



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 Regular Meeting
6:00 PM Tuesday, May 5th 2026 - Train Depot, 614 Broad Street, Beaufort, NC 28516
Minutes

Call to Order

Chair McCune called the May 5th, 2026 Beaufort Historic Preservation Commission regular meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Roll Call

Members Present: Joyce McCune, Chair; Bradley Hedrick, Vice-Chair; Bradley Cummins, Kris Davis, Tyler Tennant

Members Absent: Jessica Sabiston

A quorum was declared with five members present.

Staff Present: Mr. Kyle Garner, Planning Director; Mr. Brad Fockler, Code Enforcement Officer; Ms. Jill Quattlebaum, Town Attorney; Ms. Laurel Anderson, Board Secretary

Agenda Approval

Chair McCune noted that the Election of Officers required removal from the Agenda. Member Cummins made the motion to approve the Agenda as presented and Vice-Chair Hedrick made the second. Chair McCune took a vote that was unanimously approved.

Voting yea: Chair McCune, Vice-Chair Hedrick, Bradley Cummins, Kris Davis, Tyler Tennant

Minutes Approval

1. HPC Draft Minutes 040726

Vice-Chair Hedrick made the motion to approve the Minutes as presented and Member Tennant made the second. Chair McCune took a vote that was unanimously approved.

Voting yea: Chair McCune, Vice-Chair Hedrick, Bradley Cummins, Kris Davis, Tyler Tennant

Administration of Oaths

Chair McCune gave the Quasi-Judicial Statement as follows: This hearing is a quasi-judicial evidentiary hearing. That means it is like a court hearing. State law sets specific procedures and rules concerning how this board must make its decision. The board must base its decision upon competent, relevant and substantial evidence in the record. It is a decision constrained by the standards in the ordinance and based on the facts presented. All applications for Certificates of Appropriateness must be consistent with the Design Guidelines for the Beaufort Historic District & Landmarks; however, regardless of compliance with these Design Guidelines, the HPC will not approve a COA that is not congruous with the special nature of the Beaufort Historic District as a whole. If you will be speaking as a witness, please focus on the facts and standards, not personal preference or opinion. Participation is limited. This meeting is open to the public. Everyone is welcome to watch. Parties with standing have rights to participate fully. Parties may present evidence, call witnesses and make legal arguments. Parties are limited to the applicant, the local government and individuals who can show they will suffer special damages. Other individuals may serve as witnesses when called by the board. For certain topics, this board may hear opinion testimony from expert witnesses. Individuals providing expert opinion must be qualified as experts and provide the factual evidence upon which they base their expert opinion. Witnesses must swear or affirm their testimony.

Secretary Anderson then administered the Oath to Kyle Garner and Brad Fockler.

Items of Consent

1. Approval of the Order for 101 Ann Street, 201 Ann Street, 600-610 Front Street, 315 Ann Street, 105 Front Street & 114 Ann Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

Member Cummins made the motion to approve the Orders as presented and Member Davis made the second. Chair McCune took a vote that was unanimously approved.

Voting yea: Chair McCune, Vice-Chair Hedrick, Bradley Cummins, Kris Davis, Tyler Tennant

New Business

1. Case # 26-16 608 Ann St – Porch Railing & Fencing

Chair McCune opened the case and announced her recusal from this case, as the property is her own residence, and requested a formal vote to excuse her.

Member Cummins made the motion to recuse Chair McCune and Vice-Chair Hedrick made the second. Chair McCune took a vote that was unanimously approved.

Voting yea: Vice-Chair Hedrick, Bradley Cummins, Kris Davis, Tyler Tennant

Vice-Chair Hedrick assumed the chair for this case and called upon staff to summarize the application.

Mr. Garner explained the case involved two distinct requests at 608 Ann Street: the addition of handrails to both sides of the existing front porch steps for safety purposes, and the relocation of a front fence along the driveway. Staff noted the property's prior COA history spanning from 1998 to 2013. Staff requested that the staff report and all attachments be entered into the official record. Staff clarified that the fence would retain the same material and height, with its position shifting inward by approximately three feet, and that the handrail request was owner-initiated for safety, not required by code.

Secretary Anderson then administered the Oath to Fred and Joyce McCune, owners of the property.

Mr. McCune explained the handrails would be constructed from 2x4 grooved boards to match existing porch material and mounted on 4x4 posts consistent with the existing porch columns. Mr. McCune confirmed the fence material and height would remain unchanged.

Member Davis asked for clarification on how the handrail would terminate at the bottom post. Mr. McCune explained that the rail would extend over the post and be dressed out with a curved profile, and that the posts would be set into the existing brickwork.

Regarding the fence, Vice Chair Cummins noted that one of the arrows in the submitted photographs appeared to show the relocated fence running diagonally to the corner of the house, which Mr. McKune clarified was an error in the annotation. He confirmed the fence would terminate at the location of the existing bushes and would not extend diagonally. He also confirmed that the existing gate on that section would be removed, and that the gate was no longer in practical use, as the front entrance is the primary point of access.

Vice-Chair Hedrick asked if there were any parties with standing who wished to comment, and if there were any other witnesses who wanted to comment. There were none.

Vice-Chair Hedrick asked for a motion for a Finding of Fact for Case #26-16. Member Cummins made the following motion: Having reviewed the record and having considered all evidence submitted and oral testimony for Case #26-16, move that the Commission concludes that the pending application meets the following design standards under the Design Guidelines for the Beaufort Historic District and Landmarks: Porches and Entrances Guidelines 6.5.1, 6.5.3; Fences and Walls Guidelines 8.2.1, 8.2.6.

Member Davis made the second and Vice-Chair Hedrick took a vote that was approved.

Voting yea: Vice-Chair Hedrick, Bradley Cummins, Kris Davis, Tyler Tennant

Vice-Chair Hedrick then asked for a motion for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Case #26-16.

Member Davis made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness based on the following: Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact, I move that the Commission conclude that the proposed project is not incongruous with the special character of the historic district as a whole and that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Case #26-16 be issued for the proposed work.

Member Tennant made the second and took a vote that was unanimously approved.

Voting yea: Vice-Chair Hedrick, Bradley Cummins, Kris Davis, Tyler Tennant

Vice-Chair Hedrick thanked the applicants for bringing the matter before them and explained that once the Historic Commission adopts the minutes and Findings of Fact at the June meeting, they would receive their COA from the town. The case was then closed.

Member Cummins made a motion to reinstate Chair McCune to the meeting. Member Davis made the second and took a vote that was approved.

Voting yea: Vice-Chair Hedrick, Bradley Cummins, Kris Davis, Tyler Tennant

2. Case #26-10 316 Moore St – Construct New Single-Family Home

Chair McCune introduced Case #26-10 and confirmed no commission members needed to recuse themselves. Mr. Garner provided a summary, requesting inclusion of the staff report and exhibits in the official record.

Mr. Garner explained that the applicant, Mr. Craig Hamilton, is the owner of 316 Moore Street. The property previously received a COA in November 2014 for an accessory building in the rear, and in March 2024 for the demolition of the main structure. The current application seeks approval for the construction of a new single-family home on the site.

Mr. Garner pointed out the elevation drawings indicate a 35-foot gable height, but the finished floor elevation relative to grade is not shown on the plan set. He confirmed that the property is within a flood zone and that the applicant must comply with applicable freeboard requirements; his understanding was that the overall height would still not exceed 35 feet. Second, the site plan shows a gravel driveway, and the applicant indicated he would return for a subsequent COA to address landscaping, final driveway material, and fencing, as those details had not yet been finalized. Third, the applicant has shifted the proposed house foundation one foot to the north to gain an additional foot of driveway width. Finally, the applicant submitted a shingle color sample, proposing a dark green roof shingle.

Secretary Anderson administered the Oath to applicant and homeowner Craig Hamilton.

When asked by Chair McCune, Mr. Hamilton confirmed that the existing live oak tree in the front yard would be preserved. He also indicated that all wiring would be underground, noting that the existing accessory building in the rear is already served by underground utilities.

The board engaged in an extended discussion with Mr. Hamilton regarding materials and design details. The following items were discussed:

Siding: Chair McCune noted that Mr. Hamilton had requested the weathered-look (rough-faced) Hardie siding to match the existing accessory building at the rear of the property. Vice-Chair Hedrick acknowledged the request but suggested that the smooth side of the Hardie board is more typically in keeping with the neighborhood, given that new construction made to look weathered is conceptually distinct from a structure that has genuinely aged. Mr. Hamilton responded that smooth Hardie can resemble vinyl or aluminum siding, and that he simply preferred the weathered aesthetic. He also noted that the historic house at 208 Moore Street presents a naturally aged appearance consistent with what he was seeking. The Commission did not reach consensus on this point during the hearing, and it remained unresolved.

Window package: Member Davis asked for clarification on the window specifications. Staff confirmed from the submitted documentation that the windows are Anderson 400 Series.

Porch floor and ceiling: Mr. Hamilton stated that the porch deck would consist of decking boards painted gray. Chair McCune noted the trim boards would be Hardie trim. The porch ceiling was confirmed to be painted light blue, consistent with the rear accessory building.

Porch railings: Mr. Hamilton stated he preferred traditional turned balusters—square at the top and bottom with a turned middle section—which he associated with the character of Beaufort. Member Davis requested greater detail, including an example image of the turned baluster style, clarification on how the posts would be finished (specifically whether the corners would be routed), and a description of the material.

Columns: Mr. Hamilton confirmed that the porch columns would be square, consistent with both the Marsh Street house of his upbringing and the existing accessory building.

Porch lighting: Mr. Hamilton indicated he intended to use recessed lighting in the porch ceilings on both the upper and lower porches, consistent with the approach taken on the rear accessory building. Member Davis then raised a technical concern: if the upper deck drains through the decking and into the framing with no ceiling treatment on the underside of the second-story deck floor, how would recessed lighting be incorporated and protected from water intrusion? Mr. Hamilton acknowledged he had not yet resolved this design detail. Member Davis suggested the Commission would want to see either a drainage system or a finished ceiling material—such as bead board—on the underside of the second-floor deck, and requested further specification on this element.

Gable sunbursts: Member Davis noted that the plans showed decorative sunburst patterns at the peaks of the front gables and asked whether those would be constructed from wood. Mr. Hamilton indicated they would likely be wood but was not certain.

Exterior color: When asked by the Commission about color, Mr. Hamilton stated the house would be painted white—a monochromatic scheme with the body, trim, and gable accents all the same color, with the exception of the brick foundation and the dark green roof shingles.

Foundation brick: Mr. Hamilton stated he intended to use a "Savannah-style" brick—specifically a product called "Band-On" brick, which is a new brick manufactured to replicate the appearance of historic aged brick. He noted that the accessory building in the rear uses a similar brick and that the two structures should be complementary. No physical brick sample had been submitted with the application.

Fence: Chair McCune noted that the submitted packet appeared to reference a fence. Mr. Hamilton confirmed that no fence was being proposed as part of the current application.

Chair McCune asked if there were any parties with standing and hearing none, asked if there were any witnesses who would like to speak and there were none.

Following the extended discussion, it became clear to multiple commissioners that the application lacked the level of specification necessary to issue a COA and provide the building inspector with an adequate record to verify compliance. Vice-Chair Hedrick observed that without specific, documented details, there would be no reliable means to confirm that the finished construction matched what the Commission had approved. Chair McCune summarized the consensus by noting that in typical new home applications before the HPC, a more detailed packet is submitted. Member Cummins added that the information regarding the finished floor height and its relationship to flood elevation requirements should also be clearly represented on the plan set, as any required adjustments could materially affect the aesthetic of the structure.

Chair McCune asked whether Mr. Hamilton could return for the June meeting with the necessary additional detail, noting there would be no additional fee for the continuation. Mr. Hamilton agreed.

Mr. Garner noted that the regular submittal deadline for the June agenda is the following Tuesday—two weeks from the date of the meeting—and requested that Mr. Hamilton understand this deadline clearly. Mr. Hamilton acknowledged.

Mr. Garner then requested that the list of items to be provided be read into the record. Mr. Fockler summarized the outstanding items: finished floor height elevation shown on the plan set; details on front porch handrails including a picture or example of a turned baluster; specification of the column finish (routed corners or clean); details on light fixtures for the porches; paint samples for the house body and ceiling; clarification on the gable material (wood vs. Hardie board); clarification on the smooth vs. weathered Hardie siding; a brick sample or color chip for the foundation; details on the underside of the second-floor deck, including drainage and ceiling treatment; and details on lattice screening and removable access panels at the foundation.

Chair McCune asked for a motion to table Case #26-10. Vice-Chair Hedrick made the motion to table and Member Davis made the second. Chair McCune took a vote that was unanimously approved.

Voting yea: Chair McCune, Vice-Chair Hedrick, Bradley Cummins, Kris Davis, Tyler Tennant

Chair McCune then declared Case #26-10 closed.

3. Case #26-18 525 Front Street – 3 Story Mixed Use Building

Chair McCune opened the case with no recusals needed. Mr. Garner presented the proposal for a two-story vertical addition to the existing one-story commercial building at 525 Front Street, resulting in a three-story mixed-use structure. Staff requested that the staff report and all attachments be entered into the official record.

Mr. Garner described the existing building as a Colonial Williamsburg-style commercial structure estimated to have been constructed between 1941 and 1950, making it approximately 76 years old and theoretically eligible for historic designation. The proposed addition would place commercial office use on the ground floor, with residential units on the upper floors. Parking would be accommodated at the interior ground level with access from Queen Street via two proposed garage doors.

Mr. Garner noted that the property is located within a floodplain and has experienced what was characterized as sunny-day flooding. While not a formal condition of the current application, he indicated that flood mitigation measures—such as flood gates or flood panels similar to those used by other downtown businesses—would be an important consideration for the property going forward.

Mr. Garner acknowledged that the application implicates the guidelines for additions, new construction, and historic storefronts, and noted that the board could choose to apply any or all of those frameworks.

Vice-Chair Hedrick read Guideline 6.9.6 and asked if there was any precedent for a commercial property on Front Street being raised two stories. Mr. Garner stated that Southern Frock had added a second story to their structure, and the façade was crumbling and fixed as part of the renovation.

Secretary Anderson administered the Oath to applicants Jay Horton and Ryan Edwards of Filter Design Studio, representing the owners of the building.

Mr. Horton distributed supplemental materials giving more detail of the project to the Commission and staff for inclusion in the record.

Mr. Horton and Mr. Edwards described the proposed construction in detail. Because the existing masonry structure's load-bearing capacity is uncertain—particularly given that the exterior walls are covered in stucco and parging—the design relies on a new internal steel column and beam structure. Brick-relieving angles carried by the interior steel frame would support all new brick veneer above the existing structure's roofline, meaning the new construction above does not load-bear on the original masonry. Mr. Edwards explained that this approach would theoretically allow the addition to be removed and the original envelope restored. He acknowledged, however, that significant interior modifications would be required—including new footings—and that until the existing stucco is removed, the condition and character of the underlying brick on the side walls cannot be fully assessed.

Regarding brick selection, the applicants described two distinct brick types present in the building: a more modern brick on the Front Street facade (likely a later alteration, as evidenced by different mortar composition and joint profile) and an older, soft clay brick visible on the interior walls, which is assumed to also exist on the exterior side walls beneath the parging. The applicants indicated they intended to match one of the two existing bricks using a product called Carolina Old Brick, which they described as achieving a very close color match to the existing facade brick.

The Commission raised extensive concerns about the project. The discussion covered the following major themes:

Historic precedent for vertical additions: Vice-Chair Hedrick cited Design Guideline 6.9.6, which discourages adding stories or roof decks visible from public rights-of-way, with exceptions on a case-by-case basis if there is clear historic precedent. Mr. Garner acknowledged that the only comparable precedent on Front Street involved the building now housing Southern Frock, where a second story was added approximately 12 years ago, but where the resulting increase in parapet height was only approximately two feet above the original facade. No precedent for a two-story addition to a Front Street commercial building was identified.

The third floor: Multiple commissioners expressed difficulty with the visual and contextual impact of the third floor in particular. Member Cummins summarized a broadly shared concern, stating that while the design had merit, "it looks like it belongs in the tobacco district." Chair McCune expressed concern about the mass of the building in context. She noted that the building at its proposed height would be the tallest structure on that block, and drew a contrast with the varying, more modest scale of buildings moving westward along Front Street. Member Cummins suggested that a two-story design could open a more constructive conversation with the Commission, but the third floor with the mass of bricks was not keeping with what the downtown area was offering.

Queen Street facade and garage doors: Chair McCune observed that the Queen Street elevation presented a distinctly warehouse look, particularly given the two proposed garage doors. Mr. Edwards responded that on-site parking is required by the town, and that with the town owning the rear parking area—which cannot be guaranteed to the applicant—street-level access parking from Queen Street is the only viable option. He noted that the garage doors were proposed in wood and that the windows on the Queen Street elevation are standard double-hung aluminum windows in a bronze finish intended to match the existing storefront. Vice-Chair Hedrick observed that no matter what way the proposed structure was looked at, from the back, the front, or the side, it had a very brutalist industrial look especially with the two garage doors on the side, which look like a loading dock.

Massing and mass reduction: The Commission discussed at length whether the third floor could be recessed or tapered to reduce its visual impact. Mr. Edwards acknowledged that recessing the upper covered porch was technically feasible and that the firm had attempted to cover the rooftop space specifically to avoid it looking like an exposed roof deck from the street. Mr. Horton indicated the team was open to exploring modifications, including a stepped-back design, but expressed concern about investing additional design effort without clearer direction from the Commission as to what would and would not be approvable. He stated: "What we don't want to do is work on a taper and spend a lot of time in design and development and we're still at the same place."

Demolition and rebuild as alternative: Mr. Horton raised the question of whether the Commission would be more receptive to a complete demolition and new construction, noting that the cost and complexity is substantial to retain the existing envelope while achieving the client's goal. Chair McCune responded that concerns about massing and scale would likely persist regardless of whether the building were rebuilt from scratch. Mr. Edwards stated that the existing building's party-wall configuration leaves the owner with limited options for expanding square footage and that constraining the building to one story permanently "is a bad precedent to set." Mr. Horton acknowledged that the board was objecting to the third story only. Member Tennant noted that there is a certain burden that comes with doing business in the historic district as it is more restrictive.

By the close of discussion, the Commission's general sentiment coalesced around the view that a two-story design, potentially with additional study of the roofline and Queen Street facade, would be a more viable basis for a continued conversation.

Chair McCune asked for a motion to table Case #26-18. Member Cummins made the motion to table and Member Tennant made the second. Chair McCune took a vote that was unanimously approved.

Voting yea: Chair McCune, Vice-Chair Hedrick, Bradley Cummins, Kris Davis, Tyler Tennant
Chair McCune then declared Case #26-18 closed.

4. Case #26-17 611 Front Street – Demo – Rear Building

Chair McCune called the case with no recusals needed. She noted that in this case, the Town of Beaufort itself is the applicant.

Mr. Garner presented the Town's application to demolish the existing rear structure at 611 Front Street. He requested that all materials in the packet be entered into the official record.

Mr. Garner described the structure as a surviving remnant of the original Inlet Inn, believed to have been constructed around the 1930s. Research indicated that BB&T purchased the property in 1967, suggesting the structure was relocated from its original position on what had been the BB&T property sometime between 1967 and 1970. He described the remnant as comprising three original sides, with the western wall—formerly the point of attachment to the main Inlet Inn building—being a later reconstruction.

Mr. Garner noted that the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) in Greenville had been contacted and had dispatched staff to conduct a room-by-room survey and photographic documentation of the structure; however, a formal written report had not yet been received. He noted that a SHPO staff member had offered the informal opinion that the structure is non-contributing, citing its relocated status and its character as a partial remnant rather than a complete representative of the original Inlet Inn.

He also noted that the town's desire is only to remove the rear building; the more historic front building at 611 Front Street is to remain on the property and would be preserved in its current location or, if necessary, relocated on-site.

The Commission engaged in a detailed and at times reflective discussion of the request. Key themes included:

Significance and contributing status: Member Cummins noted that SHPO had informally determined the structure to be non-contributing due to its relocation, and asked whether this meant the Commission's only available action would be a delay order. Town Attorney Quattlebaum confirmed that unless the SHPO formally determines the structure has statewide significance—a determination that would effectively preclude demolition except under an undue burden finding—the maximum action available to the HPC under the Local Development Ordinance (LDO) is a 365-day delay. During that period, the LDO also provides for the HPC to explore alternatives such as relocation. The attorney further clarified that if the applicant withdraws the application, no action is required; if no withdrawal occurs, the Commission must address the matter within 120 days.

Vice-Chair Hedrick asked whether SHPO had been specifically asked to assess statewide significance. Mr. Garner clarified that SHPO's informal opinion was provided in that context, and that the staff member who assessed it—Ms. Pool, who works with National Register properties—concluded it did not rise to that level due to the relocation and partial character of the remnant. Vice-Chair Hedrick drew a distinction between statewide significance and local significance, noting that a structure can carry meaningful local historical value without meeting the higher threshold. Chair McCune cited the Ruth Little survey's description of the structure as "the only surviving section of the original Inlet Inn" and acknowledged the difficulty of knowing with certainty from available photographs whether the surviving remnant corresponds to the east wing visible in a historic image from Jack Dudley's book. She expressed that the structure may hold meaning for the community as the sole surviving physical remnant of the Inlet Inn but acknowledged the difficulty of determining the appropriate response without a formal SHPO report in hand.

Possibility of relocation: Chair McCune asked whether there was any mechanism for the Town to advertise the building to private citizens who might be willing to assume the cost of moving it. Mr. Garner acknowledged this was a question that would need to be reviewed by the Town's real estate attorney before a definitive answer could be given. Vice-Chair Hedrick also acknowledged, however, that moving a building in the current environment—with above-ground utilities, power lines, mature live oaks, and constrained rights-of-way—is significantly more complex and costly than it was in earlier decades.

Waiting for SHPO report: Chair McCune expressed a strong preference for tabling the matter pending receipt of the formal SHPO written report and a written determination from SHPO's National Register staff regarding contributing status. She stated: "I want to see if the report is reassurance that this is not a building that we need to go to great lengths to save." Mr. Garner acknowledged there was no pressing deadline that would preclude a one-month delay, though he noted the Town would like to proceed with marketing the property before summer.

Motion to table Case 26-17 until the June meeting, pending receipt of the State Historic Preservation Office's formal report and a written determination regarding contributing or non-contributing status, was made by Commissioner Davis and seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair McCune asked for a motion to table Case #26-17 pending receipt of the State Historic Preservation Office's formal report and a written determination regarding contributing or non-contributing status. Member Davis made the motion to table and Member Tennant made the second. Chair McCune took a vote that was unanimously approved.

Voting yea: Chair McCune, Vice-Chair Hedrick, Bradley Cummins, Kris Davis, Tyler Tennant

Chair McCune then declared Case #26-18 closed.

Commission / Board Comments

Vice-Chair Hedrick offered extended remarks regarding historic interpretation and public engagement in the district. He noted his attendance at two recent public sessions regarding Eury Park, a space across the street from Town Hall (the former post office), and the importance of documenting the historic function of that waterfront space, which was once the terminus for mail boats serving Down East communities including Atlantic, Sea Level, and Harkers Island. He expressed a broader concern that significant buildings and properties throughout the district are not being recognized or appreciated by the public.

Vice-Chair Hedrick pointed to examples from other historic communities where historic districts are identified through distinctive street signage, numbered walking tour plaques, or bronze building plaques identifying the date of construction, original builder, and original use. He noted that resources including books by Barry Marsh Wilson and Mary Faith Worshaw already contain much of the underlying information that would be needed. He proposed that the HPC, in coordination with the Town, the North Carolina Maritime Museum, and the Beaufort Historic Association, consider developing a more robust system of interpretation and marking for the historic district. He concluded: "We are here to educate and to promote and to get people to appreciate what a unique, awesome, individual little town this is while we still have it."

Member Tennant thanked all who attended the meeting.

It was noted that one more member was needed on the Commission

Staff Comments

Mr. Garner introduced Griff Barlow, the Town's new Public Information Officer, who was present at the meeting—his second day on the job. Mr. Garner expressed hope that Mr. Barlow's role would support the kind of public outreach Vice-Chair Hedrick had described.

Second, Mr. Garner provided an update on a case that had been tabled at the April meeting and did not appear on the May agenda: an application involving windows on Ann Street for an applicant identified as Mr. Flow. Following the April meeting, staff provided Mr. Flow with three names of window restoration contractors, one of whom was Vice-Chair Hedrick. Mr. Garner and Mr. Fockler accompanied Vice-Chair Hedrick on a site visit to the property the prior Friday. Mr. Garner reported that the windows were found to be in considerably better condition than the applicant's architect had represented to the Commission—wavy glass indicative of age was found in several units, and the sills were in serviceable condition.

Mr. Garner noted that the windows on the rear addition were found to be non-original and already contain grilles between the glass, such that replacing them with Anderson A-Series windows would likely be an improvement rather than a loss. The goal articulated by staff is to have Mr. Flow commit to contracting with a window restoration professional to repair the original windows, and then to return to the Commission with a written request for like-kind replacement only on the non-original units at the rear.

Mr. Garner closed by expressing confidence in the ongoing work of Mr. Fockler and Ms. Anderson, noting that their familiarity with local history and willingness to conduct field visits would serve the Commission well as he transitions out of his role.

Adjourn

Member Cummins made the motion to adjourn and Chair McCune made the second. Chair McCune took a vote that was unanimously approved.

Voting yea: Chair McCune, Vice-Chair Hedrick, Bradley Cummins, Kris Davis, Tyler Tennant

Chair McCune declared the May 5th, 2026 meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Chair, Joyce McCune

Board Secretary, Laurel Anderson