

A meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held on **March 9, 2016 at 2:00 p.m.** in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Joel Newman, board members Chuck Symes, Barbara Laurie, Quinn Peitz and John Dickerson, and Lauren Kelly, planning staff.

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

MINUTES

Mr. Symes made a motion, seconded by Mr. Peitz, to approve the minutes of the February 10, 2016 Historic District Review Board meeting. Ms. Laurie asked that the record reflect that when **Maxine Lutz** had brought up a question about parliamentary procedure, it was to ask if the reason for an abstention had to be given, and the board members had determined that it did not. **The motion to approve the minutes as amended passed unanimously.**

Public Hearing:

805 Ribaut Road – Demolition of Structure

Ms. Kelly said the Beaufort County Historic Sites Survey lists this as circa 1895; the area is not documented on the Sanborn maps. The carport may be circa 1895, she said, but the majority of the structure is circa 1965. Staff doesn't feel the structure has significant qualities remaining that are representative of Beaufort architecture, and recommends approval of the demolition.

Alan McNeal, the applicant's representative, said the house has been added onto many times. The Beach family would like to have it taken down and a new one built, he said. There was no further public comment. Ms. Kelly described the board's purview as it relates to demolitions and the procedures for demolition.

REVIEW OF FULL BOARD PROJECTS

805 Ribaut Road, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 5, Parcel 147, Major Demolition

Applicant: Alan F. McNeal for Dennis Beach (HR16-06)

The applicant is proposing demolition of the existing structure in preparation for a new home.

Mr. Dickerson asked if the structure could be donated and moved elsewhere. Mr. McNeal said he will recommend that some of the structure's valuable components be donated to Habitat for Humanity. Some components will have to be demolished in order to get to the original cottage. Chairman Newman suggested Deep Well was an option for donation, too. Mr. Symes said Historic Beaufort Foundation would like to come in

before it's demolished to see if there are any old parts of the building that HBF might want to acquire. **Mr. Peitz made a motion, second by Ms. Laurie, to approve the demolition. The motion passed unanimously.**

808 Newcastle Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 378

New Construction

Applicant: Corey Post, Saltline Construction, for Susan Sagui (HR16-07)

The applicant is requesting approval for the construction of a new main house and guest house.

Ms. Kelly said this parcel is currently vacant; two structures have been there previously that were demolished over the past 25 years. The applicant wants to construct 3 structures there: a primary house, a guest house, and a garage with an attached office. Ms. Kelly said the lot is more than 180' deep and takes up two-thirds of the block. There are a couple of zoning issues that would require a variance, she said, and staff would appreciate a recommendation about them from the HDRB. Both variances concern the garage/attached office. There's a side setback issue; it should be 5', but it is 1.5'. There are design implications on the building as a result. The second variance request would be for the garage footprint: It can't exceed 50' of the primary building.

Ms. Kelly noted the applicable guidelines. Staff appreciates the utilization of the lot's depth while maintaining the streetscape, she said. The Civic Master Plan promotes infill development. The mass and scale of the primary building are appropriate for the neighborhood, staff feels. The garage building seems large in relationship to the primary structure, Ms. Kelly said. Staff suggests a 2-car garage, instead, with a carport if necessary. Also, the roof pitch seems tall, and staff recommends reducing the pitch to lessen its mass on the street.

Other issues, staff felt, included the structure's openings. [Ms. Kelly noted that none of the buildings were labeled properly in the application.]

- Transoms are not traditionally used over windows, so the applicant should consider replacing them with larger windows that take up the whole opening.
- The sidelites on the entry door seem out of scale and out of character with this Victorian vernacular, Ms. Kelly said. She suggested that the applicant consider narrower sidelites with lite divisions, or a pair of doors with more glazing. If the sidelites are retained, the applicant should consider spanning the transom over the entire assembly.
- On the south elevation, a shallow awning window should be reconsidered. Staff feels it should have square or vertical proportions.
- Ms. Kelly said groups of windows "should be properly trimmed out," not "a ganged assembly," as they are in the dining room.

Ms. Kelly said staff recommends making the 3-car garage a 2-car garage and shifting the building to accommodate proper detailing (i.e., the eaves would not need to be clipped

to avoid overhang). Ms. Kelly said the applicant should consider a shed roof on the bay window, centering the bay window in the gable (it's close to centered already), and a shallower roof pitch.

Ms. Kelly noted that the applicant will need to provide a detailed color and materials list. In regard to the guest cottage, staff recommends an additional window on the elevation where the stove is, and moving the stove.

Staff recommends preliminary approval of the request, Ms. Kelly said, on the condition that the applicant considers staff's comments about proportion, details, and the scale of the garage. Final approval should be contingent on the resolution of zoning issues. The board should recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals whether the variance requests should be approved if they are submitted.

Chairman Newman asked the depth of the garage. **Corey Post** said it's 25'. Chairman Newman said it could be 3' shallower and be "plenty big," which would eliminate the need for the variance. He said this seemed like an "additive style." He has no problem with an occasional awning/transom window, and he disagrees with staff that they should always have a square or rectangular orientation.

Chairman Newman agreed that the roof pitch "could come down a little bit." The gable at the front door is "not modest" like the houses around it; the columns around it have the same effect. He thinks traditional Beaufort style would look better – with equal bays, "door-window-window," a traditional shed porch roof, and the original gable. The little garage gable is not a big problem, Chairman Newman feels, but it "could be simpler." The extra bay in the garage could be a carport, and it's openness would soften the massing. The style of the gable and porch roof on the guest house is the simple Beaufort style, he said. The bottom left elevation is the most characteristic, he said, and "it's charming." He said he found the plan layout to be good.

Mr. Symes asked Chairman Newman if he felt it was too crowded. Chairman Newman said there are "a lot of lines on the site plan," and there appears to be more building than there really is. "It's a lot," he said, but there is green space and the driveway. A 2-bay garage would help it fit on the site better.

Mr. Symes asked the setback minimums and maximums. The other houses around this lot are "back a little more than normal," he said – about 24' back from the street. This one is about 8' back. Ms. Kelly said the front setback is "prevailing." It is 12' to the main building, and the porch encroaches 8' into that. Mr. Post agreed this house is forward of the others around it. Chairman Newman said that's inappropriate.

Mr. Symes suggested the porches and houses of this house's neighbors could line up with it, though they don't need to do so exactly; Chairman Newman said this building just can't be significantly forward of the adjacent house.

Mr. Dickerson asked if the family needs a 3-car garage. Mr. Post said no, but two parking spaces per residence are required, and there's a guest house. Chairman Newman said the guest house only requires one parking spot. Mr. Post said he agrees that it would help to get rid of one of the garage parking places. There was more general discussion about the front setback.

There was general agreement that this application should receive preliminary approval. Mr. Symes asked about the foundation. Ms. Kelly said it is a raised slab with piers at the porch. It's not in a flood zone, so raking 24–30" is appropriate. Mr. Symes suggested there be "more windows and fewer solid walls" in the next set of drawings brought to the board, even in the garage, because that side is still seen.

Mr. Dickerson said the front door in the main house opens "oddly." Though this is not the board's purview, he said, he suggested reworking the design of that area. Chairman Newman said the two front doors are awkward, and a more traditional Beaufort front would clean that up. The owner may intend to use the front room in some way for which she wants the separate front door.

Mr. Post said he might not need to go before the ZBOA to get variances if they get rid of one garage space, and are able to move the house back on the lot. Mr. Dickerson suggested that Mr. Post and the homeowner drive around Beaufort and look at the local architecture. **Mr. Peitz made a motion to give preliminary approval, with consideration of board and staff comments. Mr. Symes seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

1407 Duke Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 344

Alterations and additions

Applicant: Allison Ramsey Architects (HR16-08) / (BB16-01)

The applicant is requesting Preliminary Approval, and Bailey Bill approval for renovation of the existing property and addition of a master bedroom and bath wing.

Ms. Kelly said this is a contributing structure, circa 1870. In 2014, the front porch restoration and minor stabilization work was approved by the HDRB, and HBF sold it to Paradise Point Construction. The applicant is proposing to finish the renovation and to add a master suite to the rear of it. HBF has an easement on the property, Ms. Kelly said, and its Preservation Committee was generally supportive of these requests, as is city staff, with two conditions: A historic photo of the front porch shows slender turned columns and balustrades, Ms. Kelly said. The idea is to go back toward that – which is what was approved in the 2014 plans – not the 10 x 10 columns shown in these plans. Also, the brick steps that are proposed were not what was approved. Wooden steps are more traditional. Staff recommends approval contingent on HBF approval and rethinking of the porch details, window openings, and colors.

Chairman Newman said the porch railing was defined on the drawings last time. There

was not an easement on it then, Ms. Kelly said. Chairman Newman asked if that changes the approval of the porch railing, which has been reviewed and approved before Historic Beaufort Foundation bought it.

Christopher Perry, architect, said they met with Historic Beaufort Foundation, talked about the columns and balustrades, and plan to change both of them. Chairman Newman said the HDRB has no purview over an easement, anyway. Mr. Perry said HBF had approved raising the two first floor windows to be at 8', which will be shown on resubmitted drawings.

Mr. Peitz clarified that the steps, columns and balustrades have been changed, and two windows on the front will be higher. Mr. Perry added that there are no windows on the sides now. Ms. Kelly said, even with an easement, if HBF were to grant approval of something, but the HDRB didn't feel what HBF had approved was appropriate, the HDRB could change it. Chairman Newman said when **Mike Rainey**, an HBF board member, was on the HDRB, he had made it clear that "the easement supersedes all." The board can comment, but it has no leverage. Ms. Kelly said this application is before the board because of the Bailey Bill and the modifications that are being made. Ms. Laurie said that in that case, they should get to the proposed addition.

Mr. Dickerson told **Jenny Evans**, the owner, about how the home's value is determined for the Bailey Bill; Ms. Kelly said the owner can use an appraisal or a county assessment. Mr. Dickerson said \$173,800 is given as the home's value on the application. Ms. Evans said that's incorrect; it "was in some old paperwork from HBF." Mr. Dickerson suggested getting an appraisal done of the property *as they bought it* in order to get a greater benefit from the Bailey Bill.

Mr. Dickerson made a motion that the applicant be given the opportunity to revise the Bailey Bill documentation, based on an appraisal of the land and buildings to establish a proper value. Ms. Evans said measures are in place to do so. Ms. Kelly said the tax assessor can be appealed to based on the sales price. Chairman Newman said Mr. Dickerson's advice is great, but it is not the responsibility of the HDRB. The architecture is. **The motion failed for lack of a second.**

There was a general discussion about alley access to the property. **Mr. Peitz made a motion to approve the request, contingent on HBF approval; Mr. Dickerson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

1402 Washington Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 342
New Construction

Applicant: Carol Corbin (HR16-09)

Applicant is requesting approval for the construction of a new house with a screened porch.

Ms. Kelly said this is currently a vacant parcel on Washington and Wilmington Streets. The applicant has designed her own house and is here for conceptual or preliminary approval. The total footprint is 1100 square feet. One big issue is that the property is zoned General Commercial, so an effort is being made to get it rezoned as General Residential.

Ms. Kelly cited applicable guidelines. The roof pitch on the side elevations seems steeper than the other elevations; that should be resolved as the drawings are more refined. There are other details – like the spacing of piers – that will be resolved as the process goes along. Ms. Kelly showed the board updated drawings on the screen. The east elevation in the original submission is different than the new one, which she showed. Staff's comments didn't change with the new drawings, she said.

Staff feels the HDRB should discuss whether a screened porch on the front of the house is appropriate. There are other houses that have them in the Northwest Quadrant, Ms. Kelly said. The Preservation Manual Supplement states that front porches should not be enclosed, while the Northwest Quadrant standards say they are acceptable. Ms. Kelly said there are examples of good and bad screened porches. There are not many openings – windows and doors – in this structure, so “that’s still unresolved.”

Staff recommends preliminary approval to the request, on the condition that the issue of the front portion of the house is resolved. **Carol Corbin** said that she had revised the plans and put double windows in the front and widened the screened porch by 2'. She clarified to Mr. Peitz that the porch is “still screened” in her plans.

Chairman Newman suggested that she look at a house in Port Royal which is “perfect” for its size. The problem with her design is that it’s “old school.” He described how he would arrange the space “to avoid bifurcation.” Ms. Corbin said that she wanted a sun room and to be able to heat smaller rooms better. Chairman Newman told her that would probably not be a problem here in South Carolina.

Ms. Kelly also showed Ms. Corbin how she could arrange the house; Chairman Newman said she can make this small house “live” like a larger house. There will be better wall space in one area and an open, glassy area elsewhere. Chairman Newman said the trick with a screened porch is to make sure it's inside the columns and rails.

There was a general discussion of Ms. Corbin's plans and a painting she had done of the exterior of the house. Chairman Newman said he's okay with the knee wall shown on the painting. He thinks the painting is more appealing than Ms. Corbin's drawings and conveys better what she wants.

Mr. Dickerson said his company does renovations and “shift things around” internally to create spaces that make small houses “feel much bigger.” The board assured Ms. Corbin, who is from Canada, that she would be able to adequately heat the house.

Ms. Laurie said she hopes that Ms. Corbin's new home will bring with it more opportunities for long-term residents among their Northwest Quadrant neighbors to upgrade their "dilapidated" homes, but the real issue, Ms. Laurie feels, is that many of those homeowners don't have the means to do that. Also, she said, the additions that were made to their houses were done under different guidelines than what the city has today. She said she's optimistic that with new homeowners in the neighborhood – on Duke Street and now on Washington Street – the city will begin to look at "how to ... lead homeowners to resources" that will "help them maintain their properties at the same level" as this new construction.

Mr. Symes made a motion to give preliminary approval to the drawings with consideration of board and staff comments. Mr. Peitz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

Ms. Kelly said in regard to the Washington Street demolition, the hearing to determine ownership will not happen until the end of March. The woman who had come to an HDRB meeting to contest the property's ownership had been in jail, so she had been unable to attend the hearing.

There being no further business to come before the board, **Mr. Peitz made a motion, second by Mr. Dickerson, to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously,** and the meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.