrible prescient to allow seven charging stations on an R-8 residential lot. He thinks the lot should be rezoned to B-1. Lastly Mr. DeButts requested that this project should go to the Planning Board and Board of Commissioners before a COA is issued. He submitted his written statement to the board secretary.

Mr. Garner stated the process for this is different. He added that the project is for a parking lot and Mr. DeButts made great comments. He said the reason this does not go before the Planning Board and Board of Commissioners first is the quasi-judicial historic elements such as the demolition of the structures which need a COA in order to proceed with the site plan review process. He said it is hard to develop this without getting the blessings for the demolition of the structures. He feels Mr. DeButts comments about access to the residential streets is a concern. He added that from a procedural standpoint, the BHPC works independently than other Boards. He said the General Statutes do not allow going to the Planning Board prior to going to the BHPC.

Ann DeButts, Orange Street, spoke next and Mrs. DeButts also submitted her written statement to the board secretary. She said she has been to a lot of BHPC

meetings and she is in support of the hotel and parking lot. She thinks this seems like a waste of time to come here because of the possibility of changes coming from the Planning Board and the Board of Commissioners. She said the HPC's Design Guideline book, on page 116 (second paragraph, first sentence) state *"Efforts should be made to incorporate parking lots and driveways in as unobtrusive manner as possible."* Next she referenced Guideline 8.5.1 (page 117) *"Locate new parking lots and driveways in the historic district as unobtrusively as possible. Parking lots consisting of large expanses of concrete or asphalt with little planting or other screening are not appropriate."* She added that her house is directly across from the driveway going onto Orange Street and she can imagine headlights coming directly into her downstairs windows when cars enter or exit the lot at night and she feels this is obtrusive. Next she spoke about Guideline 8.5.2 (also on page 117) which states *"Proposals for new parking lots or off-street parking areas should be accompanied by scaled site plans, including all proposed landscape and ground cover changes and information on proposed lighting types, placement and intensity."* She said there are no dimensions on the site plan for periphery or driveways - no dimensions at all. And for these reasons, she requests that the driveway onto Orange Street be removed and she thinks better screening from public view is needed and since the BHPC has no purview over the removal of driveways, she also requests that this item should be remanded to the Planning Board before a COA is issued.

Richard Lee Hamrick, Orange Street, stated that he is not opposed to the hotel because he feels it is a good asset for the town and will be a good neighbor. His concern is the charging stations on the R-8 lot and stated that we all know what this lot will become - a parking lot. He thinks this aspect should be ironed out and also raised the issue of a retaining wall that he felt needed to be put in in a corner where the old gas station was located which is not in the plans for the parking lot on Cedar Street. He feels that the hotel items come in in bits and pieces rather than one cohesive plan and he feels they are trying to get around stormwater issues here.

Julian Craig Hamilton, Moore Street, also submitted a written document of his testimony to the board secretary. Mr. Hamilton stated that he supports the new hotel and wants it to succeed. He said he talked to town staff today and he knows that this project supports the ordinances. His concern is that he spent \$15,000 a few years ago to properly drain the back of his property because it is very low on Moore Street - Orange Street is elevated much higher than Moore and he gets a lot of the runoff from Orange. He said that any runoff from the parking lot will affect his lot and it will likely put his lot underwater but not just his lot but the lots of his neighbors as well. He added that the six foot fence proposed will take away his view of Town Creek and the Newport River and he doesn't see why a four foot fence in the rear of that property wouldn't work as well as a six foot fence.

John Flowers, Orange Street, has no problem with the parking lot on Cedar Street. His concern is the R-8 lot being a charging station and he feels that lot should be rezoned to B-1. He added that it would be nice not putting cars directly onto Orange Street because it is better to go onto Cedar Street.

Gerry Currier, Broad Street, felt this project is disingenuous because it has no

relation to anything else going on. His concern is the stormwater drainage because at the low point on Cedar and Orange Streets there was a retaining wall there and he does not feel that the retaining wall has been addressed. Also this plan makes the entire property impervious and the drainage from this property will go to the corner of Cedar and Orange. Another concern that he has is that this plan does not address the small grassy area.

Vic Fasolino, Cedar Street, owns what he feels is the ultimate low space on Cedar and Moore Streets. His concern is that he feels the narrow necking on the east side of Moore Street should be addressed because of the lack of visibility of Cedar Street from that corner. He also feels this is a lot of impervious surface area to be adding. He thinks there are a lot of issues here that may need to be addressed by the Planning Board.

Mr. Garner stated that Mr. Fasolino brings up a good point about that necking on Moore Street but the trouble is that Moore Street belongs to the Town and Cedar Street belongs to the State and he doesn't know if this will be addressed when the improvements are made to Cedar Street.

Chair Terwilliger stated that the BHPC is not going to rule on drainage. He added that our job is to decide on the removal of the two structures and the palm trees, paving the lot and adding the fencing and landscaping. He added that this doesn't mean these issues go away and encourages all that spoke to go to the Planning Board and the Board of Commissioners when the site plan review comes into play.

Mr. Garner added that site plan approvals do not require public hearings but the Chair allows for public comment.

Mr. Fasolino had some more points to make. He had an issue with the R-8 lot becoming a parking lot even though slated to be charging stations. He does not feel this application is compliant with the LDO and he read from the LDO "*When any parking spaces are to be placed within fifty feet (50') of a public or private right-of-way, a minimum width of eight feet (8') of lawn is required parallel to the street right-of-way on the applicant's property. This section applies to all the public and private streets on which the property fronts. This area shall not be used for parking, but may include sidewalks and/or trails and shall be maintained as a planting strip for grass, trees, and/or shrubs*" and he stated that the plan submitted is not compliant with this therefore he doesn't think the BHPC should approve this tonight. He added that he supports the concept but it doesn't support the LDO.

Anna DeButts said there is a mistake in the packet that shows her house on Orange Street is zoned B-1 but it is actually zoned R-8.

Member Woodward asked if registered letters were mailed out to the adjacent property owners. Mr. Garner said registered letters are not required by law.

Chair Terwilliger asked if there were any comments from the Town. Mr. Garner said the BHPC has the opportunity to place conditions on the COA in that these

conditions would have to be met before the COA is issued. He added that you could put that other Boards need to review this before the COA is issued. He added this is a multi-phase application process and the next step will be a full site plan review. He felt that there have been great comments tonight from the audience members as well as from the BHPC.

Member McCune said that in a section of their Guidelines it states that other permits need to be secured before coming to the BHPC. Mr. Garner said that a site plan review is not a permit and that other things may come out during the site plan review and that this project would have to come back to the BHPC if changes are made.

Member Woodward asked if this property is in a flood zone. Mr. Garner said that part of it is and part of it is not.

Chair Terwilliger stated that he gets that the BHPC can put conditions on the COA but his concern is that those that have issues won't have a voice going forward. He feels there are a lot of things up in the air and design considerations that may change in the future.

Member Francis-Heckman stated that one item on this request is the demolition of structures and she does not feel that the BHPC has a complete site plan of what's going in that space. She doesn't feel this package was ready for review by the BHPC.

Member McCune doesn't feel that the BHPC has been given all the information needed for the demolition and that there are flaws in the application.

Chair Terwilliger closed the public discussion as there was an exchange that was not meant for the BHPC.

Member Francis-Heckman restated her position that she does not feel the packet is complete. Members McCune and Chadwick Sicklin agreed. Member Francis-Heckman also felt that the public comments were enlightening.

Member Stephens stated that he feels this should be tabled and the public comments should be taken into consideration.

Chair Terwilliger felt that the Planning Board should consider this prior to issuing a COA and this should be tabled until after that review by the Planning Board.

Mr. Garner asked Attorney Grady what would happen if the Planning Board reviews this and the Planning Board is totally against what was said tonight. Attorney Grady said that a site specific plan is not generally done for this Board. He felt that the Planning Board's approval would eliminate a lot of the issues raised here tonight however he does not think that this should be delayed in order for the Town Commissioners to approve the project.

Member Woodward made a motion supplemented by Attorney Grady, to table this application and send it to the Planning Board and then return it to the BHPC after

the Planning Board takes action on this item. Member Francis-Heckman seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in support of the application.

Member Francis-Heckman made a motion to reinstate Vice Chair Poling. Member Chadwick Sicklin seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

8. Public Comment

Robert Harper, Broad Street, questioned the length that the previous application has to come before the BHPC. Mr. Garner stated that it is 120 days. Mr. Harper asked what would happen after 120 days. Mr. Garner stated this was not a complete application and therefore they would have to resubmit the application.

Chair Terwilliger added that this could happen if the Planning Board does not come back with a decision in a reasonable time.

9. Commission/Board Comments

Vice Chair Poling welcomed member McCune to the team. She added that when the BHPC is discussing projects, we should leave out our personal preferences. She added also that ex parte communication should be disclosed before the item is discussed.

Member Woodward wanted to meet in a couple of weeks to review things including standards and procedures in order to make the meetings flow a bit quicker and get things more down pat.

Member Francis-Heckman brought up the training session coming up on June 21st. Mr. Garner added that it will be a full day of training in Morehead City.

Member Woodward then asked if they could talk about what we learned afterwards.

Chair Terwilliger felt that was an excellent idea and could be added to the end of the next regular meeting.

Mr. Garner stated that the next meeting is July 2 and it could have an educational piece and notices would be mailed to every property owner in the historic district. He added we usually do this in August or September.

Chair Terwilliger wanted to do it quicker - mid July and have an adjunct meeting for it. He asked the board secretary to work with staff to come up with possible dates to email to BHPC members.

10. Staff Comments

11. Adjourn

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting with the vote unanimous in support of the motion.

Robert Terwilliger, Chair

Debbie Graham, Board Secretary