A meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held on **December 10, 2014 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, Erica Dickerson, Chuck Symes and Barbara Laurie and city staff Lauren Kelly.

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. Symes made a motion, second by Ms. Dickerson, to approve the minutes of the November 19, 2014 meeting as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

REVIEW OF FULL BOARD PROJECTS

806 Boundary Street, Identified as District R121, Tax Map 4, Parcel 96

Alterations, Renovations

Applicant: 806 Boundary LLC (HR14-47)

The applicant is requesting HRB approval for both alterations to the existing structure and a rear addition. The applicant is also requesting approval to utilize the Bailey Bill for this project

Ms. Kelly said the project is on Boundary Street. It's circa 1958 and is considered non-contributing. It qualifies for the Bailey Bill because it's in the Historic District, meets the 50-year threshold, and the expenditure far exceeds the minimum for the Bailey Bill. They will renovate and construct an addition to the rear. In regard to zoning and the site plan, the site plan in the packet is not on a formal survey, and the setback line is a little in question. The applicant thinks its 12', and the setback requirement is 10'. In regard to size, it's 1300 square feet, and the addition is 1000 square feet.

Ms. Kelly cited applicable guidelines about exterior alterations and building additions. Staff feels the renovation and addition are a significant improvement, and they hope it will set a good precedent for all the buildings moving forward.

Site comments:

- The new parking configuration needs to be on the site plan.
- The mechanical equipment, utilities, and trash recycling need to be screened from the public right-of-way.
- A bike rack is required.
- If lighting is to be added, a lighting plan will be required.
- Staff had discussed stormwater with the applicant due to the increase in impervious surface. They don't want to flood other properties due to the addition of the impervious surface.

Building comments:

- The door on Boundary Street must be a useable entrance.
- The entry and portico on the east side are well composed in regard to mass and composition.
- Overall detailing should be in keeping with Lowcountry style to qualify for the Bailey Bill, and that is the authentic architecture they are striving for.
    - The rake overhang seems too deep at 2', Ms. Kelley said; the applicant should consider 12".
    - The roof pitch on the addition exceeds the height of the existing building on the front, so the applicant could consider increasing the front roof pitch.
    - For the eaves, consider exposed rafter tails, closed rafter tails or a partial return.
    - The size of the beams on the portico and alignment should be studied more and fine-tuned.
    - The east portico has a double column; Ms. Kelley suggested that they might eliminate one and just have one, which is more traditional.
    - Consider a true wood sill for more depth to the window and a detail that is typical in this area.
    - Keep the header trim on the windows 6" but reduce the side trim to 4", which is more traditional.
- Window specifications will be needed for final approval and to get the permit.

Staff recommends preliminary approval, Ms. Kelly said, with the following conditions to be approved by staff:

- An updated site plan showing resolved side setbacks, parking configuration, percentage of impervious surface, bike racks, service equipment and screening
- Stormwater run off addressed
- Modifications to some of the building details as detailed by staff

Ms. Kelly said she had recommended a text that will help with the details as she had suggested. She reiterated that details could make the building more authentic.

Mr. Peitz asked if the applicant agreed with staff's comments. **Travis Harrison**, architect, said in regard to the site plan, the masonry face is 12'; as of last week, they are well within the setbacks. The rectangular building is 12' off the property, so it is in the setback; the addition will be, too. Mr. Harrison said they "didn't need to apply for an extension."

In regard to other staff comments, Mr. Harrison said

- The mechanical equipment will be enclosed, and the trash receptacles will not be needed. **Kendall Erickson** said they have a cleaning crew that will come and

take the garbage away. The condensing unit will be at the rear, Mr. Harrison said.

- Lighting will be up to the owner's discretion, Mr. Harrison said.
- A stormwater survey may be required because the total impervious area after the addition is 39% of the lot; it's at 13% now and 26% will be added.
- In regard to the rake overhang being too deep at 24", Mr. Harrison said with a drip edge and soil conditions, you don't want lot of splash back, so it needs to be out as far as possible so as not to slash water back out and dirt onto façade. He would prefer a larger rather than a shorter overhang
- Rafter tails, custom windows, and historic elements: the exposed rafter tails and custom windows are "more exclusive to residential buildings," Mr. Harrison feels. If they renovate this building and make it more residential, it will "compete" with the building on Bellamy Curve. It will be commercial/residential and will compete with other structures in the area as well, so he "advise(d) against the rafter tails being exposed and the custom windows with sills." Mr. Harrison said he would complement the existing structures, rather than take away or compete with them. He agreed to move the columns out, but said it would expose the edges to water and therefore to mold. If the rafter tails are exposed, the amount of necessary prevention maintenance will also go up to ensure that they don't get nests, etc. in them. Mr. Harrison reiterated his contention that exposed rafter tails and shifted columns are in residential buildings.
- Mr. Harrison said he had read the supplements and the Beaufort preservation manual and all he could find was that the supplements gave recommendations in regard to restoration, not new construction. He read through other communities' preservation manuals and didn't find much on new construction there, either.
- Mr. Harrison said in regard to raising the roof, the supplement and preservation manual said this would make the addition be set apart from the existing building, and they already have that now. The roof, siding, etc. will all be new. According to the preservation manual, he said, the building shouldn't have a flat roof, the brick is antique, no defined yard space and a chain link fence; all of these are discouraged in the preservation manual, Mr. Harrison said, and they are eliminating them.
- The window treatments that staff recommended "are doable," Mr. Harrison said. They are exactly the same as the building next to them.

Mr. Peitz noted that there are 10 building comments in the staff report and asked with which ones Mr. Harrison agreed. Mr. Harrison said he agrees with the column widths comment. The measurements are 12" and 18", and he agrees with aligning the face of the columns per the suggestion in the staff report.

Mr. Peitz said he's hearing that Mr. Harrison believes the comments staff made are for a residential structure, not a commercial structure. Mr. Harrison said he would agree with that; there are distinctions between the 2 kinds of buildings, and he feels "commercial and residential should be kept separate." In his opinion, the samples in the staff report would be typical for residential structures. Mr. Harrison said in a commercial environment, "You don't want too much residential in it ... because it will overtake what you are trying to do, so it doesn't dominate it." He said, "You want both sides to complement each other," so "if there are houses on adjoining properties, you need to integrate the building into that." This will be a CPA office, Mr. Erickson responded to a query.

Mr. Peitz said Mr. Harrison had said that they have concluded the survey and have met the setback requirements. Mr. Harrison said this is approximate. The stormwater plan may have to come later, he said, because they are adding 26% impervious surface.

Mr. Peitz asked if there's additional landscaping for the parking lot. Mr. Erickson said he thinks there's a requirement. **Tim Rentz**, builder, said **Libby Anderson** had said 5% is the maximum. Ms. Kelly said what it takes to get to 5%, but the building takes up most of the front.

Ms. Laurie asked about the chain-link fence, and there followed a discussion about to whom it belongs. Mr. Erickson said the gravel area is expected to remain gravel.

Ms. Laurie asked about the recommendations from staff that were based on guidelines: if the architect has concerns about those recommendations, how do the applicants conform to the guidelines? Chairman Newman said every project goes through planning, and then a menu is given to the Board of what staff feels should be considered. Chairman Newman said the architectural elements are details that will make the building more effective and compatible. That's why they're given, not as requirements, but for the Board to review based on what Ms. Kelly saw.

Mr. Symes said he would be in favor of modifying the windows. He doesn't "buy into the commercial vs. residential" argument in the Historic District. They need to preserve a historic flavor. "This is a thousand percent improvement over what's there now," he feels, and it will help Boundary Street look better, so they want to try to make the project happen. He thinks the window change is important, but on the other recommendations, Mr. Symes said he would defer to Chairman Newman. He noted that the higher or lower roof pitch is something that the Board has looked at before. Chairman Newman said he didn't understand that comment from staff about the pitch, and to him "its fine." There are different size masses, and he "wouldn't change anything about that."

Chairman Newman said no one objects in general to the building as-is. Nothing is offensive about it, but it's clearly headed toward being in "a residential vernacular"

because of the buildings around it. The direction of staff's suggestions is "mostly making the details authentic ... not a bastardization." When the applicants are trying to save money, they "might boil it down and it would look terrible," but they're not doing that, so Chairman Newman said he would encourage things like window detailing and the columns on the porticos. He said that Ms. Kelly was right – the one at the wall would be a pilaster. "If you're following through with this," he said, the business "is a formal business," and the "last 5% will be the difference between this looking good and it looking really good."

In regard to the roof overhang, "around here, the details get more refined." A flat face on the eave and on the rake and a flat pork chop will look OK, but it *could* look really good. Even some of the poorest, run down old buildings in Beaufort "will have a little detail that elevates the building's architecture," Chairman Newman said. These details don't need a whole other Board review, but the applicants should consider the refinements, and then staff can approve. They are in a neighborhood, Chairman Newman said, and they should make it look a little more like it is in one, not make it more contemporary.

Mr. Peitz clarified what Chairman Newman meant about the eave. Chairman Newman said on the rake end and the eave, they could have a bed mold or a 1-by-2.

Chairman Newman recommended "grabbing the thought behind the contemporary elements and then cleaning them up, not just copying them." The windows in general are fine, and they are not asking them to put in wood windows. The Keyserling building has 2-over-2, Mr. Erickson said. The vertical panes are not a requirement, but he likes the recommendation.

Mr. Peitz said it can't be made into something it's not. It's "just a box, currently." Mr. Erickson said it was a loan/finance office when it was built. Mr. Peitz said now to have a modern office building, it's basically new construction, even though nothing there is brand new. He agrees with Chairman Newman. Mr. Peitz asked if it had to come back for final approval. Ms. Kelley said they could recommend final approval with staff approvals. Mr. Peitz said it would be a needless delay to make the applicants come back to the Board. He said he hopes the comments are taken to heart. It would be "a great-looking building with the right refinements."

Ms. Dickerson made a motion for final approval of the application as submitted with consideration of staff recommendations. Mr. Peitz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The January meeting will be on the 14th, Ms. Kelly said.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Newman adjourned the meeting at 2:50 p.m.