

**TOWN OF SWANSBORO  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
April 16, 2024**

**Call to Order**

The meeting of Swansboro Historic Preservation Commission was called to order at 5:30 PM. Those in attendance were Jonathan McDaniel, Kim Kingrey, Elaine Justice, Christina Ramsey, and ALT member Gregg Casper. Lauren Brown and Eric Young were not present.

**Business**

The following individuals were sworn in and/or addressed the board.

Rebecca Brehmer

Jeffrey Wallace

***Certificate of Appropriateness/204 Moore Street***

Projects/Planning Coordinator Brehmer presented the owners requested for the demolition of the existing metal car port and the construction of a new wooden one in the same location. The new car port would have been approximately 16' tall with a pitched roof and was constructed with 4 wooden posts connected to a concrete pad. The roof and siding material were consistent with what was found on the home. The new car port was primarily used for a covered outdoor seating area, not parking. This home was zoned B2 and was a non-contributing structure to the Historic District. This request appeared to be consistent with Section 11 New Construction.

The Public Hearing was opened at 5:31 pm.

Mr. Wallace responded to the board that the roof was planned for esthetic reasons to match the house. The color shingles, gables, and siding would match the house. The columns would be wrapped in white PVC.

The Public Hearing was closed at 5:35 PM.

On a motion by Mrs. Kingrey, seconded by Mrs. Casper, the COA-2024-04 was unanimously approved for the demolition of the existing car port and the new construction of a car port based on the criteria from the UDO Section 11 New Construction.

***Certificate of Appropriateness Amendment COA-2024-02/224 Water Street***

Projects/Planning Coordinator Brehmer presented the owners of 224 Water Street, also known as the Bell House, had requested an additional exterior alteration to the home. This was an amendment to the previously heard COA application at the February 20, 2024, SHPC meeting. The house was zoned R6SF and was a contributing structure to the Historic District. The applicants were approved previously for the COA, alterations, added a new color to the color palette, removed and replaced rotten porch facing and rails to be in kind to what was there before per the state's decision, constructed brick steps for the front porch, and an overhang over the side of the house. The applicant neglected to add to the COA a new solid wood door with window cutouts. The reason they had requested a new door was the existing door was rotten to the point it was a safety hazard by not being able to be secured. The new door was installed as a temporary door, per the ordinance, which allowed a temporary door for 30 days. The applicants were told

that if the board did not approve the amendment with the installed door, they would be required to change the door. The applicants were not able to be present, but if there were any questions, the staff was allowed to call them. The door was purchased from Lowe's and was painted the approved color.

On a motion by Mrs. Kingrey, seconded by Mrs. Ramsey, COA-2024-02 Amendment was unanimously denied based on the criteria in Sections 5.13 and 5, Windows and Doors of the UDO.

The following discussions were held prior to the final motion:

Mrs. Kingrey stated that Legacy Warehouse in Wilmington was a place where residents were able to purchase an appropriate historic door. It was possible to purchase a new one constructed to look just like the previous door.

Projects/Planning Coordinator Brehmer stated the applicant drove to Wilmington to purchase a door, the door had been sold prior to the arrival of the applicant and was unable to find anything else which met the measurements. Therefore, they purchased a door from Lowe's for safety reasons.

Mr. McDaniel clarified Section 5.1 - Any new replacements should have matched the original in all dimensions and details as closely as possible.

Projects/Planning Coordinator Brehmer stated she would communicate with the applicant the decision of the Amendment to the COA, a picture of the original door, and along with options for them to have purchased the appropriate door.

#### ***Discussion of Thirsty Mullet Staff Approval Application***

Projects/Planning Coordinator Brehmer presented that the new tenants of 208 Main Street, "Thirsty Mullet Taproom", had submitted a Staff Approval Application for the addition of outdoor patio/seating space in the front and rear of the building, as well as to plant privacy screening for adjacent residential properties. This building was previously the retail location for "Muttigans", zoned B2HDO, and was a noncontributing structure to the Historic District. Staff had brought this discussion item to the SHPC for guidance due to concerns expressed by one of the neighboring residential properties for noise and parking issues. It appeared this request is consistent with Section 14 Fences and Walls, as well as the Town's noise and parking ordinance.

Projects/Planning Coordinator Brehmer replied to inquiries from the board:

- If there was not enough room for planting the trees in the ground between the Thirsty Mullett and the residential lot, there would have been larger planting box options which would be used. The trees would be Green Giant Arborvitae. Green Giant Arborvitae were the healthiest and largest arborvitae and could be planted in large horse troughs.
- Fences were an option, but the trees provided a better visual and sound buffer from the patio. The adjacent residential house had a fence already.
- Acoustic grade interior storm windows could have been suggested to the tenant. The staff was only able to request what was included in the ordinance. The suggestions from the

board were not required for the Thirsty Mullet but were being offered due to concerns from the neighbors.

Mrs. Sue Ellen Dixon, of 106 Water Street, which was adjacent to the Thirsty Mullet shared that she was more concerned about parking, especially her neighbor, Mr. France. During the summer all the wait staff from downtown restaurants parked along the streets, which created little parking for neighbors. The house which had sat right next to the Thirsty Mullet was an Airbnb, so she also had concerns about loud music, live music, or people socializing.

Projects/Planning Coordinator Brehmer replied to the following questions from Mrs. Dixon:

- Mr. France had obtained a driveway permit and was working with Public Works to remedy his situation.
- As per the ordinance, the historic district businesses were exempt from the parking requirements which other new businesses in town would have had to abide by because of the public parking and how tight it was to park downtown. Even with the proposed seating area, Thirsty Mullet would have had more parking than most businesses downtown.
- Mrs. Dixon and other residents could go to all the businesses to discuss the parking issues and see if they would be open to the solution for business employees parking at the bank.
- There would be a separate area for the proposed outdoor seating with planter boxes bordering the seating areas and would be installed on part of the current parking lot.
- A couple of parking spaces could be used for the outdoor seating out of the 21 parking spaces. The parking spaces could have been reconfigured if needed.

Planner Correll shared there was a discussion about the use of installing concrete stop bars which separated the parked cars and the outdoor seating.

Mr. Tyler Skipper shared that the hedges would be planted all the way down along the backside of the property. They would be serving pizza at the Thirsty Mullet.

Projects/Planning Coordinator Brehmer reviewed the suggestions from the board's discussion of the Thirsty Mullet Taproom:

- The Thirsty Mullet could offer interior acoustic grade storm windows to the neighbor which could help with noise.
- The Thirsty Mullet could plant hedges in planter boxes and moved the boxes away from under windows and off the fence line.
- The Thirsty Mullet could reorient the parking spaces for safety issues.

Projects/Planning Coordinator Brehmer shared with the board that there were not any reasons to deny the request. The Thirsty Mullet had met and cooperated with all the guidelines in the ordinance and felt the best option was for Staff to approve the request.

### **Review of Staff Approvals**

Projects/Planning Coordinator Brehmer reviewed the following Staff Approvals:

- 224 Water Street – Replaced and added exterior light fixtures at the front door, side door, and shed.
- 127 Front Street – Replaced rotten siding in-kind and painted back to white.
- 101-A Church Street – Installed new business sign.
- 208 Main Street – One 3 ft x 8 ft temporary banner (60 days) and one 2 ft x 3 ft sandwich board sign which advertised the business coming soon.
- 101 Walnut Street – Painted home included trim, porch rails, and siding SW6182 Ethereal White and painted porch ceiling SW6218 Tradewind.

### **Review of Minor Work Approvals**

Projects/Planning Coordinator Brehmer reviewed the following Minor Work Approvals:

- 308 Church Street – Added an accessory structure shed with white lap siding, silver metal roof, natural wood vent gables, and an antique door as well as the added wood shutters to the upper and lower porch doors. Accessory structure was below the need for a massing study.
- 209 Water Street – Renovated shed which included siding and roof shingles to match the house, new wooden double doors, and replaced rotten wood.

### **Chairman/Board Thoughts/Staff Comments**

After discussions from the board, on a motion by Mrs. Ramsey, seconded by Mrs. Kingrey, the addition to the agenda for the May 2024 meeting would include a discussion of whether there needed to be changes to the current ordinance which enabled enforcement was unanimously approved.

### **Public Comments**

Mr. Joseph Brown requested information about the homeowners who purchased a historic home and how they were getting information on what was required and about tax credits for the historic district and were the tax credits an incentive.

The board responded that an addendum was created and had been given to all residents listing their homes for sale to be signed by the new homeowners. At the closing of the purchase of the home, documents were signed by the buyers which showed information on streets, etc. The attorney provided a stack of papers being signed and it was the responsibility of the real estate agent to explain. Additionally, projects that had been approved through the state, provided a 15% tax credit for North Carolina taxes. There was a tax credit for a lien easement which is placed on your deed which never allowed for demolition of the historic house and a local landmark designation tax credit which was a standard 15% state tax credit for the district. There were several local landmark properties in the district which were designated at a higher 50% tax credit.

Planner Correll shared that the workshops provided in the past to residents of the Historic District were Tax Credits with John Wood and windows and doors workshop.

Projects/Planning Coordinator Brehmer shared the local landmark designation workshop had been rescheduled for May and staff would be speaking with Kristi Brantley from the Local Historic Preservation about the details. There was a flyer provided to people who had moved in the district once they had contacted the staff. The flyer outlined the different application processes, and the approval needed for certain work. Staff worked diligently to explain the processes in the district to potential buyers.

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 6:42 pm.