#

A meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held on **May 13, 2015 at 2:00 p.m.** in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Joel Newman, board members Erica Dickerson, Quinn Peitz, Chuck Symes and Barbara Laurie.

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

Ericka Dickerson made a motion, second by Joel Newman, to approve the minutes of the April 8, 2015 meeting with the minor typos and grammar corrections. The motion passed unanimously.

REVIEW OF FULL BOARD PROJECTS
807 CRAVEN STREET
Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 808
Alterations, Additions.
Applicant: Mike Sutton for Lloyd Benjamin (HR15-12)
The applicant wishes to restore the original portion of the historic structure in-kind, and bring the mechanical systems and interiors up to date. The applicant is also requesting approval of the Bailey Bill application for the work being done.

Ms. Kelly said this property is a duplex located in the Old Commons Neighborhood. It is listed, c. 1880 as Contributing on the *1997 Above Ground Historic Sites Survey*. It has been altered multiple times and such alterations include a replacement south-facing porch, and a removed or infilled north-facing porch. Ms. Kelly said the applicant wishes to restore the original portion of the historic structure in-kind, and bring the mechanical systems and interiors up to date with no exterior modifications being proposed at this time. **This project has not previously appeared before the HRB.** Regarding the Zoning and size there are no issues since no square footage is being added to the structure. This is in a prominent area and within the downtown corridor. Staff recommends final approval of this project contingent on the photographs, which were just submitted.

Mr. Peitz made a motion that the application be approved as submitted. Ms. Dickerson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Newman asked the question, if a project is going to ask for the Baily Bill it has to go through our process. Lauren said yes because there may be pieces of historical significance inside the building (fire places, mantels, furniture that has been built in).

#

Mr. Peitz said so the Bailey Bill actually has extended our authority to certain elements inside a structure. Ms. Kelly said it has if they want to get the Bailey Bill. But if they didn't want to get the Bailey Bill, they can do whatever they want on the inside.

<u>509 CARTERET STREET</u>
Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 734
Alterations, Additions
Applicant: Robert C. Montgomery for Jeff Heirs (HR15-13)
The applicant is requesting approval to include approval of the Bailey Bill application, for exterior and interior alterations, and a small rear addition.

Ms. Kelly said this property is also known as the Von Harten Building is a prominent building, which is listed as contributing on the *1997 Above Ground Historic Sites Survey.* Circa 1921, the structure has undergone numerous additions and alterations. The applicant would like preliminary approval of the Bailey Bill application for exterior and interior alterations, and small rear addition. Some of the modifications include a new Roof & reconstructed rafter tails; Replacing front metal entry doors with wood doors/sidelites & adding a canopy on the front; Moving and adding some windows on the King Street façade; An 11' rear addition to provide access to the attic storage area; Raising a portion of the foundation slab 6" to make the entire slab at the same level; and reconstructing the interior walls, opening up a portion of the structure and reintroducing wainscoting that currently exists in the building. Since this is a structure is being added for access, the cost does go towards the investment requirement. The existing structure is about 3,700 SF. A 220SF structure is proposed to be added to the rear, housing an entry vestibule and rear stairs to access the upper level storage. Ms. Kelly referred to the Secretary of the Interior Standards #9&10, the Preservation Manual Supplement, p. 17-19, and The Supplement p. 21. Ms. Kelly regarding zoning, it's between GC and TRB-The Point; most of the building is in General Commercial and parking in the Traditional Beaufort-The Point. Mr. Symes asked if the parking goes with the entire building. Yes, said Mr. Montgomery. Since there is not a change in use in the structure, it does not have to come into compliance with the existing ordinance "use wise"; a parking lot would not be permitted in the Point if you are going to add it new but since it exists is there is no change of use it can remain, but staff will ask that it comes in compliance with the landscaping and screening standards. The site is proposed to have a revised circulation plan and we feel this will really reduce the impact on the surrounding neighborhoods particularly The Point because it's a one way and you won't have the cars going back and forth on the streets as much. The most important will be the a landscaping plan with perimeter screening between the parking area and the street, a minimum of 4.5' tall and 90% opacity, will be required. This project has not previously appeared before the HRB. Staff recommends preliminary approval of this project as submitted, with final approval of final architectural drawings, landscaping, and site details to be approved by staff. We are very excited about the project.

DRAFT

#

Chairman Newman asked if Historic Beaufort Foundation (HBF) had any comments. HBF said, "Welcome to the neighborhood. It's a good project."

It was asked if there was a picture of front door? Yes it's on the screen, Ms. Kelly said. Robert Montgomery, applicant, responded by saying it will be a door with a canopy. He also went over the colors and materials for the door. It was asked what type of business was going into the building. Mr. Montgomery said, offices for J. Heirs Construction.

Mr. Peitz made a motion that the application approved based on the conditions of staff, seconded by Ms. Dickerson. The motion passed unanimously.

<u>808 NEWCASTLE STREET</u>
Identified as R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 378
Amendment of prior demolition approval
Applicant: Corey Post for Sue Sagui (HR15-14)
The applicant wishes to amend the condition for demolishing the structure. The applicant would like to demolish the structure in advance of developing a plan for a replacement building.

Ms. Kelly said the property is listed c. 1950 as not contributing to the Historic district. The applicant wishes to amend the condition for demolishing the structure. Approval for demolition was granted in 2009, but there is a condition that a plan for a new structure must be approved concurrently, Ms. Kelly said. The applicant would like to amend that previous condition and would like to demolish the structure in advance of developing a plan for a replacement building. This demolition request appeared before the HRB in 2009. The Board granted conditional approval to the demolition. Staff recommends final approval of this request on the condition that the lot will be over-seeded and well maintained, and will not be used for parking. Ms. Kelly said the applicant now feels since the structure is deteriorating so much she wants to remove it and maintain the yard and move fairly quickly on the plans for a new structure.

Corey Post, the applicant, said he is meeting with the owner at the end of the month since she does live in town. She closed on the property last week, but cannot get insurance at all and the liability is bothering her, Mr. Post said.

Mr. Peitz made a motion that the application as submitted be approved. Ms. Laurie seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Laurie asked, in general, how do you determine when a property can be demolished and what is based on? Ms. Kelly said first we have to determine if it's contributing or not contributing. If it's non-contributing, it's not typically an issue. If it is contributing, it very rate that it would be demolished. It would have to be a severe situation. This one under review does not have historic value for the city. Chairman Newman said if

someone was considering demolishing a contributing structure, there is a procedure for having it evaluated. Codes will come and evaluate and write a report and some will get an engineer to write a report. This would be the supporting document someone would submit with their request.

<u>1508 DUKE STREET</u>
Identified as R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 442
Alterations, Additions
Applicant: William Galloway (HR15-11)
The applicant wishes to infill the existing front porch, construct a new front porch, and construct a new rear addition.

Ms. Kelly said the property is listed c. 1940s and is not contributing to the historic district. A structure in that location, but without a front porch, is indicated on the 1958 Sanborn map. The building currently houses Allen Funeral Home. This project has not previously appeared before the HRB. The current structure is 920 SF, with a 200 SF porch. The proposed addition is 1,715 square feet. In addition, the 200 square feet porch would become part of the main structure. The total square footage for the complete proposal is 2,835 square feet. Ms. Kelly referred to The Northwest Quadrant Design Principles, p. 23-26 and The Preservation Manual Supplement, p. 17-19. Ms. Kelly said with regards to the staff comment, will need site calculations of the pervious versus impervious surface will be required. This lot cannot exceed 65% impervious area, including all area under roof, ramps, sidewalks, etc. Regarding the building, staff feels it doesn't comply with some principles in the Northwest Quadrant Design such as scale of the building and the compatible with the existing structure. The portions are not indicative of other buildings in the area or the existing building. Staff does understand the building is in a mixed-use zone where there are residential buildings that were converted to businesses and its right next to Bladen Street. Ms. Kelly passed out information regarding the 3-story building that was approved to be built next door for the Black Beaufort Chamber of Commerce. Staff doesn't feel it's appropriate to be built as it is proposed. Staff recommends that the applicant reconsider the size, mass and scale of this project. If this amount of square footage is required for the program the applicant has in mind, it needs to be reconsidered to meet the principles discussed above.

Mr. Peitz asked the applicant, William Galloway, if he considered taking the existing building down and starting a new building. Mr. Galloway said he is willing to make the current building taller. I might consider starting over, but would have to look at my financial situation. Chairman Newman asked how much work the applicant is going to do inside the existing building. Mr. Galloway it's up to code now. "What I could do is tear down my building and build another building like the metal one across the street, which is more cost effective for me". Mr. Pietz said he's not ready to move forward with this project today. We need to use Bladen Street as a guide for as architecturally this project, Mr. Peitz said so it blends in with the rest of the neighborhood. He referred

DRAFT

to the Coastal Contactors white building which seems appropriate for an in-fill project. Mr. Galloway said you asked me to tear down an $80,000 building and it doesn't seem fair to me. I can make some adjustments as far as it being taller. He asked what he can do with the existing building without tearing it down. Mr. Peitz said he's not sure if the Board is in the position to redesign the building but certainly you can keep the new building but I think there's going to be issues of the size and scale of the addition versus what is there currently.
Mr. Galloway asked again, what I can do without tearing down the building. Chairman Newman said let's just have the discussion of what we can do to help him move forward. Chairman commented that Mr. Galloway has a simple structure out front that doesn't have that Beaufort small house character to it and he's putting on an addition to change it. It's a non-contributing structure and he's making it work for his business, and that's fine. Chairman Newman asked, is it allowable for him to build this much structure on this site. Ms. Kelly said yes, he has 65% allowable impervious. Chairman Newman said it would useful to start getting the detail and the look of this to be more contributory to the neighborhood and not to worry about a "little structure with big addition on it" because this is what Mr. Galloway needs to function and solve his problem. Chairman Newman suggested to make it more compatible, make the details more like the neighborhood by finding a similar porch with the columns, roof edge, type of roof, railing, etc. Mr. Galloway showed him a picture he took of a porch at Midtown and sent them to this architect. Mr. Peitz said he also took a picture of a Midtown home across the street on Bladen Street that is taking up basically the entire lot. He shown it to Mr. Galloway that he can make his pre-existing structure similar to that building. Mr. Peitz said if Mr. Galloway would work, along with the city's staff architect and come back to the Board, it would clearly meet with the intent of what he is trying to do. Chairman Newman feels the applicant's architect did not submit exactly what he should have. Mr. Galloway said he has another set of plans coming that has the front being revised to match what is across the street; I want it to look like that. Mr. Galloway said he can afford to do this but not to tear it town. Mr. Galloway wants someone to walk by and say, "Wow that building looks great!" Mr. Galloway asked what he has to do to come back to make it work? Ms. Kelly said we just need to work out the details. She can work with Mr. Galloway and his architect over the next couple weeks to make sure the architect submits a design that is consistent with what the Board is looking for. Chairman Newman said we want to see the window pattern and general detail of the front and how the roof is handled. If his intentions are to emulate what you see in those house, he should be able to address it all with Ms. Kelly and get it resolved pretty easily. Ms. Kelly asked if the portico have some relationship to the front somehow? Yes said Chairman Newman. Mr. Peitz said in his motion we need to have specific bullet points since we won't see it again.

Maxine Lutz of Historic Beaufort Foundation (HBF) expressed the opinions of the Preservation Committee. We've had the same concerns as staff regarding the overall mass of the addition and now it's almost double a small house. She was hoping Chairman Newman would have addressed a reconfiguration to make it look less

intrusive, like he has done on past projects. This also will set a precedent for others, she said. Chairman Newman addressed the scale and the mass by saying that we don't have some classic little Beaufort house sitting here and are putting something on it that will overwhelm it and ruin the over scale. But we have a very simple commercial structure and next to it is going to be a monstrous building which will dwarf this. Chairman Newman feels this will in no way be out of scale. She also asked parking and overflow. Ms. Kelly said the amount of square footage is going to be on site is 4,000 or 5,000 square feet. She asked if Mr. Galloway has any ideas for additional parking. Mr. Galloway said on-street parking. Ms. Dickerson asked why the applicant isn't using the Bailey Bill. Ms. Kelly said it's a tax assessment freeze for properties over 50 years old and investing at least 75% of the assessed value into the original structure.

Mr. Galloway said he received a list of requirements he needed to provide from the March 17, 2015 Pre-Application Conference meeting, which I've done.

Mr. Newman said that the HRB only looks at the outside; not involved in fire code, sprinklers, etc.

Mr. Peitz made a motion to grant final approval of the project subject to staff's review with the following conditions:

1. Applicant should reconsider the size, mass, and scale of the addition behind the existing building;
2. Consider possibly changing front door and/or the front window to make them more compatible with the newer buildings that are occurring in or around the Redevelopment Project along Bladen Street
3. That the amount and style of windows also should be compatible with the Redevelopment Project called Midtown in and around Bladen Street; use those as an example when installing the new windows with shutters, if appropriate.
4. Landscaping Plan for the lot that is not being used for the building would be required.

Ms. Laurie said I thought we already talked about and agreed about the mass and scale be approved by staff. **Mr. Peitz amended his motion to say that staff will make final determination of the appropriate size of mass and scale.**

Mr. Galloway said he doesn't want the mass and scale to go before staff for final approval because he is only required to 10' off the property line and side; wants the building the same size.

Ms. Laurie said just delete #1 in the motion.

Mr. Peitz *amended* his motion to withdraw condition #1.

#

Ms. Dickerson said just make it simple by saying the exterior detailing more appropriate.

Mr. Peitz *amended* his motion again to reword #3 to say, that the architectural detailing on the windows and doors of both the existing structure and the new addition are in keeping with the project known as Midtown along Bladen Street.

Ms. Laurie suggested saying, exterior detailing appropriate for surrounding neighborhood.

Ms. Laurie seconded the motion

There being no further business to come before the Board, **Mr. Peitz made a motion, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously.** The meeting adjourned the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

DRAFT