

A special meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held on January 25, 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 Bill Chambers, Inez Neal, and Erica Dickerson, and city staff Lauren Kelly.

Mike Rainey was 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 10:00 p.m.

### **REVIEW OF PROJECTS**

#### **1411 Duke Street – Major Demolition of Structure, Final Review**

Applicant: Jim Moss (HR13-01)

Ms. Kelly updated the board and those present on the project. The structure is up for major demolition. At the previous meeting, she said, the date of the structure was thought to be from 1920, as it said on the historic survey, but there was confusion about that. Since then, **Beek Webb** inspected the structure and said that the original construction was of poor quality, and there were no significant elements in the structure. Staff recommends final approval of the demolition, Ms. Kelly said, with these conditions:

- Preliminary approval of a plan for the development of the adjacent property at 1411 Duke Street and 1409 Duke Street if appropriate.
- All structures and fences must be removed and the property maintained
- No carriage, animal, equipment or vehicle storage will be permitted. The primary use of the property should not be parking, but they can have parking in the back if the property owner builds a structure.
- Staff strongly encourages the property owner to tear down the metal buildings at 1409 Duke Street.

**Jim Moss** said he and **Walter Gay** have a meeting scheduled for 1-28-13 with the ZBOA in regard to the carriages. He said the \$300 a month Mr. Gay pays him for carriage storage is the only income he makes from the property. The horses aren't left there. They are just put under the shed while they are taken off the carriages, Mr. Moss said. They have replaced a dilapidated fence, he said. They store files there from his office on the property, too, and that's another small amount of income. Also, he said as far as a plan, he does not yet have one. He hired **Eric Brown**, who had produced some initial documents. Mr. Moss's intention was to tear down everything there; the property is zoned commercial, and he intended to have three commercial structures with residences upstairs. He hasn't finalized that, though, he said.

He said in regard to design issues, they will tear down the building and fence, and plant grass in

the area, but the staff report says that all 1411 Duke Street fences are to be taken down. There's a little one around the house that he would like to tear down, but he would like to leave the fence that is there because it's covered in greenery and has a new gate.

Mr. Moss concluded that he has no plans at this time, but his intention since 2010 has been to tear down the house, put grass there, fence in the rest of the house, and tear out the dilapidated fence. He said he would appreciate the board holding off on a decision as to the carriage matter until the ZBIOA meeting the following Monday.

Chairman Newman said the only issue for the HDRB is the historical structure and its demolition. The rest can be done with staff approval and the ZBOA. The HDRB motion should have nothing to do with anything other than that: no fences, no site, no other buildings, just the demolition of the one building, Mr. Chambers clarified.

Ms. Kelly said she thinks it's important that the board be responsible for making a decision that will make the least impact on the Historic District. Unless the applicant follows the staff conditions, the demolition may open up a view to other buildings that are dilapidated and have a poor impact on the Historic District. She said she has spoken with **Libby Anderson** about this and they agree.

**Maxine Lutz** with Historic Beaufort Foundation said their board appreciated the opportunity to take a closer look at the structure. It probably was constructed in the 1940s, and they will not stand in the way of demolition. She agrees that the other structures on the property need to be addressed. Ms. Lutz said she knows the HDRB "is loathe to give demolition permits," and they are putting stipulations on the permit, "chief among which would be to clean up the whole lot." Historic Beaufort Foundation would love to see the metal buildings gone, Ms. Lutz said. They own the property on the other side of the metal buildings and "are stabilizing it." The buildings detract from the neighborhood and will lower the property value when they put their property on the market. Ms. Lutz said they can make a recommendation to the ZBOA offering an opinion as to whether or not the property should be used as a parking area.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Chambers asked if the property that is up for demolition is separate from the entire parcel. Mr. Moss said yes, there are 3 parcels together, each deeded separately. Mr. Moss could sell the other two parcels tomorrow. Mr. Moss clarified that 1411 Duke Street is a separate parcel.

Chairman Newman said he went to look at the property and saw the fencing and the carriages. He asked if there's another structure on the lot. Ms. Kelly said yes, there were. Mr. Moss said this one lot has only the house on it. Nothing else is on it. Ms. Lutz asked the address of the third lot. The buildings are on 1409 and the demolition is on 1411 Duke Street, Mr. Moss said; 1409 Duke Street is two lots. Ms. Kelly said at 1409 Duke Street, the property line isn't really distinguished to divide it into two lots.

Mr. Moss said he has evidence of the dividing line on the plat. Mr. Chambers clarified that they are using the side entrance to enter the second lot. Mr. Moss said they use the back of the old seafood building lot. One can get in from the front, too, he added.

**Ms. Dickerson made a motion to allow demolition of this building on this lot and small sections of fence on the property as requested. Ms. Neal seconded the motion.** Mr. Chambers asked if she would include anything about fencing or access points. Ms. Dickerson replied that she feels as though that's what has been asked for. Chairman Newman asked about the removal of some fencing and "if it's what's attached behind the house." Mr. Moss pointed out what he meant and reiterated that he would like to leave the fencing covered in greenery and he will complete that fencing. **The motion passed unanimously.**

#### **410 Bayard Street – Porch Addition, Final Review**

Applicant: JHN Residential Design for Frank & Caroline Coslick (HR13-04)

Chairman Newman recused himself because he employs the designer.

At the previous HDRB meeting, Ms. Kelly said, the applicant had presented another set of drawings the day before the meeting, so the HDRB created a special meeting to allow the board to look more closely at them. Ms. Kelly said the revised plan for the porch is more in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's standard #10. Staff suggests that the applicant still consider an 8' porch instead of a 10' porch, Ms. Kelly said.

Mr. Chambers clarified that he was not at the previous HDRB meeting. He invited the apps to make a presentation. **Frank Coslick** said nothing had changed. **Johan Niemand** said that the purpose of the porch was to have a space to use for entertainment of family and friends. The idea was to allow them to furnish it properly and have seating on the porch, etc. The size that suited that need was "in the 10' realm." The new roof arrangement enhances that, Mr. Niemand said.

Ms. Lutz said her committee's concern is whether from the western façade view the amount that the porch extends is in proportion or if it's too big. She said that they concur with Ms. Kelly's recommendation that the 8' porch be considered. **Caroline Coslick** said they took pictures and there is a difference of 2' coming in from the side view, but with the trees and vegetation, the vision is not like it would be if it were right on the street. They want to do what's right, she said, and have staked it out and considered furniture, etc. They "want it to be functional," Ms. Coslick said, not "an adornment," and they feel it would not be offensive to anyone or have any impact on them; it would just be an asset for the property owners.

Ms. Dickerson said the 10' porch is appropriate, considering the large addition on the east side. Mr. Chambers asked if there was any talk about the historic cottage, as opposed to the addition. Chairman Newman said the architect submitted the drawings, and Ms. Kelly had commented about that design. The drawings hadn't been given to everyone in advance, so they

had some discussion but wanted to allow Historic Beaufort Foundation to have a look at them. They had referenced a similar project – a spa – which is a similar style. Ms. Dickerson said a house around the corner was referenced, too.

Ms. Kelly said she felt the original porch plan didn't take the original structure into consideration. Staff asked them to look at the original cottage with the additions and then work with that.

**Ms. Neal made a motion to approve the renovations as requested, seconded by Ms. Dickerson. The motion passed 3-0.**

There being no further business to come before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 10:34 p.m.