

City of Goldsboro
Historic District
Commission
September 02, 2025

The Commission

Fritz Knack - Chairperson

John Peacock – Vice Chairperson

David Archibald

Richard Best

Terry Cottle

Nancy Delia

Judith McMillen

Manning Musgrave - Alternate

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 | Tuesday, September 2, 2025

- I. Call to Order/Roll Call**
- II. Action on Minutes – August 5, 2025**
- III. Old Business**
 - a. Tabled COA: CA-09-25 – 204 E. Chestnut Street/200 S. John St.
- IV. New Business**
- V. Reports/Discussion**
 - a. **Preservation North Carolina Covenant Properties:** status update
 - i. Background
 - ii. Stats
 - iii. Going forward
 - b. **Certified Local Government (CLG)**
 - i. Updated checklist
 - ii. Design Standards: must be in compliance with 160D to submit to State and NPS
 - iii. Committees
 - c. **HDC annual housekeeping**
 - i. Terms
 - ii. 2026 Calendar
 - iii. Report to City Council: October 20, 2025
- VI. Adjournment**

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
GOLDSBORO HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
AUGUST 5, 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 August 5, 2025.

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

Manning Musgrave (ALT)
Derek Roche (ALT)

Also Present: April Johnson Choice, Development Services Director
Paul Saylor, Planner I/Preservation Planner
Ron Lawrence, City Attorney
Holly Jones, Planning Executive Assistant

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

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Delia asked that the typo be corrected on page 3, to remove the extra 'the state' in the first paragraph. Mr. Archibald made a motion to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 3, 2025, as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cottle and unanimously carried.

Old Business

CA-09-25 – 204 E. Chestnut Street/200 S. John St.: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for a permit required for the deconstruction of the existing towers of St. Paul Methodist Church and new construction in accordance with the design guidelines of downtown Goldsboro. The church is currently zoned in the Central Business District (CBD). The property is located within the City of Goldsboro's Local Historic Preservation Overlay District. The property considered for approval is located on the southeast corner of S. John and E. Chestnut St. and is further identified as NCPIN# 2599-95-3044.

The item was presented by Paul Saylor, Planner I/Preservation Planner, after being properly sworn in.

Mr. Saylor reviewed the information from the previous meeting regarding what the church had presented and that the Commission had tabled further discussion until a recommendation has been received from the State Historic Preservation Office. The letter was received July 3, 2025, and shared with the Commission and applicant. (See Exhibit A).

Mr. Knack reopened the public hearing so that the Board could ask questions of Michael Richter, representative for St. Paul Methodist Church. Mr. Richter was sworn in to speak.

Mr. Peacock asked if the Church had the chance to review the letter from the State Historic Preservation Office. Mr. Richter stated they had not, but he and the engineer had. He stated that they are looking into getting a second opinion to try and save the towers. Mr. Richter further stated that the church did not want to change the look of the church for the sake of making a change.

Ms. Musgrave asked if this is something the whole congregation is aware of and must weigh in on, or just the Committee. Mr. Richter stated it is more of a council awareness; they do not want to bring anything forth to the whole congregation until they have more solid answers.

Ms. Delia stated that no structural analysis was done. Mr. Richter stated that one was done, after the Engineers Report was released. Ms. Delia states, a lot of what we need to know is structural analysis. Mr. Richter stated they had done an analysis on the towers, and that is where their recommendation is coming

from. He also stated they have looked at other options. Ms. Delia stated she would like to have answers to at least the questions in the Letter.

Ron Lawrence, City Attorney, stated that it had been asked if questions could be emailed to the Church, but advised it would not be procedurally proper; questions could be posed tonight and answers could be brought back to the next meeting.

Mr. Knack wondered to what point the Commission was worried about the cost to the applicant. Mr. Peacock asked if repairing or replacing the towers was impossible, or if it was too expensive. He asked what number they are trying to stay under. Mr. Richter answered, the engineer has not said it is impossible to repair the towers, but has not found a viable solution. He stated that some recommendations are worth looking into, and some are not.

Mr. Knack stated that we cannot go forward to say go ahead and knock them down, until we have exhausted other options. He expressed that he was not sure what the full impact would be of losing the Church as a historic building. Mr. Richter stated he would like to know that as well. Mr. Best acknowledged that it had been alluded to that businesses would not be able to get the tax breaks if we are not on the list for Raliegh.

Mr. Best inquired what the cost difference is between repair and tear down. Mr. Richter stated it is about a half million dollars. Mr. Saylor interjected that he did not think feasibility needed to factor into the Commission's decision. Mr. Lawrence confirmed that the Commission needs to refer to the guidelines to determine if the request is congruous or not. He continued, stating that if it is a safety problem then feasibility needs to be considered.

Mr. Knack reiterated some of the questions the Commission is requesting answers to:

- What is the applicant's response to the recommendations in the Letter?
- How unsafe is the building? We need to know how much danger we are in.
- Can the Commission get something official stating if the towers have 3 months or 5 years before they may fall down?
- What are the other options being looked at? At least an overview.

Mr. Archibald asked if they had contacted Andrew Consulting Engineers in Wilmington. Mr. Richter stated they had not.

Mr. Cottle asserted that they need to come up with a plan to keep it historic. Mr. Knack agreed that tearing down the towers is a significant change, that he did not feel would be congruous with the standards; the applicant would be required to come up with justification for violating the standards. Mr. Richter replied that there is at least one other option they are pursuing.

Ms. Delia asked Mr. Richter if he had the structural analysis that SKA had done. Mr. Richter stated he did not have it, and would have to ask SKA for it. He explained that it was mostly calculations, but they might be able to do a summary. Ms. Delia stated they would like to have it because it addresses the safety factor they are looking at.

Ms. Musgrave asked about the 40-page report mentioned in the analysis provided at the last meeting. Mr. Richter referred to the other report that had been previously provided, stating he believed that was the report being referred to.

Mr. Knack suggested the Commission wait for the response to the Letter and other questions the Commission had posed. He also asked how the Commission could request a safety analysis.

Mr. Lawrence read from NCGS 160D-948:

“Certain changes not prohibited.

Nothing in this Part shall be construed to prevent the ordinary maintenance or repair of any exterior architectural feature in a historic district or of a landmark that does not involve a change in design, material, or appearance thereof, nor to prevent the construction, reconstruction, alteration, restoration, moving, or demolition of any such feature which the building inspector or similar official shall certify is required by the public safety because of an unsafe or dangerous condition. Nothing in this Part shall be construed to prevent a property owner from making any use of his or her property that is not prohibited by other law. Nothing in this Part shall be construed to prevent the maintenance or, in the event of

an emergency, the immediate restoration of any existing above-ground utility structure without approval by the preservation commission.”

Mr. Knack clarified if the applicant or the Commission could request the inspection. Mr. Lawrence confirmed that if the Commission feels it is needed, they can make a motion for staff to request it.

Mr. Cottle asked if the congregation had been presented the report, so they could decide as a whole what they wanted to do. Mr. Richter stated that the congregation has not gotten all of this, but the Church Council has been given a summary, and they do not currently have another viable solution.

Mr. Best noted that the Letter indicated the State is willing to come down. Mr. Richter stated they would like that. Mr. Lawrence informed them that the Church would have to request for the State to come down.

Mr. Peacock asked if the Commission could request for the Building Inspector to have a look from a safety perspective, and assess the situation. Ms. Delia asked if the building inspector has the knowledge to access the safety of the towers, or if it would only muddy the water.

After brief discussion, the Commission decided not to request the opinion of the building inspector, at this time.

Mr. Peacock asserted that all of the things in the Letter, an engineer should have a look at, and get the Commission an answer on each point. Mr. Knack stated that the applicant has indicated it is unsafe; we need a way to know how unsafe.

Mr. Cottle asked Mr. Richter if he knew what the Church wanted to do based on the report. Mr. Richter expressed that the Church does not want to change the aesthetics of the church for the sake of change, but there are certain considerations to take into account.

Mr. Archibald stated that he has looked at the SKA report and they believe the towers need to be demolished; he does not feel the Commission will get a different answer. Mr. Richter reiterated that they are looking into another option.

Mr. Roche inquired if the State could recommend an engineer, stating they should have a list from around the state. He continued, stating that Mr. Richter’s personal resources does not seem to have gotten us to a good place. Mr. Best agreed that we would be in a better place if the State came down, at the Church’s request, to have a look. Mr. Richter confirmed that they were not shy for another opinion or suggestions.

Mr. Knack asked for a motion to have the applicant answer the questions in the SHPO Letter and those posed by the Commission. Mr. Best made the motion, and it was seconded by Mr. Peacock.

Mr. Cottle was concerned that they could not get the answers in a month. The Commission discussed.

Mr. Best amended his motion to add that the applicant reach out to the SHPO to request a visit. The amended motion was seconded by Mr. Cottle and unanimously carried.

Mr. Peacock asked if a motion was needed for how much time to give them to answer the questions. Mr. Lawrence confirmed a motion would be needed to state what meeting to continue the public hearing to.

Mr. Peacock made a motion to continue the public hearing to the October 7, 2025 Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Best and unanimously carried.

New Business

Mr. Knack announced that the 100th Anniversary of Derailabration in Goldsboro was coming up in April of next year, and he would like the Commission to be part of the party. He asked for any suggestions or ideas. Ms. Delia stated that there used to be a huge celebration, and hopefully there are still some people around that know what has been done in the past. Ms. McMillen asked if it was known which group had done it in the past, because that would be a good place to start.

Ms. Delia asked if the museum had ever changed their door, and where they were on that. Mr. Saylor confirmed that the museum has not changed the door. He has reached out to the President of the Board, but has had no response, and will soon begin issuing a violation.

Reports/Discussion

Mr. Saylor discussed updating the guidelines, and becoming a Certified Local Government (CLG).

Design Standards: Update City of Goldsboro’s Historic District Commission Design Standards.

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

Mr. Saylor reviewed the timeline of the Historic District Commission, the Design Guidelines for Goldsboro, and the reasons for updating those standards. (See Exhibit B)

Mr. Saylor reiterated that the provisions of the Commission must be framed as ‘standards’ rather than ‘guidelines’; this update should have been completed a few years ago, so Goldsboro is a little behind. He introduced the new Director of Development Services, April Choice. He stated that they had decided to revise the guidelines in house. The guidelines will cover all of the historic district, and will include the Quasi-Judicial and Certificate of Appropriateness processes.

Certified Local Government (CLG): Goldsboro’s status and goals.

- i. Architectural Inventory: Update Inventory
- ii. Preservation Plan: Elevate Goldsboro 2050
- iii. Historic Districts and Cultural Activities: Economic Development

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

Mr. Saylor reviewed what a CLG is and what the benefits are for the City to achieve this status. (See Exhibit C) He also reviewed where the City is in this process, and what the next steps are.

Mr. Peacock commended Mr. Saylor for taking these projects on. He asked for clarification on the inventory requirement for becoming a CLG. Mr. Saylor stated that SHPO was always there to provide guidance. Mr. Peacock also asked if the provisions being framed as ‘standards’ rather than ‘guidelines’ gave it more teeth. Mr. Saylor stated that was the intent of the statute. He continued, stating that others have revised their provisions to more closely resemble the Secretary of Interior Standards. Mr. Peacock agreed that Mr. Best had previously made a good point, that without following the standards, we are not able to get grants and other funding.

Other Business

Mr. Saylor asked the Commission to hand out the cards provided regarding Elevate Goldsboro, and scan the QR Code to visit the site and contribute to the Comprehensive Land Use Plan update.

Ms. Musgrave asked the Commission to think of something they could do for the late Charles Gaylor III.

There being no further business, Mr. Knack asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Musgrave made the motion, and it was seconded by Mr. Cottle. The motion was unanimously carried, and the meeting was adjourned at 6:46 p.m.

Fritz Knack
Chair

Holly Jones
Planning Executive Assistant

CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT APPLICATION CHECKLIST

*NOTE: Each completed application must include the following elements:

1. ✓ Application information sheet.
2. ✓ Assurance form signed by chief local elected official of each local government seeking certification. (The Mayor's Signature before application is turned in)
3. ✓ A copy of the local preservation ordinance.
4. ✓ A copy of the rules of procedure adopted by the historic district commission.
5. **A copy of the design standards adopted by the historic district commission.**
6. a. ✓ A current list and accompanying maps of locally designated historic districts and/or landmarks and dates of designation
b. Discuss other public measures that have been taken to identify, protect, and promote the preservation of historic districts and properties.
d. Discuss the local government's plan and schedule for designation of any additional district(s) and/or additional landmarks.
7. **Completed resume forms for each member of the historic district commission.**
8. ✓ Evidence that the local government has sought professionals in preservation-related fields to serve as members of the commission.
9. ✓ Inventory.



Resume Form for Members of the Historic Preservation Commission

(Please complete for each member)

Name: _____

Mailing Address: _____

City: _____ ZIP: _____

Telephone: _____ Fax: _____

E-mail: _____

Date Appointed: _____ Term Expires: _____

Commission Officer? NO YES (PLEASE SPECIFY: _____)

Personal residence located within the city or town limits or within extraterritorial jurisdiction (ETJ)

Personal residence located in unincorporated county territory

(NOTE: All members of city or town commissions must reside within that municipality's jurisdiction. Members of joint city-county commissions must meet the residency requirements of the ordinance establishing the commission.)

Committee assignments (if any): _____

Occupation: _____

All members of the commission must have demonstrated interest in or knowledge of historic preservation.

Please list your personal, professional, or organizational activities related to historic preservation. These may include the following: (1) restoring or rehabilitating an older house or place of business; (2) involvement in community preservation organizations, historical societies, appearance commissions, planning boards, arts councils, downtown revitalization committees, or other groups promoting historic preservation; (3) work as a professional architect, historian, architectural historian, archaeologist, anthropologist, landscape architect, planner, conservationist, curator, or folklorist; or (4) other activities that you believe are related to historic preservation.

Please describe your education (**especially** if you have degrees in preservation-related fields such as those listed in (3), above), skills, training, and/or experience that may be advantageous to your work on the preservation commission.



North Carolina
State Historic Preservation Office
Department of Natural and Cultural Resources
Office of Archives and History

Have you attended any classes, workshops, or seminars on historic preservation, history, architecture, or archaeology during the last two years? If so, please list them.

What topics for workshops would most interest you or be most helpful to your work as a commission member?

GOLDSBORO HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION 2025				
Name	Original Appt. Date	Current (Most Recent) Appt.	Expires	Term
David Archibald	12/16/24	12/16/24	12/31/27	3 years
Richard Best	04/26/18	02/12/24	12/31/26	2nd
Terry Cottle	01/21/20	12/19/22	12/31/25	2nd
Nancy Delia	12/16/24	12/16/24	12/31/27	3 years
Fritz Knack - Chairperson	02/12/24	02/12/24	12/31/26	1st
John Peacock	11/18/24	11/18/24	12/31/26	1st
Judith McMillen	02/12/24	02/12/24	12/31/25	1st
ALTERNATE MEMBERS (2)				
Manning Musgrave	12/16/24	12/16/24	12/31/26	2 years
Derek Roche	12/16/24	12/16/24	12/31/27	3 years

CITY OF GOLDSBORO UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (UDO)

8.5.4 TERM OF OFFICE and § 32.304 TERMS OF OFFICE.

The terms of office of members of all boards appointed by the City Council shall be three years unless otherwise provided by law or ordinance, or unless a vacancy is being filled, in which case a term may be one, two, or three years, depending on the remainder of the term. Terms on all boards shall be staggered, with the terms of approximately 1/3 of the membership expiring each year to ensure there is always one or more members with experience on each board. All terms shall begin on January 1 following appointment. A person shall normally serve no more than two consecutive full terms on the same board. A member may continue to serve until his successor is duly named and qualified or unless he resigns.

(Ord. 2018-8, passed 2-19-18; Am. Ord. 2021-39, passed 12-20-21)

The Goldsboro Historic District Commission meets the second Tuesday of every month at 5:30 pm in the City Hall Annex at 200 N. Center Street, Goldsboro, NC 27530 in room 206.

2026 Historic District Commission Meeting Schedule and Deadlines for Submittal

MEETING	DEADLINE
January 6	December 9, 2025
February 3	January 6
March 3	February 3
April 7	March 10
May 5	April 7
June 2	May 5
July 7	June 9
August 4	July 7
September 1	August 11
October 6	September 8
November 3	October 6
December 1	November 3
*All meetings begin at 5:30 p.m. at City Hall Annex 200 N. Center Street, Goldsboro	

*****Meeting dates and/or times are subject to change with proper notice.***

2026 Meeting Calendar

January '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

February '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28

March '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
28	30	31				

April '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

May '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

June '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				

July '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
16	27	28	29	30	31	

August '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

September '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

October '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

November '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

December '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	26	30	31		