

City of Goldsboro
Historic District
Commission
February 04, 2025

The Commission

David Archibald

Richard Best

Terry Cottle

Nancy Delia

Fritz Knack - Chairperson

Manning Musgrave - Alternate

Judith McMillen

John Peacock – Vice Chairperson

Derek Roche - Alternate

The Staff

Mark E. Helmer, AICP, CFM, Planning Director

Kenny Talton, Assistant Planning Director

Roy Publico, Senior Planner

Paul D. Saylor, Planner I | Preservation Planner

Holly Jones, Planning Executive Assistant

AGENDA
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
City of Goldsboro
Tuesday, February 04, 2025, 5:30 P.M.

The Historic District Commission will hold their meeting on Tuesday, February 04, 2025, at 5:30P.M. in room 206 of the City Hall Annex building at 200 N. Center Street.

- I. Roll Call
- II. Approval of Minutes – January 07, 2025
- III. Appointments
- IV. Old Business
- V. New Business

- 1. **CA-02-25 – 118-120 E. Mulberry Street:** The applicant is requesting an After-the-Fact Certificate of Appropriateness for a permit required for exterior changes to the building that was conducted without prior approval. 118-120 E. Mulberry Street is currently zoned Central Business District (CBD). The property is located within the City of Goldsboro’s Local Historic District. The property considered for approval is located on the south side at the mid-block of E. Mulberry Street between N. Center and N. John Streets. The property is further identified as NCPIN# 3509-62-4205.

- VI. Reports of Officers and Committees
- VII. Adjournment

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
GOLDSBORO HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
JANUARY 7, 2025

The Goldsboro Historic District Commission of the City of Goldsboro, North Carolina, met in Regular Session in the Large Conference Room, City Hall Addition, 200 North Center Street, at 5:30 p.m. on January 7, 2025.

Present: Mr. Fritz Knack, Presiding
Mr. John Peacock, Vice Chair
Mr. Richard Best
Mr. Terry Cottle
Ms. Nancy Delia
Mr. David Archibald

Ms. Manning Musgrave (ALT)
Mr. Derek Roche (ALT)

Also Present: Paul Saylor, Planner I/Preservation Planner
Ron Lawrence, City Attorney
Holly Jones, Planning Executive Assistant

Absent: Ms. Judith McMillen

Mr. Knack began the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Swearing in of New Members

Holly Jones, Planning Executive Assistant, swore in the members that were appointed by the City Council at their December 16, 2024 meeting to the Commission; Ms. Manning Musgrave and Mr. Derek Roche.

Vote on New Chair and Vice-Chair

Mr. Cottle made a motion to reappoint Mr. Fritz Knack as Chair of the Commission. The motion was seconded by Ms. Delia and unanimously carried.

Mr. Cottle made a motion to appoint Mr. John Peacock as Vice Chair of the Commission. The motion was seconded by Mr. Best and unanimously carried.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Archibald made a motion to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of December 3, 2024. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cottle and unanimously carried.

New Business

Ms. Delia made a motion to recuse Mr. Fritz Knack, due to his being on the Historical Association Board of Directors. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cottle and unanimously carried. Mr. Knack left his seat and sat in the public viewing area, and Mr. Peacock presided over the meeting until voting concluded on the following item.

CA-08-24 Wayne County Historical Association: The applicant is requesting an After-the-Fact Certificate of Appropriateness for a permit required for exterior changes to the building that was conducted without prior approval. 116 N. William Street is currently zoned within the Central Business District (CBD). The property is located within the City of Goldsboro's Local Historic District. The property considered for approval is located at the southeast corner of North William Street and East Mulberry Street. The property is further identified as NCPIN# 3509-05-2912.

The item was presented by Paul Saylor, Planner I/Preservation Planner.

Mr. Peacock opened the public hearing. The following people spoke after being properly sworn in:

1. David Weil. Stated that he should have come in for approval, but the passing of time made him forget about the need to do so. He had been speaking to the City about the parking lot, and forgot to address the other improvements needed, such as the door and windows, due to how long the approvals and funding took for that project. He asked for forgiveness and stated that if the Commission wanted the door replaced, he would personally take care of it, but it was much improved over the old one and requested an after the fact approval.
2. Charles Gaylor III, historic district homeowner. Stated that the guidelines are the bedrock for the HDC. He does not want to see anything happen that might jeopardize the investment tax credits, and the people coming to Goldsboro because of it. He respects and is supportive of the Historical Association, but feels that the building and the door replacement are too visible of a change to be approved without causing a problem.
3. Tom Anderson, Wayne County Historical Association Board Member. Stated he was also not aware of some of the processes, and appreciated the City for allowing them to come together and discuss things. They have spent a lot of money and time to refurbish the building back to its original glory. He stated that there is newer technology since the building was originally built, for energy, safety, and security. The old door could easily be jiggled and opened, wind and air came in where it did not seal well, and wheelchairs could not exit in an emergency. The new door is ADA to accommodate wheelchairs, and they tried to duplicate the original top transom window on the side of the new door.

Mr. Best asked if they had looked at going back with french doors when they replaced it. Mr. Anderson stated that the problem with the french door is the size of the opening to allow for the egress of wheelchairs, especially in an emergency.

Ms. Delia asked if there was a reason they chose the materials the doors are made of; why they did not want to use wood. Mr. Anderson stated that the metal door secures better to protect the priceless artifacts inside; the metal door is also better for longevity, safety, and a better seal. He stated that a wooden door that provided the same seal and security would have been much more expensive and unaffordable for their limited budget.

Mr. Peacock asked if anything could be added to the bottom portion of the door, such as a trim, to give it more of a historical look and take away some of the commercial bareness. Mr. Anderson stated that they have spoken to Convenient Glass about adding a trim or false panels to replicate a Jeffersonian look. He stated that if they can keep the door, that is a recommendation he would want to do.

Mr. Archibald asked where the ramp was located in the picture of the building. Mr. Anderson pointed to picture, stating that it was behind the bushes.

Mr. Peacock asked if there were any ADA or fire code requirements that led them to this door. Mr. Anderson stated that the fire marshals never stated there was a problem, but there had been problems with wheelchairs getting through before, and they had to undo the doors to let people in; this is why they went with one 42" door. Mr. Peacock asked if the old doors swung in or out. Mr. Anderson stated that they swung out, and the new one does as well.

Mr. Cottle asked Mr. Gaylor if his concern was that if the Commission approved this, then it could mess up getting tax credits down the road. Mr. Gaylor stated that if the guidelines are not followed, the historic district might still be there, but have no meaning because you will not be able to get the tax credits.

4. Jennifer Eisenhower, Treasurer for the Wayne County Historical Association Board. Spoke about a home that was recently sold in the historic district, and was broken into numerous times by the door being kicked in and the windows being broken. She stated that the old original doors and windows cannot always hold up to today's society. She has seen visitors come in though the new door with their wheelchairs without having to ask for assistance.

Mr. Best asked if they could guarantee security if they went back with french doors. Ms. Eisenhower stated they could not. Mr. Best stated they should have the locks at the top and floor. Ms. Eisenhower stated that it would still not allow for those in wheelchairs to access the building without asking for assistance.

Ms. Eisenhower stated that she was not really for either side, she understood both sides of it. She knows they should have asked permission, and there may be a better option; she agreed with adding trim to try and make it look better. She continued, stating that it would be a great burden on the museum to try and replace the door again due to their limited funding.

Ms. Delia asked if the museum board discussed the guidelines for the historic district. Ms. Eisenhower stated that she had just become the Treasurer and had not been involved at the time. Mr. Anderson stated that they had not been aware of some of the guidelines for that sort of thing, but they discussed the type of door they wanted for the traffic usually received.

Ms. Delia asked if they had considered a more secure screen door or storm door, rather than removing or replacing the doors that were there. Mr. Anderson stated that they had not considered it, and there would still be the problem of the narrow opening.

No one else spoke and the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Peacock asked what the staffing situation was when the door was installed. Mr. Saylor stated that he came on board in May, and this occurred in June, so he had just come on board.

Mr. Best made a motion to deny the request, which was seconded by Ms. Delia. Mr. Peacock read the following denial statement:

The Historic District Commission finds the proposal to be incongruous with the guidelines and standards outlined in the *Design Guidelines for Downtown Goldsboro*.

Mr. Peacock called for a vote on the motion. Mr. Archibald, Mr. Best, and Ms. Delia voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Cottle voted against the motion and Mr. Peacock abstained.

Mr. Lawrence informed the Commission that due to there being a disqualified member, the alternate members could vote to determine if there would be a majority in favor of a motion. He stated that the bylaws do not address the situation, but NCGS 160D does.

Mr. Peacock called for the vote again, with that information in mind. Mr. Archibald, Mr. Best, Ms. Delia, Mr. Roche, and Ms. Musgrave voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Cottle voted against the motion and Mr. Peacock abstained.

Mr. Lawrence stated that NCGS 160D-406(i) addresses voting and counting an alternate's vote when there is a disqualified member.

Only four votes in favor were needed for the motion to pass. Including the alternate members, the motion received five votes in favor, so by a vote of 5:1:1 the motion to approve the Denial Statement passed, and the request was denied; the Wayne County Historical Association will not receive their Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Peacock stated that he did not raise his hand, he has looked at the building and the work that has been done to restore and preserve the building; it is like the Parthenon. He agreed that the French doors were a security issue and defeated the ADA code to allow a handicap person to have independent access, but was disappointed that more effort was not made to make the door less plain.

Mr. Knack returned to his seat and presided over the remainder of the meeting.

CA-01-25 131 E. Walnut Street: The applicant is requesting an After-the-Fact Certificate of Appropriateness for a permit required for changes to the building that was conducted without prior approval. 131 E. Walnut Street is within the Central Business District (CBD) and the Local Historic District. The property considered for approval is located on the north side of East Walnut Street and is further identified as NCPIN# 2599-95-3759.

The item was presented by Paul Saylor, Planner I/Preservation Planner.

Mr. Knack asked for confirmation that painting was not addressed in the guidelines, specifically referring to a large blue building. Mr. Saylor confirmed that painting is not addressed, and that he was not sure about the building.

Mr. Knack opened the public hearing. The following person spoke after being properly sworn in:

1. Rob Phillips, applicant and owner of the building. He apologized for not applying before, but he did not think about getting a Certificate of Appropriateness for painting since buildings seem to be painted all the time. He stated that he has applied for certificates before for windows on his other buildings, and that he will be more careful in the future.

No one else spoke and the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Cottle asked if Mr. Saylor thought painting the buildings was okay, and that if someone wanted to paint in the future, it would be the same for them as in this case. Mr. Saylor stated that he did not say he agreed with painting the buildings. He continued, stating that this building had never been painted, older bricks need to breathe and paint seals the brick, so it depends on the age of the brick how well or if the paint will stick.

Mr. Peacock asked if the Commission could recommend that the design guidelines be amended to address painting. Mr. Lawrence stated that right now they had to address what was on the books with the guidelines where they are; any change to the guidelines had to go to the City Council for adoption. Mr. Saylor stated amending the guidelines was part of the Commission's job.

Mr. Peacock made a motion to go with the staff recommendation to approve the request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cottle and unanimously carried.

Other Business

Mr. Peacock reiterated the need to address painted brick. Mr. Knack asked him if he would be interested in chairing a committee to present updated guidelines and other changes to City Council; Mr. Peacock politely refused.

Mr. Cottle asked if these types of requests had to come before the Commission, could such decisions not be made a staff level. Mr. Saylor stated that the guidelines state that if a building has never been painted, it is considered 'major work' and must come before the Commission. He continued, stating that the Commission could make such changes; the first step is to make a list of what changes need to be made.

Mr. Best stated that he noticed something at every other meeting; that many in the historic district have said they do not know there are guidelines. He asked if a mailing could be done to those in the historic district to let them know. Mr. Saylor stated that the financial aspect was always the problem. Mr. Peacock and Mr. Archibald suggested asking the Mayor to include something in the newsletter that went to all citizens. Ms. Delia asked if just a simple letter could be sent, rather than the entire guidelines; Mr. Best concurred. Mr. Saylor stated that he had previously been informed that such letters would need to be sent certified, at over eight dollars each. Mr. Knack stated that he would continue to work on this.

Mr. Saylor informed the Commission that he had updated the application recently which could be seen in the member notebooks and was online. He also agreed that a mailing would be a great idea. Mr.

Archibald asked if homeowners could call him. Mr. Saylor stated that they could call or email him directly. He stated that the UDO, guidelines, and map of historic district could be found on the City's website.

There being no further business, Mr. Knack asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Archibald made the motion, and it was seconded by Mr. Cottle. The motion was unanimously carried, and the meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Fritz Knack
Chair

Holly Jones
Planning Executive Assistant

AGENDA MEMORANDUM
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
City of Goldsboro
Tuesday, February 4, 2025, 5:30 P.M.

SUBJECT: CA-02-25 - 120 E. Mulberry Street, Located on the south side at the mid-block of E. Mulberry Street between N. Center and N. John Streets.

BACKGROUND: The owner/applicant is requesting an After-the-Fact Certificate of Appropriateness for painting north front brick façade with mural with business name, perpendicular metal sign, and removing and replacing awnings on the building at 120 E. Mulberry Street.

Applicant: Mathew Wilding, Goldsboro

Owner: Suite Fortuit, LLC, Serene MacAlister, Goldsboro

The property is zoned Central Business District (CBD), is within the Historic Overlay District (HOD), and is located within the Municipal Service District and Commercial/Civic subdistricts.

Frontage: 25.69ft.

Area: 2,568.50 sq. ft.

Zoning: Central Business District (CBD)

Existing Use: Commercial

DISCUSSION: The applicant has utilized the following materials:

1. Exterior paint
 - a. Blue, Purple, Orange, Pink, White
2. Galvanized metal corrugated/ribbed panels
 - a. Black

Application Submitted: 01-08-2025

Brief History of Building/Property:

The footprint of the existing building at 120 E. Mulberry Street shows up on Sanborn Fire Insurance Company maps between 1943-1956. 116, 118, & 120 E. Mulberry Street according to City Directories from 1948-1985 have been occupied by numerous commercial uses, including Floor Covering Specialties Inc. in 1948 to the Goldsboro Chamber of Commerce and Goldsboro Merchant Association in the early 1950s. A chiropractic office in 1956-1958 and Bell-Lewis Furniture store in the 1960s-1980s.

The building does not appear in the 1979 Goldsboro Inventory Project/Historic Sites Survey completed by Barbara Hammond.

STAFF REPORT: Planning Staff will read from the attached Staff Report.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

It is the interpretation of Planning Staff that the proposal, as submitted, is not incongruous with the Historic District Guidelines and the recommendation is that this proposal be approved; however, Planning Staff are open to recommendation and guidance from the Historic District Commission.

The Historic Commission shall now close the public hearing, enter into deliberation and vote to determine if the proposal is incongruous with Goldsboro Historic District Guidelines.

Date: _____

Planner I | Preservation Planner

**CITY OF GOLDSBORO
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
WORKSHEET**

Per NCGS 160D-947, Certificates of Appropriateness are quasi-judicial and shall follow the quasi-judicial procedures of NCGS 160D-406. When voting to approve or deny for a Certificate of Appropriateness, the Commission must vote to determine if the proposal would be incongruous with the special character of the landmark or district. The *Design Guidelines for Downtown Goldsboro* serve as the guiding document for the Commission when making these decisions. The NCGS provides for the Commission to impose reasonable conditions, when necessary, upon approvals in order to achieve congruity with the district.

APPROVAL STATEMENT: The Historic District Commission finds the proposal to be not incongruous with the guidelines and standards outlined in the *Design Guidelines for Downtown Goldsboro*.

Yes _____ No _____

DENIAL STATEMENT: The Historic District Commission finds the proposal to be incongruous with the guidelines and standards outlined in the *Design Guidelines for Downtown Goldsboro*.

Yes _____ No _____

Application Fees:

Major Work \$150 (Includes advertisement fee)

Minor Work \$50 (Administrative Staff fee)

271
AFTER THE FACT \$150 -

Received Date: 1/8/25

Initials: PDS

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION

For Office Use Only:

Application Number: CA-2-25

Date processed: 1/8/25

Fee Type: Cash Check # Credit Card

Initials: PDS

Applicant Acknowledgement:

I understand that the City of Goldsboro must have three (3) sets of Site plans submitted along with an electronic site plan emailed to the Planning Administrative Assistant listed on the website at www.goldsboronc.gov/planning or they will not be able to send out my application for formal review. I understand my review period begins after the City of Goldsboro acknowledges they have an electronic PDF copy of the required site plan. Information on the site plan shall meet or exceed the City of Goldsboro Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) in Section 5.7 Historic Preservation Overlay District. Site plan needs to be in sufficient detail and scale to clearly describe the proposed alteration to the exterior of the property and list, in detail, all materials to be used. Attach drawings, photographs and/or specifications in order to fully explain the proposed work. See attached sheet for common things expected on site plan/application for a Certificate of

Applicant Signature: Mathew Wilding

Application is hereby made to the Historic Commission of the City of Goldsboro for a Certificate of Appropriateness (Complete the following information):

Minor Work Major Work (check which applies)

Property Address: 120 E. Mulberry Street, Goldsboro, NC 27530

Wayne Co. Pin #: 3509-62-4205

Scope of Work Proposed:

Exterior painting with mural and business name on building.
Awning replaced with metal coverage.
Part of business name will be painted on metal and signs installed.
*Rink & File will be painted. Gastropub will be painted on a metal sign and installed. Outdoor seating with (possibly railing) per city ordinance.

Applicant (Print): Mathew Wilding
Applicant Address: 206 E Mulberry Street City, State, Zip: Goldsboro, NC 27530
Applicant Phone: 919-888-8098 Applicant Email: mgwilding@gmail.com

Owner (Print): Serene MacAllister
Owner Address: 106 Coventry DR. City, State, Zip: Goldsboro, NC 27530
Owner Phone: 921-888-0318 Owner Email: serene.1899@icloud.com

(If owner differs from applicant a Owners Authorization Form is required upon submission)

SIGNATURE REQUIRED

MATHEW WILDING
Applicant - Printed

Mathew Wilding
Applicant Signature
1/8/25
Date

STAFF REPORT

FEBRUARY 04, 2025 HDC MEETING

CASE #: CA-02-25
Staff: Paul D. Saylor, Planner I | Preservation Planner
Applicant: Mathew Wilding, 206 E. Mulberry Street

LOCATION

District: Goldsboro Historic District (LHD), National Park Service Certified, 1985
Street: 120 E. Mulberry Street, Goldsboro
PIN#: 3509-62-4205
Building: Commercial Building
Construction: between 1943-1956
Status: Contributing
NRHP#: N/A
Landmark #: N/A

REQUEST(S)

After-the-fact Approval/Denial:

- 1) Exterior painting with mural and business name on building.
- 2) "Gastropub" perpendicular metal sign to install on side of building.
- 3) Replace awnings (Minor/Staff Approval)

APPLICABLE DESIGN REVIEW STANDARDS AND SOURCES

Design Guidelines for Downtown Goldsboro:

<https://www.goldsboronc.gov/planning/>

Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

<https://www.nps.gov/subjects/taxincentives/secretarys-standards-rehabilitation.htm>

Section 5.7: Historic Preservation Overlay District in the City of Goldsboro Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), updated 06-07-2021:

<https://www.goldsboronc.gov/wp-content/uploads/Article-5-011023.pdf>

STAFF COMMENTS

On Tuesday, September 3, 2024 planning staff made a visual inspection of 120 E. Mulberry Street and found that over Labor Day weekend a mural had been painted on the north front façade of 118 and 120 E. The canvas awnings had been removed weeks prior and the building had been pressure washed.

City Staff notified the owner to provide an application for an After-the-Fact COA for the mural, sign and awnings.

STAFF FINDINGS

Commission Staff finds that:

1) Design Guidelines for Downtown Goldsboro Section 9.2.2.n.

Section 9: Sign, Awning, & Canopy Guidelines: 9.2. Commercial Signs: 2. Sign Type, Placement and Size: n. Murals and Mural Signs: (Page 72 in the Design Guidelines)

- i. Murals should be placed on black (or mostly blank) side or back walls of commercial or industrial buildings, not on primary facades.
- ii. Size will depend on placement.
- iii. If artistic murals are to be created by private entities, the design must be approved in advance by the HDC.
- iv. Murals that advertise the business of the building are considered to be signs.
- v. They must meet the overall limits on sign square footage and applicable codes.
- vi. If the mural is simply advertising copy, the HDC may allow additional total square feet of signage on the primary façade of the building.

2) Design Guidelines for Downtown Goldsboro

Section 9: Sign, Awning, & Canopy Guidelines: 9.4 Awnings & Canopies:

9.3. Design and Allowed Materials: *Awnings and Canopies for Historic Commercial Buildings:*

- i. Fabric awnings are appropriate. These may be vinyl coated or otherwise treated to extend the life of the fabric as long as they meet district fire codes. Keep in mind that darker colors tend to fade more quickly than medium and light tones.
- ii. All awnings and canopies within the fire district must meet fire code.

9.4. Allowed Materials:

- i. Canvas or "Sunbrella" fabric awnings.
- ii. New hybrid materials are being introduced to the market. These will be considered on a case-by-case basis and must first meet all district fire codes in order to be considered.

9.5. Materials Not Recommended

- i. Backlit Awnings
- ii. Any plastic supporting or canopy materials, except for new buildings with clear or white translucent acrylic "Skylights" with review and approval.

9.6. Routine Maintenance

- i. Replacement of awnings and awning signs with like colors and messages (if any), once approved.

9.7. Certificate of Appropriateness Required

- i. All signs of any type must be approved in advance of installation.
- ii. Canopy and awning materials and colors must be approved in advance of installation. (Minor/Staff Approval)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the preceding findings, Commission Staff recommends that:

The after-the-fact application as currently proposed should meet the Historic District Guidelines:

1. Since the mural has been created/begun by a private entity the design must be approved by the HDC.
2. Since the mural advertises the business of the building, it is considered to be a sign.
3. All signs in the historic district require a COA.
4. Removal and replacement of existing awnings is considered a minor work and should be approved or denied by staff or can be considered routine maintenance. It is staff recommendation that the awnings be replaced with what was there in recent history (canvas/cloth awnings), or to match the awning at 116 E. Mulberry.

It is the interpretation of Planning Staff that the proposal, as submitted, is not incongruous with the Historic District Guidelines and the recommendation is that this proposal be approved with minor works be approved by city staff (awnings and perpendicular sign); however, Planning Staff are open to recommendation and guidance from the Historic District Commission.



112 Google

113 Google

116 Google

116

113





RANK

&

FILE

120

118





120

AV '24



120