

A meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held on **March 12, 2014 at 2:00 p.m.** in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Joel Newman, board members Mike Rainey, Inez Neal, and Erica Dickerson and city staff Lauren Kelly.

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

REVIEW OF FULL BOARD PROJECTS

1707 Bay Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 3, Parcel 239, Alterations and Additions

Applicant: R. Buzz Lucas (HR14-10)

The applicant is requesting final approval to renovate a previously infilled side porch into a master bath.

The building is listed as contributing, Ms. Kelly said. The porch was infilled in the 1980s. The request is for a modification of the infilled section of the porch. Due to some interior renovations, they want to remove 2 of the windows on the east side and add siding, and they want to take a double-hung window and make it an awning window, covering the bottom with siding.

Staff feels the request doesn't affect the historic portion, Ms. Kelly said. There is reference in the Supplement as to the way to replace the non-historic windows. She said the staff comments were that this won't change the streetscape of Bay Street; they wondered about a window that the application doesn't say why it needs to change, so staff suggests that they could put a shutter on it. There's a historic window next to this one, and they could replace it with a similar one. Staff recommends final approval with consideration of the awning window.

R. Buzz Lucas, the applicant, said the big window to the left is not double hung; they're all "eclectic," and it is a casement window. If they went with the other window, they could put in a smaller double hung; that would be fine for him.

Mr. Rainey said he appreciates the applicant's willingness to change the window. **Mr. Rainey made a motion to approve the application, with the window to be changed as discussed. Ms. Dickerson second. The motion passed unanimously.**

701 Green Street, Identified as District R121, Tax Map 4, Parcel 220, Alterations and Additions

– Post-Facto

Applicant: Nationwide Development for Jeannette Neal, Owner (HR14-11)

The applicant is requesting final approval for a rear porch addition that is partially constructed.

Ms. Kelly said this house is circa 1785 and listed as contributing. The applicant is seeking final approval for a rear porch addition that is partially constructed. On January 15, the Historic District Review Board reviewed the post-facto requests for a number of changes. At the on-site meeting on January 17, the Board approved a motion to allow the wrap-around porch to be continued if it were extended to the end as a single expression and the balustrade and the roof deck on the end be removed, and the brickwork completed as one expression from the back. The applicant was required to submit a drawing of the west elevation to show how the porch roof will be resolved to meet the Board's requirements. Since then, the applicant has had a full set of plans drawn, and they were submitted.

Ms. Kelly said the Secretary of Interior standards discuss new additions to historic buildings. The items to be considered are listed in the staff report.

Ms. Kelly said staff had a few comments and suggestions for the drawings. The balustrade on the northeast corner of the building will be completely removed. The resolution of the roof from the north to the west side appears to meet the Board's intent in the resolution. It reflects previous additions. In regard to the materials, staff feels the foundation on the west side is depicted as siding or buttboard, and they would like clarification; there are no brick piers or anything else for articulation. Staff recommends that brick piers be constructed under each column and that piers should be infilled with a similar lattice to what is on the front. The lattice under the arched bays should also match this. Ms. Kelly said the chimney cap should be replicated and drawn properly to show that it will be. Staff recommends approval.

Tim Schwartz, Nationwide Developments, representing the applicant, said everything has been discussed at the previous meetings, and there's nothing additional. **Maxine Lutz** said Historic Beaufort Foundation agrees that rather than brick the piers in, they would rather see the lattice, and they'd rather see piers on the unarticulated side. They noticed the columns were irregularly placed, and they would like them to be spaced out better.

Ms. Dickerson said she agrees with staff. Chairman Newman said he does, too. As to the piers on the west elevation and the new north elevation, the span is irregular, and an additional column there would be more in rhythm with that side over there.

Ms. Dickerson made a motion to accept the application, to include staff comments. The motion passed 3-1, with Mr. Rainey opposed in what he states was "a symbolic comment on the project."

1009 Scott Street, Identified as District R121, Tax Map 4, Parcel 216A, New Construction Applicant: Allison Ramsey Architects for Dave Thorton and Lois Smith (HR14-12)

The applicant is requesting preliminary approval to construct a new single-family residence.

Ms. Kelly said this is for new construction on a vacant parcel. The lot is vacant and has been since the earliest Sanborn maps. They want to create a single-family residence there. The Supplement discusses new construction; in regard to scale, the Supplement says the decisions of the Historic District Review Board should be affected by absolute height and massing.

Staff comments, Ms. Kelly said, include siting: the building as shown was sited near the property line and staff inquired if the trees had been evaluated. They got an email that a couple have been further evaluated and are slated for removal, so they can move the house a couple more feet south. There was a question about the materials for the driveway, parking area, and walkways for the site. This block, particularly on the opposite side of the street, has one-story cottages, and on this side, the Old Commons neighborhood has a mix of 1- and 2-story houses. Staff feels this scale is appropriate, Ms. Kelly said. Staff recommends preliminary approval with perhaps alterations to the siting of the building.

Cooter Ramsey said the summary was good; they can move the building, but they would love to keep the trees. They can go either way. Ms. Lutz said they welcome this addition to the Old Commons neighborhood. Their main question was about windows being different on the right elevation and a double window; they would like to see more consistency and elimination of the double window. Mr. Ramsey said they would like the double window, and he thinks they are not atypical. It wouldn't be a mullied window. They can explore the overall composition for that façade, and he feels "they have the room to make it look nicer."

Ms. Dickerson asked if it had been before Codes. Ms. Kelly said 5' setback is the minimum, and they can get it to 6', if they pull it over a little bit, Mr. Ramsey said, they will be in the clear.

Chairman Newman said he agrees with the window consistency because these houses tend to have that. Mr. Ramsey said they "would give another shot at refinement."

Mr. Rainey moved for approval with consideration of the comments about the windows. Ms. Dickerson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

601 Port Republic Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 889, New Construction – Carriage House

Applicant: JHN Residential Design for Norman and Rosemary Campbell, Owners (HR14-13)
The applicant is requesting final approval for a 2-story accessory dwelling building above a garage.

Ms. Kelly said this project is before the HDRB for a second time. The main building is listed as contributing, though it's uncertain if it were original on the site. It's circa 1850. The applicant is proposing living quarters above a garage. In regard to zoning, the plan as submitted meets all building requirements. The Supplement discusses secondary structures, and she reviewed what it says about them. In the UDO, Ms. Kelly said, there's a section on accessory dwelling units as well, which she read.

Staff comments: Ms. Kelly said the general location, size, mass, and scale meet the Supplement's intent. The curb cut seems wide, and they recommend it be reduced unless it's using the existing curb cut.

Ms. Kelly said a challenge **Johann Niemand** has dealt with is making the building subordinate to the primary structure because it has uncharacteristically low ceiling heights, so he has been trying to make the accessory dwelling unit shorter than the original building. Since the past submission, the roof pitch has been changed, and the details have been modified. On the east elevation, in regard to the 2 casement windows and 2 taller ones with a window seat, staff recommends more consistent proportion with the historic building, which they attain on the other elevations. Another suggestion, from the Preservation Committee, is a shed roof within a gable to protect the door, but the dormer window is needed. So Mr. Niemand and Ms. Kelly discussed removing the bracket and having a cased but recessed entry.

Staff recommends final approval with the following, Ms. Kelly said: narrowing the curb cut, working with window sizes, and a recessed door instead of the shed and gable interaction.

Maxine Lutz said that Historic Beaufort Foundation feels the railings are late nineteenth century railings, and they shouldn't be put on a new structure. It should be a simpler railing that is "more honest." Mr. Rainey said "the stairway thing seems awkward," but that's a subjective opinion.

Ms. Dickerson agreed about the shed dormer and gable, but she would like to see this extended so as not to cut into the space. Chairman Newman said there was a lot of progress, and this looks more compatible. With the overall size of the main house, he wondered if the plate upstairs could be lifted by a foot and cleaned up; they could get rid of the dormers and have just a gable. The overall mass won't be that much greater. Also, Chairman Newman wondered if it were more desirable to Historic Beaufort Foundation to use a "crosshairs" window rather than the 6 over 6 windows. He thinks it is odd to have a different window type in this little building where everything else matches. Ms. Lutz agreed with Chairman Newman. Mr. Rainey agreed. Chairman Newman said it wouldn't add to the mass. Mr. Niemand said if they go to 7', they should be able to do it. The only concern was he might have to drop the window heads.

Mr. Niemand asked about the curb cut; the current one is 30'. They thought of using some of it so 2 cars can access the space. He doesn't think the windows on the east elevation detract, but they could change; the existing house has a lot of different window sizes. In regard to the pickets on the stairs, he was trying to carry the detail across from the house, but it can change if it's a big issue.

Chairman Newman said last time they discussed how close the stair could be to the lot line, and "it's eating up valuable real estate." If it wrapped the corner, there's no headroom, and the door could face the west side. "The narrow no man's land behind the garage" could be

eliminated that way. Mr. Niemand explained why it's there; the landing is up to the 5' line. Chairman Newman asked what the issue would be. Mr. Niemand said they had a similar issue at Palmetto Bluff. Chairman Newman said if they are 5' off the line that is all he's obligated to do. Mr. Niemand said he would do that, then. Ms. Kelly said the building can be 5' from the property line, but the stair, if it's less than 5', has to be fireproofed.

Mr. Niemand said they can go to 5'. Mr. Niemand asked about the barn doors. He submitted the colors for the building. **Mr. Rainey made a motion to approve the application, turning the balusters to straight pickets, not to mimic the main house. The applicant is strongly encouraged to realign the staircase. The plate height will be raised a foot, and the dormers will go away. Ms. Dickerson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

MINUTES

Ms. Dickerson made a motion, second by Ms. Neal to approve the January 15, 2014 minutes of the Historic District Review Board as submitted. The motion passed 3-0. Mr. Rainey abstained from voting because he was not at the meeting.

Chairman Newman said that, on the second page, second paragraph of the January 17 minutes, it should say, "it would have been" and strike "very much and"; Ms. Lutz said in the 3rd paragraph in regard to her comment to add "as contributing would be threatened." **Ms. Dickerson made a motion, second by Ms. Neal, to approve the January 17, 2014 minutes of the Historic District Review Board with corrections. The motion passed 3-0.** Mr. Rainey abstained from voting because he was not present at the meeting.

On the February 12, 2014 minutes, Chairman Newman said that in regard to 915 Craven on the corner of Charles St. on page 10, last paragraph, it should read, "would have been nice," not "bee nice." **Ms. Neal made a motion, second by Mr. Rainey, to approve the February 12, 2014 minutes of the Historic District Review Board as corrected. The motion passed unanimously.**

REVIEW OF RULES OF PROCEDURE AMENDMENT FOR ADOPTION

Ms. Kelly reviewed a section of the Rules of Procedure that has been added about on-site meetings. Section 7 Site Visits says that they would be for investigative purposes only; no motions or decisions will be made on-site. A date and time for a special meeting will be set for a later date for an official discussion/decision on the project. **Mr. Rainey made a motion to approve or adopt this rule, and Ms. Dickerson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

STAFF APPROVALS – FEB. 13 - MARCH 11, 2014

Ms. Kelly presented a summary of applications in the Historic District that had come to staff for approval but didn't have to come to the Board.

Chairman Newman suggested that these items could be sent to Historic Beaufort Foundation, so that they would know that there's work going on, so they can see if they think it needs to go above staff review. He feels like they don't need to review at every Historic District Review

Board meeting what Ms. Kelly had just reviewed. **Conway Ivy** had said that Historic Beaufort Foundation wants to be aware of any projects that have come up, according to Chairman Newman.

OPEN MEETING PROCEDURES WORK SESSION

Ms. Kelly said that March 19, a work session would be help about open meeting procedures at 5 p.m. in council chambers; all board members are strongly encouraged to attend. It should last about an hour. Ms. Lutz said the Historic Beaufort Foundation annual meeting will be that same night at 5:30 with a speaker on redevelopment in historic districts and how to make it work. She will probably speak at 6:45. The meeting will be at the PAC at USCB.

Ms. Lutz explained that Robert's Rules of Order came from Mr. Robert of Robertsville.

There being no further business to come before the Board, **Mr. Rainey made a motion, second by Ms. Dickerson, to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously,** and the meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

DRAFT