

A meeting of the **Historic District Review Board** was held on **August 8, 2012 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, Inez Neal, Bill Chambers, and Erica Dickerson, and city staff Lauren Kelly and Libby Anderson.

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.

Ms. Anderson introduced **Lauren Kelly** as the new HDRB staff person.

Minutes for the Meeting of June 13, 2012

Chairman Newman noted that on page 2 of the minutes, there was a typo in the paragraph beginning with Chairman Newman. The word “and” should be “add.” **Mr. Chambers made a motion, second by Ms. Neal, to approve the minutes as amended. The motion passed 4-0.** Mr. Rainey abstained from voting because he was not present at the meeting.

Minutes for the Meeting of July 11, 2012

Mr. Rainey made a motion, second by Ms. Dickerson, to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion passed 3-0. Mr. Chambers and Chairman Newman abstained from voting because they were not present at the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING

811 King Street - Continued – Major Demolition of Structure, Final Review

Ms. Kelly provided background on the project. It’s a contributing structure, she said, and the owners had applied for demolition in 2008 and were denied. They then applied again. Two structural reports were done on the circumstances within the building. It was tabled from the last HDRB meeting because of board attendance.

Peggy Infinger is a member of the Baptist Church of Beaufort, which filed the petition, and said they are cognizant of the historic importance of the building. In 2005, the church bought the structure to renovate for the church’s use, but it became more cost prohibitive than they expected. The building at 811 King Street is “contributing but is not historic itself in nature,” Ms. Infinger said. Its significance is based on a supposition that a black carpenter *may* have been involved in its construction. There have been so many modifications over the years, Ms. Infinger said, that it is no longer of historical significance, according to the architect’s and the structural engineer’s reports. Rehabilitation of the building is not effective, and it has no structure for rehabilitation to a modern level of safety and usability. It will lose any historical value it may ever have had.

Ms. Infinger said they have looked at other options, including a swap with the city for a property that the city is not interested in making. They have collaborated with the Historic

Beaufort Foundation to market the building, Ms. Infinger said, but the church would lose a \$250,000 investment. Since they can't restore it, if it's not approved for demolition, it will be a safety hazard to the neighborhood. The structural engineer has listed a number of issues that make it unsafe, Ms. Infinger said. They would prefer to demolish it and replace it with a prayer garden.

Maxine Lutz said that Historic Beaufort Foundation in 2008 received a grant from the National Trust to have the building analyzed and to present a stabilization report. They have plans, she said, including recommendations for stabilization. They have invested some time and energy in a proposal for stabilization, she said. Ms. Lutz said they believe that the black carpenter *did* live in the house, and that it's been restored in part for the enjoyment of the neighborhood by **Rebecca Davenport**. They feel certain that "the carpenter's hands played a large part in the construction of the property," and it is an important contribution to the historic character of the neighborhood. Another house of significance was moved from the area in 1973, Ms. Lutz said, and many important homes have been lost from the neighborhood. Despite the neglect, the neighborhood still has significance, Ms. Lutz said. Historic Beaufort Foundation agrees that late 20th century changes "have changed the building in an unfortunate way," but these changes are not irreversible. She went on to discuss a number of other issues that have resulted from neglect and removal of structural elements in the building.

Ms. Lutz said the wood framing materials have retained the majority of the building's original strength. She said the house is "far from beyond the point of being beyond repair." If demolition is permitted, they urge that the owner present a new domestic building that will conform with the area's other structures. However, Historic Beaufort Foundation recommends that the building be preserved. The structure merits rehabilitation, Ms. Lutz said, but in recognition that there have been "adverse activities," they could do selective demolition of everything extant to 1912 and remove the poor construction. Finally, Historic Beaufort Foundation recommends that restoring the dwelling to the original footprint is a more radical solution and should only be done if the house at 605 West Street is a model for accurate reconstruction. It can't be rehabbed to meet current building codes, Ms. Lutz said, and new materials will have to be used extensively, but this can be said of many homes in the preservation district. 811 King "is impaired but not critically so," Ms. Lutz said. The status of "contributing" has already been made, and it is linked to neighboring buildings. It could be subject to salvage, she said, citing the Sons of Beaufort Lodge.

Ray Stocks said he has owned the property across the street for 25 years. The house is in very bad shape, he says, and was made that way by the present owners. He said he tried to stop them from taking out the supporting walls. He hopes that they will put in structural walls to stabilize the building, though it will be expensive. The building is leaning to the west, Mr. Stocks said, but he thinks it can be saved and should be. The city "made them reinstall the windows and doors," he said, and "that's where the building is now." The current owners were going to put a health clinic in there, Mr. Stocks said, and he told them that would be hard in a building with 7' ceilings and a very narrow stairway.

Jay Weidner said that he would ask the HDRB to consider the neighborhood character of the area. He cited another property that would contribute to the destruction of the character of the neighborhood if it were demolished. The continuity of the street is very spotty, he said, and there is a lot of potential for infill development. He thinks it's important "not to further this history of loss."

Betsy Kinghorn is a member of the Baptist Church of Beaufort and a Historic Beaufort Foundation board member. She said she sees both sides of the issue. When the house was purchased, Ms. Kinghorn realized through research that it was a mistake for the church to purchase the property because of the HDRB, the landmark district, and their missions. The Baptist Church of Beaufort was told by former historic planner Donna Alley that they could do what they intended to do for the building, Ms. Kinghorn said, which was to make it a headquarters for Operation Good Neighbor. The building was adjacent to already existing church property and gave possible room for future expansion, Ms. Kinghorn said. They also wanted to use the house for the ministry center for Operation Good Neighbor. Therefore, Ms. Kinghorn said, a group of citizens from many of the downtown churches came to the building and "did allowable interior destruction to renovate it for the Operation Good Neighbor center." When much was removed, "someone from the city came and said the building wasn't safe to be in."

When the Baptist Church of Beaufort purchased the property, no one was told about preservation or the Milner guidelines, Ms. Kinghorn said. They were not told what had to be done to preserve property in Beaufort. No one knew what needed to be done, Ms. Kinghorn said. Restoration would cost a great deal of money, and the church is not going to restore it. The only way it can be done is if the building is moved, it's swapped for another building, or someone else buys it. Historic Beaufort Foundation is meant to help with the marketing of the building, but the church is likely to only get \$40-50,000, and they purchased it for \$250,000. She said she understands the need for support for historic preservation in the Historic District, but not every building can be preserved.

Ms. Davenport, a Historic Beaufort Foundation member, lives next door to the structure. She read a plea for the Baptist Church of Beaufort to preserve the structure, especially in light of the upcoming form-based code. She said they "shouldn't let it rot anymore than they would let a person rot beyond salvation." She asked that the board not let part of their legacy be destroyed.

Mr. Stocks said he wanted to refute some of Ms. Kinghorn's statements. He said the church had "a permit to renovate, not to destroy the building." Taking out the supporting walls is not renovation, he said, and he feels that "they should be made to put them back." He told the history of the ownership of the building and said two real estate agents sold it to the church.

Ms. Infinger said the Historic Beaufort Foundation report was done by Mr. Brooker, who is not a structural engineer. There's nothing to refute the structural engineer's report on the building's safety, and there's nothing to refute the fact that the historic significance of it is

questionable. Even if load-bearing walls were removed, this building lost its historical significance before the Baptist Church of Beaufort went into it, Ms. Infinger said. There were many alterations and additions done which reduced and then removed any historical significance the building may have ever had. The building will continue to deteriorate, Ms. Infinger said, and it is already unsafe, according to the structural engineer. Under Milner, she added, the HDRB should allow the demolition of the building. It will not affect the integrity of the neighborhood but would do nothing but improve the neighborhood.

Gerald Infinger is a member of the Baptist Church of Beaufort. He said there's no proof that Mr. Mulligan built the building. It may once have been historically significant, but it has had so many alterations that it no longer has that. Bringing it up to code, he said, would also make it lose any remaining historical value. "The church would love to do it," Mr. Infinger said, but they don't know anyone who could do it, and it's a hazard to the neighborhood.

Ms. Lutz said that she agrees that the church made a bad choice when they purchased the building, but that's not important to the HDRB. She wondered if they have done due diligence on the prayer garden they propose to put in its place, because only residential and institutional uses are permitted there. There needs to be investigation into that before the garden is built.

Dick Morehead asked, if a house is demolished, if the Baptist Church of Beaufort would retain land ownership. He was told by several people present that it would. He asked what the real net loss would be. The city would demolish the house, and the Baptist Church of Beaufort would end up with the property.

Jim Wooten, pastor of the Baptist Church of Beaufort, said their intention is to beautify the neighborhood. The proposed prayer garden would be a part of the wider community and would be "reaching out." It would not be private or exclusive, he said. It would be like a park.

505 East Street – Side Yard Setback Development Design Exception, Final Review

Ms. Anderson gave background on a development design exception. It is similar to a variance, she said, but the review body is different: if it's historic, it comes to the HDRB. The property is in the Historic District in The Point. It requires a 10' side yard setback. In March, the HDRB gave final approval on alterations to the dwelling and an addition for the north side of the building from the north side property line. The setback requirement is 10' and an exception is necessary because the addition would extend into the setback by 2-3 feet on the side which is adjacent to an open park. Public notice was made. Ms. Anderson said, and no public comments were received.

REVIEW OF FULL BOARD PROJECTS

505 East Street – Side Yard Setback Development Design Exception, Final Review

Applicant: Bill Chambers, Architect, for Dr. & Mrs. Jagar (DE12-02)

Ms. Anderson reviewed the criteria for a design exception. **Mr. Rainey made a motion, second by Ms. Dickerson, to allow the variance, based on the criteria in the staff report. The motion**

passed 4-0. Mr. Chambers abstained from voting because he is the architect of record on the project.

505 East Street – Change After Certification, Final Review.

Applicant: Bill Chambers, Architect, for Dr. & Mrs. Jagar (HR12-34)

Ms. Kelly said the project is approved. There were some material changes: the brick and a wide shed dormer to allow clerestory windows into the kitchen. Mr. Chambers showed the reclaimed brick, which it would be changed to, and a drawing to show how more light would be let in with the dormer. **Ms. Neal, second by Ms. Dickerson, made a motion to approve the changes. The motion passed 4-0.** Mr. Chambers abstained from voting because he is the architect of record on the project.

807 New Street – Alterations, Final Review

Applicant: Bill Chambers, Architect, for Mr. & Mrs. Reich (HR12-33)

Mr. Chambers said this project was ready for final approval of the windows. **Chris Collum** presented the window options. Chairman Newman asked if the louvers were on the west elevation, and Mr. Chambers said yes, they are there now and back up to a solid wall. The windows that are there and being taken out are very contemporary, full aluminum, sliding single-pane glass windows.

Mr. Chambers showed the first choice sample, which is clad, and then one that's all wood. Mr. Chambers explained the difference in the windows to the board. Ms. Dickerson said she had no problem with a clad window. Mr. Rainey said he doesn't like the precedent, but it's an addition, not going into a historic structure, and is blended properly. Ms. Lutz said Historic Beaufort Foundation traditionally favors wood windows. If there are no back splash issues, she asked why they could not use wood windows. The other windows on the main body are historic windows, Mr. Chambers said. Mr. Collum said these would be going into an addition. Ms. Lutz said the Historic Beaufort Foundation would prefer to see wood windows installed. Mr. Collum said this clad window was used in Senator Davis's house. Ms. Dickerson said it's a non-historic addition.

Mr. Rainey made a motion for approval of the project as submitted for clad windows; Ms. Dickerson seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0. Mr. Chambers abstained from voting because he is the architect of record on the project.

501 Pinckney Street – New Construction, Elevator, Final Review.

Applicant: Bill Chambers, Architect, for Brantley Harvey (HR12-32)

Mr. Chambers said the project was studied in 2001, and there is a letter which Historic Beaufort Foundation has a copy of in regard to a glassed in rear porch extension, and an elevator. Archives and History were against that, Mr. Chambers said, and said the extension shouldn't be moved and the elevator should be put elsewhere. Now they are proposing adding the elevator

“as discreet and as temporary as possible.” Mr. Chambers said this proposal seems most logical and gets it away from the view from the street. It moves a stairwell off the back of the house. The elevator only requires 96” from floor to floor so the roof wouldn’t project higher than the existing roof. There’s a little window on the third floor that would have to be removed. The elevator is freestanding on the first floor and had to be connected with a little box on the top two levels.

Mr. Chambers said Historic Beaufort Foundation had made suggestions but not a decision. He reviewed their suggestions, which included putting the elevator inside, as well as moving the elevator to line up with the middle set of windows on this elevation. The house is completely inaccessible now, Mr. Chambers said, and it needs to be accessible. The proposal will have to go back to Historic Beaufort Foundation and Archives and History even if the HDRB approves it. He can take this approved solution to Archives and History.

Ms. Lutz said Historic Beaufort Foundation “is waiting to make up their minds.” It’s a home individually listed as a national landmark and has nothing added to it unlike some other historic houses. Since it’s such a significant landmark, they are not making decisions on their own; they have sent it to their easement attorney who is helping them by making sure that they raise no red flags about the easement stewardship, and **Brantley Harvey’s** stewardship of the house. They “want to make sure it withstands all tests.”

Mr. Rainey said Historic Beaufort Foundation can cancel the HDRB’s decision because they own the easement. Mr. Chambers added that the state can, too. Chairman Newman said that in his opinion he thinks this is a suitable solution; “coming inside would sunder a lot of the fabric of the house.” If someone later wanted to remove it, they could and make it back to the original. This seems to not destroy anything but helps the people who live there. Chairman Newman added that he feels there’s no need for a motion because “the HDRB has no sway.”

Mr. Rainey suggested that Mr. Chambers proceed through the Historic Beaufort Foundation and state steps and then HDRB could agree to convene a special meeting give its approval or disapproval if it’s approved. Chairman Newman said they could make a motion that if this is the approved solution by the state and Historic Beaufort Foundation, then the HDRB would approve it. **Mr. Rainey made a motion that the subject as submitted be tabled awaiting approval by the two other agencies, but approval can be given by staff if the other bodies approve it, thereby by-passing approval by HDRB. Ms. Neal seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0.** Mr. Chambers abstained from voting because he is the architect of record on the project.

507 Washington Street – Alterations, Additions, Preliminary Review.

Applicant: Allison Ramsey Architects for Peter & Terry Hussey (HR12-35)

Ms. Kelly said the project was submitted in March for a minor demolition, a larger addition, and a screened porch. **Cooter Ramsey** has come back with a new proposal, Ms. Kelly said, which consists of a new entry and sunroom. The plan modifies the parking area, as shown in the

landscaping plan, adds a walkway along New Street, and has an installation of an east side patio. Ms. Kelly said the palms in the landscape plan are being reused.

Chairman Newman asked Historic Beaufort Foundation for comments. Ms. Lutz said she would listen to the discussion before commenting. Mr. Chambers said this project reminds him of another. It's much different than the last submission, he commented. On the north side, where there's a single pier, he asked if there would be storage underneath. Mr. Ramsey said they could easily do two piers instead of one. Mr. Chambers asked for the reason for the number of grids in the windows themselves. Mr. Ramsey said staff has the correct number of panes in the windows.

There was general agreement that this proposal was better. "95% of what the board looks at is subjective. 5% comes under personal opinion," Mr. Rainey said, and his opinion is that the steps coming off with the bottom flaring in two different directions is "too complicated" and "looks inappropriate for the Historic District." Chairman Newman said most stairs in the Historic District go straight down and are simple and elegantly done. The landing "isn't the character or nature of the stairs here," he added.

Chairman Newman agreed that the piers seem like they should line up with the columns, and he thinks the addition is far superior to the first one submitted. Chairman Newman added that if he were to live there, he "would want the roof of the link [between the main house and the sunroom] to somehow cover the two entry doors." Chairman Newman said the link between the sunroom has its own roof, and the roof would allow water to "pour in on you" whereas it would be easy to prevent that. Ms. Lutz asked, if there were four openings within the connector, if it were big enough for that. Mr. Chambers said there are no doors. **Terry Hussey** said there's only an entrance into the sunroom.

Ms. Dickerson said she agreed that she'd like a cover if she were living there. Ms. Hussey asked if the change to the type of stairs that Mr. Rainey suggested was "mandated." Mr. Rainey said it is his opinion, not from the Milner guidelines. Chairman Newman said "the stairs in town don't look like a ship wreck" like he feels they do on Spring Island or Harbor Island. Ms. Hussey said that the house across the street has the same stairs. Chairman Newman said the board is making a recommendation.

Mr. Ramsey said making the roof larger can be done, and "there's a little bit of play." They don't want to make it too dark because it's tucked in, but it would be nice to have it covered. Chairman Newman said they're suggesting the hip roof be taken back and made into one roof. Mr. Ramsey said he "personally would like it to have more finesse than that, but it could be done." **Mr. Chambers made a motion for approval of preliminary submission with the following suggestions: re-study the stairs on both sides but mainly on the drive side, look at the connector of the roof to the addition, and study the pier on the north side of the location of the addition. Mr. Rainey seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

314 Charles Street – Alterations, Additions, Conceptual Review.

Applicant: Montgomery Architecture + Planning for Mr. & Mrs. Dickerson (HR12-36)

Ms. Kelly said this is a conceptual review, but the applicants have requested that it be a final review if consensus can be reached; they could also receive preliminary approval with final approval by staff if that makes sense. They are requesting a new rear addition, modification of an existing roof configuration, and replacement of rails on the front elevation. Ms. Dickerson said their neighbor owns an easement, which changes what the Dickersons want to do eventually with the back yard, but they can't yet. The main part of the job will make a huge improvement on the corner, Ms. Dickerson said.

Ms. Kelly said there's an addition on the rear that is from at least 1889 – a historic addition – that is proposed to be modified. It's not in the Old Commons neighborhood, Ms. Kelly added, which is a mistake on the staff report. She said a site visit confirmed that the renovations are all good. They want to combine the roofs on the rear addition and change the roof configuration. Ms. Kelly said they should consider if that's the appropriate thing to do with this historic house. She said there are two vacant lots beside this house, which is on a corner so it could add to the infill plans for the city.

Ms. Dickerson showed photos and said they had met with Historic Beaufort Foundation which had approved what the Dickersons want to do. There was discussion about the plans for the additions. **John Dickerson** said the shed addition, which is the second addition to the house, is probably from 1960. Ms. Dickerson said they will reuse and relocate the windows. She described the changes they want to make. She said they want to maintain the roof line's integrity and not change how it looks from the street.

Mr. Dickerson said the sheathing above the beams is all new. The roof portions above the beams are all new, he said, so they wouldn't be removing much fabric. Ms. Dickerson said their goal is to change it as little as possible and "turn it into a fabulous single family home."

Chairman Newman said he was surprised they didn't use the front room as it is and complete the corner with a single shed addition instead of the greater effort they are making to capture the corner. Ms. Dickerson said they explored that but "preferred the way this laid out."

Ms. Lutz said the Historic Beaufort Foundation applauds what the Dickersons are doing, but they share the concern about the addition to the 1860s -1870s part, and said "it's a shame to lose it." Mr. Rainey said they are not losing it. Ms. Lutz said, "there's precedent all over this town." Mr. Rainey said it's a fine project. He sees everything is to match existing. They are relocating the window on to the addition, replacing the rail, and the existing rail and stairs will be relocated. The new addition finishing is to match the existing structure. Ms. Dickerson showed the color pallet they are proposing.

Mr. Chambers said the Dickersons would need to provide details about the brackets on the stoop to them or to staff. He said it's tight, and he's concerned about design. He thinks, "the

back stoop looks out of character.” The gable doesn’t bother him. Mr. Dickerson said, “The stair and the landing at the top are pretty much the same.” Ms. Dickerson showed where they would move it to.

There was discussion among the Dickersons and Mr. Chambers about adding a down light to the stoop and the Dickersons said they would do so. Mr. Dickerson asked if they should widen the stoop. Mr. Chambers said the brackets are 5’ high, and he suggested it be less cramped.

Mr. Rainey said going from conceptual to final review “seems too rushed.” He would be comfortable with preliminary approval but not final, and he also rejected staff review for final approval. Mr. Rainey said they are making a significant change visually on the corner, especially with the color pallet, and he wants more time to think about it. Chairman Newman said they also haven’t determined how they are dealing with the foundation. Mr. Dickerson said that’s not correct. It will be brought back to HRB later and nothing will be done to it right now, though they are adding the piers on the addition.

Mr. Weidner said as a Preservation Committee member, he thought later about relocating the back staircase; he wondered if they had investigated how old it is. In other Historic District projects, “they have screwed up detailing on handrails and pickets.” **Beek Webb** used a photo to reconstruct what was there, Mr. Weidner said, and he wondered if it might be more trouble than it’s worth to take down the old handrails and pickets. The HDRB should investigate the details and think about all aspects of what goes there, Mr. Weidner said.

Mr. Rainey made a motion for preliminary approval as submitted with the applicants taking into consideration the HRDB’s suggestions. He added that he would be fine with final approval on the next submission. **Ms. Neal seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0.** Ms. Dickerson abstained from voting because she is one of the applicants on the project.

811 King Street - Continued – Major Demolition of Structure, Final Review.

Applicant: The Baptist Church of Beaufort (HR12-27)

Chairman Newman said he had read the structural engineer’s report but didn’t read Historic Beaufort Foundation’s report. He said that he appreciated the commentary on both sides of the matter, and he understands the economics of it. Mr. Rainey said that he has “probably reviewed 30-40 applications for demolition and this is the least deserving of demolition.” He has seen buildings on the verge of self-destruction that have been renovated. The most problems on this project “came from the inept handling of the support elements being ripped out,” Mr. Rainey said. He understands the Baptist Church of Beaufort’s “temerity about doing this project and spending more money” but that’s not the HDRB’s concern.

Mr. Chambers said the building was confirmed by the Department of Interior as being contributing because it was built pre-1900, and he’s not concerned with who built it. He asked if anyone had made a report of when the additions were made. Mr. Rainey said when he restored his house, they skimmed off five additions, and six on his guest house to get to the

original structure. Mr. Chambers said he's trying to get at the core of the building.

Ms. Lutz said there were four building phases. The first was in the late 19th century; there was one in 1912, another in 1924, and then another in the later 20th century. Changes such as asbestos tile and kitchen and bathroom updates were made in the 1950s and 1960s but not additions. Ms. Infinger said it's her understanding that these 1950s and 1960s additions are what compromised the building. Mr. Chambers said that the church representatives have said that the additions have compromised the original historic integrity, but they "haven't convinced him of that." Mr. Chambers said the Department of Interior "wouldn't come back and say it no longer has historic integrity."

Ms. Infinger said any rehabilitation, even to the original portion, can't restore it, according to the structural engineer. Chairman Newman said most structural evaluations don't have a lot of value; from the outside when he looked at it, he's fixed houses that were in much worse condition than it is. The roof is intact, the building is not coming apart, it is not listing, the windows aren't bashed out or "a rotted pile of mess." Ms. Infinger asked if they could make the building available for the HDRB to look at the interior so that they can see for themselves what it's like before they vote.

Mr. Chambers said it's on the records in Washington. If they demolished everything but the original house and restored that – though there's not much there – they could still have a garden and a room for it, and preserve history. If all the layers are peeled back, the historic integrity is maintained. He doesn't see that it's not contributing; this would be "an adaptive re-use." Ms. Infinger asked if he was suggesting a partial demolition. Mr. Rainey said they could use the building for another purpose.

Mr. Rainey said they could table this. Mr. Chambers said the board has a problem with a demolition of the entire building. Ms. Infinger asked if the HDRB would be open to partial demolition, and Mr. Rainey said "absolutely." Chairman Newman said "these projects don't make economic sense, and it's a shame what they paid for it, but eliminating the building and making a garden will not realize the Baptist Church of Beaufort any return" on its investment. The HDRB is not allowed to make decisions based on its applicants' economics.

Ms. Infinger said their concern was about safety as much as economics. When the city representatives got there, they were concerned about the building's safety. Mr. Rainey suggested Historic Beaufort Foundation could send Mr. Webb to go in with them, show them the original structure, and then could explain what should be saved, what should be gotten rid of, and assess a cost. Then the HDRB, the Baptist Church of Beaufort, and Historic Beaufort Foundation will "have a better handle on what you're dealing with."

Mr. Stocks said Mr. Webb has said he "doesn't want anything to do with" this project. Mr. Rainey said they're not talking about Mr. Webb renovating it, just going in to assess it. Mr. Stocks said it needs to be stabilized to be safe first.

Ms. Lutz said Historic Beaufort Foundation has offered to help the Baptist Church of Beaufort market the property, and she believes they can find someone to buy it. In their 2008 report, they recommended that it be taken back to its 1912 configuration, which is what the HDRB is still recommending. She said she knows it “wasn’t unsafe before the Baptist Church of Beaufort bought it and volunteers went to work on it.” She would hope that people lacking knowledge would not do the work; Mr. Rainey added that professionals should at least supervise them. Chairman Newman said the board doesn’t have the authority to make anyone do that and said there should be a motion to table. **Mr. Rainey made a motion, second by Ms. Dickerson, to table the project. The motion passed unanimously.**

There being no further business to come before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:01 p.m.