A meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held on **October 14, 2015** at 2:00 p.m. in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Joel Newman, board members Quinn Peitz, Chuck Symes, and Barbara Laurie, and Lauren Kelly.

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 Ms. Laurie, to approve the minutes of the September 10, 2015. Mr. Symes recused himself, as he was not present at the meeting. **The motion to approve as submitted passed 3-0.**

Public Hearing: 771 Ribaut Road – Major Demolition
This structure is circa 1928, Ms. Kelly said. It is not in the Historic District but it is on the Historic Sites Survey. There have been multiple alterations and additions, significantly in 1970, and more since then. Staff feels it's infeasible to move the structure, and staff feels it has not retained "many of its unique and defining characteristics" through the many alterations. Staff recommends final approval as submitted. Since this structure is not in the Historic District, Ms. Kelly said, this comes before the Historic District Review Board, and the Board can approve or deny the demolition; if the demolition is denied, it can be for a period up to 180 days.

Lolita Townsend, 761 Ribaut Road objected to the petition for demolition in her neighborhood and has concerns about changes citywide. The house at 765 Ribaut Road – between her house and this one – had a similar design, and the "core" of it was relocated to Bay and Depot and is now a lovely Lowcountry-style home.

This house had been called structurally unsound, Ms. Townsend said, and she wondered if that applies to the whole house, and if the add-ons could be removed without demolishing the entire house. She feels homes like this add to the city's character. In 2007, council discussed expanding the powers of the HDRB over homes outside the Historic District, but that protection never happened. Ms. Townsend concluded that she questions the practice of "all this new construction" of houses in Beaufort as "progress."

Sally Hendricks lives across the street from Ms. Townsend. She feels that there have been several houses in Beaufort – "even on The Point" – that might not have fit in with the surroundings, but "set the tone and an era, and they were not allowed to do things to them." She feels "Billy Keyserling's old house should not be torn down."

REVIEW OF FULL BOARD PROJECTS
771 Ribaut Road, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 3, Parcel 605, Major Demolition
Applicant: Allen Patterson for Micky Masters (HR15-34)
The applicant is proposing demolition of the existing structure in order to build a new house.

Mr. Patterson said the original intention was to restore the structure, but as they looked at it, there were many issues. It no longer resembles the original house. A lot of structural work needs to be done. Someone just "fixed it up over time." One structure – the garage – is built on the ground, not a foundation. Mr. Patterson said he does a lot of this work, but he doesn't know how to make it like it should be. They didn't want to tear it down, and made the decision after "a lot of work and a lot of agony." They drew up plans to renovate but found it would be "super expensive."

The new house design looks better, Mr. Patterson said, and he knows it changes the complexion of the neighborhood, but it is necessary and will be for the better. The garage will remain, he told Mr. Symes. Mr. Patterson said that foundations and parts of the roof have failed. The new design is 2,633 square ft.

Mr. Peitz asked why this was on the Historic Sites Survey. Ms. Kelly replied that it is at least 50 years old. Every building in the city that is more than over 50 years old wasn't surveyed, so there was some reason that this one was – some of the characteristics – "but it was mostly based on age."

Chairman Newman clarified that the house, which "looks like it's in pretty good condition (per) a windshield survey," is to be demolished, while the garage, "which is sitting on the ground," will remain. Mr. Symes noted that there is a third structure; Ms. Kelly said it will also remain.

Ms. Lutz said that they will not oppose it, and reluctantly agrees to support demolition, though Historic Beaufort Foundation doesn't want to see something from the era this represents go away. She said that they encourage replacement of this house with "a house of modest proportions." **Mr. Peitz moved approval of the application for demolition; Mr. Symes seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Symes said that there are homes "of an era and with a look" that they will want to preserve, and not just those that are in the Historic District proper. He cautioned that this "could be a Pandora's Box." Ms. Laurie said that this is happening in other neighborhoods, too, in that the structure was not kept up properly. When it's in such poor repair, she applauds taking it out when the homeowner can't afford to repair it, and replacing it with something "comparable to the surrounding area." In other parts of the city, Ms. Laurie added, like the Northwest Quadrant, it would not be as easy to do this. Mr. Peitz said repairs can be even more expensive than new construction, as they rip things out and find more issues.

Ms. Kelly said when the idea of expanding the Historic District was considered, a study was done, including homes in Pigeon Point and on North Street and areas of Ribaut Road. It was determined that there was "not enough concentration" to be another district. Mr. Peitz said the survey is going on 20 years old.

Chairman Newman said the requirements of historic designation remove the option to build in-kind and "not settle with a rotted mess that can't be restored." Putting this "historic" umbrella over a structure can mean people are "ruined." It would be nice, he feels, to have the latitude to replace things that are not repairable.

1107 Duke Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 382
New construction
Applicant: Paradise Point Construction (HR15-35)
The applicant wishes to construct a new two-story, single-family residence.

Ms. Kelly said this parcel is in the Northwest Quadrant and is currently vacant. This application is for a new construction. There were 2 one-story cottages on this property, according to the Sanborn map: one pre-1912 and the other between 1912 and 1958 that was demolished in 1997.

The new structure is 2-stories, 1,285 square foot total with 330 square feet of covered porches. There are no zoning or setback issues, Ms. Kelly said. The design meets applicable guidelines. Staff feels the scale and building proportions are appropriate. Staff commented on window glazing and the proportions of solids to void on the side elevations. On the left elevation, there may be an opportunity to add windows in the second bedroom and/or the entry area to "alleviate the unarticulated" side façade. There's another "fairly unarticulated façade" on the right side, and they could add a window in the owner's bedroom and/or in the living area. On the rear elevation, Ms. Kelly said, there may be an opportunity to add a bedroom window, where there is only one. Also, staff feels that they could consider adding a column on the porch to make it more vertically proportioned.

Ms. Kelly said they still need specs for the piers and concrete foundation and the proposed type of underpinning. The Board should address the door material. Staff recommends full approval with Board input on the windows and the rear porch, and submission of the remaining colors and materials during the permit process.

Jenny Evans, the applicant, said they would like to do stucco on the piers and do hog-fencing. Chairman Newman said it's called "hog-boarding"; he explained that instead of lattice under a porch, it is horizontal boards "with a ¾-gap between them." In regard to the windows, Ms. Evans said she and her husband are very amenable to them in the rear elevation. On the right and left elevations, there will be homes on both sides, eventually – there's only one now – so they would rather not have windows in the bedrooms, to ensure privacy. They are open to the column in the back, Ms. Evans said. She prefers the wood front door. If they cannot find one

that's suitable, they would go with fiberglass, if the Board approves, but they prefer wood.

Ms. Laurie asked how what she is intending to do compares to the 2-story house on the corner, and Ms. Evans said it's very similar, and also to "the pink house," which is a 2-story. This house is most similar to the yellow one on the corner. The front elevation will have 3 windows, she said.

Chairman Newman said the yellow house has a nicely done eave; the pork chops are a nice detail, and it is nicer than the simple eave that is on Ms. Evans's drawings. It is also lifted off the ground. When people build slab on grade, Chairman Newman said, it looks better and more traditional when it's lifted to 24" at a minimum, and the porch would then be up off the ground like this yellow house. Railings along the porch are also a nice detail, Chairman Newman feels, and keep it from "just being a box." They make the porch like a room, not "just something hanging out on the street."

If Ms. Evans put a window on the back, Chairman Newman feels it should be like those in the front. He would enlarge the bathroom window and make all 3 of them the same size as the rest of those on the house. In older houses, all the windows were the same size, he said. He feels the column is a must on the back porch. In regard to the bedroom windows on the sides, Chairman Newman said he agrees with staff. There are houses on either side of his, too, and he understands the desire for privacy, but if they add windows, they "will ultimately find that more appealing," and they can add blinds to them for privacy.

The double window looks out of character on this house, Chairman Newman said. Mr. Peitz asked if they should foreshorten the steps, so they don't go all the way across. Chairman Newman said they may base that decision on whether they lift the house; right now, it's a little stark. The fiberglass door could work, he said, but he told Ms. Evans not to "be afraid of a wooden door": he recommended putting in "the real thing" because the owners will be going through it all the time, and the "quality will have an effect on you and your enjoyment of the house."

Ms. Evans said her only concern about raising the house is that it would add cost, as does adding windows. They will not live there, she told Mr. Peitz. Ms. Kelly said they could raise it at least 6" "without having a huge effect." Chairman Newman said he thinks "a little more investment in some detail would raise the threshold" and it also which "raises the bar in a community" where others will see what they've done and "make a little bit more effort" on their own homes. As a single image, Chairman Newman said, the comparable yellow house offers "curb appeal," and he suggested that Ms. Evans try to get to this house to that level.

Ms. Evans said they have talked about the railings on the porch. Ms. Laurie asked if it would be a long-term rental, and Ms. Evans said they plan to sell it.

Mr. Symes asked if it falls within the setback because he's concerned that "it's a little bit close to the curb." It seems like it could be set back a few more feet from the sidewalk "to look nicer," he feels. He gave the example of houses on King Street that "are too close" to the sidewalk. Ms. Evans said there is an existing concrete slab that used to be a porch, so those lines are what the positioning is based on. Chairman Newman said they are forward of the adjacent structure. Ms. Evans said they could move the house back; there's plenty of room at the back of the lot.

Mr. Symes asked if the windows were the old style, with a sill. Ms. Kelly said they are simulated divided lite windows. Chairman Newman said all new windows are in a clad frame but can be trimmed out to have a sill. Ms. Evans said they will all be fully trimmed out. Chairman Newman said a modern window doesn't have a projected sill – it's in a frame and the sill is added on.

Ms. Evans said she agreed to the setback, if it's at least to where the concrete is now, or, she asked, would the Board prefer a particular footage? Mr. Symes said roughly 2'–3' would give the house more room, though that might not work with the slab. The corner house, Mr. Symes said, is about 6' back.

Ms. Kelly said parking is on the street.

Ms. Lutz thanked Ms. Evans on behalf of Historic Beaufort Foundation for this new construction in the Northwest Quadrant. They agree with staff and Chairman Newman that there should be more detail, agree about the columns, and would love to see sills and fenestration of the windows to make them "pop out a little bit." Also, Ms. Lutz said, "We don't typically give permission for double windows to be next to each other like that," so she urged the Board to ask for space between them, as well. Chairman Newman said it looks like there is about 4" of trim between them. Ms. Lutz said HBF also agreed about the column on the back, the 3 windows of the same size across the back, and the 3 windows in the front. Those details will add value to the house, Ms. Lutz said, and Ms. Evans said they "want to add value to the community as well."

Mr. Symes said there are a lot of old cottages in the area of this house, but the 2-stories are blending in. Ms. Evans said that they had thought of that, but the lot is narrow. Mr. Peitz said variation in styles is preferred.

Ms. Evans and the Board discussed the suggestions that had been made: add a rear column; bring steps in to work well; add a rear window and make all windows the same size; make the setback further back; add detail on the front (pork chop eave) and definitely porch railings; separate the double windows into at least two that are apart from each other; strongly consider more windows on the sides, raising the house 6", and stucco on the piers.

Mr. Peitz made a motion for final approval, with the applicant working with staff, based on comments made by the Board, to complete the project. Mr. Symes seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

1411 Duke Street. Identified as District R120. Tax Map 4. Parcel 343
Alterations, Additions
Applicant: Nichole Myers (HR15-36)
The applicant is requesting approval to construct a fence (post facto) and create a parking area for horse carriages.
Mr. Symes made a motion, seconded by Ms. Laurie, to approve the request. The motion passed unanimously.

509 Carteret Street. Identified as District R120. Tax Map 4. Parcel 734
Change After Certification
Applicant: Montgomery Architecture + Planning for J.H. Hiers (HR15-37)
The applicant is requesting to amend their previous approval to add two shed dormers to this structure.

This is the Von Harten Building, Ms. Kelly said, and is a request to add 2 shed dormers. Staff recommends approval. Historic Beaufort Foundation agrees that it needs light added to it, if there is to be residential use. Mr. Peitz asked if the dormers are in line with each other. **Robert Montgomery** said they are not. The south elevation is blocked by the Chocolate Tree. **Mr. Symes moved to accept the modifications as presented. Ms. Laurie seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

301 Laurens Street. Identified as District R120. Tax Map 4. Parcel 579
Alterations, Additions
Applicant: Allison Ramsey Architects for Michael & Roberta McNally (HR15-38)
Applicant is requesting approval for alterations and additions to this structure to include additions to the front and rear of a master bedroom and modifying the parapet roofs on both the addition side and east side.

This structure is circa 1870, and it is contributing, Ms. Kelly said. The applicant would like final approval for additions to the front and rear of the master bedroom on the west side and modifying the parapet roofs on the addition side and on the east side. This building was originally a store, Ms. Kelly said, and the wings and rear evolved. The porch was an addition as well. 206 additional square feet are proposed. Staff feels size, mass, etc. are appropriate, and the change to a pitch roof is a benefit. Ms. Kelly said there is a question of whether the proposed materials are to match the historic structure, and **Mike McNally** said yes. Ms. Kelly said staff recommends final approval as submitted.

Ms. Lutz said Historic Beaufort Foundation likes what's proposed and sees that they put in "that board that we mentioned" to differentiate between the new and the old. Mr. McNally said there's interesting history. It was a store in 1825 with wide pine

floors and fireplaces. In the mid-1800s, another family bought it and added a big dining room, blew a hole in the back of the store, and added a bedroom. It probably had a shed roof. At the turn of the twentieth century, they increased the footprint and put on a flat roof instead of the gable (which is what Allison Ramsey plans to do). They have realized there are no closets. **Mr. Peitz moved approval as submitted; Mr. Symes seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

HDRB PURVIEW OVER DOCKS

Mr. Symes said that he had requested that they talk about the docks – so that everyone knows what the responsibilities are for docks in the Historic District. He lives in The Point, and there is a lot of concern about the Board's authority. Ms. Kelly put out an email that details the issue, but he would like it summarized. He said he has questions.

Ms. Kelly said the city's understanding of the HDRB purview is that they can look at any aesthetic component: materials, how high it is, handrails, if there are buildings permitted at the front or the end of it and what they look like, if it has a boat lift, and if it is lit. HDRB has no purview over where the dock is located, or if a dock can be located there.

Mr. Peitz asked, if a dock is built, and it blocks someone's view, does the HDRB have authority over it? Ms. Kelly said HDRB has no authority over view sheds on private property. Mr. Peitz asked, if someone kayaks, for example, and their maneuverability is affected by a dock being built, can the HDRB speak to it? Chairman Newman said that was addressed in a packet of information Ms. Kelly had sent out. The pilings have to be spread apart by about 20', and have allowance to raise a portion of the dock from 3' to 4'. Mr. Peitz said one of the issues is of length. If the length adversely affects where someone lives, can the HDRB determine the dock length? He was told that the Board has no purview by everyone.

Mr. Peitz said, if someone wants a 1,000-foot dock, and they have a permit, the HDRB cannot deny that. Ms. Kelly said OCRM would not approve that unless that was the closest distance to the water. They have their limits. Mr. Peitz clarified that the HDRB has no purview over dock lengths. After reading the city attorney's opinion, it's the docks' length that is causing so much acrimony, he feels, because it will affect people's quality of life.

Mr. Symes asked if the HDRB has purview over whether a dock has railings or not. Ms. Kelly believes it does, but they haven't had many docks, she said. There are circumstances where OCRM doesn't require railings, and if it's not an OCRM requirement, then it is in the purview of the HDRB. If OCRM requires a 3' railing, the HDRB "can decide what it looks like."

Mr. Symes asked about boatlifts or gazebos: does the Board determine whether someone can have them on a dock, or just what they can look like? Ms. Kelly said HDRB has historically had authority over those. Chairman Newman said DHEC

doesn't decide if you can have a boatlift. If you have a dock, the community or the city decides if you can have that. Ms. Kelly said the city has no dock rules – except for things like "accessory structures" which would apply to a gazebo.

Ms. Townsend asked what the criteria are for "a fancy gazebo"; Ms. Kelly said that is what HDRB decides: they can evaluate the impact of that gazebo on the Historic District. Ms. Lutz asked if the HDRB has purview over lighting, and Ms. Kelly said yes. Ms. Lutz asked if "the one that got approval" came to the review Board or was approved by staff. Chairman Newman said he thought that the Board had reviewed it, and when there were changes, it went to staff. Some discussion, Chairman Newman said, was about where it was on the property. Ms. Kelly said she knows that the Board had approved the dock but denied the boatlift and lighting.

Cheryl Neison asked if the city was relying on the city attorney's "interpretation" about docks, or if there were other guidelines. Ms. Kelly said the city attorney interprets what elements the HDRB can address and what its "purview is over specific items." The Board would use the Preservation Manual and supplement for their intent (rather than the letter) to ensure those elements are "in keeping with the Historic District." Ms. Neison said she's interested in the design/visage/structure, which is in the Board's purview. Ms. Kelly said the city attorney had determined that the city's ordinance provides the HDRB with purview over the docks because of the role of the HDRB in the Historic District. The city attorney has affirmed the boundaries of the ordinance.

Liz Namerow said **Scott Sonoc** had sued the state, and his first dock is "not to be changed," and she understands that, in regard to its size and design, "it's over." She asked if there are lights and railings on it, and how much of that dock has been approved. Ms. Namerow feels this has an impact on all of Beaufort, not just those in the HD. It takes away the "serenity" of the area to see 2 big docks there, when their boats could be at the marinas. She said this is an example of "aggressive greed." What Mr. Sonoc is doing is not making a community dock for all of The Point, Ms. Namerow said, and even if it were, it would still not be historically or aesthetically appealing, but more understandable. She is concerned that now there's a precedent that there can be docks all the way along the river to its east side. Ms. Namerow suggested that the HDRB might be able to "keep off the ugly aesthetic elements" like rails. This is a "huge alteration to what Beaufort is."

Chairman Newman said Mr. Sonoc has a permit for the one dock, but the Board has not reviewed the other dock, for which Mr. Sonoc has applied to OCRM and expects to get it. Ms. Lutz said staff decided the first dock's design. Mr. Peitz said HDRB approved the dock at a certain length, and then Mr. Sonoc wanted it to be longer, so he amended his state application, and then it went to court. The city attorney said that court's decision trumped everything else, so it didn't have to come back to the HDRB.

Chairman Newman said the Board approved the short dock, not the 300' dock, but the long dock was approved by the court, and is to have the same design. Ms. Lutz said she thought it came back with a gazebo and a boatlift. Ms. Kelly said it came back with a proposed boatlift and lighting. Staff had said that if the dock didn't have the lift or lighting, and retained the same design as the shorter dock that the Board had approved, then staff would approve it.

There was more general discussion of the steps that had occurred. According to Mr. Peitz, the first dock came to the Board, "X" was approved, Mr. Sonoc sued the state, and then a judge approved "Y," as long as Mr. Sonoc didn't change the aesthetics. The presumption is that it's done, Mr. Peitz said.

Ms. Neison said Mr. Sonoc's application for a second dock is at OCRM, and there are at least 2 more homeowners who want to do the same thing. The handrails are approved now, so she asked if now his second dock, and other docks, will automatically be granted handrails because the precedent is set. Chairman Newman said they probably will. The precedent is with DHEC because they "allowed a situation that shouldn't have been allowed." Mr. Sonoc sued for a right, he said.

Chairman Newman said his opinion about this dock is that it is inappropriate. There are no docks there, characteristically, because, in the past, the people who lived in The Point were natives and realized that a 300' dock is impractical. People who use a boat regularly have it on a trailer in their yard and they put in at landings. Many houses in The Point are now occupied by people from elsewhere who look at the river as an asset, and they see a dock as adding to its value, but Chairman Newman believes it's a liability – "not just to the community, but for the owner." It will cost $100,000, he estimates, to build a 300' dock, and it will immediately start to deteriorate. Mr. Sonoc has 3 boat landings within 5 minutes of his property, and 2 marinas "almost within eyesight" of it; if he is going to have a yacht, it would be much more sensible to have it at a marina, because they are being watched, and it is cheaper. This is impractical, Chairman Newman said, and that's why the people who lived there 50 years ago would put a 50' dock to a creek, but not in navigable water near the bridge. He thinks "it will look worse than anybody even thinks" because the dock will have to extend beyond the grass and mud to get to navigable water.

A member of the public asked, since the precedent has now been set, if the docks that will be there will be of different sizes and with different accouterments: gazebos, boat lifts, etc. Is there any way they can be consistent? Chairman Newman said that the only purview that is allowed for this Board is those sorts of details – the aesthetics of the docks. Chairman Newman said they will have to be lengths that get them to navigable water.

Mr. Peitz suggested lobbying city council, talking to staff, a devising a proposal, if the community wants uniformity in the docks. People could get a study group together to determine how to amend the ordinance for uniformity, more definition and design review for docks.

Ms. Lutz asked **Reed Armstrong**, Coastal Conservation League, if DHEC will take one person having two docks into consideration, and Mr. Armstrong said that DHEC generally wouldn't allow 2 docks on one lot, but these docks are on separate lots. OCRM denied the first permit, but the court approved it.

Ms. Neison explained the history of both docks: Mr. Sonoc bought the property at 400 Port Republic Street, got permission for the short dock, then bought 500 Port Republic Street and went for approval of a dock there, was denied, and that is what was settled on. Now Mr. Sonoc wants to replace the short dock at 400 Port Republic Street and go to 306' out. Mr. Armstrong said the first permit Mr. Sonoc applied for was for an existing dock; he wanted to extend the length of it. The second one is a new dock. The previous owner of 400 Port Republic Street had applied for a dock that would extend into the Beaufort River and was denied. Then he sold the property to Mr. Sonoc, who put in a new application.

Chairman Newman said the handrails and uniformity are the least of the problems; the issue is that a dock of this size in this location is inappropriate, but these are private properties in the city, not a planned community with covenants, so the city may not be able to create a dock ordinance. Mr. Armstrong said the county has a dock ordinance that restricts length, but no municipalities have a similar ordinances for residential properties. The city could adopt a dock ordinance, Mr. Armstrong said. A property owner can get a dock permit from OCRM, then apply to the county for its construction. If they have a dock permit, they can advertise the property for sale, but then, when the new owner wants to build a dock, they may be denied. Mr. Armstrong said an OCRM permit is usually for 5 years. Ms. Neison was told that Mr. Sonoc doesn't need county approval because it's in the city, which didn't adopt the county's dock ordinance.

Ms. Kelly said there would be a public hearing on November 9 at OCRM about the dock. The meeting may be at City Hall. Ms. Namerow asked if the property owner will be present. Ms. Kelly said she didn't know. Ms. Namerow asked what court Mr. Sonoc had sued in; Mr. Armstrong said that it was a state administrative law court in Columbia.

Chairman Newman said those who object to the docks only have "social leverage" to use against Mr. Sonoc, and Ms. Neison said, "He doesn't care." Chairman Newman said he's curious about whether such a dock is an asset or liability from a real estate perspective. Ms. Lutz said the realtor for Mr. Sonoc's property had told her "he's all for it."

RECOMMENDATION ON PROPOSED DOWNTOWN HOLIDAY LIGHTING FIXTURES

Chairman Newman said he couldn't care less about Christmas lights. Mr. Symes said the proposed lighting "needs work." He finds it "sort of acceptable in the daytime." Staff needs "to look around a little harder."

Ms. Lutz said, "It's plastic," and "really bad-looking plastic." Ms. Kelly said the city used to do candy cane lights, but the poles are different now. Ms. Kelly told them to send her pictures of what they thought would look better. She had suggested the kind that isn't as visible during the day. Ms. Lutz said the stars that had been used on Boundary Street in the past were "retro" looking, which was more appealing than what's on offer now.

DATE FOR NOVEMBER HDRB MEETING

Ms. Kelly said the meeting next month is on November 11, which is Veterans' Day, so she asked if it could be November 18, instead. It was agreed that a Friday meeting might work.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 3:38 p.m.

DRAFT