A meeting of the **Historic District Review Board** was held on September 11, 2013 at 2:10 p.m. in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Joel Newman and board members Mike Rainey, Inez Neal, Bill Chambers, and city staff Lauren Kelly. 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 2:00 p.m.

MINUTES

Mr. Rainey made a motion, second by Ms. Dickerson, to approve the minutes of August 14, 2013 as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

REVIEW OF FULL BOARD PROJECTS

1214 DUKE STREET – Alterations, Additions, Final Review

Applicant: Allen Patterson for Meredith & Mark Anderson, Owners (HR13-36)

Lauren Kelly said the new house was built in 2011. The applicant is requesting final approval to finish the attic space and add dormers to the front of the building. Staff feels that this addition is appropriate to the size, mass and scale of the buildings. Staff recommends that the applicant use the smaller divided lites to match the pattern of the existing windows. Staff has one question, is it possible to lower the windows slightly or use shorter windows to allow the trop trim to be complete and not chamfered at the gable? Staff recommends final approval of this request, with the discussion of non-chamfered trim board running above windows.

Chairman Newman asked the applicant, Allen Patterson, if there is anything different than what was submitted or any updated drawings. Mr. Patterson said we put notes on the plans where we are going to use a 12 lite window. Mr. Patterson asked for more information about the trim board. Chairman Newman said when you look at the elevation you see the window trimmed but the eave fascia clips the corners off. Mr. Rainey said the dormer portions are way out of portion and don't work. Mr. Patterson suggested bringing it up and putting in double-hung with 9 lites to match the lites below. Mr. Newman said the Board doesn't have any objections to gable dormers and the appropriate path would be that the applicant is to make the alterations to solve the trim problem and window lite problem and submit that elevation to staff for her to review and approve. However, if Ms. Kelly has questions, she can email it out to the Board members. All board members agreed. Historic Beaufort Foundation (HBF) agreed.

Mr. Rainey made a motion, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve the application with the suggestions talked about taken into account and that staff has approval authority over the final documents. The motion was approved unanimously.

712 CONGRESS STREET – Minor Demolition, Alterations, Additions, Final Review
Applicant: Mark W. Sutton, Architect, for Lois Smith & David Thorton (HR13-37)

Ms. Kelly said 712 Congress Street is listed on the *1997 Beaufort County Above Ground Historic Sites Survey* as circa 1880 as "Contributing to the listed district." It appears that on the 1924 Sanborn maps, the main house and an outbuilding were situated on this site. Between 1924 and 1952, the outbuilding was connected to the main house and an addition was placed on the southwest corner. The porch has also been modified and is currently concrete with metal lace columns. The building has been listed as vacant/abandoned for over 40 years. Ms. Kelly said the applicant is requesting to remove a portion of the NE corner of the building, and replace it with a larger addition. The square footage would increase from 1,348 SF to 1,709 SF. The applicant also requests to replace the modern, metal columns on the front to turned wood columns.

Staff is very excited to see this building come back into use and feels that in general. Staff asked what the planned use for the existing kitchen building is. And, is the proposal to move the building? If so, this should be depicted on the drawings as well as on a landscaping/site plan. Staff said regarding the site, where will the HVAC units be placed? They must be screened on all sides and may not be located in the setback. Staff asked that this be included on the landscaping plan, as well as a detail of the screening. Regarding the building issues, staff asked if it is possible to incorporate the existing kitchen in its current location into the design of the addition. On the front (north) elevation, has the applicant considered using windows that were more in proportion to the ones on the front? Staff would recommend narrower windows with around a 2:3 proportion, and a lite pattern similar to the one on the rest of the house. Currently they are shown with a cottage-style lite pattern, an around a 4:5 proportion, which is a little less vertical than the others. Staff also recommends not adding shutters to the building, unless this is a design modification proposed wholesale. They currently have limited applications and do not appear to be original to the building. Lastly, on the east elevation, what type of door will be installed?

Staff recommends preliminary approval of this request, with the issues mentioned above to be discussed and resolved upon final submission. The proposal for what will happen with the existing kitchen building should also be discussed.

Chairman Newman asked the applicant, Mark Sutton, if there is anything different than what was submitted. He apologized for leaving off the details of the door. He said the owners really like the house and it's very small and they want to make it a full-time residence, and wanted to add a kitchen that would be more of a family live-in kitchen. The applicant's intent was to move the little kitchen to make into a garden house and preserve it; not living quarters and then build the addition. The case of the windows is that they are above a wall of countertops and he could not get deeper windows in there so he made it "cottage" like. Not sure if shutters will be all over the house. But if there were never shutters than we probably would not put any on. The house was very simple. Regarding the columns, he said "I originally drew them as

round columns but the owner wants them to be squared." Mr. Rainey said a period house should have square columns. Chairman Newman asked what the situation with the site is because it seems like about 20% of the house is not on the lot. Mr. Sutton said it's actually on the right-of-way and doesn't seem practical to move it. He said we are not doing anything on this side of the house. Mr. Sutton showed the plat of the property. Chairman Newman said he likes the house without the shutters. Ms. Dickerson feels the original roof line is more simple and elegant than the proposed roof line; it doesn't compliment the other roof line. Ms. Kelly said she had a similar thought but came back around to other additions that have been done. Ms. Dickerson said it needs more study. Mr. Sutton said maybe working with the roof would help the façade. Chairman Newman agreed. Mr. Sutton said he has a problem keeping the kitchen and would be happy to design something that would be it similar in form and use that as the link and reduce the scale and fix the roof line. Mr. Chairman said he would prefer one of two things: Either leave the building alone and utilize it as part of the connective tissue to get to this addition or take that thing the off it, save it and reutilize it on the site but make the addition more sympathetic to the existing house because right now it looks like a ranch house attached to the side. He said the Board doesn't have a problem with what is in the plan and what you are trying to accomplish but he thinks one of his suggestions is more appropriate. Mr. Rainey referred to *The Secretary of Interior Standards*. Mr. Rainey said would like to see the building remain in place. He'd rather see it used as it is and used as a linkage to get to something. Ms. Dickerson said the part that connects to the kitchen to the house would be the perfect bridge to the new house but there is a challenge. The Board feels no one would object to losing the "connector". Mr. Sutton feels he needs to revisit the plans and come back with what the Board wants to see for approval. Mr. Sutton said he still likes the idea of removing it; saving it; reusing it; re-purposing it and reconfigure the existing. He asked the board members would consider doing some of this work intermittently through email and get a consensus so he doesn't have to walk out with a rejection and have to drive back to Columbia. Mr. Rainey said he would be open to a special meeting in the future to speed things up. Mr. Rainey would like to hear from HBF about the kitchen house.

Maxine Lutz from HBF said the Preservation Committee obviously objects to any demolition if that was ever a consideration. They do object to moving the structure. She said this is the last kitchen house in Beaufort. They would like the street side historic façade retained and use the small building as a connector to something that goes off the back; this would be much better. Ms. Lutz talked about cutting a door on the back side to go into another connector similar to the Pennsylvania Farmhouses. Chairman Newman did the applicant study coming out of the back of the house because than there would be no street impact. Mr. Sutton said there is large Water Oak tree. Chairman Newman said we are saying as a Board and HBF is saying, this is an important project and the more of the street elevation you can save the better. Mr. Rainey said he would rather see the water oak go and the kitchen house to stay. He suggested getting his clients to agree with seeing the tree gone, modify the plan to utilize that space and preserve the original footprint of the house. Also explain to them that this is the only one left like this.

Jay Weidner, HBF and Preservation Committee, He reiterated what Ms. Lutz said that this is

the last kitchen that's freestanding. It's really important that this be saved onsite and be incorporated into the house. He suggested raised it a little bit to be level with the house because it would not materially destroy the integrity of the building as part of a kitchen. He referred to 502 Scott Street. He made suggestions of how to treat the freestanding buildings to integrate them into existing buildings, the applicant needs to go look at Rita Idleheart's house with the farm; she would love to show them. It's built of 3 separate buildings that are joined. The height is no more than a hallway with a shower closet added to it. He referred to *The Milner Report.* Mr. Weidner said the proportion of the windows on any addition should be the same proportion as they are on the original house. He suggested the applicant take a look at the kitchen on the back of 807 Scott Street. Ms. Lutz asked about the awning windows. Mr. Sutton said they wanted the awning windows because this is the owner's bedroom. Mr. Weidner talked about the narrow gables and sloping sides all around town. Mr. Sutton likes the idea of reposition to the rear and will present this to the owners. He said his intent as an Architect is to make this house as cool as possible in Beaufort. He asked the Board if they could let him know if the awning windows are okay. He said he will have the owners get a Topo or Tree Survey. Chairman Newman said you can't build this project without the Tree and Topo Survey.

Mr. Rainey needed to leave the meeting at this point.

Chairman Newman suggested Mr. Sutton sent a PDF to Lauren Kelly and then she can distribute it to the board members. Ms. Dickerson asked if we care that the kitchen is attached to the house. Mr. Weidner said the *Standards for Rehabilitation* say don't reposition. Ms. Dickerson said that's not what I mean. Chairman Newman said Ms. Dickerson is asking if he removed the linkage does he have to put it back or can it be an independent structure. Mr. Weidner said that's fine. Ms. Lutz objects to replacing out the original windows. Mr. Sutton talked about square columns vs. round columns. Mr. Newman agreed with everyone that the general aura is that the house is not fancy and the square columns has its own kind of dignity. Mr. Sutton has no problem with the square columns and in fact that's what the owners want. Ms. Kelly said its very similar detailing to the duplex house on the next block at 810-812 Congress Street. Chairman Newman asked if there is anything wrong will rising up the plate of the bedroom area. Ms. Lutz said no. Chairman Newman said it's a distinct piece of the building and there's nothing wrong with raising the plate to 8' and having the roof have a break in its peak. Ms. Dickerson referred to 912 Duke Street. Ms. Kelly said once Mr. Sutton has something new, to send it to her. Ms. Kelly also said he will need a tree removal permit needed but there will be no fee since the house is listed on the Vacant and Abandoned List. Mr. Sutton asked what the submittal date is. Ms. Kelly said he has about 10 days to resubmit.

No motion.

DISCUSSION: 702 BLADEN STREET

Maxine Lutz, HBF, said they wanted to bring this address for discussion since it's in the Bladen Street Redevelopment District. Ms. Lutz showed the architectural plans to the board members. She also gave out a proposed plan of what they want to do. We merely need to stabilize it, address foundation issues and roof issues. If funds are available replace roof with metal. Already the siding that has asbestos has begun to come off; the drop ceilings have asbestos and will be removed; also the linoleum floors have a presence of asbestos and will be removed. We will gut the building and stabilize it and make it a shell for someone to come and do what they wish. Ms. Lutz said the Bladen Street Redevelopment Plan is for that part of it is to be commercial, but so far that really hasn't happened on that block. Ms. Kelly said there is a Live-work there. Ms. Lutz said there is one. She said we've talked to two different couples who may be interested about live-work space and its 3,200 square feet. Ms. Dickerson asked if she has considered selling it to one of those couples as-is. Ms. Lutz said that one couple asked about this but HBF feels we want to do this work and hold it to a certain standard. Chairman Newman asked why not sell it with an easement on it. Ms. Lutz said they could do that. Ms. Dickerson said why delay it if they are anxious to move. This has not been discussed in committee forum as we operate. It should have been discussed 3 months ago. Ms. Lutz said they just talked to them in August. The first couple is out the picture because they made an offer on another property. The problem is that no one had a vision for this property and so that's why we decided to take it on.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.