A meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held on **September 10, 2014** at 2:00 p.m. in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Board members Barbara Laurie, Erica Dickerson, and Chuck Symes, and city staff Lauren Kelly.

Chairman Joel Newman was delayed and arrived at 2:10 p.m. Quinn Peitz 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
Vice Chairman Ms. Dickerson called the meeting to order at 2:07 p.m.

MINUTES
The approval of the minutes of the special meeting July 31, 2014 and the regular meeting August 13, 2014 was tabled because of the absence of a quorum of voters present at those meetings.

PUBLIC HEARING: 509 Harrington Street
Requesting Development Design Exception to construct a rear addition
Ms. Dickerson opened this public hearing. There were no comments. **Ms. Dickerson closed this public hearing**.

REVIEW OF FULL BOARD PROJECTS
509 Harrington Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 678
Development Design Exception
Applicant: Ansley Hester Manuel, Architect, for John and Celeste Cherol (DE14-3)

The applicant is requesting approval for a 10' rear setback in order to construct a rear addition of a master suite. Ms. Kelly said the project has been to the Historic District Review Board for discussion; this is for a development design exception to reduce the rear setback to 10'.

Ms. Kelly said this building is on the Above Ground Historic Survey, and is circa 1867; it has had modifications to the rear before. A design had received preliminary approval to proceed from the Historic District Review Board, and this is the formal request for the design exception. This project is residential but in a commercial zone, so it would have a 10' setback, anyway, Ms. Kelly said; it's consistent with adopted city plans.

Staff recommends final approval to the design exception request and to the design itself, Ms. Kelly said. Only preliminary design approval was given at the last meeting, and if it gets the design exception, it makes sense to have final design approval, too. **Mr. Symes made a motion to approve the final plans and the development design**

exception on the rear setback from 5' to 10'. Ms. Laurie seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-0.

908 Charles Street, Identified as District R121, Tax Map 4, Parcel 291
New construction of an accessory building
Applicant: Paul Cole for Donald K. Johnson (HR14-30)
The applicant is requesting approval in order to construct an accessory dwelling unit before the construction of the main dwelling

Ms. Kelly said this is for final approval for the site plan of a guest cottage. The project last came to the Board in July, and the applicant wants to build the accessory dwelling unit prior to the live-work unit. She said the applicant has gone to the ZBOA and received the variance that is required. Staff believes all requirements have been met for the project and recommends final approval.

The condition of approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals was that the Historic Beaufort Foundation would have final approval to guarantee that the main structure will be built; also, rear alley access is to be constructed as part of this project, Ms. Kelly said. Ms. Laurie asked if the Preservation Committee would want to review this; **Maxine Lutz** said they hadn't had time, but they will review the main structure.

Mr. Symes said, in the back, the windows in the gable on the second floor seem "congested" to him, and he doesn't see the purpose of them. **Paul Cole** said the ceiling is vaulted; that side faces the park, according to Ms. Dickerson. The window style is not in keeping with the windows in the Historic District, she said. The front is fine; she can see why they want to have more light. Ms. Kelly said that configuration was approved previously, and no conditions were placed on it.

Mr. Symes said he's also concerned about the 2 full windows on the front. He's concerned that it might look like the house is vacant if the yard is neglected. Ms. Dickerson said the Board has gone over that, too. Chairman Newman arrived and said he thought they had taken all of this into account. **Ms. Dickerson made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Symes seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

808 Bay Street, Identified as District R121, Tax Map 4, Parcel 937
Alterations, Additions
Applicant: Ansley Hester Manuel, architect, for 303 Associates, LLC (HR14-39)

Ms. Kelly said the applicant is requesting approval for interior renovations to convert second floor from office to residential; extend and screen existing porch and rebuild stairs (alley); extend second floor and build balcony at rear portion.

DRAFT

Ms. Kelly said this is in the Core Commercial district. In July 2014, the project was given preliminary approval. Staff feels this is appropriate, and modifications are in line with the historic fabric of the building. Staff recommends final approval contingent on the approval of samples, which Ms. Manuel brought to the meeting.

Ms. Manuel said in regard to materials, they are matching and need approval for stucco on the piers; for the metal roof, they want a medium bronze. There is a red roof and a dark bronze on the other roofs adjacent to it. The stucco on the building that the porch is attached to is yellow, and they have grey paint. She thought of trying to match the yellow for the piers, and she showed it. Ms. Manuel said they don't own the building that is yellow, so she can "match it or go with something totally different." Chairman Newman said the 808 Bay building is basically white; Ms. Manuel showed the Board a bright white stucco paint sample. Chairman Newman said Ms. Manuel and her client have "no reason to relate to anything ... The most context they will see are the piers" behind their own building. They "don't have any important reference to make." Mr. Symes and Ms. Dickerson agreed that they should "relate" to their own building.

Chairman Newman said it's a new addition, and they are planning a cable rail. He asked if they had considered not stuccoing it. Ms. Manuel said that it was concrete block, and Ms. Kelly said that's not approved anywhere in the city. There's an ordinance that says you can't do it if it's visible from a public right-of-way, she said. Ms. Manuel clarified that the Board was saying that even though the building is attached, she need not feel compelled to match the other stucco. Chairman Newman said it could be "detailed to be an intentional thing to be seen as detail and could be painted to look finished." He would have no objection to that, and Ms. Kelly could do a staff approval. Ms. Manuel asked if painted concrete block was allowed, and Ms. Kelly said the Board could say it is allowed. **Ms. Dickerson made a motion to approve per the discussion: with 808 Bay Street "as its own entity," not trying to match the other building. Mr. Symes seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

810-812 Congress Street, Identified as District R121, Tax Map 4, Parcel 207A
Alterations, additions
Applicant: George H. Singleton (HR14-38)
The applicant is requesting to restore the original portion of the historic duplex in-kind and add a rear addition.

Ms. Kelly said this project is in the Old Commons neighborhood and is circa 1900; it is contributing. It is a historic duplex, which it was on the 1924 map. It's been vacant since at least 1997; the applicant wants to restore and add a rear addition of 900 square feet. 133 square feet would be on the second floor.

Ms. Kelly described the applicable guidelines, primarily in regard to scale: the addition should be smaller than the original building. Ms. Kelly said staff is excited this project is coming to fruition; it's a significant historic building. In regard to siting, staff feels it's

DRAFT

appropriate and conforms. Staff has some concerns about design and detailing of the project. They reviewed a similar plan a few months ago: the height, mass, and scale don't relate to the original house in terms of proportions and height. The original proportions were “elegant,” but the new proportions are “wide” and “don’t relate that well,” Ms. Kelly said.

Ms. Kelly said the mass is being driven by the applicant’s desire for a master bedroom and a study, which she showed the plans for. There is not enough room for an accessory dwelling unit or even a carport in the rear, so staff had made sketches to show how they could adapt the study and prevent the addition being “one wide, shallow gable.”

Ms. Kelly said the applicant wants to use a blue roof material, and that typically isn’t approved in the Historic District or in the city at large. Staff recommends that the applicant take the second story roof form idea into consideration and to not have the blue roof.

Chairman Newman said he was confused about what was original. Ms. Kelly showed the plan of the original house and the existing conditions, then where the addition begins and goes back. She also showed the second floor plan

Chairman Newman said, “The only thing getting above the gable is the ridge from the back piece.” Ms. Kelly said it is on a corner and showed the streetscape on Congress and West Streets. Chairman Newman asked how high the ceiling was across the first floor, and Ms. Kelly said its 8’. Chairman Newman said the applicant, **George Singleton**, could keep the study upstairs if he dropped the ceiling in the section where Mr. Singleton has the kitchen and laundry room to 7’, and that would bring the study floor down. If they had a cross section at 6’11” with a cross piece in it, they could remove that and be able to bring the big gable pitch down so it didn't get above the other roof. Then Mr. Singleton could keep the study upstairs. Chairman Newman said, “It’s do-able without doing away with that piece.” The street view wouldn't change at all on the front elevation. The side roof mass could be brought down to where it was the same ridge as the other. Chairman Newman said Mr. Singleton “could have the gable that does all that,” and the piece on the porch “could be a smaller gable instead of a little flap to give it a way of stepping down.” Chairman Newman said the house is on the back of the lot and is very tight.

Mr. Symes said he was concerned about the addition’s roofline being above the original; Ms. Dickerson said it was her concern as well. Mr. Singleton said he has “given it a lot of thought and time.” He said he needs the space because of how he’s going to use it for collections and books. He said he understands what they are saying about the addition coming above the original, “but the lines are clear and distinct to separate the new from the old,” and he indicated where those were. There’s a 6” indention between the old and the new at one point, he said, but he sees the point about the addition being 3’ taller than the original. He would have liked 6’ instead of 3’ for the space, he said. “It

looks out of sync in the drawings," he said, "because they are one-dimensional," but it won't really look like that. The Beaufort Preservation manual, Mr. Singleton said, "provides guidelines, and guidelines are *guidelines*." They are written with language that allows some flexibility, and he wants it to be a space to live for himself and his grandchildren. Mr. Singleton said he believes that when people build their homes, they should "feel great while they are living there." The 36" doesn't seem to be much, he feels. Where it's located – it's not in The Point or on Bay Street – the members of his community will see it like he does, Mr. Singleton said. He feels the 36" isn't that much, and since the guidelines aren't carved in stone, he thinks the Board should be okay with approving it. He said the plans that Ms. Kelly did "didn't work for me," because they took out the closet space; the alternate closet goes into the master bedroom space and "takes away from it." He'd had an architect look at the stairs "for ways to do them differently, so they didn't impede into the study." They will have "clean lines," and the full amount of space available in the second floor area.

Mr. Singleton asked about the blue roof, which he said is a medium-dark blue roof. He asked if Ms. Kelly was saying that it was not typical in regard to the shingles or the metal. Ms. Kelly said historically, blue roofs aren't approved. Mr. Singleton said blue plays a part in Gullah Geechee culture, and he thought "it would be a great presentation of a place he'd like to live." The original roof was metal, and "the design is terrific." He found out he might be able to replace it with almost exactly the same roof as was there originally, which he wants to follow up on, so in regard to the color of the roof, he is "open to change." Chairman Newman said Mr. Singleton had represented that very well, and what he said about the issue of guidelines, Chairman Newman agrees with.

Ms. Lutz said that Historic Beaufort Foundation had met with Mr. Singleton for an hour that week. They fully support Ms. Kelly's recommendation to reduce the mass, and "it's pretty clear in the guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior standards that the addition not impose over the original structure." Ms. Lutz said she knows about the use of blue in the Gullah Geechee culture for porch roofs, though she hasn't seen a blue roof. Historic Beaufort Foundation's concern is that "the new house dwarfs the original house." She said Historic Beaufort Foundation supports the one-story addition or the reduction in height as Chairman Newman had recommended. Ms. Lutz said that ever since the Historic District Review Board had approved the McGrath- Scheper House to be built high – it has 12' ceilings – there have been a lot of comments about the guest house/garage at 601 Port Republic Street, and she's concerned that people might say of Mr. Singleton's addition, after it's built, "How did it get so high?"

Ms. Laurie said she's lives adjacent to the Old Commons; the house has been unoccupied for many years, so she is excited that Mr. Singleton and his family are doing something. Ms. Laurie said she wants "to come to a medium point": to allow the homeowners to make it their home and to comply with the regulations that the city has. She "strongly suggest(s) that we come to a solution, so Mr. Singleton can proceed." It needs to be inhabited, and they should try to find middle ground.

DRAFT

Chairman Newman said whenever you work on a historic house, there is leeway for what you have to do. They are intending to create two spaces – to have 2 places to live in. Mr. Singleton said yes. Chairman Newman said this doesn't meet the guidelines because the intention is that when you do additions to historical stock, they aren't supposed to dominate the existing structure. Chairman Newman said that he advocates that people should be able to do whatever they want with their structures; he asked if Mr. Singleton had thought of building "a separate structure that wouldn't fall under the same rules about one thing dominating another." He asked if that process was thought through, and Mr. Singleton said he hadn't considered it because he thought there wasn't the room, and it would cost too much to have two buildings there. Chairman Newman said Mr. Singleton has "one complete structure and (is) building another complete structure," and they "only share a wall"; they will have 2 mechanical systems because it's a duplex, with separate bathrooms and kitchens – not, say, the efficiencies of a two-story.

Mr. Singleton said that wouldn't be his dream house. He feels the guidelines are meant "for the tabby manses." He feels "working class" homes shouldn't be viewed the same way, and he thinks there should be different consideration for those kinds of houses. This is "a neighborhood and a community," and what he wants to do "would be acceptable there," though it might not be on The Point, Mr. Singleton said. He doesn't feel that the 36" above the original structure is as important "as it seems to be to, seemingly, most of you." He hoped the Board would consider an exception to the guidelines because of the homes around his in his neighborhood. His community wants "to see it go forward," Mr. Singleton said. If there's a delay, he doesn't know what will happen. His children are "on Board as of now," and Mr. Singleton stated again that "the language of the Milner report is ... soft." He read to the Board from the report about additions to existing buildings. The report says, "wherever possible," Mr. Singleton concluded, so he feels "it's not carved in stone."

Ms. Dickerson said she is part of the same neighborhood, and she applauded Mr. Singleton for his desire to renovate the house. She said 3' doesn't sound like much, but "it is a big mass of a roof," and "mass and scale is the first rule." She agrees that the homeowner should get to live in whatever they want, and if Chairman Newman can come up with something that gives Mr. Singleton what he wants, and it also goes with the guidelines, and she thinks Mr. Singleton "should give it some thought." She has been in a similar position, and "the Board came up with something" that saved the Dickersons $40,000, and it was like what they wanted to begin with.

Chairman Newman indicated the difference in roof pitch to lower it 3'. He said it's different to look at the elevations vs. a model. The gable will still be seen, Chairman Newman said, and "if it's part of the historic stock, it will essentially come over it." He said that Mr. Singleton could have the same amount of room he has now and will have one less rise to get up in the room. Mr. Singleton can have what he wants and meet the

objective to preserve the original structure. Mr. Singleton said he would like to see it in terms of plans and in a form where he "can see the numbers."

Chairman Newman showed the plans and how it could be done "to gain a few inches here and there and maybe lose corners." Mr. Singleton might lose on fewer risers on the stairs, but he will lose no square footage, and he's adding more ceiling. Chairman Newman said they won't lose anything, and anyone who could do these drawings that he'd submitted could show this change to Mr. Singleton and give the new plans to him. Ms. Kelly said they could have an exposed ceiling in the laundry room. Mr. Singleton said he'd "like to see it," and "if it works" for him, he "can see it could probably work."

Chairman Newman said Mr. Singleton could get plans that bring the ridge down, and the Board could "approve it pending a staff review." Mr. Singleton said, "In principle, it's reasonable." He "just wants to see it done," so he can study the change and ensure it's what he wants and meets his needs. Ms. Lutz said Historic Beaufort Foundation is "absolutely on Board" with this idea.

Ms. Dickerson said there's a blue roof across from Pigeon Point boat landing. Chairman Newman said he's "never seen a blue roof that is a good idea." Mr. Singleton said he's "much easier with the roof than (he is) with the space."

Chairman Newman made a motion to accept the plan with the suggestions that have been made, with the exception of the coloring of the roof. Approval of the roofline – to be modified so the size of the new structure does not exceed the lines of the original structure – would be between the homeowner and the staff planner. Ms. Dickerson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Dickerson asked if Mr. Singleton was "aware of the bathroom situation." She said the only access to the bathroom appeared to be through the bedroom. Chairman Newman said that wasn't so and explained why. Chairman Newman added that there would be a flat ceiling in the living, and "the study has access to the whole area." Mr. Singleton could use some attic space for storage, and he will have "a lot of space up there."

DISCUSSION: CHANGING NOVEMBER MEETING DATE

Ms. Kelly said she wanted to move the November 12 meeting to November 19.

DISCUSSION: METAL CARPORTS IN THE NORTHWEST QUADRANT

Christina Wilson, 910 Wilmington Street, has a wooden carport from the 1940s, Ms. Kelly said. It's rotting, and she wants to replace it with a prefabricated metal carport, but these haven't been approved. Ms. Wilson had obtained a letter from **Dwayne Smalley**, who said he's in support of it for this specific case, but Ms. Kelly feels once it's approved, it needs to be permitted everywhere. Ms. Wilson said the carport is white, and the house is white with green trim. She "can't change the state of the wood." Ms.

Wilson said the carport she wants “would blend in with the house.” Finances are an issue with her needing to continually repair it. She said she couldn’t park under it because she is afraid of her carport falling on her car. It has a corrugated plastic roof, it was agreed, and it’s leaking, Ms. Wilson said. The bolts are corroded.

Ms. Lutz asked about what code says about this sort of carport and about tie downs. Chairman Newman said, “It’s so minimal…a shade structure.” Ms. Wilson said that there are other such structures in the Northwest Quadrant. Ms. Lutz said the last time this was an issue, there was a metal shed installed in the Old Commons neighborhood, and the owners were made to cover it with wood. Ms. Dickerson said, “This is such a non-carport,” adding that she was expecting it to be much bigger. “I want a metal structure,” Ms. Wilson said.

The place that has the carport she wants, which is 12 x 21, is at 2729 Boundary Street, Ms. Wilson said. It’s called Quality Builders. Ms. Dickerson asked if this were considered a temporary structure, and Ms. Kelly said no. She wants “something that’s self-sufficient,” Ms. Wilson said. Ms. Dickerson said she would like to have a look at it, and Mr. Symes agreed. Ms. Kelly told Ms. Wilson that staff would need a formal submission to the HRB for next time. Ms. Lutz asked if design questions would be involved, and Ms. Dickerson said she has to see it first to know.

There being no further business to come before the Board, **Mr. Symes made a motion to adjourn, and Ms. Laurie seconded. The motion passed 3-0**, and the meeting was adjourned at 3:39 p.m.

DRAFT