A meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held on **January 15, 2014 at 2:00 p.m.** in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Joel Newman, board members Michelle Knoll, Inez Neal, and Erica Dickerson and city staff Lauren Kelly.

Mike Rainey was absent.

In accordance with the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, Section 30-4-80(d) as amended, all local media were duly notified of the time, date, place, and agenda of this meeting.

CALL TO ORDER
Chairman Newman called the meeting to order at 2: 15 p.m.

REVIEW OF FULL BOARD PROJECTS
101 Scott Street – Alterations, Signage, Awnings, Final Review
Applicant: Allison Ramsey Architects for Paul Trask (HR14-02)

This building is not formally documented in the *Beaufort County Above Ground Historic Sites Survey*, Ms. Kelly said, or the Sanborn maps, but **Beek Webb** found postcards of the building, and they indicate that it has been moved over the period between 1930-present. She described the changes that are being requested. The modifications appear to be in context with the size, mass, and scale of the existing building. Staff feels that with the modifications, the building will better engage the public realm of Waterfront Park, Bay Street and Scott Street.

Signs require a separate review and application process, but the Historic District Review Board can permit additional signs, and in this particular design, one sign is in excess of the number typically allowed, but the board may permit it. The rest of the signs meet signage requirements. Staff likes the general sign design and its incorporation into the building. Staff recommends final approval.

Cooter Ramsey said, "The basic idea is to clean it up" and "connect it a bit more to the water" with benches. **Maxine Lutz** asked if there was meant to be a stop sign there because that would be dangerous with children running from the playground. Her concern is the narrow piece of property that adjoins the road, she said. Mr. Ramsey said that they are planning to build a small fence there. Right now, the stairs fall down into West Street on the other side, so there's no more or less safety now than there would be if they put up the fence.

Ms. Lutz asked if there were any DOT requirements. Ms. Kelly said there are 0 setbacks in this district and its city property. **Jay Weidner** asked if the city owns the Scott Street extension. Ms. Kelly said she believes it's city-owned. Chairman Newman said the stairs are headed in the direction "where the victims would be." Ms. Lutz said there are a lot of vision problems right in there.

Ms. Knoll said she thinks the plan looks appropriate to the structure. She appreciates the safety concerns but feels like the board's role is not to vet those concerns. Ms. Dickerson agreed. Chairman Newman said he thought it looked fine, and whether there are stairs there or not, they will not make a difference in whether people find it more inviting. They could put a deck on the waterside and be more inviting and reduce the circulation through that stair, Chairman Newman suggested. But he agrees with Ms. Knoll that the Historic District Review Board's role is not to determine the safety. Mr. Ramsey asked if Chairman Newman meant keeping the door. Chairman Newman said he meant that the stairs that wrap around could become a deck.

Mr. Weidner asked if it would be appropriate to ask the city to put up signs about the children running there, since it's a city street. Chairman Newman said he feels it's not the purview of this board to tell the city to put up signs. **Ms. Knoll made a motion to approve the application as submitted, second by Ms. Dickerson. The motion passed unanimously.**

Chairman Newman asked if Mr. Ramsey could come back with a deck and get Planning's approval, and Ms. Kelly said yes.

<u>1103 Bay Street</u> – Alterations, Additions, Final Review
Applicant: Allison Ramsey Architects for Frank & Amy Lesesne (HR14-01)
Ms. Kelly said this came to the Historic District Review Board in October 2013. It's circa 1750, and is listed as "contributing" on the 1997 Above Ground Historic Sites Survey. It has had extensive modifications, including stuccoing over the clapboard, a 2-story front porch, and the rear entry.

The Historic District Review Board granted conceptual approval for the project on October 9, 2013, on the condition that the applicant took into account the items discussed at the meeting. Historic Beaufort Foundation holds an easement on the property, so they must approve any exterior changes to the main house.

Ms. Kelly said the applicants are asking for conceptual approval of some things and final approval of others, so the notes will list the items separately. For final approval of the master site plan and main house, a few modifications are listed, and Ms. Kelly reviewed those:

- A revised entry from Newcastle Street with internal paths connecting to the front and rear of the yard
- A sunken courtyard for ADA access into the rear of the building;
- A new 2-unit suite in the northeast corner of the site;
- Reconstructing a stoop onto the rear wing and creating an ADA accessibly entry to the basement via a sunken garden;
- Installing a glass guard behind the existing rail on the third floor porch; and
- Interior renovations to the basement, including replacing a window on the west façade with a door.

Ms. Kelly described the modifications requested for preliminary approval, including an internal

elevator. She believes the sunken courtyard was a concern – as to how it would affect the tabby foundation – but Ms. Kelly said it's not a tabby foundation.

The current owner has recently applied for this to be Core Commercial zoning, Ms. Kelly said, but it's not been approved yet. The final outcome and placement of the accessory building could be affected by a change in zoning.

In the site plan, the applicants still need to provide an impervious percentage and a complete materials list. Staff appreciates the glass railing contrast. The hip roof on the rear, with simplified detailing is more appropriate than in the previous design, so staff recommends final approval of the building restoration, which is contingent on a Historic Beaufort Foundation approval with a small shift to the 2-unit suite to meet the 5' setback.

The applicants are seeking conceptual approval of the 570' 2-unit suite in the northeast corner of the property. The required rear setback for an accessory building in the Historic District is 5'; the suite is slightly too close to the northern property line. The finished floor height must be above the flood elevation, and staff would like that confirmed. Staff requested a drawing showing both the 2-unit suite and the Anchorage buildings together. Mass and scale seem to match the Preservation Manual Supplement. Since this is a conceptual submission, there are not specifics about architecture, but staff provided comments. Staff recommends conceptual approval with minor relocation to meet setback requirements, based on the final zoning.

Mr. Ramsey said since the last go-around they have a less ambitious plan after meetings with Historic Beaufort Foundation. They would still like to do the rear entry and the glass rail. They have an internal elevator that only goes to the 2nd floor, and they're "still fumbling with that." They have one other improvement to address: an egress issue ("where folks will come out"). They have eliminated the renovations of the existing outbuilding and the swimming pool. They just want to get the building started and will eventually have a landscaping plan and sidewalks. They just want a feel for where they are now, Mr. Ramsey said, and a nod as to whether they are going in the right direction or not.

They still haven't had an official meeting with Historic Beaufort Foundation on the latest information, Mr. Ramsey said. He thinks they have met Historic Beaufort Foundation's concerns, though maybe not on the style on the back entry. Ms. Lutz said that's been resolved. She said she doesn't know which foundation isn't tabby, and Mr. Ramsey said it's on the back, and they are not doing any excavation except for some of it off the original addition.

Ms. Lutz said they are so pleased with the way the Lesesnes and Mr. Ramsey have worked with them. They are still concerned with the tabby foundation being disturbed. Mr. Ramsey said they must have it to gain access. There is no second means of egress, and it's required. Ms. Knoll said the rear addition already penetrates that back wall. She asked how much additional space of the tabby foundation would be cut into. Mr. Ramsey said 4' on each side, but he thinks it's not tabby. Chairman Newman showed the tabby on a schematic and showed where the

egress would be. Mr. Ramsey said he expects that the exterior wall will be brick, like the interior foundations. He's not sure what the exterior foundations are until they get in and cut them.

Ms. Lutz asked about egress under the front porch, and Mr. Ramsey said there's no egress on the front. He showed Ms. Lutz where the openings are and said they don't exit to the exterior because that space is being filled in. Mr. Ramsey said, "There's about 3' of dirt out there." The windows are 2 x2 or 2 x 3. **Cynthia Jenkins** asked about the engineers who are working on it, and when told, said she doesn't know that they have a lot of experience with tabby. Mr. Ramsey said he didn't know that anyone has a lot of experience with it. There was a general discussion about handicap accessibility.

Chairman Newman said Historic Beaufort Foundation has the final say. He asked for comments on the building itself.

Ms. Dickerson said she's fine with it as proposed. Ms. Knoll had a thought on a rounded feature around the back stair. Mr. Ramsey said it's just decoration and can go away. Mr. Ramsey said they would incorporate a bench at the bottom instead of a plain wall. Mr. Ramsey said they are "not attached to the rounded feature in any manner." Ms. Knoll said in Beaufort they would see a more angular approach to that. Ms. Neal had no comments.

Chairman Newman said he thinks the rear entry looks fine, and he has no issue with the arched benches. He doesn't find this out of character.

In regard to the site plan in general, there's a lot less development, Chairman Newman noted. He asked if the assumption was that they would move forward, create a hotel, and the rest would come later. Mr. Ramsey said the sunken garden and rear entry are musts. They may phase in the other changes, but they aren't exactly sure what will be done until the final budget is done.

In regard to the 2-unit structure, Chairman Newman said they would discuss it separately. He said the location could change by 2' if the zoning is changed. He asked if there was anything else different. Mr. Ramsey said they have been going back and forth on which street it should address or if it should address the garden. He likes it addressing the street, personally, so it doesn't compete with the Anchorage, and he didn't want to tie it in to the Anchorage. They considered rotating it to look across the green space, "which a piece of us likes," but they probably will keep it addressing the street. It will have a masonry base and a sided upper structure. He said it's a really small, simple form.

Ms. Lutz said that Historic Beaufort Foundation supports what Ms. Kelly has said in her report. They feel the conceptual design is a little too informal for that building, and something more formal is needed. Historically, accessory buildings don't face the street – they face the garden – so they would like to see that reconsidered. Mr. Ramsey said the owners would love that direction as well, and Chairman Newman agreed that the site was "so distinctive that it's hard

to create the illusion that this building has its own address." He feels somehow it should be more akin to the original building, with window shaping or roof form, maybe, and Mr. Ramsey should make "less of an effort to make it its own thing."

Ms. Dickerson agreed that it should relate to the Anchorage and treat it like an accessory structure would be treated, "not looking alien, like it just landed there," especially since they don't have all of the lot developed. She would rather see it look more cohesive, and Ms. Knoll agreed. Ms. Jenkins said it could be more contemporary and told Mr. Ramsey, "Don't make it look old." Ms. Knoll said simple is okay, as is referencing the main structure; she feels "it's a little too vernacular at the moment."

Chairman Newman said they have several things they can work with now. The building looked "mountain-like" and possibly "like a shack." It can be tied to looking contemporary from the simplicity of the Anchorage, which is pretty clean, or the whole issue of the garden: it could be a garden building. Determining a little more strongly the feel of the garden might be what addresses that building, and it could become part of that garden.

Mr. Ramsey asked if the idea of it being 2-story was "scary." Chairman Newman said it "will need to have more stuff integrated into it, like a simpler roof, like the other little outbuilding." This design is busy, he feels, and doing a lot of things, so the stairs incorporated into the feel of it will seem more like an extension of the garden. Ms. Dickerson asked if there was a reason they went so small. Mr. Ramsey said to save the ground. Ms. Dickerson said it will be a challenging guest room because it's so small; she suggested they enlarge it, maybe even by a couple feet. Mr. Ramsey said that's been discussed as well.

Chairman Newman said that, while they can make a motion, Historic Beaufort Foundation would have a final say on the main house. **Ms. Dickerson made a motion for final approval of the main house as documented, with the caveat that Historic Beaufort Foundation has final approval due to the easement. Ms. Neal seconded the motion.**

Ms. Knoll said she's concerned that if Historic Beaufort Foundation makes substantial changes it will have to come back. Chairman Newman said they approve it as submitted, and if Historic Beaufort Foundation requires substantial changes, that will put another review into motion, but if its small things, Ms. Kelly can take care of it. He prefers to move the applicants forward. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Ms. Dickerson made a motion, second by Ms. Knoll, for final approval of the site and site planning as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Dickerson made a motion, second by Ms. Knoll, to give conceptual approval of the 2-story building addition as discussed. The motion passed unanimously.

<u>810 Carteret Street</u> – Alterations, Additions, Final Review
Applicant: Eddie Powell – Anchor Construction (HR14-03)

Ms. Kelly said this is a part of 6 townhouses in the Old Commons, circa 1974, and it's not on the Above Ground Historic Sites survey. The applicant is applying to replace the wood windows on one unit with Marvin Wood-Ultrex windows, with simulated divided lites. They are an extruded paintable fiberglass on the exterior and would be painted white to match the other windows on the adjacent townhouses.

One window in this development has already been replaced with a synthetic material, though not within the past 5 years, Ms. Kelly said. It's not a good example of building construction in the Historic District. Ms. Kelly said the proposed window is high quality and will be as good as or better than the current 1970s windows and staff advises that other homes in this development be given approval if they apply to replace their windows with this specific one.

Eddie Powell said he might be replacing 4 windows instead of just 2, upstairs and downstairs. The siding is rotten, and he will replace it with Hardie siding and paint it to match. It's also on the back of that same unit referred to earlier, but some didn't get replaced. Mr. Powell said that people are already calling him about replacing their windows, and Marvin fiberglass windows would be used. **Ms. Dickerson made a motion to approve and Ms. Knoll seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

701 Greene Street – Alterations and Additions, Final Review
Applicant: Jeannette Neal, owner (HR14-04)

Ms. Kelly said if the board needs her to go through the last-minute documents, she would. The house, circa 1785, is one of the oldest houses in Beaufort and has been in every survey and report done in the city. In October 2013, staff and HDRB approval was given to replace the roof. Since then, the applicant has replaced numerous elements to the porches and constructed a new porch. They have been instructed to stop all work until the Historic District Review Board has a chance to review this. Ms. Kelly said this was discovered on January 10; since then, they "have been trying to figure out what was there."

Based on historic photos and Sanborn maps, between 1924-1956 the house wasn't changed that much. It was a 2-story T-shaped house with 1-story wings on either side. There's a 2-story porch on the front. Between 1956-1979, a one-story rear porch was added along with an addition with a shed roof and then a porch with a shed roof, both on the west side. Since then, the house has remained essentially the same. The applicant has begun work, and Ms. Kelly reviewed the work. The roof replacement was done, and there has been in-kind work that doesn't require board approval. The applicant didn't get permits or approval for modification work on existing elements, and Ms. Kelly listed those.

Ms. Kelly said the existing side porch has had the roof replaced; there's no longer a division. The

stairs, piers, and foundation have been replaced on these stairs. The new construction is the wrap-around porch and includes new columns and partial roof construction, but it's been stopped. The roof pitch is meant to match the existing roof, and the brick is to be painted white. There's also a rear shed being constructed that requires a permit. There's no record of a permit for one shed that exists and another that's in various states of construction.

Ms. Kelly said since none of the work is being done directly to the historic portion of the house, that's positive for the applicant. In regard to the rear porch, the columns, the porch wasn't original to the house but had some unique elements and staff encourages the applicant to retain those details, and they should replace what they have put in with what was there before. They also put in a second-level balustrade. The applicant put the balustrade in for safety, and Ms. Kelly thought the board should discuss it. The applicant recently inherited the house and staff appreciates their wanting to maintain and rehabilitate it.

Staff recommends approval for the in-kind work to date and approval for the new construction with conditions and some discussion, e.g., the revised configuration of the roof on the west side of the porch. The applicant needs to provide a site plan, showing where the steps came out, paths, new sheds, etc., and will have to get zoning approval. The applicant will also have to provide a minimum roof plan drawing for all elements not yet underway. Ms. Kelly said this statement doesn't preclude anything the building official may require.

Jeanette Neal, the homeowner, said they were trying to divert the water away from the house that destroyed the wood and caused termite damage. They want the water away from the house so it will last longer and avoid further deterioration. The section that was put on was put on with non-treated wood. Her grandparents built "a haphazard addition." Ms. Neal's mother applied for assistance to do renovations for the rotting, "but they said she had too much money," Ms. Neal said, and she didn't have enough to have it done properly. Ms. Neal is trying to do it the way her mother wanted it with respect to all of the aesthetics of the original house.

Gerhard and Ruth Spieler were her parents, Ms. Neal said, and they both passed away. The house has been in her family more than 100 years. She thought replacing rotten wood and making it safe was a good thing. In regard to the extra shed, they "had to have somewhere to put stuff" to paint the inside. She may donate some of her mother's collections to the library, but it needed to be protected. It's a tiny shed that she will sell later when she's done with it.

Tim Schwartz is their contractor, Ms. Neal said. They ran into more rotten wood than they had anticipated, so they ran over-schedule and over-budget. He hasn't been as available to this job lately. She said she'd make changes she needs to make to suit the Historic District Review Board.

Chairman Newman asked Historic Beaufort Foundation for specific comments. Ms. Lutz said there's so much to address, and their position is that the alterations shouldn't have been made to this house in this way; there's no historic evidence of a wrap around porch on this house or

any in Beaufort at all, and this is one of the more important houses in Beaufort. There are concerns about the balustrade and the flat porch roof, which is not something that was ever on the house. There were modifications in the last 50 years. Ms. Lutz said they have seen chimney dismantling and that could also be a problem. Ms. Lutz said she recommends that the board members "visit the site to visualize all of the things that are going on there."

Ms. Neal said "the chimney has dismantled itself"; the house was falling to pieces, but she decided to fix it up. She "was overwhelmed with the nightmare that was happening." Her mother's collecting got to the point where it was difficult to walk in the house. They are trying to replace what's left of the outside. They got the application and the permit and didn't know they needed to get one for each step, Ms. Neal said.

Chairman Newman asked Historic Beaufort Foundation about the diagram of the original structure and the things that had happened to it: Which were due to the normal evolution of any house, in The Point or anywhere? He asked. In regard to this house, the appendages changed, and now one is connecting the two porches; the other, more controversial, change is putting the balustrade upstairs, "which materially and characteristically is different from the original house in a large sense." Ms. Neal said that kids always go on the roof, no matter what they're told, and the rail is meant to prevent toddlers from going over the side. She said they stopped on the balustrade because they "thought that was a good thing to do." If they can get permission, they will do more. Chairman Newman said he appreciates the safety concern, but board members are not allowed to be concerned about expense or safety issues. Hundreds of things can happen in a house, Chairman Newman said, and it's not within the Historic District Review Board's purview to determine whether something is safe.

Chairman Newman told Ms. Neal that she was "given a highly historical piece of the context of the town … so that's why there is so much that it is brought to bear on this house." Chairman Newman said that what Ms. Lutz recommended - for the board to go look at the house - might be the best idea. He said there was an appendage on the west face and one directly to the north, and it's hard to tell if they are similar, and they are trying to tie one form to another with a continuing line. When they turn the corner around the west end, it's less clear if they are "apples to apples."

Mr. Schwartz said there's an 8" difference on the rafter tail height, which wouldn't be visible from the north or south, and it, would taper to 0". Chairman Newman said they're at a different pitch at the plate line. Mr. Schwartz said that's correct; it's because of the north porch and the west porch. Mr. Schwartz said the floors of the porches are contiguous.

Ms. Kelly said for clarification as to whether the new foundation is more closely related to the foundation on the front. Ms. Lutz said the new ones are rounded. Ms. Kelly said the ones on the front are perfectly rounded, which is historic. The ones from the 50s or 60s are pointed, and the new ones are more like the original design.

Ms. Jenkins said the Sanborn map in the packet shows them as the same as in 1924, so they are almost 100 years old themselves. Ms. Kelly said yes, but they are talking about the porch in the back. It's post-1956. Ms. Jenkins said she would be concerned by the north elevation additions; they are historic. Chairman Newman said yes. They discussed the middle map; the "blue" additions are less historical, and they are connecting the two additions at this point.

Chairman Newman asked why Milner would object; Ms. Jenkins said it's out of historic context from the north elevation to the west elevation. She showed how houses connect traditionally and said this way destroys its historic context. Chairman Newman said they are not taking any of the fabric that existed in the original structure and are only adding to two additions that were already made. They can't find a precedent for every kind of addition anyone would want to make, Chairman Newman feels. On the south and east facades, the Historic District Review Board would never approve any additions, but the only thing disturbing to him about this is the 8" difference. The Rhett House has had many appendages added, and they were controversial; the owner has some right to do things to the house. Chairman Newman said he's interested in accomplishing something appropriately without trying to find an exact precedent. He prefers to see that if it really is done right, it's not destructive.

Chairman Newman said he's not comfortable with the upstairs railing; people can crawl on any roofs, fall, and get hurt, and "that truly is way different from the character of this house." There are other solutions. This looks like a roof deck now, he said, but he has no big problem with the roof connection, although he wants "it done less wonky." He suggested a way it could possibly be done.

Ms. Lutz added that this is the rear of the house, but it faces Carteret, and the Boundary Street curve. It's a very important façade on this house. This is highly visible, and Ms. Lutz thinks as much as they can needs to be maintained. Chairman Newman said he's not suggesting that it's okay because it's out back. As a home owner, he thinks people should be permitted some leeway. Previous owners have done this with this house already. Ms. Lutz said "it's adding bad to bad." Ms. Knoll said they have two porch additions, and they are now adding another mass to it. Ms. Neal said they are trying to do everything appropriately. She can take the roof balustrade off if necessary.

Ms. Inez Neal asked, 20-50 years from now, if the changes will make it a combination of modern and historical, or if it will still be a historical house. Ms. Neal said they are using the original type of wood on the porch, and the railings are also being restored from what had been rotting away to make the back and front rail match. Ms. Neal said they are doing everything they can to make the house look historical in 100 years but not rotten.

Ms. Lutz asked the plan for the chimney. Ms. Neal said they are going to take the original bricks and put it back together. **Bruce Skipper**, city building official, said he's waiting on some plans. **Jay Weidner** said the house is "a classic Beaufort T-style house that could be seen as such from Carteret Street." The porch under construction subsumes the T on the west side of the house

and takes away that quality of the house. Ms. Knoll said they could remove the porch additions. Mr. Weidner showed Chairman Newman that the Sanborn map would probably indicate that there was nothing on the backside. Mr. Weidner said if he had rotting, he would solve the problem with gutters and drain spout. Ms. Neal said they had that, and the gutters filled with leaves that they couldn't clean out.

Ms. Jenkins asked if they were being fined, and Chairman Newman said it's not in the board's purview. Chairman Newman said no one on the board is prepared to make a motion. The board will plan a field trip to the house, hopefully together, within the next 7 days and then reconvene. Ms. Neal said if it gets to a point where she is losing money because of construction delays, the project will cost more than she is able to afford. They are already over-budget because they are trying to restore the house to the original style. Chairman Newman said, "If you aren't doing construction, you aren't losing money." All the board can offer them is the conclusion that they can't decide this now, but the board can come look at the house, "and try to affect a reasonable solution." It was determined that they would meet January 17 at 8 am for a site visit. Ms. Neal asked if the crew could keep working on the roof. Mr. Skipper said he "can stop the whole thing," so he "would say no to any work until this is resolved." The contractor should have realized that the work had proceeded way past the point where it should have been, he added.

MINUTES

Ms. Dickerson made a motion, second by Ms. Neal, to approve the minutes of December 20, 2013 as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Chairman Newman made a motion to nominate Ms. Dickerson to be the Vice Chairman; Ms. Neal seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-0.

There being no further business to come before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.