MEETING AGENDA
The City of Beaufort
HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW BOARD
Wednesday, June 12, 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/86822813940?pwd=Mo2x9eqL5VtvYk6fx8h2VWUCr410iQ.aD2B84W8FdlM8s6M
Password:  757377             Meeting ID:  868 2281 3940             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. May 8, 2024 Meeting Minutes

III. Applications:
   A. **101 Scott Street, PIN R120 004 000 0948 0000**, New Construction
      Applicant: Adam Biery, Beaufort Design Build, agent for Greens Drugstore, LLC.
      The applicant is requesting preliminary approval for a new three and two story building.

   B. **1110 Greene Street, PIN R120 004 000 0277 0000**, New Construction
      Applicant: Edward G. Simpson, Owner
      The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for the construction of a single-family home and garage/ADU.

   C. **902 Harrington Street, PIN R120 004 000 0262 0000**, New Construction
      Applicant: Jeremiah Smith, Agent for Sea Island Development Company
      The applicant is requesting final approval for the construction of a single-family home and garage/ADU.

   D. **301 Carteret Street, PIN R121 004 000 0887 0000**, Site Improvements
      Applicant: Matthew S. McAlhaney, City Loft
      The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for exterior common area improvements.

IV. Adjournment
CALL TO ORDER 1:48

A meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held in-person on Wednesday, May 8, 2024 at 2:00 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).

REVIEW OF MINUTES 2:27

Mr. Sutton abstained from voting since he was not present at the May 8, 2024 meeting.

Motion: Mr. Woods made a motion to approve the April 10, 2024; 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.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEM 2:57

A. 811 King Street, PIN R120 004 000 0619 0000, Bailey Bill

Applicant: Cary Tolley

The applicant is requesting final approval of a Bailey Bill Submittal for renovations of an existing single-family residence.

Curt Freese presented his staff report.

Public Comment:

None.

Public comment closed.
**Motion:** Mr. Woods made a motion to approve the Bailey Bill as submitted. Ms. Prentice seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**3:44**

A. **410 King Street Drainage Improvements, PIN RI20 004 000 0744 and 0747,** Additional Applicant: Michael Horton, PE, Davis & Floyd and Rob Montgomery, agenda for City of Beaufort

The City of Beaufort is requesting conceptual approval of drainage structures, including a pump station, equipment room, back up and out fall structure at the City owned lot (Knott Park).

Curt Freese presented his staff report. He stated that petitions were submitted from The Point prior to today to the HRB members.

**Public Comment:**

**Stephen Murray, 609 Craven Street,** read his written comments aloud. He feels rain/flooding issues are going to get worse. This project is about us being proactive and about the future of more than just today; it’s long term. He’s disappointed in some of his neighbors who came out to stop the project and hopes everyone can work together to figure out the aesthetics of the hard infrastructure. He asked the Board to continue with this project and move it along.

**Gene Grace, 905 North Street** referred to Mr. Murray’s comments about being disappointed about some of his neighbors. Mr. Grace referred to the 238 signed petitions from The Point residents he submitted to the City Hall for the Board Members. He asked that this project be tabled.

**Dave Russell, 411 Craven Street** was disappointed in his neighbor for talking about the engineering and the need for this and not what we really are here for, which is the aesthetics to keep in character with the historic nature. He mentioned that this was tabled at the last meeting because the public didn’t have a chance to have input into the process to see the latest plans and ask questions for the engineers. The staff report is misleading under the title that says, *changes since the April Meeting.* There is a meeting today after this meeting which will be the one chance we all have to make comments. It’s hard to understand from the staff report if the integrity guidelines apply only to the two structures in that park or if they are applied to the pump station. Mr. Grace doesn’t feel conceptual approval can be granted when the main integrity items and the guidelines are not met with the pump which is the largest industrial building or structure.

**Lise Sundrla, Historic Beaufort Foundation (HBF)** stated at this time, it’s too premature to approve the design of these projects until we actually know what is happening. She referred to Section 601, Federal Funding and the requirements before approvals are made, permitting. She referred to the Bayard Street project but that is funded through EPA.

Public comment closed.

**Motion:** Mr. Berman made a motion to grant conceptual approval with the applicant to pursue option D with a building structure more similar to option F and approve the materials that were submitted today. Mr. Woods seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
B. **1203 Bay Street, PIN R120 004 000 0771 0000**, Alterations
   Applicant: Chris and Suzanne Ramm

   The applicant is requesting final approval for replacement of a wood front porch deck, with a manmade product called Aeratis on a contributing structure.

   Mr. Woods recused himself from this project.

   Curt Freese presented his staff report.

   **Public Comment:**

   **Lise Sundrla, Historic Beaufort Foundation (HBF)** stated from the perspective of the Preservation Committee, she said this is such a critical building on a pivotal location and probably on the most scenic corner you’re going to find in our Historic District with the views across the street. She referred to the improvement that HBF requested to make a few years ago for Verdier House. The committee felt that without further information and further study and agree with staff’s recommendations for denial.

   Public comment closed.

   **Motion:** Mr. Berman made a motion to approve the materials as applied for.

   Motion failed from lack of a second.

   **Motion:** Ms. Wilson made a motion to approve the use of this material for the front porch on a case-by-case basis and not an overall approval for all projects. And that we review the product every year for the next five years. Mr. Berman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

   Board took a brief break.

C. **101 Scott Street, PIN R120 004 000 0948**, New Construction
   Applicant: Adam Biery, Beaufort Design Build, agent for Greens Drugstore, LLC

   The applicant is requesting preliminary approval for a new three and two story building.

   Mr. Woods returned to the Board at this time.
   Curt Freese presented his staff report.

   **Public Comment:**

   **Stephen Murray, 609 Bay Street**, read his comments aloud. He said some feel discretionary boards are not needed and that the city codes are clear and city planning staff is capable of making these decisions on their own, and that the Board is only here to rubber stamp the
projects; he disagreed. He feels it’s impossible to capture every nuance and issue within in the Codes when it comes to development, especially in a 300-year old city and when it comes to making sure that our vision aligns with our development code. He said he sees several issues with the proposed project: (1) the process. He referred to Section 2.4.D. - Building Form that states a building over 100 feet long requires approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals and this requirement is not listed in the staff report. He estimates the building to be approximately 116 feet long. He asked the Board to request the City Attorney weigh in on this project and provide guidance to staff and this Board on appropriate approval process before moving forward. He said he is disappointed in staff for not providing greater transparency on a project of this magnitude. He was also surprised to hear that they’re skipping the conceptual step. He referred to the number of times the applicant has presented this project to the HTRC and HBF. He said the City can do better informing the public. (2) materials and placement of the building. He suggested the building be masonry of sort, tabby, brick. (3) Preservation Manual states the district should complement the mass, scale, and context of the neighboring properties. If approved in its current form, this building will be as tall or taller than the approved hotel that created so much controversy downtown. He referred to the staff report regarding the comment, market/warehouse and asked, “is that what we want in our waterfront”? (4) parking. If approved, 22 spaces will be removed. Parking is a problem and city leadership does not have a plan to address it. He asked the Board to deny or table this project until these concerns are addressed.

Paul Trask, 610 Bladen Street, spoke in favor of this project.

Lise Sundrla, Historic Beaufort Foundation (HBF) said there were a lot changes made to the design from where it originally began with the intent of making sure that it did meet the seven integrities with the intent of making sure that it was not overbearing to the adjacent properties. She referred to the comment the former Mayor Murray said, “do we want a warehouse there”. She referred to the photos that Adam Biery showed what the waterfront park looked like in the past to present day. Our Preservation Committee did not agree with item #4 in the staff report regarding the metal board and batten panels. HBF also didn’t agree with the ganged windows. HBF agreed if it does exceed the 100 feet than the project needs through the variance process. From our Preservation Committee’s perspective, we support this project moving forward.

Maxine Lutz, 811 North Street, complimented Mr. Biery on his concept for filling in the nasty parking lot. She agreed with staff that the concept fits the seven integrities. It fits in perfectly with the context of the other buildings. Regarding the comment about the view of the rooftop, she feels it would be much better to look at that than the 700 Bay Building and their rooftop mechanical equipment. She concurs with Ms. Sundrla that the warehouse motif is totally appropriate for our waterfront. She hopes the Board will give conceptual approval to the project.

Public comment closed.

Motion: Mr. Berman made a motion to approve conceptually with the staff conditions and add the condition that the applicant restudy the scale of the center and consider alternative materials to the Efis. Ms. Prentice seconded the motion.

Mr. Freese asked Mr. Berman to amend his motion to include that staff revisit the 100 feet
Mr. Berman amended his motion to include a restudy of the 100 foot requirement for clarification.

Mr. Berman withdrew his motion. Ms. Prentice withdrew her second.

**Motion:** Mr. Berman made a motion to grant conceptual approval with staff’s recommendations and add the conditions that the scale is reduced to the center; the material choices are restudied; the 100 feet requirement is taken a second look at and proven to the Board to meet that requirement. Ms. Prentice seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**D. 1714 Washington & 807 Hamar Street, PIN R120 003 000 0128 0000, Renovations**

Applicant: Beaufort Preservation Trust, LLC, Woods Dendy, Agent.

The applicant is requesting final approval for renovations of two non-contributing structures.

Mr. Woods recused himself from this project.

Curt Freese presented his staff report.

**Public Comment:**

**Lise Sundrla, Historic Beaufort Foundation (HBF)** said the Preservation Committee is supportive of these projects and excited to see more buildings put back into use in the district.

Public comment closed.

**Motion:** Mr. Berman made a motion to grant approval final approval with the staff recommendations and the cutsheets provided today. Ms. Wilson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**E. 910 Greene Street, PIN R120 004 000 0296 0000, Change After Certification**

Applicant: Stacy Applegate, agent for Fred Washington, Jr.

The applicant is requesting a change after certification for window replacement on a contributing single-family residence.

Curt Freese presented his staff report.

**Public Comment:**

**Dick Stewart** said Mr. Washington has a house that’s going to be rented to people and the Board is asking him to do something about an architectural feature somebody says that a window is but what about the wall underneath that will have condensation. This will cause damage to the structure we’re trying to replace. Mr. Stewart stated, what is more important, Mr. Washington and his family or the people who have ties to this community or the working people that are looking for a place to live in this community or is it some old and rotten...
windows that might need to be fixed now and then again in the future.

**Paul Trask, 610 Bladen Street,** is favor of the proposal and in support of what the applicant is requesting.

**Lise Sundrla, Historic Beaufort Foundation (HBF)** confirmed this project is in the Preservation District. She referred to the John Mark Verdier House when the HVAC was changed and then windows needed to be changed for the exact reasons as this project. Our Preservation Committee met with Stacy Applegate and the representative from Victorbuilt on Friday, and they felt very strongly to uphold staff’s comments from the standpoint of repair rather than replace. HBF feels this is an opportunity for a twofold (1) can we have more repaired than replaced (2) need to revisit materials throughout the whole district not just the conservation district and what works and what is fair to the community. She referred to the Board’s meeting packet and the materials that that Libby Anderson had and were able to be followed. She feels this needs to be revisited.

Public comment closed.

**Motion:** Mr. Berman made a motion to approve the use of the Victorbuilt windows as requested by the applicant. Ms. Wilson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

---

**DISCUSSION**

**A. Discussion of Materials List and FAQ for Historic District**

Mr. Freese said we need to revisit the Materials List. Several years ago, the City had a list that they were providing to people, and it was a good guide. Mr. Freese said he will have Maria Short and Jeremy Tate from Meadors do some research in other communities to see what they are doing. All board members agreed.

---

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Berman made a motion seconded by Ms. Prentice to adjourn. The meeting ended at 5:35 pm.
STAFF REPORT: 101 Scott Street Preliminary Approval

DATE: June 12, 2024

GENERAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant:</th>
<th>Beaufort Design Build LLC, agent for Greens Drugstore LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location/Address:</td>
<td>101 Scott Street; R120 004 000 0948 0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant's Request:</td>
<td>The applicant is requesting preliminary approval for a new three and two story building at 101 Scott Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Zoning:</td>
<td>T-5 DC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ZONING DISTRICT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Width at Setback:</th>
<th>T5-DC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max Lot Coverage:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Frontage Build Out</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>0’ min (max prevailing setback on block)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback</td>
<td>0’/15’ side corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>0’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height:</td>
<td>2 stories min/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: T5-DC</td>
<td>Historic Commercial Building</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South: T5-DC</td>
<td>Historic Commercial Building</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East: T5-DC</td>
<td>Historic Commercial Building</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West: T5-DC</td>
<td>Historic Commercial Building</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes Since 5/8/2024 HRB Conceptual Approval Meeting:

The project was heard for Conceptual approval at the May 8, 2024, meeting. Conceptual approval was granted with ten recommendations for future submittals. The applicant has provided a supplemental document attached with explanation (including visual) of how they addressed the ten recommendations found below, which has also been provided in this staff report in red below each recommendation:

1. Removing the central raised portions of the gable parapet walls of the three-story mass (east and west elevations) and making the parapet wall one single gable or reducing the height of the central raised gable portion.
The height of the central raised gable portion of the parapet walls (east and west elevations) has been reduced by 1’-6”. Sheets A-201 (elevations) and A-202 (3-Dimensional Model Views) have been revised to reflect this change. In addition, Sheet A-201.1 has been added to the set for comparison. Please see the following page for images.

2. Converting the storefront windows on the three-story mass (east and west elevations) to ganged double-hung windows like the central mass.

The storefront window have been replaced with metal windows. The fenestration has been studied and additional lites/mulleins have been added. Sheets G-105.2 (window and door cutsheets) and A-201 (building elevations) have been revised to reflect the new windows and doors.

3. Not supportive of vinyl-clad windows and recommends either fiberglass- clad or aluminum-clad windows. Chapter 10 of the Beaufort Preservation Manual notes, “For new construction, the appearance of vinyl, especially as it ages, makes it difficult to recommend. While understanding the appeal of reduced costs, a building sympathetically designed for the surrounding District would likely be better served aesthetically with windows of a different material.”

The use of vinyl-clad windows was never intended. The typo on Sheet G-105.1 has been revised. Andersen E-Series windows are the basis of design, for the windows in the two-story mass.

4. Remove the metal board and batten panels as this is not a material frequently seen in the Beaufort Historic District, with a recommendation of utilizing a smooth cementitous siding.

The metal board and batten siding has been replaced with flush seam panels at the recommendation of the HBF. Sheets G-105.1 (cut sheet) and sheet A-201 (elevations) have been revised to reflect these changes.

5. Reduce the thickness of the metal awnings and providing brackets or cables so that they appear visually supported. Applicant to note a color at final review.

The metal awning thickness has been reduced to match the adjacent banding trim. Sheets A-201 and A-202 have been revised to reflect these changes. A cutsheet for the awnings has been provided on sheet G-105.1.

6. Applicant to provide color renderings at final review.

Color rendering will be presented / provided at final review.

7. Applicant to provide typical sections and details at final review.

Whereas a few typical sections have been provided in this submission finalized sections and details will be presented / provided at final review.

8. Applicant to provide a cutsheet for any railings.

A cutsheet for the railings has been provided on sheet G-105.2 and is also provided below.

9. Restudy the height and scale of the center building, as its current height is felt to be too tall compared to surrounding structures.

Restudy the height and scale of the center building, as its current height is felt to be too tall to the surrounding structures.”
A height comparison diagram with the surrounding structures is provide on sheet A-201. This diagram has been updated to reflect the decrease in height.

10. Consider alternative materials to Efis.

Where as EFIS was noted on the prior submission set this was in error. The use of EFIS was never intended, instead a 3-coat stucco with a drainage layer will be utilized. A cut sheet for this system, basis of design, can be found on G-105.3

**100’ Building Requirement**:

1) In 2.4.1.D there is a footnote 9 that limits buildings in T5-DC to 100’ of length on any frontage:

   ✓ Applicant has shortened the building to 99’ 6” for compliance.

**Background:** The applicant is proposing to build a new 17,988 SF shell building which is designed to appear as two different structures: a three story middle section, and two story end section towards the Henry Chambers waterfront park. The building is expected to function as an office building, first floor restaurant, and third floor roof-top bar. The new building will be constructed in the location of the current stand-alone Yoyo's ice cream shop and a parking lot.

This project was presented at three HTRC meetings. The primary discussion was regarding the building design, determining the status of the current Yo Yo’s building (non-contributing and not historic and issued a demo permit in 2023), the height of the proposed building, and finding historic examples for proposed architecture.

**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>
</table>
| 1. Location: This is the relationship between the property and its historical context. | Yes | ✓ The property historically bordered the waterfront before the park was built.  
 ✓ The applicant did consider the previous architecture of the waterfront area pre-park with the design, with the middle three story building more like a market/warehouse building which would have existed. |
| 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 | Yes | “New construction should relate to the dominant proportions of the styles present in its immediate neighborhood. New construction should emulate the proportions of the major elements of its early neighbors to the degree practicable.” (pg. 64, Beaufort Preservation Manual.) There is some concern about the middle third story portion and how it relates to other waterfront buildings in the area. The applicant has minimized its impact by placing it in the middle of the property and with the proposed roof form. |
### 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.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The new building relates and interfaces with the water and the waterfront park, with a rooftop bar and patio fronting to these areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The new building is designed to appear as if it was an addition to 720-724 Bay Street to the North.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Materials

These are the physical elements that make up a property or district.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The building reflects the structures along Bay Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The fenestration and clapboard visually reduces the mass and scale and is more in keeping with the surrounding structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The roof design and its location in the middle lightens the heaviness of the building and its elements upon the surrounding area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>This is a new building, so no original building details or materials are being saved or retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The building reflects the structures along Bay Street and their historic workmanship though design, choice in materials, and fenestration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The applicant has provided a street scape depicting how the structure is similar in size and scale to properties on Bay Street. There is some concern about the middle third story portion and how it relates to other waterfront buildings in the area. The applicant has minimized its impact by placing it in the middle of the property and with the proposed roof form, and to design it to look more like a market/wharf type structure that would have existed in the past.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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>The applicant did consider the previous architecture of the waterfront area pre-park with the design, with the middle three story building more like a market/warehouse building which would have existed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends preliminary approval as Staff believes the seven integrity standards of Section 4.7.2 are met as well as the intent of the Beaufort Preservation Manual and the standards of the Development Code, with the following conditions:

1. In general, staff is supportive of the height, scale, and mass of the structure and believes the massing is appropriate for this site.

   Staff offers the following recommendations for Final Approval:

2. Applicant to provide color renderings at final review.

3. Applicant to provide typical sections and details at final review.
GREENS DRUGSTORE INFILL PROJECT
101 SCOTT STREET
CONCEPTUAL DECISION LETTER RESPONSE

REVISED PRELIMINARY DESIGN SUBMISSION

May 31, 2024
May 14, 2021

Adam Berry
Benford Design Build, LLC
Via email: adam@benforddesignbuild.com

REG: (APP# 36899) 101 Scott Street - New Construction Conceptual

Dear Mr. Berry,

On May 8, 2021, the City of Beaufort Historic Review Board (HDB) met to review your application for approval for a new three and two-story building located at 101 Scott Street. The HDB voted to conditionally approve your application with the staff conditions listed below:

1. Removing the central mixed portions of the gable gable-ends walls of the three-story mass (east and west elevations) and making the parapet wall one single gable or reducing the height of the central mixed gable parapet.

2. Converting the double-hung windows on the three-story mass (east and west elevations) to paired double-hung windows like the central mass.

3. Not supportives of vinyl-clad windows and recommends either fiberglass-clad or aluminum-clad windows. Chapter 10 of the Beaufort Preservation Manual states, “The new construction, the appearance of vinyl, especially in its ages, makes it difficult to recommend. While understanding the appeal of reduced costs, a building sympathetically designed for the surrounding District would likely be better served architecturally with windows of a different material.”

4. Remove the metal board and baron words as this is not a material frequently seen in the Beaufort Historic District, with a recommendation of utilizing a smooth, continuous finish.

5. Reduce the thickness of the metal soffits and providing brackets or cables so that they appear visually supported. Applicant to state a color at final review.

6. Applicant to provide color renderings at final review.

7. Applicant to provide typical sections and details at final review.

8. Applicant to provide a landscape for any site parking.

9. Review the height and scale of the center building, as its current height is 60 to be set on low compared to surrounding structures.

10. Consider aluminum materials to Ellis.

Note: Conceptual approval does not provide record rights as per the Beaufort Preservation Manual, and a Preliminary and Final architectural and approvals will be required. If you have any questions, feel free to call the Community Development Department at 843-525-7011.

Sincerely,

Mike Benge, Chair
Beaufort Historic Review Board
c/o Graham Tank, grahamtank@gmail.com
Adam Berry, adam@benforddesignbuild.com
file copy
1. “Removing the central raised portions of the gable parapet walls of the three-story mass (east and west elevations) and making the parapet wall one single gable or reducing the height of the central raised gable portion.”

The height of the central raised gable portion of the parapet walls (east and west elevations) has been reduced by 1’-6”. Sheets A-201 (elevations) and A-202 (3-Dimensional Model Views) have been revised to reflect this change. In addition, Sheet A-201.1 has been added to the set for comparison. Please see the following page for images.
2. “Converting the storefront windows on the three-story mass to ganged double-hung windows like the central mass.”

The storefront window have been replaced with metal windows. The fenestration has been studied and additional lites / mulls have been added. Sheets G-105.2 (window and door cutsheets) and A-201 (building elevations) have been revised to reflect the new windows and doors.
3. “Not supportive of vinyl-clad windows and recommends either fiberglass-clad or aluminum-clad windows…..”

The use of vinyl-clad windows was never intended. The typo on Sheet G-105.1 has been revised. Andersen E-Series windows are the basis of design, for the windows in the two-story mass. See next page for images.
4. “Remove the metal board and batten panels as this is not a material frequently seen in the Historic District, with the recommendation of utilizing a smooth cementitious siding.”

The metal board and batten siding has been replaced with flush seam panels at the recommendation of the HBF. Sheets G-105.1 (cut sheet) and sheet A-201 (elevations) have been revised to reflect these changes.
5. “Reduce the thickness of the metal awnings and provided brackets or cables so that are visually supported. Applicant to note a color at final review.”

The metal awning thickness has been reduced to match the adjacent banding trim. Sheets A-201 and A-202 have been revised to reflect these changes. A cutsheet for the awnings has been provided on sheet G-105.1
6. **“Applicant to provide color rendering at final review.”**

   Color rendering will be presented / provided at final review.

7. **“Applicant to provide typical sections and details at final review.”**

   Whereas a few typical sections have been provided in this submission finalized sections and details will be presented / provided at final review.
8. “Applicant to provide a cutsheet for any railings.”

A cutsheet for the railings has been provided on sheet G-105.2 and is also provided below.
9. “Restudy the height and scale of the center building, as its current height is felt to be too tall to the surrounding structures.”

A height comparison diagram with the surrounding structures is provide on sheet A-201. This diagram has been updated to reflect the decrease in height.
10. “Consider alternative materials to EFIS.”

Where as EFIS was noted on the prior submission set this was in error. The use of EFIS was never intended, instead a 3-coat stucco with a drainage layer will be utilized. A cut sheet for this system, basis of design, can be found on G-105.3
A. GENERAL, THE PROJECT CONSISTS OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF A TWO AND THREE STORY BUILDING.

B. INTENDED USES ARE RESTAURANT ON THE FIRST FLOOR, OFFICE SPACE ON THE SECOND FLOOR AND ROOF DECK.

C. THE CURRENT PROJECT WILL CONSIST OF A COLD / DARK SHELL. FUTURE TENANT UPFITS WILL BE DESIGNED AND PERMITTED SEPARATELY.

D. THE BUILDING WILL BE PROVIDED WITH A FIRE SPRINKLER SYSTEM DESIGNED AND PERMITTED SEPARATELY.

E. THEN BUILDING STRUCTURE WILL UTILIZE REINFORCED CONCRETE FOOTINGS, FOUNDATIONS AND FLOOR SLAB, LIGHT-GAUGE METAL WALL FRAMING AND WOOD FLOOR AND ROOF JOISTS.

F. LATERAL BRACING WILL BE PROVIDED THROUGH THE USE OF LOAD-BEARING MASONRY STAIR AND ELEVATOR SHAFTS AND SHEAR WALLS.

G. THE BUILDING WILL BE FOUNDED ON CONCRETE FOOTINGS, FOUNDATIONS AND FLOOR SLAB.

H. LIGHT-GAUGE METAL WALL FRAMING AND WOOD FLOOR AND ROOF JOISTS. LATERAL BRACING WILL BE PROVIDED THROUGH THE USE OF LOAD-BEARING MASONRY STAIR AND ELEVATOR SHAFTS AND SHEAR WALL PANELS.

I. THE CONSTRUCTION WILL UTILIZE REINFORCED CONCRETE FOOTINGS, FOUNDATIONS AND FLOOR SLAB.

J. LIGHT-GAUGE METAL WALL FRAMING AND WOOD FLOOR AND ROOF JOISTS.

K. LATERAL BRACING WILL BE PROVIDED THROUGH THE USE OF LOAD-BEARING MASONRY STAIR AND ELEVATOR SHAFTS AND SHEAR WALL PANELS.

L. THE BUILDING WILL BE PROVIDED WITH A FIRE SPRINKLER SYSTEM DESIGNED AND PERMITTED SEPARATELY.

M. THEN BUILDING STRUCTURE WILL UTILIZE REINFORCED CONCRETE FOOTINGS, FOUNDATIONS AND FLOOR SLAB.

N. LIGHT-GAUGE METAL WALL FRAMING AND WOOD FLOOR AND ROOF JOISTS. LATERAL BRACING WILL BE PROVIDED THROUGH THE USE OF LOAD-BEARING MASONRY STAIR AND ELEVATOR SHAFTS AND SHEAR WALL PANELS.

O. THE BUILDING WILL BE FOUNDED ON CONCRETE FOOTINGS, FOUNDATIONS AND FLOOR SLAB.

P. LIGHT-GAUGE METAL WALL FRAMING AND WOOD FLOOR AND ROOF JOISTS. LATERAL BRACING WILL BE PROVIDED THROUGH THE USE OF LOAD-BEARING MASONRY STAIR AND ELEVATOR SHAFTS AND SHEAR WALL PANELS.

Q. THE BUILDING WILL BE PROVIDED WITH A FIRE SPRINKLER SYSTEM DESIGNED AND PERMITTED SEPARATELY.

R. THEN BUILDING STRUCTURE WILL UTILIZE REINFORCED CONCRETE FOOTINGS, FOUNDATIONS AND FLOOR SLAB.

S. LIGHT-GAUGE METAL WALL FRAMING AND WOOD FLOOR AND ROOF JOISTS. LATERAL BRACING WILL BE PROVIDED THROUGH THE USE OF LOAD-BEARING MASONRY STAIR AND ELEVATOR SHAFTS AND SHEAR WALL PANELS.

T. THE BUILDING WILL BE FOUNDED ON CONCRETE FOOTINGS, FOUNDATIONS AND FLOOR SLAB.

U. LIGHT-GAUGE METAL WALL FRAMING AND WOOD FLOOR AND ROOF JOISTS. LATERAL BRACING WILL BE PROVIDED THROUGH THE USE OF LOAD-BEARING MASONRY STAIR AND ELEVATOR SHAFTS AND SHEAR WALL PANELS.

V. THE BUILDING WILL BE PROVIDED WITH A FIRE SPRINKLER SYSTEM DESIGNED AND PERMITTED SEPARATELY.

W. THEN BUILDING STRUCTURE WILL UTILIZE REINFORCED CONCRETE FOOTINGS, FOUNDATIONS AND FLOOR SLAB.

X. LIGHT-GAUGE METAL WALL FRAMING AND WOOD FLOOR AND ROOF JOISTS. LATERAL BRACING WILL BE PROVIDED THROUGH THE USE OF LOAD-BEARING MASONRY STAIR AND ELEVATOR SHAFTS AND SHEAR WALL PANELS.

Y. THE BUILDING WILL BE FOUNDED ON CONCRETE FOOTINGS, FOUNDATIONS AND FLOOR SLAB.

Z. LIGHT-GAUGE METAL WALL FRAMING AND WOOD FLOOR AND ROOF JOISTS. LATERAL BRACING WILL BE PROVIDED THROUGH THE USE OF LOAD-BEARING MASONRY STAIR AND ELEVATOR SHAFTS AND SHEAR WALL PANELS.
**TABLE 7** — FIRE RESISTANCE RATING OF BUILDING ELEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Element</th>
<th>Rating Class</th>
<th>Fire Rating (in minutes)</th>
<th>Protection Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wall</strong></td>
<td>Fire-Rated</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>To meet local codes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ceiling</strong></td>
<td>Fire-Rated</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>To meet local codes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roof</strong></td>
<td>Fire-Rated</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>To meet local codes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floor</strong></td>
<td>Fire-Rated</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>To meet local codes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 8** — STRUCTURAL DESIGN INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure Type</th>
<th>Span (ft)</th>
<th>Load (kips)</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Connections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beams</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Steel</td>
<td>焊接连接</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Columns</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>月牙形连接</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diaphragms</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>木板连接</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 9** — ELECTRICAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electrical Systems</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lighting System</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>Energy Efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Panel</td>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>Self-Protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generator</td>
<td>50kW</td>
<td>Standby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 10** — MECHANICAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HVAC System</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heating System</td>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>Efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling System</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Energy Efficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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1.1 NORTH ELEVATION TRANSPARENCY DIAGRAM
1.2 WEST ELEVATION TRANSPARENCY DIAGRAM
1.3 EAST ELEVATION TRANSPARENCY DIAGRAM

2.0 SUMMARY OF TRANSPARENCY DEPARTMENTS

2.1.2 NORTH ELEVATION TRANSPARENCY DEPARTMENT

A. Total First Floor Area = 480 SQ FT
   B. Total First Floor Transparency = 202 SQ FT
   C. Transparency Ratio = 202 SQ FT / 480 SQ FT = 42%

2.1.3 WEST ELEVATION TRANSPARENCY DEPARTMENT

A. Total First Floor Area = 480 SQ FT
   B. Total First Floor Transparency = 173 SQ FT
   C. Transparency Ratio = 173 SQ FT / 519 SQ FT = 33%

2.1.4 EAST ELEVATION TRANSPARENCY DEPARTMENT

A. Total First Floor Area = 480 SQ FT
   B. Total First Floor Transparency = 96 SQ FT
   C. Transparency Ratio = 96 SQ FT / 459 SQ FT = 21%

3.0 SHEET INFORMATION

3.1 APPENDIXES AND ATTACHMENTS

3.2.1 APPENDICES

A. Applicable standards, codes, and guidelines for the project.
B. Construction specifications and submittal requirements.
C. Reference drawings and project information.
D. List of materials and equipment.
E. Safety and health standards.
F. Environmental impact statements.
G. Site plans and landscape plans.
H. Structural drawings and calculations.
I. Plumbing drawings and calculations.
J. Electrical drawings and calculations.
K. Mechanical drawings and calculations.
L. Energy management plans.
M. Operations and maintenance plans.
N. Security plans.
O. Sustainability plans.

3.2.2 ATTACHMENTS

A. Contract documents.
B. Project schedules.
C. Project budgets.
D. Project reports.
E. Project progress updates.
F. Project closure plans.
G. Project warranties.
H. Project certifications.
I. Project legal documentation.
J. Project financial documentation.
K. Project marketing materials.
L. Project promotional materials.
M. Project social media materials.
N. Project customer service materials.
O. Project community engagement materials.
P. Project public relations materials.
Q. Project community outreach materials.
R. Project community benefit materials.
S. Project community involvement materials.
T. Project community engagement materials.
U. Project community contribution materials.
V. Project community participation materials.
W. Project community engagement materials.
X. Project community involvement materials.
Y. Project community benefit materials.
Z. Project community contribution materials.

3.2.3 APPENDIX A - SITE PLANS

A. Site plans.
B. Site plans.
C. Site plans.
D. Site plans.
E. Site plans.
F. Site plans.
G. Site plans.
H. Site plans.
I. Site plans.
J. Site plans.
K. Site plans.
L. Site plans.
M. Site plans.
N. Site plans.
O. Site plans.
P. Site plans.
Q. Site plans.
R. Site plans.
S. Site plans.
T. Site plans.
U. Site plans.
V. Site plans.
W. Site plans.
X. Site plans.
Y. Site plans.
Z. Site plans.

3.2.4 ATTACHMENT B - STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS

A. Structural drawings.
B. Structural drawings.
C. Structural drawings.
D. Structural drawings.
E. Structural drawings.
F. Structural drawings.
G. Structural drawings.
H. Structural drawings.
I. Structural drawings.
J. Structural drawings.
K. Structural drawings.
L. Structural drawings.
M. Structural drawings.
N. Structural drawings.
O. Structural drawings.
P. Structural drawings.
Q. Structural drawings.
R. Structural drawings.
S. Structural drawings.
T. Structural drawings.
U. Structural drawings.
V. Structural drawings.
W. Structural drawings.
X. Structural drawings.
Y. Structural drawings.
Z. Structural drawings.
**GREENS DRUGSTORE INFILL PROJECT**

101 Scott Street
Beaufort, SC 29902

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**

- A5A&S COMMERCIAL STEEL WINDOWS
- A3A&S COMMERCIAL STEEL DOOR
- A6ALUMINUM BI-FOLD DOOR SPEC SHEET
- A1ALUMINUM CANOPY
- C5RAILING SPEC SHEET
- G-105.2
**GREENS DRUGSTORE INFILL PROJECT**
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**NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION**

---

**STANDARD 3-COAT STUCCO FINISH WITH DRAINAGE MEDIUM**

---

**Star-O-Flex® Elastomeric Acrylic Finishes**

The Rubber-Flour Finish

---

**Specifications**

- **Finish:** Elastomeric Acrylic
- **Application:** Transparent

---

**Materials**

- **Color:** Multiple options available
- **Finish:** Rubber-Flour

---

**Video Gallery**

---

**Literature**

*Star-O-Flex Elastomeric Acrylic Finish - Product Data Sheet*

---

**Greenways Drainable Stucco Assembly**

**Component Assembly**

- Sheathing Board
- Waterway Drainage Base
- Self-Framing Jamb
- Traditional Stucco
- Stucco Corner Beads
- Reinforcing Mesh
- Star-Clear
- Star-O-Flex Elastomeric Acrylic Finish

---

**Supporting Documents**

- G-105.3
- A1 Standard 3-Coat Stucco Finish with Drainage Medium

---

**This detail is generic in nature. Metal studs will be used in lieu of wood studs and cement backer board in lieu of plywood.**
GENERAL NOTES:

LEGEND:

A. GENERAL NOTE

SHEET KEY NOTES:

1. PROPERTY LINE
2. ALUMINUM CLAD FIXED WINDOW; ANDERSEN "E" SERIES
3. 3'-4"x9'-0" WOOD DOOR AND FRAME WITH TRANSOM; ANDERSEN "E" SERIES COMMERCIAL DOOR
4. PRE-FINISHED ALUMINUM WALL PANEL
5. CEMENT STUCCO
6. CONCRETE STAIR TREAD AND RISER
7. ACCESSIBLE CONCRETE RAMP. SLOPE TO HAVE NO GREATER THAN 1" : 12"
   CONCRETE TO HAVE BROOM FINISH
8. (2) 3'-0"x8'-0" FULL GLASS SOLID CORE WOOD DOOR WITH TRANSOM AND SIDELIGHTS; ANDERSEN "E" SERIES COMMERCIAL DOOR. FRAME TO BE INTEGRAL WITH WINDOW FRAMING AND TRIM. ALL TRIM TO BE PRIMED AND PAINTED
9. DOUBLE HUNG ALUMINUM CLAD WINDOWS; ANDERSEN "E" SERIES WINDOWS
10. SAVANNAH SMOOTH NICHIHA FIBER CEMENT LAP SIDING WITH 7" EXPOSURE; TO BE INSTALLED SMOOTH SIDE OUT
11. AWNING WINDOW; ANDERSEN "E" SERIES
12. FIXED STEEL WINDOW (A&S WINDOWS)
13. HVAC ELEVATED SERVICE YARD
14. 1-1/2" Ø BRUSHED METAL PIPE RAIL
15. FIRE DEPARTMENT CONNECTION
16. SPRINKLER SYSTEM DRAIN
17. KNOX BOX
18. EXISTING BUILDING SINGLE STORY BUILDING
19. METAL DOOR FOR TRASH DEPOSIT YARD
20. (2) 3'-0"x9'-0" STEEL DOOR (A&S DOORS)
21. 3'-4"x9'-0" STEEL DOOR (A&S DOORS)
22. ALUMINUM CANOPY

PROPOSED BUILDING IS FULLY FIRE SPRINKLERED

PLANNING AND ZONING NOTES:

APPLICABLE CODE: THE BEAUFORT CODE
DISTRICT: T5 - DOWNTOWN CORE
LOT WIDTH AT FRONT SETBACK: N/A
LOT SIZE: N/A
MAXIMUM LOT COVERAGE: 100%
FRONTAGE BUILD-OUT: 75% MINIMUM
FRONT SETBACK: 0 FT MINIMUM / PREVAILING SETBACK ON THE BLOCK MAXIMUM
SIDE SETBACK - CORNER / ALLEY: 0 FT MINIMUM / 15 FT MAXIMUM
SIDE SETBACK - INTERIOR: N/A
REAR SETBACK: 0 FT MINIMUM
REAR SETBACK FROM ALLEY: 0 FT MINIMUM
ATTACHED GARAGE / CARPORT SETBACK: N/A
ACCESSORY BUILDING STANDARDS: N/A
PRIMARY BUILDING HEIGHT: 3 STORIES MAXIMUM AT PROPERTY LINE
ACCESSORY BUILDING HEIGHT: N/A
BUILDING WIDTH AT FRONTAGE: 100 FT MAXIMUM

EXISTING CONDITIONS SURVEY

GREENS DRUGSTORE INFILL PROJECT
101 SCOTT STREET
BEAUFORT, SC 29902

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

REVISIONS / SUBMISSIONS
S2 RE-SUBMISSION TO HTRC 03/20/24
S3 SUBMISSION TO HDRB 04/25/24
S4 SUBMISSION FOR PRELIMINARY HRB APPROVAL 05/31/24

Copyright © 2024 Beaufort Design Build, LLC
www.beaufortdesignbuild.com
GENERAL NOTES:

A. GENERAL NOTE

PLANNING AND ZONING NOTES:

APPLICABLE CODE: THE BEAUFORT CODE

DISTRICT: T5 - DOWNTOWN CORE

LOT WIDTH AT FRONT SETBACK: N/A
LOT SIZE: N/A
MAXIMUM LOT COVERAGE: 100%
FRONTAGE BUILD-OUT: 75% MINIMUM
FRONT SETBACK: 0 FT MINIMUM / PREVAILING SETBACK ON THE BLOCK MAXIMUM
SIDE SETBACK - CORNER / ALLEY: 0 FT MINIMUM / 15 FT MAXIMUM
SIDE SETBACK - INTERIOR: N/A
REAR SETBACK: 0 FT MINIMUM
REAR SETBACK FROM ALLEY: 0 FT MINIMUM
ATTACHED GARAGE / CARPORT SETBACK: N/A
ACCESSORY BUILDING STANDARDS: N/A
PRIMARY BUILDING HEIGHT: 3 STORIES MAXIMUM AT PROPERTY LINE
ACCESSORY BUILDING HEIGHT: N/A
BUILDING WIDTH AT FRONTAGE: 100 FT MAXIMUM
PERCENTAGE OF IMPERVIOUS AREA: 98%
EXISTING TREE TO BE REMOVED. REMOVE STUMP IN ITS ENTIRETY AND BACKFILL

ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN
GENERAL NOTES:

LEGEND:

A. GENERAL NOTE

SHEET KEY NOTES:

1. PROPERTY LINE
2. ALUMINUM CLAD FIXED WINDOW; ANDERSEN "E" SERIES
3. 3'-4"x9'-0" WOOD DOOR AND FRAME WITH TRANSOM; ANDERSEN "E" SERIES
4. PRE-FINISHED ALUMINUM WALL PANEL
5. CEMENT STUCCO
6. CONCRETE STAIR TREAD AND RISER
7. ACCESSIBLE CONCRETE RAMP. SLOPE TO HAVE NO GREATER THAN 1" : 12"
   CONCRETE TO HAVE BROOM FINISH
8. (2) 3'-0"x8'-0" FULL GLASS SOLID CORE WOOD DOOR WITH TRANSOM AND
   SIDELIGHTS; ANDERSEN "E" SERIES COMMERCIAL DOOR. FRAME TO BE INTEGRAL
   WITH WINDOW FRAMING AND TRIM. ALL TRIM TO BE PRIMED AND PAINTED
9. DOUBLE HUNG ALUMINUM CLAD WINDOWS; ANDERSEN "E" SERIES
10. SAVANNAH SMOOTH NICHIHA FIBER CEMENT LAP SIDING WITH 7" EXPOSURE; TO
    BE INSTALLED SMOOTH SIDE OUT
11. AWNING WINDOW; ANDERSEN "E" SERIES
12. FIXED STEEL WINDOW (A&S WINDOWS)
13. HVAC ELEVATED SERVICE YARD
14. 1-1/2" Ø BRUSHED METAL PIPE RAIL
15. FIRE DEPARTMENT CONNECTION
16. SPRINKLER SYSTEM DRAIN
17. KNOX BOX
18. EXISTING BUILDING SINGLE STORY BUILDING
19. METAL DOOR FOR TRASH DEPOSIT YARD
20. (2) 3'-0"x9'-0" STEEL DOOR (A&S DOORS)
21. 3'-4"x9'-0" STEEL DOOR (A&S DOORS)
22. ALUMINUM CANOPY

PROPOSED BUILDING IS FULLY FIRE SPRINKLERED

PLANNING AND ZONING NOTES:

APPLICABLE CODE: THE BEAUFORT CODE
DISTRICT: T5 - DOWNTOWN CORE
LOT WIDTH AT FRONT SETBACK: N/A
LOT SIZE: N/A
MAXIMUM LOT COVERAGE: 100%
FRONTAGE BUILD-OUT: 75% MINIMUM
FRONT SETBACK: 0 FT MINIMUM / PREVAILING SETBACK ON THE BLOCK MAXIMUM
SIDE SETBACK - CORNER / ALLEY: 0 FT MINIMUM / 15 FT MAXIMUM
SIDE SETBACK - INTERIOR: N/A
REAR SETBACK: 0 FT MINIMUM
REAR SETBACK FROM ALLEY: 0 FT MINIMUM
ATTACHED GARAGE / CARPORT SETBACK: N/A
ACCESSORY BUILDING STANDARDS: N/A
PRIMARY BUILDING HEIGHT: 3 STORIES MAXIMUM AT PROPERTY LINE
ACCESSORY BUILDING HEIGHT: N/A
BUILDING WIDTH AT FRONTAGE: 100 FT MAXIMUM

FIRST FLOOR
4,076 SF LEASABLE
5,511 SF GROSS
COOK ON BAY
RETAIL STORE
YO YO'S
RESTAURANT
RUSTIC PUP
RETAIL STORE

SECOND FLOOR
4,858 SF LEASABLE
5,608 SF GROSS

GREENS DRUGSTORE INFILL PROJECT
101 SCOTT STREET
BEAUFORT, SC 29902

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

PROPOSED FIRST AND SECOND FLOOR PLANS

A-101
GENERAL NOTES:

ALUMINUM COPING
PRE-FINISHED ALUMINUM WALL PANEL
STANDING SEAM METAL ROOF
CEMENT STUCCO
FIXED STEEL WINDOW (A&S WINDOWS)
FOLDING FULL GLASS WOOD DOOR
METAL HANDRAIL ALONG TOP OF PARAPET
TO HAVE A HEIGHT OF 42" MINIMUM
ROOF TOP PAVER SYSTEM OVER 5/8" HIGH TYP; HIGH-DENSITY POLYETHYLENE PEDESTALS WITH DRAINAGE SLOTS UNDERNEATH; OVER EPDM ROOFING MEMBRANE SYSTEM OVER 3-1/2" THICK RIGID INSULATION TAPERED 1/4":1'-0" TO ROOF DRAIN
ALUMINUM CANOPY
(2) 3'-0"x9'-0" ALUMINUM STOREFRONT DOOR WITH 1" INSULATED GLASS
6" HALF ROUND ALUMINUM GUTTER AND DOWNSPOUT

ROOF DRAIN CONFIGURATION

LEGEND:

RD
OD
RD OD RD OD

ROOF DRAIN
OVERFLOW DRAIN
DIRECTIONS OF 1/4":1'-0" ROOF SLOPE
INDICATES WALL BELOW
INDICATES DIRECTION OF ROOF SLOPE UP
INDICATES RAFTER PLATE HEIGHT ABOVE NEAREST FINISHED FLOOR
INDICATES HORIZ FROM PLYWOOD SHEATHING SEE DETAIL @ WALL SECTIONS
INDICATES ROOF PITCH

SHEET INFORMATION

CONSTRUCTION
GREENS DRUGSTORE INFILL PROJECT
101 SCOTT STREET
BEAUFORT, SC 29902

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

PROPOSED THIRD FLOOR PLAN AND ROOF PLAN
A-102
PLANNING AND ZONING NOTES:

BUILDING WIDTH AT FRONTAGE: 100 FT MAXIMUM
ACCESSORY BUILDING HEIGHT: N/A
PRIMARY BUILDING HEIGHT: 3 STORIES MAXIMUM AT PROPERTY LINE
ATTACHED GARAGE / CARPORT SETBACK: N/A
ACCESSORY BUILDING STANDARDS: N/A
REAR SETBACK: 0 FT MINIMUM
REAR SETBACK FROM ALLEY: 0 FT MINIMUM
SIDE SETBACK - INTERIOR: N/A
FRONT SETBACK: 0 FT MINIMUM / PREVAILING SETBACK ON THE BLOCK MAXIMUM
FRONTAGE BUILD-OUT: 75% MINIMUM
MAXIMUM LOT COVERAGE: 100%
LOT SIZE: N/A
DISTRICT: T5 - DOWNTOWN CORE

GENERAL NOTES:

1. BUILDING HEIGHT
2. ALUMINUM COPING
3. METAL FOUNDATION LOUVER
4. BRICK BASE VENEER
5. STANDING SEAM METAL ROOF
6. PRE-FINISHED ALUMINUM WALL PANEL
7. ALUMINUM CLAD FIXED WINDOW; ANDERSEN "E" SERIES
8. NOT USED
9. CEMENT STUCCO
10. STUCCO EXPANSION JOINT
11. CONCRETE STAIR TREAD AND RISER
12. (2) 3'-0"x8'-0" FULL GLASS SOLID CORE WOOD DOOR WITH TRANSOM AND SIDELIGHTS; ANDERSEN "E" SERIES COMMERCIAL DOOR. FRAME TO BE INTEGRAL
13. DOUBLE HUNG ALUMINUM CLAD WINDOWS; ANDERSEN "E" SERIES WINDOWS
14. CEMENTITIOUS TRIM BOARD
15. 5/4x8 CEMENTITIOUS HEAD TRIM W/ RIGID FLASHING ABOVE. TYPICAL AT ALL RAFTER BEARING
16. 5/4x6 CEMENTITIOUS TRIM
17. 5/4x6 CEMENTITIOUS JAMB. TYPICAL AT ALL WINDOWS
18. SAVANNAH SMOOTH NICHIHA FIBER CEMENT LAP SIDING WITH 7" EXPOSURE; TO BE INSTALLED SMOOTH SIDE OUT
19. 27'-7 ½" AFF 2ND FINISHED FLOOR
20. 3RD FINISHED FLOOR
21. 37'-7 ½" AFF TOP OF PARAPET
22. FIXED STEEL WINDOW (A&S WINDOWS )
23. METAL DOOR FOR TRASH DEPOSIT YARD
24. FIRE DEPARTMENT CONNECTION
25. NOT USED
26. 1-1/2" Ø BRUSHED METAL PIPE RAIL
27. CEMENTITIOUS PANEL BOARD, PRIME AND PAINTED
28. SPRINKLER SYSTEM DRAIN
29. KNOX BOX
30. OVERFLOW SCUPPER DRAIN
31. DASHED LINE INDICATE FORWARD EXISTING BUILDING
32. METAL DOOR FOR TRASH DEPOSIT YARD
33. METAL HANDRAIL ALONG TOP OF PARAPET
34. 6" HALF ROUND ALUMINUM GUTTER AND DOWNSPOUT
35. FYPON MOULDING
36. NOT USED
37. NOT USED
38. (2) 3'-0"x9'-0" STEEL DOOR (A&S DOORS )
39. 3'-4"x9'-0" STEEL DOOR (A&S DOORS )
40. ALUMINUM CANOPY

PROPOSED BUILDING IS FULLY FIRE SPRINKLERED
STAFF REPORT: 1110 Greene Street – Conceptual-Prelim

DATE: June 12, 2024

GENERAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Edward Simpson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location/Address:</td>
<td>1110 Greene Street; R 120-004-000-0277-0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant's Request:</td>
<td>The applicant is requesting approval for the construction of a single-family home and garage/ADU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Zoning:</td>
<td>T4-HN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing/Neighborhood</td>
<td>Vacant/Northwest Quadrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ZONING DISTRICT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>T4-HN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width at Setback:</td>
<td>40'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Lot Coverage:</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Frontage Build Out</td>
<td>75% of the lot area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>Average Setback of the block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback</td>
<td>Side Interior – 5’ min, or 0’ if attached. 10’ interior in the point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>15’</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: T4-HN</td>
<td>Historic Homes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South: T4-HN</td>
<td>Historic Homes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East: T4-HN</td>
<td>Historic Homes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West: T4-HN</td>
<td>Historic Homes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background:** The applicant is requesting approval to build a house and a garage/ADU at 1110 Greene Street. This is currently a vacant interior lot ~4,826 sq. ft in size. The proposed house is one story and 1,542 square feet, with a two-story garage ADU of 612 sq. ft. The house is 18” wide on a ~39’ wide lot, with a 16’ drive to the western portion of the property accessing Greene Street. The Applicant attended an HTRC in late April 2024. The Applicant submitted for Final Approval, but Staff recommends Conceptual/Preliminary due to the lack of final details on exterior materials.
### Exterior Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Siding/Trim:</td>
<td>Smooth fiber cement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White (final unknown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors:</td>
<td>Mahogany Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front/Fiberglass Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wood stain/Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows:</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White (final unknown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>Metal 5V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch</td>
<td>Front porch at grade, 8’ in depth, with 9’ shed roof with four 8’ wood columns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tree Removal Proposed:

The proposed layout would require the removal of the following trees:

- 24” Magnolia,
- 16” Sabal palm,
- 14”, 15”, 21” Laurel Oaks.

The 24’ Magnolia tree is considered a landmark tree under Section 5.3.2.

### Surrounding Area:

This property is located in the Northwest Quadrant. The homes on the block are made up of historic homes (two new homes) and one to two stories tall.

### 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>
</table>
| **1. Location:** This is the relationship between the property and its historical context. | Yes | ✓ No major structures on this lot in the near past.  
✓ Narrow interior lot on the block, well-suited for a narrow one story house, |
| **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 | Yes | ▪ The one story house and its architectural details, mass and scale match the Beaufort style and is sensitive to the surrounding area, while still providing much-needed attainable housing with the ADU. |
| **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/w Condition | ✓ The setting is residential, with a historic grocery store that was rehabilitated into residential use recently. The one-story home and cottage fit with the existing residential structures in the area. |
Staff would recommend a condition for a wood/fiberglass window to be consistent with this Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Workmanship:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>The building has typical Beaufort architectural details and materials such as a front porch, metal roofs, and fenestration of the Beaufort style.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff would recommend a condition for a wood/fiberglass window to be consistent with this Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Feeling:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>This is a narrow interior lot on the block, well-suited for a narrow one-story house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Association:</td>
<td>N/A</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 Recommendation:**

Staff recommends Preliminary approval for the proposed single family house and garage/ADU as submitted, in that it satisfies the intent of the Beaufort Preservation Manual and requirements of...
the Beaufort Code, with the following conditions:

1) Applicant to note the total lot coverage (both pervious and impervious surfaces) in the site plan. Applicant to note that per Section 2.4.1.A.2, the total roof coverage for a T4-HN site may not exceed 55%, and an additional 10% for impervious surface coverage is allowed.

2) Staff recommends the applicant rework the front porch roof so that it does not awkwardly connect to the main house roof.

3) Consider if the house can be shifted back on the lot or to the west to save the Landmark Magnolia Tree.

4) Applicant to provide final cut sheets and/or provide a schedule for all exterior materials.

5) Applicant to provide final colors on siding, side door, and roof.

6) Staff does not support the use of vinyl windows on either the main house or the accessory building as the Preservation Manual states these windows as inappropriate. Staff recommends the applicant consider an all-wood, wood-clad, or fiberglass-clad window.

7) Applicant to provide north arrows on future plans and label the building elevations with the cardinal directions.

8) The garage and associated driveway work only if the applicant gains access to maintain and use the existing alley.
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS
HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION
Community Development Department
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina, 29902
p. (843) 525-7011 / f. (843) 986-5606
Email: development@cityofbeaufort.org / website: www.cityofbeaufort.org

□ Staff Review
□ Board Review

Application Fee:
see attached schedule

Required Project Information

Project Name: Urban Unit

Property Size in Acres: 1/1

Proposed Building Use: Residential - Single Family

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

*Demolition and Relocation requires a public hearing

Building Square Footage (if multiple buildings, please list each one and their square footage by floor):

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):

Single Family Residence - Cementitious board siding, white in color, mahogany front door, side door painted fiberglass, galvanized roof, 5/4 white vinyl windows.

CONTACT INFORMATION:

Attention: Julie A. Bachey, Administrative Assistant II
City of Beaufort Community Development Department
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina 29902
E-Mail: development@cityofbeaufort.org | Phone: (843) 525-7011 | Fax: (843) 986-5606
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS
HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION
Community Development Department
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina, 29902
p. (843) 525-7011 / f. (843) 986-5606
Email: development@cityofbeaufort.org / website: www.cityofbeaufort.org

☐ Staff Review
☐ Board Review
Application Fee: see attached schedule

OFFICE USE ONLY: Date Filed: Application #: Zoning District:
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://cityofbeaufort.org/372/Historic-Review-Board

Submittal Requirements: All forms and information shall be submitted digitally + 5 hardcopies of all documents. In addition to a complete application form, applicants shall submit the required items according to the checklists on the subsequent page. Submittals are due by 12:00 noon on the 2nd Friday before the meeting you want to attend.

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: Edward Galt Simpson
Applicant Address: 84 River Oaks Road, Seabrook, SC 29940
Applicant Email: egalt@midpoint.net, Applicant Phone Number: 904-234-9526
Applicant Title: ☒ Homeowner ☐ Tenant ☐ Architect ☐ Engineer ☐ Developer

Owner (of other than the Applicant):
Owner Address:

Project Name: Urban Unit
Property Address: 110 Greene Street
Property Identification Number (Tax Map & Parcel Number): R120 004 000 0257 0000
Date Submitted: May 20th, 2024

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

Applicant’s Signature: Edward Galt Simpson Date: 5/20/24
Owner’s Signature: Date:

(The owner’s signature is required if the applicant is not the owner.)

Submission Requirements for New Construction and Alterations or Additions

Please submit DIGITAL FILES ONLY via email to development@cityofbeaufort.org

*Initial submittals should show existing and proposed conditions. For all subsequent submittals, architectural drawings should show and clearly label existing conditions, the previous proposal, and the current proposed. Each version of the same drawing should be adjacent to the others in the application for easy review.

*This Application Requirements Checklist MUST be included in applications, with submitted items checked.

Conceptual Review

- **Existing Context**: Color photographs of the existing structure and the adjacent structures.
- **Plat**: A plat indicating the tax map and parcel number, existing structure(s), setbacks, existing trees, and proposed construction footprint.
- **Site Plan**: A site plan, to scale, indicating the location of the existing structure on the lot, proposed new structure, any site modifications (parking, paths, landscaping, tree removal, etc.), any new or existing mechanical equipment and screening area, and percentage of the total impervious paving. The plan should also include any connections to the public right of way (street and/or sidewalk), and grade elevations of the street and/or sidewalk and the proposed construction at the first floor.
- **Design**: One or more drawings that convey the intent of the proposal. This may include: floor plans, elevations, and building sections. They should display massing and scale of new construction and how it relates to the existing structure or surrounding context. For new construction and additions, this drawing should include a street elevation and/or a street section showing height and width relationships to existing adjacent buildings.
- **3-D Rendering**: A 3-D rendering, or physical scale model, showing the height, mass and scale of the proposed building in its context is required for all structures except single-family and 2-3 unit residential buildings.
- **Pre-Application Conference**: A pre-application conference is required for all commercial new construction and substantial commercial renovation projects. The requirement for an Archaeological Impact Assessment will be determined at this meeting.

Preliminary Review: All the documents required for Conceptual Review, PLUS:

- **Floor Plans**: 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.
- **Color Rendering**: A colored version of at least one elevation, noting proposed materials and colors.
- **Additional on-site representation, such as a height story pole, and corner staking of the foundation, may be required.**
- **A Certified Arborist report may be required if grand trees are affected by the project.**

Final Review: All the documents required for Preliminary Review, PLUS:

- **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, is 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.
A New House & Detached Garage for Edward Simpson
1110 Greene Street
Beaufort, SC 29902
STAFF REPORT: 902 Harrington Street – Final

DATE: June 12, 2024

GENERAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant:</th>
<th>Jeremiah Smith, Agent for Sea Island Development Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location/Address:</td>
<td>902 Harrington Street; R 120-004-000-0262-0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant's Request:</td>
<td>The applicant is requesting approval for the construction of a single family home and garage/ADU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Zoning:</td>
<td>T4-HN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing/Neighborhood</td>
<td>Vacant/Northwest Quadrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ZONING DISTRICT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T4-HN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width at Setback:</td>
<td>40'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Lot Coverage:</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Frontage Build Out</td>
<td>75% of the lot area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>Average Setback of the block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback</td>
<td>Side Interior – 5’ min, or 0’ if attached. 10’ interior in the point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>15’</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: T4-HN</td>
<td>Historic Homes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South: T4-HN</td>
<td>Historic Homes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East: T4-HN</td>
<td>Historic Homes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West: T4-HN</td>
<td>Historic Homes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background: The applicant is requesting approval to build a house and a garage/ADU at 902 Harrington Street. This is currently a vacant interior lot ~4,600 sq. ft in size. The proposed house is two stories and 1,799 square feet, with a one story ADU/carport of 240 sq. ft. The house is 28’ wide on a ~60’ wide lot, with a 10’ drive to the Southern portion of the property accessing Harrington Street—which curves to avoid a tree—and then opens to the carport/ADU on the Southwest portion of the property. The Applicant attended an HTRC in May 2024, and received favorable comments. The Applicant submitted for Final Approval, and has provided cut sheets on all exterior materials, etc.
Exterior Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Siding/Trim: Smooth fiber cement/wood</td>
<td>Charleston White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors: Wood with SDL spacer bars</td>
<td>Wood stain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows: Marvin Elevate, with SDL and spacer bars</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shutters Wood</td>
<td>Acanthus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof Asphalt Shingle</td>
<td>Slate Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railings Wood</td>
<td>Charleston White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch Wood, 10’ depth/raised, four 8’ wood columns</td>
<td>Charleston White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tree Removal Proposed:

The proposed layout would require the removal of the following trees:

- 16’, and 19” Pecan
- 19” Laurel Oak
- Sugarberries: 8”, 10”, 11”, and 12”

None of the trees to be removed are considered protected trees under Section 5.3.2 (Pecans and Laurel Oaks only become specimen trees at 24” DBH).

Surrounding Area:

This property is located in the Northwest Quadrant. The homes on the block are made up of historic homes (one new home) and one to two stories tall. The Applicant has provided a streetscape with both form and height of adjoining homes.
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>
</table>
| **1. Location:** This is the relationship between the property and its historical context. | Yes | ✓ No major structures on this lot in the near past.  
✓ Wide interior lot on the block, next to two story homes. |
| **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 | Yes | ✓ The two story house and its architectural details, windows, mass and scale match the Beaufort style and is sensitive to the surrounding area, while still providing much-needed attainable housing with the ADU. |
| **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 residential. The two story home and ADU 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 building has typical Beaufort architectural details and materials such as a front porch, 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 building has typical Beaufort architectural details and materials such as a front porch 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.  

| N/A | This is a wide interior lot on the block, next to two story homes. |

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 Final approval of the proposed single-family house and ADU as submitted, in that it satisfies the intent of the Beaufort Preservation Manual and requirements of the Beaufort
Code, with the following conditions:

1) Applicant to clarify if they are using the Marvin Elevate Windows or the Kolbe Forgent Series. The material list states Marvin but the provided cutsheet is Kolbe Forgent. Applicant to clearly note SDL with spacer bars on the cutsheets and elsewhere in the documents.

2) Applicant to note that all cementitious trim, eaves, and fascia must be smooth.

3) Applicant to provide cutsheets for any decorative exterior lights or exterior ceiling fans.

4) Applicant to clarify if the colors/materials apply to both the main and guest house.

5) Applicant to provide typical window details to illustrate the casings and projecting sill.

6) Applicant to add north arrow to all floor plans and label elevation drawings with cardinal directions.
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS
HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION
Community & Economic Development Department
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina, 29902
p. (843) 525-7011 / f. (843) 525-5606
www.cityofbeaufort.org

OFFICE USE ONLY: Date Filed: 5/31 Application #: 21076 Zoning District: T9-NN
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, Beaufort, SC
Applicant E-mail: jeremiah@allisonramseyarchitects.cc ☐ Applicant Phone Number: 843-986-0559

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

Owner (if other than the Applicant): Sea Island Development Company
Owner Address: 395 Distant Island

Project Name: 902 Harrington
Property Address: 902 Harrington St
Property Identification Number (Tax Map & Parcel Number): R120 004 000 0262 0000
Date Submitted: 5-29-24

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

Applicant's Signature: [Signature] Date: 5-29-24
Owner's Signature: [Signature] Date: 5-29-24
(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
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: 902 Harrington
Property Size in Acres: 0.11  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):
Main House = 1799 SF; Guest House = 240 SF

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 a new home and guest house. The zoning is T4-HN. The
lot size is 4,627 SF; 0.11 acres. It is in the Northwest Quadrant neighborhood.

CONTACT INFORMATION –
Attention: Julie A. Bachety, Administrative Assistant II
City of Beaufort Department of Planning & Development Services
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina  29902
E-Mail: jbachety@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 Section10.7 for
complete information about the Historic Review Board. This form is also available online at www.cityofbeaufort.org | Updated 4/16/21
Your roof can represent up to 40% of your home's curb appeal. Improve its resale value with Timberline® natural shadow® Shingles from GAF. Installing the rugged, dependable performance of Timberline® natural shadow® Shingles will give you the upscale, architectural look you want at a price you can afford.

- Architectural style that's practically priced
- Features a classic shadow effect that lends any home a subtle, even-tone with the warm look of wood in an asphalt shingle
- Highest roofing fire rating: UL Class A, Listed to ANSI/UL 790
- Advanced protection shingle technology reduces the use of natural resources while providing excellent protection for your home
- Dura Grip Adhesive seals each shingle tightly to roof reducing the risk of shingle blow-off; Shingles warranted to withstand winds up to 130 mph
- Wind speed coverage requires special installation; see GAF shingle and accessory limited warranty for complete coverage and restrictions

Lifetime limited transferable warranty with smart choice protection (non-prorated material and installation labor coverage) for the first ten years; see GAF shingle and accessory limited warranty for complete coverage and restrictions.

CA Residents: Prop 65 Warning(s)
FORGENT® SERIES
INNOVATION & TECHNOLOGY

MATERIAL
Forgent Series products are comprised of Glastra, a proprietary hybrid of fiberglass and UV stable polymer. To better match décor and performance requirements, a Glastra exterior with a choice of Glastra or Wood interior is available in select colors and finishes.

Glastra is an innovative, recyclable material that helps form the resilient foundation of Forgent Series products. Manufacturing byproducts are repurposed for use in other industries, such as underground industrial piping.

Both the exterior and interior are comprised of Glastra, with finishes available in Cloud, Sahara, Midnight or Bronze.

CONSTRUCTION
Forgent Series windows are constructed of multi-chambered Glastra extrusions in an advanced ladder design for numerous benefits – the chambers add strength and promote energy efficiency. The same structural framework is used for All Glastra and Glastra/Wood products, for consistent performance.

The exterior is comprised of Glastra, while the interior is Pine wood, available in popular pre-finishes including: Double Clear Coat, Latex Primer, Black Paint, White Paint, or a variety of stains.
DOUBLE HUNG STANDARD FEATURES

- All Glastra units with Cloud or Sahara integral color (see pg. 58)
- Flush frame groove filler for drywall return (New Construction - no extension jamb)
- Energy efficient, insulating Solar Low-E glass (see pg. 60)
- Equal glass sizing provides matching sight lines from sash to sash
- Dry glazed to the interior with beveled glazing bead
- Accessory grooves are integral to the extruded frames for the easy addition of accessories

NOTE: All measurements are nominal.

- Full frame insect screen with BetterVue® fiberglass mesh and Water Shed Technology™ (see screen finishes, pg. 62)
- Stainless steel, constant force balance system provides durability and ease of operation
- Sash lock and tilt latches are color matched to the interior (pg. 17)
- Lift handle on bottom sash is color matched to the interior (only on All Glastra units; pg. 17)
- Integral 1-1/4” nailing fin provides easier installation and helps seal the window opening (New Construction)
DOUBLE HUNG OPTIONS

Glass (see pg. 60):
- Solar Gain Low-E
- Solar Control Low-E
- Solar Advanced Control Low-E
- Turtle Glass
- ThermaPlus™ Low-E
- Neat™
- Triple pane
- Tinted, colored or patterned
- Tempered
- Laminated
- Preserve® Film
- Other options standard to the industry

Divided Lites (see pg. 61):
- Performance divided lites with 7/8", 1-1/8" or 2-1/4" bars
- Grilles-in-the-airspace

NOTE: All measurements are nominal.

Other Options:
- Replacement double hungs (3-1/4" overall frame depth for All Glastra units, 4-1/8" for Glastra/Wood units)
- Glastra/Wood: Unfinished pine interior with no visible fasteners or wood exposed to the exterior
- Latex primed interior” (Glastra/Wood units, see pg. 59)
- Interior prefinishing (Glastra/Wood units, see pg. 59)
- Exterior acrylic film in Midnight or Bronze (available on All Glastra or Glastra/Wood units; see pg. 58)
- Interior acrylic film in Midnight or Bronze (only on All Glastra units with Midnight or Bronze exterior; see pg. 58)
- Fixed top sash
- Multiple trim accessories (shipped loose; see pg. 63)
- Insect screen available with aluminum or UltraVue® mesh (see screen finishes, pg. 62)
- Extension jambs available in depths up to 9" overall
- Offset extension jambs
- Stepped frame groove filler for drywall return (no extension jamb)
- Glastra/Wood: Wood glazing bead receptor
- Galvanized steel installation clips
- Window Opening Control Device (WOCD) (see pg. 62)
- Sash limiters for safety (non by-passable and does not meet WOCD requirements)
- Cottage and reverse cottage style
- Impact performance modifications (see pg. 65)

*Latex primer is not a final finish.

HARDWARE (see hardware finishes, pg. 62):
A sash lock and tilt latches are applied to all double hung windows as standard.

Also available: Satin Nickel | White | Matte Black | Rustic Umber

UltraVue® is a registered trademark of PHIFER INCORPORATED. Limitations may apply. Please consult your local Kolbe dealer for more details.

Finish colors will vary from printed images. Please make selections using actual color samples available from your local Kolbe dealer.

Not all hardware color options are available on all products.
### NEW CONSTRUCTION DOUBLE HUNG S

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F.S.</th>
<th>1'-5 1/2&quot;</th>
<th>1'-11 1/2&quot;</th>
<th>2'-5 1/2&quot;</th>
<th>2'-7 1/2&quot;</th>
<th>2'-11 1/2&quot;</th>
<th>3'-1 1/2&quot;</th>
<th>3'-5 1/2&quot;</th>
<th>3'-11 1/2&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1'-6&quot;</td>
<td>2'-0&quot;</td>
<td>2'-6&quot;</td>
<td>2'-8&quot;</td>
<td>3'-0&quot;</td>
<td>3'-2&quot;</td>
<td>3'-6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.O.</td>
<td>12'-1/4&quot;</td>
<td>18'-1/4&quot;</td>
<td>24'-1/4&quot;</td>
<td>26'-1/4&quot;</td>
<td>30'-1/4&quot;</td>
<td>32'-1/4&quot;</td>
<td>36'-1/4&quot;</td>
<td>42'-1/4&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F.S. = Frame Size • R.O. = Rough Opening • G.S. = Glass Size

* Units meet most national emergency escape and rescue requirements

NOTE: All measurements are nominal. Elevation charts are not to scale.

Divided lites are optional.

Some installation procedures will require a larger rough opening than noted (i.e. installations utilizing our installation clips), therefore, you may need to increase the rough opening size accordingly. Rough opening gaps may be increased up to a maximum of 1/2" on all sides and still be within good practice guidelines.

For rough opening recommendations, see pg. 68.
NOTE: All measurements are nominal. Elevation charts are not to scale.
Divided lites are optional.
Some installation procedures will require a larger rough opening than noted (i.e. installations utilizing our installation clips), therefore, you may need to increase the rough opening size accordingly. Rough opening gaps may be increased up to a maximum of 1/2" on all sides and still be within good practice guidelines.
For rough opening recommendations, see pg. 68.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F.S. x R.O.</th>
<th>1'-6 1/2&quot;</th>
<th>1'-11 1/2&quot;</th>
<th>2'-6 1/2&quot;</th>
<th>2'-11 1/2&quot;</th>
<th>3'-6 1/2&quot;</th>
<th>3'-11 1/2&quot;</th>
<th>4'-6 1/2&quot;</th>
<th>4'-11 1/2&quot;</th>
<th>5'-6 1/2&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 7/32&quot;</td>
<td>24 7/32&quot;</td>
<td>30 7/32&quot;</td>
<td>34 7/32&quot;</td>
<td>38 7/32&quot;</td>
<td>44 7/32&quot;</td>
<td>50 7/32&quot;</td>
<td>62 7/32&quot;</td>
<td>74 7/32&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 7/32&quot;</td>
<td>27 7/32&quot;</td>
<td>33 7/32&quot;</td>
<td>37 7/32&quot;</td>
<td>41 7/32&quot;</td>
<td>47 7/32&quot;</td>
<td>53 7/32&quot;</td>
<td>65 7/32&quot;</td>
<td>77 7/32&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F.S. = Frame Size • R.O. = Rough Opening • G.S. = Glass Size
NEW CONSTRUCTION DOUBLE HUNGS – ALL GLASTRA

Vertical Section

Horizontal Section

NOTE: Drawings are not to scale. For Forgent Series accessory drawings, see pg. 63. Additional and the most current drawings are available at kolbewindows.com

Kolbe Windows & Doors
NOTE: Drawings are not to scale. For Forgent Series accessory drawings, see pg. 63. Additional and the most current drawings are available at kolbewindows.com
Forgent Series windows and doors are available with two types of divided lites: performance divided lites and grilles-in-the-airspace.

**PERFORMANCE DIVIDED LITES**

Kolbe’s performance divided lite (PDL) glazing system gives the appearance of true divided lites without sacrificing energy efficiency. Extruded aluminum bars are adhered to the exterior of Forgent Series windows and doors. Unfinished pine bars are adhered to the interior of the single lite of insulating glass on Glastra/Wood units, while aluminum bars are adhered to the interior of All Glastra units. Aesthetically pleasing spacer bars are installed within the insulating glass unit. Together, these bars create the illusion of true divided lites. Beveled profile PDL bars are available in 7/8", 1-1/8" or 2-1/4" bar widths, and can be finished to match the exterior and/or interior, as requested. Some designs may have a composite material for the exterior PDL bar. Limited lite patterns are available.

**GRILLES-IN-THE-AIRSPACE**

Grilles-in-the-airspace are constructed with 3/4" wide, contoured profile aluminum bars sealed between two panes of insulating glass, offering the look of divided panes while reducing cleaning time. Bars are available in solid, woodgrain, and bi-color, for a pleasing match to the exterior and interior finishes.

NOTES: Limitations may apply. Please consult your local Kolbe dealer for more information.
STAFF REPORT: 301 Carteret Street – Conceptual Approval

DATE: June 12, 2024

GENERAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant:</th>
<th>City Loft, Matthew McAlveney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location/Address:</td>
<td>301 Carteret Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant's Request:</td>
<td>The applicant is requesting approval for exterior common area improvements at 301 Carteret Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Zoning:</td>
<td>T5-DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing:</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ZONING DISTRICT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T5-DC</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: T5-DC</td>
<td>Law Office</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South: T5-DC</td>
<td>Breakwater Grill</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East: T5-DC</td>
<td>Historic Homes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West: T5-DC</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background: The applicant is requesting approval to build a 581 sq.ft. pergola and bar/outdoor patio area for outdoor dining/tables for City Loft Hotel. The patio/pergola would face the Carteret Street portion of the lot, on the corner of Port Republic in what was a parking space (note, the area is bricked and is currently being used as a patio with no permanent improvements). A two-story roof-top bar structure over the parking was approved by the HRB in 2023, but this has been put on hold by the owner. The applicant did attend an HTRC in May, in which the committee asked for additional materials and information before moving to HRB. This application was made for a final approval, but Staff believes this should be conceptually due to lack of final materials and the nature of the request.
Site Plan:

The applicant is proposing two specific areas for the bar, patio area, with description below:

**Area 1:** A 19’ x 27’ area, formerly used as parking for the hotel, on the corner of Port Republic and Carteret, with a pergola and plantings around it.

**Area 2:** A 4’ x 17’ area along Carteret and bordering the existing handicap parking spot which is to remain. This area will also have a smaller pergola, and a bar top over the existing columns/bollards.

**Exterior Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Details/Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pergola:</strong></td>
<td>Metal, 10” high, 3” x 3” beams on 19’ x 27’ area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metal 9” high on 4’x 17” area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adjacent to Handicap ramp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bar top:</strong></td>
<td>Wood, laid over top of existing columns/bollards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lighting:</strong></td>
<td>Uplit LED at pegola base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roof</strong></td>
<td>Fabric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Screening/Plantings</strong></td>
<td>4’ and 6’ Planters/screens along parking lot with climbing plants such as creeping jenny/string of pearls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Details Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis:**

There is no precedent downtown for such an outdoor improvement on a main corridor. Staff is concerned about the minimal size of the 4’ x 17” bar top area and how it may restrict the accessibility of the required handicap space (and may result in customers leaning on cars parked in this area), as well as the modern materials and how they interplay with the historic district.
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends the HRB take one of two paths 1) Tabling the project for additional detail of materials, colors, size of the pergola, and accurate site plan or 2) Consideration of approval or disapproval of the project at a conceptual level. Should the HRB take the second aforementioned path, Staff would recommend denial of the project.

If #1 Tabled is considered:

1. Applicant must provide an accurate site plan in the area around the proposed improvements. This is especially important to show the accurate dimensions of the ADA parking space and its associated access aisle. Staff is concerned the proposed column supports for the pergola and the 4’x17’ bar top extension will impede the use of this parking space. When looking at the area via Google Street view, it appears a car occupying the ADA parking space will need to extend into the pergola where the corner sofa and two-seater tabletop are shown. A typical parking space measures 18 feet in length.

2. Applicant must provide more detailed information on the structure of this proposed pergola. The structure, as illustrated, appears inadequate to resist wind uplift and to properly support the fabric shades. The structure should NOT appear as a temporary device on the site.

If # 2 Conceptual is Considered:

3. Staff believes the current proposed structure is not appropriate for this specific location on this site. The structure does not appear to work with the site constraints to create a usable/functional space in relation to retaining the ADA parking space and its associated access aisle. The proposed structure appears temporary in nature and not appropriate for this location.
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS
HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION
Community Development Department
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina, 29902
p. (843) 525-7011 / f. (843) 986-5606
Email: development@cityofbeaufort.org / website: www.cityofbeaufort.org

OFFICE USE ONLY: Date Filed: 6/3 Application #: 87080 Zoning District: 75-DC
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://cityofbeaufort.org/372/Historic-District-Review-Board

Submittal Requirements: All forms and information shall be submitted digitally + 5 hardcopies of all documents. In addition to a complete application form, applicants shall submit the required items according to the checklists on the subsequent page. Submittals are due by 12:00 noon on the 2nd Friday before the meeting you want to attend.

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: Matthew S. McGarvey
Applicant Address: 502 CRAVEN ST BEAUFORT, SC 29902
Applicant Email: MATHMC02@gmail.com Applicant Phone Number: 843.321.6288

Applicant Title: [ ] Homeowner [ ] Tenant [ ] Architect [ ] Engineer [ ] Developer

Owner (if other than the Applicant):

Owner Address:

Project Name: CITY LOFT HOTEL PERGOLA
Property Address: 301 CARTERET STREET, BEAUFORT, SC 29902
Property Identification Number (Tax Map & Parcel Number): R121-004-000-0887-0000
Date Submitted: 6/3/24

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

Applicant’s Signature: Matthew S. McGarvey Date: 6/3/24
Owner’s Signature: Date: 11/11/24

(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 Dec. 18, 2023)
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS
HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION
Community Development Department
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina, 29902
p. (843) 525-7011 / f. (843) 986-5606
Email: development@cityofbeaufort.org / website: www.cityofbeaufort.org

Required Project Information
Project Name: pergola
Property Size in Acres: .42
Proposed Building Use: Seating / Dining
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):
Existing Building 9,338 ft² Pergola 581 ft²

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):

A proposed pergola is to be erected over a brick patio area of approx. 580 ft² located in the southwest corner of the parking lot. The pergola would be erected with multiple 3" x 6" steel beams spanning in height from 10' to 9'. The pergola will have a sun-shield or sunshade like fire resistant fabric which would be hung on wires, thereby making it retractable.

CONTACT INFORMATION:
Attention: Julie A. Bachety, Administrative Assistant II
City of Beaufort Community Development Department
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina 29902
E-Mail: development@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 Dec. 18, 2023

001
City of Beaufort Certificate of Appropriateness Checklists

Submission Requirements for New Construction and Alterations or Additions
Please submit DIGITAL FILES ONLY via email to: development@cityofbeaufort.org

*Initial submittals should show existing and proposed conditions. For all subsequent submittals, architectural drawings should show and clearly label existing conditions, the previous proposal, and the current proposed. Each version of the same drawing should be adjacent to the others in the application for easy review.

*This Application Requirements Checklist MUST be included in applications, with submitted items checked.

Conceptual Review

☑ Existing Context: Color photographs of the existing structure and the adjacent structures.
☑ Plat: A plat indicating the tax map and parcel number, existing structure(s), setbacks, existing trees, and proposed construction footprint.
☑ Site Plan: A site plan, to scale, indicating the location of the existing structure on the lot, proposed new structure, any site modifications (parking, paths, landscaping, tree removal, etc...), any new or existing mechanical equipment and screening area, and percentage of the total impervious paving. The plan should also include any connections to the public right of way (street and/or sidewalk), and grade elevations of the street and/or sidewalk and the proposed construction at the first floor.
☑ Design: One or more drawings that convey the intent of the proposal. This may include: floor plans, elevations, and building sections. They should display massing and scale of new construction and how it relates to the existing structure or surrounding context. For new construction and additions, this drawing should include a street elevation and/or a street section showing height and width relationships to existing adjacent buildings.
☑ 3-D Rendering: A 3-D rendering, or physical scale model, showing the height, mass and scale of the proposed building in its context is required for all structures except single-family and 2-3 unit residential buildings.
☑ Pre-Application Conference: A Pre-application conference is required for all commercial new construction and substantial commercial renovation projects. The requirement for an Archeological Impact Assessment will be determined at this meeting.

Preliminary Review: All the documents required for Conceptual Review, PLUS:

☑ Floor Plans: 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.
☐ Color Rendering: A colored version of at least one elevation, noting proposed materials and colors.
☐ Additional on-site representation, such as a height story pole, and corner staking of the foundation, may be required.
☐ A Certified Arborist report may be required if grand trees are affected by the project.

Final Review: All the documents required for Preliminary Review, PLUS:

☑ Details: A typical wall section(s), window details, door details, eave 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, is 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.
CLOSING PLAT PREPARED FOR ATLANTIC STREET TRADING CO. CITY OF BEAUFORT BEAUFORT COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA

THE SAME BEING A PORTION OF BLOCK 37, CITY OF BEAUFORT AS SHOWN ON A PLAT BY R.D. TROGDON, JR. DATED DEC. 27, 1976 AND RECORDED IN THE REGISTER OF DEEDS OFFICE FOR BEAUFORT COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA IN PLAT BOOK 25, PAGE 91.

I HEREBY STATE THAT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, INFORMATION AND BELIEF, THE SURVEY SHOWN HEREON WAS MADE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE MINIMUM STANDARDS MANUAL FOR THE PRACTICE OF LAND-SURVEYING IN SOUTH CAROLINA, AND MEETS OR EXCEEDS THE REQUIREMENTS FOR A CLASS B SURVEY AS SPECIFIED THEREIN; ALSO THERE ARE NO VISIBLE ENCROACHMENTS OR PROJECTIONS OTHER THAN SHOWN.

THIS PROPERTY IS LOCATED IN ZONE A-11 (EL 13.0) AS DETERMINED BY FEMA, FIRM COMMUNITY-PANEL NUMBER 450026 0005 D, DATED 9-29-86.

R121-004-000-0887-0000

SCALE 1" = 20'

AUGUST 3, 2006
P12943/MMA

DAVID S. YOUUMANS RLS 9765
BEAUFORT SURVEYING, INC.
1613 PARIS AVENUE
PORT ROYAL, S.C. 29935
PHONE (843) 524-3261
Overview

City Loft Hotel – Café Sun Shade
May 30, 2024
View Looking South

City Loft Hotel – Café Sun Shade
May 30, 2024
Overview

City Loft Hotel – Café Sun Shade
May 30, 2024
D) we’ve decided that the back of the couch can be 22-25” high from the lumbar point (without cushion) / being dictated by standard size.

Best, Melissa
String of Pearls

Example planter box wall plant
Creeping Jenny

Example of planter box "wall" plants
FABRIC FEATURES

DURABILITY/CLEANABILITY
Functional and durable, Phifertex fabrics offer excellent performance while withstanding spills, splatters and the hustle and bustle of high traffic areas. These fabrics are easy to maintain - easily cleaned with soap and water or SEFA.

WARRANTY
Infinity Canopy offers a 5 year limited warranty for Phifertex Outdoor fabrics. This warranty covers the fabric becoming non-functional due to loss of dimensional stability from exposure to conditions including sunlight, mildew, rot and normal atmospheric conditions. The warranty does not cover damage to the fabric from any source nor does it cover gradual fading or discoloration. This warranty does not cover the cost of labor or other consequential or incidental expenses.

GREENGUARD
GREENGUARD Certification ensures products have met some of the world's most rigorous and comprehensive standards for low emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) into indoor air. Phifer was the first manufacturer in the outdoor fabric industry to achieve GREENGUARD certification. Certification is completely voluntary and ensures that the highest industry standards are being applied to maintain indoor air quality for the health and safety of building occupants.

MICRONAN
Phifertex fabrics are the only outdoor furniture fabrics in the world to include Microban protection. Microban antimicrobial protection works continuously to inhibit the growth of bacteria, mold and mildew that can cause stains, odors and product deterioration.

- Microban antimicrobial protection is infused into Phifertex fabrics for lasting protection that won't wash off or wear away for the lifetime of the product.

- Phifertex fabrics infused with Microban antimicrobial technology are ideal for any commercial or residential environment where microbes are a concern, including healthcare, hospitality, home, office, schools and institutions.

FLAME RETARDANCE
  17x11 (ASTM E84-16), 25x25 (ASTM E84-15b), 37x15 (ASTM E84-16), Plus (ASTM E84-15b)
- International Building Code (IBC), Section 803.1.1, Class "A" rating (Tested in accordance to ASTM E84).
- Upholstered Furniture Action Council Fabric Classification Test Method 1990 (UFAC) - Class "I" Rating.
- Federal Motor Vehicles Safety Standards, Section 571.302, Standard Number 302 (FMVSS 302).
- Flammability of Interior Materials.
- California Technical Bulletin 117-2013, Section 1, Cover Fabric Test.

Pergola Awning Material
Oyster Color
As Seen in Sunbrella
Blocks 100% of UV Rays
Non-Transparent
Not Fire Rated
Resistant to Mold and Fading
Water Repellent
9 oz. Awning Grade Fabric
100% Solution Died Acrylic
Made in USA

WHITE 721796
NATURAL 721752
OYSTER 721776
LINEN 721767
Subtle uplighting LED solar if possible
LED Lighting
ADA Photo

Pergola will be continued after the brick footprint
Matthew McAlhaney
Will do.
Thank you.

Julie Bachety
Matt.

Just received the following notes that staff look at the 5/8 HTRC meeting:

- provide a site plan to scale to illustrate the exact location of the pergola.
- illustrate how the pergola will be structured to interact with the ADA parking space.
- Provide drawings that depict the materiality and dimensionality of the structure.
- Consideration should be given to the vertical supports of the structure and how they will interact with the site.
- Provide information on any lighting.
- Provide information on the bar top and how it will interact with the site.

Bar top hardwood ipe or teak or similar type wood in appearance & function with deep brown color as shown in 3D or color reddish brown to match existing ipe wood railing cap at City Loft Hotel.