



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, June 2nd 2026 - Train Depot, 614 Broad Street, Beaufort, NC 28516
Minutes

Call to Order

Chair McCune called the June 2nd, 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; Kris Davis, Jessica Sabiston

Members Absent: Bradley Cummins, Tyler Tennant

A quorum was declared with four 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

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

Voting yea: Chair McCune, Vice-Chair Hedrick, Kris Davis, Jessica Sabiston

Minutes Approval

1. HPC Draft Minutes 050526

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

Voting yea: Chair McCune, Vice-Chair Hedrick, Kris Davis, Jessica Sabiston

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 608 Ann Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

Vice-Chair Hedrick 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, Kris Davis, Jessica Sabiston

Old Business

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

Mr. Fockler reported that this case had been tabled at the previous meeting pending additional material samples and clarification. The applicant, Mr. Hamilton, had provided all requested information, including physical samples delivered to the staff office at least two weeks prior to the meeting.

Mr. Fockler confirmed that the flood elevation certificate was included in the updated packet and that the proposed finished floor elevation meets the historic district's height guidelines.

Secretary Anderson then administered the Oath to Craig Hamilton, applicant and owner of the property.

The Commission and Mr. Hamilton discussed the following:

Siding Material: Mr. Hamilton expressed a preference for using the textured (rough) side of Hardie Plank siding, as opposed to the smooth side called for in the standard guidelines. He noted that the existing accessory dwelling unit on the property uses the textured side, and he finds it more aesthetically authentic as he does not want it to look like vinyl siding. The Commission acknowledged it has approved this on a case-by-case basis previously and that matching the existing accessory structure would produce a more cohesive appearance. Mr. Hamilton had submitted a written request for this exception, which was included in the packet.

Porch Lighting: Mr. Hamilton proposed recessed lighting on the front porch ceiling. Vice-Chair Hedrick, who is an electrician, raised practical questions about waterproofing such fixtures beneath an open upper deck. Mr. Hamilton described his intent to position the fixtures behind the floor joists so they would not be visible from the street. The Commission determined that indirect lighting of this nature was acceptable from a design standpoint, and that the

specific waterproofing and code compliance details would be addressed through the standard building permit and inspection process.

Baluster/Railing Detail: Mr. Fockler presented a physical sample of the proposed hand-turned wood balusters. Commissioners confirmed these were appropriate and consistent with materials used elsewhere in the historic district.

Columns: The applicant proposed square columns with chamfered edges, which the Commission noted are prevalent throughout the historic district.

Lattice Screening: Discussion clarified that wood lattice screening was intended between the porch columns at the base of the structure, and the applicant confirmed the material would be treated wood.

Chair McCune 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, and the Commission moved to findings of fact and approval.

Vice-Chair Hedrick asked for a motion for a Finding of Fact for Case #26-10. Vice-Chair Hedrick made the following motion: Having reviewed the record and having considered all evidence submitted and oral testimony for Case #26-10, 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: Building Placement 7.1.1, 7.1.2, 7.1.4; Building Height/Scale 7.2.1, 7.2.2, 7.2.3, 7.2.4; Materials 7.3.1, 7.3.2, 7.3.3; Details 7.4.1, 7.4.2; Texture and Color 7.5.1; Form and Rhythm 7.6.1, 7.6.2, 7.6.3; Landscaping 8.1.7, 8.1.8, 8.1.12; Fences and Walls Guidelines 8.2.2, 8.2.3; Outside Utilities Guidelines 8.3.1, 8.3.3, 8.3.6; Exterior Lighting Guidelines 8.4.1, 8.4.2, 8.4.3; Off-Street Parking Guidelines 8.5.1, 8.5.7. Under Materials 7.3.2 the textured side is approved.

Member Davis made the second and Chair McCune took a vote that was approved.

Voting yea: Chair McCune, Vice-Chair Hedrick, Kris Davis, Jessica Sabiston

Chair McCune then asked for a motion for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Case #26-10.

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 #26-10 be issued for the proposed work.

Vice-Chair Hedrick made the second and Chair McCune took a vote that was unanimously approved.

Voting yea: Chair McCune, Vice-Chair Hedrick, Kris Davis, Jessica Sabiston

Chair McCune thanked Mr. Hamilton for bringing the matter before them and explained that once the Historic Commission adopts the minutes and Findings of Fact at the June meeting, he would receive the COA from the town. The case was then closed.

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

Chair McCune introduced Case #26-17 and Mr. Garner presented an update on this case, which had been tabled at the May meeting pending additional historical research. Staff had obtained information from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) in Greenville and compiled an extensive photographic record of 111 images for the packet. Mr. Garner requested that all materials be admitted into the record.

SHPO determined the rear structure to be **non-contributing** to the historic district. It was further established that the structure was not included in the Tony Wrenn survey of the 1970s that formed the basis of the original historic district application, and that the structure had been relocated at some point in its history.

Discussion among commissioners touched on the following points:

- The structure that remains is believed to be a later addition or wing appended to the rear of the original inn; the historically and architecturally significant main building and façade have been gone since approximately the mid-1960s, when the property was transferred and the bank building was constructed.
- Photographs from the inside of the structure showed floors covered with linoleum and general deterioration, making it difficult to assess original fabric.
- The Town's rationale for demolition was summarized by Mr. Garner: the Town originally acquired the property primarily to secure riparian rights for the waterfront; the Town intends to preserve and retain the authentic historic structure at the front of 611 Front Street; and the Town is seeking to place the property for sale. Prospective buyers have expressed willingness to preserve the front structure but not the non-contributing rear building.
- Mr. Garner confirmed that the Town had previously reached out to the Beaufort Historical Association regarding relocating the structure free of charge, but the Association did not have available property. The offer for a party to take the building for free and move it at their own expense remains open.
- The Chair noted the structure has asphalt shingle siding on its exterior, likely applied after relocation, and that any demolition will require asbestos assessment and abatement prior to a demolition permit being issued. Mr. Garner estimated a 30–45 day gap in the process, providing additional time for any interested parties to come forward.

Chair McCune then outlined the findings the Commission could choose: vote to allow demolition, vote for demolition with a delay, or vote to allow the demolition to go ahead.

Vice-Chair Hedrick raised the question of salvaging architectural features per Guideline 10.1.3. Mr. Garner indicated the State did not identify any particular features of significance but noted the Town would likely be amenable to allowing interested parties to salvage elements such as doors prior to demolition.

Chair McCune asked for a motion for a Finding of Fact for Case #26-17. Member Davis made the following motion: Having reviewed the record and having considered all evidence submitted and oral testimony for Case #26-17, 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: Demolitions of Buildings Guidelines 10.1.1, 10.1.2, 10.1.3, 10.1.4, 10.1.5, 10.1.6.

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

Voting yea: Chair McCune, Vice-Chair Hedrick, Kris Davis, Jessica Sabiston

Chair McCune then asked for a motion for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Case #26-17.

Vice-Chair Hedrick 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 #26-17 be issued for the proposed work.

Member Sabiston made the second and Chair McCune took a vote that was unanimously approved.

Voting yea: Chair McCune, Vice-Chair Hedrick, Kris Davis, Jessica Sabiston

Mr. Garner reiterated that if someone was interested in moving the building or salvage parts of it there would be at least a 30-45 day window in which to do that, and his understanding was that the building was free though the town would not pay for the removal of the building.

Chair McCune then closed Case #26-17.

New Business

1. Case #26-19 215 Turner Street – Porch, Utilities & Fencing

Mr. Garner presented this case as a follow-up to a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness. He requested the staff report and all exhibits in the packet be included in the record. The applicant, Mr. John Griffin, was seeking approval for three items: (1) a change in porch decking material from Trex to brick, which staff characterized as an improvement over what was originally approved; (2) confirmation of utility placement on the site, as required by the original COA; and (3) a wooden picket Beaufort-style fence that had been installed without prior COA approval. Mr. Garner noted the applicant's Certificate of Occupancy was withheld pending resolution of these items, but that all work otherwise met town and district guidelines. There were no questions for Mr. Garner.

Secretary Anderson administered the Oath to John Griffin, the applicant and owner of the property.

Mr. Griffin confirmed he had nothing to add beyond staff's summary. Chair McCune agreed that the change in front porch decking was an improvement.

No parties with standing or witnesses wished to speak. There was no substantive discussion among commissioners, who were satisfied with the application but noted this was an after-the-fact COA.

Chair McCune asked for a motion for a Finding of Fact for Case #26-19. Member Sabiston made the following motion: Having reviewed the record and having considered all evidence submitted and oral testimony for Case #26-19, 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: Materials Guidelines 7.3.2, 7.3.3; Fences and Walls Guidelines 8.2.2, 8.2.3; Outside Utilities Guidelines 8.3.1, 8.3.6.

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

Voting yea: Chair McCune, Vice-Chair Hedrick, Kris Davis, Jessica Sabiston

Chair McCune then asked for a motion for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Case #26-19.

Vice-Chair Hedrick 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 #26-19 be issued for the proposed work.

Member Sabiston made the second and Chair McCune took a vote that was unanimously approved.

Voting yea: Chair McCune, Vice-Chair Hedrick, Kris Davis, Jessica Sabiston

Chair McCune thanked Mr. Griffin for bringing the matter before them and explained that once the Historic Commission adopts the minutes and Findings of Fact at the June meeting, he would receive the COA from the town. The case was then closed.

At the request of town legal counsel, the Commission briefly reopened Case #26-19 to formally vote on the written COA order document, which was needed on an expedited basis due to a time-sensitive matter.

Chair McCune verified the Order for Case #26-19 was complete and accurate and made a motion to approve it as presented. Member Sabiston made the second and Chair McCune took a vote that was unanimous.

Voting yea: Chair McCune, Vice-Chair Hedrick, Kris Davis, Jessica Sabiston

Chair McCune then closed Case #26-19 and opened Case #26-20.

3. Case #26-20 303 Turner Street – Window Replacement

Chair McCune opened Case #26-20 and asked if any members needed to recuse themselves. Hearing none, Mr. Garner presented this new case involving a request by S&T Development (Mr. Billy Tickle) to replace 18 windows at 303 Turner Street with Andersen A-Series windows. He noted this is a contributing structure as identified by architectural historian Ruth Little and included in the National Register. This was the property's first COA application since being added to the local historic district in 2006–2008. Mr. Garner stated that much of the glass in the panes looked original though quite a bit were cracked or broken.

Mr. Garner reported that the applicant had submitted extensive photographs documenting the condition of the existing windows, showing cracked and broken panes, sashes with butyl caulk used in place of glazing compound, and storm windows installed over the originals for protection.

Secretary Anderson administered the Oath to Billy Tickle, the applicant and contractor for the project.

Mr. Tickle provided the following information: 21 individual panes across 18 windows are broken; sashes have been compromised through improper repair with butyl caulk that is very difficult to remove without causing further damage; in his professional opinion the windows are not salvageable. He proposed a replacement-in-kind approach retaining all existing exterior and interior trim casings, inserting the new windows into the existing frames, with a slight reduction in visible glass area.

The Commission's discussion centered on the guidelines, which were the primary basis for its decision:

- Chair McCune cited guideline **6.4.5**, which states that replacement of historic windows for the sole purpose of improved thermal performance is not appropriate, and guideline **6.4.3**, which requires that wood windows be replaced with wood windows. The commission agreed that they had been consistent in not approving Andersen windows on historic homes, only on new structures or additions.
- Commissioners noted that the Andersen A-Series is a fiberglass-composite product with a wood interior, not a solid wood exterior window as called for in the guidelines.
- Vice-Chair Hedrick stated a preference for the windows either being repaired or, if replacement is necessary, replaced with solid wood windows—noting the house is on a prominent gateway street into the historic district. The members were in agreement that repairs should be required first before allowing replacement on historic structures.
- Chair McCune confirmed that these guidelines have been in place and consistently applied for approximately 20 years, consistent with federal Secretary of the Interior Standards and the practices of comparable preservation jurisdictions.
- From the discussion with the applicant and looking at the supplied photos the commission

Mr. Garner clarified that if the applicant ultimately chooses to repair the existing windows or replace them with like-for-like wood windows, that work would not require a return to the full Commission and could be processed through a staff-level like-for-like application.

Chair McCune asked for a motion for a Finding of Fact against Case #26-20. Vice-Chair Hedrick made the following motion: Having reviewed the record and having considered all evidence submitted and oral testimony for Case #26-20, move that the Commission concludes that the pending application fails to meet the following design standards under the Design Guidelines for the Beaufort Historic District and Landmarks: Windows and Door Guidelines 6.4.1, 6.4.2, 6.4.3, 6.4.5, 6.4.7.

Member Davis made the second and Chair McCune took a vote that was approved.

Voting yea: Chair McCune, Vice-Chair Hedrick, Kris Davis, Jessica Sabiston

Chair McCune then asked for a motion for a Certificate of Appropriateness against Case #26-20.

Chair McCune made a motion to deny 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 incongruous with the special character of the historic district as a whole and that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Case #26-20 not be issued for the proposed work.

Vice-Chair Hedrick made the second and Chair McCune took a vote that was unanimously approved.

Voting yea: Chair McCune, Vice-Chair Hedrick, Kris Davis, Jessica Sabiston

The Chair advised Mr. Tickle that the Commission's guidelines require wood-for-wood replacement on a contributing historic structure, and encouraged him to explore repair options or wood window alternatives with his client.

2. Case # 26-21 201 Front Street – Remove & Replace Existing Chimney

Mr. Garner presented Case #26-21 and requested the staff report and all exhibits in the packet be included in the record. The case is a request to remove and rebuild two chimneys at 201 Front Street. Mr. Garner noted the Commission had recently approved a metal roof replacement for this contributing structure, and the chimney issues were discovered in the course of that work. Staff confirmed this is the first chimney replacement request to come before the Commission in at least 18 years; prior requests had involved only repairs or removals, and if approved, the replacement will require a building permit.

The board secretary administered the Oath to John Engelhard of Owens Construction, the applicant and contractor for the project.

Mr. Engelhard provided the following context:

- The **east chimney** is constructed of concrete masonry unit (CMU) block, not historic brick, and was likely rebuilt around 1950 or during a renovation circa 2008. This disqualifies the work from a like-for-like staff-level approval and necessitates a COA.
- The **west chimney**, while brick, is visibly separating from the house and has required a structural support bracket for several years.
- Both chimneys are presently non-functional and will remain so after reconstruction.
- The proposal is to rebuild both chimneys to match the existing appearance—same slope profile and overall form—using historically appropriate brick. A structural engineer is already involved with the overall renovations at the house.
- Two structural options were presented to the property owner for budget purposes: (1) solid masonry reconstruction, or (2) a hybrid framing with a full brick face. Both options would produce an identical exterior appearance.
- The metal roof installation, previously approved as Case #25-27, cannot be completed until the chimneys are rebuilt to the roofline, making the matter time-sensitive.

Though the COA application materials referenced unpainted brick, Chair McCune noted that historic photographs show portions of the chimneys having been painted, and the chimneys are currently painted white. Vice-Chair Hedrick cited guideline **6.3.9**, which discourages painting masonry that was not historically painted. However, it was acknowledged the chimneys are painted at present, which complicates a denial on that basis. During the hearing, Mr. Engelhard was notified by the property owner, Ms. Williamson, that she had decided **not** to paint the new chimneys and would leave them in natural brick. This resolved the painting question to the Commission's satisfaction and was noted for the record.

No parties with standing or witnesses wished to speak.

Chair McCune asked for a motion for a Finding of Fact for Case #26-21. Member Davis made the following motion: Having reviewed the record and having considered all evidence submitted and oral testimony for Case #26-21, 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: Brickwork and Masonry Guidelines 6.3.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.5, 6.3.6, 6.3.7, 6.3.8, 6.3.9; Paint and Exterior Colors Guidelines 6.7.3.

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

Voting yea: Chair McCune, Vice-Chair Hedrick, Kris Davis, Jessica Sabiston

Chair McCune then asked for a motion for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Case #26-21.

Chair McCune 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 incongruous with the special character of the historic district as a whole and that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Case #26-21 be issued for the proposed work.

Vice-Chair Hedrick made the second and Chair McCune took a vote that was unanimously approved.

Voting yea: Chair McCune, Vice-Chair Hedrick, Kris Davis, Jessica Sabiston

Chair McCune thanked Mr. Engelhard for bringing the matter before them and explained that once the Historic Commission adopts the minutes and Findings of Fact at the June meeting, he would receive the COA from the town. The case was then closed.

Commission / Board Comments

Vice-Chair Hedrick noted that the agenda packet was 451 pages long and thanked the staff.

Chair McCune noted that she had observed the recently installed railings along the commercial docks on the 600 block of Front Street following a "Beaufort Minute" segment by town staff. She reported that the improvements look very good and noted that town staff indicated consideration is being given to extending the railings further east for additional safety.

Staff Comments

Mr. Garner provided the following updates:

CLG Training: A historic preservation training session with Ms. Kristi Brantley, SHPO, is anticipated in Wilmington in late July. At least two Commission members will be required to attend with staff to fulfill Certified Local Government (CLG) continuing education hours. Details and agenda topics will be distributed when available.

Ann Street Window Restoration: Mr. Garner commended Vice-Chair Hedrick for his work restoring windows at the house on Ann Street in collaboration with Mr. Flow. Staff visited the property and reported the windows look "absolutely wonderful."

611 Ann Street / Mr. Flow's Property: Staff provided an update that concerns about potential demolition of the contributing historic structure at this address have been resolved. Mr. Flow has agreed to retain and improve the historic structure. Due to flood resiliency concerns, the lower level will be used for storage only. Mr. Garner characterized this outcome as a significant preservation win.

525 Front Street (Tabled Application): Mr. Garner noted that the applicants for the previously tabled Front Street project will not be returning in June and a significant revision is expected before resubmission.

Local Landmark Applications: Mr. Garner advised the Commission to prepare for a forthcoming application for local landmark status, which may be the first such application before this body. Mr. Garner explained the multi-step process: the Commission first votes to support the application to SHPO; the state reviews and approves the architectural and historic report; the Commission then conducts a formal hearing; and ultimately the Board of Commissioners makes the final designation, which carries associated property tax incentives.

Bronze Landmark Plaque: Mr. Garner encouraged the Commission to consider establishing a program for bronze plaques to recognize locally designated landmarks, and suggested this could potentially be funded through the Commission's existing annual budget. He also noted that Ms. Anderson had successfully secured line-item funding in future town budgets for historically designed street blades for the local district.

Adjourn

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

Voting yea: Chair McCune, Vice-Chair Hedrick, Kris Davis, Jessica Sabiston

Chair McCune declared the May 5th, 2026 meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Chair, Joyce McCune

Board Secretary, Laurel Anderson