



EDENTON PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
P.O. Box 300, Edenton, NC 27932
400 South Broad Street, Edenton, NC 27932
PHONE 252-482-2155 FAX 252-482-7377

Edenton Preservation Commission
February 13, 2023
1:15pm
Town Council Chambers

Ms. Otey can now vote on all Down East Preservation projects.

Ms. Baker called meeting to order.

An oath was taken by all application speakers.

Judge Newbern, Ms. Vaughan, Ms. Ms. Otey, Ms. Thornton, Ms. Baker, Ms. Maffitt, Mr. Hicks were present.

Corrections needed to be made to the minutes for grammar issues.

Ms. Baker called for the first application.

Brownie Investments, LLC (Catherine Smoak), 215 W. Eden St.; Converting screened in back porch to enclosed structure, adding a deck, and adding master bedroom/bathroom.

The application was presented by Catherine Smoak. She explains that Brownie Investments LLC belongs to Catherine and her brother. It is the small blue house at 215 W Eden St. Catherine will be moving to Edenton in the spring and will be buying the house from the company. She did a major application for some renovations and an addition onto the house.

Ms. Baker asked if she was including a finished driveway with brick and adding a fence in the back yard with the same design in that packet.

Ms. Smoak confirms. She will only need a fence on one side.

Ms. Baker asked if the commission had any questions.

No questions were asked.

Ms. Baker asked if there were any public comments.

No comments from the public.

Ms. Vaughan made a motion. Ms. Thornton Seconds.

All voted in favor.

Ms. Maffitt made a motion for COA. Ms. Vaughan seconds.

All voted in favor.

Ms. Baker called for the second application.

Robert and Marikay Kovac, 216 E. King St.; to move accessory structure to another area on same property and placed on foundation like existing due to sinking on west side. Mr. Kovac presented application. He stated they have applied to move an existing shed on the property to another location on the property.

Ms. Baker asked in the shed was as old as the house.

Mr. Kovac said that it was not as old as the house but it was located when the house was relocated to the current address.

Ms. Baker asked if it will be a concrete foundation.

Mr. Kovac states that it is currently on a brick foundation and that is how they would like to do it again.

Mr. Whealton shares that from doing some of his research that there are underground pipes along that edge of the shed and causing it to sink. A condition that should be placed on the COA is that it should be observed when it is being moved, to keep the structural integrity of the shed. This way it not just picked up with a fork lift and moved.

Judge Newbern said that it looked like a very appropriate place to out it historically. That is where you would expect to see a shed.

Ms. Baker asked if there was any public comment.

No public comments were made.

Judge Newbern made a motion. Ms. Vaughan seconds.

All vote in a favor.

Ms. Thornton makes a motion for a COA. Ms. Vaughan seconds.

All vote in favor.

Ms. Baker called for the third application.

Leonard and Ms. Timberlake Pritchett, 116 W. Gale St.; Build a 16'x26' 1.5 story Garage in rear of residence.

Mr. Pritchett said that a 16x24 detached garage is wanting to be built. This will be used a storage.

Ms. Baker asked if there was a listing of the materials that were going to be used. Pritchett said that the outside will be hardy plank, board and batten. The house is flat board. So, if flat board needs to be done, he can do that.

Judge Newbern said that whatever material is on the house is what needs to be used on the house as well. It needs to blend in as seamlessly as possible with the house.

Mr. Pritchett said that he thought the original roof is tin but it has been changed to architectural structure.

Ms. Maffitt asked about the garage door.

Mr. Pritchett said that he has not gotten that far, but it would be in fitting with the house.

Ms. Thornton asked what the garage door would be.

Mr. Pritchett said that he prefers a roll up garage door, aluminum, standard door. The older style is one piece and it pulls up.

Ms. Baker said that normally they would want a much more specific presentation what you plan on doing.

Judge Newbern said that to approve it, they will need more specific on what he plans on doing.

Mr. Pritchett shows the board the garage door that he wants to use.

Discussion was made about the door that was shown.

Judge Newbern said that if this is the door he wants to use, he can give a copy to Mr. Whealton to add into the packet.

Mr. Pritchett asked about the setbacks.

Mr. Whealton said since the building is less than 600 sq. ft. that it will only be 5 feet. With the historical district it will go by the average of the area, which would be about 5 feet.

Ms. Thornton said that if it is new construction, hardy plank can be used.

Judge Newbern asked the age of the house.

Mr. Pritchett said it was built in 1947.

Ms. Baker asked if there was any other questions or public comments.

No further questions were asked.

Judge Newbern made a motion to incorporate the garage door and siding. Ms. Thornton seconds.

All vote in favor.

Ms. Maffitt made a motion for COA. Ms. Otey Seconds.

All vote in favor.

Ms. Baker calls for the 4th application.

Andrew Vorce, 108 N Granville St.; addition of breezeway and garage (28'x22'), replace door, and adding court yard.

Mr. Bean presents. He states that Mr. Vorce is requesting to add on to the property because it does lack some amenities that most people would want for easier living. Mr. Vorce wants to add on a laundry room, bathroom, breakfast room, a den/downstairs bedroom, and a garage. Because this house is important and unique they did not want to attach just some addition. In 1942, after the first addition, it was a separate hip roof with a curved breezeway. He states that on the side of the garage that will face towards Granville St. they will have a porch that will match the one on the southside of the building. The windows that are going into the building will also match the existing. They did use a landscaper to plan the courtyard. Behind is a small pool, that is shown in an attachment.

Ms. Baker said that she can not see the pool size.

Mr. Bean said that it will only be about 10x10.

Ms. Maffitt asked if it was a swimming pool.

Mr. Bean said that it was just a basic swimming pool to cool off in.

Ms. Baker said that in the guidelines the pool should not be visible from the street. She asked if that will fit the guidelines.

Mr. Bean answers yes.

Ms. Baker asked if the fence was the property line and if you could fit everything on the property.

Mr. Bean answered yes, that was the line and that the lot is a good size, they will be able to fit.

Ms. Baker asked Mr. Whealton about the percentage of footprint and if that will fit.

Mr. Whealton answered 60 percent.

Mr. Bean answered that it would fit in there.

Ms. Thornton said that she had one concern. There is a very old and large pecan tree in the back yard that the drive to the car pad will affect significantly.

Mr. Bean said that they walked around the lot and that they would like to take out the river birch, but the pecan tree should be alright.

Ms. Thornton asked about the kitchen.

Mr. Bean states it was part of the 1942 addition.

Ms. Baker asked for any public comments.

Ed Ross asked if he can see the design.

A copy was shown to him.

Ms. Baker asked for a motion.

Ms. Vaughan makes a motion. Ms. Otey seconds.

All vote in favor.

Judge Newbern makes a motion for COA. Ms. Vaughan seconds.

All vote in favor.

Ms. Baker calls for the 5th application. Chowan Arts Council, 112 W. Water St.; public art to be painted on east side of building in courtyard. Approximately 16'x15' by artist Matt Lively.

Ms. Timberlake presents. She has worked with the artist before and has known him for over 20 years, doing multiple murals. The project will be funded NC Arts with some grant funding. This is also involving the Boys and Girls Club collaborating with Matt and also Chowan Arts. The goal is to have it done by April 22nd.

Ms. Baker asked for questions from the board.

Ms. Thornton said that in the guidelines you cannot paint unpainted masonry.

Ms. Vaughan said that haven't we been doing that anyways.

Judge Newbern said they take that case by case.

Ms. Vaughan said that in the past one had been approved on the Surf Wind and Fire Building, but nothing happened there.

Judge Newbern said the problem with that is it creates a false sense of history, and that was such a public display, and that building would have created a false sense of history. This building is different, it secluded and he understands about the bricks. They have made exemptions on the past.

Ms. Thornton said that the issue is in protecting the brick.

Ms. Timberlake said that the only other option would be to put it on panels and then install that to the brick. But, that would still be marking the brick. You would have to weather proof the panels because they will not stand up to the elements.

Ms. Maffitt asked how the age of the building.

Judge Newbern states that it was from the turn of the century and he thought that would be a good compromise.

Ms. Vaughan said that she loves design of the painting but her only suggestion would be to make the building that is behind the teapot a building that everyone knows.

Ms. Timberlake agrees.

Ms. Maffitt said that she thinks the teapot may be oversized.

Ms. Timberlake said the reason for having it a little larger is easier to convey what they want in the mural. But, everything will need to change if they go to panels.

Ms. Otey asked if she would be open to that.

Ms. Timberlake said that they only have a set amount of money for this and that will increase the cost.

Mr. Dawson Tyler asked about another house that was painted in town, that most have been some sort of exception there.

Ms. Baker said that the new guidelines had not been put in place at the time.

Mr. Tyler asked if there was a type of paint that could be used that would be more breathable.

Judge Newbern said that there really isn't a paint that can do that.

Ms. Timberlake said that she has worked with Mr. Lively before using panels but the weather will get to them in a couple of years.

Judge Newbern asked if Ms. Timberlake would like to check about the panels and come back next month. He asked if they are talking about approving some kind of other material or the brick.

Pat Grother asked if panels are adhered to the brick wouldn't that put holes in the brick and allow water to penetrate.

Ms. Vaughan said that those are not old brick.

Mr. Tyler asked about the size of the wall.

Ms. Timberlake answers that its right in between where the gutter comes down.

Mr. Tyler said that since it is not covering the whole wall that it would still have the breathability on the sides, top and bottom.

Ms. Timberlake said that Mr. Lively has done many paintings on buildings that are historic.

Judge Newbern makes a motion saying that they need to note this is an exception. Ms. Vaughan seconds.

Judge Newbern, Ms. Vaughan, Ms. Otey, Ms. Baker, Ms. Maffitt, and Mr. Hicks vote in favor.

Ms. Thornton votes opposed.

Ms. Vaughan makes a motion for COA. Mr. Hicks Seconds.

Judge Newbern, Ms. Vaughan, Ms. Otey, Ms. Baker, Ms. Maffitt, and Mr. Hicks vote in favor.

Ms. Thornton votes opposed.

Ms. Baker calls for the 6th application.

Ms. Rene Sawyer, 413 S. Broad St.; install two 6'x2' signs, above each window.

Ms. Sawyer said that hers is simple. She just wants a sign for her office.

Ms. Baker asked if the second sign will be for the Journey Group.

Ms. Sawyer said yes, they share an office.

Mr. Whealton confirmed that this complies with the sign ordinance. The only reason this had to come before the board is because they require a sign permit.

Ms. Thornton made a motion. Judge Newbern seconds

All vote in favor.

Ms. Otey makes motion for COA. Mr. Hicks seconds.

All vote in favor.

Ms. Baker calls for the 7th application.

Scott and Dee Spruce, 415 S. Broad St.; replace damaged door and window in front of building. Mr. Tyler presents. This is to fix from when a vehicle drove into the front of a building. This has allowed for some of the historical look to be returned to the building.

No questions were asked. No public comments were made.

Ms. Vaughan made a motion. Ms. Otey seconds.

All vote in favor.

Ms. Maffitt makes a motion for COA. Ms. Vaughan seconds.

All vote in favor.

Mr. Tyler adds for the COA that this is for the owners not Down East Preservation.

Next move to old business.

Kevin Bennett and Cathy Jo McKee application was removed. They were reach out to but due to medical emergencies they have not been able to move forward at this time.

Ms. Baker called for the final application.

Down and Out East Investments, LLC, 119 W Water Street; requesting to restore/construct a raised (36'') platform on the West side of the building.

This is a previous application from September of 2022. All was approved in the application except what needed to be approved by CAMA for the pier. Nothing has changed on the application, they just got approved.

Mr. Joe Wach presents. Last time it was pointed out that they need to obtain a permit from CAMA before they could take a vote. They have worked with the department of cultural resources and CAMA combined. They met an agreement CAMA has approved it. Town manager Goodwin has been met with the CAMA representative to make sure the town was clear on the approval. Now they can go forward with the vote.

Mr. Whealton said that the town is requesting that conditions can be put on this. Conditions being adequate screening for adjacent property owners so restaurant guest cannot see into

someone's back yard, to present the town with the CAMA permit, and for an encroachment agreement between Mr. Wach and the town of Edenton. This will be presented at the March Town Council meeting for approval. There are steps involved but they did not know because this is the first time the town has had to do something like this. If the board wanted to add any conditions to it that it will be only approved if these are met those are the 3 the town wanted to put on it.

Mr. Wach said that they are not clear on any screening requirements. That has not been made clear on their part. They have already planted trees for screening. As far as they are concerned they have completed that part.

Mr. Whealton said that he guesses the town wanted to go back and put additional screening in that area they could.

Judge Newbern asked where that screening requirement is from.

Mr. Whealton said that should have been addresses before, he is guessing the would have to go through tree committee proposal and all that stuff. Since one is resident and the other commercial

Mr. Wach said that both of these properties are commercial.

Judge Newbern wanted to make sure that they are not the ones dealing with the screening.

Ms. Vaughan did say that was new but they did plant 4 big magnolia trees. That was done before anything was required.

Ms. Baker said that they will just need assurance that the CAMA permit has been put in place.

Mr. Wach said that there is nothing more than he can do with that. He has made sure that the town is aware of that. He asked Mr. Whealton what else he would need with that.

Mr. Whealton said that it would just be a condition that the town would provide that encroachment agreement and he has not seen the CAMA permit. His understanding was the encroachment was needed to get that permit.

Mr. Tyler said that they were given permission to build the extension of the pier with out any sort of an encroachment agreement. They would just have to build the pier so that it didn't encroach on the town's property.

Mr. Whealton said that what his understanding was if they wanted to build outside of that.

Mr. Wach said that was correct. If the build will go on the town property they will seek that out from the town. If the town does not grant that they will just build it 5 feet shorter.

Judge Newbern asked if their property goes out a certain distance to the west of the building.

Mr. Wach confirmed that it did not go to the west but to the south.

No more questions were asked by the board.

Ms. Baker asked for public comments.

Mr. Leary said that he invited the board to come look from his yard to see what was done. He did not get notice about this meeting or the CAMA. He had a problem with that. He had an attorney ready to look at the permit and see that all was good with it. He said that the screening they put up was a joke and that you can see right through.

Mr. Tyler said that was the problem with building residential on a commercial lot.

Ms. Baker asked Mr. Leary about the town giving him some town property to extend fencing.

Mr. Leary said that no, they had someone survey it but that was done wrong.

Mr. Wach said that the way it is recorded for the town is that additional property was added. No money was exchanged, that was a gift from the town.

Ms. Baker said that they even signed a COA for the fencing.

Mr. Wach talked about how they have done a lot to be good neighbors. When they started the project, they approached the Leary's to find out what the main concerns were. They got a list and fixed those things, even though it cost more. At this point they need to just look that both of these are commercial properties. Mr. Wach has looked careful and has not found anything that requires shielding. With Mr. Leary building on that property he has to live with that. They property will be use whether a deck is there or not.

Ms. Baker calls for a motion.

Ms. Vaughan makes a motion. Judge Newbern seconds.

All vote in favor.

Judge Newbern makes a motion for COA. Ms. Vaughan seconds.

All vote in favor.

Judge Newbern gave a brief description on how the Preservation Committee works.

An update was given about Hinton hotel.

Hearing no further business, meeting adjourned.

