

#

A meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held on **September 9, 2015 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, and Barbara Laurie, and city planner Libby Anderson. Chuck Symes 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 2:01 p.m.

MINUTES

Chairman Newman said the following:

- On page 4, Mr. Symes made a motion, but there was no second or a vote shown. Let the record reflect that **Mr. Peitz seconded the motion** after clarifying that the applicant understood the discussion about impervious surfaces, and **the motion passed unanimously.**
- On page 5, the minutes state that Mr. Peitz asked Mr. Montgomery if he agreed with staff's comments. Chairman Newman felt it should be clarified that Mr. Peitz was asking Mr. Montgomery if he agreed with the staff's comment about *widening the 5' porch.*
- On 6, Chairman Newman requested that the sentence "Mr. Montgomery said the owner likes it in this location because he is planning *plantings on this side,*" be changed to plantings on *the outside* to be "less nebulous."
- On page 8, the minutes state that Ms. Anderson said this commercial "building needs to be either elevated or flood-proofed because it's in the flood zone, and the applicant has chosen the latter option." Chairman Newman said the applicant chose the *former* option (elevation), not the latter. [The stenographer clarified this on the audio recording, and it was her error. Ms. Anderson said, "The applicant has chosen to elevate."]
- On page 9, Chairman Newman said he had said none of the apartments would be "dark," not "down."
- Also on page 9, Chairman Newman said he had said the apartment on the back "could completely *lose* [not *use*, as was recorded] its eyesight."

Maxine Lutz requested that the record show that, in reference to the "three huge trees" at 204 West Street, which Mr. Biery said the arborist had told him were 24" hackberries and therefore not grand trees, aren't *all* hackberries; Ms. Lutz said one of them is a hackberry, but one is a Live Oak, and the other is a sycamore.

Mr. Peitz made a motion, second by Ms. Laurie, to approve the minutes of the August 12, 2015 meeting as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

#

708 Pinckney Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 575, Alterations and additions

Applicant: Robert Marek for Catherine Scarborough (HR15-28)

The applicant is proposing to enclose a garage and convert it into an owner suite.

Ms. Kelly said the structure is circa 1962 and is non-contributing. This project has not come before the Board before. This is a separate application and a separate project than one the Board has seen before; only the building is the same. The alterations and additions proposed include enclosing a garage and converting it into a living space, replacing the windows, and adding shutters and corner trim.

Ms. Kelly said that staff recommends that the applicant use a shutter on the garage conversion's windows that is similar to the Bahama shutters that are being added to the other windows. Staff recommends final approval as submitted with this condition. All materials will need to be submitted and reviewed for approval during the building permit submission, Ms. Kelly said.

Chairman Newman clarified that Ms. Kelly was saying that the shutters all need to be the same *style*, and Ms. Kelly said she was suggesting that they all operate the same way, as well.

Mr. Peitz asked **Robert Marek** if he agreed with staff's recommendation about the shutters. Mr. Marek said, "Yes and no." He likes Bahama shutters for this part of the house, but if the client wants shutters elsewhere in the house later, they might not want Bahama shutters on all of the windows, such as in an area where there is good, natural lighting that they don't want to have blocked out, for example. Mr. Marek said he likes the look and would suggest that they "take it down to a single window and shutter it."

Chairman Newman said he disagrees with staff's comment because the house is "basically odd (and) non-conforming in a historical context," so he doesn't feel the "shutter use . . . will matter remarkably." Bahama shutters work well where privacy is sought, but not where you want to see out and get light in the window. They might work in the bedroom on the right side but will darken the room on the left side. Ms. Kelly said if they were just to add shutters, it wouldn't have come to the HDRB, but because they were "changing the opening/adding windows," they had to. If they add shutters on the side, they wouldn't need to come before the Board. Ms. Dickerson said the shutters don't bother her because the windows are "completely different . . . across the front of the house."

Ms. Lutz asked why the picture window is single pane, rather than matching the others, which are 2-over-2. Mr. Marek said they are "opening the whole inside up," and it gives someone the option to go with interior shutters, since it's such a large window. All of the windows but that one will be 2-over-2. **Ms. Dickerson made a motion to approve**

#

the application as submitted. Ms. Laurie seconded. The motion was approved 3-1, Mr. Peitz opposed.

905 & 905½ Wilmington Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 258,
Restoration.

Applicant: Otis Smith for Kevin Dennis (HR15-29)

The applicant wishes to make renovations to the original structure and is requesting approval of the Bailey Bill application for the work being done.

These two structures are one submission because both are on the same parcel, Ms. Kelly said. Both are listed as contributing on the 1997 Above Ground Historic Sites Survey. 905½ is older (circa 1900), while the other structure is from the 1950s and became contributing in 2001 when the period of significance was updated. They have been vacant and abandoned for years, and then a large tree fell in 2014, which damaged 905 significantly and 905½ somewhat.

Ms. Kelly said the request is for approval of the Bailey Bill application and final approval of an in-kind restoration and replacement of the front stoop at 905 Wilmington, and for in-kind restoration, minor demolition of a rear addition, and restoration of the front porch at 905½ Wilmington. There are no zoning issues, and no additional square footage will be added. It meets the Bailey Bill requirements.

Ms. Kelly said staff feels that on 905 Wilmington Street, a shed or gable roof might work better than the planned hip roof for the front stoop; a hip roof is not found anywhere else on this building. Window specifications and shutter materials need to be approved.

Staff recommends final approval of the project, Ms. Kelly said, with some discussion by the Board about the roof, and with new materials to be approved during the permitting process.

Otis Smith said they plan to keep both chimneys. Chairman Newman said the shed Ms. Kelly had mentioned might be a problem because of how close it comes to the right-hand corner. It will be snug under the eave, and have to be virtually flat. He agrees about the hip on the front, but if they made a conventional front porch, they would have to “go closer to the other side, make it like it was across the whole front of it” for it to be “like a shed on the front of it.” Chairman Newman asked if there was “any foundation there that you’re acting on top of, or are you making this up from scratch on the front?” Mr. Smith said they are acting on top of existing deck. Ms. Dickerson said, “Actually, the right side of the porch roof looks like a continuation of the regular roof.” Chairman Newman said it would not be easy to do what Ms. Kelly is describing, “because you can’t tuck that in under the eave, so to speak.” He suggested a gable “might be even more conventional.”

#

Ms. Lutz said Historic Beaufort Foundation is delighted to see this project happen. Mr. Peitz said he thinks it's great. Ms. Dickerson said she does, too. **Mr. Peitz made a motion to approve.** Ms. Dickerson said if they "flipped the tub and the sink" in 905½ Wilmington, "you could put a window there."

Ms. Lutz noted that there's no dining area in either plan. Mr. Smith said they are working with what they have there. **Ms. Laurie seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

508 Craven Street, Identified as District 120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 891, New Construction.

Applicant: Allison Ramsey Architects for Anne & Bill Lamm (HR15-30)

The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing one-story garage and construct a new two-story accessory building with living quarters above a garage.

Ms. Kelly said this structure is circa 1880 and is listed as contributing. It has undergone some alterations. The applicant is proposing to remove the 1-story garage in the rear and construct a 2-story garage with an accessory dwelling unit above it. There has been an accessory structure in the rear of this parcel since 1924, she said; the 1958 Sanborn map shows a different accessory structure, and neither matches the current one-story building, so it's not a historical structure.

The current building footprint is 348 square feet, and the proposed total building footprint is 468 square feet of garage with heated space above, and a 251 square foot, one-story carport, for a total building footprint of close to 700 square feet. Concerning zoning, Ms. Kelly said the garage is right on the eastern lot line, but this building will bring it into compliance.

Staff feels the general location on the site, and the mass, size and scale meet the intent of the guidelines, Ms. Kelly said. The proposed windows are appropriate, but they must have simulated divided lites. Staff suggested considering a standing seam metal material for the roof in order to be compatible with the main structure. Ms. Kelly said staff recommends final approval of the application, with Board discussion of the roof material, and on the condition that the building permit specifies the simulated divided lite windows.

Robert Moore, the architect for the project, said the client wanted "to use asphalt shingles because the metal roof was going to be cost-prohibitive for them." Mr. Peitz asked what color the shingles are. Mr. Moore said his client was "hoping to find shingles that are a similar color to the metal roof on the existing structure: some kind of reddish color." Mr. Peitz asked from where the roof could be seen. Ms. Kelly said, "You really couldn't see the main structure from the street. You could only see the roof on the bracketed awning that comes out over the garage doors." Mr. Peitz said he feels if it can't be seen, he "wouldn't mind going with a shingled roof." He doesn't know if the Board has mandated the use of the same roof materials in the past. Ms. Dickerson asked if "the

#

little shed roofs” were metal. Mr. Moore said he had thought “that would be a good thing to do: have that little shed roof that you can see from the road be metal – over the garage door.”

Ms. Dickerson said she is not a fan of red asphalt shingles, but she wouldn't mind one that goes with the other color palette: grey or black. Mr. Peitz agreed.

Ms. Lutz said Historic Beaufort Foundation wanted to know if there is room to pull a car into the carport and back out without hitting the house. Mr. Moore said, “The carport was meant more as outdoor living space than a carport, and all the parking was going to happen in the graveled area in front of the garage and inside the garage.”

Ms. Lutz said “someone who is very familiar with the landscaping of that property” had said that there is a well that will be covered if the building is moved over, and had asked if it’s important to the owner to have a well for irrigation. Ms. Lutz said they had wondered why the applicant wouldn't leave the building on the property line, and go to Zoning Board of Appeals to get a variance. Mr. Moore said the owners didn't want plants right up against the side because it presents “a maintenance issue.” The owners are aware of the well and are fine with capping it, he said. **Ms. Dickerson made a motion to approve the project with the use of an asphalt shingle that coordinates with the shutters, and metal to match the house on the little shed roofs. Mr. Peitz seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

1408 Greene Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 240, Alterations, Additions and New Construction

Applicant: Allison Ramsey Architects for Cecilia Washington (HR15-31)

The applicant wishes to restore the original portion of the historic structure in-kind, and to modify and expand the small post-1960 rear addition. The applicant is also requesting approval of the Bailey Bill application for the work being done to the original historic portion of the structure.

Ms. Kelly said staff is also excited about this project, which is for a structure that’s been vacant for more than 20 years. It’s located in the Northwest Quadrant and is circa 1870. The applicant wants to restore the original portion of the historic structure in-kind, and to modify and expand the small, post-1960 rear addition. This is also a request for approval of the Bailey Bill application.

The existing square footage is 689 square feet, and the proposed square footage of the addition is 274 square feet, Ms. Kelly said. Staff recommends approval for the project and for the Bailey Bill with the condition that the specifications for the proposed windows are provided and approved by staff when the applicant applies for the building permit.

#

Ms. Lutz said Historic Beaufort Foundation “love, love, love(s) it.” Ms. Laurie said she is glad to see the “movement” of both of these Northwest Quadrant projects that the board has seen today, and that the owners are able to do it. Ms. Dickerson said that she is happy to see the Bailey Bill being utilized. **Ms. Laurie made a motion to accept the project as presented with the recommendations made by staff. Mr. Peitz seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

509 Harrington Street, Identified as R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 678, Alterations, additions, minor demolition

Applicant: Ansley Hester Manuel, Architect (HR15-32)

The applicant is proposing to remove the existing rear stoop, and add a rear addition with a porch, along with minor interior renovations.

Mr. Peitz said he thinks this project is “moving in a positive direction.” Ms. Kelly said this is “the side yard house on Harrington,” circa 1860, which came before the HDRB in July and August of 2014, and received final approval for a different addition to the structure with a plan that had a similar mass and scale; the configuration of the stairs was a little different.

The structure has a Historic Beaufort Foundation façade easement on it, Ms. Kelly said. This time, the applicant is proposing to remove the existing rear stoop, and add an addition with a large screened porch.

Mr. Peitz asked if the roof would be metal. **Ansley Manuel** said, “Yes.” Mr. Peitz asked what color it would be. Ms. Manuel and the owner discussed this. Ms. Manuel said, “They just want a silvery, natural color.”

Ms. Kelly said staff recommends final approval for the project, as submitted, on the condition that Historic Beaufort Foundation approval is given before the applicant receives any building permits. Ms. Kelly said Historic Beaufort Foundation was unable to have a meeting prior to this HDRB meeting because they did not have a quorum. Ms. Lutz said they would meet Friday, and the conversations about this project “have been positive.” **Ms. Dickerson moved for approval as submitted. Mr. Peitz seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

214 New Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 958, Alterations, additions

Applicant: Montgomery Planning & Architecture for Augustus Oemler & Deborah Warren (HR15-32)

The applicant is requesting approval for alterations and additions to the structure.

Ms. Kelly said this project came before the Board last month and was given conceptual approval. The plans are more refined this time. It’s a modification of a small, existing infill porch on the Hepworth-Pringle House, one of the oldest in Beaufort, circa 1760,

#

replacing it with a hyphen. Other proposed work includes adding windows back into the other 1950s-infilled porch, and adding a 650 square foot addition to the west side, an 80 square foot garden shed, and a privacy fence.

Ms. Kelly said some of the discussion last time was about the materials to be used. Staff had a question about the proposed material/pattern for the panel under the new windows on the infill porch. For the materials used in the new construction, staff recommends an asphalt shingle on the hyphen, to match the rest of the house and using wood siding and handrails, but for the windows, the Anderson A-series with simulated divided lites is appropriate, as are the PermaCast columns. Staff recommends using wood siding for the new construction, Ms. Kelly said, but for the garden building, HardiePlank could be used. Staff recommends final approval with Board discussion of the materials to be used in the new construction.

Robert Montgomery said there was a description of the wooden windows to be used in the original building, and in his last submittal, he had enclosed a brochure describing the materials in the A-series windows and doors. Also, the A-series windows “are on the New Street building, at the corner of New and Bay,” which was a new construction project in 2006.

Ms. Dickerson said she disagrees about the bridge roof because she thinks it would look better in metal, to differentiate the two buildings. Mr. Montgomery said they could go either way, but he and his clients like the metal because it “accentuates the division between new and old.” Chairman Newman said he thinks they could treat the entire hyphen that way, and if there’s a detail color, “the side walls on either side of the entry door, might be actually treated that way as well, so the whole entity truly felt like a link” between the two buildings. Ms. Dickerson and Mr. Peitz agreed.

Chairman Newman said when they discussed the issue of new materials at the previous month’s meeting, he had agreed that “new materials can be an effective solution,” but they had set precedent at the Davis’s house with Ms. Manuel, when the Board determined that with a new house, synthetic materials were fine, but a historical structure being repaired or added to required that “we had to stay in kind with materials. I think the only exception was . . . an outbuilding or something like that.” This is the reason he brought the matter up, Chairman Newman said. He “thought with this kind of important character structure, we had to stay in texture and materiality with it.” Ms. Dickerson asked, “But we can do PermaCast columns these days, right?” Chairman Newman said, “I don’t recall exactly that discussion and where we got to that.” Ms. Dickerson said she thought it was because even the new wood wouldn’t have the same integrity. Chairman Newman said the Board has had that discussion, but he doesn’t remember “whether that gate has been opened or not. Certainly, everybody in town has replaced their columns before, and columns today are not the same.” He said he recalled examples had been cited of columns that were replaced with PermaCast without the property owners coming to the Historic District Review Board. He’s not

#

against them or against the artisan siding; Ms. Manuel had made a painted sample for a project of hers that came before the Board, he said, and the two had looked virtually identical.

Ms. Lutz said that wood and Hardie do age differently; “wood is going to age.” Mr. Peitz said that wood gets “a little wavy,” and “artisan has tried to overcome that with a thicker product, and it’s very costly.” Chairman Newman said the original hardie is very thin, but the artisan is as thick as full siding” and “is more expensive than wood.” He doesn’t have a problem with it, but he didn’t “know where HBF is with this issue.” This is “a distinct addition” and “a separate structure.” Mr. Peitz said wood splits and paint on wood flakes, and over time, it gets a “layering look.” Cement fiber will be smooth to start and always will be as it’s painted. Chairman Newman said the layering doesn’t really happen now because there are no more lead-base paints; most paints stretch now, like latex. Whatever is painted on one will go on the other, regardless.

Chairman Newman asked Ms. Lutz if the Board could approve the materials. Ms. Lutz said she would predict that the committee would agree with this. Chairman Newman asked if they could make a motion that HDRB would approve that, and when HBF meets, they could address this with Mr. Montgomery. Mr. Peitz clarified that they would be approving the metal roof on the hyphen, the A-series windows, the PermaCast columns, and the wood siding.

Ms. Kelly asked about the handrails, which are AZEK. Mr. Montgomery said, “We would put a wood cap on the AZEK rail system with the balusters and the fasteners, top and bottom.” He said the AZEK rail he’s “proposing is milled from AZEK stock” and is not a prefabricated rail system. “It’s built as a wood rail would be built out of solid AZEK material that would be the same dimensions as the wood that it replaces,” Mr. Montgomery said. **Mr. Peitz made a motion to approve with a metal roof on the hyphen, the A-series windows, the PermaCast columns, the wood siding, and the AZEK railings.**

Ms. Kelly asked if they want to make any clarification about the hyphen. If the roof changes, she said, it makes sense to intentionally make it different. Chairman Newman said that could be a staff approval if Mr. Montgomery wants to study that more and bring it back to Ms. Kelly for staff approval. It’s not a requirement, Chairman Newman clarified. **Ms. Dickerson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Montgomery said in the first submittal, the windows in the old porch were 12-over-12, and he had changed them to 9-over-9. He asked about the south elevation in the new bedroom addition. All those lites are larger, he showed, which is consistent with the existing porch, and the owners didn’t like that as much. They may want a smaller pane, and he is hoping that would be a staff approval. The other windows aren’t changing, he clarified.

#

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Dickerson said she is fine with the meeting materials coming to her via email, and she feels “guilty about all the paper” when it’s then also given to her printed for the meetings. Mr. Peitz said he “love(s) the paper.” When he’s out in the field, he wants paper. Chairman Newman told Ms. Kelly that he and Ms. Dickerson don’t want paper copies. Ms. Lutz said HBF needs paper copies. Ms. Kelly said that she would tell Julie to make two fewer packets.

Mr. Peitz said, concerning his “No” vote on the 708 Pinckney Street project, the windows and shutters were all different, and with a little creativity, it could be made a little more uniform, and “they could at least look around to see what is going on around them.” He felt they didn’t need a Board review because the Board didn’t add or subtract anything from that project.

Ms. Laurie said sometimes people bring things to the Board because that's procedure, and sometimes the Board needs to keep in mind that some people have limited resources, even to be “creative.” People have to work with what they have, and “even though you might want something to look more aesthetically correct, that translates to dollars.” Mr. Peitz said he means that since they are going to buy shutters and replace windows, anyway, it might not cost more to be creative, and it wouldn't cost them to step back and consider context. Ms. Dickerson said, “It’s a very tiny, dark house.” She felt like there wasn’t anything the Board could do to make it better.

Ms. Kelly said as they go forward, they do need for Bailey Bill projects to make sure the details are good, especially when people have the resources to do it well.

There being no further business to come before the Board, **Ms. Dickerson made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Peitz**, and the meeting adjourned at 3:02 p.m.