

A meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held **on February 13, 2019 at 2:00 p.m.** in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Chuck Symes, board members John Dickerson and Katherine Pringle, and Libby Anderson, guest planning staff. Bill Allison and Quinn Peitz were absent.

In accordance with the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, Section 30-4-80(d) as amended, all local media were duly notified of the time, date, place, and agenda of this meeting.

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Symes called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

### **MINUTES**

**Ms. Pringle made a motion, second by Mr. Dickerson, to approve the minutes of the January 9, 2019 HDRB meeting. The motion to approve the minutes as submitted passed unanimously.**

### **REVIEW OF FULL BOARD PROJECTS**

**1511 WASHINGTON STREET, PIN R120 004 000 0232 0000**

#### **New Construction**

Applicant: Marcie Banks (19-02 HRB.2)

*The applicant is requesting approval for construction of a new single-family house.*

The applicant, **Marcie Banks**, was present via phone. This project came before the board in November 2018 and received preliminary approval with conditions, which Ms. Anderson read from the staff report. Ms. Anderson said everything seems to be in order for final approval, but the board needs to offer a detailed review.

**Maxine Lutz**, Historic Beaufort Foundation, said the organization's Preservation Committee was happy with the changes that had been made since last time. She asked what the new windows would be made of, if they'd be insulated, and if they're true divided lites. Ms. Banks said she thinks the windows are vinyl-clad, but she's open to what is acceptable in the Historic District. They are simulated divided lites. She told Ms. Lutz that they would be vinyl-clad wood.

Ms. Pringle said she prefers "the picket look in Beaufort," but the porch is on the back of the house, so she's "not having heartburn about it."

Where the porch roof fits in over the gable, Ms. Pringle suggested it could be pushed down. Ms. Banks said they need to look at the roof pitches and asked if Ms. Pringle had a suggestion for a different pitch. Mr. Dickerson said they "could go up a little bit with the roof," and "that might eliminate the issue."

Of the pickets, Mr. Dickerson said the porch is on the back of the house, and the owner

prefers not to have them, so he's okay with it.

Ms. Lutz asked if the window lites are simulated or true divided lites. Ms. Banks said they're simulated divided lites. Ms. Lutz said HBF is "more interested in having true divided lites and wood windows." Also, the Preservation Committee wants there to be pickets on the back porch, she said, even though it's not visible from the street. Mr. Dickerson said this is new construction, so there is "a different set of standards."

Chairman Symes said he prefers pickets on the back porch, but he would agree with the rest of the board.

**Mr. Dickerson made a motion, second by Ms. Pringle, for final approval, with no pickets on the back porch and no additional windows on the east side. The motion passed unanimously.**

There was a discussion about the windows. Chairman Symes said the applicant could choose windows that are on the city's approved windows list.

Mr. Dickerson asked where it is written that the windows need to be true divided lites. Ms. Lutz read about simulated divided lites from "a general guideline," which she said doesn't apply to new construction. Ms. Anderson said clad windows are permitted in the Northwest Quadrant on new construction. True divided lites or simulated divided lites "could go either way," she said, and she will send the approved windows list to Ms. Banks. It was agreed that Ms. Banks could use simulated divided lites.

#### **REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF MATERIAL FOR BENCHES AT 808 BAY STREET**

Applicant: Allen Brooker

Ms. Anderson said **Allen Brooker** is the owner of the new Kilwins shop downtown. He is proposing installing two permanent benches.

Ms. Anderson said she was unsure about the proposed material, which Chairman Symes said is "a resin bench." He asked if the entire bench is resin. Mr. Brooker said it's a German product, and it's entirely resin: a composite material with a "wood-like look." He said his concern is "size constraints." They could have a 6' bench in front of the windows, but it would impede access. The ones he's chosen are a good size for the space, Mr. Brooker said, and they have "a historic look [for] a bench." He said he is looking of direction from the board on what looks good and is durable.

Ms. Lutz said HBF's Preservation Committee was "not in favor of using resin material on Bay Street." The Preservation Manual "calls for the use of sympathetic material in the Historic District," she said. The upstairs porch would protect the benches, so Mr. Brooker might not need to be concerned about weather damage to traditional materials, Ms. Lutz said.

Ms. Pringle said her concern is that approving a “plastic product” would “begin to set a precedent” along Bay Street. She would prefer wood and metal or “all metal.”

Mr. Brooker said he’d appreciate suggestions about where to find acceptable benches. Mr. Dickerson said there is a bench style that’s accepted in the Historic District, and Mr. Brooker “could carry that bench style right onto your front step.” Ms. Anderson said she could find out the manufacturer for him. Mr. Dickerson said a 60’ version of that bench “works for me.”

Chairman Symes said he likes the design Mr. Brooker proposed, but he doesn’t think they should use resin. He agrees that finding the bench that’s used in the Historic District now would be most appropriate for Kilwins.

Mr. Brooker asked, if he is able to get a bench similar to the one proposed in wood, if he’d need to come back to the HDRB. Chairman Symes told him to send a photo of the bench to Ms. Anderson.

**407 WEST STREET, PIN R120 004 000 0802 0000**

**Alterations & additions**

Applicant: Ansley Hester Manuel (19-03 HRB.1)

*The applicant is requesting approval for exterior renovations.*

Ms. Anderson said this is in the Old Commons neighborhood and is a contributing structure on the survey. She reviewed the changes the applicant is requesting.

**Ansley Hester Manuel**, the project’s architect, said **Beekman Webb** is the contractor.

Ms. Manuel said there are two doors on the front porch. All of the other minor exterior changes are being done to portions of the house that have been renovated or are “newer additions to the rear.” They propose to turn the current sunroom’s existing steps for “a landing at the door,” Ms. Manuel said. The other changes are to an area of the house that isn’t original. They want to remove the back steps and the rear door and add a matching window in “the walk-in closet,” she said.

Ms. Manuel showed the door that they are proposing to change into a window. When it’s replaced, it will be “the true windows that match the windows in the other part of the house.” Chairman Symes asked if the door is “an original door” or if it was added later. Ms. Manuel said it matches the front door, but she doesn’t know if it’s original to the house. Mr. Webb said, “A lot of things have been changed on that house,” so it’s hard to tell, but there aren’t many original doors on the house, and there is a mix of original and not-original doors.

Mr. Webb pointed out various windows in the house.

Ms. Pringle asked if they are planning to use the door, they're taking out on the side porch. Mr. Webb said it would be better than the door that is there, so he agreed it "would be a good place to use it."

On the rear changes, Ms. Manuel said they want to wall-in a door on the new portion. They would take away the back steps as well. They want to match a window on the back to a window that's in the bathroom, she said.

Mr. Dickerson clarified that the door and 6/6 window would both go.

Ms. Lutz said HBF's Preservation Committee is appreciative that someone is "finally going to love" this "antebellum cottage." The Preservation Committee's real concern is removing "what appears to be the original door to the house," she said. The Preservation Committee feels that this is not something "that needs to be done to an antebellum house," and that the openings should remain as they historically were. It might have been a window, Ms. Lutz said, but she believes it was the original front door.

Ms. Lutz asked Ms. Manuel to indicate where they were planning to put another window on the back of the house. Ms. Manuel indicated it to her. It would match the existing window that is near the walled-in door, she told Ms. Lutz.

Ms. Lutz asked if they had considered replacing one of the 6/6 "[19]30s windows" and matching it to the others. Ms. Manuel said they have not and explained why.

Ms. Lutz asked about the original front porch on the house, which is south-facing. She said she understands that using it as a sunroom "expands your living space," but she thinks "it's a shame" not to replace that original south-facing front porch.

Ms. Lutz said HBF would strongly oppose changing the original door on the front to a window.

**Jay Weidner** said he thinks it's important to find out what the house was like historically. It was built to face the south, originally, he said, so the current front porch was not originally the front porch. On the recent addition, Mr. Weidner suggested reconfiguring the roofline "to be compatible with the rest of the house."

Mr. Weidner said he personally feels that it would be a mistake to "destroy the original façade of the house. Period," referring to the windows "inside," between the bedroom, the den, and the sunroom. Mr. Webb said in this house, all the part to the left has different windows from the part to the right. There is a good chance that this was "a very small house" when it was built, with two or three rooms at the most. The fireplace was originally a double fireplace, he said, and two rooms were heated. On the other side, there's no fireplace, he said, which indicates that that part is an addition to the original. It's possible that "none of those doors were there when the house was built,"

he told Mr. Weidner.

Mr. Weidner suggested investigating the wall between the den and “bedroom 1” and determining if the windows are original, and if they are, they shouldn't be removed. Mr. Webb said that “doesn't have anything to do with the application.” The porch “has probably been enclosed for 75 years,” if not longer, he added.

Chairman Symes said he's very happy with reconfiguring the steps on the side. He has a concern about the second door in the front porch area, if it's original, but he doesn't “have a good answer” yet.

Mr. Dickerson said rotating the steps adds to them and “gives a much safer and better landing.” If the windows are going to be relocated to where the door is now, he's happy they're being preserved. As for removing the door, the roof pitch makes him wonder if it was originally a 2-room house. Mr. Dickerson asked if the door into the living room was added later, and the other door was original, or “if it's the other way around.” He is having a hard time approving removing the door without knowing. Mr. Webb said he believes both doors “might have been added later.” Ms. Lutz said there has been a determination that it was originally a 2-room house. Mr. Webb is right about “the addition to the left” being “very old,” so it should be considered for protection, she said.

**Johan Niemand** said he understands the historic protection, but because of “the current way of living,” the doors are “becoming obsolete.” Changing one door to a window isn't detrimental, he said; the design indicates “a purpose to that.”

Mr. Dickerson said that the board doesn't have “purview over the interior of the building,” and the board needs to “stay inside our lane.”

Ms. Anderson said this is not a Bailey Bill application.

Mr. Weidner asked if “not in our lane” includes the Milner report saying that the exterior shouldn't be changed. Additions are to be removable and leave the original architecture of the house intact, he said. They could look at all of the Sanborn maps that this house appears on, Mr. Weidner said, to determine the original structure and the historic additions.

Ms. Manuel said she and Mr. Webb are guessing that the sunroom and bathroom were done at the same time. That enclosure is probably as old as whenever people started having indoor plumbing, she said.

Ms. Pringle said the doors might not be original, but she is good with taking it out if it's being reused and they are replacing it with one of the original windows. If the next owner wants to put the door back, there would be historic proof that there was an opening there, she said.

Ms. Pringle asked if the materials used for the last addition are usable for this work. Mr. Webb said they're not. There is a plywood door and two different kinds of plywood siding. He'll leave a corner board, but horizontal siding "would look better there," Mr. Webb said.

There was a general discussion about the siding. **Katrina Billig**, the homeowner, said it is not her intent to change the vertical siding. Mr. Dickerson said the lowest-cost alternative is to remove the plywood and put on siding. Ms. Billig said she's open to that. Mr. Dickerson explained what he was suggesting. Chairman Symes recommended "embracing" the house's "eccentricity."

Chairman Symes said he's "still torn about what to do about" the second door on the front porch. Ms. Lutz said she thinks the Sanborn maps should be consulted, and unless there are plans to put cabinets or counters there, they should preserve that door. Mr. Webb said he doesn't think the second door is "a huge thing," though it would be nice to have light and a view. Ms. Manuel said the homeowner has agreed to keep the door, so that requested change is "off the table."

Mr. Dickerson said the sunroom is enclosed as of today, and allowing it to remain so is okay with him. The entry into it will be "a little wider when it's extended," so if they "can use those windows elsewhere," he's "fine with that."

If the current sunroom is the original front of the house, Ms. Lutz asked if they need to consider what the original steps would have been like. Mr. Webb described how the original steps would have been, and they are not like that now. They probably would have been wooden and went "straight out from the door." Mr. Weidner suggested that if they build a wooden deck "there's no reason to take the steps away." Chairman Symes asked if Mr. Weidner is assuming that the steps are original. Mr. Weidner was told that they're not.

**Chairman Symes made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted, less the door removal, which has been taken off the table. Ms. Pringle seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**708 HAMILTON STREET, PIN R120 004 000 0566 0000**

**Alterations & additions**

Applicant: Johan Niemand, JHN Residential Building Design (19-04 HRB.1)

Ms. Anderson said this project is in The Point, and the house is a contributing structure. The applicant is seeking preliminary approval for alterations and additions, which she reviewed from the staff report.

**Johan Niemand**, the project's architect, said he believes this project was a Sears & Roebuck house built in the 1920s or 1930s. There are no bedrooms on the first floor, he

said, and the homeowners would like a master suite on the first floor. Also, the kitchen is very small, so they would like to extend it, and thirdly, they would like to build a porch on the first floor. The second floor porch would be enclosed and made into a bedroom. They have discussed the phasing of the project for budgetary reasons with city staff, Mr. Niemand said. He described the work to be done in each of the three phases.

Mr. Niemand said the windows in the house are in terrible shape, so he would like the board's guidance on a new approved window to replace them. Chairman Symes asked if the windows are 4/1, and Mr. Niemand said they are, and the owners would like to keep that style, which is appropriate for the style of the house.

Ms. Lutz said the Preservation Committee thinks the proposal contradicts the Secretary of the Interior's standards about the addition needing to be subordinate to the original because the addition is "quite a bit larger than the original building."

Ms. Lutz said before this application goes any further, the mass of the addition "is overwhelming the original house" and needs "to be scaled back." The committee wants to see elevation drawings that show the existing and proposed plans side-by-side, she said.

Staff recommended true divided lites, Ms. Lutz noted.

Ms. Pringle said what Ms. Lutz said about the size of the addition versus the original indicates that "we need to look at this all over again." Chairman Symes said additions are to be 50% or less of the original footprint of the building, which is "a significant problem" with this proposal.

Mr. Niemand said he wanted to "show the big picture" of "what we're working toward." He is trying to make this a livable structure for "modern living," as well as maintaining "the historical context." He doesn't want the addition to stick out like a sore thumb, and he's tried to maintain the character of the structure.

Mr. Niemand showed the original house, the proposed additions on the front of the house on Hamilton and Hancock Streets, and the porch upstairs that is proposed to be enclosed.

The homeowner, **Sally Scudder**, said the current kitchen is "totally unworkable." The house has been in her family for three generations, and she and her husband "really need a downstairs bedroom." This is a double lot, she said, which is unusually large in The Point. The palladium window on the back of the house is not essential, she said. Ms. Scudder asked if there is an alternative if this application is not approved.

Chairman Symes said he's concerned about it because it appears to be "jammed" in, and there is a problem with having a 115% increase in the size of the structure with the

addition of the front porch.

Mr. Dickerson said the board has to stay within guidelines. As for the phasing, that is within the guidelines “as far as change of front porch size,” but it is “far less than 115%.” He said perhaps the board should ask Mr. Niemand to revise the request according to the phases. This would make the house “more usable” for the homeowner “without dramatically changing the front porch of the house,” Mr. Dickerson said, and he suggested this application could be tabled to allow Mr. Niemand to do that.

Chairman Symes suggested looking at not having the den bump-out and the screened porch, to see if that gets the additions down to less than 50%. If focusing on the downstairs bedroom and the kitchen plan gets it closer to 50% or 60% “we could work with that,” he said.

Ms. Pringle asked if Chairman Symes means to “do away with the porch forever” or just now. Chairman Symes joked that the applicants could come back someday when he’s not on the board to propose a porch; for now, this is the way to work with the board’s restrictions and still help the applicants achieve what they want. Mr. Dickerson said if they did what Chairman Symes suggests, they might be within the range.

Ms. Anderson said she had calculated the existing and proposed footprints, and with just the master bedroom and kitchen, the addition would be 57%. Chairman Symes said the board’s guideline is “approximately 50%,” so that could work. Mr. Niemand told the Scudders that the board is saying he needs to present them with drawings to show that the adjustments would do put the proposed additions within the range of the guidelines.

On the windows, Ms. Lutz said deteriorated features are to be repaired rather than replaced, but if they can’t be, the new windows need to match the old in design, color, texture, and materials. The house’s distinctive architecture needs to be compatible with the old, with the essential form and integrity of the building remaining intact. Mr. Weidner warned against builders that have making mistakes in this neighborhood lately, including double-paned windows and modern glass in historic houses.

**Chairman Symes made a motion to table the project, with the architect returning with a new set of drawings based on today’s discussions. Ms. Pringle seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

### **OLD BUSINESS**

Chairman Symes said **Lauren Kelly** was working with the owner of 808 Bay Street; the doors and windows were to be temporary, but they were meant to be wooden, not metal-clad as they are now. He suggested the city go to the owner and tell them the doors and windows are not acceptable on a permanent basis. Mr. Dickerson said he feels they should pull the minutes to look at what was agreed to. They could review



that. He recalls there was “a lot of negotiation back and forth.” Chairman Symes said he recalls Ms. Kelly had a hard time convincing the owner of what she was saying.

Chairman Symes said he and **David Prichard** had discussed getting the information the HDRB needs to make its decisions – including a site plan with different elevations, and the old and proposed elevations side-by-side. Chairman Symes proposed looking at requirements for applications to the HDRB and whether there are things the board would like to add. There was a discussion about using the Design Review Board’s requirements and working from there.

Ms. Pringle said it would be helpful for her to know how the process works before the homeowner gets to the HDRB. Ms. Anderson said the applicants come in with an idea about what they want, and then Ms. Kelly or the preservation planner works with them: it goes to the board or staff, and Ms. Kelly tries to work with applicants to guide them before it goes to the HDRB.

Ms. Lutz asked if Mr. Prichard had indicated “what the new staff position would be,” for Ms. Kelly’s replacement. Chairman Symes said they “didn’t get into that much detail.” Mr. Prichard is looking for a contract architect in the interim; Chairman Symes said personally he hopes Ms. Kelly’s replacement has her skills. Ms. Lutz said she hopes the board members would let Mr. Prichard or the city manager know that they want Ms. Kelly’s replacement to have her design background. Ms. Anderson said that’s “made a big difference in the perception” of the city’s historic planning.

Mr. Dickerson told Ms. Pringle an applicant goes to Ms. Kelly, then to HBF, then back to Ms. Kelly, then submits a packet reviewed “by all the internal departments that do that,” and *then* the project comes to the HDRB.

Mr. Dickerson asked about staff approval of the Kilwins bench. Chairman Symes said the photo Mr. Brooker submits could be sent to the board members. Mr. Dickerson said that might be problematic. Ms. Anderson said she would immediately look for the manufacturer of the bench approved for use in the Historic District.

Chairman Symes said his term and Mr. Peitz’s are up in June, and he believes Mr. Peitz wants to retire from the board. Chairman Symes said he’d agreed to stay on until his replacement is found.

Chairman Symes thanked Ms. Kelly on the record for the “exceptional professional job she has done over her tenure” with the city, and the board wishes her well in her future endeavors.

There being no further business to come before the board, **Chairman Symes made a motion, second by Ms. Pringle, to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously**, and the meeting was adjourned at 3:59 p.m.