A meeting of the **Historic District Review Board was held on February 13, 2013 at 2:00 p.m.** in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Joel Newman and board members Mike Rainey, Bill Chambers, Inez Neal, and Erica Dickerson, and city 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 FOR THE MEETING OF JANUARY 9, 2013 AND JANUARY 15, 2013

Ms. Dickerson made a motion, second by Mr. Rainey, to approve the minutes of January 9, 2013. The motion passed 4-0. Mr. Chambers abstained from voting because he was not present at the meeting.

Ms. Neal made a motion, second by Ms. Dickerson, to approve the minutes of January 15, 2013. The motion passed unanimously.

2822 Depot Road – Major demolition of existing structure, Final Review

Applicant: Robert Burrows, SCANA (HR13-07)

Ms. Kelly said this is the second time this application has come before the board. The matter was tabled to give the applicants time to look at ways to not demolish the building. The applicants have worked with the Planning department and adjacent property owners. **Mike Sutton** has seen the building and said it would be difficult to move because of its size and type of construction. There are maps in the board packets that **Tommy Logan** has provided of the old railroad right-of-way, Ms. Kelly said.

There's a discrepancy as to the property line on this old map, Ms. Kelly said, and "the right-of-way runs straight through the building." The county GIS has led to a probable conclusion that the right-of-way was expanded because of a spur, and then "when it was abandoned, it shifted back to where it is today." That is an update on the research to date. Ms. Kelly said that essentially not much other information has been added by the applicant since the previous submittal. Staff "recommends denial because of the uniqueness and integral quality of the structure." The task force that has been begun can work with SCE&G and SCANA to restore the building and prevent demolition, Ms. Kelly said.

Chairman Newman said they heard this information from SCANA and the community's reaction. He asked if the board would want to hear a motion prior to re-hearing all of this information. Mr. Rainey said he plans to move for denial of the request for demolition, and no presentation by the applicant would sway him otherwise.

Mr. Chambers asked if anyone has asked about whether this building could be habitable based on the transformers beside it. Chairman Newman said no information has been presented on the electro-magnetic issue.

Ms. Dickerson said she is leaning toward denial. **Mr. Rainey made a motion to deny the application as**

submitted. Ms. Neal seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The parties have 180 days to determine if there is as suitable solution, Chairman Newman said.

Mr. Logan said that there were concerns about the right-of-way issue from the last HDRB meeting and a few meetings with Historic Beaufort Foundation. The footprint of the railroad right-of-way on the 1915 and 1962 maps represents what they presented to the federal government as it relates to rail banking. 100' of right-of-way from the center line is included in the lawsuit, Mr. Logan said. It is recognized by the federal government; theoretically, the rails could be put in, and the property used later on, which he said "further clouds the issue of the building." This "runs halfway through the length of the building," Mr. Logan said.

Chairman Newman said he has "no intention of not allowing someone to speak," but the HDRB can only give or deny the right to demolish, and there's been no new information given that would sway the board to grant the right to demolish. Mr. Rainey said the presentation was made at the previous meeting, and the applicants were allowed 60 days to find alternatives, but they did not come back with alternatives.

<u>912 Duke Street</u> – Alterations, Additions, Preliminary Review.
Applicant: Dennis and Mary Harvey (HR13-09)

Ms. Kelly said this property is in the Historic District and is listed as a contributing structure. It was on the City of Beaufort's vacant and abandoned properties list, and the applicant bought it and is stabilizing the property. It is "definitely a work in progress," Ms. Kelly said. "Great strides" are being made to it. The applicant is proposing a rear story and a porch as well as restoration and new materials i.e., a new roof, trim, and siding. Staff in general feels the work done to date has been sensitively done, Ms. Kelly said, and "the historic integrity has been preserved." Staff wants that to continue with the rest of the addition. The main concern is that the large mass overpowers the original house, and the shallow gable "is not typical of the forms seen in Beaufort," so staff has given tips to break up the mass and form of the addition. Staff recommends conceptual approval of the application with notation of concerns about mass and form which staff feels should continue to be studied, Ms. Kelly said.

Mary Harvey said Ms. Kelly had emailed a sketch of a different roofline, and she and her husband had looked it over. She said "it appears to work nicely." The biggest problem, Ms. Harvey said, is that her husband is 6'2", and he can't look out the existing windows of the house. the addition should help support it as well. There's more weight in the house now, she said, i.e., a piano and bathtubs, etc.

Mr. Rainey asked if she had inset the addition a little bit from the original structure. Ms. Kelly said that's what the sketch shows. Mr. Rainey said Milner says that "there needs to be delineation between old and new" and approving "a flush elevation on all sides goes against all precepts" of what the HDRB is meant to do. Ms. Harvey said they had left original bead board, and they had checked with others who had done restorations; they heard that some had delineated and "some didn't bother." Ms. Harvey added that if she "chops inches off," her house "will get smaller and smaller."

Chairman Newman said he didn't see a site plan. He asked if she were limited as to how far she could go back, and if she could go back a few inches. Mr. Rainey said they are talking about bringing in the walls of the addition 8" total from the historic structure, 4" on each side. Mr. Chambers said then they could extend the length of the house. Ms. Harvey said that then they "would be out of proportion to the lot

and more than the one-story house next door." Mr. Rainey reiterated that Milner specifically states that they have to have clear delineation.

Chairman Newman made suggestions for insetting one side and outsetting the other side. Ms. Harvey said the roof line Ms. Kelly sent is "perfect" and would be delineating and "a great statement for the house." She agreed that they can extend it to one side. Ms. Harvey said she has adequate setbacks to do it. Mr. Chambers said they "just want to see delineation somehow." Ms. Harvey asked if they could put a piece of stained glass in a back transom window and it was agreed that she could.

Mr. Chambers clarified that Ms. Harvey would alter the roof form based on the sketch from Ms. Kelly, and Ms. Harvey will provide some sort of delineation when she comes back. Ms. Harvey asked if she "could mail everything" to Ms. Kelly or needed to come back before the HDRB next month. Mr. Rainey said staff can approve it. Ms. Harvey clarified what staff needed her to send.

Ms. Dickerson asked if it could be staff review or needed to come to the HDRB. Mr. Rainey said next time the HDRB can do preliminary approval. Ms. Harvey asked if they can have permits to start working in April. Mr. Chambers said if they can meet City of Beaufort requirements, then it shouldn't be a problem.

<u>1305 Bay Street</u> – Alterations, Additions, Final Review.
Applicant: Frederick + Frederick for Andrew Scallan (HR13-10)

Ms. Kelly said this is the second time this project has come before the board. Last time the application received preliminary approval and final approval to demolish the chimneys. Staff asked about the three double-hung windows in the kitchen; if they're original, staff doesn't necessarily feel it's appropriate to remove them, but everything else they "are on board with."

Jane Frederick said in regard to the windows that her clients wanted to be able to look at the trees on the eastern side. They thought double hungs would be most appropriate, and they wanted to match the windows in the front rooms. It was originally a kitchen, and "those windows are important to (her) client, so they would like them to be replaced.

Mr. Chambers asked "if there were previous headaches about removing a window and an entry." He was told no, and he said that helps him make his judgment "on the others." Ms. Frederick said when it was built, the door was put on the wrong side. Chairman Newman said he had walked through the house and tried to figure out how the house was originally configured. Mr. Chambers said they are removing original fabric, replacing it, and taking an old window and dropping it 3-4". Ms. Frederick said the other two windows around the corner will match. She and Mr. Chambers reviewed which windows would be removed and replaced. Just the height is being changed, Ms. Frederick said. They will be the same length as the ones in the living room, **Andrew Scallan** said.

Maxine Lutz said the Preservation Committee is willing to recognize Ms. Frederick's design and the board's architectural expertise on this matter. **Mr. Rainey moved for approval of the application as submitted. Ms. Dickerson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

There was a general discussion led by Mr. Rainey about street lights in the city; Mr. Rainey said that the city has not consulted the HDRB about its decisions.

Ms. Kelly said that on matters such as 912 Duke Street which will be coming back before the HDRB, she would like board members to keep the paperwork on the matter so that the paperwork doesn't have to be re-done. Also, there is now an FTP site for those who prefer digital formats to paper.

There being no further business to come before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:41 p.m.