

A meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held on **January 13, 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 planning staff 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. Dickerson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Symes, to approve the minutes of the December 9, 2015 Historic District Review Board meeting. The motion to approve as submitted passed unanimously.

606 New Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 640, New Construction
Applicant: Allison Ramsey Architects for Andy Corriveau (HR16-01)
The applicant is requesting approval for new construction on a vacant lot to include a single-family residence and a garage with an accessory dwelling unit above.

Ms. Kelly said both of the projects before the Board today are in The Point and are new construction. This vacant lot had a small dwelling in the late nineteenth – early twentieth century, and then an auto storage building that was taken out in the 1960s or 1970s. The applicant wishes to construct a 1.5 story single-family residence with a detached garage that has an accessory dwelling unit above it. This is located in a flood zone, so the building must be elevated a significant degree to meet the base flood elevations. Ms. Kelly noted the applicable guidelines, which are in the staff report.

Ms. Kelly said the mass and scale of the building are appropriate for the neighborhood, as are the building's proportions. Staff wondered if it were possible to add more windows in the north elevation. A detailed color list was received. Staff recommends final approval, Ms. Kelly said, with Board discussion of adding windows on the north elevation – in the master bedroom – and potentially smaller windows in the "entertainment area."

Mr. Symes asked if the small window on the north side downstairs was still there. **Bill Harris** said it is. Mr. Peitz asked if there were a fireplace. Ms. Kelly said there used to be, but in the new plans there's not; some comments were carried over from the older plan.

Mr. Symes said Historic Beaufort Foundation had also expressed concern about windows on the north side and about the setback: it is "right up to the setback line," he

said. There are "6' or 7' between the stairs and the asphalt." After they met with Historic Beaufort Foundation, Mr. Harris said, they had looked at surrounding houses, and two of them "are raised up pretty high . . . and (are) actually closer to the street" than this one is. If there were a way there could be fewer stairs, they could try to get closer, but they're required to have that number of stairs. This is the case for "everything else on New Street," he said. Mr. Symes agreed, noting that the house across the street from this lot is "about the same distance away from (the street)." Mr. Harris said they're "pushed up as far as we can. Everything else is closer up."

Chairman Newman said he agreed about the windows. He finds the eave details "pretty chunky," and feels that's not characteristic of Beaufort or of the character of this design. Usually, eaves would be more delicate and "refined," and there appear to be two different eave details, he said.

Mr. Symes asked if, on the main house, the roof overhang is enough. Mr. Harris said they are 1'. The eave is 1x4 or 1x8; they wanted a shorter overhang. It is possible it could get thinner, but they're no different than eaves that are seen all over Beaufort.

Ms. Laurie asked what happens as a result of Chairman Newman's comments. Chairman Newman said the Board has been approving applications including the Board's comments, and then the applicants have staff-level review of details like these, so it doesn't have to come to the Board again. **Mr. Peitz made a motion for final approval with consideration of staff and Board comments on the north side windows and the eaves. Mr. Dickerson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

505 Prince Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 557, New Construction
Applicant: Joseph P. Devoe & Mary Suzanne Parker (HR16-01)

The applicant is requesting approval for new construction of a single-family residence on a vacant lot.

Ms. Kelly said this new construction replaces a contributing cottage that burned down in 2013. It will be a 1.5 story single-family residence. There are no accessory dwelling units. Like the New Street property, it is also raised a good deal to accommodate the base flood elevation. It meets zoning standards, and this parcel is a non-conforming lot – it's smaller than what's permitted – so the setbacks can be a little smaller to accommodate a reasonable development on this parcel: 5' on one side and 11' on the other. Staff feels the size, mass and scale are appropriate, Ms. Kelly said, and they appreciate the effort to maintain the size, mass and scale of the previous building.

Ms. Kelly said staff had some questions about the design details. The details lean toward a Craftsman-style cottage, i.e., bracket detailing, exposed rafter tails, etc., so staff thought the applicants should consider reinforcing this with details such as a modification to the porch column, and a window lite pattern that is a little different and more Craftsman-style. The Board should discuss if they think this is appropriate, Ms.

Kelly said. In addition, corner boards should be added to the gable dormer; on the front elevation, one of the bays has full-size windows and one has smaller windows. With a slight modification to the stairs, she said, they could be matched and have larger windows on both sides.

Ms. Kelly said in a couple of cases, windows are right up to the corner board, and if there's an opportunity to push them away from the corner, they should, because "that's a little bit of an odd detail in Beaufort." On the left elevation, there's a double casement in the tub area; staff suggests reducing that to a single casement to alleviate the closeness to the trim and the gable. Also, the applicants had given the Board a couple of color options to look at. The differentiated trim seems more characteristic of Beaufort, she said.

Staff recommends preliminary approval of this application, Ms. Kelly said, with final approval by staff provided that consideration is given to staff and Board comments about detailing at the final submission. In general, whether or not the color submissions are final, the trim should be in contrast to the siding.

Robbie Moore said the original plan was for a more Craftsman-style cottage with bigger columns and 3-over-1 windows, but the clients didn't love it and wanted it to be more Beaufort-style. In regard to the 2 small windows, they are there because of the staircase, and he sees that it's asymmetrical, but said it could be "called approximate symmetry." If they were to move the stairs, Mr. Moore said, "I don't know if that powder room would really work, if we moved it to allow those windows to be bigger," so he doesn't think that would be a "slight" modification to the plan. The original house had an asymmetrical window pattern to it, he said, so this is in keeping with what was originally there.

Mr. Dickerson asked how close the windows are to the stair. He suggested they might enlarge the ones to the left and decrease the ones to the right. Mr. Moore said the width could increase, and the "sill might be able to drop," which would get them "a little closer." Mr. Harris said they know these window sizes are not the norm, but they consider them "some quirky things to this house." They could make it less obvious, but they thought it was "refreshing" to do it this way.

Mr. Moore said at the meeting with Historic Beaufort Foundation, there had been a comment made not to "make everything 'cookie cutter,'" so this adds variety. Chairman Newman said he doesn't mind it, and Mr. Peitz agreed. Chairman Newman said there's "a way to put a pair of the same double-hungs over there." There could be a little window well at the base of the stair. Chairman Newman said the windows on the left are the size of the upper sash of the windows on the right; he suggested that if he were to do that, he would make those windows "as if they were just the upper sashes of the other windows, not a completely different pattern."

The window around the corner, Chairman Newman feels, doesn't work. There are already 2 windows at the base of the stair, so the third window's head doesn't line up with it, and that might be "bothersome," when you're walking up the stair. So he would make the double windows on the front like the upper sashes of the right-hand windows, and get rid of the single window around the corner. The double windows in the back – if they wrap around the corner – "won't . . . read together" because 2 are inside the screened porch and 2 are outside.

Mr. Peitz said he likes the detailing in this project, and it offsets the quiriness and asymmetry. He would change one window to a single-casement. Mr. Symes said he agrees about the windows. He would be OK with leaving the corner window but moving it back. He also agrees about the trim on the dormers. Mr. Peitz asked the roof color; Mr. Moore said its galvanized silver.

Mr. Symes said the double windows on the left could be single windows. Chairman Newman said the difference in the patterning at 4-lites is odd. He would be inclined to make the other windows 2-over-2. He'd make them all one way or the other. Mr. Symes agreed.

Mr. Peitz moved approval with the following changes to the windows:

- a) **On the left elevation, make the second floor window a single casement.**
- b) **On the front porch windows, "make those 2-over-2 throughout on the upper part of those windows."**
- c) **Move the window back on the left elevation at the stairwell.**

When Chairman Newman asked Mr. Moore his and the homeowners' preference for a cohesive window pattern, Mr. Moore said he was leaning toward increasing the width and height of the windows to be more similar to the windows on the right, and "then going with a 6-lite pattern throughout – kind of like it is right now – except for those two."

Mr. Peitz restated the motion to approve with the following changes to the windows: the window treatment on the front should be consistent throughout, the pair of second floor casements become a single casement, and this window in the front corner gets moved back. The motion passed unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Laurie asked about the demolition project at 1311 Washington Street, which had been given a 6-month timeframe for resolution. Ms. Kelly said the owner had come to the Board for demolition, but then there was a claim by another of ownership, so the matter went before a judge on December 4. The judge was going to schedule a hearing, which is supposed to be in January, so the parties are working with an attorney, and there will be legal action by the end of January/beginning of February. Ms. Kelly said she'd offer an update on the matter at the next meeting.

Ms. Laurie asked **Maxine Lutz** about the Lodge. Ms. Lutz said they close on it next week, and it sold quickly and at their asking price.

There being no further business to come before the Board, **Mr. Dickerson made a motion, second by Mr. Symes, to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously, and the meeting adjourned at 2:36 p.m.**

DRAFT