

A meeting of the **Historic District Review Board** was held on March 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 FEBRUARY 13, 2013

Chairman Newman requested that the notation of a 6" support on page 2 be removed for clarity. **Ms. Dickerson made a motion, second by Mr. Rainey, to approve the minutes of February 13, 2013 as amended. The motion passed unanimously.**

912 Duke Street – Alterations, Additions, Final Review

Applicant: Dennis and Mary Harvey (HR13-13)

Ms. Kelly said this property is on a historic site survey and has been on the city's vacant and abandoned properties list. The owners have been rehabbing and restoring for about a year and a half. The applicants received a suggestion about how to address the porch, and the two staff suggestions are in setting the width of the addition 4" on either side to differentiate it from the original form, and to change the form on the rear to a smaller gable with a side shed roof to break up that mass. Staff feels these are more in keeping with the historic structure, Ms. Kelly said.

The side shed roof in the rear was called out as "a rubber roof"; the applicant said her husband believed the slope was too shallow to use a metal roof. Ms. Kelly suggested that they *could* use metal, and the applicants might have to increase the roof pitch slightly. They have agreed to use metal. With those changes, staff recommended final approval. Ms. Kelly said she would relay any comments from the board. Mr. Chambers asked if that would be the same for the front porch, and Ms. Kelly said it is metal, and they intend to replace the whole roof with that material.

Maxine Lutz said that the Historic Beaufort Foundation agreed with Ms. Kelly's presentation. **Mr. Rainey made a motion, second by Ms. Neal, for approval with the changes to the roof. The motion passed unanimously.**

803 Harrington St – Alterations, Additions, Preliminary Review

Applicant: Sara McEachern (HR13-14)

Derrick McEachern

Ms. Kelly said this project's construction date is in the early 1900s. It's listed as contributing. The applicant wants to add an 18 square foot addition, removing one wall and then pushing it out 2' onto the northwest corner of the house and a 100' screened porch. The porch is on the northwest corner and the addition is on the northeast corner. On the existing structure, one window is proposed to be removed and replaced with French doors to access the screen porch, and then another window is proposed to be added to the existing structure.

In general, Ms. Kelly said, the concept, scale, and mass of the addition seem appropriate, according to staff. They have "pragmatic things to be dealt with": they need a site plan or plat shown to scale for final approval, Ms. Kelly said. Specifically, staff commented in regard to the architecture that two windows proposed on the right and rear elevations could be found that are similar in size to the existing windows. Since they're using the same double-hung type of window, particularly the rear elevation is showing a small light pattern, and they could switch them to the 4-over-4 lights and it would be "vertically fine and compatible." In general, the light patterns should be vertically proportioned as opposed to horizontally proportioned.

The roof drawing was confusing, Ms. Kelly said; the shed roof shows it coming below the gable on one set of drawings and not another, so that should be clarified. Finally, Ms. Kelly asked if they have showed a hip roof on the new screen porch which would be more similar to the hip roof on the front of house. Since the wall is coming out 2' to be flush with the wall on the front of the house, a delineation of materials would be good.

Staff recommends preliminary approval with a few recommendations, Ms. Kelly said. **Nate Schoen** said the pitch of the roof is below the existing roof. The only window they can't change is the right elevation window because they had to meet egress standards for the bedroom. The rest of the windows are 6-over-6 to match. Chairman Newman said the preliminary drawings are wrong, so they need to correct it to 6-over-6 by the final submittal. The windows shown on the street elevation are 6-over-6, Chairman Newman said. The right side window is the same 6-over-6 pattern but needs to be bigger for egress, the applicant said.

Historic Beaufort Foundation feels the same way as the board. The aluminum salad columns are "next on the applicant's agenda," **Maxine Lutz** said in response to Chairman Newman's question. Mr. Rainey said they tore off the wrong Victorian heart pine columns on his house, and they went to a farm of someone deceased, so he could try to give the columns to the applicant.

Chairman Newman asked about the hip porch as opposed to the gable in the drawings. Ms. Dickerson said she likes it as drawn. **Mr. Rainey made a motion to approve with the inclusion of staff's review of the changes requested and the applicant's resubmission. Ms. Dickerson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

There was a discussion about the master plan for a particular property. Ms. Kelly explained that "this is a highlighted area but won't necessarily happen that way."

UPDATE ON FORM-BASED CODE PROCESS

After months of “utterly exasperating, useless discussion about how things are to be done and re-grouping,” the committee regrouped and put the running of the meetings in the hands of **Terry Hussey** and **David Tedder**, Chairman Newman said. The committee then took up an area – Verdier Bluff – and started looking specifically there because people had asked questions. They went step by step “to determine the impact on each of the things” and made comments and adjustments. “For the first time, the committee moved the ball forward,” and thereby made some progress, Chairman Newman concluded.

There being no further business to come before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:23 p.m.