



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, April 7th 2026 - Train Depot, 614 Broad Street, Beaufort, NC 28516
Minutes

Call to Order

Chair McCune called the April 7th, 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, Jessica Sabiston

Members Absent: Tyler Tennant

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

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, Bradley Cummins, Kris Davis, Jessica Sabiston

Minutes Approval

1. HPC Draft Minutes 030326

Chair McCune noted that the draft minutes from the March 3rd meeting contained two small typos that had been corrected.

Member Davis made the motion to approve the Minutes as corrected 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, Jessica Sabiston

Election of Officers

Town Attorney Quattlebaum opened the floor for nominations for Chair.

Member Cummins nominated Joyce McCune for Chair and Member Sabiston made the second. There were no further nominations. Member Cummins made the motion to close nominations for Chair and Vice-Chair Hedrick made the second.

Ms. Quattlebaum took a vote that was unanimously approved.

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

Chair McCune opened the floor for nominations for Vice-Chair.

Chair McCune nominated Bradley Hedrick for Vice-Chair and Member Davis made the second. There were no further nominations. Member Cummins made the motion to close nominations for Vice-Chair 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, Jessica Sabiston

Chair McCune declared the election of officers closed.

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 618 Ann Street, 907 Ann Street, 117 Ann Street, 105 Front Street & 114 Ann Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

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

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

New Business

1. Case # 26-09 315 Ann St – Fence, Driveway & Rear Porch

Chair McCune opened the case and asked if any commission members needed to recuse themselves. Member Davis recused himself, stating that the applicant was a previous client.

Mr. Garner provided a summary of the case, submitting the staff report and exhibits as part of the record. He explained the request was to erect a fence and gate section on the west side of the house, replace a damaged door, replace missing glass, remove plywood from the garage window, install handrails on front and side porches to match existing handrails, remove the existing driveway and sidewalk and install new ones, and create a larger rear deck by removing an exterior basement roof, and installing a deck on the foundation.

Mr. Garner noted that while the house currently doesn't have front handrails, it was built around the same time as the neighboring house at 313 Ann Street, suggesting there may have been rails there originally, though no photographic evidence exists to prove this.

Vice-Chair Hedrick questioned the application details, noting he couldn't find information about the rails in the application and asking if the rail was strictly decorative since the house doesn't require one due to the porch height. Mr. Garner indicated the applicant would need to speak to that specifically.

Secretary Anderson administered the Oath to David Durham, applicant and homeowner.

Chair McCune mentioned she had researched the history of the house, confirming that the houses at 313 and 315 Ann Street were built by the same person at the same time, with the developer splitting the lot and building both houses.

Mr. Durham explained the basement roof situation, describing it as an addition from the 1950s or 60s based on the brick style that appeared to house a furnace. He planned to remove the roof and deck over the foundation, which seemed to be at the same elevation as the existing back stoop, making it continuous with the existing back deck.

Regarding the front porch rail, Mr. Durham confirmed his intent to duplicate what exists on his back porch or match 313 Ann Street, noting they were extremely similar in style, shape, size, and height. He explained that the front porch height was technically just below the minimum requiring rails, so it served both safety and aesthetic purposes.

Vice-Chair Hedrick asked about the rail composition, and Mr. Durham confirmed it would be wood. Member Cummins requested clarification that the railing would match the existing back porch specifications already shown in the packet, which Mr. Durham agreed to.

Chair McCune asked about the driveway material, and Mr. Durham confirmed it would be concrete with brick borders. Member Cummins requested that the driveway specifications be clearly spelled out since the image wasn't in the packet. Mr. Durham confirmed the brick would border the edges and expansion joints.

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.

Chair McCune asked for a motion for a Finding of Fact for Case #26-09. Member Cummins made the following motion: Having reviewed the record and having considered all evidence submitted and oral testimony for Case #26-09, 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: Window and Door Guidelines 6.4.1, 6.4.3; Decks on Historic Buildings Guidelines 7.9.1, 7.9.2; Fences and Walls Guidelines 8.2.2, 8.2.3, 8.2.7; Off-Street Parking Guidelines 8.5.7.

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

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

Chair McCune then asked for a motion for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Case #26-09.

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 #26-09 be issued for the proposed work.

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

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

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

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

Voting yea: Chair McCune, Vice-Chair Hedrick, Bradley Cummins, Jessica Sabiston

2. Case #26-11 201 Ann St – Driveway, Addition, Fence & Porch

Chair McCune introduced Case #26-11 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 homeowner Eric Lindstrom had first secured a special use permit from the Board of Commissioners (BOC) for an accessory dwelling unit behind the existing house at 201 Ann Street, which was required before submitting the COA application. The request included detailed plans for the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) location in the rear yard, landscaping, and creation of off-street parking where none currently existed.

Mr. Garner clarified that because the structure is less than 16 feet in height, it is allowed to be within 5 feet of side and rear property lines, addressing concerns about proximity to property boundaries.

Vice-Chair Hedrick asked about the treatment of the project, questioning whether it was considered new construction despite being an existing building with changed use. Mr. Garner explained that due to the change from a shed to habitable space and the addition work, it was treated as new construction under the guidelines.

Member Cummins asked about the requirement to go before the BOC for ADU approval. Mr. Garner explained this was necessary for all properties wanting ADU's, particularly for public safety reasons. He noted that Mr. Lindstrom had met with the fire department to ensure apparatus and personnel could access the structure in emergencies.

Secretary Anderson administered the Oath to applicant and homeowner Eric Lindstrom.

Mr. Lindstrom highlighted that one issue was the brick driveway running to the street, which would be decided by the HPC. He noted the property's unique situation of not having a sidewalk and probably never getting one, similar to other properties in town that have been allowed to run brick driveways to the street. He expressed willingness to execute legal documents with the town to guarantee replacement if anything happened to the driveway in the public right-of-way.

Mr. Lindstrom explained the structure's provenance from 1985, built by John Costlow using salvaged historic materials from other Beaufort properties, including historic windows. He emphasized staying within the 16-foot height limit and designing all additions as additive massing that looked like additions added over time. All materials would be like-wood materials including wood windows, siding, and door casings.

He detailed three different types of bricks for the project: rumbled palmetto for driveway material, handmade Carolina brick for walls and foundation to match the house foundation, and another brick to tie into existing backyard walkways.

Member Cummins confirmed the use of wood windows and doors, and functional louvered shutters. Mr. Lindstrom confirmed the galvanized metal low slope roof would only be on porch shed roofs.

Member Cummins questioned whether standing seam would be better than the proposed 5V screw-down metal roofing. Mr. Lindstrom indicated willingness to go with whatever the commission preferred, noting that 5V had been used more commonly for historic buildings. Member Cummins felt standing seam would match the caliber of the structure better. Commissioners discussed that while the metal roof wouldn't be visible from public rights-of-way, standing seam would be more appropriate for new construction than screw-down 5V.

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.

Chair McCune asked for a motion for a Finding of Fact for Case #26-11. Vice-Chair Hedrick made the following motion: Having reviewed the record and having considered all evidence submitted and oral testimony for Case #26-11, 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, 7.1.3, 7.1.4; Building Height/Scale 7.2.1, 7.2.2, 7.2.3, 7.2.4; Materials 7.3.1, 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 7.7.1; Fences and Walls Guidelines 8.2.1, 8.2.2, 8.2.3, 8.2.4, 8.2.5, 8.2.6, 8.2.7; Outside Utilities Guidelines 8.3.1, 8.3.2, 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, 8.5.2, 8.5.3, 8.5.4, 8.5.5, 8.5.6, 8.5.7; Roofing Guidelines 6.1.2, 6.1.3.

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

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

Chair McCune then asked for a motion for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Case #26-11.

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 not incongruous with the special character of the historic district as a whole and that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Case #26-11 be issued for the proposed work, with the condition that the metal roof be standing seam.

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

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

Chair McCune then declared Case #26-11 closed and notified the applicant that the Minutes and Findings of Fact would be adopted at the next meeting and the COA would then be issued.

3. Case #26-12 101 Ann Street – Three Townhome Units – Metal Railing & Fencing

Chair McCune opened the case with no recusals needed. Mr. Garner explained this was a revision to a previously approved certificate of appropriateness. The original request was for the same dimensions and design but with wood material. After construction began, the developer wanted to use lighter weight aluminum material, but after learning aluminum wasn't preferred in the guidelines, they switched to a steel frame that was quite heavy and substantial.

Mr. Garner showed a material sample, explaining it was an exact replica of the approved design, just in a different material. He noted this was new construction requiring commission approval.

Member Davis asked about code conflicts with height, which Mr. Garner said he wasn't aware of, noting the applicants were registered architects who could speak to that issue.

Member Cummins asked if the railing was for both street and water sides, which Mr. Garner confirmed.

Secretary Anderson administered the Oath to Jay Horton, Filter Design Studio, representing the homeowners.

Mr. Horton confirmed the steel was galvanized and powder coated, emphasizing it was substantial. The owners chose this route for safety reasons and longevity, particularly with grandchildren around. The height remained at the original 42 inches from the drawings, with no code issues since the 36–42-inch range was acceptable.

Chair McCune confirmed this application was for railing only, not fencing, despite one reference to fencing in the materials.

Chair McCune asked if there were any parties with standing who wished to comment and there were none.

Chair McCune asked for a motion for a Finding of Fact for Case #26-12. Member Cummins made the following motion: Having reviewed the record and having considered all evidence submitted and oral testimony for Case #26-12, 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 7.3.3; Details 7.4.1; Texture and Color 7.5.1; Form and Rhythm 7.6.1; Paint and Exterior Colors Guidelines 6.7.2.

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

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

Chair McCune then asked for a motion for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Case #26-12.

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 #26-12 be issued for the proposed work.

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

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

Chair McCune then declared Case #26-12 closed and notified the applicant that the Minutes and Findings of Fact would be adopted at the next meeting and the COA would then be issued.

4. Case #26-13 105 Front Street – New Construction

Chair McCune called the case with no recusals needed. Mr. Garner requested the staff report and all exhibits be submitted as part of the official record. He provided a summary, noting this was "probably one of the most significant COAs that this Board has had come before them in the 18 years that I've been here." This concerned the Duncan House property that caught fire on December 15th, 2025.

Mr. Garner emphasized this was an application for a new structure, not a renovation, explaining that because the structure was damaged more than 50 percent, it must meet all regulatory flood requirements. He noted the Duncan House had carried the historic statewide significance designation, but the new structure would not carry that designation, and the landmark status would be addressed at another meeting with legal counsel.

The staff had verified that the proposed front setback met guidelines and zoning requirements. Mr. Garner noted very little had changed from the original foundation or footprint, with some changes including garage elevation, different parking materials, and modifications on the rear of the structure.

He emphasized this was a new structure, not a replica, noting the guidelines point this out, which is why date bricks are required so people don't think structures are older than they are.

Member Cummins asked about maximum building height in the area and how raising the property affected that. Mr. Garner explained they measure from the average grade around the structure to the peak, with a maximum of 35 feet. He clarified that while plans showed 42 feet, that wasn't from ground elevation, and the structure wasn't actually 42 feet high.

Member Cummins asked about measuring from pre-existing grade versus after retaining wall installation. Mr. Garner confirmed they measure from the average grade after retaining wall installation to the peak.

Secretary Anderson administered the Oath to Ryan Edwards, Filter Design Studio, representing the homeowners. Mr. Horton of Filter Design Studio had already been sworn in during a previous agenda item.

Mr. Horton addressed the house's height question, explaining they start at about 4 feet at the street, go to 4.25 feet at back of curb, 6.25 feet at top of wall (taking advantage of maximum 2-foot wall height), then slope up to 7 feet around the house. The grade starts at 7 feet to get to 42 feet, achieving the maximum 35-foot building height to the ridge peak at 34 feet 11 inches.

Mr. Edwards noted the significant investment in the original foundation, explaining there were over 100 helical piers under the structure that they planned to reuse as much as possible. The majority of the exterior perimeter was based on the original foundation, with only a small bump-out on the north side.

Mr. Horton explained the stair changes, noting they originally had five risers when the house was on the ground. After raising it and putting the finished floor at about eight feet, they were now going to twelve feet, taking advantage of the two-foot wall and having eight risers to the porch.

Vice-Chair Hedrick raised concerns about the date brick requirement and the philosophical issue of the building being a "dead ringer" for the famous Duncan House. He worried that the majority of people walking down the street would think it was the original Duncan House, creating confusion about what is old and new, which conflicts with Secretary of Interior Standards requiring clear differentiation between the two.

Mr. Horton acknowledged this was difficult since the Wootens loved the property and were good stewards who put their hearts into the renovation. He noted they did make changes: moving the house up so it doesn't look the same, changing chimney locations, adding a widow's walk, and modifying the rear entrance and garage height. While similar, it wasn't an exact replica.

Chair McCune appreciated that they were building something that looked like the old structure while making changes. She felt the public wanted their Duncan House back given the emotional blow of the fire, particularly for the Wootens who had loved and previously saved the house.

Member Sabiston valued Vice-Chair Hedrick's input but felt given the circumstances of the loss, Filter Design had done a fantastic job rendering what was there with changes, noting it was different and well done.

Member Cummins confirmed the use of smooth Hardie siding and wood windows. Regarding the front porch columns, Mr. Horton explained they would try to save any original columns.

Chair McCune confirmed continuation with wood shake roof, mahogany stained doors, and composite shutters (allowed on new construction). She noted the standing seam metal roof referenced for back porch areas.

Member Sabiston asked about the design choice to mix shingle and metal roofing. Mr. Horton explained he originally had all metal but felt keeping shingles on the main house (like the original) was more in character, even though mixing systems would cost more.

The board discussed whether they had sufficient detail for approval, questioning if all necessary specifications were included. There were references to matching "original" elements throughout the plans, raising questions about which original plans were being referenced.

Ms. Quattlebaum suggested either tabling for more specific details or making compliance with the earlier COA a condition, since the earlier application contained the specific details being referenced.

The discussion became complex regarding what "original" meant when referencing a building that no longer existed. Mr. Horton clarified they meant using the same materials from the previous renovation and were specifically calling out materials in the current application.

Member Cummins felt they could proceed with language linking references to "original" back to the previous COA application. After extensive discussion about defining "original" and ensuring proper documentation, the board decided to proceed with conditions.

Chair McCune asked if there were any parties with standing or other witnesses who wished to comment and there were none.

Chair McCune asked for a motion for a Finding of Fact for Case #26-13. Member Davis made the following motion: Having reviewed the record and having considered all evidence submitted and oral testimony for Case #26-13, 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, 7.1.3, 7.1.4; Building Height/Scale 7.2.1, 7.2.2, 7.2.3, 7.2.4, 7.2.5; 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 7.7.1; Off-Street Parking Guidelines 8.5.1, 8.5.2, 8.5.3, 8.5.4, 8.5.6, 8.5.7; Outside Utilities Guidelines 8.3.1, 8.3.6; Exterior Lighting Guidelines 8.4.1, 8.4.2, 8.4.3; Landscaping Guidelines 8.1.2, 8.1.5, 8.1.7, 8.1.8, 8.1.12, 8.1.13.

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

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

Chair McCune then asked for a motion for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Case #26-13.

Member Cummins 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 #26-13 be issued for the proposed work with the conditions that the Hardie board siding be smooth and where original is referred to on the application the same or substantially similar type of material approved in the COA for the most recent renovation for the prior single family structure on the property is used.

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

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

Chair McCune then declared Case #26-13 closed and notified the applicants that the Minutes and Findings of Fact would be adopted at the next meeting and the COA would then be issued.

5. Case # 26-14 114 Ann Street - West Side Entrance, Replace Windows & Tree Replacement

Chair McCune opened the case with no recusals needed. Mr. Garner provided a summary, requesting inclusion of the staff report and exhibits in the official record.

The application requested replacing wood windows with Andersen A Series, widening the west entrance, and removing and replacing an existing established live oak adjacent to Ann Street. Mr. Garner noted that during the approval process, the owner had already removed the existing live oak without approval, which violated the guidelines. The tree had been replaced, but the removal occurred prior to commission approval.

Secretary Anderson administered the Oath to Maggie Chalk from MK Chalk Architecture.

Ms. Chalk addressed the tree misunderstanding, explaining she had told the owner she would apply for tree replacement, but he thought that meant he could proceed with removal, which was an unfortunate miscommunication. She stated they had replaced it with a tree with a larger than required 6-inch diameter, about 16 feet high, and would contribute nicely to the Ann Street canopy when mature.

Chair McCune identified additional items in the application beyond what was initially mentioned, including a proposed lift change to accessible stairs in the back, relocation of the west side basement entrance, front entry stair reframing for accessibility, window replacement, and 6 inches of fill in the center of the backyard.

Member Cummins asked about the stair landing, noting what appeared to be a new block pad and the removal of a crepe myrtle. Ms. Chalk explained they hadn't specifically addressed individual landscaping elements and that the house had serious water problems requiring installation of a new sock pipe around the foundation. The brick pad would replace a concrete pad and sidewalk that had been removed because they were not in the correct location.

Vice-Chair Hedrick questioned replacing all windows throughout the entire structure, including those on the main facade that appeared to be very close to first period with wavy glass, asking why they couldn't be repaired instead of replaced. Ms. Chalk stated the frames were rotted.

Chair McCune confirmed the windows appeared to be old and made of wood, noting the guidelines call for wood-to-wood replacement when old windows cannot be repaired, not the proposed Andersen windows without wood exteriors.

Secretary Anderson administered the Oath to Victor Flow, homeowner of 114 Ann Street.

Mr. Flow testified that he did not want to spend a lot of money if he did not need to, and he stated that many of the windows and sashes were rotten on the upper part of the house but on the lower part some could be salvaged.

Member Cummins clarified that the A Series was Fibrex (wood core with Fibrex clad exterior) with impact resistant glass. Ms. Chalk asked if guidelines applied only to street-front windows or all windows, since those on the 1970s addition were not wood.

Chair McCune emphasized this was the historic Buckman House, included in Tony Wrenn's 1970s survey as historically and architecturally significant to Beaufort. Despite its current condition, it had significance in the historic district, requiring careful consideration of any updates. She noted that guidelines required wood-to-wood replacement on historic structures, just as they had approved for the earlier ADU agenda item.

Board discussion revealed various approaches, including potentially restoring wood windows on the front while using quality replacements elsewhere, since the addition didn't have original wood windows.

Chair McCune acknowledged they weren't being unreasonable, noting that other quality wood window manufacturers also make windows for historic properties.

Ms. Chalk confirmed they were happy to comply with wood-for-wood on the historic windows and asked for clarification whether that applied to all windows around the original block or just the street face.

Mr. Garner questioned the proposed front step's extension beyond the current footprint, noting this would extend a nonconforming structure without a variance which violated zoning standards. Ms. Chalk indicated they had since pulled the steps back to the corner of the house to stay within the same footprint.

Chair McCune then addressed the relocation of the west side basement entrance, confirming it would be a wood door. Regarding the rear accessible stairs, commissioners found these acceptable since they were in the rear.

The discussion of front entry stair changes was withdrawn since extending beyond the current footprint wasn't possible without a variance.

For window replacement, the commission emphasized wood-for-wood replacement was required in the old part of the house (front and two sides), following Guidelines 6.4.2 and 6.4.3 requiring repair where possible and wood-to-wood replacement when necessary.

Vice-Chair Hedrick suggested an independent assessment of the windows, possibly from the State Historic Preservation Office, questioning whether the windows were truly beyond repair since a builder wasn't consulted. Ms. Chalk, identifying as a former builder and member of Preservation North Carolina's professional associates network, professed her capability to assess that the window frames were rotted through and unrepairable.

Member Cummins noted past situations where they had requested maintaining wavy glass on the front facade while replacing others and observed that the A Series Fibrex clad wouldn't be visually distinguishable from painted wood windows from the street.

The discussion grew complex around the guidelines requiring retention of historic materials where possible and wood-to-wood replacement. Board members debated whether clad windows were acceptable versus requiring solid wood windows. Vice-Chair Hedrick stated his preference to retain as much historic material as possible and follow windows guidelines 6.4.2 and 6.4.3.

Chair McCune discussed item number five of the COA, the replacement of the existing live oak at the corner. Ms. Chalk explained that this work had already been completed, stating "It's already been done. It's in place. Unfortunately it didn't happen in the sequence that I envisioned or would've preferred, but it was a unfortunate misunderstanding on the part of the owner. He thought that when I said we could apply for a replacement, that it would be all right to go ahead and move ahead."

Regarding item number six pertaining to fill in the back yard, Chair McCune confirmed this was not within their purview to consider as part of the meeting, and this item would be removed from their consideration.

Chair McCune clarified that the last COA application received approval for demolishing the carport and driveway, refurbishing siding with cedar lap siding, the ADA lift, and a two-foot wall, with no tree removal in that application. She noted the applicant was currently asking forgiveness for the tree removal that had already occurred, and no fill dirt in the front.

Member Cummins returned to his concerns about the crepe myrtle on the corner and whether a new brick pad was being requested. Ms. Chalk stated that a new brick pad had been intended but Mr. Garner had notified them that it did not meet zoning requirements. Member Cummins clarified that extending the envelope beyond the preexisting would go into the right of way, making it impermissible without a variance. Ms. Chalk stated they would need to research this further with Mr. Garner.

Member Davis asked about framing new steps and back-pouring with concrete. Ms. Chalk indicated they would need to connect back to the sidewalk somehow, preferably with brick as Mr. Flow desired. Member Davis reminded her that it would need to be approved by the HPC beforehand.

Member Cummins again asked whether the crepe myrtle would stay or be removed. Ms. Chalk admitted that she was not prepared to answer that question.

Chair McCune sought clarification about replacing the concrete pad with brick and Ms. Chalk stated that she could not testify that it would be identical but every effort would be made to keep it in the same footprint. The commission discussed their concern with the changing scope of work and lack of information, and Chair McCune suggested they could approve certain items and table others until more information could be obtained.

The discussion turned to which items could be approved. Chair McCune noted they could approve moving the west side basement entrance and the accessible stair on the back of the house but wanted more information about the current state of the existing windows in the old part of the house.

Ms. Chalk decided to withdraw the window item and asked what could be approved, specifically mentioning relocating the door and changing the lift on the stairs. The commission indicated they would consider items one, two, and five (relocating the door, changing the lift, and the tree replacement), while withdrawing items three (windows), four (brick pad), and six (fill dirt).

The commission then opened the floor for public comment.

Secretary Anderson administered the Oath to Ann Whitford, homeowner of 116 and 118 Ann Street.

Ms. Whitford expressed concerns about the amount of fill dirt that had been brought to the property and future drainage problems she may have on her property.

Ms. Quattlebaum clarified that fill issues fell under the floodplain manager's jurisdiction under the flood damage prevention ordinance. Chair McCune explained they needed to determine if Ms. Whitford had standing, noting she could speak as a witness but would need to prove special damages for standing as a party to the case.

Ms. Whitford also expressed concern regarding the original windows with wavy glass in the house and how they are central in the way the house looks, and the size of the windows should also be kept the same. She stated that she had been a contractor for 42 years and she knew that there are people who can repair the windows.

Motion: Member Davis moved to determine that Ms. Whitford does not have standing in this case. Member Cummins seconded. Motion carried.

Secretary Anderson administered the Oath to William Ziegler, homeowner of 117 Ann Street.

Mr. Ziegler asked about fill in front of the house, specifically whether building up in front would come under the commission's purview, expressing concerns about water displacement and flooding impacts and stating that fill had been brought in. Chair McCune referenced previous testimony from Ms. Chalk that no fill would be added to the front of the house, which would bring this issue into the commission's consideration.

Motion: Member Davis moved to determine that Mr. Ziegler does not have standing in this case. Member Sabiston seconded. Motion carried.

The commission then deliberated on the tree replacement issue. Member Cummins questioned whether they had to approve the tree replacement since it was already done. Ms. Quattlebaum explained that even when people come asking for forgiveness rather than permission, the commission could approve or deny COAs, and if denied, it becomes an enforcement issue through the Planning and Inspections department.

Chair McCune made a motion to table Item #4, "Replace all windows with same size Andersen windows" until the May 5th meeting.

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

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

Chair McCune made the following motion for a Finding of Fact for Case #26-14: Having reviewed the record and having considered all evidence submitted and oral testimony for Case #26-14, 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, 6.5.2, 6.5.3, 6.5.7; Accessibility and Life Safety Guidelines 6.8.1, 6.8.2.

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

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

Chair McCune made the following motion for a Finding of Fact against Case #26-14. Having reviewed the record and having considered all evidence submitted and oral testimony for Case #26-14, 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: because the tree was removed without permission.

Ms. Quattlebaum advised that the request needed to be considered as if the tree had not been removed without permission.

Chair McCune withdrew her motion. There was board discussion regarding the replacement of the tree and Chair McCune noted the difficulty with tree removals since "once the tree is cut down, it's gone forever." The commission discussed whether to approve the tree replacement on its merits, reviewing the landscaping guidelines and the applicant's proposal for a six-inch diameter live oak, 12-16 feet in height.

Member Cummins made the following motion for a Finding of Fact for Case #26-14: Having reviewed the record and having considered all evidence submitted and oral testimony for Case #26-14, 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: Landscaping Guidelines 8.1.3.

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

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

Chair McCune then asked for a motion for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Case #26-14.

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 not incongruous with

the special character of the historic district as a whole and that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Case #26-14 be issued for the proposed work for items 1, 2, and 5 only.

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

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

Chair McCune then declared Case #26-14 closed and notified the applicants that the Minutes and Findings of Fact would be adopted at the next meeting and the COA would then be issued.

Mr. Garner requested clarity on what was approved. Chair McCune clarified that items one, two, and five from Page 118 were approved, items three and six were withdrawn by Ms. Chalk, and item four (windows) was tabled until May. Commissioner Davis emphasized they wanted supporting documentation of existing wood windows and detailed scope of work for window replacements, plus details on brick paver materials and dimensions for any new walkway and information about the crepe myrtle.

Ms. Chalk confirmed her understanding and indicated she would pursue window restoration rather than replacement.

6. Case # 26-15 600 – 610 Front Street – Fencing

Mr. Garner presented the town's request to replace 150 feet of fencing between 600 and 610 Front Street. He submitted the staff report and exhibits as part of the official record and provided an additional exhibit showing the fence would be natural wood construction rather than painted.

He described the proposed fence as a two-rail system with a flat board on top and explained that the Board of Commissioners had requested the Historic Preservation Commission determine the type of post top for the six-by-six posts, presenting three options: a chamfered look, a metal top, or a plastic top.

There was commission discussion regarding the height of the existing rail, spacing, and the Simpson metal bases.

The discussion centered on the three post top options, with commissioners expressing preferences and reaching consensus for the chamfered look for its simplicity and longevity.

Member Cummins made the following motion for a Finding of Fact for Case #26-15: Having reviewed the record and having considered all evidence submitted and oral testimony for Case #26-15, 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: Fences and Wall Guidelines 8.2.2; Accessibility and Life Safety Guidelines 6.8.1.

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

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

Chair McCune then asked for a motion for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Case #26-15.

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 #26-15 be issued for the proposed work.

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

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

Chair McCune thanked Mr. Garner for bringing the application before them and closed Case #26-15.

Commission / Board Comments

Chair McCune asked Mr. Garner about the Washburn Seminary Building at 512 Cedar St, noting she had observed a hole in the roof and asking if there was anything the commission could do to help preserve the building.

Mr. Garner explained they had tried reaching out to the building owners many times and noted the difficulty in finding contact information. He mentioned someone had recently expressed interest in purchasing the entire corner and redeveloping it while keeping the church for offices.

Member Davis asked about the zoning, and Mr. Garner confirmed it was Cedar Street Mixed Use. Chair McCune noted the building's significance to post-Civil War history. Mr. Garner clarified that while the building was in the National Register District, it was not in the local district.

Vice-Chair Hedrick asked about demolition by neglect ordinances, and Mr. Garner confirmed they had such provisions but noted enforcement challenges due to the difficulty contacting property owners.

Vice-Chair Hedrick provided extensive commentary on the philosophical challenges of historic preservation, discussing the difference between preservation, restoration, and reconstruction. He referenced his concerns about the earlier Duncan House case, noting his struggle with the concept of recreating historic buildings versus preserving original structures.

Member Davis thanked town staff and fellow board members for their hard work through complicated situations, expressing appreciation for how they handled the evening's challenging matters.

Chair McCune thanked Ms. Quattlebaum for helping navigate the evening's legal complexities.

Staff Comments

Mr. Garner thanked the committee working on the new Standards.

Before adjournment, Ms. Susan McGee approached with a question about an incorrectly plaqued house on Ann Street. She explained that research had proven the plaque was incorrect and asked for advice on correction procedures. Chair McCune advised that the property owner would need to initiate any plaque correction process, as third parties cannot bring such matters before the commission. Ms. McGee confirmed there would be application fees involved and that the owners would need to agree to any changes.

Adjourn

Member Davis 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, Jessica Sabiston

Chair McCune declared the April 7th, 2026 meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Chair, Joyce McCune

Board Secretary, Laurel Anderson