



45 speak would have to be sworn in. Several individuals were sworn in by Acting Chair Adolph.

46

47 **Staff Comments:**

48

49 Mr. McCoy presented the item to the Board. He stated that according to Section 15-427 no  
50 exterior alteration, construction, or demolition can occur in the local historic districts unless a  
51 Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) application has been submitted and approved by the  
52 Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). The Appellant Paul Tyler, alleges that the HPC erred  
53 in its decision to grant a COA to construct a garage/workshop because the material and  
54 substantial evidence that the HPC received to support the decision was inaccurate and  
55 misleading.

56

57 Mr. McCoy reminded the Board that this is not a re-hearing. No new evidence may be taken. The  
58 Board may not base its decision on evidence that is not part of the record. The appealing party  
59 can only argue errors of law or mistakes of fact made during the HPC decision. If the Board of  
60 Adjustment believes the HPC made an error, the Board may apply its own judgment to correct  
61 what it believes was a mistake of law. At the end of the meeting the Board will need to make a  
62 motion to affirm or reverse the decision of the HPC. He informed the Board that copies of the  
63 documentation that was submitted to the HPC, such as the required notifications, and a brief  
64 summary written by Mr. Kevin Robinson, HPC Administrator are included in their packets. The  
65 property was posted in the required time as well. Mr. McCoy invited any questions, none were  
66 asked.

67

68 At Acting Chair Adolph's request Mr. Robinson took the floor to review the application for  
69 COA. He stated that of the 5 items required for review, the appellant is only opposing 1 of them;  
70 "Competent material and substantial evidence to support the decision". The appellant cited 3  
71 major objections related to this:

72

- 73 1. The Building description should be a 1 7/8 story building with a room addition and a  
74 second floor apartment with plumbing. Mr. Robinson stated that 1 1/2 story is the  
75 commonly used term by the commission to describe structures such as this, both the plans  
76 and presentation were clear in the proposal layout, design and use of the building.
- 77 2. The survey was not stamped with a seal. Mr. Robinson stated that stamped, sealed  
78 surveys are not absolutely necessary, but the survey submitted was in fact stamped with a  
79 seal by Mr. Roy R. Smith, Jr. dated December 2013
- 80 3. That HPC based their decision on minor discrepancies in the roof pitch and height to  
81 three separate portions of the adjacent building shown on the 3D renderings. Mr.  
82 Robinson stated that the 3D renderings were provided as an aid in determining the  
83 context of the form and placement of the structure, but were not the only information  
84 provided to the HPC. The Commission was given full plans for the structure including a  
85 plot plan showing the before and after with alterations as well as elevations, a survey and  
86 multiple photos of adjacent structures. During the second application process the  
87 Commissioners were able to review the site for themselves.

87

88 Mr. Robinson informed the Board of the credentials of the HPC Commissioners, their knowledge  
89 and expertise, and described the process of review.

90 **Staff Recommendations:**

91  
92 Mr. Robinson advised that it is the opinion of staff that HPC was not lacking in any information  
93 needed to make the decision and recommends the Board uphold the Commission's decision to  
94 approve the COA and deny this appeal.

95  
96 **Appellant Comments:**

97  
98 Mr. Tyler, Appellant presented his appeal to the Board. He showed the drawings on the overhead  
99 projector, pointing out what he believes are inaccuracies and mistakes in the submitted drawings.  
100 He further stated that the drawings are not to scale and roof lines were not accurate. Mr. Tyler  
101 stated that he believes the proposed garage will be too close to the boundary line and as a result  
102 will not meet OSHA requirements for maintenance and upkeep. He stated that his overall  
103 objection is the size of the proposed garage. He stated that they did not take into consideration  
104 what's around the property and the drawings are not in harmony with the area as required by the  
105 guidelines. In addition, he stated that the garage/workshop might be used as an apartment.

106  
107 **Public Comments:**

108  
109 *Ms. Sarah Afflerbach* stated that the issues that Mr. Tyler brought before the Board were issues  
110 for the HPC. She addressed the concerns that Mr. Tyler raised, showing the Board that the HPC  
111 did have accurate and detailed drawings submitted to them. She also stated that the project was  
112 within the allowed distance from the boundary line in accordance with the Land Use Ordinance.  
113 She further stated that the maximum lot coverage for the Historic District is 60 percent and this  
114 lot is only 40 percent.

115  
116 *Mr. Dave Stout, 802 Pollock Street* stated that the garage will not be used as a rental apartment;  
117 the upstairs room is for occasional guests to stay in. He further stated that he submitted a  
118 notarized letter to city staff noting that the garage/workshop will not be used for rental purposes.

119  
120 **Staff Comments:**

121  
122 Mr. Robinson advised the board that most, if not all, of the issues brought before them were  
123 heard at the HPC hearing as well and properly addressed by the appropriate authorities. The City  
124 of New Bern Land and Community Development Administrator and Inspections Department  
125 reviewed the files prior to the hearing. Mr. Robinson further stated that during the HPC meeting  
126 the Chief Building Inspector addressed OSHA questions and concerns.

127  
128 **Board Comments:**

129  
130 Mr. Midgette asked what is the difference between a 1 7/8 story versus a 1 1/2 story building. Mr.  
131 Robinson explained that 1 1/2 story is the term commonly used.

132  
133 **Motion: Mr. P.J. Walker made a motion to affirm the Historic Preservation**  
134 **Commission decision to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for 802 Pollock Street. Ms.**

135 **Lois Jamison seconded. Motion passed by unanimous vote.**

136

137

138 Acting Chair Adolph informed the appellant that he does have the right, within 30 days to appeal  
139 the Boards decision to Craven County Superior Court.

140

141 With no further discussion, meeting adjourned.

142

143

144

145

146

147

---

Peter Adolph, Acting Chair

---

Greg McCoy, Board Clerk