



**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](http://www.beaufortnc.org)

**Town of Beaufort Historic Preservation Regular Meeting**  
**6:00 PM Tuesday, September 1<sup>st</sup> 2026 - Train Depot, 614 Broad Street, Beaufort, NC 28516**  
**Minutes**

---

**Call to Order**

Chair McCune called the September 1<sup>st</sup>, 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: Tina Proctor, Tyler Tennant

A quorum was declared with five members present.

Staff Present:

|                                            |                                      |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Mr. Charlie Rocci, Senior Planner          | Ms. Jill Quattlebaum, Town Attorney  |
| Mr. Brad Fockler, Code Enforcement Officer | Ms. Laurel Anderson, Board Secretary |

**Agenda Approval**

Chair McCune noted that a technical issue with the agenda management system had introduced extraneous items onto the displayed agenda. A corrected version was distributed to commissioners. All five quasi-judicial cases remained on the agenda in their original order, with no substantive changes.

*Vice-Chair Hedrick made the motion to approve the Agenda as presented and Member Cummins 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 080426

*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, Bradley Cummins, 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. These parties may present evidence, call witnesses and make legal arguments. Parties with standing are limited to the applicant, the local government and individuals who can show they will suffer special damages. Parties are limited to those individuals with standing as set forth in North Carolina general statutes 160D-406 and 160D-1402. Other witnesses may present competent, material, and substantial evidence that is not repetitive as allowed 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. Everyone who testifies before this hearing must swear or affirm their testimony.

Secretary Anderson then administered the Oath to Charlie Rocci.

### **Items of Consent**

1. HPC – 105 Front Street – Pool and Roof

The Commission voted to approve the findings of fact for Case #26-24 as amended, correcting a typographical error in which the applicant was incorrectly identified as "Ready Five Holdings" rather than "Filter Design Studios."

*Member Cummins made the motion to approve the Minutes as amended 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*

2. Case #26-23 – 200 Craven Street – Proposed Fence Addition, Landscaping Adjustments, and Exterior Lighting

*Member Cummins made the motion to approve the Minutes 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, Jessica Sabiston*

### **Old Business**

1. Case #26-24 105 Front Street – Fence and Landscaping

Chair McCune introduced Case #26-24 and asked if there were any members who needed to recuse themselves. Hearing none, Mr. Rocci presented the case and reported that at the previous meeting the Commission had approved the pool location and copper shed roof for this property. The outstanding items - landscaping details and pool safety fencing specifications - had since been submitted and were before the Commission for review.

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

Mr. Horton appeared on behalf of property owners Margaret Ann and Billy Wooten. He confirmed that the proposed pool fence would be a custom-welded, galvanized powder-coated tube steel fence, finished in white, and screened by a formal hedge of needlepoint hollies pruned to fence height. Commissioners expressed satisfaction with the landscaping plan and the fence detail, noting that the planting screen would render the fence largely invisible from the street.

There was no further discussion and the Commission reached a general consensus to proceed with approval, updating the Findings of Fact to acknowledge those guidelines that were already approved during the last meeting.

*Chair McCune asked for a motion for a Finding of Fact for Case #26-24. Member Cummins made the following motion: Having reviewed the record and having considered all evidence submitted and oral testimony for Case #26-24, 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 8.1.1, 8.1.2, 8.1.3, 8.1.5, 8.1.6, 8.1.7, 8.1.8, 8.1.10, 8.1.12, 8.1.13; Fences and Walls Guidelines 8.2.1, 8.2.2, 8.2.3, 8.2.4, 8.2.5, 8.2.7.*

*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 #26-24.*

*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 #26-24 be issued for the proposed work.*

*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 thanked Mr. Horton and explained that the COA would be issued at the October 6, 2026 meeting.

The case was then closed.

## **New Business**

### **1. Case #26-26 326 Front Street – Addition to Extended Deck and Dock**

Chair McCune introduced Case #26-26 and asked if there were any members who needed to recuse themselves. Hearing none, Mr. Rocci presented the application from the Moonrakers restaurant (Taylors Creek Group), proposing to extend an existing gangway and install a floating dock to allow transient boat access. He noted that the proposed improvements mirror what existed at the property prior to Hurricane Arthur in 2014, that the project is ADA-compliant at all but extreme low tides, and that it has been approved via a CAMA General Permit and authorized by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in compliance with channel setback requirements in Beaufort Harbor.

In response to Vice-Chair Hedrick's question, Mr. Rocci confirmed that the Town's public boardwalk would not be extended westward to connect with this property, as the boardwalk is limited to town-owned property ending at the public restrooms on Front Street.

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

Mr. Stephens testified that the design was intended to be understated and consistent with existing waterfront elements in the district. He noted that the proposed vertical stainless steel cable fencing was selected over horizontal cable because vertical orientation is more durable, safer for children, and visually recedes better. He further confirmed that the fencing design would replicate the approved aluminum nautical-style fencing on the existing sky deck. Mr. Stephens explained that at all times, to accommodate ADA guidelines, except for the extreme low tide of king tides, the slopes to get down to the floating platform will be able to handle a wheelchair. Commissioners found the application complete and the materials consistent with those previously approved for dock installations in the downtown waterfront area.

There were no persons with standing or witnesses who wished to comment.

*Chair McCune asked for a motion for a Finding of Fact for Case #26-26. Vice-Chair Hedrick made the following motion: Having reviewed the record and having considered all evidence submitted and oral testimony for Case #26-26, 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: Docks, Piers, and Boardwalks Guidelines 8.7.1, 8.7.2.*

*Member Davis 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 #26-26.*

*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 #26-26 be issued for the proposed work.*

*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 thanked Mr. Stephens and explained that the COA would be issued at the October 6, 2026 meeting.

The case was then closed.

## **2. Case #26-27 217 Broad Street – Update Paint Color, Doors, add Shed Dormer, Windows and Fence**

Chair McCune introduced Case #26-27 and asked if there were any members who needed to recuse themselves. Hearing none, Mr. Rocci provided background on the property, a craftsman bungalow first appearing on maps in 1908 and remodeled circa 1930. The application, submitted by owners Ian and Tracy Huckabee, encompasses several exterior modifications: a new paint color scheme (Chantilly Lace body, Clear Skies trim, Edgecomb Gray accents), replacement of several doors and windows with Sierra Pacific wood windows, addition of a rear-yard privacy fence, a pergola in the rear yard, two sconces flanking the garage door, and a structural shed dormer addition to expand an upstairs bathroom. There were no questions for Mr. Rocci.

Secretary Anderson administered the Oath to Ian and Tracy Huckabee, applicants and owners of the property.

The Huckabees testified that the home's current form reflects three distinct periods of construction - the original 1908 - 1909 section, a connector addition believed to date to the 1950s, and a 2008 garage and bonus room addition. Their architect, noted for extensive experience with historic properties in New Bern, was engaged on the project.

Commission discussion focused on several points:

- *Front door:* The existing original door features historic leaded glass including a noted bullet hole from a childhood BB gun incident — acknowledged by commissioners as a genuinely historic artifact. The applicant indicated the door's joinery is failing and proposed replacement with a high-quality replica to be fabricated by a Raleigh-area millwork firm, with the intent of matching the slab on the connector door for visual consistency.
- *Windows:* The applicant proposed Sierra Pacific wood windows throughout, including a new window to be added under the eave on the west elevation for natural light in a currently windowless bathroom area. Commissioners were satisfied that the location under the eave rendered the addition minimally visible and appropriate.
- *Fence:* The applicant proposed transitioning from the existing Beaufort-style picket fence at an oak tree on the property line to a six-foot dog-ear privacy fence in the rear yard. Commissioners discussed how to handle the transition at the tree, noting the tree falls on or near the property line. The applicant agreed to face the posts so they do not protrude above the fence line, creating a continuous, flush appearance.
- *Dormer:* The new rear shed dormer, visible primarily from the Orange Street side, was reviewed. Commissioners noted it would blend well, characterizing it as consistent with the historic pattern of incremental rear additions common in Beaufort's older homes.
- *Corner lot considerations:* Because the property fronts both Broad and Orange Streets, commissioners noted that any fencing along street frontages must not exceed four feet in height per district guidelines.

There were no parties with standing or witnesses who wished to speak.

*Chair McCune asked for a motion for a Finding of Fact for Case #26-27. Vice-Chair Hedrick made the following motion: Having reviewed the record and having considered all evidence submitted and oral testimony for Case #26-27, 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: Roof Guidelines 6.1.1, 6.1.2, 6.1.3, 6.1.4; Wood Siding, Trim and Ornament Guidelines 6.2.1, 6.2.3, 6.2.4, 6.2.5, 6.2.6; Window and Door Guidelines 6.4.1, 6.4.2, 6.4.3, 6.4.5, 6.4.7, 6.4.10; Paint and Exterior Color Guidelines 6.7.2, 6.7.4; Materials 7.3.1; Additions to Historic Buildings Guidelines 7.8.1, 7.8.2, 7.8.3, 7.8.4, 7.8.5, 7.8.6, 7.8.7, 7.8.8, 7.8.9; Fences and Walls Guidelines 8.2.2, 8.2.3; Exterior Lighting Guidelines 8.4.1, 8.4.2, 8.4.3.*

*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 #26-27.*

*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 #26-27 be issued for the proposed work.*

*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 thanked Mr. and Mrs. Huckabee and explained that the COA would be issued at the October 6, 2026 meeting.

The case was then closed.

### 3. Case #26-28 217 Turner Street – Demo Rear of House, Add New Rear Addition and Convert Shed to ADU

Mr. Rocci introduced the application. The subject property is recognized in the Ruth Little Survey as the Gibble-Delmar House, a two-story, three-bay side gable structure with chamfered columns remodeled in 1927. Applicants George and

Debbie Aiken propose to demolish a portion of the rear of the house and replace it with a new addition adding approximately 100 square feet, and to convert an existing backyard shed into an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU), for which the applicants have already received a Special Use Permit (Case #26-12) from the Planning Board and Board of Commissioners. Mr. Rocci noted that SUP approval does not substitute for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Chair McCune then asked if there were any members who needed to recuse themselves and there were none.

Secretary Anderson administered the Oath to George Aiken, applicant and owner of the property.

Mr. Aiken testified at length. He described the existing rear of the house as a series of enclosed porches accumulated over roughly a century, resulting in inconsistent windows, floor levels, and rooflines. His proposed addition would demolish this piecemeal section and rebuild with a new single-gable roof maintaining the existing pitch to avoid impacting original upper-story windows on the historic 1866 house. The addition steps out four feet to the rear and two feet to the south, with a new CMU-and-brick foundation faced to match existing conditions. The ADU conversion involves leveling the settled shed, adding a small dormer for natural light, and retaining the existing vertical board-and-batten siding.

After detailed discussion, the Commission identified several items requiring clarification or revision before the application could be approved:

- *Standing seam metal roof:* No panel width, rib height, or seam details were submitted. The Commission asked the applicant to review the design guidelines on metal roofing and return with specifications consistent with those guidelines.
- *Exterior siding and trim materials:* The applicant proposed fiber cement (HardiePlank, smooth face) and Azek (PVC) trim. Given that the property is a corner lot visible from both Broad and Turner Streets, and that the work involves demolishing a near-century-old addition, commissioners expressed a preference for wood siding and wood trim on the new addition. The applicant agreed to provide a full survey of existing siding and proposed replacement materials.
- *Windows:* The applicant proposed Anderson 100 Series composite windows, which the Commission noted had not been previously approved. The Commission asked the applicant to work with staff to agree on an appropriate window specification prior to the next meeting. Mr. Aiken stated that the windows would not have grilles between glass.
- *Exterior doors:* Commissioners expressed a preference for wood doors on elements visible from public streets. The applicant agreed to specify wood doors for the main addition. It was noted that the ADU's entry door, not directly facing Broad Street, could be evaluated with greater flexibility.
- *Exterior lighting:* No fixture details were submitted; the Commission requested specifications.
- *Rear addition roof form:* Commissioners noted that the proposed split-gable roof over the four-foot rear bump-out created an awkward aesthetic. The applicant acknowledged the concern and indicated he would explore a revised roof form.
- *Rear handrail detail:* No design was submitted for the rear landing handrail. The Commission requested details consistent with those proposed for the historic front porch restoration.

*Chair McCune made a motion to table the application until the October 6<sup>th</sup>, 2026 meeting, with direction to the applicant to resubmit addressing the items identified by the Commission.*

*Member Davis 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*

#### 4. Case #26-29 – 201 Broad Street – 12' x 19' Side Screen Porch Addition

Chair McCune opened Case #26-29 and asked if any members needed to recuse themselves. Hearing none, Mr. Rocci introduced the application, noting that the existing structure does not match the vernacular Queen Anne house described in the Ruth Little Survey, as Carteret County tax records indicate the current structure was built in 2006. The application, submitted by Barbara and Jay Tervo, proposes a screened covered porch addition on the eastern side of the corner lot, visible from Broad Street. Proposed materials match the existing front porch: two-by-six handrails, one-and-a-half-inch square spindles, five-quarter-by-six painted flooring, and five steps off the rear toward Moore Street. There is no intention of removing the shed in the back yard.

Secretary Anderson administered the Oath to Jay and Barbara Tervo, applicants and owners of the property.

During testimony, the applicants clarified that the drawings submitted in the agenda packet contained an error - the porch was shown set back twenty feet from the street due to an initial assumption about setback requirements, when in fact only a fifteen-foot setback is required. The corrected dimensions are 12 feet by 22 feet (not 12 by 19 as they originally submitted in their packet), and the porch is shifted toward the front of the structure. The applicants submitted updated drawings and a revised site plan into the record during the hearing. Chair McCune accepted the revised drawings as part of the record.

Additional points of discussion included the removal of one existing living room window, which would be covered where the porch wall intersects it; the installation of double French doors with flanking sidelights at the existing side entry; and the retention of an existing exterior light fixture inside the new porch enclosure with no other lighting changes proposed. No exterior handrail changes were required as the railing would be enclosed within the screen. Commissioners found the materials and design consistent with the existing structure and with the character of the district.

There were no parties with standing or witnesses who wished to speak.

Replacement pages for pages 170 and 171 were submitted as part of the testimony by the applicants. The size of the addition was updated to 12' x 22' by the applicants during their testimony.

*Chair McCune asked for a motion for a Finding of Fact for Case #26-29. Vice-Chair Hedrick made the following motion: Having reviewed the record and having considered all evidence submitted including evidence submitted this evening with this witnesses' s testimony and oral testimony for Case #26-29, 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, 7.1.3, 7.1.4; Building Height/Scale 7.2.1, 7.2.2, 7.2.3, 7.2.4; Materials 7.3.1, 7.3.2; Details 7.4.1; Texture and Color 7.5.1; Form and Rhythm 7.6.1, 7.6.2, 7.6.3.; Landscaping 7.7.1.*

*Member Davis 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 #26-27.*

*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 #26-29 be issued for the proposed work.*

*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 thanked the applicants and explained that the COA would be issued at the October 6, 2026 meeting.

The case was then closed.

### **Commission / Board Comments**

Vice-Chair Hedrick raised a concern regarding the staff report for 105 Front Street, which referred to the project as a "rebuild of the Duncan House following the fire in December 2025." He noted that when the case was originally heard, both the applicant's representative and town staff confirmed the project was new construction, not a reconstruction. He expressed concern about establishing a precedent by which the completed structure would be identified as the Duncan House, noting that the original historic structure was lost in the December 2025 fire and no longer exists.

Chair McCune acknowledged the concern and noted that she had spoken with the property owners, who expressed interest in installing interpretive signage commemorating the original Duncan House. Mr. Rocci agreed that going forward the property would be referenced only by its address, 105 Front Street.

Chair McCune also commended Mr. Rocci for an excellent job and the thoroughness of the applications.

### **Staff Comments**

There were no staff comments.

### **Adjourn**

*Member Cummins made the motion to adjourn 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 September 1<sup>st</sup>, 2026 meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

---

Chair, Joyce McCune

---

Board Secretary, Laurel Anderson