

A meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held on **April 13, 2016 at 2:00 p.m.** in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Vice Chairman Chuck Symes, board members Barbara Laurie, and John Dickerson, and Lauren Kelly, planning staff. Chairman Joel Newman and Quinn Peitz were 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

Vice Chairman Symes called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

MINUTES

Ms. Laurie made a motion, seconded by Mr. Dickerson, to approve the minutes of the March 9, 2016 Historic District Review Board meeting. The motion to approve the minutes as submitted passed unanimously.

REVIEW OF FULL BOARD PROJECTS

808 Newcastle Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 378

New Construction

Applicant: Corey Post, Saltline Construction, for Susan Sagui (HR16-10) ☐

The applicant is requesting approval for the construction of a new main house and guesthouse.

Ms. Kelly said this is a vacant lot. The applicant was given preliminary approval with some conditions the last time they came to the HDRB. Three one-story structures are proposed for this project: a primary house, a garage with an attached office, and a guesthouse.

The garage footprint is 55% of the house, Ms. Kelly said. Per the ordinance, a garage cannot exceed 50% of the footprint of the primary structure. An administrative adjustment could cover this, she said, which is done at the staff level, or “you could just make it a little bit smaller.”

Staff appreciates the effort to use the depth of the whole lot, Ms. Kelly said, because this is unusually deep. Some comments made by the board and staff at the previous meeting with the applicant were not addressed:

- Modifying the roof pitch on all three structures was recommended from a 9/12 to a 6/12. Ms. Kelly said the garage roof appears to have been modified to 6/12, but not the roofs of the accessory building or the primary structure. This is especially important on the primary structure, she said, because the 9/12 roof pitch leaves a “pretty big roof form on the street.”
- There is still a “very shallow awning window.” The proportions could be deeper, Ms. Kelly said, and it could be less horizontal and still maintain its function.

There will be a variance request before the Zoning Board of Appeals for this project, Ms. Kelly said, to allow the applicant to build the two accessory buildings before the primary structure, for budget reasons. The owner, **Susan Sagui**, intends to build the primary structure in less than three years, **Corey Post**, the applicant, said, noting that they also have a variance request to have a second accessory building on the property. They would like to ask for a three-year limit on building that primary structure. Ms. Kelly said because of that, "it is important that the east elevation of the garage and the accessory dwelling unit are as good as they possibly can be." The garage elevation "came together from the last meeting," she said. The east elevation of the accessory dwelling unit is "probably one of the more unorganized elevations" of the project. There are three window types on a small elevation, and the roof pitch is still high, so it should be simplified and given more order.

Staff needs a detailed color list. The applicant said he could forward that to Ms. Kelly tomorrow.

Ms. Kelly said staff recommends final approval with the resolution of the following items and their approval at staff level, if the board feels comfortable with that: studying the roof pitch on the primary structure and guest house at 6/12; making the awning window deep enough that it can be square or vertically proportioned; forwarding the materials and colors lists, and studying and reorganizing the east face of the accessory dwelling unit.

Mr. Post said because of the unusual shape of the lot, not much of the accessory dwelling unit would be seen. He feels that the issues Ms. Kelly had detailed can be resolved. Mr. Post said he feels certain that the roof pitch can be "at least 7/12."

Mr. Post said a 2-story yellow house on the corner "sits on the property line," so that's where the line is on that street.

Ms. Laurie asked if the garage office would be used for a business. Mr. Post said it is for Ms. Sagui's use; she has rental property in New Mexico and "does some consulting." Ms. Kelly said because it has a kitchen and a bathroom, the office could be used as an accessory dwelling unit, so the city is requiring a variance. Ms. Laurie asked if the property is zoned for Ms. Sagui to conduct business there. Mr. Post said she would not be having people come to her there to conduct business. She will just use the space as her office. He said Ms. Sagui has contemplated doing a short-term rental with her accessory dwelling unit. Ms. Kelly said home occupations are permitted in all zoning districts in the city, so Ms. Sagui could have a business there, but there would be a process, as there would be if she decides to have a short-term rental.

Mr. Dickerson said, in the matter of the garage being 55% of the primary structure's footprint – and needing to be 50% or less – he feels the proportions seem

“comfortable,” and he feels there’s no need to change it for only 5% over.

Vice Chairman Symes asked the size of the columns in front of the house. Mr. Post said he believes they’re 8”x 8’. Vice Chairman Symes said that’s okay.

About the 7/12 pitch, Mr. Post said he believes Ms. Sagui would be “open to that.” Though she wanted the house to have “presence on the street . . . in the grand scheme of things . . . going to a 7/12 pitch (wouldn’t) affect the look,” he said. Vice Chairman Symes said as it’s drawn now, it’s “too massive.”

Vice Chairman Symes said on the north elevation of the guesthouse and the primary structure, there are gangs of windows that are not framed out. Mr. Post said they would be framed and trimmed in between.

Maxine Lutz expressed support for Ms. Kelly’s request about the roof pitch and her comment about the “three different kinds of windows” on the east elevation of the accessory dwelling unit. She asked what might be done about that. Also, the Preservation Committee of Historic Beaufort Foundation “thought those columns looked a little thin.” They had a question as to whether they could be made thicker, Ms. Lutz said. Mr. Post said he had two or three options on the porch posts, and these that are shown are not what he would pick. Vice Chairman Symes said, “They need to be substantial.” Ms. Lutz agreed: “They’re too spindly, I think, and if she’s looking for a presence on the street that could detract from it.”

Ms. Lutz asked Ms. Kelly what the city’s recourse is if the primary structure is not built in three years. Ms. Kelly said the city doesn’t have a precedent for that. The last time a similar case (on Charles Street) came to this board – where the applicant wanted to put a guest house behind the primary structure and build the guest house first – the condition of the variance was that a design for the primary structure would be approved by the board, but there was not a timeframe within which the house had to be built. Vice Chairman Symes said he was at the ZBOA meeting about that variance, and the board had said “occupancy was contingent on having a full set of plans.” They “weren’t happy about starting with the back building,” he said, “because they figured the front would never get built.” Ms. Kelly said the fact that Ms. Sagui has architectural plans for the primary structure is “a commitment.”

Vice Chairman Symes said the board agrees with and supports the variance on the garage and the three-year limit on building the main house.

Vice Chairman Symes made a motion to approve the application with consideration of staff’s recommendations and final approval by staff of materials, colors, and the following: reduce the roof pitch to 6/12 or 7/12, ensure that “the columns (are) in the 8”x 8’ range, and “enhance the windows on the east side of the guest cottage.” Mr. Dickerson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

1402 Washington Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 342

New Construction

Applicant: Carol Corbin (HR16-11)

The applicant is requesting approval for the construction of a new house with a screened porch.

Ms. Kelly said this project had been before the HDRB in March; it received preliminary approval then “with a few conditions.” The size of the building is unchanged.

Staff commends the applicant for taking on the project and doing most of it herself. There are two questions about details, Ms. Kelly said. She asked **Carol Corbin**, the applicant, what was happening above the front door. Ms. Corbin said **Tom Michaels**, the project’s architect, has “left out the screen door . . . trying to show through the trim that’s around the front door and the windows.” She described the trim and said there are no sidelites. Vice Chairman Symes and Ms. Kelly said they understood the drawing after that explanation.

Ms. Kelly said the other comment from staff was to lower the dormer vent. Ms. Corbin said she agreed. Ms. Kelly said it’s not in the staff report, but they wanted to ensure that the screening was all “inside the porch, behind the trim.” Ms. Corbin said it would be. Ms. Kelly said, showing that “should be included in the porch section . . . it’s not in the detail.”

Ms. Corbin said she had some slight changes she would like to make. The first was to make two windows over the kitchen counter “about 10” deeper . . . which would mean raising all the windows about 6 inches.” There was no objection from the board members.

Ms. Corbin said she would like the columns to be simpler than those shown in the plans. She would like them “a little more vernacular, plain” and to “get rid of (the) half-rounds and (a) three-quarter piece,” as well as another quarter-round. Vice Chairman Symes suggested keeping the quarter-round for water flow, to prevent rot. He said he believes Ms. Corbin will “like the columns more with that little chamfer in them.” Mr. Dickerson agreed, saying, “It will look more finished” if she keeps that. Vice Chairman Symes agreed that it’s a clean and simple detail. Ms. Corbin said she would go with his recommendation. Ms. Kelly said, in the drawing the column “looks more dramatic” than it actually is.

Ms. Corbin asked if the board needed to see colors. Ms. Kelly said that they had been submitted. Mr. Dickerson said Ms. Corbin should specify that the porch screen is “no-see-‘em”-proof, including having a screen underneath, if necessary.

Ms. Laurie said that there was discussion last time this project came to the HDRB about

the placement of the rooms in the house, but they're the same. Ms. Corbin said that she kept them that way because it's important to her that there be "a lot of light in the living areas," so she has designed them to face south. "Half the year, the screen porch will be like a living room," she said.

Ms. Lutz said the Preservation Committee had a question about whether an area in "the back was a stoop or a deck." Ms. Kelly said, "Typically, stoops are covered," and Ms. Corbin "might want to consider an awning . . . so water doesn't get into your door." Ms. Corbin said she'd rather not, if it's not required, because of the cost and because of "my desire to have sun" on that side of the house. Ms. Lutz said Ms. Kelly would have to weigh in on this because "decks are not approved in the Historic District." Ms. Corbin said it's 6' x 6'. Vice Chairman Symes said he believes the size is close to the limit – before it's considered a deck – but it's okay. Mr. Dickerson said she could do it later, but after living in Beaufort awhile, Ms. Corbin might find that having something over the primary entrance "may be worth your while," especially when there are "monster rains." Vice Chairman Symes agreed that an awning is a good idea.

Ms. Lutz said the Preservation Committee had said on the front porch, "it looks like there's stucco in the piers," and she believed the committee had discussed using brick instead. Mr. Dickerson explained to Ms. Corbin that the piers can be made with cinder block and have brick veneers. Ms. Corbin agreed to do that.

Ms. Lutz said the front porch panels are "a little different treatment than (what) we usually see around here," which is balustrades. Ms. Corbin said there was a long discussion about this last time she came to the HDRB. Ms. Lutz asked if the panels would fit together. Vice Chairman Symes said one thing that was discussed was that the panels go "all the way to the porch floor," and rainwater that blows in needs to have somewhere to go. He suggested that Ms. Corbin talk to the builder or architect about what will happen if a lot of rain gets in through the screen. Mr. Dickerson told her about a technique he'd used for screening underneath the flooring to help with bugs, leaves, and geckos.

Ms. Lutz asked if the two windows on the front elevation were "separate windows." Ms. Corbin said yes.

Vice Chairman Symes summarized that the dormer windows are to be moved down, and a detail should show that the screen is behind the columns on the front porch. **Ms. Laurie made a motion to give final approval to the project with consideration of staff's and the board's comments. Mr. Dickerson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.** There was a brief discussion of two colors Ms. Corbin was considering for the exterior.

926 Bay Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 917
Shade structure

Applicant: Josh Beckler, Coastal Canvas Products, for Paul Thompson (HR16-12)
Applicant is requesting approval for three new shade sails being mounted over existing patio space in the rear facing the Waterfront Park.

Ms. Kelly said this project is an application to construct three shade structures on the back porch of Panini's in Waterfront Park. They are similar to the shade sails on the playground in the park. This application is before the HDRB because it's the first time this type of product has been used at a historic building in the Historic District, she said.

Ms. Kelly said there were no dimensions given for the sails on the plans, and there is an existing bar on the back porch. **Andrew Barber**, owner of Coastal Canvas Products, said that "should be gone." He showed an updated plan, which showed the sails to be 14' and 7.5' (head height). He said the panels are "twisted."

Ms. Kelly said staff had asked if a more neutral palette could be chosen and how these sails will work with the new bar addition that has been brought before the HDRB. Mr. Barber said he had sent an email to **Paul Thompson**, the owner of Panini's, with those questions, but didn't get a reply. Mr. Thompson had told Mr. Barber that a new bar "is not happening . . . It's off the table," and the tiki bar has been removed. Mr. Barber said Mr. Thompson had chosen blue sails because that is the color of his umbrellas, but Mr. Barber didn't believe Mr. Thompson was "dedicated" to a particular color. He had brought samples of other color options, he said, including some neutrals.

Mr. Dickerson asked how colorfast the materials are. Mr. Barber said the material has a 10-year warranty against fading. Vice Chairman Symes asked if the poles with lights on them will be coming down to put these sails up. Mr. Barber said he is not sure. They don't necessarily have to go, he said.

Ms. Kelly asked if they have to be 14' tall. Mr. Barber said there's a 30% difference between the low and high sides, so with a head height of 7.5' as the low point, the higher ones need to be 14'. He said they "could bring it down a little bit," but lowering them could create problems with water in a big storm. Vice Chairman Symes said most of the time, the view of the shade sails will be obstructed by trees, but there's one view where they'll be fully visible, so he's concerned about the height "coming up, back against the building, and not getting too high," though he understands the structural requirements.

Mr. Dickerson said "a real elevation" would be helpful. Ms. Kelly asked if he knew how high the shade sails would be in relation to the light posts. Vice Chairman Symes said he guessed the light posts were 10' tall. Mr. Barber agreed, so they'd be "3'-3.5' higher than that." Mr. Dickerson and Vice Chairman Symes agreed that the scale seemed okay, and Vice Chairman Symes said he feels "it's a nice design to cover the patio."

Vice Chairman Symes said he's comfortable with final approval of the application if they

reduce the height by about a foot, “realizing you have to maintain structural integrity,” and with staff approval of the color of the material. Mr. Barber said there’s a navy in a different material that is less bright than the blue that was proposed. Mr. Dickerson said he thinks the proposed blue is a “nautical blue, and it’s a nautical area.” Ms. Laurie said it “has an island kind of feel to it.” Mr. Barber said the blue and white look nice together. Ms. Laurie said keeping a lighter color clean could be a challenge.

Mr. Dickerson said he’d like the applicant to work out the height with staff on-site “to make sure the locations make sense for the building.” Mr. Barber agreed. Ms. Lutz suggested that the HDRB chairman, **Joel Newman**, has his office in the building next door that will look down on to the Panini’s patio, so he might be consulted for this site visit. **Mr. Dickerson made a motion to give final approval, with staff and Mr. Newman or another design professional seeing and adjusting the height of the sails “to get the appropriate proportions for the building.” The color choice is okay with the board. Ms. Laurie seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

There being no further business to come before the board, **Mr. Dickerson made a motion, second by Ms. Laurie, to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously,** and the meeting adjourned at 2:52 p.m.