

#

A meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held on **August 12, 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 city planner Libby Anderson. Erica Dickerson 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 2:01 p.m.

MINUTES

Mr. Symes made a motion, second by Mr. Peitz, to approve the minutes of the June 10, 2015 meeting. The motion to approve the minutes as written passed unanimously.

Mr. Peitz made a motion, second by Mr. Symes, to approve the minutes of the July 8, 2015 meeting. The motion to approve the minutes as written passed unanimously.

Mr. Peitz made a motion to change the order of the agenda, second by Mr. Symes. The motion passed unanimously.

1508 Duke Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 442

Alterations, Additions

Applicant: William Galloway (BB15-05)

The applicant is proposing alterations and additions to the original structure. The applicant is requesting approval of the Bailey Bill application for the work being done.

Ms. Anderson explained the Bailey Bill as an incentive. This project appeared before the HDRB in May of 2015, and the board approved it with the condition that the shutters fit the windows and have operable hardware, or that they be removed if that can't be achieved. Staff feels the work improves the streetscape and makes the non-contributing structure more compatible, Ms. Anderson said. It's an improvement overall to the area. Staff recommends approval of the Bailey Bill application. **Ms. Laurie made a motion to accept this project as submitted, indicating that the applicant has met all requirements. Mr. Peitz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

PUBLIC HEARING: 808 Scott Street

Requesting a development design exception to reduce the lot size requirement from 4,000 square feet to 2,836 square feet

Ms. Anderson said this property in the Historic District/Old Commons and is zoned TBR–Old Commons. The owner would like to subdivide it into two lots and is requesting a development design exception. The lot size would be reduced by 30% with the

#

subdivision. This board has the authority to grant these types of exceptions, Ms. Anderson said. The request is for a waiver of the lot area requirement. All other standards/zoning requirements would still apply. All public notice was made. One public comment came in via email, and Ms. Anderson mailed it to the board and the applicant.

Ms. Anderson showed the 1912 Sanborn map, which indicates that the parcel was once divided into two lots. The proposed subdivision would permit a structure to be built and to face Washington Street within the setbacks. Two parking spaces would be allowed, and they would be accessed off of Scott Street. This is a corner lot, and it can be anchored with a structure. **Lauren Kelly**, who wrote the staff report, feels the two-story form with the corner porch would be appropriate for the neighborhood.

In regard to compatibility with conforming uses, Ms. Anderson said staff feels the proposed design exception is appropriate for the location and generally compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood and should add to – not detract from – the value of other properties in the neighborhood. No other variances are being requested. Neither the design nor the lot reduction appears likely to have any adverse impact.

The proposed design exception adheres to the Comprehensive Plan, the Civic Master Plan, and other city plans, Ms. Anderson said. It creates an infill opportunity and restores a streetscape; the city is focused on doing that with its plans, she said. Staff recommends approval of the subdivision. The building design will need to come back to the Historic District Review Board for final review.

Michael Green, 708 Green Street, said he knows “this is a four-integer change,” meaning that it will “(lop) four figures off of” the lot size. Chairman Newman said there is an allowable variance for this. Ms. Anderson said she believes it’s 30% in a development design exception, which is a form of a variance. The Historic District Review Board hears this type of exception. Mr. Green asked if doing this is “a regular thing.” Ms. Anderson said she thinks there has been at least one other development design exception for this board and a couple for the other boards, like the Zoning Board of Appeals. If the lot size reduction is 30% or less, the design boards can approve it. Mr. Green asked, “How often (is) 1300 square feet lopped off a lot?” Ms. Anderson said the design exception process gives design review boards the ability to give a variance of up to 35%.

REVIEW OF FULL BOARD PROJECTS

808 Scott Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 417

Development Design Exception

Applicant: Allison Ramsey Architects for Richard O’Connor (DE15-01)

The applicant is requesting approval to reduce the lot size in order construct a new single-family home.

#

Chairman Newman said all that's being reviewed is the lot, not the architectural content of the lot. Ms. Anderson said they should look at the site plan and consider conditions could be put on it, such as no additional variances. Mr. Peitz and Chairman Newman discussed access via steps from both streets on the corner on which this sits. Chairman Newman said the way the stair is set up now makes sense to him, but if the structure could be entered another way, it would become a "hallway." Ms. Anderson said it's one lot, and if it's subdivided, it will get a Washington Street address, if the structure is facing it. Per the Sanborn map, a structure once faced Washington Street, so that's what they would want to do. Mr. Peitz said staff approval of the design exception was based in part on it doing so, and this would finish the streetscape.

Ms. Laurie asked what the owner of the lot was planning to do with the new house. Ms. Anderson said the applicant might be able to answer that. Ms. Laurie asked where the parking would be, and Ms. Anderson showed her that it is stacked parking in the back, not on the street. Mr. Symes asked if the site plan meets the requirements for impervious surface. Ms. Anderson said the applicant might be able to answer that. Ms. Anderson reiterated that the board might put reasonable conditions on its approval.

Mr. Symes said initially he thought the subdivided lot would be too small to put another house on. Now he feels it's possible to subdivide and put a house on it. However, he believes that the conceptual drawing of a house that might be proposed that the board was given "is too massive to put there." Mr. Peitz said he's supportive of the subdivision if it meets the city's requirements. At one time, it was two lots, and this doesn't change the historic fabric of the neighborhood. Mr. Peitz said he's "deferring the concept for a variety of reasons," and staff had told the board that they could discuss it further, "particularly if it has to come back to us," but, he said, he's open to ideas about changing it. He thinks for it to be a part of the streetscape of Washington, it should have steps on that side.

Chairman Newman said the aerial context map has a number of very small lots in the neighborhood, including directly across the street on Washington. It's not out of character with the neighborhood at all. It doesn't appear too big to him. Lots across the street on Scott are deeper but very narrow. He has no objection to it. Architecturally, it carries off the presence on both streets and has nice faces/presence on both streets. Where the steps come up makes no difference to him.

Ms. Laurie said looking at the neighborhood in general and how it looked in the past, there's a new two-story purple house between Congress and Green Streets, and it has been put in a very small space. As long as staff and the board are looking at the requirements that are already documented in terms of policy and procedures, though she has some concerns about large houses in little spaces, if staff and the city support that, then that's what they have to go by.

#

Ms. Anderson said before the meeting, they had mentioned 1102 Duke Street, which is fairly new on an 1800 square foot lot. She showed a photo.

Chairman Newman asked for a motion. Ms. Laurie asked for clarification of what they are doing. There's an "L"-shaped lot, Chairman Newman said, with a house on it on Scott Street, and the applicant is asking to subdivide the leg of the lot.

Mr. Symes moved to approve the subdivision of the lot and that no additional waivers or variance made. Mr. Peitz said that based on Mr. Symes' motion, that house would still fit on the lot. Ms. Anderson said she doesn't know about the amount of impervious surface on this property; the limit is 50%. The applicant said he doesn't know the amount, either. Mr. Peitz said he wanted the applicant to understand that he might have to have a smaller house if the amount of impervious surface in this plan is too great.

214 New Street, District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 958

Alterations, Additions

Applicant: Montgomery Planning & Architecture (HR15-23)

The applicant is requesting approval for alterations and additions to the structure.

Ms. Anderson showed photos of the structure, the Hepworth-Pringle House, in The Point, which dates back to 1760 and is contributing. There have been several alterations over the years, she said. The lot is on the corner of New and Port Republic Streets. The applicant would like conceptual approval for modifying a 1950s infilled porch into a hyphen, adding windows back into another 1950s infilled porch, and adding a 650 square foot addition to the west side.

Ms. Anderson showed the site plan for the proposed project and gave the dimensions of the house and the addition. She said Ms. Kelly had prepared the review. Ms. Kelly feels the general size, scale and mass is appropriate. She appreciates the effort to bring back the unsympathetically infilled porches. Ms. Kelly had asked if any trees would need to be removed as part of the project. **Robert Montgomery**, the architect, said a few trees need to come out. He said there's been no tree or topo survey done yet, but they have identified two 10-12" palmettos and two loquat trees that need to be removed. Staff sees no issues with the trees, Ms. Anderson said.

Ms. Kelly had asked if the 5' porch off the master bedroom could be made wider – at least 8', if possible – to be more functional and more in keeping with the house's history. Also, curved steps don't seem to be in keeping with the orthogonal nature of the house or the axial nature of the landscaping plan, Ms. Kelly had noted, according to Ms. Anderson. Though it is not part of the conceptual approval, Ms. Kelly hoped all of the windows would have similar lite patterns and proportions to those in the existing house. Staff recommends conceptual approval of the project with discussion of concerns outlined in the staff report.

#

Mr. Montgomery said his clients have a garden shed that is a part of the submittal that wasn't mentioned in Ms. Kelly's comments. It would be held within the 5' setback requirement, and there would be an 8' screened fence to be introduced on the west side of the site. It would turn at the parking area, and they would like to have it close at the building but be behind the parking, not on the road. All the heights are designed to engage a garden structure that's modeled after a dovecot, he said.

Mr. Peitz asked what the exterior siding would be, and Mr. Montgomery said it would be clapboard siding. They would like to use hardie plank on the new part of the building. The form of the addition would be the same as the original house, which he speculated was heart pine. There's a little bit of difference in the sizes that were mentioned.

Mr. Montgomery said they're adding 1510 square feet total from a footprint standpoint. Chairman Newman said a little piece would be removed, where the hyphen will be built. Mr. Montgomery said it is, because otherwise, it would be hard to do what they want to do on that structure.

Mr. Montgomery showed the existing conditions on a drawing. Mr. Peitz asked Mr. Montgomery if he agrees with staff's comments. Mr. Montgomery said no, because he "drew it this way" for a reason. The porch is a covered walk, he said. The owners are "very keen on the garden and the relationship of the building to the site," so they have developed a major axis that runs east to west in the body of the garden into a cross axis, which would have a dribbling birdbath to add white noise to the outdoor sitting area. Splitting the garden in two, they would do more formal plantings in front of the existing structure, Mr. Montgomery said, and have "a little more free-form lawn associated with the new wing." The walkway with steps up would also be a balcony for the bedroom, offering some screening for it from the southern property, as well as softening the mass of the building to the garden.

In regard to the curved steps, Mr. Montgomery said he knows it's not rectilinear, but the public would never see it from any vista, and it fits in with the more organic side of the garden – to the path to the garden shed – and gives access to the parking area.

Mr. Montgomery said in regard to changing out the windows on what had been an enclosed porch, the hyphen would reuse an enclosed porch from the 1950s, and they are putting in a major entrance on the north side that was original to the building when it was built in the 1700s. He referred to a study from the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation and said putting the double-hung windows between a logical pilaster to "represent those structural elements of the former porch" ends up with a four-by-three sash vs. the three-by-three sash on the ground floor and a three-by-two sash in the dormers. Mr. Montgomery said they felt that proportionately, the size of the lites and panes fit well, and he also likes the idea of their identification of the next generation of construction in a multi-generational building.

#

Mr. Peitz asked if a neighbor could see the garden. Mr. Montgomery said one of the neighbors could. Mr. Peitz asked if the southern neighbor would have an opportunity to look at the plans. Mr. Montgomery said that neighbor has extra screening in the form of a fence so as to not see into this lot. It's very dense with overgrowth. Mr. Peitz feels that they can put their own signature on the building that may not be identical to 1771 but can be compatible. He doesn't have a problem with the smaller porch or with the curved steps because no one can see it, and the owners – who will live there – want it. Though he usually supports staff, “this will not affect how the citizens of Beaufort see this, because they *won't* see it.”

Mr. Symes said he thinks it's “really nice and well designed.” His only concern is the twelve-over-twelves vs. the nine-over-nines. He would prefer the latter, which seems like the standard in the neighborhood, but he doesn't think that's a deal breaker since they can't be seen. Chairman Newman said the place where the new windows will go was a porch, so it's a new use. He agrees with Mr. Montgomery that “the pane size is a better matchup than some relevant number of this-over-that.”

Chairman Newman asked if the fence can be on the lot line, or if it has to be 5' off the line. Ms. Anderson said the maximum height for a fence in the setback is 6', but it has to be out of the setback to be 8'. Chairman Newman asked if it could be 8' if it's behind the setback, and Ms. Anderson said yes. Chairman Newman said he feels that on these properties, “that's a room out there,” so he would put the fence on the lot line, “and put my room where I had access to it.” Mr. Montgomery said the owner likes it in this location because he is planning plantings on this side and is worried about noise from Carteret Street. The fence, plus dense vegetation, can absorb noise. It drops to 4' when it goes to either side of the parking, he said. The lot behind the concrete house goes all the way to Bay Street. Ms. Anderson said the shed would have to have hydrostatic vents because this is in the flood zone.

Chairman Newman said they had a project years ago that broke the issue of hardie materials. He believes that the deal is that if a new house is built, hardie materials could be used, but “if you are doing work in a strongly historical context,” you need “to use traditional, fast-rotting material.” Chairman Newman said the concept is being approved here, but they could bring something forward like that. Mr. Peitz asked if they could consider artisan hardie plank. Chairman Newman said **Ansley Manuel** had brought in a house to the Historic District Review Board and made a physical painted sample of the artisan hardie plank, and the Historic District Review Board had approved it, because it was going on a brand new structure. Chairman Newman said Mr. Montgomery has done such a project, too, on a completely new structure, but the feeling is, “in a highly historical context,” they “need to keep the materiality of it real.” Mr. Peitz said he appreciates the context of this building, and Mr. Montgomery said it's on the tax rolls as the oldest house in town.

#

Chairman Newman said that if **Maxine Lutz** were here, they would ask her for her comments, but since she wasn't, he asked Mr. Symes, who said Historic Beaufort Foundation is "happy with all of it." Chairman Newman suggested that Mr. Montgomery could go to Historic Beaufort Foundation and ask them about the windows and hardie material. Mr. Montgomery said it's "such a clean, bright material," which is why he had broached the subject. He'd love to use a PermaCast column and AZEK rail, too. Chairman Newman joked that such an idea was "crazy." Mr. Montgomery said he understands that that is not in keeping with the context.

Mr. Symes asked what the alternatives are besides conceptual approval. Mr. Montgomery said that Ms. Kelly had said he had enough for preliminary approval. **Mr. Peitz moved that the board give preliminary approval to the project as submitted. Mr. Symes seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

1100 Boundary Street, Identified as District R120 Tax Map 4, Parcel 68

Applicant: Charlie Calvert for Bridges Charter School (HR15-26)

Ms. Anderson said the applicant wishes to extend their time frame for receiving final approval for a permanent building for nine months, until May of 2016.

Bridges Charter School is located in the former Boys and Girls Club, Ms. Anderson said. In August last year, the school had applied with the HDRB to put in two temporary classrooms. Approval was conditional, and they were given twelve months for a final plan for a new building, so the trailers could be removed and construction completed in three years. The year is up, Ms. Anderson said, but they are "not quite ready for approval," so they are requesting an extension until May of next year.

Ms. Laurie asked when public hearings are indicated. Ms. Anderson said they are required for demolitions and design exceptions. All other projects are reviewed at a public meeting, and the public may come and comment; the applications are put online. Public hearings are "few and far between." Ms. Laurie said this was not a design exception, and Ms. Anderson said that's correct. Ms. Laurie said she had had concerns about the modular units a year ago, and "to have them there even longer is a problem" for her. Chairman Newman said Bridges was given permission to have the modular units for three years, and in one year, the school was to have given the board a permanent plan. They are not considering extending the time the units are there, just the time until the board will review the replacement structures. If approved, Bridges would be given nine more months to come up with a game plan to bring to the board for review. **Mr. Symes moved to approve the request to extend the submission of a conceptual plan to be approved by the Historic District Review Board by May 2016. Mr. Peitz seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

209 West Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 923

New Construction

#

Applicant: Beaufort Design Build (HR15-24)

The applicant is requesting approval for a new residential building.

209 West Street is in the Core Commercial district in the downtown area, Ms. Anderson said. This is a new building proposed to go on a vacant parcel adjacent to Old Bull Tavern. Ms. Anderson said an 1894 map shows that the lot has had buildings on it, but it has been vacant since at least 1912.

Ms. Anderson showed the elevations. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for a new mixed-use building, with commercial use on the ground floor and residential uses above. The footprint is just over 3000 square feet, the second floor is the same, and the third is stepped back, as the ordinance requires, and contains a little over 1200 square feet. The façade is 32' above sidewalk grade and increases to 45' to the median roof height at the stepped-back third floor. The maximum height is 50', but it has to be stepped back, and Ms. Kelly has determined that this meets that requirement. Ms. Kelly and Ms. Anderson are very excited about the project and believe it will be a great addition to the downtown area.

Ms. Anderson described the buildings that surround this lot. Across the street, they are one-story, but there are two-story and multi-story buildings around it. As a commercial structure, the building needs to be either elevated or flood-proofed because it's in the flood zone, and the applicant has chosen the latter option. All of the elements are compatible with the Historic District, Ms. Anderson noted. Height has always been an issue there, so they "appreciate the effort to step the building back . . . and also to use lighter materials on the third story." Ms. Kelly and **Adam Biery** worked together on the open stair rear for "egress from the upper stories in lieu of a stair tower." Staff recommends approval of the site plan and the building as submitted, Ms. Anderson said.

Mr. Peitz asked if there were parking requirements with projects in the downtown core. Ms. Anderson said there are not; a hotel with 26 guest units or more would need to have a plan for onsite parking, but it's not necessary for this project.

Chairman Newman said the only difficulty he had with the building would be the center apartment upstairs because he "can't live (somewhere) that I can't see out of." He thought the rest of the plan was "really lovely." Mr. Peitz said the last time the board had looked at a project to build a big building downtown, "we were quite critical of that." Chairman Newman said he had planned to make a similar comment, and he would love to have Mr. Biery design a similar project for **Dick Stewart**: their submission was "a big, important, spectacular site, and just an appalling building." Mr. Peitz said, "This is what we should be doing in the downtown . . . This really fits."

Ms. Laurie said this looks like the City Marketplace, where apartments used to be when there was a department store downstairs. Chairman Newman said what Mr. Biery has done is exactly what they had told Mr. Stewart's architect, which is that the board

#

needed, first of all, “to see your building in context.” Instead, the board was shown “banal elevations of a building that was ‘Somewhere, USA’ with zero context around it.” That was what the board made “99% of our comments” about, Chairman Newman said. “Here you can see direct correlation with the scale and the lines of the things that are happening,” around this building, he told Mr. Biery, and “you can see plainly how it correlates to the scale of things next to it . . . You nailed that as well.”

Mr. Symes said he thinks it’s “a fantastic building to put in there” and is “well-designed.” The Historic Beaufort Foundation was “all happy with it,” too. Mr. Symes said he assumes the building goes to the property line on the east side, and they will have to cut out “three huge trees that are back there.” Mr. Biery said that they didn’t have permission yet, but he’d spoken to Ms. Kelly about it, and she foresaw no problem with it. The arborist told them that the trees are 24” “hackberries.”

Mr. Symes asked about the stairs, which were the issue that Historic Beaufort Foundation had with the project. He said he doesn’t know a solution, but he finds them “extremely visible.” Mr. Biery said he knows that. He said they are not showing the trash enclosure on the lower level. Mr. Symes said he understands that, but getting up to the third story will be visible for everyone. Mr. Biery said the third floor has the elevator, and the second-floor tenants will be using the stairs. Mr. Peitz said he much prefers them being open to enclosing them and making the building more bulky. Mr. Peitz said the other project they’d referred to earlier was “an abomination,” and given modern building standards, he’d much rather see the stairs open.

Chairman Newman said he had a question related to the stair and to the windows across the east elevation. Currently, there’s a one-story building behind it, “but there’s no zoning or anything that would stop the guy who owns the property behind” this one from tearing it down and building “two stories with a penthouse on top,” and then the back apartment would be like the middle apartment – all closed in, he said. Chairman Newman said he understands why Mr. Biery did this that way, but he asked if Mr. Biery had considered *not* doing three units upstairs. Chairman Newman said the stairway is in the back anyway, so the circulation and access would be on the east side, traditionally, and then the apartments would have frontage on the north, south, and west. They would never lose access to the outside: “Putting that core and that circulation on the back would secure that forever and ever,” and none of the apartments would be “down.”

Chairman Newman thinks this “could be three great apartments” for those who wanted to live downtown, away from the bar scene, and that “might be slightly more valuable than four apartments where one of them, quite frankly, is a dog” and could only be a short-term rental. That apartment on the back “could completely use its eyesight,” he said. Changing this design would also give Mr. Biery the opportunity to change the stairs, to use it as a back porch and a stair circulation. Those kinds of stairs are “unwieldy things,” Chairman Newman feels, and could be more integral to the entire

#

width of the back: "You haven't lost anything, and you have zero risk of something changing behind you." Chairman Newman said he would never buy the back apartment if they were made into condos, because he wouldn't want a door on one side that people walk by to get to their unit, and a couple windows in the back, but the risk that all the other windows might be lost some day. Mr. Biery acknowledged that it's a zero lot line. Chairman Newman said they "might gain a lot of value at the end of the day."

Mr. Biery asked if they could get preliminary approval. Chairman Newman said they could, and they could come back to the board for just one more meeting to get final approval. Implementing changes could be addressed at that meeting. **Mr. Peitz moved for preliminary approval of the project as submitted, and Ms. Laurie seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Peitz said since Mr. Stewart's property had been brought up, he had thought that the plans would be redone and resubmitted. He asked if staff had heard from Mr. Stewart about that. Ms. Anderson said the project had included the demolition of a building, but 303 Associates had recently proposed to renovate that building as a breakfast room for the Beaufort Inn. As of two weeks ago, the building was going to stay. Chairman Newman explained that Mr. Stewart owns a lot of properties in Beaufort; he brings projects forward, and they're reviewed, but then something may not happen for a few years. His company is now doing work at the old Piggly Wiggly building after having come to the board twice with different plans.

There was a general discussion of downtown parking. The West Street project would displace twelve parking spaces, but Mr. Peitz said parking shouldn't prevent infill development. There was general agreement that the city should have a parking garage.

Ms. Anderson said state law requires six hours of board training for all members in their first year. There's a series of DVDs to look at dealing with specific legal issues. After the six hours, board members have to do three hours annually. Mr. Peitz asked if they could do them for the next six months. Ms. Anderson said they could. Chairman Newman asked why they are required to come and watch them. He asked if they could do that online. Ms. Anderson said if you're a member of a group that has access to this information, it could count, but all of the ways of getting the training have to be done through state-sanctioned means. Ms. Anderson said they could watch two videos in three sessions or three videos in two sessions, and she asked how they would like to schedule it. Mr. Peitz asked if they could do it after the Historic District Review Board meetings or an hour before. Ms. Laurie said she prefers to do it before the meetings.

There being no further business to come before the board, **Mr. Symes made a motion to adjourn**, and the meeting adjourned at 3:31 p.m.