

A meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held on September 14, 2016 at 2:00 p.m. in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Joel Newman and board members Barbara Laurie, Quinn Peitz, John Dickerson, Chuck Symes, and Libby Anderson, planning staff.

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

Approval of the minutes of the minutes of the August 17, 2016 Historic District Review Board meeting was tabled to allow the board more time for review.

REVIEW OF RULES OF PROCEDURE

Chairman Newman reviewed the rules of procedure for HDRB meetings.

REVIEW OF FULL BOARD PROJECTS

212-214 Scott Street and 812 Port Republic Street, Identified as R121, Tax Map 4, Parcels 924, 926, 928, and 984

New construction

Applicant: R.W. Chambers for 303 Associates, LLC (HR16-31)

The applicant is requesting approval for a new 70-unit, three-story hotel with commercial space on the ground floor with parking under the building.

Ms. Anderson said the site is comprised of two tax parcels. The Scott Street lot is a gravel parking lot used for public and private parking; it is sometimes referred to as the Western Auto lot. A structure would need to be demolished for this project; it is not on the *Historic Sites Survey*.

Ms. Anderson said the applicant is requesting conceptual approval for a new mixed-use building with retail/commercial space on the ground floor and a hotel above. The applicant had come to the HDRB in October 2013 and August 2014 with proposals for residential buildings on this property; this application for a hotel has not previously appeared before this board.

The property is zoned Core Commercial, Ms. Anderson said, and no setbacks are required. Maximum height is 35' at the street, with a maximum height of 50' back from the street. The building would be three stories high, and the ground level may contain parking in an "interior courtyard arrangement," she said.

Site: The context directly adjacent to this property is varied and inconsistent, Ms.

Anderson said: the building the Palm and Moon is in on Scott Street (70' long and 1 story), cottages across Port Republic Street, and the Beaufort Inn (3+ stories), a historic 2-story shopfront building, and the library parking lot. A protected tabby wall is adjacent to the proposed trash enclosure; it appears to be protected from disturbances, Ms. Anderson said.

Staff suggested that the traffic pattern be considered as the design progresses, Ms. Anderson said, particularly if parking is to be incorporated on the ground level. The city manager is committed to exploring the City of Beaufort taking over the sidewalk in this area, she said. This could permit the encroachment of colonnades/arcades and balconies, and increase the project's buildable area, while incorporating elements that "engage the street and provide pedestrian protection," she said. This would allow the applicant to bring the bottom two floors forward, and extend a pedestrian-covering element over the sidewalk to within 18" of the curb, Ms. Anderson said; the third level could then be pushed back to mitigate the mass on the street.

Building: The rhythm and articulation of the building should be studied, Ms. Anderson said. The effort to make it look like "a series of buildings built over time" may not be "the most authentic strategy." **Lauren Kelly** had suggested the applicant look at other hotel precedents (e.g., the Planter's Inn in Charleston, the Marshal House in Savannah), which are flexible buildings that could house a variety of uses over time.

To modulate the façade and create a better relationship with the surrounding context, staff suggested the applicant could increase the height of the two interior wings on the building's southwest corner, Ms. Anderson said. This could offset a height reduction elsewhere. Staff had also discussed with **Bill Chambers**, the project's architect, the idea of breaking the building into 3 corner/end elements with a simpler building fabric in the middle.

The corner of Port Republic and Scott Streets is currently proposed to be an open corner with a plaza, Ms. Anderson said, with a hotel entrance on the second floor and rooms on the third level. This would be a unique feature in a Beaufort building, she said, so it needs careful study to see how it interacts with the street. If colonnades or galleries are used, they should be at least 8' clear depth, and preferably 10' to 12'. These "overhanging elements" break up the façade and minimize the perception of the mass from the street, so this is a good strategy, staff feels.

HVAC unit vents should not be visible for the rooms fronting the street in the historic district, Ms. Anderson said. The idea of having commercial or retail space on the ground floor with individual on-street entries is good, and staff encourages the applicant to maintain this aspect of their plans, she said. The grand hotel entry/lobby could also be a great addition to the district if it is properly articulated.

Ms. Anderson said, for the next submission, streetscapes, street sections, and a 3D

massing model will be required. The drawings should show the existing surrounding context, ideally from Bay Street to West Street, to the mid-block of Port Republic between Scott and Carteret Streets, and the mid-block of Scott Street between Craven and Port Republic Streets. The applicant must attend a pre-application conference before returning to the HDRB, and make an application for demolition before, or concurrent with, that HDRB meeting, Ms. Anderson said. Lot consolidation will be required as the project moves forward, she said, and the applicant should demonstrate how trash and mechanical equipment will be handled.

Staff recommends that the applicant revise the plans and elevations based on these staff comments and the board's, Ms. Anderson said, and return to the HDRB for another conceptual review.

Mr. Peitz asked if the applicant agrees with staff's comments. Mr. Chambers said most of them had been generated from a meeting with staff before this HDRB meeting. The massing of the building "from the old (plans) to the new" is "completely different," he said.

Mr. Chambers said there is "parking underneath the building" in the original site plan, with "a plaza on the second level." These are city parking spaces that "were on that [Western Auto] parking lot there now," but the City of Beaufort is in favor of moving those spots elsewhere, which frees the lot up, so there does not have to be parking underneath this building, and they can create a green space behind it, which they "feel would be better for the block," Mr. Chambers said. The green space will create "that street energy" that they want "to occur," whatever the building design.

Mr. Chambers said the difference between the original design and the new design is that the hotel lobby would move down to grade (30" off the ground). It would be "dry-flood-proofed."

The Port Republic sidewalk was widened by setting the building back 4' – 5', Mr. Chambers said. They are able to go higher this way: the Scott Street sidewalk is wider. He showed the site plan for the ground floor and said the second floor would be dedicated to a lobby and hotel functions. The garden space will replace the buildings that are articulated in the older plan. On the third floor, the three outbuildings are gone, and the third floor is all hotel rooms. Mr. Chambers said this project kept the scale of the building on three bays, which is typical Beaufort scale. They created a variety of buildings with the same articulation. They asked the city if it looked like a hotel, he said, and if they wanted it to look like one or to be "modulated on these different planes." Mr. Chambers showed the scale of the buildings on the street, which they tried to maintain. They are now trying for end buildings on either end of a building that wraps the street.

Mr. Chambers said he has tried "to create a streetscape." He showed articulation of the

colonnades, which is how he “modulated this larger building into pieces.” After the applicant met with the city, staff sent examples of projects to them for scale, some of which he reviewed for the HDRB. Most of Bay Street now is retail below and residential above, “or it looks like it is,” he said.

Mr. Chambers said the parking on the first floor is now gone, and it “is a garden.” He showed which portions were at grade and which were 30” high. Without the parking, they could have rooms that look out to the green courtyard, he said, which is better with the outbuildings eliminated. He showed the space the lobby would occupy “versus the second floor.”

Mr. Chambers showed new exterior drawings of the forms “on the ends and one form going all the way across” between them. This has to be studied and hadn’t been seen by the developer and applicant, **Dick Stewart**, Beaufort Inn, LLC, but Mr. Chambers wanted to bring the option to the HDRB so they could discuss “where this (project) should go.” Mr. Chambers showed the property line and how the building was set back. Whatever they do, they want to widen the sidewalks, he said.

Chairman Newman asked if HBF had comments. **Maxine Lutz** said she had a question about the height of the building adjacent to Greyhound Flats. She wondered why it “was so much higher than the rest of it.” Mr. Chambers said the scale could be reduced. They are well under the 35’ allowance now, he told Chairman Newman. On the perimeter of the back lot, they are set back 6’ off the property line in an effort to have “those corners read more like corners.” He would like them to “feel like independent buildings.”

Mr. Peitz asked if HBF was leaning toward this new submittal or the original. Ms. Lutz said that no one else from HBF has seen the plans, so she and Mr. Symes would be speaking for themselves. HBF had liked the articulation of the initial plan and also liked “a hotel looking like a hotel,” Ms. Lutz said. Mr. Peitz clarified that HBF is “open to” this new plan, and Ms. Lutz said, “Sure.”

Mr. Peitz said he felt like staff’s examples from other cities were “very good.” He feels the project should be an “authentic,” continuous building.

Ms. Laurie asked Mr. Chambers “how you build over a sidewalk.” He said the former Beaufort Bookstore building is “built over the sidewalk,” with columns “out in the middle of” it, for example, and the Saltus building had a cantilevered balcony over the sidewalk. Chairman Newman said, “It’s more like making a nice covered walk.” Mr. Chambers said it’s “basically air rights.”

Mr. Peitz said he likes the new elevations and finds them “most appropriate.” They “unif(y) the use.” He understands that the original submittal mimicked Bay Street, but prefers this.

Ms. Laurie said she feels this is a “good thing for downtown” and those tourists who want to stay there, as there is only one hotel downtown at this time. She said she is leaning “toward staff’s recommendation,” which Mr. Chambers has worked toward.

Mr. Dickerson said he likes the design and the creativity of “taking a little bit from the past to create today’s Beaufort look.”

Mr. Symes said he likes the idea and the layout of both designs, and he thinks people will feel the building is “a monstrosity,” but he doesn't think it is. He doesn't like the colonnades or “a New Orleans look” in the historic district of Beaufort. He feels it's important to understand, as Ms. Anderson had pointed out, that the blocks around it are mixed, and to understand the transition in the zoning. Mr. Symes feels it's important for this building to “facilitate the transition.” He prefers the look of the building in the original plan, because he feels it fits in better, and he doesn't feel a hotel “needs to look like a hotel.” In the second design, he doesn't care for “all the glass on the chopped corner,” which he finds historically inappropriate. The two end buildings in both designs “could use a little more character.” Mr. Chambers said he agrees. Mr. Symes said Mr. Chambers is “conceptually on the right road.”

Mr. Chambers asked Mr. Symes about his objection to colonnades, and Mr. Symes said he doesn't think they are seen in Beaufort, and he would favor balconies, though they wouldn't be his preference if they were wrought iron, like they are in New Orleans.

Mr. Peitz said there are two distinct concepts; he asked if Mr. Symes was saying that of these two concepts, he prefers the original one, and Mr. Symes said that is his preference – the series of buildings. Mr. Symes said that “adds to the transition from a very commercial area to a residential area.”

Chairman Newman said he feels “the second scheme is far superior to the first one.” He believes a “fake sense of a collection of buildings over time” is never successful. No two buildings on Bay Street look alike, he said. They “happened over 200 years,” and people grew used to them, so to try to “instantly create” that collection is not as successful as what Ms. Kelly had recommended. The colonnade would be “far more successful” than pushing the building back, Chairman Newman said, and it creates an “inviting character.” They would not want wrought iron, like buildings in New Orleans, he said, but he thinks “the colonnade would be fantastic.”

Mr. Symes asked if there have to be two stories of colonnades, or if there could be just one. They could have a porch on the second or third floors, Mr. Chambers said. Mr. Stewart said it would depend on the agreement reached with the city. Chairman Newman said a “stepped relationship” to the Greyhound Flats and HBF buildings would be nice, but it's not essential. He and Mr. Chambers discussed the context this building is in and how its construction might lead other building owners to see how they could “gain more value out of” their sites eventually.

Mr. Dickerson said Milner says new construction in a historic district should take “a creative approach” and be “fresh.” He told Mr. Chambers, “You have a great opportunity.”

Mr. Stewart responded to a comment from Mr. Symes, saying he prefers that a guest staying on the second level of this building would be able to walk out onto a porch or balcony, and they “may want the same on the third floor, but we may not need a roof on that one.” Mr. Chambers told Mr. Peitz a low rail would probably separate the balconies from one another.

Mr. Chambers said staff had commented about the window air conditioning units, and they had been taken out of the revised design.

Chairman Newman said they could free themselves from the hip roofs on the end buildings. “The roof up there has no real bearing” on the streetscape or on “my feel for the building,” he said. Mr. Stewart said a flat roof would provide the opportunity to install rooftop solar panels “and still meet our mechanical requirement.”

Mr. Peitz asked Mr. Stewart about his opinion of the drawings he was seeing for the first time today. Mr. Stewart said this is a conceptual design, and they will get feedback from the HDRB, and then when they are putting their proposal together, they will consider these comments and others. Operationally, he said, it would be best if the hotel staff doesn’t have to explain so much to guests seeking rooms (e.g., which rooms have balconies), and could give everyone rooms with balconies on the hotel’s second floor. Mr. Stewart added that he prefers having a garden in the back to having a concrete plaza and parking.

1304, 1306, and 1308 Washington Street, Identified as R120, Tax Map 4, Parcels 352, 351, and 351A

New construction

Applicant: Paradise Point Construction (HR16-32)

The applicant is requesting approval for a series of new cottages.

Ms. Anderson said this project is in the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood of the city’s historic district. There have been a series of dwellings on these lots and along the alley. The applicant wants to develop a 2-phase infill project: Phase 1 involves constructing three cottages on existing platted lots; Phase 2 involves subdividing the lots at 1304 and 1308 Washington Street to create lots fronting both Washington Street and lots fronting Crofut Lane. A development design exception (DDE) would be required to do that, Ms. Anderson said; granting a DDE is within this board’s purview, and it would require a public hearing during Phase 2 of the project.

Today, the applicant is seeking conceptual review of the architecture proposed for

Phase 1 and feedback on the site plan and architecture proposed for Phase 2, Ms. Anderson said. The Phase 2 plan also shows redevelopment of a vacant and abandoned structure at 1310 Washington Street, she said, so it would require the HDRB to do a final review of the demolition that the board had tabled at a public hearing in August 2015 to allow the title to be cleared and more investigation into the property's ownership.

This is a new project to the HDRB, Ms. Anderson said. Phase 1 involves three new cottages on existing platted lots – two 1.5-story buildings (with 800 and 560 square foot footprints) and a 2-story building with a 714 square foot footprint. Phase 2 would involve the construction of 4 new cottages, two of them on newly platted lots: two 1-story buildings with 300 square foot footprints, one 1.5-story building with a 522 square foot footprint, and one 1.5-story building with a 1000 square foot footprint.

Ms. Anderson described the setbacks in General Residential zoning in the Northwest Quadrant. The platted lot at 1306 Washington Street is smaller than a typically permitted lot in this area, she said, so deviations in the setbacks may be permitted by the administrator “to accommodate a reasonable building area.” Rear setbacks of this lot and “additionally permitted subdivisions” may be reduced to 5’, with a goal of around 10’ for the main building, she said. Porches and/or steps could encroach into that setback, but not to within 5’ of the lot line.

Ms. Anderson said staff is thankful to the applicant, Paradise Point Construction, for taking on this project, which could spur additional investment in this community with smaller, reasonably priced housing. There is precedent in the Northwest Quadrant for the idea of creating an interior streetscape along the alley; the 1958 Sanborn map shows this two blocks away from where this project is proposed.

The size, scale, and mass of the proposed buildings seem appropriate for the character of the neighborhood and are in keeping with the guidelines, Ms. Anderson said. Staff recommends conceptual approval for Phase 1, and Ms. Anderson went on to detail what the applicant would need to include in the next submission. For Phase 2, staff recommends submitting the DDE for 1304 and 1308 Washington Street; 1310 Washington Street “probably needs to be put on hold,” she said, until ownership is secured or the owner brings the demolition petition back to the HDRB. Staff would like an update on this, Ms. Anderson concluded.

The applicant, **Jenny Evans**, said they had spoken with the owner of 1310 Washington Street, and hope to complete the demolition process. Paradise Point Construction has offered to “take that whole project from him.” The owner said he has addressed the issue of the lot's ownership, and she told the board she could look into that.

Their vision is to “create a place people can afford,” Ms. Evans said. The possibility of an artisan community is appealing. The alleyway is there and underutilized; it presents an opportunity for “a more community feel.” They are not set on this architecture, she

said; this is conceptual, and they want to reflect the diversity of the small cottages in the Northwest Quadrant.

Phase 1 does not need a subdivision, Ms. Anderson said, so it does not need the DDE, though Phase 2 does, and the HDRB approves those. Chairman Newman asked if the applicant was asking only for Phase 1 approval or for more. Ms. Evans said Ms. Kelly had posed that question, too. She wanted to present the whole project conceptually and get the board's approval to move forward with both phases, and then come back to it for final approval.

Mr. Peitz asked if improvements to the alley could be required with the subdivision approval, and who would be responsible for the alley's improvement. Ms. Anderson said as the lots are subdivided, the applicant would need to get fire department approval; if the fire department said improvements needed to be made to the alley so they could provide services, the applicant would need to provide those improvements.

Ms. Evans said her understanding was that alleyways are maintained by the City of Beaufort; Ms. Laurie said the city might maintain them if they were improved by the applicant, and Ms. Evans agreed that they are not maintained by the city now. Mr. Symes said a garbage or fire truck could not get through that alley easily now.

Mr. Peitz said Paradise Point Construction would be creating a new neighborhood on that alley, but that can't happen until the alley is improved, and this will affect those residents who are using the alley now. The density is less of a concern for him than "the off-site public improvements," which may be Ms. Evans's responsibility, so that emergency vehicles can get through that alley to service the residents of the new neighborhood.

Ms. Anderson said there are three existing lots of record. The HDRB could do the Phase 1 approval, but she suggested that for Phase 2, in order for Ms. Evans to create new lots, she will need to know what the expenses are, including the amount of improvement to the alley that would be required. The applicant should also know what the water and sewer costs are, Ms. Anderson said, which staff can do with her at a pre-application conference. Ms. Evans said they definitely want to know which improvements Paradise Point Construction will be responsible for.

Mr. Dickerson asked if they could "get a more definitive answer" about who would own and maintain the alley. Ms. Anderson said it would "probably (be) the city."

Ms. Laurie said years ago, there was a structure where Ms. Evans is proposing a cottage on Crofut Lane, so there is precedent for these cottages, but there were no guidelines then, and most people walked, rather than drove. Ms. Evans pointed out that in their plans, "every place has a driveway of its own and/or a garage." There would probably be gravel parking areas.

Mr. Symes said his concerns are the alley – which is a dirt road, basically, and people on the other side of the alley use it to get into their parking spaces – and who will pay for its improvement and maintenance. Also, he questioned the sale-ability or rent-ability of the houses that face the alley, looking across it at the backs of other houses. Ms. Evans said that is a valid concern that she and her husband, **Greg Evans**, have spoken about. There's another vacant lot there they could buy that is on the alleyway. While the issues Mr. Symes raised about the alley are a concern, she said, their goal is to create a place with lighting and landscaping that is inviting and encourages others in the neighborhood to take pride in what they own.

Ms. Laurie said it's not that people in the neighborhood don't take pride in what they own, but many can't afford to do the improvements to their homes that are needed within the confines of the city's regulations, often because they are elderly. For current property owners to make their homes "aesthetically comparable" to what Ms. Evans is planning would be "a far stretch," Ms. Laurie said. That these people still own their properties – after many generations, in some cases – shows their pride in them, but they struggle to maintain them, and as improvements are made to other properties, the property taxes of current residents will go up.

Ms. Evans asked Ms. Laurie if she felt this project would be a good thing for the neighborhood. Ms. Laurie said the Evanses own this property and have a right to develop it within established guidelines. Her concerns are the size of the alley and getting vehicles "in and out of there."

Ms. Lutz thanked the Evanses for coming to Beaufort and for this – their third – project in the Northwest Quadrant. The HBF Preservation Committee had looked at the architecture of their plan and felt it needed more detail and "more charm." The Preservation Committee still has "a lot of questions," she said, because "we opposed the adoption of the Civic Master Plan, and we still have concerns about the Northwest Quadrant being targeted by the city for subdivision and extensive infill." Infill on vacant lots is different, Ms. Lutz said, than "continuing to make smaller and smaller lots" as the city – not the neighborhood, necessarily – is determined to do. While HBF is "all for infill," the organization has concerns about "continuing to make these smaller lots," she said.

Ms. Lutz asked Ms. Evans if the two phases were dependent on one another. Ms. Evans said she hadn't thought about doing *only* Phase 1, for example, because "we were . . . wanting to go for it all," so she couldn't answer that now.

Ms. Lutz said if the new development code passes, this project wouldn't come to this board. Ms. Anderson said that while the architecture of a new single-family dwelling on an existing lot of record in the Northwest Quadrant would not come to the HDRB, the other aspects of this project would.

Tom Michaels suggested that Ms. Evans look at the cottage court prototype used in Port Royal.

Sue Derrenbacher, Duke Street, asked about the number of bedrooms. Ms. Evans said most of their cottages would have two or three bedrooms. Ms. Derrenbacher said 2-bedroom houses in this neighborhood that are long-term rentals can have as many as five cars, if two couples live there. She asked if the driveways would accommodate two cars. Ms. Evans said that is the plan. On Washington Street, many people park in their front yards, so they would develop driveways that can park at least two cars. There was a general discussion to clarify what this means, and whether the parking is in the right-of-way. Chairman Newman said Ms. Evans' plans are to get parked cars out of the right-of-way, and there is currently nowhere for "extra cars" to be. He said, given the size of these cottages, there is no way for the developers to give space to more than two-car driveways.

Ms. Evans said the designs they have been considering are affordable and a nice concept that is similar to the cottage courts that Mr. Michaels had mentioned, in that they "promote community (and) relationships." Approximately "87% of the people who . . . looked at" the house they built on Duke Street were "older" and wanted to live in a "walkable" downtown property, Ms. Evans said, and that's what inspired their interest in this project. She said the points that are being raised are very good, and she does want to move forward if the HDRB approves of what Paradise Point Construction wants to do.

Chairman Newman said he'd driven down the alley and saw its "limitations and concerns." An alleyway "is kind of my own private back door," he said, so the issue is not how the existing houses on the other side of the alley are maintained, but about how building these houses that have the alley at their front door creates an "imposition" on the privacy of those who have been living there.

The economics of building a new house in this location, Chairman Newman said, will mean that even if it's small, it will still be "fairly expensive," and those who could afford it will not want to live "on a tiny street," unable to look out at a normal streetscape, so he feels these houses would be a "tough sell."

As an architect, Chairman Newman said he knows people without accessory structures have nowhere to put their stuff (e.g., bikes and gardening equipment). Making an accessory structure, and making the second level of it a dwelling, allows the homeowner to rent it out as a garage apartment, without Ms. Evans having to split the lots. There was a prototype of this in the past, Chairman Newman said, and it is more logical to follow that prototype, even if they didn't do the subdivision.

Ms. Evans asked about the two little cottages on Elton Lane, which have front stoops

and a back courtyard that is a “very private . . . living space” with a small garden shed. That seems to capitalize on the alleyway space, she said; alleyway living is appealing to particular people. Mr. Peitz said there is no pattern of people living on an alleyway; Ms. Evans is proposing to change the pattern of this block and create that kind of living for the first time.

Mr. Peitz said he feels he can’t move forward with this until the public improvements are “fleshed out” with the city, as to who is responsible for the various aspects of that element of this project. He feels Ms. Evans should go “back to the drawing board” and consider conceptually how people might live on this alley, and how they might improve this alley so people *want* to live on it. He feels Ms. Evans should meet again with city staff to discuss these issues.

Mr. Symes added that the issue for Ms. Evans is that if Paradise Point Construction has to improve this alley, it might not be economically feasible, or at least would be very expensive. Also, he said, the front door of these properties is at the back door of existing properties. There are some precedents, Mr. Symes said, but they are not prevalent enough to be a standard. The smaller cottages face different directions because they were built on those lots as accessory dwelling units to the larger, original house.

Chairman Newman said that the idea of the internal courtyards and Ms. Evans’s plans are “charming” and “could be fine,” but the idea of subdividing these properties to create another community in the alley seems contrary to the pattern of the neighborhood. Paradise Point Construction has the right and opportunity to create “economic variability” with an accessory dwelling that allows the owner to have a rental unit to “offset a lot of the cost of the larger property,” Chairman Newman said. He’s not familiar enough with the cottage court model, he said, but he does know that as a developer, Ms. Evans could build within “a viable pattern” that already exists, and “meet all of your objectives without having to” perhaps pay “for the utilities and the upgrade of the alleyway,” which is “perfectly serviceable” as-is, if it’s used as “normal access to the back of the property.”

Ms. Evans said they “don’t want to subdivide every lot,” because they don’t want “a cookie cutter feel,” but if only one house faces an alleyway, the property owners won’t feel “warm and fuzzy and safe. You need at least two.” Chairman Newman suggested they could “erase the line. You don’t have to have 2 lots there.”

Mr. Symes said he understands what the Evanses are trying to do, but he thinks the option Chairman Newman has articulated might be more successful than what they had planned, especially if Paradise Point Construction is obliged to pay for the improvements to the alleyway.

Ms. Evans said she would think about what she’s heard. They want to improve Beaufort, and they don’t want to “foul up an entire neighborhood” or its “dynamics,” she said.

707 Church Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 902

New construction and alterations, additions

Applicant: Labi Kryeziv (HR16-33)

The applicant is requesting approval for minor modifications to an existing structure, as well as approval for a new residence.

Ms. Anderson said this lot is on the corner of Church and Duke Streets. A building in the existing building's location is on the Sanborn maps. The structure has been altered from its original 1920s form. The request is to subdivide the lot contingent on the ZBOA's approval and to build a new structure on the subdivided lot. On the existing structure, the applicant's request has been modified since the August meeting, she said; the proposal is now to maintain the existing porch, remove the north-facing steps, and incorporate steps facing Church Street and the rear of the property.

Ms. Anderson said this project has been before the HDRB in May, July, and August, and she reviewed its history with this board and the ZBOA, and why this property is unique. The HDRB tabled the project in August to give the applicant time to address the size, mass, and scale of the proposed new structure and the location of the proposed porch in relation to a tree.

Ms. Anderson said the existing structure was set back in a way that created a large, vacant space on a corner lot, so the applicant proposed to remedy that by subdividing the lot and constructing a new house in that vacant space.

The new cottage is proposed to be 1.5 stories with a 980 square foot footprint, Ms. Anderson said, and a front porch of 132 square feet, for a total of 1361 square feet of heated space. The subdivision requires a variance from the ZBOA because the size of the relief exceeds 35%. The HDRB had recommended approval of the subdivision, she said.

The proposal to relocate the steps to the Church Street façade will maintain the structure's existing form, while removing any impact on the tree, Ms. Anderson said. Staff feels this modification is appropriate. The applicant is proposing to shift the lot line slightly north to maintain the existing driveway access, she said. These changes will eliminate any impact on the large live oak adjacent to the existing house.

Staff supports the size, mass, and scale of the new dwelling, Ms. Anderson said. The plate height has been reduced by 12" (a total of 38" reduction since the original submission), and the gable roof in the front has been replaced with a simple shed dormer. She reviewed the materials the applicant is required to submit for staff approval before the building is permitted.

Staff recommends final approval of the project, with additional material to be provided when the building permit is applied for. If the board gives final approval to this project, the applicant will need to go back to the ZBOA for final approval of the variance for the

subdivision, Ms. Anderson said.

Mr. Symes asked Mr. Michaels how much he had moved the line toward Duke Street. Mr. Michaels indicated it and said it was a shift of a couple feet. **Labi Kryeziv**, the property owner and applicant, said that it was only 2’.

Mr. Peitz asked if moving the front door had been discussed, and Mr. Michaels said it had. Since there were concerns about the tree, he and Mr. Kryeziv had decided “not to do anything about that structure.”

Ms. Lutz asked if there was a new elevation of the existing structure “with the porch changed.” Mr. Michaels pointed out that they were only adding the stairs within the existing house’s front porch.

Chairman Newman said that the tree issue has been addressed. This is an “odd site configuration,” he said, and while it’s small, splitting it is understandable as a “reasonable development option.”

Mr. Peitz made a motion to approve this project, per staff’s recommendation. Mr. Dickerson seconded the motion. Mr. Symes said he still does not approve of the subdivision of the lot, and feels the cottage should be one story, but he feels the applicant has done a lot to ameliorate the issues. **The motion passed unanimously.**

306 King Street, Identified as District R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 750

Alterations and additions

Applicant: Rob Montgomery

The applicant is requesting to add a screen porch to the east and a 10’ addition to the southwest corner and build a small garage and brick terrace.

Ms. Anderson said this structure is in The Point; it is not listed in the *Historic Sites Survey*. It was built circa 1940. The applicant is requesting approval to build a screened porch on the east side and a small addition to the southwest corner. The rear setback at 15’ is currently nonconforming, and the proposed screened porch will increase the nonconformity by encroaching an additional 6.5”, she said. The project adds 270 square feet of interior space and 476 square feet of exterior screened porch space. A rear deck space is to be removed, so the new net impervious surface is 200 square feet, approximately.

Ms. Kelly had asked if the applicant had considered a lower porch roof pitch, Ms. Anderson said. A roof plan would be helpful, and a materials list is needed, including window specifications. Staff asked if pickets would be required in the screened porch, and if the new underpinning would match the existing house. More details on the construction are required upon submission for the final building permit, Ms. Anderson said. The proposed shed/garage is appropriate and meets all the zoning requirements.

Staff recommends final approval of this application, pending discussion of the roof form and submission of a complete materials list and details during the building permit process, Ms. Anderson said. An administrative adjustment will be required to increase the rear setback nonconformity by 6.5", which is a separate process, she said.

Rob Montgomery said the materials and underpinning would all match, and they have enough windows that they are "removing from the original building to go into the additions," so the existing windows will be relocated. On the roof, he feels that this is "such a clean little cottage," so repeating the same simple form would be more appropriate than a shed roof. No pickets would be required on the screen porch, Mr. Montgomery added.

Chairman Newman commented that on the street elevation, the form is clean, but the addition causes a little "nib" on the roof that is visible from the street façade. All that's needed to fix that, he said, is to take the left side of the screened porch and pull it in 16" or so, and pull in the right side about the same amount, still with "connectivity to the other covered porch." He said "that width difference would translate into the roof going up" and "meeting at the same ridge height as the existing house." The wider the hip covering the porch, the higher the ridge, Chairman Newman said, so this would bring that ridge down, and they would have only a couple feet less porch. The street elevation is what everyone sees, he said, and that's the only place from which this little point would be noticeable.

Mr. Montgomery said what Chairman Newman had suggested with the screen porch won't solve that problem. They have looked at solutions, and he discussed two options. Chairman Newman said he sees what Mr. Montgomery is saying, and he would "affect some kind of simple device" like Mr. Montgomery had suggested because this is the elevation that people see. This is not a requirement, he said, but he feels the applicant would like the way this looks better if eliminating this raised point were addressed.

Mr. Symes asked the setback encroachment. Mr. Montgomery said on the southern side/rear yard, the existing house encroaches about 10" into the setback, and then 6" are being added. The storage shed is 5' into the setback in both directions, he said, which is allowed.

Ms. Lutz said HBF likes this project. **Mr. Peitz made a motion for final approval of the project.** Mr. Dickerson said if they adjust the roofline to be level, the value of the house would be maintained, while the resale value could be less if the nib remains. **Mr. Dickerson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

There being no further business to come before the board, **Mr. Dickerson made a motion, second by Mr. Symes, to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously,** and the meeting adjourned at 4:17 p.m.