MEETING AGENDA
The City of Beaufort
HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW BOARD
Wednesday, February 14, 2024, 2:00 P.M.
City Hall, Council Chambers, 2nd Floor – 1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, SC

Please click the link below to access the webinar:
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81548517753?pwd=bTZmWEZaMDg3MFJXzdFiMakhIEVIZz09
Password: 668151 Meeting ID: 815 4851 7753 Call in Phone #: 1+929 205 6099

STATEMENT OF MEDIA NOTIFICATION: “In accordance with 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.”

Note: A project will not be reviewed if the applicant or representative is not present at the meeting.

I. Call to Order:

II. Review of Minutes:

A. January 10, 2024 Meeting Minutes

III. Applications:

A. 1607 & 1609 Duke Street, PIN R120 003 000 0147 0000, major demolition
Applicant: Stacey Applegate, agenda for Kenneth Singleton Living Trust

The applicant is requesting approval to demolish both contributing structures.

B. 919 Bay Street, PIN R120 004 000 910A 0000, signage
Applicant: Lisa Mykleby

The applicant is requesting final approval of interior window signs on the property.

C. 316 Federal Street, PIN R120 004 000 0840 0000, alterations/addition
Applicant: Ashley Randolph, Allison Ramsey Architects, agent for Lynn King

The applicant is requesting final approval for alterations and additions to combine the two existing structures.
D. **709 Greene Street, PIN R120 004 000 1035 0000**, new construction
Applicant Ashley Randolph, Allison Ramsey Architects, agent for Paul & Lynda Smith

The applicant is requesting preliminary approval for a duplex, with an attached garage/workshop/ADU.

E. **1411 Duke Street, PIN R120 004 000 0343 0000**, new construction
Applicant: Allison Ramsey Architects, agent for Randy & Kimberly Withers

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for a subdivision of a lot, and the construction of two new homes on each lot.

F. **408 Carteret Street, PIN R120 004 000 0814 0000**, window replacement
Applicant: David Murray, agenda for Carteret Street Methodist Church

The applicant requesting conceptual approval for replacement of all windows on the ca. 1954 addition.

IV. Adjournment
CALL TO ORDER 1:35

A meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held in-person on Wednesday, January 10, 2024 at 2:08 pm.

ATTENDEES

Members in attendance: Mike Sutton (Chair), Grady Woods, (Vice-Chair), Michelle Prentice, Rita Wilson, and Eric Berman.

Staff in attendance: Curt Freese (Community Development Director), Jeremy Tate (Meadors Architecture).

Vice-Chair, Grady Woods, chaired the meeting in the absence of the Chairman, who was late to the meeting and did not arrive until the second agenda item.

REVIEW OF MINUTES 1:50

Ms. Prentice noted on page 3 under application 1607 & 1609 Duke Street that there was an error. The minutes state that Mr. Sutton recused himself, but this was incorrect, and it should state Mr. Woods recused himself. She recommended the deletion of the following sentence which says Mr. Woods, Vice-Chair, took over the meeting.

Ms. Wilson noted on page 4 under Lise Sundrla’s public comment, the word Friedman was misspelled and should be Freedman’s.

Motion: Mr. Berman made a motion to approve the December 13, 2024 minutes with the noted changes; seconded by Ms. Prentice. The motion passed unanimously.

All Historic District Review Board Meeting minutes are recorded and can be found on the City’s website at http://www.cityofbeaufort.org/AgendaCenter. Audio recordings are available upon request by contacting the City Clerk, Traci Guldner at 843-525-7024 or by email at tgundler@cityofbeaufort.org.

APPLICATIONS 3:02

A. 1203 Bay Street, PIN R120 004 000 0771 0000, Exterior landscaping
Applicant: Dan Keefer, agent for 1203 Bay Street, LLC
Mr. Woods recused himself from the Board. Mr. Berman took over chairing the meeting.

The applicant is requesting final approval for exterior landscaping improvements including new fencing.

Curt Freese presented his staff report under the Public Hearing.

Dan Keefer from Witmer Jones Keefer, Ltd. were present as well as the owner.

Public Comment:

Wallace Scarborough resides at 1207 Bay Street, and said he lives next door, it’s the Means Gage House. He said he spoke to the owner of the Cutberth House about the fence in question and has agreed to hold off on that. He said he put that fence in about 23 years ago. He did a foot setback from property line. The owner said he would do a survey which will be good before any fencing goes up. He then stated they are very pleased with them; they’re doing a great job and will be great neighbors, and we support what they’re trying to do.

Lise Sundrla, Historic Beaufort Foundation (HBF), named the current members on the HBF Preservation Committee Board that were requested from the last HRB meeting. She will provide Ms. Bachety with a list to send the Board. She then stated it was an exciting project, and all the requirements regarding height have been met; the plan is good for the fence and in the back the rear additional landscaping will finish off a part of the property that hasn’t really been finished off over the years. HBF has no issues or concerns with the fire pit. They are supportive of their efforts to improve the property.

Public comment closed.

Motion: Ms. Prentice made a motion to approve as submitted with the absence of the fence. Ms. Wilson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Vice-Chair Grady Woods returned to the Board at this time. Chairman Mike Sutton arrived at the meeting at this time.

B. 808 Hamilton Street, PIN R120 004 000 0562 0000, Alterations 12:00

Applicant: Jack Dempsey, owner

The applicants are requesting final approval for a change to the existing garage, i.e., new dormers.

Curt Freese presented the staff report.

The applicant/owner, Jack Dempsey, was present.

Public Comment:

Lise Sundrla, Historic Beaufort Foundation (HBF), stated HBF is happy and very comfortable with the proposal. The applicant and his wife participated in the HTRC meetings. There are no
negative impacts with regard to visual and it meets the code.

Public comment closed.

**Motion:** Mr. Berman made a motion to approve the project with staff recommendations as written and whatever field details need to be hashed out can be adjudicated at the staff level for the trim. to staff. Ms. Wilson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

C. **919 Bay Street, PIN R120 004 000 910A 0000, Signage**

   Applicant: Lisa Mykleby

   Ms. Wilson recused herself from this project.

   The applicant is requesting final approval of interior window signs on the property.

   Curt Freese presented the staff report.

   The applicant was not present yet.

   **Motion:** Mr. Berman made a motion to move this application to the end of the agenda to allow more time for the applicant to appear.

D. **1114 Greene Street, PIN R120 004 000 02710000, Addition**

   Applicant: Johan Niemand, agent for Kathy and Mike Uzzle

   The applicant is requesting final approval for a screen porch addition.

   Curt Freese presented the staff report.

   The applicant Johan Niemand was present. The applicant Kathy Uzzle was present virtually via Zoom.

   **Public Comment:**

   Lise Sundrla, Historic Beaufort Foundation (HBF), stated the Committee felt this was an easy one to review. They were comfortable and felt they followed the Secretary Interior Standards as well as our seven integrities and really compliments the structure. The original structure was the Pruitt’s store. The addition of the porch is proposed in a very sensitive manner.

   Public comment closed.

   **Motion:** Mr. Berman made a motion to approve with staff conditions as noted. Ms. Prentice seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

E. **919 Bay Street, PIN R120 004 000 910A 0000, Signage**

   Applicant: Lisa Mykleby

   The applicant still was not present at the meeting.

   **Motion:** Ms. Prentice made a motion to table the project until an applicant can be present. Mr. Berman seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.
Mr. Freese reminded the Board that the demolitions for 1607 and 1609 Duke Street are coming back to the February 14 meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**  
51:32

Mr. Berman made a motion seconded by Mike Sutton to adjourn. The meeting ended at 2:50 pm.
STAFF REPORT: 1607 and 1609 Duke Street Demolition

DATE: February 14, 2024

GENERAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant:</th>
<th>Stacey Applegate, agent for Kenneth Singleton Living Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location/Address:</td>
<td>1607 and 1609 Duke (a combined unsubdivided lot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant's Request:</td>
<td>The applicant is requesting approval to demolish both contributing houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Zoning:</td>
<td>T-4 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing:</td>
<td>Both 1607 and 1609 circa 1910, are listed as contributing structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ZONING DISTRICT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T-4 N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width at Setback:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Lot Coverage:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Frontage Build Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SURROUNDING ZONING, LAND USE AND REQUIRED BUFFERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent Zoning</th>
<th>Adjacent Land Uses</th>
<th>Setbacks for Adjacent Zoning/Buffer required if rezoned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North: T-4 N</td>
<td>Homes/Vacant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South: T-4 HN</td>
<td>New Residential Infill: Single Family Homes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East: T-4 HN</td>
<td>Historic Homes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West: T-4 N</td>
<td>New Infill Single Family home</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updates: 1/11/2024, an on-site meeting with HBF, Mayor Cromer, Councilmember Mitchell, and property owner Ken Singleton. HBF offered to buy a home, but the owner Mr. Singleton did not agree to a sale. A letter from Dick Stewart dated 1/12/24 on behalf of the Freedman Arts District has been included. No other revisions have been made, and the report from the tabled December meeting is found below.
2/6/2024: Staff was sent two stamped letters from a licensed structural engineer. The letters are found in the packet. The final recommendation is quoted below:

**Summary:** In summary, the structure is not unlike many older, early 1900’s, structures prior to being renovated. After many years of neglect and failure to be properly maintained, many of the timber elements will require replacement and substantial repair. The foundation is failing, inadequate and not in a condition that can be viably repaired. Based on my investigation, it is my opinion that the structure is not a viable candidate for renovation and would be best suited for removal and replacement.

**Background:** The applicant is requesting approval to demolish the homes at 1607 and 1609 Duke Street. The homes are currently located on the same property, which was never subdivided, and owned by the Kenneth Singleton Trust. The homes were built from 1900-1910 and are both Contributing Structures. The agent for the applicant attended a recent HTRC meeting and were requested to provide a structural analysis from a third-party engineer to verify the structural condition of each structure.

The two homes had a variety of additions over the years, including beauty and sweet shops, which were all run out of the homes. The applicant has provided pictures of the homes, site assessments from Hawkeye Inspections, pictures of the surrounding homes, and a possible cost for rehabilitation of the structures. The applicant has stated they do not presently have the means to restore either structure.

**Structure Safety**

The Code Administrator has been through the house and has found it to be in a state of disrepair. The home is secured from the outside. The Code Administrator and Building Code Official could not make a determination as to its threat to public safety without a third-party structural engineering report.

Now a structural engineering report has been provided, Staff will post this property that it is unsafe for habitation, have it boarded up, and place it on the vacant/dilapidated list.

**Surrounding Area**

As per the pictures included with the packet, there is a significant portion of new infill in the area surrounding the home, and no other historic buildings on this particular block of Duke Street.

**Economic Conditions:**

As per the Beaufort Preservation Manual and the Development Code, there is currently no provision for economic hardship with regards to demolitions.
Demolitions 9.10.2:

Section 9.10.2 D, Demolitions, covers the powers of the HRB with regards to demolitions. All demolitions as per Section 9.10.2 D 1, require a public hearing, as well as posting of the property. Section 9.10.2 D 2, allows the HRB to call upon the Codes Administrator to “provide them with a report on the state of repair and structural stability of the structure under consideration.” As per the HTRC meeting, this was requested of the applicant. Please see structural report found in the packet for both addresses.

Section 4.7.2 F Infill for Demolitions:

While new development is not being proposed in place of this demolition, Staff did want to add this other relevant section of 4.7.2 F related to demolitions, for the Board to make a decision: “Properties deemed contributing in the 1997 Beaufort County Above Ground Historic Sites Survey,” or in the most recent historic resources survey, should not be removed or rendered non-contributing to make way for new construction.”

Beaufort Preservation Manual:

The section on demolitions in the Preservation Manual in Chapter 5, is about a half page, and staff is providing the entire text below for reference with highlights of important passages. Again, this is a guiding document to be gleaned from with regard to HRB decision-making.

The pressure to demolish buildings within any historic district is a regrettable fact of life. Either through catastrophic damage or through years of neglect, there are and will continue to develop situations when a building is deemed beyond repair and “not worth” preserving. In addition, as the Beaufort Historic District continues to attract new residents and businesses, there may be pressure to “make way” for the “progress” that new construction is believed by some to represent. Whereas issues of design guidelines for preservation and new construction are driven by architectural and aesthetic considerations, demolition, especially of repairable structures, is more frequently an economic issue. Indeed, the only other legitimate reason for consideration of demolition is if the building poses a threat to public safety. In considering applications for demolition, especially those based on economic or development considerations, the HRB must weigh issues beyond matters of architectural appropriateness, for demolition of an historic building in an Historic District is rarely if ever appropriate. Rather, the HRB must be convinced that all possible means of saving the building have been exhausted. Valiant efforts to preserve buildings threatened by demolition have been successful in the past. These include the Historic Beaufort Foundation's revolving fund that has purchased, renovated, and then sold property, private efforts to do the same, and, as an absolute last resort, moving threatened buildings to other locations. The Beaufort Code currently includes several provisions regarding the demolition of contributing primary and
accessory structures within the Historic District. These include public notification of the demolition application and holding a public hearing about the application. The HRB may also request from the Administrator a report on the state of repair and structural stability of the structure before deciding on approval, denial, or postponement.

**FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends denial as per the requirements of Section 9.10.2 D 2, and the Beaufort Preservation Manual, finding that all means to save or rehabilitate the structure have not been exhausted.
January 11, 2024

Rob Montgomery, Chair  
HISTORIC BEAUFORT FOUNDATION  

RE: Freedman Arts District & Houses at 1607 & 1609 Duke Street

Dear Rob:

Around 2002, I was working to establish Project Shelter to help restore houses in the NW Quadrant in collaboration with The City, United Way and The Historic Beaufort Foundation. You and I were talking and you said that you hoped the people that lived and owned property in the NW Quadrant would be able to stay because they were an important part of building Beaufort’s history and culture. Project Shelter did a few houses, but ultimately moved out of the historic district because getting approvals and financing renovations was not sustainable. I’m still trying and I’m supporting The Freedman Arts District in this effort. I welcome the opportunity to work with you and HBF under your leadership to achieve results. This letter is intended to frame the issues for discussion generally but also specifically for Mr. Singleton’s property at 1607 and 1609 Duke Street.

**Objectives:** Freedman Arts District is working with property owners to keep ownership within the family, revitalize property so that it becomes a positive asset for the family rather than a negative liability. There are estimated to be 20 houses in the Arts District in similar condition to 1607 & 1609 Duke St. There are other buildings that are deteriorating. There are many (some estimate 50) homes that are occupied but need significant repairs. Each house requires a different approach to be successful. Sometimes, as in the case with 1607 and 1609 Duke, the cost to restore the buildings far exceeds the financial returns that building will produce for the family. The obvious question is “**What cultural and historic value justifies spending large sums to preserve each specific building and, who is the beneficiary of such additional expenditure?**” Each house requires funding tailored to the needs of the family, the house, and the requirements of the party providing the funds.

A rudimentary cost estimate to fund the needs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition of house.</th>
<th>Number Houses</th>
<th>Est cost excess $ / house (1)</th>
<th>Est Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant disrepair</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Disrepair</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$2.25 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs (up to code)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12.500,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) These costs are more than costs for new house construction estimated at $300 / sq ft.
(2) This does not include funds for administration, design, or oversight.
Is funding available? We think revolving funds can be found if it can be demonstrated that the revolving funds will be repaid. Freedman Arts District is doing that demonstration now with funding that has been offered from our family on a discounted basis. We hope HBF will join with Freedman Arts District, the City, property owners and other stakeholders to develop a plan to address these issues without requiring families to sell their property?

HBF priorities? Please provide information on this, it would be helpful in creating a collaborative environment. Some questions to be considered include: (1) How can the buildings be restored without requiring families to sell their property but leave the right within the family to sell if they later chose to sell? (2) Demolition by neglect actions like boarding up houses, putting tarps on roofs and placing liens on the property reduces the value of the property and communicates blight neglect. Is there a better approach? (3) Is it important to retain the history of the people and the buildings in the Arts District when buildings are demolished? How can this best be achieved?

1607 and 1609 Duke Street. These houses require significant work. More than can be justified financially. Freedman Arts District has asked anyone to provide approximately $500,000 which is the cost of restoration compared to the cost to build new homes on the property. HBF is a logical party to ask. There will be other houses in a similar condition. Mr. Singleton owns the property and he says he wants to continue to own the property. Freedman Arts district with available revolving funding, wants to help. The solution must work financially which means the houses, after renovation, will produce sufficient rental revenue to provide income to the family and repay the revolving funds. The appear to be two options:

Option A. Preserve the history of the buildings, their owners and uses by doing a photographic inventory of the houses, preparing a written history of the property, its uses, and a history of the area in which the houses are located. Will HBF do this work? Can you fund it or do you require help? Freedman Arts District will then put this information on-line as well as, if Mr. Singleton agrees, put a small sign in front of the property so that the public can access the information. New houses consistent with the surrounding houses will then be built.

Option B. Find the funds necessary to supplement the cost of renovation so that the buildings are ready for rental. Current estates are $200 per square foot. Assuming the two houses total 2500 square feet the shortfall is 2500 sq ft * $200 / ft = $500,000.

Selling the property is not an option.

Thanks again for your interest. The Freedman Arts District is a potential collaborator to restore and preserve the history, culture, and buildings in the Arts District. As you know, I have been interested in finding a strategy for decades. I remain hopeful that The Freedman Arts District, working with the City, The Center for Heirs Property, HBF, the revolving funds currently available and, most importantly, the families that own the properties, can achieve a positive result for all parties.

Sincerely,

Dick Stewart
As requested, I have investigated the above referenced residence. The purpose of this investigation was to perform a general condition survey.

The structure is a one story timber framed residential building. The foundation, where exposed, does appear to be typical of the early 1900’s unreinforced. The walls are framed with a timber stud system over a very low crawl space. Typically, the exterior siding is applied directly to the studs with no meaningful layer of damp proofing or waterproofing.

**Masonry Foundations / Walls:** At the time of construction the brick masonry used in foundation was installed as described herein below. Depending on the age of the structure, you can expect to find no traditional concrete footing. The mortar used to placed these multiple wythe brick walls is a soft and potentially lime based historic mortar. This brick and lime based mortar approach does degrade over time. As rain water is applied to the face of the exposed brick wall the moisture does penetrate into the inner layers of the wall. As this moisture passes through the wall it will dissolve very small amounts of the constituent properties of the lime mortar. Over an extended period of many years, sufficient amounts of binding constituent properties have been lost and leaves the brick wall mortar joists with the consistency of sand. The brick work exposed on this building did show varying degrees of mortar deterioration. There are ‘tuck-pointing’ procedures using the same lime based historic mortar to help stabilize these old walls.

**Timber Floors and Walls:** The joists and studs in the house are typical of the time and are heavy rough sawn timber elements. The timber framed walls will often rest on top of the masonry foundation wall with a large horizontal sill element.

**Field Observations:** The following conditions were observed. Numerous locations of brick foundation piers were exposed to view. The brick work noted is in varying degree of degradation. There will be foundation walls and interior piers that will require stabilization and re-pointing with the matching mortar.

The roof framing is deflected and sagging typical of an older failing roof system. The floor system if sloped and deflected as a result of extensive deterioration with the floor framing and subfloor. There is evidence of prior termite damage in numerous locations.
**Summary:** In summary, the structure is not unlike many older, early 1900’s, structures prior to being renovated. After many years of neglect and failure to be properly maintained, many of the timber elements will require replacement and substantial repair. The foundation is failing, inadequate and not in a condition that can be viably repaired.

Based on my investigation, it is my opinion that the structure is not a viable candidate for renovation and would be best suited for removal and replacement.

Anthony Austin, PE  SE

Southern Consulting and Engineering, Inc.
N. Charleston, SC • (843)718-2525 Bus.
2135-A NAD Rd. North Charleston, SC 29406 • www.scestructure.com • info@scestructure.com
As requested, I have investigated the above referenced residence. The purpose of this investigation was to perform a general condition survey.

The structure is a one story timber framed residential building. The foundation, where exposed, does appear to be typical of the early 1900’s unreinforced. The walls are framed with a timber stud system over a very low crawl space. Typically, the exterior siding is applied directly to the studs with no meaningful layer of damp proofing or waterproofing.

**Masonry Foundations / Walls:** At the time of construction the brick masonry used in foundation was installed as described herein below. Depending on the age of the structure, you can expect to find no traditional concrete footing. The mortar used to placed these multiple wythe brick walls is a soft and potentially lime based historic mortar. This brick and lime based mortar approach does degrade over time. As rain water is applied to the face of the exposed brick wall the moisture does penetrate into the inner layers of the wall. As this moisture passes through the wall it will dissolve very small amounts of the constituent properties of the lime mortar. Over an extended period of many years, sufficient amounts of binding constituent properties have been lost and leaves the brick wall mortar joists with the consistency of sand. The brick work exposed on this building did show varying degrees of mortar deterioration. There are ‘tuck-pointing’ procedures using the same lime based historic mortar to help stabilize these old walls.

**Timber Floors and Walls:** The joists and studs in the house are typical of the time and are heavy rough sawn timber elements. The timber framed walls will often rest on top of the masonry foundation wall with a large horizontal sill element.

**Field Observations:** The following conditions were observed. Numerous locations of brick foundation piers were exposed to view. The brick work noted is in varying degree of degradation. There will be foundation walls and interior piers that will require stabilization and re-pointing with the matching mortar.

The roof framing is deflected and sagging typical of an older failing roof system. The floor system if sloped and deflected as a result of extensive deterioration with the floor framing and subfloor. There is evidence of prior termite damage in numerous locations.
Summary: In summary, the structure is not unlike many older, early 1900’s, structures prior to being renovated. After many years of neglect and failure to be properly maintained, many of the timber elements will require replacement and substantial repair. The foundation is failing, inadequate and not in a condition that can be viably repaired.

Based on my investigation, it is my opinion that the structure is not a viable candidate for renovation and would be best suited for removal and replacement.

Anthony Austin, PE  SE
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS
HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION

Office Use Only: Date Filed: 11/21 Application #: 24102 Zoning District: T4-A
BCAGHS Survey: Yes No

Schedule: The Historic Review Board (HRB) typically meets the 2nd Wednesday of each month at 2pm. The complete schedule, along with the list of deadlines, may be found here - http://www.cityofbeaufort.org/historic-review-board.aspx

Submittal Requirements: All forms and information shall be submitted digitally. In addition to a complete application form, applicants shall submit the required items according to the checklists on the subsequent page.

Review Request: □ Conceptual □ Preliminary □ Final □ Bailey Bill Approval* □ Change After Certification
*Requires a Bailey Bill - Part A Preliminary Review Application Form
Pursuant to Section 6-29-1154 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, is this tract or parcel restricted by any recorded covenant that is contrary to, conflicts with, or prohibits the activity described in this application? □ Yes □ No

Applicant, Property, and Project Information
Applicant Name: Freedman Arts District
Applicant Address: PO Box 987 Beaufort SC 29901
Applicant E-mail: stacy@freedmanartsdistrict.org Applicant Phone Number: 843-304-5301
Applicant Title: □ Homeowner □ Tenant □ Architect □ Engineer □ Developer
Owner (if other than the Applicant): Kenneth Singleton
Owner Address: 815 National Street Beaufort SC 29902
Project Name: 1607 and 1609 Duko Street
Property Address: 1607 and 1609 Duke Street
Property Identification Number (Tax Map & Parcel Number): R120 003 000 0147 0000
Date Submitted: 11.21.23

Certification of Correctness: I/we certify that the information in this application is correct.

Applicant’s Signature: [Signature] Date: 11/21/23
Owner’s Signature: [Signature] Date: 11/21/23
(The owner’s signature is required if the applicant is not the owner.)

See Section 9.10 of the Beaufort Code for complete information about Certificates of Appropriateness and Section 10.7 for complete information about the historic review board. This form is also available online at www.cityofbeaufort.org. Updated April 10, 2021.
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS
HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION
Community & Economic Development Department
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina 29902
p. (843) 525-7011 / f. (843) 986-5606
www.cityofbeaufort.org

Project Name: 1607 and 1609 Duke St

Property Size in Acres: .34

Proposed Building Use: Single Family

Nature of Work (check all that apply):
- ☐ New Construction, Primary Structure
- ☐ New Construction, Primary Structure
- ☐ Alterations / Additions
- ☑ Demolition*
- ☐ Relocation*

*Demolition and Relocation requires a public hearing

Building Square Footage (if multiple buildings, please list each one and their square footage by floor):
1607 Duke - 1497 sq feet
1609 Duke - 1144 Square Feet

Is this project a redevelopment project? ☑ Y ☐ N

Are there existing buildings on the site? ☑ Y ☐ N If yes, will they remain? ☑ Y ☐ N

Provide a brief Project Narrative (if requesting Bailey Bill Approval, this section may be left blank):
See attached narrative

CONTACT INFORMATION -
Attention: Julie A. Bachey, Administrative Assistant II
City of Beaufort Department of Planning & Development Services
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina 29902
E-Mail: jbachey@cityofbeaufort.org  Phone: (843) 525-7011  Fax: (843) 986-5606

See Section 8.10 of the Beaufort Code for complete information about Certificates of Appropriateness and Section 10.7 for complete information about the Historic Review Board. This form is also available online at www.cityofbeaufort.org | Updated April 16, 2021
Due to the extensive amount of deterioration on 1607 and 1609 Duke Street, the homeowner, Mr. Singleton, and the Freedman Arts District, the nonprofit providing funding and guidance, are respectfully requesting demolition of both structures. Both buildings are contributing, however, mass and scale are the only historic features that remain. Please see attached photographs and inspection reports on both buildings. We respectfully request a site visit by the City Staff, all Historic Review Board Members, and the Historic Beaufort Foundation. After demolition, two homes like those across the street in Midtown Square, will be built. An example plan is in the documents.

The initial intent was restoration, and we have renovation plans ready, however, the restoration estimate is $1,050,000 - $1,322,000. In the HRTC meeting, William Pelloni, owner of Pell-co construction approximated renovation could cost an additional $200 a square foot. The increase for 2641 square feet (for both houses) in lieu of building new, is an additional $529,000. Unless funding for the additional renovation cost of $529,000 can be obtained by local preservation, or other groups, we are requesting a demolition permit based on condition and feasibility.

If additional funding cannot be secured or if a demolition permit is not obtained, the project will be postponed indefinitely.
FREEDMAN ARTS DISTRICT
PIN: R120-003-000-0147-0000


THE CERTIFIER HAS NOT INVESTIGATED OR BEEN INSTRUCTED TO INVESTIGATE THE EXISTENCE OR MONITORING OF ANY OVERLAY DISTRICTS, SUCH AS AIRPORT, MILITARY, NOISE, CRASH POTENTIAL OR ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES.
CERTIFICATIONS ARE NOT TRANSFERABLE TO ADDITIONAL INSTITUTIONS OR SUBSEQUENT OWNERS.
THIS PLAT IS COPYRIGHTED AND IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE ENTITY OR PERSON(S) SHOWN HEREON.
THIS PLAT REPRESENTS A SURVEY BASED ON THE LISTED REFERENCES ONLY AND IS NOT THE RESULT OF A TITLE SEARCH.
REVOKED SHOWN AS PER PLAT OF RECORD AND MUST BE VERIFIED WITH OFFICIAL AGENCY BEFORE PURCHASE.
AND OR CONSTRUCTION ON SUBJECT PROPERTY.
AND OR CONSTRUCTION ON THIS SITE IS STARTED FLOOD ZONE INFORMATION.
MUST BE VERIFIED BY PROPER BUILDING CODES OFFICIAL.
THE PROPERTY APPEARS TO BE LOCATED IN ZONE X AS DETERMINED BY FEMA, HOME COMMUNITY-PANEL.
THE PROPERTY SHOWN HEREON COMPLIES WITH ANY REQUIRMENTS OF THE MINIMUM STANDARDS MANUAL FOR THE
UNDERSTAND DOES NOT CERTIFY ANY CITY AND OR COUNTY CONVENANTS OR ANY CITY AND OR COUNTY ORDINANCES.
REGULATIONS OF LAND SURVEYING IN SOUTH CAROLINA, AND MEETS OR EXCEEDS THE REQUIREMENTS FOR A CLASS 4 SURVEY AS
SHEET.
STATED ON THE ORIGINAL SIGNATURE AND HAS AN EMBOSSED SEAL.

S. C. REGISTRATION NUMBER 10509
THIS PLAT IS NOT BINDING UNTIL ACCOMPANYED AN ORIGINAL SIGNATURE AND AN EMBOSSED S.
LAND SURVEYORS & PLANNERS
28 PROFESSIONAL VILLAGE CIRCLE, BEAUFORT, S.C.
P.O. BOX 1363, BEAUFORT, S.C.
PHONE (643) 522-1798

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>BEARING</th>
<th>DISTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S 00°22'17&quot; W</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N 89°51'28&quot; E</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WONITY MAP NOT TO SCALE

R120 003 139A
Jenkins
L2 S 89°13'15" E 39.73
1/4"Rebar Set
1/4"Rebar Found
0.1'-1'-CONC BLOCK SHEL
75.47
R120 003 0139
Jenkins
CHAIN LINK FENCE

R120 003 0140
Galloway
CMF 4x4
L2 S 89°14'37" E 41.92
1/4"Rebar Found
0.1'-1'-CONC PLANTER
37.4

R120 003 0145
Reynolds
CMF 4x4

R120 003 0148
Prentice
L2 S 89°16'06" W 119.60
1/4"Rebar Set
1/4"Rebar Found
5.3'-1'-CONC BLOCK SHEL
12.3'-1'-CONC PLANTER

14,626.92 Sq. Feet
0.34 Acres

EDGEOF PAVEMENT
EDGE OF PAVEMENT

EDGE OF PAVEMENT

DUKE STREET 60' R/W

±69.3'

AS BUILT PREPARED FOR
FREEDMAN ARTS DISTRICT
PIN: R120-003-000-0147-0000


THE CERTIFIER HAS NOT INVESTIGATED OR BEEN INSTRUCTED TO INVESTIGATE THE EXISTENCE OR NONEXISTENCE OF ANY OVERLAY DISTRICTS, SUCH AS: AIRPORT, MILITARY, NOISE, CRASH POTENTIAL OR ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES.
CERTIFICATIONS ARE NOT TRANSFERABLE TO ADDITIONAL INSTITUTIONS OR SUBSEQUENT OWNERS.
THIS PLAT IS COPYRIGHTED AND IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE ENTITY OR PERSON(S) SHOWN HERE ON.
THIS PLAT REPRESENTS A SURVEY BASED ON THE LISTED REFERENCES ONLY AND IS NOT THE RESULT OF A TITLE SEARCH.
REMARKS SHOWN AS PER PLAT OF RECORD AND MUST BE VERIFIED WITH OFFICIAL AGENCY BEFORE PURCHASE.
AND OR CONSTRUCTION ON SUBJECT PROPERTY.
BEFORE ANY DESIGN WORK OR CONSTRUCTION ON THIS SITE IS STARTED FLOOD ZONE INFORMATION MUST BE CONDUCTED BY PROPER BUILDING CODES OFFICIAL.
THE PROPERTY APPEARS TO BE LOCATED IN ZONE X AS DETERMINED BY FEMA, FIRM COMMUNITY PANEL.
THIS PROPERTY COMPLIES WITH ANY REQUIREMENTS OF THE MINIMUM STANDARDS MANUAL FOR THE FREEDMAN ARTS DISTRICT.
UNDERNO SIGNATURE OF ANY PERSON, THIS SURVEY IS NOT VALID UNLESS SIGNED.
THE CERTIFIER HAS CERTIFIED THIS PLAT TO FREEDMAN ARTS DISTRICT THAT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, INFORMATION AND BELIEF.

David E. Gasque, R.L.
S.C. REGISTRATION NUMBER 10506 FRM 112/77
THIS PLAT IS NOT BINDING UNLESS ACCOMPANIED BY THE ORIGINAL SIGNATURE AND HAS AN EMBOSSED SEAL.

NOT TO SCALE
**Beaufort County, South Carolina**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property ID (PIN)</th>
<th>Alternate ID (AIN)</th>
<th>Parcel Address</th>
<th>Data refreshed as of</th>
<th>Assess Year</th>
<th>Pay Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R120 003 000 0147 0000</td>
<td>00206315</td>
<td>1607 DUKE ST, City of Beaufort</td>
<td>9/22/2023</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Parcel Information**

- **Owner**: SINGLETON KENNETH L (LIFE ESTATE) KENNETH SINGLETON LIVING TRUST
- **Property Class Code Acreage**
- **ResImp SingleFamily .0000

**Owner Address**

- PO BOX 1764
- BEAUFORT SC 29902

**Legal Description**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Year</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
<th>Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$99,700</td>
<td>$86,200</td>
<td>$185,900</td>
<td>$3,592.02</td>
<td>$3,951.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$99,700</td>
<td>$86,200</td>
<td>$185,900</td>
<td>$3,547.12</td>
<td>$3,901.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$99,700</td>
<td>$86,200</td>
<td>$185,900</td>
<td>$3,467.65</td>
<td>$3,467.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$99,700</td>
<td>$86,200</td>
<td>$185,900</td>
<td>$3,388.25</td>
<td>$3,388.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$99,700</td>
<td>$86,200</td>
<td>$185,900</td>
<td>$3,192.66</td>
<td>$3,192.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$82,200</td>
<td>$150,100</td>
<td>$232,300</td>
<td>$4,044.53</td>
<td>$4,726.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$82,200</td>
<td>$150,100</td>
<td>$232,300</td>
<td>$3,987.09</td>
<td>$3,987.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$82,200</td>
<td>$150,100</td>
<td>$232,300</td>
<td>$3,129.59</td>
<td>$3,674.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$82,200</td>
<td>$150,100</td>
<td>$232,300</td>
<td>$3,098.65</td>
<td>$3,638.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$82,200</td>
<td>$150,100</td>
<td>$232,300</td>
<td>$2,955.92</td>
<td>$3,474.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sales Disclosure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Book &amp; Page</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Deed</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Sale Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGLETON KENNETH L</td>
<td>3934 84</td>
<td>11/12/2020</td>
<td>Qu</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGLETON PEARL H KENNETH L JTROS</td>
<td>3414 2497</td>
<td>6/30/2015</td>
<td>Ge</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONVERSION OWNER 00206315</td>
<td>568 1658</td>
<td>10/26/1990</td>
<td>Fu</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN OWNER 00206315</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/31/1985</td>
<td>Or</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Improvements**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use Code Description</th>
<th>Constructed Year</th>
<th>Stories</th>
<th>Rooms</th>
<th>Square Footage</th>
<th>Improvement Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R01</td>
<td>DWELL</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>1,497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R02</td>
<td>DWELL</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1607 DUKE STREET

PHOTOS
1609 DUKE STREET

PHOTOS
1607 & 1609 DUKE STREET

SURROUNDING AREA PHOTOS
1608 to 1612 Duke St
BEAUFORT COUNTY
HISTORIC SITES SURVEY - 1997
RECONNAISSANCE LEVEL BUILDING INVENTORY FORM

Statewide Survey Site Form
State Historic Preservation Office
South Carolina Department of Archives and History
Columbia, SC

Site Number: 13 - 1249
USGS Quad: 025 Beaufort
Doc. Level: Reconnaissance Level

Historic name(s): Map Ref.: BFT.06
Common name(s): City Block Ref.: 127
Address/location: 1607 Duke St.
City/Vicinity of (vic.): Beaufort

Date: 1910
Alteration date: 

Ownership: ☑ 1. private ☐ 2. city ☐ 3. county ☐ 4. state ☐ 5. federal ☐ 6. unknown

Category: ☑ 1. building ☑ 2. site ☐ 3. structure ☐ 4. object

Historic use(s): single dwelling

Current uses: single dwelling

Notes: Rectangular 3 x 1 bay frame dwelling w/lateral gable roof

National Register Status:
National Register Historic District (NHL, 11/73) 12/17/69 Beaufort Historic District 69000159

SHPO National Register Evaluation: Contributes to listed district
Name: Beaufort Historic District

Consultant Recommendation:
Name:

Previous Survey:
☐ H.A.B.S.
☐ Feiss-Wright (1969)
☐ Historic Resources of the Lowcountry (1979)
☐ Milner Historic District Inventory (1979)

Reference:

Notes:

Photograph:

Photographs:
☒ prints
☐ slides
☒ negatives

Date: 8/1/97
Recorder: D. Schneider, Historic Beaufort Fdn.

Roll # Neg. View of:
S-14 19 S facade & W elev., fac. NE.
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HISTORIC SITES SURVEY - 1997
RECONNAISSANCE LEVEL BUILDING INVENTORY FORM
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South Carolina Department of Archives and History
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Common name(s): 
Address/location: 1607 Duke St.
City Block Ref.: 127
City/Vicinity of (vic.): Beaufort

Date: 1910
Alteration date: 
Ownership: ☑ 1. private ☐ 2. city ☐ 3. county ☐ 4. state ☐ 5. federal ☐ 6. unknown
Category: ☑ 1. building ☐ 2. site ☐ 3. structure ☐ 4. object
Historic use(s): single dwelling
Current uses: single dwelling

Notes: Rectangular 3 x 1 bay frame dwelling w/lateral gable roof

National Register Status:
National Register Historic District (NHL, 11/73) 12/17/69 Beaufort Historic District 69000159

SHPO National Register Evaluation: contributes to listed district
Name: Beaufort Historic District

Consultant Recommendation:
Name: 

Previous Survey:
☑ H.A.B.S.
☐ Feiss-Wright (1969)
☐ Historic Resources of the Lowcountry (1979)
☐ Milner Historic District Inventory (1979)

Reference: 
Notes: 

Photograph:

Photographs:
☒ prints
☐ slides
☒ negatives

Date: 8/1/97
Recorder: D. Schneider, Historic Beaufort Fdn.

Roll #: Neg. View of:
S-14 19 S facade & W elev., fac. NE

Brockington Associates, Inc. • Brooker Architectural Design Consultants • Historic Beaufort Foundation • Preservation Consultants, Inc.
BEAUFORT COUNTY HISTORIC SITES INVENTORY
SITE INDEX

Community: Northwest Quadrant
Address: 1607 Duke St.

HBF Site #: 202
NW Quad - 28

Historic Name: NHL district - contributing
Status: Contributing
Integrity: good

Year Built: circa 1910
Significance: contributes to area

Historic Use: single dwelling
Current Use: single dwelling
Condition: good

Stylistic Period: hall-and-parlor
Sub Style: folk type

Desc.: twin to site #28

Notes:

Neg#: 96.02.12  Add. Neg:
Block #: 125  Faces: 3. South

Contact:

Date Surveyed: 2/21/96  By: D. Schneider, Historic
Date Modified: 4/21/96

Quad: Beaufort  East: North:

---

BEAUFORT COUNTY HISTORIC SITES INVENTORY
SITE INDEX

Community: Northwest Quadrant
Address: 1603 Duke St.

HBF Site #: 203
NW Quad - 29

Historic Name: NHL district - contributing
Status: Contributing
Integrity: good

Year Built: circa 1900
Significance: significant local site

Historic Use: commercial
Current Use: vacant
Condition: deteriorate

Stylistic Period: gable front
Sub Style: folk type

Desc.: 

Notes:

Neg#: 96.02.13  Add. Neg:
Block #: 125  Faces: 3. South

Contact:

Date Surveyed: 2/21/96  By: D. Schneider, Historic
Date Modified: 4/21/96

Quad: Beaufort  East: North:

TMS#
STAFF REPORT: 919 Bay Street FINAL Approval

DATE: 1/10/23

GENERAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant:</th>
<th>Lisa Mykleby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location/Address:</td>
<td>919 Bay St; Parcel R120 004 000 910A 0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant's Request:</td>
<td>The applicant is requesting final approval of interior window signs on the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Zoning:</td>
<td>T5-UC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ZONING DISTRICT INFORMATION

| T5-UC |
|--------------------|-------------------|
| Lot Width at Setback: | N/A |
| Max Lot Coverage: | 100% |
| Min. Frontage Build Out | 60% of lot area |
| Front Setback | 0-15 ft |
| Side Setback | 0-15 ft |
| Rear Setback | 5 ft min |
| Building Height: | 2-3.5 stories max |

SURROUNDING ZONING, LAND USE AND REQUIRED BUFFERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent Zoning</th>
<th>Adjacent Land Uses</th>
<th>Setbacks for Adjacent Zoning /Buffer required if rezoned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North: T5-UC</td>
<td>Commercial Uses</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South: T5-UC</td>
<td>Commercial Uses</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East: T5-UC</td>
<td>Commercial Uses</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West: T5-UC</td>
<td>Commercial Uses</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background: The applicant is requesting final approval to install two interior window signs for a shop on Bay Street. The proposal does follow the Beaufort Historic District Guidelines; however it does not follow the other portions of the sign code. Section 6.6.1. C of the Beaufort sign code states, the max area for any window/door sign is “25% of the glass area per window/door”. From the images given, the proposal will have the sign area be the entire window area for both windows. The signs also appear to be opaque and have a size of 74 inches by 51.5 inches for each sign. (26.46 sq. ft. for each sign). Staff does not support the proposal.
SIGN PERMIT APPLICATION
Community Development Department
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina, 29902
p. (843) 525-7049 / f. (843) 566-5606 / permits@cityofbeaufort.org / www.cityofbeaufort.org

OFFICE USE ONLY: Date Filed: 1/13/23 Application #: 26052 Permit Fee: 
Zoning: 

Pursuant to Section 6-29-3145 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, is this tract or parcel restricted by any recorded covenant that is contrary to, conflicts with, or prohibits the activity described in this application? ☐ Yes ☐ No

The owner of the property is aware of and has authorized the proposed work as described in this application. ☐ Yes ☐ No

Applicant, Property, and Project Information

Applicant/Contractor Name: LISA M. KLEBY
JAMIE RANKIN

Hiring subcontractors? ☐ YES ☐ NO

Applicant E-mail: designwithm@gmail.com

Applicant Phone Number: 843-279-7467
843-263-5090

Applicant Title: ☐ Contractor ☐ Tenant ☐ Architect ☐ Engineer ☐ Developer

Property Owner: Laben Chapel

Property Address: 919 Bay St

Historic District? ☐ YES ☐ NO

SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS:

☐ Include drawing/rendering of sign(s) showing ALL dimensions, colors, and materials of sign and base/support.

☐ Building elevations or color photo showing building and location where sign is to be placed (for attached signs).

☐ One square foot of landscaping per square footage of sign is required at base of all monument signs – provide a Landscaping Plan.

☐ Site plan (to scale) with location of freestanding signs in relation to building, existing signs and property lines.

☐ Name of electrician if sign is to be illuminated. If not included with this permit, a separate permit may be required.

Note: The background of illuminated signs shall be OPAQUE.

Applicant Signature: [Signature] Date: 1/14/23

Property Owner’s Signature (if a multi-tenant building):

See Section 6-29-3145 for additional information about signs (updated Dec. 29, 2022)
This form is also available online at www.cityofbeaufort.org
p. 7 of 11
# SIGN PERMIT APPLICATION
Community Development Department
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina, 29902
p. (843) 525-7049 / F. (855) 986-5606 / permits@cityofbeaufort.org / www.cityofbeaufort.org

**TYPE OF SIGNAGE:** (check all that apply)

- ☐ FREESTANDING  ☑ ATTACHED  ☐ SPECIAL (i.e. Tenant Directory, Directional, Service Station, Menu)
- ☐ TEMPORARY (i.e. Construction Sign, Banner, Grand Opening, etc.)  ☐ MASTER SIGN PLAN (for multi-tenant buildings)

---

**FREESTANDING SIGNS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monument / Pole</th>
<th>Sign Area &amp; Dimensions (per side)</th>
<th>Base Area &amp; Material or Pole Material</th>
<th>Total Height above grade</th>
<th>Distance from ROW</th>
<th>Illumination? Yes or No If Yes, Internal or External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 2 (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post &amp; Arm</th>
<th>Sign Area &amp; Dimensions (per side)</th>
<th>Post/Arm Material</th>
<th>Total Height above grade</th>
<th>Distance from ROW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 2 (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sandwich Board / Easel</th>
<th>Sign Area &amp; Dimensions (per side)</th>
<th>Frame Material</th>
<th>Total Height above grade</th>
<th>Distance from ROW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 2 (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ATTACHED SIGNS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linear Frontage of Building/Tenant Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign 2 (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

See Section 6 for complete information about signs (updated Aug. 29, 2012)
This form is also available online at www.cityofbeaufort.org

a. 2 of 4
### Canopy/Awning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Letter Height (in. max)</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Clearance above sidewalk (in. min.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 2 (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ATTACHED SIGNS (continued): Linear Frontage of Building/Tenant Space:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window/Door</th>
<th>Sign Area &amp; Dimensions</th>
<th>Material (vinyl/plastic prohibited)</th>
<th>% of Window/Door coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 2 (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projecting/Suspend</th>
<th>Sign Area &amp; Dimensions</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Clearance above sidewalk (in. min.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 2 (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Marquee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sign Area &amp; Dimensions</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Illumination? Yes or No; if Yes, internally or externally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER PERMANENT SIGNS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenant Directory</th>
<th>Sign Area &amp; Dimensions</th>
<th>Pole Material</th>
<th>Illumination? Yes or No; if Yes, External is required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 2 (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directional</th>
<th>Sign Area &amp; Dimensions</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Illumination? Yes or No; if Yes, internally or externally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 2 (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SIGN PERMIT APPLICATION
Community Development Department
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina, 29902
p. (843) 525-7049 / E. (843) 525-3606 / permits@cityofbeaufort.org / www.cityofbeaufort.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Station</th>
<th>Pump Island Sign Area/Dimensions</th>
<th>Pump Sign Area/Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign 2 (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Menu Board</th>
<th>Menu Board Area &amp; Dimensions</th>
<th>Pre-Order Board Area &amp; Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive Thru 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TEMPORARY SIGNS:

### Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign Area &amp; Dimensions (32 SF max)</th>
<th>Pole Material</th>
<th>Illumination? Yes or No; if Yes, External is required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Banner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign Area &amp; Dimensions (30 SF max)</th>
<th>Location (must be secured to a building on all 4 corners)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banner 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banner 2 (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grand Opening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign Type (banner, sandwich board, etc.)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4 (add more below if needed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe the Grand Opening signage plan in detail, including dates and duration of the display.

See Section 6 for complete information about signs (updated Aug. 29, 2022)
This form is also available online at www.cityofbeaufort.org
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STAFF REPORT: 316 Federal Street, FINAL Approval

**DATE:** February 14, 2024

---

### GENERAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant:</th>
<th>Ashley Randolph, agent for Lynn King</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location/Address:</td>
<td>316 Federal Street; R120 004 000 0840 0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant's Request:</td>
<td>The applicant is requesting final approval for alterations and additions to combine two existing structures at 316 Federal Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Zoning:</td>
<td>T-4 HN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing:</td>
<td>Non-contributing, structures built in 1965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ZONING DISTRICT INFORMATION

| T-4 HN |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Lot Width at Setback: | 40' |
| Max Lot Coverage:    | 55% |
| Min. Frontage Build Out | 75% of the lot area |
| Front Setback        | Average Setback of the block |
| Side Setback         | Side Interior – 5’ min, or 0’ if attached. 10’ interior in the point |
| Rear Setback         | 15’ |
| Building Height:     | 3 stories max |

### SURROUNDING ZONING, LAND USE AND REQUIRED BUFFERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent Zoning</th>
<th>Adjacent Land Uses</th>
<th>Setbacks for Adjacent Zoning /Buffer required if rezoned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North: T-4 HN</td>
<td>Historic Homes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South: T-4 HN</td>
<td>Historic Homes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East: T-4 HN</td>
<td>Historic Homes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West: T-4 HN</td>
<td>Historic Homes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background:** The applicant is requesting approval to combine the existing building constructed in 1965 into one structure. The applicant is proposing to accomplish this combination by adding a central area connecting the two structures, and other corresponding alterations and additions. Staff is recommending this be considered as a final approval, so that all issues and concerns are worked out by the final approval.

The structures are non-conforming and located in the Point neighborhood. The project was first submitted at the October 4, 2023, HTRC meeting and was heard by the HRB at the November 8th meeting,
where the project was turned down due to concerns the alterations did not fit the historic fabric of the existing homes and surrounding area. Significant revisions were submitted and heard at the December meeting, with changes that included fenestration, roof lines, and façade for the middle connecting portion. The applicant is now requesting final approval. The HRB granted Conceptual Approval at the December 13th meeting with conditions that are found below.

Staff Comments from the December, 2023, HRB

1. On the proposed floor plan, staff supports the proportion of window to wall for the rear façade of the great room. Four 2880 windows (two left and two right of the central door) may be a good option for the front elevation. Note the floor plan does not match the rear elevation as noted in comment 3 below.

2. Staff does not support the blank sections of wall on the primary façade (where the closets are located) and recommends reducing the closet sizes to reduce these blank areas.

3. As another way to address comment 1b, staff recommends realigning the front porch columns so that they are not located in front of the windows. Staff asks the applicant to consider double columns on the outside of the porch (with some relation to the alignment of brick piers in the garden wall) and then shifting the two inner columns to exist within the brick stairs and possibly aligned with the brick piers at the pedestrian opening in the garden wall.

4. Staff understands that the existing structures may not provide perfect symmetry between the left and right structures. However, on the front elevation, the window on the east side of the house next to proposed addition mass and porch appears crowded. This may be a graphical error as the floor plan dimensions illustrate that the smaller side should be the west side of the structure. Applicant may have the opportunity to adjust the proposed central mass to allow the window shutters approximately 4 inches on both sides of the porch.

5. Staff recommends the applicant raise the porch beam so that the heads of the transom windows and their casing are visible. While this will raise the ridge of the structure, added verticality of the porch and columns will assist with the overall proportion of the central mass.

6. The proposed rake boards of the pediment are out of scale with the porch beam entablature and gable pediment.
i. The applicant should also consider the proportion of the porch beam entablature, which could be taller containing both an architrave and frieze with applied Taenia molding between. Staff believes the taller entablature will assist with the overall proportion.

ii. The ocular window in the gable pediment seems undersized and staff recommends the applicant study the proportion of that element within the pediment. The applicant should also consider increasing the height of the rake frieze in the gable and consider the materiality of the gable wall as horizontal siding plays a large role in scale.

7. Staff recommends that all transoms on the primary (front) elevation be aligned. The applicant should either raise the heads of the windows flanking the doors or lower the door head.

8. The floor plan for the rear façade fenestration (central mass) does not match the elevation drawing; applicant to coordinate all plans and elevation drawings in future submittals.

9. A fireplace is shown in the great room in plan but does not appear in elevations or 3D views. Applicant to clarify if this is a functional fireplace. If a flue is required for the fireplace, the applicant to include the chimney in future drawings.

10. Applicant to show the porch and stair railings on the elevation drawings in future submissions.

11. The applicant to study sight lines in the 3D model and adjust the roof slope of the rear screened porch if it proves visible above the parapet wall on the left façade (east elevation).

12. Applicant to use cardinal directions for labeling elevation drawings in future submissions.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends final approval with the following recommendations/conditions to be rectified at Final approval:

1. Applicant has successfully incorporated staff’s comments from the previous meeting, and staff believes the front fenestration is now symmetrical between the columns, and the transoms and their casings are now visible under the porch trim.

2. Staff believes this ocular window is better proportioned to the front gable.

3. Applicant to provide window details for the windows that are to be replaced in the original
building – mainly to show how the new window unit interact with brick veneer and any surrounding trim.

4. Applicant to provide exterior door cutsheets.

5. Applicant has provided a scanned image of a site plan drawing that is not consistent with the site plan on sheet S2. Applicant to confirm which site plan is accurate and eliminate the other plan from future drawing sets.

6. Based on applicant’s dimension from grade to porch floor, a railing does not appear to be necessary. If a railing is required, a design must be approved by the board.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MO (mm)</th>
<th>1-10 (559)</th>
<th>2-2 (660)</th>
<th>2-6 (762)</th>
<th>2-8 (813)</th>
<th>2-10 (864)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RO (mm)</td>
<td>1-10 1/2 (572)</td>
<td>2-2 1/2 (673)</td>
<td>2-6 1/2 (775)</td>
<td>2-8 1/2 (826)</td>
<td>2-10 1/2 (876)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS (mm)</td>
<td>1-9 1/2 (566)</td>
<td>2-1 1/2 (668)</td>
<td>2-5 1/2 (760)</td>
<td>2-7 1/2 (862)</td>
<td>2-9 1/2 (961)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLO (mm)</td>
<td>1-3 11/16 (398)</td>
<td>1-7 11/16 (500)</td>
<td>1-11 11/16 (602)</td>
<td>2-1 11/16 (652)</td>
<td>2-3 11/16 (703)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: MO, RO, FS, and DLO are measurements in mm. The table shows various sizes and configurations for Marvin Elevate™ Collection Double Hung windows.
### DOUBLE HUNG

#### Multiple Assemblies

Multiple assemblies can be factory mulled.

**MAXIMUM ROUGH OPENING not to exceed** 113 1/2" x 76 1/2" Maximum up to 5 units wide by 1 unit high.

**MAXIMUM ROUGH OPENING not to exceed** 84" x 92" Maximum up to 5 units wide by 5 units high.

Field mull kits are available. Structural mullion reinforcement is required for some assemblies.

Please consult your local Marvin representative for more information.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MO (mm)</th>
<th>RO (mm)</th>
<th>FS (mm)</th>
<th>DLO (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-0 (914)</td>
<td>3-0 1/2 (927)</td>
<td>2-11 1/2 (802)</td>
<td>2-5 11/16 (754)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2 (965)</td>
<td>3-2 1/2 (978)</td>
<td>3-1 1/2 (963)</td>
<td>2-7 11/16 (805)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 (1067)</td>
<td>3-6 1/2 (1080)</td>
<td>3-5 1/2 (1054)</td>
<td>2-11 1/16 (805)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-0 (1219)</td>
<td>4-0 1/2 (1232)</td>
<td>3-11 1/2 (1027)</td>
<td>3-5 11/16 (1059)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 (1372)</td>
<td>4-6 1/2 (1384)</td>
<td>4-5 1/2 (1359)</td>
<td>3-11 11/16 (1211)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details and Elevations not to scale.

Special sized units available within and outside of CN matrix. Please contact your Marvin dealer.

Minimum frame size: 17 1/2" x 27 3/4"

Maximum frame size: 53 1/2" x 83 3/4"

Optional Double Hung GBGs and SDLs are available in a standard Rectangular cut shown. Other available lite cuts shown on page 3.

When ordering 6 9/16 " (167 mm) or 6 13/16 " (173 mm) jambs, add 1/4" (6 mm) to width and 1/8 " (3 mm) to height for Rough Opening, Frame Size and Masonry Opening.

E = These windows meet National Egress Codes for fire evacuation. Local codes may differ.

Available in equal, cottage, and reverse cottage sash configurations. Cottage and reverse cottage sash configurations are not available below CN 36 height and above CN 68 height.

For further details and drawings visit the "Tools and Documents’ section at Marvin.com.

---
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**The Elegance™**

The Elegance™ pulls out all the stops: ultra-modern square corners, a bold design and clean, crisp lines. As one of the most in-demand designs in the world, this pool is a perfect blend of form and function where sophistication and refinement reside.

Keeping pace with the demand for modern design, The Elegance™ is a decided showstopper with its stunning visual appeal and optimized functionality. With an unobstructed swimming corridor, avid swimmers can comfortably make full use of the space without crowding those who choose to relax in the generous seating area. Optional spa jets could luxuriously transform this seating space into a relaxing spa area. By integrating the entry/exit steps to the side of the swimming corridor, the area inside the pool is fully maximized. Further, The Elegance™ comes in a variety of sizes to accommodate most any backyard setting.

1. Extended Entry
2. Entry & Exit Steps
3. Bench Seat & Spa Nook
4. End to End Swim Channel

---

Page 42  Styles | The Elegance™

---

Modern Style
Large Size

**40' Size**
- length: 39' 4" width: 14' 6"
- shallow: 3' 10" depth: 6' 2"

**33' Size**
- length: 33' 0" width: 14' 6"
- shallow: 4' 0" depth: 6' 0"

**30' Size**
- length: 29' 7" width: 14' 6"
- shallow: 4' 2" depth: 5' 9"

**26' Size**
- length: 26' 3" width: 14' 0"
- shallow: 4' 3" depth: 6' 9"

**23' Size**
- length: 23' 0" width: 12' 6"
- shallow: 4' 4" depth: 5' 7"

**20' Size**
- length: 19' 8" width: 11' 6"
- shallow: 4' 5" depth: 5' 6"

Some measurements rounded.
Timberline HD® Shingles
Made to protect your home. Your story. And those of over 50 million of your fellow Americans!

Great Value
Architecturally stylish but practically priced

Dimensional Look
Features GAF proprietary color blends and enhanced shadow effect for a genuine wood-shake look

Highest Roofing Fire Rating
UL Class A, Listed to ANSI/UL 790

High Performance
Designed with Advanced Protection® Shingle Technology, which reduces the use of natural resources while providing excellent protection for your home (visit gaf.com/APS/ to learn more)

Stays in Place
Dura Grip™ Adhesive seals each shingle tightly and reduces the risk of shingle blow-off. Shingles warranted to withstand winds up to 130 mph (209 km/h)¹

StainGuard® Protection
Helps ensure the beauty of your roof against unsightly blue-green algae²

Peace of Mind
Lifetime ltd. transferable warranty with Smart Choice® Protection (non-prorated material and installation labor coverage) for the first ten years³

Perfect Finishing Touch
For the best look, use Timbertex® Premium Ridge Cap Shingles or Ridglass® Premium Ridge Cap Shingles⁴

¹This wind speed coverage requires special installation; see GAF Shingle & Accessory Ltd. Warranty for details.
²StainGuard® Protection applies only to shingles with StainGuard®-labeled packaging. See GAF Shingle & Accessory Ltd. Warranty for complete coverage and restrictions.
³See GAF Shingle & Accessory Ltd. Warranty for complete coverage and restrictions. The word “Lifetime” refers to the length of coverage provided by the GAF Shingle & Accessory Ltd. Warranty and means as long as the original individual owner(s) of a single-family detached residence (or the second owner(s) in certain circumstances) owns the property where the shingles are installed. For owners/structures not meeting the above criteria, Lifetime coverage is not applicable.
⁴These products are not available in all areas. See www.gaf.com/ridgecapavailability for details.
Colors & Availability

Regional Availability
Northeast, Southeast, Southwest, West, and Central Areas

Applicable Standards & Protocols
- UL Listed to ANSI/UL 790 Class A
- Miami-Dade County Product Control approved
- State of Florida approved
- UL 997 modified to 110 mph
- Classified by UL in accordance with ICC-ES AC438
- Meets ASTM D7158, Class H
- Meets ASTM D3161, Class F
- Meets ASTM D3018, Type 1
- Meets ASTM D3462
- Classified by UL in accordance with ICC-ES AC438
- Meets ASTM D7158, Class H
- Meets ASTM D3161, Class F
- Meets ASTM D3018, Type 1
- Meets ASTM D3462
- ICC-ES Evaluation Reports ESR-1475 and ESR-3267
- Texas Department of Insurance listed
- CSA A123.5
- ENERGY STAR® Certified (White Only) (U.S. Only)
- Rated by the CRRC
- Can be used to comply with Title 24 cool roof requirements
- Meets the cool roof requirements of the Los Angeles Green Building Code (Birchwood, Copper Canyon, Golden Amber, and White Only)

Product/System Specifics
- Fiberglass Asphalt Construction
- Dimensions (approx.): 13 1/4" x 39 3/8" (337 x 1,000 mm)
- Exposure: 5 5/8" (143 mm)
- Bundles/Square: 3
- Pieces/Square: 64
- StainGuard® Protection: Yes
- Hip/Ridge: Timbertex®; Seal-A-Ridge®; Z® Ridge; Ridglass®
- Starter: Pro-Start® & WeatherBlocker™

Installation
Detailed installation instructions are provided on the inside of each bundle wrapper of Timberline HD® Shingles. Installation instructions may also be obtained at gaf.com.

Note: It is difficult to reproduce the color clarity and actual color blends of these products. Before selecting your color, please ask to see several full-size shingles.

Periodically tested by independent and internal labs to ensure compliance with ASTM D3462 at time of manufacture.
*Refers to shingles sold in Canada only.
†StainGuard® Protection applies only to shingles with StainGuard®-labeled packaging. See GAF Shingle & Accessory Ltd. Warranty for complete coverage and restrictions.
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### STAFF REPORT: 709 Greene Street – Preliminary Approval

**DATE:** February 14, 2024

#### GENERAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant:</th>
<th>Allison Ramsay Architects, agent for Paul and Lynda Smith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location/Address:</td>
<td>709 Greene Street; R 120-004-000-1035-0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant's Request:</td>
<td>The applicant is requesting preliminary approval of for a duplex, with an attached garage/workshop/ADU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Zoning:</td>
<td>T4-HN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ZONING DISTRICT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Width at Setback:</th>
<th>40’ min 60’ in the Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max Lot Coverage:</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Frontage Build Out</td>
<td>55% of lot area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>0’ min/15’ max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback</td>
<td>Average prevailing setback on block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>0’ alley; 15’ no alley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height:</td>
<td>3 stories max</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SURROUNDING ZONING, LAND USE AND REQUIRED BUFFERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent Zoning</th>
<th>Adjacent Land Uses</th>
<th>Setbacks for Adjacent Zoning /Buffer required if rezoned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North: T-4 HN</td>
<td>One and two story homes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South: T-4 HN</td>
<td>One and two story homes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East: T-4 HN</td>
<td>One and two story homes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West: T-4 HN</td>
<td>One and two story homes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background:** The applicant is requesting preliminary approval to build a duplex with an attached ADU over a garage. The duplex is proposed as two-story flats with an ADU on the upper floor of the garage attached by an uncovered porch. The total square footage for the duplex is 2113 sq ft, with 1050 sq. ft on the first floor, and 1063 sq. ft. on the second floor, and a 320 square foot ADU. This is a corner lot that is currently vacant. The applicant has provided a schematic depicting the proposed home, with the heights and exterior facades of all adjacent and nearby homes in the area, as well as the addresses of said homes. The applicant did attend two HTRC meetings and made changes based on comments received at those meetings.

**Site Plan/Access**
The duplex fronts the corner of Greene and Scott, with parking and street access to the garage from Scott Street to the North.

**Height**

The applicant has provided a streetscape of the existing homes in the area, and of the proposed units. The majority of units on the adjoining blocks are two stories.

**Architecture**

The applicant has provided a streetscape with front façade elevation and floorplans. The proposed duplex features upper and lower front porches, clapboard siding, columns, metal roofs, and substantial fenestration. Basic floorplans were included on the streetscape of surrounding buildings. Again, the duplex is proposed as a flat-style of development, wherein units will be on the upper and lower floors.

**Findings for New Historic Infill**

Section 4.7 of the Development sets the standards the HRB must use in considering an infill project in the historic district. Section 4.7 states, “The District is the Resource, Not Only Its Individual Parts: Beaufort is comprised of a number of individually significant buildings. Additionally, Beaufort’s historic areas are significant as a collective whole, and shall be considered as such and protected in their entirety. This is the primary, overarching principle.” To this end, seven integrity standards found in Section 4.7.2 — why, where and when a property is important — were created to be upheld in all new construction and rehabilitation projects. Guidelines for determining integrity, and staff analysis of each are found below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.7.2 Integrity Guidelines</th>
<th>Rationale Present (yes/no)</th>
<th>Staff Analysis of Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Location:</strong> This is the relationship between the property and its historical context.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓ There doesn’t appear to be any major structures on this lot in the past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Design:</strong> This is the combination of elements that create the feeling of a district or structure. These elements include</td>
<td>Yes (w/)</td>
<td>• The proposed structures, architectural details, mass and scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building patterns, streetscapes, site elements, building size, mass and scale, spatial relationships, and specific architectural elements and details</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>of the buildings attempt to match the Beaufort style and are sensitive to the surrounding area, while still providing much-needed attainable housing with the duplex and ADU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **3. Setting:** This is the physical environment of a property and should be evaluated on its context as well as on the historical role the property has played and continues to play. Important features include topography, vegetation, man-made features, and relationships between existing structures and their surroundings. | Yes | ✓ The setting is one of mostly two-story residential structures, consistent with this proposal.  
✓ Adding well-designed housing is consistent with the setting of the adjoining blocks, |
| **4. Materials:** These are the physical elements that make up a property or district. | Yes | ✓ The buildings possess the architectural details and materials such as porches, clapboard, metal roofs, and fenestration of the Beaufort style.  
✓ The proposed duplex is designed to look like a single family home, consistent with the surrounding area. |
<p>| <strong>5. Workmanship:</strong> This is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or time period. This particularly applies to rehabilitation projects, but for new infill projects, workmanship of surrounding structures should be considered and respected. Retaining the details of the original craft and craftsman (i.e., wood, masonry, tabby etc.) of the original building ensures the historic fabric is retained and serves as an important component of the integrity and the patina of age of individual structures and the district as a whole. | Yes/w condition | ✓ The buildings possess the architectural details and materials such as porches, clapboard, metal roofs, and fenestration of the Beaufort style. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. <strong>Feeling:</strong> This is the property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time. This particularly applies to rehabilitation projects, but for new infill projects, the feeling of surrounding structures should be considered and respected.</th>
<th><strong>Yes</strong></th>
<th>✓ The proposed structures, architectural details, mass and scale of the buildings attempt to match the Beaufort style and are sensitive to the surrounding area, while still providing much-needed attainable housing with the duplex and ADU.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Association:</strong> This is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a property. This particularly applies to rehabilitation projects, but for new infill projects, association of particular sites and neighborhoods should be considered.</td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td>✓ Staff has not found any relevant history or persons directly linked to this specific property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Staff recommends preliminary approval with the following conditions:
1. The elevation drawings on sheets 4 and 5 show that there is no cap and base to the carport columns/pilasters. Staff recommends utilizing the simple cap and base.

2. At future submittals, the applicant shall submit wall sections, final materials list, paint colors, cut sheets for doors, windows, lighting, etc., and all other required information for final review and approval.

3. The applicant shows a 10 feet front setback, where the code references the average prevailing on the block. Applicant to demonstrate the location of the average prevailing setback and ensure compliance with placement of proposed structure.

4. Applicant noted that the building footprint is 53% of the lot area and driveways and walkways constitute an additional 8%. Per Section 2.4.1.A.3, an additional 10% of pervious surface is allowed. Applicant to confirm that the walkways and driveways will be pervious.

5. Applicant to note that the stucco foundation will have a smooth finish.
HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION

Community & Economic Development Department
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina, 29902
p. (843) 525-7011 / f. (843) 986-5606
www.cityofbeaufort.org

OFFICE USE ONLY: Date Filed: 12/29 Application #2631 Zoning District: 741H

BCAGHS Survey: Yes No

Schedule: The Historic Review Board (HRB) typically meets the 2nd Wednesday of each month at 2pm. The complete schedule, along with the list of deadlines, may be found here - http://www.cityofbeaufort.org/historic-review-board.aspx

Submittal Requirements: All forms and information shall be submitted digitally. In addition to a complete application form, applicants shall submit the required items according to the checklists on the subsequent page.

Review Request: Conceptual Preliminary Final Bailey Bill Approval Change After Certification

*Requires a Bailey Bill - Part A Preliminary Review Application Form

Pursuant to Section 6:29:1145 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, is this tract or parcel restricted by any recorded covenant that is contrary to, conflicts with, or prohibits the activity described in this application? Yes No

Applicant, Property, and Project Information

Applicant Name: Jeremiah Smith/ Allison Ramsey Architects

Applicant Address: 1003 Charles St

Applicant E-mail: jeremiah@allisonramsayarchitects.com

Applicant Phone Number: 843-986-0559

Applicant Title: Homeowner Tenant Architect Engineer Developer

Owner (if other than the Applicant):

Paul & Lynda Smith

Owner Address: 9542 Legacy Oaks Dr., Ooltewah, TN 37363

Project Name: 709 Greene

Property Address: 709 Greene St

Property Identification Number (Tax Map & Parcel Number): R120 004 000 1035 0000

Date Submitted: 12-29-23

Certification of Correctness: I/we certify that the information in this application is correct.

Applicant's Signature: Date: 12-29-23

Owner's Signature: Date:

(The owner's signature is required if the applicant is not the owner.)
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS
HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION
Community & Economic Development Department
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina, 29902
p. (843) 525-7011 / f. (843) 528-5606
www.cityofbeaufort.org

OFFICE USE ONLY:  Date Filed:  Application #:  Zoning District:
BCAGSHS Survey:  Yes  No

Schedule: The Historic Review Board (HRB) typically meets the 2nd Wednesday of each month at 2pm. The complete schedule, along with the list of deadlines, may be found here - http://www.cityofbeaufort.org/historic-review-board.aspx

Submittal Requirements: All forms and information shall be submitted digitally. In addition to a complete application form, applicants shall submit the required items according to the checklists on the subsequent page.

Review Request:  Conceptual  Preliminary  Final  Bailey Bill Approval*  Change After Certification
*Requires a Bailey Bill - Part A Preliminary Review Application Form

Pursuant to Section 6-29-1145 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, is this tract or parcel restricted by any recorded covenant that is contrary to, conflicts with, or prohibits the activity described in this application?  Yes  No

Applicant, Property, and Project Information
Applicant Name: Jeremiah Smith/ Allison Ramsey Architects
Applicant Address: 1003 Charles St
Applicant Email: jeremiah@allisonramseyarchitects.com
Applicant Phone Number: 843-986-0550
Applicant Title: Homeowner  Owner (if other than the Applicant):
Paul & Lynda Smith
Owner Address: 5942 Legacy Oaks Dr., Ooltewah, TN 37363
Project Name: 709 Greene
Property Address: 709 Greene St
Property Identification Number (Tax Map & Parcel Number): R120 004 000 1035 0000
Date Submitted: 12-29-23

Certification of Correctness: I/we certify that the information in this application is correct.
Applicant's Signature:  Date:
Owner's Signature:  Date: 12-29-23
(The owner's signature is required if the applicant is not the owner.)

See Section 9.10 of the Beaufort Code for complete information about Certificates of Appropriateness and Section 10.7 for complete information about the Historic Review Board. This form is also available online at www.cityofbeaufort.org | updated April 16, 2021.
Project Name: 709 Greene
Property Size in Acres: 0.09
Proposed Building Use: Residential

Nature of Work (check all that apply):
- New Construction, Primary Structure
- New Construction, Primary Structure (Alterations / Additions)
- Demolition*
- Relocation*
*Demolition and Relocation requires a public hearing

Building Square Footage (if multiple buildings, please list each one and their square footage by floor):
- House: 2113 (1st: 1050; 2nd: 1063);
- Carriage House: 320;
- Total Heated: 2433

Is this project a redevelopment project: Y [ ] N [x] [ ]
Are there existing buildings on the site? Y [x] N [ ]
If yes, will they remain? Y [x] N [ ]

Provide a brief Project Narrative (if requesting Bailey Bill Approval, this section may be left blank):
Proposed new construction of a duplex with an Accessory Dwelling Unit above a workshop.

CONTACT INFORMATION –
Attention: Julie A. Bachey, Administrative Assistant II
City of Beaufort Department of Planning & Development Services
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina 29902
E-Mail: jbachey@cityofbeaufort.org | Phone: (843) 525-7011 | Fax: (843) 986-5606

See Section 9.10 of the Beaufort Code for complete information about Certificates of Appropriateness and Section 10.7 for complete information about the Historic Review Board | This form is also available online at www.cityofbeaufort.org | updated April 16, 2021
Background: The applicant is requesting conceptual/preliminary approval to build a house and a cottage at 1411 Duke Street. This is currently a vacant corner lot adjoining a business. The applicant has attended the HTRC and made revisions based on this meeting.

The applicant is also proposing a minor lot subdivision to turn this lot, and the lot next door, into four lots. As the Applicant has not provided a potential survey, and the small cottage can be approved as an ADU, Staff recommends this portion of the request be held at the Final approval with a proposed plat.
Site Plan/Access

Access to the house and the cottage would be via a rear 16’ driveway, which could be extended to provide access to the adjoining lot. This layout would follow best practices for access permits.

Height

Both proposed homes are one story in height.

Architecture

The applicant has provided a front façade elevation and floorplans for the home and cottage.

Findings for New Historic Infill

Section 4.7 of the Development sets the standards the HRB must use in considering an infill project in the historic district. Section 4.7 states, “The District is the Resource, Not Only Its Individual Parts: Beaufort is comprised of a number of individually significant buildings. Additionally, Beaufort’s historic areas are significant as a collective whole, and shall be considered as such and protected in their entirety. This is the primary, overarching principle.” To this end, seven integrity standards found in Section 4.7.2 — why, where and when a property is important — were created to be upheld in all new construction and rehabilitation projects. Guidelines for determining integrity, and staff analysis of each are found below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.7.2 Integrity Guidelines</th>
<th>Rationale Present (yes/no)</th>
<th>Staff Analysis of Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Location: This is the relationship between the property and its historical context.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓ No major structures on this lot in the near past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Design: This is the combination of elements that create the feeling of a district or structure. These elements include building patterns, streetscapes, site elements, building size, mass and scale, spatial relationships, and specific architectural elements and details</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>▪ The proposed structures which are one story in height, architectural details, mass and scale of the buildings attempt to match the Beaufort style and are sensitive to the surrounding area, while still providing much-needed attainable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Setting:
This is the physical environment of a property and should be evaluated on its context as well as on the historical role the property has played and continues to play. Important features include topography, vegetation, man-made features, and relationships between existing structures and their surroundings.

**Yes**

- The setting is a mix of uses, from residential, utilities, and commercial. The one story home and cottage fit with the existing residential structures in the area.

### 4. Materials:
These are the physical elements that make up a property or district.

**Yes**

- The buildings possess the architectural details and materials such as porches, clapboard, metal roofs, and fenestration of the Beaufort style.

### 5. Workmanship:
This is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or time period. This particularly applies to rehabilitation projects, but for new infill projects, workmanship of surrounding structures should be considered and respected. Retaining the details of the original craft and craftsman (i.e., wood, masonry, tabby etc.) of the original building ensures the historic fabric is retained and serves as an important component of the integrity and the patina of age of individual structures and the district as a whole.

**Yes**

- The buildings possess the architectural details and materials such as porches, clapboard, metal roofs, and fenestration of the Beaufort style.

### 6. Feeling:
This is the property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time. This particularly applies to rehabilitation projects, but for new infill projects, the feeling of surrounding structures should be considered and respected.

**Yes**

- The proposed structures, architectural details, mass and scale of the buildings attempt to match the Beaufort style and are sensitive to the surrounding area, while still providing much-needed attainable housing with the duplex and ADU.
7. **Association**: This is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a property. This particularly applies to rehabilitation projects, but for new infill projects, association of particular sites and neighborhoods should be considered.

| N/A | ✓ Staff has not found any relevant history or persons directly linked to this specific property. |

**FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends Conceptual/Preliminary approval for the design, mass and scale of the proposed single family house and cottage, with the following comments and conditions:

For the larger structure, staff has the following recommendations:

1. **Staff recommends converting the hipped roof over the main structure into a gable ended roof which will better relate to the gable porch roof and gable rear master bedroom roof.**

2. **Staff recommends the applicant consider a triple ganged window unit at the front elevation within bedroom 2 to offset the current imbalance of the front elevation. The current front elevation fenestration seems crowded within the porch relative to the bedroom 2 windows.**

Smaller structure:

3. **Staff recommends adding a small simple cap and base to the porch columns.**

4. **Applicant to submit door cutsheets.**

5. **Applicant to submit a window detail to illustrate that the windows will have projecting sills. The elevations appear to depict a projecting sill, but a detail should be provided.**

6. **Applicant to use cardinal directions for all elevation drawings.**
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS
HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION

Community & Economic Development Department:
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina, 29902
p. (843) 525-7011 / f. (843) 986-5606
www.cityofbeaufort.org

OFFICE USE ONLY: Date Filed: 1/30 Application #: 26280 Zoning District: T4N

BEAUGHS Survey: Yes No

Schedule: The Historic Review Board (HRB) typically meets the 2nd Wednesday of each month at 2pm. The complete schedule, along with the list of deadlines, may be found here: http://www.cityofbeaufort.org/historic-review-board.aspx

Submitter Requirements: All forms and information shall be submitted digitally. In addition to a complete application form, applicants shall submit the required items according to the checklists on the subsequent page.

Review Request: ☐ Conceptual ☐ Preliminary ☐ Final ☐ Bailey Bill Approval* ☐ Change After Certification
*Requires a Bailey Bill - Part A Preliminary Review Application Form

Pursuant to Section 6-29-1145 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, is this tract or parcel restricted by any recorded covenant that is contrary to, conflicts with, or prohibits the activity described in this application? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Applicant, Property, and Project Information

Applicant Name: Jeremiah Smith/Allison Ramsey Architects
Applicant Address: 1003 Charles St
Applicant E-mail: jeremiah@allisonramseyarchitects.com
Applicant Phone Number: 843-986-0559

Applicant Title: ☐ Homeowner ☐ Tenant ☐ Architect ☐ Engineer ☐ Developer

Owner if other than the Applicant:
Randy & Kimberly Withers
Owner Address: 20225 Pocotaligo Rd., Early Branch, SC 29916

Project Name: 1411 Duke
Property Address: 1411 Duke St.

Property Identification Number (Tax Map & Parcel Number): R120 004 000 0343 0000

Date Submitted: 1-30-24

Certification of Correctness: I/we certify that the information in this application is correct.

Applicant’s Signature: [Signature] Date: 1-30-24
Owner’s Signature: [Signature] Date: 1-30-24

(The owner’s signature is required if the applicant is not the owner.)
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS
HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION
Community & Economic Development Department
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina, 29902
p: (843) 525-7011 / e: (843) 986-5606
www.cityofbeaufort.org

Project Name: 1411 Duke

Property Size in Acres: 0.18

Proposed Building Use: Residential

Nature of Work (check all that apply):

- New Construction, Primary Structure
- New Construction, Primary Structure
- Alterations / Additions
- Demolition*
- Relocation*

*Demolition and Relocation requires a public hearing

Building Square Footage (if multiple buildings, please list each one and their square footage by floor):
Duke Street House: 1149; Monson Street House: 459

Is this project a redevelopment project? Y N

Are there existing buildings on the site? Y N If yes, will they remain? Y N

Provide a brief Project Narrative (if requesting Bailey Bill Approval, this section may be left blank):
This is an infill project for 2 new construction homes. It includes subdividing a large lot at the northeast corner of Duke and Monson.

__________________________

CONTACT INFORMATION

Attention: Julie A. Bachey, Administrative Assistant II
City of Beaufort Department of Planning & Development Services
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina 29902
E-Mail: jbachey@cityofbeaufort.org | Phone: (843) 525-7011 | Fax: (843) 986-5606

See Section 9-10 of the Beaufort Code for complete information about Certificates of Appropriateness and Section 10-7 for complete information about the Historic Review Board. This form is also available online at www.cityofbeaufort.org Updated April 16, 2021.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MO (mm)</th>
<th>RO (mm)</th>
<th>FS (mm)</th>
<th>DLO (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10 (559)</td>
<td>1-01 (508)</td>
<td>1-03 (501)</td>
<td>1-04 (500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2 (660)</td>
<td>2-2 (660)</td>
<td>2-2 (660)</td>
<td>2-2 (660)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6 (762)</td>
<td>2-6 (762)</td>
<td>2-6 (762)</td>
<td>2-6 (762)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8 (813)</td>
<td>2-8 (813)</td>
<td>2-8 (813)</td>
<td>2-8 (813)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-10 (864)</td>
<td>2-10 (864)</td>
<td>2-10 (864)</td>
<td>2-10 (864)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**January 2020**
## Multiple Assemblies

Multiple assemblies can be factory milled.

**Maximum Rough Opening** not to exceed 113 1/2" x 76 1/4" Maximum up to 5 units wide by 1 unit high.

**Maximum Rough Opening** not to exceed 84" x 92" Maximum up to 3 units wide by 5 units high.

Field mull kits are available. Structural mullion reinforcement is required for some assemblies.

Please consult your local Marvin representative for more information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MO (mm)</th>
<th>3-0 (914)</th>
<th>3-2 (965)</th>
<th>3-6 (1067)</th>
<th>4-0 (1219)</th>
<th>4-6 (1372)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RO (mm)</td>
<td>3-1/2 (927)</td>
<td>3-2 1/2 (978)</td>
<td>3-6 1/2 (1080)</td>
<td>4-0 1/2 (1232)</td>
<td>4-6 1/2 (1384)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS (mm)</td>
<td>2-11/16 (805)</td>
<td>2-11/16 (806)</td>
<td>3-11/16 (1207)</td>
<td>4-11/16 (1309)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLO (mm)</td>
<td>2-5 11/16 (754)</td>
<td>2-7 11/16 (805)</td>
<td>3-5 11/16 (1054)</td>
<td>4-5 11/16 (1359)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details and Elevations not to scale.

Special sized units available within and outside of CN matrix. Please contact your Marvin dealer.

Minimum frame size: 17 1/2" x 27 3/4"

Maximum frame size: 53 1/2" x 83 3/4"

Optional Double Hung GBGs and SDLs are available in a standard Rectangular cut shown. Other available lite cuts shown on page 3.

When ordering 6 9/16" (167 mm) or 6 13/16" (173 mm) jambs, add 1/4" (6 mm) to width and 1/8" (3 mm) to height for Rough Opening, Frame Size and Masonry Opening.

E = These windows meet National Egress Codes for fire evacuation. Local codes may differ.

Available in equal, cottage, and reverse cottage sash configurations. Cottage and reverse cottage sash configurations are not available below CN 36 height and above CN 68 height.

For further details and drawings visit the "Tools and Documents" section at Marvin.com.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MO (mm)</th>
<th>1-4 1/2 (419)</th>
<th>1-8 1/2 (521)</th>
<th>2-0 1/2 (622)</th>
<th>2-4 1/2 (724)</th>
<th>2-8 1/2 (826)</th>
<th>3-0 1/2 (927)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RO (mm)</td>
<td>1-5 (432)</td>
<td>1-9 (533)</td>
<td>2-1 (635)</td>
<td>2-5 (737)</td>
<td>2-9 (838)</td>
<td>3-1 (940)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS (mm)</td>
<td>1-4 (408)</td>
<td>1-8 (508)</td>
<td>2-0 (609)</td>
<td>2-4 (711)</td>
<td>2-8 (813)</td>
<td>3-0 (914)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLO (mm)</td>
<td>0-10 25/32 (274)</td>
<td>1-2 25/32 (376)</td>
<td>1-6 25/32 (477)</td>
<td>1-10 25/32 (579)</td>
<td>2-2 25/32 (680)</td>
<td>2-6 25/32 (782)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MO (mm)</th>
<th>4-2 1/4 (1078)</th>
<th>4-6 1/4 (1180)</th>
<th>5-0 1/4 (1282)</th>
<th>5-4 1/4 (1384)</th>
<th>5-8 1/4 (1486)</th>
<th>6-2 1/4 (1588)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RO (mm)</td>
<td>4-2 1/4 (1078)</td>
<td>4-6 1/4 (1180)</td>
<td>5-0 1/4 (1282)</td>
<td>5-4 1/4 (1384)</td>
<td>5-8 1/4 (1486)</td>
<td>6-2 1/4 (1588)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS (mm)</td>
<td>4-2 1/4 (1078)</td>
<td>4-6 1/4 (1180)</td>
<td>5-0 1/4 (1282)</td>
<td>5-4 1/4 (1384)</td>
<td>5-8 1/4 (1486)</td>
<td>6-2 1/4 (1588)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLO (mm)</td>
<td>4-2 1/4 (1078)</td>
<td>4-6 1/4 (1180)</td>
<td>5-0 1/4 (1282)</td>
<td>5-4 1/4 (1384)</td>
<td>5-8 1/4 (1486)</td>
<td>6-2 1/4 (1588)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CASEMENT

ELCA1731  ELCA2131  ELCA2531  ELCA2931  ELCA3331  ELCA3731
ELCA1735  ELCA2135  ELCA2535  ELCA2935  ELCA3335  ELCA3735 E*
ELCA1739  ELCA2139  ELCA2539  ELCA2939  ELCA3339  ELCA3739 E*
ELCA1743  ELCA2143  ELCA2543  ELCA2943 E  ELCA3343 E  ELCA3743 E
ELCA1747  ELCA2147  ELCA2547  ELCA2947 E  ELCA3347 E  ELCA3747 E
ELCA1755  ELCA2155  ELCA2555  ELCA2955 E  ELCA3355 E  ELCA3755 E
ELCA1759  ELCA2159  ELCA2559  ELCA2959 E  ELCA3359 E  ELCA3759 E
ELCA1763  ELCA2163  ELCA2563  ELCA2963 E  ELCA3363 E  ELCA3763 E
ELCA1771 T  ELCA2171 T  ELCA2571 T  ELCA2971 ET  ELCA3371 ET  ELCA3771 ET
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Panel Details

- 24” Total Coverage with 1/2” Rib Height
- 26 & 24 Gauge Available
- 15 Available colors in Stock
- Available in Galvalume
- Exposed Fasteners
- Agricultural, Residential & Commercial Use
- Applies Over Solid Substrates with the use of Underlayment
- Suggested minimum Roof Slope 3:12

201 Red Oaks Way • Ridgeland, SC 29936
Telephone: 843.208.2433 • Fax: 843.208.2430
Website: www.4mmetals.com
**DATE: February 14, 2024**

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant:</th>
<th>David Murray, agent for Carteret Street United Methodist Church</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location/Address:</td>
<td>408 Carteret Street; R-120-004-000-0814-0000;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant’s Request:</td>
<td>The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for replacement of all windows on the ca. 1954 addition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Zoning:</td>
<td>T4-N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing:</td>
<td>Contributing Structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ZONING DISTRICT INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T4-N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width at Setback:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Lot Coverage:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Frontage Build Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SURROUNDING ZONING, LAND USE AND REQUIRED BUFFERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent Zoning</th>
<th>Adjacent Land Uses</th>
<th>Setbacks for Adjacent Zoning/Buffer required if rezoned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North: T-4 N</td>
<td>Landing Pad/Digital Corridor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South: T-4 N</td>
<td>Arsenal/Carnegie Library</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East: T-4 N</td>
<td>Contributing Structures</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West: T-4 N</td>
<td>Historic Homes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background:** The applicant is requesting final approval to replace 88 windows on the ca. 1954 addition. No windows on the original 1922 building will be altered. The proposed windows are fiberglass Kolbe Forgent Double-Hung. From the manufacturer: “Forgent Series products are comprised of Glastra, a proprietary hybrid of fiberglass and UV stable polymer. Please see included cut sheets for more information.”
The windows are being replaced as per the applicant: “The majority of the windows have failed because of rot, and some also have seal failures causing condensation between the glass panes. Additionally, the existing casings, sills and mulls have decayed and are allowing water to enter the building and breakdown the original brick and mortar structure. To rectify the situation and better preserve the brick building, all windows and frames will be replaced along with special attention paid on a case-by-case basis to restore the window bucks and brick sills to their original function and historical look with additional flashing. UMC’s goal with this large investment is to add longevity to their community spaces while at the same time honoring historical aesthetics.”

In addition, the Applicant states the following regarding the casings and sills of the windows:

“The existing casings, mulls, and sills appear to be wood and should be preserved and restored. In the applicant’s replacement campaign, the windows should not be sized down to fit a full window frame within the existing jambs, head, and sill. Rather, the applicant should only consider sash replacement kits with associated new jamb liners where required. In most cases the casings and mulls will have to be replaced along with the windows. In many cases, the surrounding brick sills have failed and will be regrouted where applicable and some completely replaced. The latter will be done sparingly. Regardless, they will be returned to their original historical aesthetics.”

The applicant attended an HTRC meeting on 8/30/23.

**Beaufort Preservation Manual:**

Chapter 10 of the Beaufort Preservation Manual relates to window replacements, and strongly recommends replacing wood windows with wood windows:

- Repair or replace existing historic windows in-kind. The profiles of window frames, sash, mullions, muntins, beads, and stops are critical elements to the appearance and character of the window and must be closely replicated. The “relief” of these elements, the relationship of their receding planes, cause the shadow lines which determine the character of the window.

- Replacement windows should thus duplicate the existing historic windows. •

- Save as much historic fabric as possible. In some cases, this will involve removing deteriorated sections and patching as invisibly as possible. Historic windows should be replaced only if they are beyond repair.
- Replace inappropriate windows with windows appropriate to the period of the house.
- Extant wood window screens should be retained, maintained, and repaired as necessary.

The Preservation Manual has a specific section on Fiberglass windows, but does have some recommendation to avoid a wood gran appearance:

- Fiberglass: Similar to aluminum-clad wood, fiberglass windows can blend authentic appearance with reduced maintenance. Fiberglass profiles, unlike aluminum and vinyl windows, are often available in sizes similar to historic wood windows. Sash and frame members approximating wood sizes allow for glass pane sizes similar to historic configurations. Additionally, fiberglass can be painted giving it a painted wood-like appearance. While painted surfaces will have to be maintained, fiberglass windows can have a very long life and age well without warping and fewer open joints that vinyl. Like fiberglass siding, fiberglass windows are available with a wood grain pattern. This option should be avoided to achieve the most authentic appearance.

**FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Staff Recommendation:**

The applicant has provided more information since the initial HTRC meeting. However, still more information is needed for complete review and decision. Staff would recommend tabling the request with the following recommendations to be provided or clarified before approval.

1. The applicant notes which existing windows are vinyl. However, there are numerous window types existing that do not provide a description of the existing window. They appear to be wood. Some appear to have jamb liners and may be insulated glass (IG) units, but others may be single pane units. A complete list of existing windows noting their composition should be provided and correlated to the labeling system.

2. The applicant provided a typical window section detail and plan detail of a fiberglass clad unit where the applicant is proposing to replace the brickmould and subsill as part of the project. Staff has the following concerns:
   
   i. Are these windows able to be obtained in custom sizes to properly fit the existing openings? If not, these typical details will need to be adapted for specific conditions and extra trim may be necessary to fill the gaps. The Beaufort Preservation Manual states (p. 155), “Do not alter the size of existing window openings to accommodate stock sizes of replacement windows….Do not decrease the size of window openings to allow for the installation of stock-size replacement windows.”

   ii. Staff understands the request is to replace windows on a noncontributing portion of the
building and likely most existing window sashes are not original to the 1950’s construction. However, the existing building does seem to retain its existing brickmould surrounds, mull covers, and wood subsills in most locations. The profile of these items appears different than the stock universal items provided by the proposed window manufacturer.

iii. While the building in question is not contributing to the district, it is within the district and highly visible from the public right-of-way. Windows are significant character defining features and the consideration to replace must be a careful one. A window is more than just the sashes. With this application, consideration must be given to the visual of the building relative to complete replacement of existing wood trim and window units for stock components. To assist in this review the applicant should provide existing window section and plan details for the various existing window types. These details will more easily show how the proposed window will relate to the existing conditions.

iv. With the present information, staff is not supportive of a full replacement unit where all wood elements are removed for the installation of universal window system components.

v. Staff is more supportive of replacement window sash kits that are made to fit the existing window jamb and head/sill dimensions and utilize jamb liners installed on the existing jambs. This type of proposal would utilize the existing brickmould trim and subsills, which will need various levels of repair. This type of solution is generally more successful in retaining the character defining feature of these windows. If the applicant were making this proposal, staff supports the fiberglass sashes in custom sizes made to fit the existing openings.

3. If any exterior doors are to be replaced, they must be noted and cut sheets of the proposed doors provided for review.
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**Project Name:** Carteret Street UMC - Renovation
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<tr>
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<tbody>
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</tbody>
</table>

**Nature of Work (check all that apply):**

- [ ] New Construction, Primary Structure
- [ ] New Construction, Primary Structure + Alterations / Additions
- [ ] Demolition
- [ ] Relocation

*Demolition and Relocation requires a public hearing*
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The Carteret Street United Methodist Church aims to better protect and operate the original 1954 structure surrounding the original 1922 church. With similar materials and aesthetics as the elevator addition in 2019, the Church hopes to replace the existing windows on the 1954 structure. Additionally, the Church hopes to replace two double door entry doors on the interior facade of the property.

---
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□ Floor Plan(s): Proposed floor plans of all levels of the building, including square footage. For Alterations or Additions, existing conditions drawings of the floor plan are also required, showing the area and square footage affected by the addition.
□ Elevations: Elevation drawings of all sides of the building, including heights – height above grade, floor-to-floor heights, eave height and ridge height (if applicable). For Alterations or Additions, existing conditions drawings of all four elevations are also required.
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□ Details: A typical wall section(s), window details, door details, roof details, porch details, and any other details characteristic to the building are required.
□ Material Samples and Cut Sheets: Applicant to submit cut sheets for all exterior building materials, to include roof and typical roof details, doors, windows, dryer vents, exterior lighting, etc. Samples of windows, lighting and building materials may be required at Staff's discretion.
□ Final Materials List: A final list, including colors, if required.
□ Landscaping Plan: A landscaping plan is required for commercial projects. It shall include a schedule detailing materials and colors of all plants and landscape materials, all existing trees, with the trees to be removed noted, existing and proposed grading, and any exterior lighting proposed.

Revised Dec. 10, 2021
February 2, 2024

Historic District Review Board,

The Carteret Street United Methodist Church (UMC), at 408 Carteret Street, aims to better protect and operate the original 1954 structure surrounding the original 1922 church. To do this their objective is to replace the 88 windows and two doors on the rear of the building. The majority of the windows have failed because of rot, and some also have seal failures causing condensation between the glass panes. Additionally, the existing casings, sills and mulls have decayed and are allowing water to enter the building and breakdown the original brick and mortar structure. To rectify the situation and better preserve the brick building, all windows and frames will be replaced along with special attention paid on a case-by-case basis to restore the window bucks and brick sills to their original function and historical look with additional flashing. UMC’s goal with this large investment is to add longevity to their community spaces while at the same time honoring historical aesthetics.

Thank you for your time and comments at the HTRC meeting September 6, 2023, with Carteret Street United Methodist Church’s representative, Todd Keyserling. To help outline the project, here is a response (in blue color) to staff comments per the email titled “Subject: Beaufort United Methodist Church – HTRC 9/6/2023 Comments” from Jeremy Tate:

“408 Carteret
1. T4-N
2. Contributing Structure – 1922 It is important to note that the structure involved is an addition to the 1922 original, built in 1954. The date of 1954 is according UMC.
3. Recommend noting specifically which windows are proposed to be replaced, applicant could add numbers 1-88 on photographs. Windows have been cataloged.
4. It appears the western most addition was hand-drawn on portions of the 1958 Sanborn update and was likely built after 1958. The year was 1954 according to UMC.
5. Staff supports an in-kind replacement approach as the window sashes do not appear to be historic. Rather the window sashes appear to be more recent replacement sashes with jamb liners. Applicant to confirm that all proposed window replacements are in fact not historic to the 1922 portion of the building. No windows or doors to be replaced in the 1922 structure.
6. It appears the 1 over 1 lite pattern is original to the structure from old postcard. From pictures, many sashes look like more recent replacements. Confirmed.
7. Staff needs to understand what the applicant means by composite window. Applicant to submit cutsheets for the proposed windows. The proposed windows are Kolbe Forgent Double-Hung. From the manufacturer: “Forgent Series products are comprised of Glastra, a proprietary hybrid
of fiberglass and UV stable polymer.” Please see included cut sheets for more information.

8. Staff does not support vinyl windows. Vinyl windows are not proposed.

9. Given the contributing nature of this structure, its prominence along a major corridor in the historic district, and in-keeping with the preservation manual chapter 10, staff recommends the applicant select a quality all wood replacement window paying attention to species of wood selected and construction technique. Looking to the preservation manual chapter 10 page 154, it states:

   “Fiberglass: Similar to aluminum-clad wood, fiberglass windows can blend authentic appearance with reduced maintenance. Fiberglass profiles, unlike aluminum and vinyl windows, are often available in sizes similar to historic wood windows. Sash and frame members approximating wood sizes allow for glass pane sizes similar to historic configurations. Additionally, fiberglass can be painted giving it a painted wood-like appearance. While painted surfaces will have to be maintained, fiberglass windows can have a very long life and age well without warping and fewer open joints than vinyl. Like fiberglass siding, fiberglass windows are available with a wood grain pattern. This option should be avoided to achieve the most authentic appearance.”

For these reasons, “fiberglass windows can blend authentic appearance with reduced maintenance,” the Kolbe Forgent Double-Hung windows are proposed.

10. Applicant to note what else is involved in replacing the windows. The existing casings, mulls, and sills appear to be wood and should be preserved and restored. In the applicant’s replacement campaign, the windows should not be sized down to fit a full window frame within the existing jambs, head, and sill. Rather, the applicant should only consider sash replacement kits with associated new jamb liners where required. In most cases the casings and mulls will have to be replaced along with the windows. In many cases, the surrounding brick sills have failed and will be regrouted where applicable and some completely replaced. The latter will be done sparingly. Regardless, they will be returned to their original historical aesthetics.

11. Staff supports replacing the doors, but recommends the applicant choose a design with more traditional detailing for the panels and vision light molding. The doors currently existing on the elevator addition appear suburban residential with their stamped raised panels and applied molding around the vision lite. To be clear, the elevator vestibule door is not to be replaced. The doors on the rear of the building are still to be decided.

Again, thank you for your time and expertise. We look forward to presenting the project and discussing.

Regards,

David Murray, AIA

David Murray
dmurray@tidemarsh.com 843-441-3709

Johan Niemand
jniemand@tidemarsh.com 843-252-9251
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DESIGN | EAST/FRONT ELEVATION FACING CARTERET STREET

ELEVATOR ADDITION
- FINISHED 2018
- COMPOSITE WINDOWS
- NO CHANGES

1922 ORIGINAL SANCTUARY - NO CHANGES

1954 ADDITION
- DOOR TO REMAIN
- WINDOWS TO BE REPLACED
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Design | North/Right Elevation Facing North Street
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1954 ADDITION - DOOR + WINDOWS TO BE REPLACED

UC + CC - EXISTING VINYL WINDOW
EE - EXISTING VINYL WINDOW
GG - EXISTING VINYL WINDOW

NOTE: WINDOWS CCC, DDD, EEE, FFF, GGG, HHH, III, AND JJJ ARE VINYL WINDOWS.
Conceptual Contractor shall check all dimensions on the work and report any discrepancy to the architect before proceeding. All work to be done is to the adopted codes and standards required for approved construction. All drawings and specifications are the property of the architect and must be returned upon request. This drawing is not to be used for construction until signed by the architect.
Conceptual Contractor shall check all dimensions on the work and report any discrepancy to the architect before proceeding.

All work to be done is to the adopted codes and standards required for approved construction.

All drawings and specifications are the property of the architect and must be returned upon request.

This drawing is not to be used for construction until signed by the architect.

dmurray@tidemarsh.com
jniemand@tidemarsh.com
(843) 605-6380

Prints issued No. Date

CONSULTANTS
TIDEMARSH, LLC
73 Sams Point Road,
Beaufort, SC 29907

HR-107
February 2, 2024

408 Carteret Street
Beaufort, SC 29902

United Methodist Church

Conceptual Review Drawings
Historic District Design Review Board
Beaufort, South Carolina

DESIGN | SOUTH/LEFT ELEVATION
Conceptual Contractor shall check all dimensions on the work and report any discrepancy to the architect before proceeding. All work to be done is to the adopted codes and standards required for approved construction. All drawings and specifications are the property of the architect and must be returned upon request. This drawing is not to be used for construction until signed by the architect.

dmurray@tidemarsh.com
jniemand@tidemarsh.com
(843) 605-6380

Prints issued No. Date

CONSULTANTS
TIDEMARSH, LLC
73 Sams Point Road,
Beaufort, SC 29907

February 2, 2024