

A meeting of the **Historic District Review Board** was held on **July 13, 2011 at 2:00 p.m.** in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Joel Newman, Board members Bill Chambers and Inez Neal, and City Historic Preservation Planner Donna Alley.

Mike Rainey and Marianne Norton were 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.

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 11, 2011

The board members reviewed the minutes from the May 11, 2011 meeting.

Motion: Mr. Chambers made a motion, second by Ms. Neal, to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2011

The board members reviewed the minutes from the June 8, 2011 meeting.

Motion: Mr. Chambers made a motion, second by Ms. Neal, to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

REVIEW OF FULL BOARD PROJECTS

601 Craven Street - Continuation– Alterations, Additions, Final Review.

Applicant: Daniel Henry (HR11-23) and Mary Trask

Ms. Alley reviewed the history of the application. The applicant has a new plan for an addition. Ms. Alley recommended denial; she feels the alterations may create problems with the structure's historic integrity and could result in the loss of their current contributing status.

Daniel Henry said he has studied appropriate guidelines over the last two months. He would like to keep the home and expand it for his growing family. Within the possible parameters, he has developed an idea he feels will preserve the original structure's character. He proposes that elements removed from the façade will be used elsewhere on the house. He said the board had expressed problems with a previous proposal in regard to a bay window, which he believes he's solved with the addition of "an octagonal base to move the element out." This maintains the original elements of the structure and "leaves them basically unadulterated." The upstairs space will include two small bedrooms, and the downstairs addition will be living space. He said a detail in the gable will be used again in the new construction and he "can leave the old detail

up there,” which he feels could be architecturally interesting.

Chairman Newman asked the size of the footprint; Mr. Chambers said 15' x 17' approximately. Mr. Henry said it could be as small as 12', but he created a 3' "bridge." Though they're small rooms, both rooms will have a relationship to the larger space.

The preservation committee of Historic Beaufort Foundation said they didn't feel there was a need to separate the old and the new, **Pete Palmer** said. Overall, they felt it was a good proposal and recommended it.

Mr. Chambers said he had consulted the Milner report. He said the addition is appropriately sized and placed; it is clearly an addition and "of today." Mr. Chambers said he's unclear about the detail of the connector. The roof is lower than the existing gable. He asked if it's set back past the corner board, and Mr. Henry said yes. Mr. Chambers said all they lose is a single window; Mr. Henry said the window will be made into a type of doorway with a sill – jibbed or a French door. Mr. Chambers asked why the upper mass is larger than the one below it. Mr. Henry said he did that "to protect the wings of the bay window without altering it." Mr. Chambers asked why the top doesn't connect like the bottom. Mr. Henry said it could line up, but it's a matter of aesthetics.

Mr. Chambers asked if "the deck and stoop were okay setback-wise." Mr. Henry said they are. Mr. Chambers asked about colors. Mr. Henry said it will match the existing colors. He's proposing a metal roof on the addition, so if the roof on the existing structure needs replacement, he'll use metal for that. The metal also sets the new structure apart from the old in accordance with the recommendation of the Department of the Interior. He said he will not cut any trees down. A tree will obscure the addition to a great extent.

He's proposing a set of steps off the front, but he's not sure they're necessary and sought the board's opinion. Mr. Chambers asked why Mr. Henry didn't propose covers in the form of a stoop or bracket to protect the door. Mr. Henry said that would be a good idea, but he was trying to avoid "junking up the form." Chairman Newman clarified that the doors could be "either/or," and Mr. Henry said yes.

Chairman Newman said it would be useful to have a model of the house next door. He asked how many feet of space there are between them, and Mr. Henry said about 10'. Chairman Newman asked about fire code issues; he speculated that the gap might need to be 11'. Mr. Henry said he had researched it, and it needed to be 5'. Mr. Chambers said it's a fire issue, not a zoning issue. Chairman Newman cited a prior instance in his experience which caused him concern in this case. The concept, he feels, is appropriate, but in the context of the house next door, "it looks pretty tight in there." Chairman Newman said Mr. Henry might be able to take the link and make that the place where the doors are; it would be recessed somewhat and make the screened porch more functional. As an addition concept, he feels it's a nice job.

Mary Trask asked how they would find out about the fire codes, etc., and Ms. Alley said when they submitted for permits. Mr. Chambers said there are solutions that may involve some extra expense. Ms. Neal asked why there weren't front and back doors on the addition. Mr. Henry said the primary entrance will be the existing front door, but he was trying to create "synergy" instead of a mass of screen. Ms. Neal said she sees a possible safety hazard because there would be children in the addition and a screened porch with only a front exit, not a back one. Chairman Newman said they would have to do that anyway, because there is no stair. Mr. Henry said there's no vertical connection between the two; one is indoor space and the other is outdoor space.

Mr. Chambers said he feels comfortable with what has been done but they don't yet have all the details they would need for a final approval. Ms. Alley said he would have to have building plans. Ms. Trask asked what they would need to have submitted and Mr. Chambers and Ms. Alley explained what they would need, i.e., building plans, materials lists, etc. Mr. Henry said if the bridge between the two weren't there, and he could move the addition together, it would solve the problem of being too close to the other lot and would make construction simpler. The Historic Beaufort Foundation group advocated that he not concern himself with the separation of old and new. Milner asks for the separation, but no carpenter in 1890 would have tried to execute the design. He can repeat the elements as they are, and the only issue would be with the bay window, which he was trying to solve. He would still do both floors, extend the gable, and put little wings on the front and back.

Mr. Chambers said that Mr. Henry would be creating a dormer that would read differently than what is in the current design. It would look like a gabled roof with a dormer. Chairman Newman said the current model is an appealing solution to an architectural problem, and what he was suggesting with telescoping the gable would not be.

Maxine Lutz asked how the board would feel with the metal roof and the original roof not being changed. Mr. Chambers said he would not have an issue with it; two roof forms are fine, he said, depending on the color of the metal. Ms. Trask asked how the board felt about them painting the house in Victorian colors since it's on Victorian Row. Mr. Chambers said he doesn't think colors would receive much objection. Mr. Henry clarified that they could continue with this design and get drawings and that would be welcomed by the board.

Motion: Mr. Chambers made a motion to move this application to preliminary approval. Ms. Neal seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion: Mr. Chambers made a motion to approve the project as submitted for preliminary approval, awaiting further and final details. Ms. Neal seconded the motion. **The motion passed unanimously.**

OLD BUSINESS

Chairman Newman initiated a discussion about the George Trask house (1211 Bay Street) and the window substitution issue discussed at a previous meeting (May 11, 2011). He said the years ago the property's owners replaced the historic windows with one over one wood windows. These replacement windows are failing. They were requesting not to take out anything further but to put in something that didn't meet the elevation of replacing a historical window with what would have been in there historically. The HDRB voted on it, but thinking of it later, he thought differently. Christian Trask knew the rules, regulations, and objectives, and he feels the vote was bad. Nothing prevents some other owner from replacing the windows. They won't put in a window that functions with air conditioning. He said "they're in a silly standoff." Ms. Alley asked if he'd seen this type of window, and Chairman Newman said yes. Architecturally, Chairman Newman said if you looked at a line of where they are now and a vintage replacement, the window goes into about 80%. It will protect the house better than the glass in there now, and it will take nothing away from the historical fabric. Aesthetically and in other ways, the window will perform better. The windows in there now have no basis on which they are performing their job. He thinks the line drawn in the sand is the bad one. He doesn't like the "setting a precedent" argument.

Chairman Newman said the window's made of Fibrex. It goes entirely inside of what's there. Ms. Alley said it had occurred to her that new materials and applications are looked at case by case; they might want to try a test window and take it out if the HDRB doesn't approve it. Chairman Newman said Christian Trask agreed to that, but Chairman Newman had offered to speak on his behalf and state that there are inappropriate windows in there now and they should be replaced them with one that is much closer to what they should have.

Mr. Chambers said the discussion wasn't about single-pane or antique glass. The objection was to vinyl-clad windows. Chairman Newman said that's not how they interpreted that. Mr. Chambers said he recalled talking about insulated glass but in a wooden window. He's never seen this kind of replacement allowed in a historic house. The objection, he recalls, was to the cladding. The insulated glass was not an issue. For him, the issue was with Fibrex. Ms. Alley said that was the objection from a staff viewpoint for replacement. An aluminum clad replacement has not been approved in a historic house, Ms. Alley said.

Chairman Newman asked why HDRB can't approve the use for this product in this window replacement since they're not replacing historic windows with this; they're replacing one window with one that is much closer to conforming in many ways. Ms. Alley said they can replace windows in-kind, but since they have wood in there now, they have to come to HDRB for approval. Tax credits (energy or historic) won't apply, and it's never been replaced in a historic house. Ms. Alley said JN's argument is valid though she doesn't agree with it. This house is one of the most significant houses in the district. Chairman Newman said that's irrelevant because it has a very inappropriate window in it now. The owners don't want to put painted wooden windows in there. They're not eroding the historical quality of the house; they're

bringing it visually 80-90% closer to how it looked historically. Chairman Newman feels they're not protecting the historic nature of it, nor are they supporting green standards. Mr. Chambers said it opens up issues like putting vinyl everywhere.

Ms. Alley asked how Chairman Newman knows that these are superior windows that will last longer than a quality custom built wood window. Chairman Newman said he's built houses for 20 years, and a typical budget has a big portion for windows. There is always the need for repair with them when they're wood. Mr. Chambers said some wood windows can be very good, but they're very expensive. Chairman Newman said the ones that work best are those where the owners have an inordinate amount of money to maintain them.

It's a Department of Interior issue, Mr. Chambers thinks, and it's insane that something couldn't be replaced with something better. Chairman Newman said if the house had wood windows, he wouldn't advocate replacing them with something else which would truly take away from its historic value. But in this case, he feels it's a good thing that the owner is replacing something inappropriate with something else that isn't historic, but looks much better, saves energy, etc.

Ms. Alley said it's important when something is approved or denied, if someone comes in later with another request that doesn't meet the same criteria, they can explain the context in which the first thing was approved for a particular reason. Mr. Chambers said he agrees with JN, but he's never seen what JN's suggesting happen.

There being no further business, Mr. Chambers made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Ms. Neal. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 3:06 p.m.