

A meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held on **June 15, 2016 at 2:00 p.m.** in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Joel Newman and board members Barbara Laurie, Quinn Peitz, Chuck Symes and John Dickerson, and Lauren Kelly, planning staff.

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 2:01 p.m.

MINUTES

Mr. Peitz made a motion, seconded by Mr. Dickerson, to approve the minutes of the May 11, 2016 Historic District Review Board meeting. The motion to approve the minutes as submitted passed unanimously.

REVIEW OF FULL BOARD PROJECTS

1007 Duke Street, Identified as R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 394 and 802 Charles Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 397 Alterations, Additions

Applicant: JHN Residential Building Design for Duanne Smalley (HR16-17)

The applicant is proposing alterations and additions to include front and side stoops at 1007 Duke Street, and at 802 Charles Street, a minor addition to the Duke Street side, and a rear screened porch.

Ms. Kelly said these projects could be considered together, because the owner and applicants are the same, and they're "very similar projects." These two parcels are adjacent to one another on Duke Street and the corner of Duke and Charles Streets. There is a vacant parcel in between these two buildings, she said. 1007 Duke Street is listed as contributing on the Historic Sites Survey, but staff believes it was moved there, so Ms. Kelly said she doesn't believe that status is accurate. 802 Charles Street is non-contributing. On both projects, the applicant is requesting approval of small additions: entry stoops at the Duke Street house, and extending a wall of the Charles Street house, on the Duke Street side elevation, and a screened porch on the rear.

When the projects come for a building permit, staff will need the proposed building materials, Ms. Kelly said, and construction details. Staff recommends that the board give final approval to the projects, pending submission of the requested materials.

Mr. Symes feels it will be a good addition and will look nice. Mr. Peitz asked if they would "close in" the side entry door on 1007 Duke Street." The architect, **Johan Niemand**, said the idea is to make the kitchen more functional by moving "the door into the existing dining room," not eliminating it. Mr. Peitz asked how they would "blend it

in.” Mr. Niemand said there would be historic siding to match, and they would try to use that to blend it in.

Mr. Dickerson said the addition “addresses the street well and changes it,” so there is “a good front.” **Maxine Lutz** said Historic Beaufort Foundation (HBF) had no comment.

Mr. Peitz moved for final approval of the project for 1007 Duke Street as submitted. Mr. Dickerson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Peitz moved for final approval of the project for 802 Charles Street as submitted. Mr. Dickerson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

310 Scott Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 1013

New Construction

Applicant: Beaufort Inn, LLC (HR16-19)

The applicant is proposing to construct a new cottage to house one room for the Beaufort Inn.

This parcel is in the core commercial district, Ms. Kelly said. Historically, this block “has always contained the two buildings that flank the proposed structure,” and there have been “a series of accessory buildings in the rear of the property, as the site has evolved.” The applicant wants to construct a new one-story guest cottage between the former Bayside Salon on the corner, and the Female Benevolent Society building. “The idea is that it is in keeping with the (building pattern of the) accessory structure that’s on the south side of the Female Benevolent Society,” Ms. Kelly said.

The total building footprint is 467 square feet, which includes 220 square feet of front porch. There are no zoning issues. Applicable guidelines are in the staff report, Ms. Kelly said.

Site Plan: Ms. Kelly showed the proposed plan; staff had suggested setting the building back more, so the front of the porch columns aligned with the main body of the adjacent buildings. This way, it will “read as secondary” to the buildings on either side of it. The applicant was “fine with that,” Ms. Kelly said.

The mass and scale seem appropriate. The biggest unknown is how the fire codes will affect the building, Ms. Kelly said; it needs to be sprinkled because it’s part of the inn, and it will also require one-hour fire-rating on at least one side it, which will affect the amount and type of windows that are permitted.

The proportion and detail are appropriate, Ms. Kelly said. There is a question about the proposed foundation material and type. The applicant will need to provide a detailed material list, window and door specs, and a landscaping plan.

Staff recommends preliminary approval of this request, Ms. Kelly said, with board input on the building's placement and any other comments. At the board's discretion, staff could make final approval of the project, "since this is a fairly small and simple building."

Courtney Worrell, representing the applicant, said the building will "be raised probably about a foot." It will be no higher than the elevation shows, she said, confirming that the building's total height would still be 16'. The applicant has not decided on the type of foundation or HVAC unit.

Chairman Newman asked Ms. Worrell what restricts the applicant from moving this building back further. Ms. Worrell said, "Our future plans for the property . . . (as) an event courtyard." Mr. Dickerson suggested a way to line this accessory structure up with the houses, which "presents better to the street." Chairman Newman said he feels the opposite of Mr. Dickerson: As this structure is presented in the drawings, it "looks like a tiny house stuck between two houses" that are similarly proportioned with one another. They are sit higher off the ground than this structure, so he suggested "getting (the proposed structure) up a little bit higher."

Chairman Newman said that because of what Beaufort Inn had done with its properties in this block, there are "wonderful . . . little garden spaces," but positioning this structure as proposed "doesn't give you one of those." Increasing the space at the street in front of the cottage would make it more desirable, and "open up the sides," he said. Chairman Newman feels this accessory building should be "behind this structure, virtually, like the other accessory buildings (are)." Where it sits currently, it doesn't look like an accessory structure, he said.

Mr. Symes agreed and said this structure could move back as much as 12' more. In her drawing, Ms. Kelly had moved it back 10', and Mr. Symes thinks that as-is, the building's "too small to be next to these nice houses" and looks "inappropriate."

Ms. Worrell said she appreciates what the board is saying. She explained that the applicant intends to redevelop the tabby garden as an event space "down the road," so they don't want to push the building back further, or they won't have the open space that is behind this proposed structure. The landscape plan could suggest how this "would complement the gardens that are already there," Ms. Worrell said.

Mr. Peitz said that small houses next to large houses can be found all over Beaufort. He suggested the applicants could push the building right to the sidewalk, or they could push it back more, and "make it clearly accessory," but, he said, "it's not working in between."

Chairman Newman explained to Ms. Laurie that the building is not on a separate parcel, which is why it is considered an accessory building. The entire block is one parcel, Ms. Worrell added. Mr. Dickerson asked if the applicant planned to make a little garden up

front. Ms. Worrell said yes, there would be landscaping.

Chairman Newman asked if the applicant had considered building an addition to “the gray building on the corner,” instead of this plan. He asked if an attached suite there would work with the way the gray building is used, or if it would ruin the guest suite that’s there. Ms. Worrell said a guest room’s windows look out onto the courtyard. Chairman Newman said the courtyard is ruined, anyway, “if there’s a building built where this pink building is shown right now,” on the drawings, so adding a suite with its own entry onto the gray building could be a “win-win.” They wouldn’t interrupt the bigger courtyard idea. The proposed building doesn’t look like an accessory structure because of its position, Chairman Newman said, though it’s been designed to look like an accessory structure.

Chairman Newman said he didn’t think the rendering they had was accurate. Ms. Worrell said it’s not. He asked how much space is left between the buildings; Ms. Worrell said 10’ and 8.5’.

Ms. Laurie asked if the applicant would be willing to do what Ms. Kelly had said was necessary to meet the fire codes. Ms. Worrell said yes. Ms. Kelly said sprinklers are required for this type of building, but it also needs to be fire-rated. Ms. Worrell said that **Bruce Skipper** would research and determine what might apply to a building this small.

Mr. Peitz asked the setback difference between the applicant’s original submission and Ms. Kelly’s drawing. “The original one aligns with the other two houses,” Chairman Newman told him. Ms. Worrell said it was “about 5’ off Scott Street.” Ms. Kelly said her drawing had made the front of the porch align with the main body of the flanking houses. “This plan doesn’t show the building” that the applicant is proposing, she said; “it still contains a wing on the side,” and the building footprint is not the one that’s being proposed. Ms. Kelly said she and the applicant had discussed “a bunch of . . . different options.”

Chairman Newman asked if the applicant had considered putting this structure on Craven Street, instead. Ms. Worrell replied, “We did not.” There is a lot of room between the back of the grey building and a proposed new structure, Chairman Newman said, and doing so would leave the inn an outlet to Scott Street, which could be a courtyard entry. He reiterated that he thinks the structure should be higher, like the neighboring houses; it’s “too modest” now, Chairman Newman feels. The old building that was moved to this area is small, but it “has a lot of dignity to it.”

Mr. Peitz said he agrees that the structure should be enhanced, and he feels it should be brought to the street. Chairman Newman said they could bring it to the street if it were relocated to Craven Street, where there is room on either side of it, between the houses of different sizes. He feels it needs to be moved back or to be on Craven Street, where it could “do its own thing.”

Mr. Symes and Chairman Newman suggested the applicant could add another story onto the structure. Ms. Worrell said that would help with the fire rating.

Mr. Dickerson suggested, if this proposed structure were made “a little bit grander,” and two buildings on Port Republic Street that appear to be separated by a foot were used as a guide, this building could be “amplified . . . but allow(ed) . . . to be much tighter into the building area.” Ms. Kelly said the setbacks are not just determined by the housing pattern on this block. This is a new building; the others around it are historic, so different codes apply.

Mr. Dickerson said this is a “nice little bungalow,” but a larger, airier structure “would sell better.” Chairman Newman said the HDRB can’t comment on economics, but he doesn’t think the building is “successful” right now – as an accessory structure *or* as a main building. Mr. Peitz said he likes the building, and it is a complement to the complex of buildings.

Mr. Peitz moved that this application be tabled for 30 days, so the applicants can work on the siting of the building. Ms. Lutz asked if Mr. Peitz knew of any examples of very small structures like this that “are tiny and pushed to the street.” She and Mr. Peitz then agreed on “Three Little Pigs.” Ms. Lutz said she agreed with staff, Chairman Newman, and Mr. Symes. Mr. Peitz said tabling this application would give the applicants more time, and they could “absorb the comments.” They have a lot of different choices, he feels.

Ms. Laurie said she wondered if the owner intends for this structure to look as the board members have been suggesting. Historically, she said, there were big houses, with little ones in the back or to the side, and also, slaves lived in small structures behind the big, main house. Ms. Worrell said, “The intent is to repeat a pattern that has been established on that street.” Ms. Laurie said, “And that pattern is historical.” Chairman Newman said an accessory structure that is “supposed to be related to the bigger house,” would generally be set back (into the back yard). The Rhett Cottage is an example of where this “context set-up” works perfectly, but this doesn’t have that feel. It needs to be set back another 15’ from where it is now, he said.

Ms. Lutz asked if Ms. Worrell was open to moving the building back. Ms. Worrell said she and Ms. Kelly had discussed numerous options. Ms. Kelly said they could discuss those with the board if the board wants them to. Ms. Worrell said she understands and appreciates the feedback on the architecture, and she “can work with siting issues.”

Mr. Symes said he thinks moving the building back “works,” and so does moving it to Craven Street, in order to protect the garden area, so he encouraged Ms. Worrell to look at the options. Moving the building back would also help her with the fire problem. Ms. Worrell said both options would do that. **Mr. Dickerson seconded the motion. The**

motion passed unanimously.

806 Craven Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 1013

New Construction

Applicant: Bill Chambers, 303 Associates, LLC (HR16-20)

The applicant is proposing to construct a new building to house 12 rooms for the Beaufort Inn.

This is another proposed building in the same block, Ms. Kelly said. The parcel is currently vacant, but historically housed up to three structures. The applicant proposes to construct a new 2-story building with 12 guest rooms. The proposed footprint is 3,441 square feet; the total building square footage is 7,882 square feet.

This parcel is zoned Core Commercial, and there are no zoning issues with setbacks or maximum height, Ms. Kelly said. The elevation should not be much more than is shown. The Civic Master Plan shows three infill buildings on this site. Placement and orientation of the two components of this building makes sense with the plan for the block and the adjacent garden space, Ms. Kelly said.

Site plan

Ms. Kelly said the applicant should reconsider the brick pier and/or picket fence between the porch and the street. There is not a lot of space there, and a fence between the porch and the street doesn't occur elsewhere in this block, "where the building is set close to the street."

Mass and scale

- A 2-story structure "is appropriate for the area," Ms. Kelly said. It would be helpful to know how its proposed height relates to the new construction across the street; heights and proportions are similar, but this one "is raised up a good bit more off the street."
- HBF's Preservation Committee had determined that the building's footprint and size is two-thirds that of the Anchorage, Ms. Kelly said. To reduce the overall building mass, she asked if the east wing could be read more as a wing, with a different roof height and massing than the rest of the structure.

Proportions and details

- Ms. Kelly said the applicant should consider expanding the porches so they're at least 8' deep, which will make them more useable.
- There a question as to whether the roof is a complete hip or flat on top, and a roof plan would help to clarify this on the next submission
- The applicant should consider treating all the porches similarly, with a shallower hip, Ms. Kelly said.
- A wall section will be required, with details.

- On the porch, the outside edge of the pier should align with the column base.
- The applicant will need to submit a detailed materials list, a landscape plan, and window/door specifications, Ms. Kelly said.

Staff recommends preliminary approval of this request, Ms. Kelly said with staff and board comments considered before the next submission. Final approval by staff could be a possibility, “depending on the complexity of the board’s comments.”

Bill Chambers, the project’s architect, said the property owners had decided not to put three buildings in this space, so they would have alleys, courtyards, and setbacks. They decided to have one building with “traditional Beaufort” proportions, most of which have a flat roof on the porch, which helps to lessen the mass, he said. This building’s roof pitch is 5:12, so it will “almost . . . appear flat,” and it may be reduced to 4:12.

The building is 34’ in height, Mr. Chambers said. He believes he is above the flood plain now, and he doesn’t see building “going up any more.”

As to how this building relates to those across the street, Mr. Chambers said it will probably be “a little bit lower” than the one that was just built. They “go by” the building’s Craven Street façade. It is about 38’ wide, which he said is “a pretty standard dimension in Beaufort.” It was “not based on a hotel blueprint.”

They can lower the wing as Ms. Kelly had suggested, Mr. Chambers said. Mr. Peitz asked how much they’d consider lowering it. Mr. Chambers said it could easily go at least a foot lower. They want trim above the windows and some space for this traditional design. It could even drop 2’. He is willing to study that. It is a deliberately a “L” shaped building, Mr. Chambers said. Mr. Peitz asked if Mr. Chambers feels it’s “more appropriate lower” or the way he had submitted it. Mr. Chambers said, to look like a wing of a house, “it should drop.”

As far as materials, Mr. Chambers said, they can use brick because of the houses around this one. They are fine with getting rid of the picket fence. He doesn't “mind bringing the hip roof to the street.” He had deliberately extended it on the back side of the building. The columns are Permacast, so they will be 10” square. They will probably be “non-load columns,” he said.

Chairman Newman said the former Bayside Salon is shown in this drawing as if it’s “sitting right . . . on the ground, but that building doesn’t sit on the ground like that, does it?” He said Bayside Salon and the proposed building compare unfavorably in the drawing, but in fact, “Bayside is taller than what’s shown here.” Chairman Newman asked Mr. Chambers for an elevation drawing when the Beaufort Inn brings back the previously discussed project to the HDRB. If Bayside Salon is shown “up where it really is,” Chairman Newman said, it will diminish the difference between “what you’re trying to build now and what’s out there.”

Mr. Symes asked about a big live oak in front of this building. One limb comes back to the building, Mr. Chambers said, and will need to be trimmed.

Ms. Lutz said the Preservation Committee “was very pleased with this project.” She asked how this structure compares to the Beaufort Inn itself in height. The Beaufort Inn is 53’, Mr. Chambers said. Chairman Newman said this building is “hugely different.”

Mr. Chambers said there is an error in the drawing; the roof is not as tall as shown. There are two small gable roofs on it. Ms. Lutz asked how close this building will be to the salon. Mr. Chambers said it’s 30’ “from the other building.” It’s 40’–45’ from Bayside Salon, Ms. Kelly said. Mr. Chambers said it’s 80’ to the street corner.

Chairman Newman asked Mr. Chambers if he could “somehow affect the idea of shutters” at the ends of porches, on the inside – from the columns back to the wall – in order “to make . . . private porch(es).” Ms. Worrell said if the board would support that, they would be glad to do it. Mr. Peitz said that he understands the need for privacy, but this a mixed-use neighborhood, and dividing the porches into “subsections will take away tremendously from the look of the building.” He doesn't think they should change the architecture of the building for privacy.

Chairman Newman said Mr. Chambers could do that kind of detail well and “not diminish (the architecture) at all.” The shutters are at the ends of porches, making them private from the street or a close neighbor. He described how the shutters could work. Mr. Peitz said they could have sliding shutters, too.

Mr. Symes said the second floor only has two rooms on Craven Street, so that would only need 1 or two panels. Mr. Chambers said on Craven Street and the back side of the building, “you could delete the porch” and create an atrium. Mr. Peitz said he doesn’t like the idea of six subsections, but two or three might be an appropriate compromise, though he’s reluctant to “put something there that’s fixed.” Mr. Symes said he understood what Chairman Newman and Mr. Chambers were saying.

Mr. Peitz asked about 8’ porches. Mr. Chambers said he has no issue with that, but they “want to be appropriate.”

Ms. Kelly said the openings in the elevation are shown as doors, which would compromise the space if they swing out. Chairman Newman said, “Big porches are nice,” so he has no issue with that.

Chairman Newman said stepping down the wing is a nice idea, architecturally. Mr. Chambers said on the rear elevation, Historic Beaufort Foundation had suggested there should be another break in the wing, and he thinks that needs to be looked at. The “wing can slide up and down that wall,” he said.

If the cottage from the previous application goes on Craven Street, Mr. Chambers said, this building would “slide over a little . . . to give breathing space.” There’s a 6’-wide pathway that Mr. Chambers pointed out and said is “impressive.” Chairman Newman said he doesn't have a problem with these constrictions; they make “the neighborhood appealing.”

Mr. Symes made a motion for final approval of the application, with consideration of board comments about porches and the roof line. Staff will give final approval when all of the appropriate paperwork is submitted and other requirements are met. Mr. Peitz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

1100 Boundary Street – Bridges Portables Extension

Ms. Kelly said there have been various phases of this project, which she described. Bridges Preparatory School, the City of Beaufort, and the Department of Transportation (DOT) are “stuck . . . not being able to figure out appropriate vehicular circulation that wouldn't have a detrimental impact on the neighborhood,” given that the number of students would nearly triple with the addition, she said. While Bridges figures out its next step, they are asking for an extension to retain the portable units until June 2018. The portables were put in place in April 2015, Ms. Kelly said.

Mr. Dickerson said extending the use of the portables is not Bridges’ choice. Ms. Kelly said that’s not entirely accurate. “There are surrounding complexities,” including that it’s a charter school, not a public school, so students come from everywhere, not from the surrounding district, and they have not been able to determine a successful solution for the school, the city, and the DOT.

Dee Matthews described the places at which the school is housing classes for its various grades. Bridges is looking to “build an entire(ly) new school at a different location,” she said. Chairman Newman said they may be “decamping entirely because it’s not going to fit there.” Ms. Matthews said, “Exactly.” Mr. Peitz asked if there had been feedback about the trailers. Ms. Matthews said no one has complained to the school; Ms. Kelly said no one has complained to the city.

Mr. Peitz moved to approve the extension until June 30, 2018, with the stipulation that if Bridges vacates the property before that date, they must move the trailers. Ms. Laurie asked if Bridges will have a structure built elsewhere within that time frame. Ms. Matthews said that they have the funding set up, and if they are building a school on open land, without the need to move their students, they can do it by June 2018. **Mr. Symes seconded the motion.**

Ms. Laurie asked Ms. Matthews if Bridges owned the building they’re currently in. Ms. Matthews said yes, and they will sell it if a solution is not determined that allows them to use it. She told Ms. Laurie that the Charles Lind Brown Center, which the school also

uses, is owned by the county, and Bridges has no agreement to purchase it.

Mr. Peitz said those trailers are to be used for classrooms only. Ms. Matthews said they never intended them for another use, and if they build a new school, they “would absolutely have them moved.” **The motion passed 4-0, with Ms. Laurie abstaining from the vote.**

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Ms. Kelly said the board has no vice-chairman. She said Mr. Peitz, Ms. Laurie, and Mr. Symes are all up for reappointment. **Chairman Newman nominated Mr. Peitz. Mr. Dickerson seconded the nomination. The motion passed unanimously.**

DISCUSSION: BEAUFORT ARTS COUNCIL’S REQUEST FOR MURAL DISPLAY, 916 PORT REPUBLIC STREET

The Beaufort Arts Council (BAC) has moved to Port Republic Street, and its building has a large blank wall, Ms. Kelly said. The arts council would like to put a mural there, and had asked for feedback from the HDRB. Then the BAC will determine what it wants to do and will come back to the board. Ms. Kelly said staff had commented that “murals should not be signs.”

Mark Heyward said he is a board member at the BAC; he introduced **Delene Miller**, the board president, and **Kim Sullivan**, executive director. He said the group plans to make the mural from removable panels that would attach to the wall, not put a mural on the wall itself. The art on those panels would “change over time,” Mr. Heyward said.

The group could put up something quickly if they used images from ArtPop, Mr. Heyward said, which is a billboard campaign that followed a contest the BAC had, from which it chose 10 winners, whose work is displayed on billboards in Beaufort, Hampton, Jasper, and Colleton counties. Mr. Heyward said they could use those images as a stop gap until they decide how they want to “muralize that wall.” He showed some of the ArtPop images to the board.

There is no plan to light the mural, Mr. Heyward told Mr. Peitz. Mr. Peitz said he is concerned about backlighting; Chairman Newman said if there was lighting on it, that would constitute a sign. Mr. Heyward said, “to us, (the murals) are public art,” not signs.

Mr. Symes noted that there’s a house across the street from the BAC building. He asked if the arts council has talked to that homeowner. Ms. Sullivan said they have not.

Ms. Sullivan said they had originally speculated that artists could work on the murals onsite. There are only two murals in town, she said, and this could draw people to the building. The ArtPop imagery is specific to the Lowcountry and professionally done.

Mr. Heyward said there’s no timeframe for getting the mural up. They want to beautify

the building and tie into the public art aspect of the arts council's mission. Over time, they could have competitions, schools' art classes could decorate the panels, etc.

Chairman Newman said he doesn't feel the HDRB should review anything the arts council puts on the wall. Mr. Peitz said the City of Beaufort "has a set of values," and the arts council doesn't want to go beyond those with "extreme artwork." The arts council's board of directors will approve the art that goes on these panels, he feels, and they should be tasteful, "so as not to go beyond community values."

Mr. Symes said the arts council should consider using professional judges. Ms. Sullivan said when they had presented this to Ms. Kelly, they had discussed creating the murals' art onsite, having three separate panels, and having the community watch the process of creating the murals. The ArtPop idea came up after that meeting; Ms. Sullivan said the ArtPop images have been juried professionally.

Chairman Newman said it would be nice, in his opinion, for the imagery on this wall to look "more mural-like" than the ArtPop images do. Also, he feels the panels should fit the wall more. He thinks the arts council should get the opinion of those who live and work across the street from this wall. Chairman Newman has no objection to this, though he does not think "it's (the HDRB's) job to determine what's there."

Ms. Kelly said she's hearing from the board that if another mural is proposed somewhere in the Historic District in the future, the city does not have a process, so the HDRB would rather the determination be made at the staff level. Ms. Kelly said this is a noncontributing building; if it were historical, though, Ms. Lutz said, it *would* be the HDRB's purview. Mr. Peitz said this is just a discussion about whether a blank wall can have art on it.

Ms. Laurie said there was artwork done on another building in the Historic District years ago, and it had to be taken down. She asked where approval of murals takes place, if the HDRB doesn't approve them. If an individual or group wanted to paint a mural on the Charles Lind Brown Center, would they need to get approval? Ms. Laurie asked. If so, and they did not come to the HDRB for it, where would they go?

Chairman Newman suggested that staff should come up with a proposal of what the procedure should be for this; having such a procedure would be helpful to the community. Ms. Kelly would then know where to direct people who came to the city about this, and she could "give them limitations." Mr. Peitz agreed.

Erica Dickerson said staff should differentiate between signage and artwork. It is not an obvious distinction. Ms. Kelly said there are some decisions staff can make easily, but they might come back to the HDRB for clarification. She said she would put a proposal together and could run it by the board via email. She would let the applicant know what was decided. There is no defined procedure, Ms. Kelly said, but the applicant would not

have to come back to the board. Mr. Heyward said the BAC would consider the comments, especially about their neighbor.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Laurie said an alley in the Northwest Quadrant had been named Crofut Lane. **Libby Anderson** had given her information about how the name of the lane had been chosen, but Ms. Laurie didn't know anything about it, and she said "nobody in the neighborhood" did either. When "those types of things are done," she said, the neighborhoods where the streets are should be included in the process. Residents called this alley "Nancy's Lane," Ms. Laurie said. Those residents should have known about and been able to participate in the process of the city naming the alley.

Ms. Lutz said that was a staff decision, and Historic Beaufort Foundation had been asked to contribute information. **Mary Crofut** had owned the lots along that alley and was one of the first businesswomen in Beaufort, she said, so that's how the name came up and was chosen.

Ms. Lutz told Ms. Laurie that if the Northwest Quadrant neighbors want to be involved, then they "need to support HBF's position that the HDRB, not staff," should approve new construction in the Northwest Quadrant (as opposed to what's in the draft Beaufort Code), so that there will public discussion of it.

Ms. Kelly said that Nancy Lane was a colloquial, unofficial name, and when a lot was built on that alley, it needed an official name. Ms. Lutz said when a lane in the Old Commons needed a name, the residents had a competition, and the top three names were submitted to council, which chose a winner. Ms. Laurie said, "That was a process." Ms. Kelly said there are possibly six other lanes that are platted but not named, so she will get together with Ms. Laurie, and "if that comes up," they can "speak to the neighbors about it."

There was a discussion about unnamed alleys and lanes in the City of Beaufort. Ms. Kelly suggested that she and Ms. Laurie could look at a map and identify which streets don't have names. Chairman Newman suggested that the process could then be to go to the neighborhoods those streets are in and find out if there are colloquial names for them. There was general agreement from the board.

There being no further business to come before the board, **Mr. Dickerson made a motion, second by Mr. Symes, to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously**, and the meeting adjourned at 3:58 p.m.