A meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held on **November 9, 2015 at 2:00 p.m.** in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Joel Newman, board members Quinn Peitz, Chuck Symes, Erika Dickerson, and Barbara Laurie, and Lauren Kelly.

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. Peitz made a motion, seconded by Mr. Symes, to approve the minutes of the October 9, 2015. The motion to approve as submitted passed The motion passed unanimously.**

**804 North Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 803,**
Alterations, Additions
Applicant: John B. Crouch III for Kevin Robinson (HR15-39)
*The applicant would like preliminary approval, and Bailey Bill approval, for alterations and addition to this structure.*

Ms. Kelly said the structure is circa 1920 and is listed as contributing. It first appears on the 1924 Sanborn map. There are two post-1958 rear additions; demolishing those additions is part of what is being applied for, as well as building a new rear addition and reconstructing the front porch.

The new footprint is a net of 764 square feet, Ms. Kelly said. Staff appreciates the removal of the rear additions. The offset of the new addition differentiates it from the original cottage, and it also makes the structure more in compliance with Secretary of the Interior standard #10.

Staff wondered whether the roof jogged in the offset, Ms. Kelly said. The architect said it will. Staff feels the mass and disposition are sympathetic, but has a question about materials and what types of windows are proposed. Ms. Kelly said the applicant should consider making the small awning windows square or vertically proportioned. An existing one is horizontal, but square or vertical are more in keeping with 1920s proportions. Also, staff feels the applicant should consider a full-size window in the half-bath.

Staff recommends final approval with a board discussion of the windows. The applicant will need a materials list with the building permit submission and interior photos for the Bailey Bill application.

**John Crouch**, the architect for **Kevin Robinson**, said there was a meeting at Historic Beaufort Foundation on Friday, and they had talked about the windows. HBF felt the rectangular windows might be more in keeping with the age of the building. Mr. Crouch feels the horizontal rectangle is more like a 1920s building, rather than a more modern window.

Mr. Symes said someone at Historic Beaufort Foundation had brought up using a 6-pane and asked if that was acceptable to Mr. Crouch. Ms. Dickerson noted that all the other windows are 4-pane. Mr. Crouch thinks 2-over-2 is more appropriate; a little 6-over-6 is more "colonial." He thinks a bigger 2-over-2 is better, and then it will be reflected in the glazing of the small windows. Mr. Symes said it was just one person's idea. **Maxine Lutz** said she wasn't at that meeting with the applicant, but the project in general is "great," and she would support whatever is an appropriate 1920s window.

Chairman Newman said windows with a horizontal prospect aren't great, and short double-hungs aren't either. An alternative would be a 2-lite window that keeps "the same proportions in a real simple window."

Ms. Dickerson asked if there would be sliding glass doors inside the porch. Mr. Crouch said yes, they're interior and will be a French wood slider from Anderson.

Chairman Newman asked how to get into the driveway. Mr. Crouch said he'll make a better curve. Ms. Lutz said there's no curb now. Mr. Crouch said there's also not a sidewalk. Chairman Newman said there "appears to be a lot of pavement" and asked about it. Mr. Crouch said there will be one large curve for access. He'll pave it – with "bricks or something like that" – to the street. Chairman Newman reiterated his concern about "what looks like a lot of pavement" and "a big, wide curb cut." This "looks like an unresolved element" to him. Mr. Crouch said the only hard surface will be between the property line and the street.

Mr. Peitz asked if the garage would be altered. Mr. Crouch said he will probably put in a glass walk-through entry door on the side. The garage is existing and will be refurbished. It has a regular overhead door.

Mr. Crouch said again that the only hard surface will be between the property line and the street. He said he will put in absorbing material – such as plantation mix – for the rest of the area where there were concerns expressed about its imperviousness.

**Ms. Dickerson made a motion to recommend the project for final approval as presented, with consideration of comments about the windows and pervious surface; Mr. Peitz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**<u>913 Port Republic Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 858,</u>** Post Facto

Applicant: Marty Miley, Beaufort Construction (HR15-40)
*The applicant wishes to receive post facto approval for changes to the approved wall and post materials on the patio at 913 Port Republic Street.*

Ms. Kelly said this is the old Piggly Wiggly building, now named Tabby Place. Changes were made to the approved plans; what was approved and what was constructed are to be reviewed.

Ms. Kelly said in 2014, the board approved a restoration plan and a 26' wide patio. Issues came up about it being in the flood plain and not meeting the flood elevation, so the slab was raised 16" to get it to elevation and to obtain building code approval. Shortly after that, a plan was brought to staff to enlarge the outdoor patio. There was a parking area there between the building and the bank. Staff also approved that, Ms. Kelly said. There were a couple of other minor changes, too. But the materials used to construct the retaining wall and the piers were not brought to the board or staff. There's also a series of large metal posts that had not appeared on any plans that staff or the board had seen.

Ms. Kelly showed the drawings that had been approved by the Historic District Review Board. The patio was narrower, and the approved wall had concrete piers and was to be concrete, overlaid with stucco. She showed what was constructed; it is "more split-faced . . . a self-supporting retaining wall that has a slight angle" with metal piers at the edges. The landscaping plan was modified; "it was stepped back a little bit from the street in order to accommodate landscaping . . . the intent is to cover the wall, all the way around it" with landscaping.

Ms. Kelly said this is a significant improvement to the structure and in how the site is used. The introduction of this material is staff's main concern, so they are asking for a board recommendation on that. If it's screened with landscaping, it won't be an issue, she said, but the screening plants might not survive, or they might not sufficiently screen it. Staff recommends that the board allow the applicant to keep the wall and patio as constructed, given the screening with landscaping, but with discussion about what, if any, measures might be required if the landscaping dies or doesn't screen sufficiently, and staff also recommends that the board specifically note that this material shouldn't be used in other projects in the Historic District.

Chairman Newman said he thinks it looks "fabulous," and his biggest concern had been the wrought iron fence and gates, he recalled, but it "exceeds (his) expectations by a great deal."

Mr. Peitz asked if the poles are a structure for a tent. **Courtney Worrell** said the intent of the project "is that you don't need a tent," because the building serves that purpose. The plans call for a "wooden arbor," she said. "That's a steel arbor." They aren't done with landscaping yet. There's irrigated creeping fig along the base that will crawl up the split face block; there will also be planters at the top of the wall with Confederate jasmine, and the parking lot will be screened, too. Rather than use

a different material, they constructed it out of metal "while we had all of our wrought iron guys on site."

Mr. Symes asked how they got from the approved plan to this. When they "had to do the 16 additional inches of concrete," Ms. Worrell said, what had been approved couldn't support the additional height. Stepping out into the garden would have "presented egress issues," so they had to build the garden to the level of the floor inside Tabby Place. They looked at concrete piers when they were going to construct it, but when they went to dig down, there were "layers of concrete underneath the asphalt," Ms. Worrell said, so building concrete piers, while perhaps not impossible, presented a building issue. They "had this retaining wall system (at) Beaufort Town Center, we'd worked with it before, and we knew that (it) was actually constructible, and we could get it done without damaging things" under the surface.

Mr. Symes asked if they thought it was OK to do this without permission. Ms. Worrell replied, "It fell through the cracks." Mr. Symes said he's not opposed to the way it looks, he's opposed to the process they used and feels "insulted" that they didn't respect the board enough to come back and ask. Ms. Worrell said disrespect was not intended.

Ms. Lutz said Mr. Symes is reflecting the Historic Beaufort Foundation's feeling. She feels 303 Associates knows the process to be followed, but they were rushing to complete the space for an event, and asking for permission would have held that up. She agrees with Ms. Kelly that this material should not be allowed again in the Historic District. While Ms. Lutz said she's delighted if something covers it, she thinks the material (cinderblock) that's being used is ugly. Mr. Peitz asked if she had an opinion about the metal arbor. Mr. Symes said the HBF committee would prefer that it be put back to the way the plans were, and if that's not possible, that it be stucco or tabby.

Chairman Newman added that maybe the process wasn't good, but he disagrees that this material is inappropriate. Everything here is "a landscape/hardscape project," and they often don't see or review that at all. They had talked extensively about the landscaping for Beaufort Day Spa. He thinks "it's nicer than what was approved." He agrees that it could have been done procedurally better, but he finds "it very successful," and the split-face block doesn't bother him.

Mr. Peitz said he's seen this material used all over Charleston's Historic District. In regard to procedures, he thinks he is appointed to give his opinion on the aesthetics of each project and how it fits in the guidelines of the Historic District. He likes this, and is eager "to see the final product" with the vegetation.

Ms. Laurie asked Ms. Kelly how Ms. Kelly's recommendation can be achieved to note that such materials not be used in future Historic District projects. Ms. Kelly said staff wants the note about the materials included in the motion to indicate that the

board didn't approve it, but that it will be kept. Ms. Kelly said there is often concern about landscaping review for commercial projects. There are recommendations in the guidelines for certain types of materials; the board can interpret that differently than she does. Ms. Laurie said if this should come up with another applicant, what position should the board take? She's not clear how this is decided. Chairman Newman said Ms. Laurie wants to know if the board is going to take a position "that is going to become policy." Ms. Laurie said their decisions "need to be based on something," and another applicant could cite this case as a precedent; the board could be "accused of using (its) own opinion" when allowing this in this case.

Mr. Peitz asked if there's any guideline or ordinance that says this material can't be used. Ms. Kelly said this material wasn't invented when the Milner guidelines were written. Mr. Peitz said new materials are invented all the time that can blend in with old materials. He doesn't feel that the board is "bound by what (they) do today"; if another applicant brings new materials, they may be "compatible with old Georgetown brick." The board needs to look at each application of this sort and determine compatibility.

Ms. Dickerson said she also thinks it "looks good," especially with the brick and stucco covered in fig: to her, "it's just a hard surface to allow something to grow into it." Mr. Peitz said he has faith his colleagues will determine whether new materials look good and are compatible in the various areas of the Historic District. What the board does today will not necessarily bind them from this case to the next, Mr. Peitz feels. If he feels this material is not appropriate for the next project, he would say so.

Ms. Kelly said her concern is that the board doesn't review most landscape projects in the Historic District, and this an inexpensive material that's being used more often. So if the board approves it, when someone comes in who wants to use it in The Point, it shouldn't be used, but staff can't say "No."

Chairman Newman said he always falls back on context. If something happens once, it's not precedent *if it's not appropriate in a different context*. He thinks what 303 Associates has done is "a successful solution," especially if the fig ivy works, but in another context, if it didn't work, he would not have a problem saying so.

Ms. Lutz asked Chairman Newman what he would do if people pointed to this project, which is in a prominent place in town, as precedent. Chairman Newman said he'd state his opinion. Mr. Peitz said he would say that it's appropriate for a commercial building with a variety of building around it, but it wouldn't be appropriate in a residential neighborhood, with 18th- and 19th-century buildings. Ms. Dickerson said that's why there's a board instead a list of permitted and prohibited materials.

In regard to process, Mr. Peitz said he doesn't like it; 303 Associates are "frequent fliers" before the HDRB and should know the procedure; he said he hopes it doesn't happen again, but he thinks the aesthetics "are very good in this particular location."

Mr. Symes asked if the cantilevered posts are to have wire on them to get jasmine to grow up them. Ms. Worrell said yes. Mr. Symes said this is acceptable, though "the process was evaded." He, too, is concerned about setting precedent. He understands the argument about this being in a commercial area, and he believes that the fig will cover up the problem, so while that solves the problem, he feels it's a bad solution He disagrees that it's okay to say this works for a commercial area but wouldn't in The Point. He thinks some people might want to go to court about it.

Ms. Lutz said this material may have been seen in Charleston, but they "don't do everything right, either."

Mr. Symes asked about the planting deadline. Ms. Worrell said the fig is planted, and it's irrigated. They are getting planters next; they'll be on top of the ledge. Ms. Dickerson asked if they had run the planter design by Ms. Kelly. Ms. Worrell said they're moveable, so they didn't think they had to, but they will do that.

**Ms. Dickerson made a motion to, in this particular instance, approve post facto changes to the approved design of the terrace on Tabby Place. Mr. Peitz seconded.** Ms. Kelly said the next step after this is to get a drawing of what has been installed for **Bruce Skipper** to approve. Mr. Peitz asked, if the landscape is damaged or dies, what's the procedure to get it fixed? Ms. Kelly said a landscaping bond is held for a year for commercial projects. **The motion passed 4-1, Mr. Symes opposed.**

**There being no further business to come before the board, the meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.**