REVISED AGENDA
The City of Beaufort
HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW BOARD
Wednesday, July 10, 2019, 2:00 P.M.
City Hall, Planning Conference Room – 1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, SC

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.”

I. Call to Order:

II. Minutes:

A. Minutes of the June 12, 2019 Meeting

III. Review of Full Board Projects:

A. 708 New Street, PIN R120 004 000 499A 0000, Alterations.
   Applicant: Beekman Webb (19-11 HRB.1)
   The applicant is requesting approval for exterior alterations to this structure.

B. 1402 King Street, PIN R120 004 000 0665 0000, Addition and Remodel.
   Applicant: Johan Niemand, JHN-Residential Building Design (19-13 HRB.1)
   The applicant is requesting approval for new construction of a garage/carport.

C. Residences of The Beaufort Inn, 214 Scott Street / 812 Port Republic Street, PIN R120 004 000 0984 & 0926 0000, New Construction
   Applicant: Beaufort, LLC (19-12 HRB.1).
   The applicant is requesting approval for new construction of a residential building.

IV. Old Business

V. New Business

VI. Discussion

VII. Adjournment

Note: A project will not be reviewed if the applicant or representative is not present at the meeting.
A meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held on June 12, 2019 at 2:00 p.m. in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Chuck Symes, board members Bill Allison, John Dickerson, Quinn Peitz, and Katherine Pringle, and David Prichard and Heather Spade, city staff.

In accordance with the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, Section 30-4-80(d) as amended, all local media were duly notified of the time, date, place, and agenda of this meeting.

**CALL TO ORDER**
Chairman Symes called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

**MINUTES**
Mr. Peitz made a motion, second by Mr. Dickerson, to approve the minutes of the May 8, 2019 HDRB meeting. The motion to approve the minutes as submitted passed unanimously.

**REVIEW OF FULL BOARD PROJECTS**

910 PORT REPUBLIC STREET, PIN R120 004 000 0912 0000
New construction
Applicant: Stephen Schein, Jr. (19-10 HRB.1)
The applicant is requesting approval to construct a new building on this parcel.

Stephen Schein, Jr. said he and his father are “looking for an extension.” The original period ended May 23, and they wanted to know the length of an extension. Ms. Spade said an extension lasts 12 months, but an applicant has to apply for an extension 30 days prior to the end of the initial 24-month period.

Mr. Schein said he and his father, Stephen Schein, Sr., have agreed to stick with the project as initially presented, so the letter he sent is no longer valid. Chairman Symes said he is confused and extremely disappointed in staff’s work on this application. The HDRB and staff have discussed the need for staff to do work on behalf of the board, which needs architectural and planning support, he said. The applicants need approval to demolish the building, then to build something, Chairman Symes said. He is sorry the applicants have had “this mess befall” them, and he feels they shouldn't have to have additional application fees imposed on them in the future.

Chairman Symes asked if they should do a conceptual approval without demolition, or demolition and conceptual approval.

Mr. Allison asked why the applicant is asking for an extension, but not doing the work. He said the Scheins haven’t done anything in the 2 years since the original approval, and it doesn't sound like they are planning to do anything for another year. Mr. Schein said he retired and intended to return to Beaufort to retire, but he hasn’t been able to yet.
He can make some forward movement here, he said, but it’s limited. He said Mr. Schein, Sr. has made it clear that this is to be his son’s project. They want to make progress, Mr. Schein said, but it will be slow. If it’s required to have a demolition before conceptual approval, they will do that, he said; if they could get both today, that would be fantastic, but he understands if that can’t be done. Mr. Schein said they are doing this to move forward as soon as possible per his circumstances.

Mr. Allison said the board has old staff notes but not the letter that was sent to the applicant after he came to the HDRB 2 years ago. Mr. Schein said, “The iterative process will change that presentation.” He will work with an architect as that moves forward. Mr. Peitz said the board had talked about multiple issues in 2017. Mr. Schein said he would address those. He would like to move forward with the project, but the earliest he could do that would be next spring.

Ms. Pringle said there hasn’t been a formal application for demolition or a public hearing, so the board couldn't decide on that today.

Mr. Allison suggested that since Mr. Schein hasn’t submitted a plan, and this process would be starting over, he would like the applicants to respond to the prior comments the HDRB made. This process will take 3 or 4 months, he said, and Mr. Schein would have to submit applications for different approvals. If Mr. Schein were his client, Mr. Allison said, he would make the formal application process later, so when he gets approval next February or March, he could take his time, and that would give him more time than the board’s approval process.

Mr. Peitz explained the steps of the process, and the submittal of the conceptual plan is done after the demolition approval. The comments staff and the HDRB made 2 years ago were good, he said. The HDRB today is in an awkward position, and Mr. Peitz feels this is no one’s fault, but the process needs reevaluation. The applicant should come back to the board with a demolition request and conceptual approval, he said, and then if the board approves demolition, the applicant could move forward with the conceptual plan.

Mr. Schein asked if the HDRB has a guide he could read. Chairman Symes said on the city website, under “HDRB,” the application process is detailed. He thinks Mr. Peitz outlined
perfectly the process for getting the demolition and the HDRB’s first look at replacement buildings.

Mr. Dickerson explained what the HDRB looks at and suggested Mr. Schein look at the Milner guidelines. Knowing that and the city’s master plan will prepare Mr. Schein for the questions staff and the board will have, he said. Chairman Symes said a courtesy visit with HBF to get their opinion would also help the applicant know what he does and doesn’t want to change.

Chairman Symes said he wasn’t aware the applicant’s application had expired. Since it would be a few months before the applicants could work on the project, he suggested bringing it back when they’re ready, and there shouldn’t be additional costs. Mr. Dickerson said if the board would table the application, Mr. Schein could come back without additional costs.

Mr. Prichard said the applicants had asked for an extension, and staff said they needed to have applied for it 30 days before. If the applicants had asked for an extension 30 days before, they wouldn't be at the HDRB meeting. Planning was trying to be decent, he said. This “really isn’t a do-over,” Mr. Prichard said, but an effort to give the applicants an extension while following the code. Mr. Allison said, “Either way, it’s the same.”

Of the 2 options, Chairman Symes felt tabling it would be better. Mr. Prichard said there’s nothing to extend because the application has expired.

Heather Seifert said HBF’s Preservation Committee had a similar conversation. She offered to help the applicant however she could. Mr. Prichard said he’s okay with waiving the fees when Mr. Schein applies again.

Mr. Dickerson said the HDRB has recently discussed an application it approved to move a building for which the applicant said he had only a short timeframe in which to get work on it rolling, and now it’s been 2 years, and nothing’s been done since it was moved. It’s problematic for the city to have “approvals that are just hanging out there,” he said. The board is first interested in having positive things happen and move forward, Mr. Dickerson said, but things have happened in the last 18 months that haven’t been good.

Maxine Lutz said she recalls this project and HBF being happy with the conceptual approval, but someone on staff should have gone through everything with the applicant like Mr. Peitz did. The board should not be explaining the process to applicants, she said. It’s important to have staff that will focus on preservation in the Historic District, Ms. Lutz added. Mr. Schein, Sr. has done great work in preservation, she said, and he shouldn't have to go through this today, so staff should “step to the plate.”
Chairman Symes said if the application is expired, the board can’t recommend an extension, but he strongly recommends that the Scheins not have to pay more fees in the future.

Mr. Prichard asked what the board means by “conceptual approval.” Mr. Peitz said some people feel conceptual approval for this project has expired, so “we go back to square one.” The applicants could present an application for demolition and a new series of plans for what replaces the demolished building. He said, “We are not so onerous” as to have the applicants go back to the beginning with nothing, so they will be guided, and they might be able to run the steps of the process concurrently. Mr. Peitz said he’s ready not to have the applicant pay any fees again because of the confusion of the city staff. The applicants could reference the 2017 approval. They will have to pay design fees, anyway, he said, and Mr. Schein could come back to the board to have them look at the demolition and project applications in a “practical and logical way.”

Mr. Prichard said what was decided in 2017 was conceptual approval. The Scheins are coming back now, and this was meant to be an opportunity for them to see if the board would approve the conceptual approval from 2017. Mr. Allison said the applicant had submitted “a set of working drawings,” but conceptual approval is given for something that is “almost a sketch.” You should not hire an architect to get a conceptual approval, he said. The previous board had approved the concept only, not the drawings.

Chairman Symes apologized to the applicants about “this mess,” and he asked them to do the demolition and conceptual applications in the spring and to ask questions of staff if they have them.

Chairman Symes made a motion to recommend that the city not charge the applicants for additional application fees when they bring the project back. Mr. Allison seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS
Mr. Prichard said staff wants to provide the best support to all of the boards. He has looked for an architect to support the HDRB, and he’s still trying to do that. The planning department is short-staffed, he said.

There has been criticism of staff in this situation, Mr. Prichard said, but Ms. Spade had explained the situation to Mr. Schein, Sr., who was “confused.” She tried to find a solution, and that’s why this happened this way, Mr. Prichard said. He understands the board’s frustration, but he wants them to know that Ms. Spade was trying to be “compassionate.”

Mr. Prichard said if the HDRB needs someone who specializes in a particular kind of architecture, they should ask him to find someone. He said he is sorry the board asked
for the 2017 meeting’s minutes and didn’t get them; he’ll look for them. The deadline for an application is two weeks before the HDRB meeting, he said, and staff has a week to do the report.

Mr. Prichard said the board members are expected to have the necessary design expertise. The ordinance doesn’t guarantee staff support for boards, he said, and while they have had that in the past, by law, the board is expected to work on its own.

Mr. Prichard said he had a long interview yesterday with someone with two master’s degrees in planning and design. If that hire happens, good, but if it doesn’t, he has it in his budget to hire experts to help the boards.

Mr. Allison said the board doesn’t need an architect to review applications; it needs someone who understands the code, which Ms. Kelly did because she helped write it. He suggested that SCAD has a very good historic preservation program. They need someone who understands historic architecture and what our “code means in terms of how to look at a building,” he said.

Ms. Pringle said the board’s first opportunity to discuss the applications is in front of the applicants. If the board needs to consult an expert, they might need another meeting to do that first.

Mr. Allison said they need to look at the guidelines again for the steps of the process. Ms. Kelly often did preliminary and final approvals herself. She did detailed write-ups, but he doesn’t think the city can be expected to deliver that level of service now. He thinks the HDRB needs to take more detailed looks at projects, rather than relying on staff to do “further approvals.”

Mr. Dickerson said the board gave Ms. Kelly the ability to see that the applicants did small things that the board had suggested (e.g., “Take that awning off”) before giving final approval.

Ms. Lutz said Ms. Kelly had been “under a directive to speed up the [approval] process,” which had gotten bogged down in the past, so that’s why applicants didn’t come to the board 3 times: so, they could get going on their projects. She thinks someone with architectural experience would be good, but Planning needs someone with historic preservation experience.

Mr. Prichard said he would like more expert staff, but there isn’t the budget for it. If the board doesn’t have the expertise, and staff can’t answer their questions, he would find an expert to do it. He suggested adding an additional week to the process between submitting an application and going to the board.

Chairman Symes said he agrees with Ms. Lutz that there was a push to make the process
faster for applicants. When something looked like it was 95% there, the board would have Ms. Kelly take care of it, he said. He’s not sure what type of staff person is needed to support the board; they need to have a historic preservation background and architectural expertise. Chairman Symes feels the city needs to look at what each board member’s area of expertise is. **Joel Newman**, for example, could look at something and recommend what the applicant needed to do to fix the architecture, he said.

Mr. Prichard said one HDRB member needs to be a member of HBF. Ms. Pringle is the “de facto HBF representative,” Mr. Dickerson said. He feels the HDRB is “over-weighted with HBF connections.” Chairman Symes said he is also on the HBF board of trustees. HBF can decide who its designated person on HDRB is, he said.

Chairman Symes said it wasn’t clear to him today why the board was here, and any chairperson should know why the board is meeting. Mr. Prichard said staff thought the board would say the applicant still had conceptual approval. Anyone he brings on staff will have to learn the Beaufort Code. Ms. Spade is learning and so is he, Mr. Prichard said.

If the board needs something, they need to ask staff, Mr. Prichard said. He feels their frustration because of the great job Ms. Kelly did. Mr. Allison said he asked for minutes and staff comments as soon as the board received the email about this project, but they still don’t have some of that. Some applicants will try to get around the board or try get away with something, he said, though that’s not the case with this application.

Mr. Dickerson said the building that was on Charles and Craven Streets was approved to move in a hurry; the applicant had plans for the building, but it’s sat there for 18 months, and nothing has happened, other than the building being lowered a bit. Mr. Allison said the approval was to sit the building on the site, and the applicant got a building permit to raise the building on a foundation 15’ up in the air. He knows the building inspector came to see it. It’s been permanently moved, but there’s no way to get in it and no plan for it. Mr. Allison was told the owner has been renewing “the building permit every so often.”

Ms. Pringle asked who is responsible for monitoring something like that. Mr. Dickerson said Codes Enforcement has to be involved. When the board pulls the trigger on something that is *supposed* to be a concept, he said, the applicants “have done an end-around,” with no concern that anything at all will happen to them. Mr. Dickerson said it’s really important that the board has “some teeth” to enforce what it tells applicants they have to do. Mr. Prichard said when the board members see things that are “awry,” they should call staff.

Mr. Allison asked if he should call Codes Enforcement about this building at Newcastle and Congress. Ms. Spade said **Ken Meola** said he’d looked at it, but he doesn't have an update on it. Mr. Prichard said the city’s Codes Enforcement guy has been having to do
other things that aren’t his job.

Mr. Allison said he assumes there is a file system for what has been submitted and what’s been acted on, so the board needs to know how this person with the building at Newcastle and Congress got permission to do what he’s done. Mr. Prichard said he could be cited, and the city could take action on it. Mr. Allison said this is the second year that this has been going on. Mr. Dickerson said he brought it up a few months ago; Mr. Allison said he brought it up as soon as he saw the building “jacked up into the air,” so he’s been trying to get something done about it for more than a year.

Ms. Lutz said HBF gets a lot of calls about what’s going on, and in the past, Ms. Kelly or Mr. Meola would check it out and stop work if necessary. She asked if Mr. Prichard has considered hiring “a contract historic preservationist.” Mr. Prichard said yes. Ms. Lutz said she has some names of good possible candidates for that position.

Mr. Prichard said he had budgeted $300,000 for the Comp Plan update, but to save money, staff’s doing that, so there are funds to contract with experts.

Ms. Pringle asked Mr. Prichard why the board didn’t get the Scheins’ packet earlier. Mr. Prichard said Mr. Schein, Sr. missed the deadline to apply for the extension, and he seemed confused about what to do. Ms. Spade said she thinks Mr. Schein, Sr.’s confusion is why Mr. Schein, Jr. is taking over the project. Mr. Dickerson said the first thing he got about this application was on June 7. Chairman Symes said an extra week for the board to review would be good. Mr. Allison said staff should not be afraid to enforce deadlines. It’s okay to push someone off for a month in order to get a proper submittal, he said.

Mr. Prichard said the open HDRB positions are posted.

The board thanked Mr. Peitz and Chairman Symes for their service to the HDRB. Ms. Lutz asked how the board would operate until their replacements are chosen. Chairman Symes said the board could operate with 3 members.

There being no further business to come before the board, Mr. Peitz made a motion, second by Chairman Symes, to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned at 3:07 p.m.
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS
HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION
Community & Economic Development Department
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina, 29902
p. (843) 525-7011 / f. (843) 986-5606
www.cityofbeaufort.org

OFFICE USE ONLY: Date Filed: 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://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: Beckman Webb
Applicant Address: 30 Savannah Point Road, Beaufort, SC 29907
Applicant E-mail: beckman@centurylink.net
Applicant Phone Number: 843-592-2300

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

Owner (if other than the Applicant): Harold and Long Acker
Owner Address: 1000 S. Ocean Dr., Boca Raton, FL 33432

Project Name: 708 New St.

Property Address: 708 New St.

Property Identification Number (Tax Map & Parcel Number):

Date Submitted: 6-25-19

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

Applicant’s Signature: Beckman Webb Date: 6-25-19

Owner’s Signature: Date:

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

Project Name: 708 New Street

Property Size in Acres: Less than 1/4 acre

Proposed Building Use: Office/Professional

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 Building: 1st Floor 760 sq ft, 2nd Floor 640 sq ft, Accessory Building 160 sq ft

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):

Please see attached.
708 New Street narrative for HRB application.

This application addresses the exterior changes that the owners want to make to the house at 708 New Street. Mr. and Mrs. Acker, who own the house, also own the Robert Smalls House across the street. They plan to use 708 New as guest quarters, a home office and as a space to utilize their exercise equipment. Mr. Acker is permanently disabled. He will be able to gain access to the basement living area of the Robert Smalls House and will need access to his exercise equipment at 708 New. The following changes to 708 New are desired by the Ackers to accommodate their needs:

1. Remove steps from porch located on New Street and reconfigure walks and landscaping to make the side entrance the main entrance to the house. Construction of a handicap access ramp off the rear of the side entrance porch. Slight expansion of the side porch to allow wheelchair access. New steps at side main entrance to be of old brick.

2. Relocate steps at rear “kitchen” porch to make room for ramp. New steps to be of old brick.

3. Move utility building towards the South property line so that it meets the 5 foot side setback and better centers on the driveway.

4. Install a small, 7’ x 13’ plunge pool at the rear of the yard as shown.

5. Remove a tall, spindly water oak on the North property line behind the house that is hanging over the roof of the house.

6. Replace concrete block infill between brick piers of house with pierced “lace” brick infill.

Please see accompanying drawings for details of these changes.
APPLICATION FOR DISABLED PERSON PARKING PERMIT

Please Print/Type below

APPLICATION BY DISABLED PERSON (See Warning Below)

I certify that I am a person with one of the disabilities listed in section 320.0848, Florida Statutes. I further state that my physician or other certifying practitioner has completed the statement of certification below on my behalf, as required in section 320.0848, Florida Statutes.

Name of Disabled Person as printed on their Florida Driver License or Florida ID Card: Harold Hotley

Date of Birth: 1-2-3-30

Sec: M

Disabled Person's Email Address:

Signature of Disabled Person or Guardian of the Disabled Person

Date Signed: 1-13-18

Address: 1000 S Ocean Dr

City: Boca Raton

State: FL

Zip: 33432

Florida Driver License or Florida ID Number: [Required for permanent and temporary parking permits unless exception is noted by physician below]

If applicable, check one of the following:

☐ I am a frequent traveler.
☐ I am a quadriplegic.

PHYSICIAN/CERTIFYING PRACTITIONER'S STATEMENT OF CERTIFICATION (See Warning Below)

☐ TEMPORARY PERMIT: This is to certify that the applicant named above is a person with a temporary disability (six months or less) that limits or impairs his/her ability to walk or is temporarily sight impaired. Due to the temporary specific disability (type) checked below (a-g), the disabled parking permit should be issued from (date) through (date).

☐ PERMANENT PERMIT: This is to certify that the applicant named above is legally blind or is a disabled person with a permanent disability (type) that limits or impairs his/her ability to walk 200 feet without stopping to rest. The specific disability (type) is/are checked below (a-g).

NOTE: "Unable to walk 200 feet" is no longer a qualifying disability, unless it is due to one of the conditions listed below (h-n).

DISABILITY TYPE:

a. Legally Blind (This is the only disability an Optometrist can certify.)

b. Inability to walk without the use of or assistance from a brace, cane, crutch, prosthetic device, or other assistive device, or without assistance of another person. If the assistive device significantly restores the person's ability to walk to the extent that the person can walk without severe limitation, the person is not eligible for the exemption parking permit.

c. The need to permanently use a wheelchair.

d. Restriction by lung disease to the extent that the person's forced (respiratory) expiratory volume for 1 second, when measured by spirometry, is less than one liter or the person's arterial oxygen is less than 80 mm Hg on room air at rest.

e. Use of portable oxygen.

f. Restriction by cardiac condition to the extent that the person's functional limitations are classified in severity as Class III or Class IV according to standards set by the American Heart Association.

h. Severe limitation in a person's ability to walk due to an orthopedic, neurological, or orthopedic condition.

WARNING: Any person who knowingly makes a false or misleading statement in an application or certification under section 320.0848, Florida Statutes, commits a misdemeanor of the first degree, punishable as provided in section 775.082 or 775.083, F.S. The penalty is up to one year in jail or a fine of $1,000 or both.

Certification or License No. (Required) ME6052132 of a Physician, Osteopathic or Podiatric Physician, Chiropractor, Optometrist, Advanced Registered Nurse Practitioner under the protocols of a licensed physician or a Physician Assistant licensed under Ch 458 or 459.

FL

LICENSED IN THE STATE OF FL

Amanda Rodriguez

Print/Type Name of Certifying Authority

1400 E Commercial Blvd

Business Address

Hollywood

FL

954-567-2500

(Phone Number)

Certifying Authority Signature

Date Signed: 11/05/18

SPECIAL EXEMPTION: The severely disabled applicant named above applying for a permanent placard is unable to obtain a Florida driver license or identification card.

If the Special Exemption box is checked, the certifying physician must provide his/her signature and date signed below.

Date Signed: 11/05/18

SPECIAL EXEMPTION: The severely disabled applicant named above applying for a permanent placard is unable to obtain a Florida driver license or identification card.

If the Special Exemption box is checked, the certifying physician must provide his/her signature and date signed below.

Date Signed: 11/05/18

APPLICATION BY AN ORGANIZATION (See Warning Above)

This is to certify that provides regular transportation service to disabled persons having disabilities that limit or impair their ability to walk or are certified to be legally blind.

Number of Vehicles in fleet for this purpose:

FEI NUMBER:

Organizations Email Address:

Signature of Organization's Authorized Representative

Date Signed:

Address: City:

State:

Zip:

TAX COLLECTOR USE ONLY

Agency Personnel Processing this Application

County

Agency

Date

KSMV 0339 (Rev. 06/11) www.flhsmv.gov
1. Add 1x4 Fencing to rear yard.
2. Shovel existing accessory building B from left property line.
3. Add 1x6 composite raised deck.
4. Add rear stairs off back porch.
5. Remove left side stairs off back porch.
6. Add handicap ramp (84" x 9")

1. Remove existing left side steps.
2. Add large step on left side.
3. Remove existing left side stairs off front porch.
4. Improve present driveway.
5. Add 2" x 4" stepping stones.
6. Install new copper standing seam roof.
Case Number: HR19-11  
Property Address: 708 New Street  
Applicant: Beekman Webb  
Type of Request: Exterior Restorations  
Zoning: T4-HN

Historical: Property located within the Historical Preservation Neighborhood. This house was listed in the 1979 Milner Historic District Inventory as a contributing structure. On January 9, 2018 the board gave the applicant conceptual approval for a new one-car garage, tree removal and a lot recombination.

Request: The applicant is requesting approval of the following:

- Removal of steps from porch located on New Street and reconfigure the walkway and landscaping to make the side entrance the main entrance to the house.
- Construct a handicap access ramp at the rear of the side entrance porch
  - expand the side porch to allow wheelchair access.
  - relocate the steps at the rear “kitchen” porch to make room for the ramp.
  - New steps at side main entrance to be constructed of old brick
- Improve pervious driveway
- Relocate utility building to the South property line to meet 5’ set back, allowing the utility building to better center the driveway.
- Install a 7’x13’ plunge pool at the rear yard
- Removal of water oak located on northern property line
- Replace concrete block infill between brick piers of house and replace with “lace” brick infill
- Install new copper standing seam roof

Background: The property owner has a permanent disability. Mr. and Mrs. Acker, the owners, also own the Robert Smalls House across the street, they plan to use 708 New street as guest quarters, a home office, and as a place to use their exercise equipment.

Use: Residential
The Beaufort Code:

- **Setback requirements – Accessory Structure:**
  - *Front:* 20’ min. from the front façade
  - *Rear:* 5’
  - *Side:* 5’

- **Impervious Surface Coverage:** 55% maximum

- **Building Placement and orientation:** Frontage and orientation on street: All buildings shall front a street right-of-way, and have a usable entrance on the Primary Frontage” section 2.5.1 p.18

The Beaufort Preservation Manual Supplement:

- Orientation: any new additions or alterations to existing buildings under the BOAR (Board of Architectural review) jurisdiction receive a certificate of appropriateness.

- Steps: Painted wood steps with closed treads and risers are the most appropriate design for porch steps.

- Area under the porch: although lace-brick infill is relatively maintenance-free, it makes routine maintenance beneath the porch difficult and is not as visually appropriate as lattice, and not recommended (p.29)

The Beaufort Preservation Manual:

- Lace brick infill (p.81): “The property owner who is determined to install lace brick infill between his porch piers should consider the following recommendations:
  - Try to match color, size and pointing of the brick of the porch piers if neither element is to be painted
  - Recess the outside face of the lace brick infill at least 2” from the outside of the foundation piers
  - Do not key the brickwork of the infill to the brickwork of the pier”

- In the case of orientation, p.17 of the manual states: “Orientation: the addition should be located, planned and detailed so as not to confuse the dominant historic orientation of the original building. The addition may or may not have its hierarchy of facades, but it must have the effect of creating a primary façade out of a secondary façade. The addition should not assert itself visually but should be screened from the street as much as possible”.

Staff Comments:

- The removal of the side steps on the front porch seems out of context. Removing the side steps leaves the front porch inaccessible and may confuse the dominant historic orientation of the house.

- Staff recommends that the balusters for the proposed side porch stay in context with the existing balusters on the front porch. P. 38-39 *The Beaufort Preservation Manual*

- Is the applicant still planning to construct a one car garage which was granted conceptual approval at the January 9, 2019 HDRB meeting?

- The proposal does not show a deck around the pool, is there a proposed deck? If so, this contributes to the total impervious surface coverage.

- Staff recommends the applicant uses chapter 14 of the Historic Preservation manual as a guideline for the proposed landscape improvements

- Tree removal – for laurel oaks a permit is not required
• Is the pool above or below ground?
• How do you plan to improve the pervious driveway?

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends the HRB give conceptual approval to this project with comments above addressed
BEAUFTON COUNTY
HISTORIC SITES SURVEY - 1997

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

Site Number: 844
Access County 13
USGS Quad: 025 Beaufort
Doc. Level: Intensive Level-Building

Historic name(s): Map Ref.: BFT 09 (TR)
Common name(s): Tax Number: R120 004 000 0551 0000
Address/location: City Block Ref.: 33 .05
City/Vicinity of (vic.) Beaufort

Date: 1878 ca.
Alteration date: Not known
Ownership: ☒ 1. private ☐ 2. city ☐ 3. county ☐ 4. state ☐ 5. federal ☐ 6. unknown
Category: ☒ 1. building ☐ 2. site ☐ 3. structure ☐ 4. object
Historic use(s): single dwelling
Current uses: single dwelling

National Register Status:
National Register Historic District (NHL, 11/73) Date: 12/17/69 Listing Name: Beaufort Historic District NRIS # 69000159

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

Consultant Recommendation:
Reference: Name:

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

Notes:

Photograph:

Photographs:
☒ prints
☐ slides
☐ negatives

Date: 8.8.97
Recorder: C. Brooker, Brooker Arch. Cons.

Roll # Neg. View of:
B-12 22 E facade & S elev., fac. NW
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style:</th>
<th>Folk: gable front</th>
<th>Commercial Form:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Shape:</td>
<td>rectangular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof: Shape:</td>
<td>gable (end to front)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimney: Type:</td>
<td>interior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Walls:</td>
<td>weatherboard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows:</td>
<td>single</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors:</td>
<td>single transom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch Height:</td>
<td>2 or more with tiers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch Details:</td>
<td>chamfered posts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch Roof Shape:</td>
<td>shed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outbuildings:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Related Resources:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surroundings:</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage:</td>
<td>less than 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrangle:</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alterations:</td>
<td>Alteration date: Not known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity:</td>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Two story end gable dwelling facing street to east. Main facade incorporates 3 bays, side hall. 2 story tiered porch south, supported on chamfered and pedestaled timber posts. Second entrance on south facade.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Data:</td>
<td>shown as 2 story structure with 2 story porch on Sanborn Insurance Co. map 1912. Same plan configuration illustrated by Sanborn map of 1924.</td>
<td>Sketch:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informant/Bibliography:</td>
<td>Brockington Associates, Inc. • Brooker Architectural Design Consultants • Historic Beaufort Foundation • Preservation Consultants, Inc.</td>
<td>Site Number: U - 13 - 844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concrete Masonry Infill  
At Foundation Piers

should be employed only if the style and date of your building gracefully accepts foundation planting (see "Landscape"). The property owner should be aware that, in all cases where the crawl space has been infilled with concrete masonry, continuous subfloor ventilation must be maintained. Large openings must be cut in the concrete masonry to allow for this essential cross ventilation.

- If the face of the concrete masonry is recessed from the face of the brick pier, the piers are already expressed to a degree. If the setback is less than 1-1/4", the stucco treatment given above should be employed. However, the stucco should not be brought flush with the surface of the brick pier. If the setback is at least 1-1/4", it is possible to effectively and economically obscure the inappropriate concrete masonry with wood lattice. The concrete masonry should be painted a dark black green prior to installation of the lattice. This treatment is also recommended for crawl spaces that have been enclosed to form additional living or storage areas; in such cases, the window and door openings can be expressed simply by framing the lattice around the existing opening.

Lattice Infill Over Masonry  
Between Foundation Piers

Remember to:
- always maintain continuous ventilation to the crawl space
- always provide continuous access to the crawl space for periodic inspection
- paint concrete masonry black or black-green prior to the installation of the lattice
- soak the lattice in preservative prior to assembly and keep the lower edge a minimum of 2" above the ground to prevent damage from surface water.

(Note: For a discussion of the insulation value of concrete masonry infill, see "Energy.")

- Lace brick infill. Like many of the modern garden walls laid up in this bond, infill of this sort merely looks authentic. One drawback is the frequent installation of "antiqued" brick which is much more regular than the adjacent older bricks of the piers. The major advantage of this sort of infill is that it successfully provides continuous ventilation and is relatively maintenance free, however, it is not as visually appropriate for most Beaufort houses as lattice.

Lace Brick Infill  
At Foundation Piers

The property owner who is determined to install lace brick infill between his porch piers should consider the following recommendations:
- try to match color, size, and pointing of the brick of the porch piers if neither element is to be painted
- recess the outside face of the lace brick infill at least 2" from the outside face of the foundation piers
- do not key the brickwork of the infill to the brickwork of the pier.

- Inappropriate infill treatments. There are three modern infill treatments used throughout the District which are entirely inappropriate: chain-link fencing, plywood, and corrugated metal or fiberglass. The apparent intent of such infill is the exclusion of rodents and small animals. A simpler and less obtrusive solution consists of a frame of hardware cloth or heavy screen, painted black and attached to the inside face of the piers. At least one panel should be hinged for easy access to the crawl space.

Fascia Deterioration

The fascia boards which trim and protect the ends of the first and second floor porch railers are subject to several kinds
Balusters. It is especially difficult to take balusters out of context for the purpose of dating, except for certain late Victorian types whose period is immediately apparent. Balusters are highly susceptible to deterioration and are frequently replaced entirely. Thus, they date from a period different than the house; in fact, they are often not of the same period of the porch itself. The accompanying illustrations exhibit some of the range of the baluster types found either in Beaufort or in important architectural books. The illustrations make the following observations apparent:

- Square spindles are in themselves not a design feature appropriate to only one particular architectural period. As shown, they are used at the Federal style Tabby Manse, the Beaufort style Robert Means House, the early Victorian house at 605 Prince, and the bungalow style house at 2307 North.
- Scroll-cut batten balusters, such as those at 601 Port Republic or 807 Craven, are typical features of the 1870s; that they were often stock parts is indicated by the recurrence of the latter balusters in several locations throughout the town.
- Reversible balusters -- those that are symmetrical top to bottom -- though based on early precedents are frequently used in the Colonial Revival period. (Such balusters can be seen at 305 Federal.)
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

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://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: Johan Niemand - JHN-Residential Building Design

Applicant Address: 73 Sams Point Road, Beaufort, SC 29907

Applicant E-mail: info@jhn-residential.com Applicant Phone Number: (843) 605-6168

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

Owner (if other than the Applicant):

Owner Address: 1402 King Street, Beaufort, SC 29907

Project Name: Johnston Addition and Remodel

Property Address: 1402 King Street, Beaufort, SC 29902

Property Identification Number (Tax Map & Parcel Number): R120 004 000 0665 0000

Date Submitted: June 28, 2019

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

Applicant’s Signature: ___________________________ Date: June 28, 2019

Owner’s Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
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

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

Required Project Information
Project Name: Johnston Addition and Remodel

Property Size in Acres: 6,799.26
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):

0 Sq. Feet Heated, 678Sq. Feet Unheated

Is this project a redevelopment project: Y ✔
Are there existing buildings on the site? Y ✔
if yes, will they remain? Y ✔

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

The intent is to remodel the existing office building to become a single family residence,
with minimal exterior changes apart from the new Screen porch that will be added taking
existing heated space and converting it to unheated space.
Additionally a Covered entry was added over the front door and a covered Stoop
over the back door.
The rest of the interior remodel was coordinated with existing window locations.
With the Garage/ Carport addition, the intent is for the roof shape and style,
as well all roof and wall finish and trim to match the existing structure.

This Property has appeared before the Historic Review Board during last year
with similar proposals under the previous owner.

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
Preliminary not for Permit - For Historic Review Board Review

SCALE: 3/16" = 1'-0"

1402 King Street, Beaufort, SC 29902

Proposed Remodel of the Johnston Residence
Case Number: HR19-13
Property Address: 1402 King Street
Applicant: Johan Niemand – JHN-Residential Building Design
Type of Request: Addition and Remodel
Zoning: T4-N

Historical: Property located within the Historical Conservation Neighborhood. 1402 King Street is a non-contributing structure, c. 1950.

Request: The applicant is requesting approval of the following:

- Remodel existing office building to become a single-family residence
- Converting existing heated space into a screened porch on the back eastern corner of the structure.
- Addition of a covered entry over the front door.
- Addition of a covered stoop over the back door.
- New garage/carport with details to match the primary structure.

Background: This structure has been used as office space. On February 14, 2018 the board gave the applicant Final approval on a similar project at this location. This approval was contingent on the applicant installing 3 equal bays on a proposed porch. The property is now under new ownership and plans have since been updated.

Use: Office to Residential

The Beaufort Code:

- Setback requirements – Primary Structure:
  - Front – 0’min – 15’maximum
  - Rear setback – 15’ minimum

- Setback requirements – Accessory Structure:
  - Detached Garage Door/Carport Setback from Front Façade: 20’ min. from the front façade
  - Rear: 5’ minimum
  - Side Interior – 5’
  - Side – Corner / Alley: 5’
• Impervious Surface Coverage: 70% maximum
• Permitted Uses: Single Family Dwelling is permitted by right in the T4-N zoning classification

The Beaufort Preservation Manual Supplement:
• Orientation: any new additions or alterations to existing buildings under the BOAR (Board of Architectural review) jurisdiction receive a certificate of appropriateness.
• It should be noted that the sympathetic use of materials does not imply that materials used in new construction will replicate the old in detail, nor that new construction attempt to replicate historic structures. Rather it is a matter of determining the compatibility of the new with the old.

Staff Comments:
• The applicant has not met the front setback requirements for a detached garage.
• Staff needs to see drawings showing setbacks
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS
HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION
Community & Economic Development Department
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina, 29902
p. (843) 525-7011 / f. (843) 986-5606
www.cityofbeaufort.org

OFFICE USE ONLY: Date Filed: 6/28 Application #: 18522 Zoning District: 75-DX
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: Beaufort Inn, LLC

Applicant Address: 2015 Boundary Street, Suite 300 Beaufort, SC 29902

Applicant E-mail: ctw@303associates.com Applicant Phone Number: (843) 521-9000

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

Owner (if other than the Applicant):

Owner Address:

Project Name: Residences of The Beaufort Inn

Property Address: 214 Scott / 812 Port Republic

Property Identification Number (Tax Map & Parcel Number):

Date Submitted:

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

Applicant’s Signature: ___________________________ Date: 6/28/19

Owner’s Signature: ___________________________ Date: 

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 February 5, 2019
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

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

Required Project Information

Project Name: Residences of The Beaufort Inn

Property Size in Acres: 649

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):

40,472

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):

Please see attached

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

CONTACT INFORMATION –

Attention: Julie A. Bachey, Administrative Assistant II

City of Beaufort Department of Planning & Development Services
1911 Boundary Street, Beaufort, South Carolina 29902

E-Mail: jbachey@cityofbeaufort.org | Phone: (843) 525-7011 | Fax: (843) 986-5606

See Section 9.10 of the Beaufort Code for complete information about Certificates of Appropriateness and Section 10.7 for complete information about the Historic Review Board | This form is also available online at www.cityofbeaufort.org | updated February
On July 12, 2017, the Historic District Review Board granted Preliminary Approval for new construction at the corner of Scott and Port Republic Streets. The façade renderings of this project are attached.

In the interim, the impact of short-term rentals (STRs) on the hospitality industry have been better understood. In the last 12 months through April of 2019 the STR inventory in Beaufort has grown 18% and the demand has increased by 20%. During the same time period, traditional lodging has seen a 7.6% decrease in demand and 6.3% reduction in revenues.

Given the uncertain future of the hospitality industry, we decided to refocus efforts to support a stated City of Beaufort objective to have more residents downtown. As such, we have revamped the program from a hotel to The Residences at The Beaufort Inn. After meeting with real-estate professionals we learned that having parking on-site would be critical to a residential concept.

We shared this concept with Historic Beaufort Foundation’s Preservation Committee on May 3, 2019. In response to their feedback, we lowered the pitch of the roof, reduced the size of the central element on Port Republic Street, modified window sizes and changed columns to reduce the first-floor mass and lighten the overall building appearance. The result of these changes are the plans you have before you today. We have sent the revised plans back to HBF but have not yet received any additional response.

We are seeking Preliminary Approval for the included plans. Please note the required rendering has been designed to be consistent with the City’s stated goals for redevelopment of Downtown Beaufort.
Existing Conditions - Plat
Residences of the Beaufort Inn - Beaufort, SC

SITE DATA:
PARCEL "A": 0.196 ACRES
R120 004 000 0984 0000

PARCEL "B": 0.453 ACRES
R120 004 000 0926 0000

TOTAL SITE AREA: +/- 0.649 ACRES

THE BEAUFORT CODE:
Zoning: T5-DC
Max Lot Coverage: 100%
Frontage Build Out: 75% Min
Front Setback: 0'; max prevailing setback on block
Side Setback - corner/insula: 0' min; 15' max
Side Setback - Interior: 0' min
Rear Setback: 0'
Rear Setback from alley: 0'
Primary Bldg Height: 2 stories min; 3 stories max at
property line (see 2.6.1.G); max height 15' behind
the property line, or front line of the building, shall
be 4 stories
Building Width at Frontage: 100' max

Specific to T5 zones:
- The finished ground floor height for residential
structures shall be elevated a minimum of 3 feet
above the average adjacent sidewalk grade. Apart-
ment Houses are permitted to be a minimum of 18''
above grade, per Section 4.5.7.
ELEVATIONS
The Residences of The Beaufort Inn

BEAUFORT INN, LLC | 06.07.2019

NILES BOLTON ASSOCIATES
COMPOSITE PLAT
PREPARED FOR
303 ASSOCIATES, LLC.
PORTION OF BLOCK 60, CITY OF BEAUFORT
BEAUFORT COUNTY SOUTH CAROLINA
1.024 ACRES TOTAL

Beaufort Inn
Port Republic St
Beaufort SC
Corner View from Intersection - Alternative Design

Alternative East Elevation (Scott St)

Alternative Streetscape (Scott St)

Beaufort Inn
Port Republic St
Beaufort SC

NOTE: This alternative elevation does not require a street encroachment permit on Scott St.
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06/26/17
Case Number: HR19-12  
Property Address: 214 Scott / 812 Port Republic  
Applicant: Beaufort Inn, LLC  
Type of Request: New Construction/Infill  
Zoning: T5-DC  
Proposed Use: Apartment House

Historical: Property located within the Historical Preservation Neighborhood. The proposed project would be located on the South West corner of Port Republic and Scott Streets. The parcel is currently being used as a gravel parking lot for both public and private parking. The parcel historically housed a bus station and a Coca cola bottling plant which has since been demolished.

Request: The applicant is requesting approval to construct a new building on this parcel. It would be 3 stories max at the property line and increase to 4 stories in the interior of the lot. Another project was previously given Preliminary approval on July 12, 2017. The original project was structured for a hotel, since the original submittal the project has been revamped from a hotel to residential “The Residents at the Beaufort Inn”

Use: Apartment houses are allowed by right.

Building Placement: The plans are in accordance with The Beaufort Code regarding maximum lot coverage, frontage build-out, lot size, lot width, and rear and side setbacks.

Front setback requirements for T5-DC are 0 to prevailing setback.[§2.4.1] The plans show an arcade over the sidewalk which the code allows provided the arcade is a minimum of 12 feet wide and only overlaps the sidewalk to within 2 feet of the curb. [§4.4.H]. It is unclear from the drawings if this requirement has been met.

Building Form: Maximum height allowed in T5-DC is 3 stories at the property line and four stories 15 feet behind property line. It is unclear from the drawings whether the fourth story is 15’ behind property line.

The maximum building width at frontage is 100 feet. Buildings that exceed this maximum shall comply with the Large Footprint Building standards of §4.5.10. However, apartment houses must not exceed 160 feet along any frontage in accordance with §4.5.7.B.4. Based on the plans the building frontage along Scott Street is approximately 157 feet; the building frontage along Port Republic Street...
is approximately 178 feet.

**Contextual Design:** Monolithic massing that disrupts the predominant building pattern of the neighborhood and corridor is strongly discouraged. §4.3.2.B

New construction should complement the massing of neighboring buildings by utilizing roof forms, architectural trim, differentiation of facade planes, and a relationship of solids (siding and walls) to voids (window and door openings) that are consistent with the patterns established in neighboring buildings. §4.3.2.C.1

When large scale construction is proposed that is not consistent with the predominant building height and lot width of the surrounding area, special attention shall be paid to specific building design elements in order to articulate a building form that is appropriate to the neighborhood context. These include the items listed in the paragraph above, along with siting, setbacks, and facade treatments. §4.3.2.C.2

**Historic Infill:**
- New Construction Shall Reinforce the Historic Significance of the District
- New Construction Shall Complement and Support the District
- Infill Shall Be Compatible Yet Distinct
- The Exterior Envelope and Patterning of New Buildings Shall Reflect District Characteristics

**Parking:** Parking requirements will be determined upon submission of the number of bedrooms per unit.

*The Preservation Manual Supplement*, p. 13-15, discusses new construction. In the case of absolute size, the Supplement states: “When the scale of the neighborhood buildings, or those of an entire community are relatively consistent, new construction should be restricted from drastically altering these relationships.

*The Civic Master Plan* addresses downtown in section 3.2 and Port Republic in section 3.3. see below

*The City’s Strategic Plan* – Goal 5 - Initiate a plan to accommodate balanced growth through infill and community development within targeted areas of the City

**Staff Comments:**
- The context directly adjacent to this property is varied. On the opposite side of Scott street there is a 70’ long one-story building. Across the street on the North side are cottage and a 3+ story Beaufort Inn building.
- In general, the size, mass, scale, proportions of the building, upper-story windows and openings are all compatible with the historic district.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends the HRB give preliminary approval to this project with comments above addressed
K. Entrances

1. At the main entrance, there shall be an entryway transition, such as a porch or stoop, that is a minimum of 6 feet by 6 feet.
2. Stairs, porches, entrance platforms, ramps, or other means of access shall be attached to the structure and anchored securely to the ground.

L. Roof Form and Materials

1. Roofs shall have a minimum eave projection and roof overhang of 6 inches, not including the gutter.
2. Roofs must be covered with a material that is customarily used on site-built dwellings. Aluminum or metal roofing is not permitted unless standing seam metal roofing or metal shingles are used.

M. Wall Materials: Exterior siding shall be wood, vinyl, metal horizontal siding, brick, fiber cement board, stucco, or similar materials. Smooth, ribbed, or corrugated metal or plastic panels, exposed plywood, and materials with a high-gloss finish are not permitted.

4.7: HISTORIC DISTRICT INFILL DESIGN GUIDELINES

4.7.1 APPLICABILITY AND INTENT

The following principles shall be considered by the HRB for new construction within the Historic District overlay. The intent of these principles is to protect the integrity and coherence of the Historic District, and to provide clarity and consistency for developers, designers, and regulators.

4.7.2 PRINCIPLES FOR COMPATIBLE INFILL

A. 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.

1. New construction shall respond to and protect the integrity of the overall Historic District in much the same way as an addition does to a historic building.
2. The integrity of the district — why, where and when a property is important — shall be upheld in all new construction and rehabilitation projects. Guidelines for determining integrity are as follows:
   a. Location: This is the relationship between the property and its historical context.
   b. 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.
   c. 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.
   d. Materials: These are the physical elements that make up a property or district.
   e. 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.
   f. 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.
g. **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.

B. **New Construction Shall Reinforce the Historic Significance of the District:** Infill buildings should relate to and strengthen the core characteristics of the district, as identified in the National Register nomination’s “Statement of Significance”.

1. New construction should build upon the history and established pattern of the district through its design, landscape, use, and cultural expression. An understanding of the character and significance of the district should predicate any design or development activities.
2. If applicable, cultural expressions and/or historic uses within the district may be considered in design or development activities.

C. **New Construction Shall Complement and Support the District:** The Historic District has a distinct rhythm of massing, scale, and siting. Infill buildings should not deviate in a detracting manner from these elements, but appear as complementary members of the district.

1. Lot size, massing, siting, floor area ratio, and height must correspond to or complement the rhythm of the district.
2. The use of buildings will be secondary to their design and integration into the district. However, newly introduced uses should not be detrimental to the historic fabric.

D. **Infill Shall Be Compatible Yet Distinct:** New buildings should be identifiable as being of their period of construction; however, they should not be so differentiated that they detract from – or visually compete with – their historic neighbors. Within historic districts, compatibility is more important than differentiation.

1. Because the district is the resource, the reconstruction of buildings that existed within the district during the period of significance is allowed. Reconstructions shall be done in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s “Standards for Reconstruction”.
2. Style is discouraged from being the primary indicator of differentiation.
3. Means of differentiation may include materials, mechanical systems, and construction methods.

E. **The Exterior Envelope and Patterning of New Buildings Shall Reflect District Characteristics:** Infill design elements, patterning, texture, and materials should reflect the aesthetic and historic themes of the district.

1. Patterns of fenestration, building divisions, setbacks, and landscapes that are characteristic of the district should inform the design of new buildings.
2. Mechanical and automobile infrastructure should be appropriately concealed when not consistent with the district’s character.

F. **Contributing Buildings Should Not Be Demolished to Create Infill Opportunities:** Properties deemed contributing in the “1997 Beaufort County Above Ground Historic Sites Survey,” or in the most recent historic resources survey, should not be removed or rendered non-contributing to make way for new construction.

G. **Archeological Resources Shall Be Preserved in Place or Mitigated:** When new construction disturbs or affects archaeological resources, mitigation measures should be taken such that the history of a the site can be traced. See Section 8.3 for archeological assessment requirements.

1. Archaeological mitigation must conform to local, state, and federal laws and accepted professional standards.
2. When appropriate, archaeological mitigation should be accessible to the general public in an educational capacity.
3. Information yielded from archaeological mitigation should be interpreted in the new building and throughout the district.
3.2 Redefining & Expanding “Downtown”

Sector: 1
Project Type: Public | Private
Civic Investment Required: Streetscaping
See Also: 5.6; 10.2

The emotional core of Beaufort has long been the three blocks of Bay Street between Charles and Carteret Streets. Even with all of its amenities, this area is too geographically constrained to fully serve the greater community with the range of goods and services normally expected in a vibrant and robust downtown. In the last few decades, this area has emerged as a primarily entertainment- and tourist-oriented destination with small shops, art galleries, and restaurants but has struggled with providing more neighborhood-oriented services. Additionally, the commercially zoned corridors of Boundary (east of Ribaut Road), Carteret, Charles and Bladen Streets have struggled to flourish in a manner that is complimentary to the Bay Street core.

An economic study by the city’s finance office in 2012 demonstrated that while the historic core generated approximately $16,710 per acre (net of operating expenses), the other commercial corridors (Boundary, Carteret, Charles and Bladen) yielded only $2,888 per acre. Therefore, there are two appropriate ways to grow these areas - encourage more development to expand the potential tax base and/or better maximize the existing building stock for better performing economic activity.

Clearly the greatest potential for real physical growth is in the secondary corridors in the downtown area - Carteret, Charles, Bladen, and Boundary Streets. These areas also represent the greatest opportunity for providing services for the surrounding neighborhoods. With less historic fabric to serve as a precedent, these corridors would include variations on traditional design that reflect contemporary building practices. Any historic fabric can be preserved and restored alongside sensitive infill and redevelopment to replace outmoded, non-contributing structures with buildings that are modern in their programming, but that fit the area’s architectural context.

The perception of downtown Beaufort needs to expand beyond its Bay Street core and into a continuous vibrancy that connects to other parts of the city. Five streets in the Sector 1 study area (Boundary, Bladen, Charles, Carteret and Ribaut) are re-imagined in this plan as mixed-use corridors that form the broad and extensive foundation of a reinvigorated downtown district. As key streetscape investments in these corridors create a series of places and experiences that attract more residents and businesses, both historic and new neighborhoods within this corridor framework will begin to fill with new places to live, work, and shop.

On the surface, this expansion of downtown would be only a change in perceived boundaries. More profoundly, this expansion would mean a greater variety of businesses and institutions, and a diversity of residents (from young children to university students to the elderly) that downtown could serve. It would also mean a shift in the modes of travel available, streets that would remain active and populated for a longer period each day, and an increased breadth of basic needs and services that could be accomplished by residents within walking distance to their homes.

▲ EXISTING COMMERCIAL CORRIDORS
3.3 Port Republic Street

Sector: 1

Project Type: Public | Private

Civic Investment Required: Port Republic Festival Street

This plan proposes infill commercial development along Port Republic Street to extend the shopfront environment of Bay Street through downtown. New retail opportunities would be facilitated by a civic investment that transforms Port Republic Street into a festival street that can be easily closed off to vehicular traffic and function as an event space. The new Port Republic Street design would not have a raised curb, but would instead utilize consistent decorative paving from building face to building face with intermittent bollards to separate pedestrians from vehicular circulation. This mix of pedestrian and vehicular environments at an intimate scale would slow traffic speeds and better serves the retail character of the area.
The conceptual infill scheme for this area also imagines a prominent new commercial building on a current parking lot at the west end of Port Republic Street along Charles Street to provide a visual terminus of this pedestrian-oriented area.

3.4 Parking Structure

-sector: 1
-project type: Public | Private
-civic investment required: Parking Structure
-see also: 2.2

Acknowledging the existing parking issues in downtown that will be exacerbated by additional attractions, one conceptual location this plan illustrates is a parking structure in the middle of the block bound by Port Republic Street, Craven Street, Charles Street, and West Street. As shown in the rendering below, the parking structure would be concealed with ground floor uses or with mixed-use buildings to shield the parking area from view.

On Port Republic Street and West Street, a new commercial space would activate the street for pedestrians. On Craven Street, apartment units would line the parking structure and create

▲ CONCEPTUAL LOCATION OF A PARKING STRUCTURE

▲ EXISTING CONDITIONS (view from Craven Street Looking East)

▲ CONCEPTUAL PARKING STRUCTURE LINER BUILDINGS WITH SIDE COURTYARDS (OPTION A)
Why Is a Parking Structure Needed in Downtown Beaufort?

According to a recent parking study, the City of Beaufort’s parking demand will increase by approximately 100 spaces (less than 10% of the current demand) in the next 5-10 years. However, the anticipated redevelopment of existing surface lots will create a much greater need for new parking spaces in the future and drive demand for a new parking structure.

A parking structure will support the downtown infill development described in the Civic Master Plan in a central, walkable location.

3.5 Carteret Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector:</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type:</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Investment Required:</td>
<td>Minor Streetscape Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Also:</td>
<td>2.6; 7.1; 10.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carteret Street Corridor

The Carteret Street corridor begins where Boundary Street (east of Ribaut Road) meets Bellamy Curve, and connects to Lady’s Island via the US 21 (Business)/Sea Island Parkway Bridge. It is the most significant north-south corridor in downtown Beaufort, and connects key project sites, like Old City Hall, and institutions, like USCB and the Beaufort County Library. Carteret Street has two vehicle travel lanes for the majority of its length, with on-street parking on either side. Carteret Street supports a fairly wide variety of service businesses, including real estate offices, insurance and financial planning firms, and attorney’s offices. It also supports several restaurants, a hotel, and religious facilities such as Carteret Street United Methodist and St. Peter Catholic Church chapel.
4.3: CONTEXTUAL DESIGN GUIDELINES

4.3.1 PURPOSE AND APPLICABILITY

All buildings possess a number of common elements that combine to express a structure both as an entity and as a part of the larger community. No building is so insulated from its surroundings as to avoid an impact on the surrounding context. Applications that require Major Design Review (Section 9.8) and Certificate of Appropriateness, Major (Section 9.10.2), are subject to the additional contextual design guidelines of this section. These guidelines shall be used by the Design Review Body as applicable, to evaluate the appropriateness of the proposed construction to its immediate context and the character of the broader community.

4.3.2 SPECIFIC GUIDELINES

A. Conformity to Civic Master Plan: The Civic Master Plan provides site-specific guidance for the development of many parcels within the city. The intent of this Code is to facilitate the vision and ensure the visions are permitted. In instances where the Civic Master Plan provides guidance for building and site design standards on a particular parcel, development applications on that parcel should meet the general intent of such guidance to the extent practicable, as determined by the Design Review Body.

B. Rhythm of Development on the Street: Monolithic massing that disrupts the predominant building pattern of the neighborhood and corridor is strongly discouraged.

C. Massing and Articulation

1. New construction should complement the massing of neighboring buildings by utilizing roof forms, architectural trim, differentiation of facade planes, and a relationship of solids (siding and walls) to voids (window and door openings) that are consistent with the patterns established in neighboring buildings.

2. When large scale construction is proposed that is not consistent with the predominant building height and lot width of the surrounding area, special attention shall be paid to specific building design elements in order to articulate a building form that is appropriate to the neighborhood context. These include the items listed in the paragraph above, along with siting, setbacks, and facade treatments.
A meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held on July 12, 2017 at 2:00 p.m. in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Joel Newman, board members Chuck Symes, Barbara Laurie, Quinn Peitz, and John Dickerson, and Lauren Kelly, planning staff.

In accordance with the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, Section 30-4-80(d) as amended, all local media were duly notified of the time, date, place, and agenda of this meeting.

CALL TO ORDER
Chairman Newman called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

MINUTES
Mr. Dickerson made a motion, second by Mr. Symes, to approve the minutes of the June 7, 2017 meeting of the HDRB. Chairman Newman recused himself because he was not present at the meeting. The motion to approve the minutes as submitted passed 4-0.

Mr. Dickerson made a motion, second by Mr. Peitz, to approve the minutes of the June 14, 2017 meeting of the HDRB. Mr. Symes recused himself because he was not present at the meeting. The motion to approve the minutes as submitted passed 4-0.

601 CHARLES STREET, identified as R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 609
Secondary structure
Applicant: Baptist Church of Beaufort, Joe Dean (HR17-24)
The applicant is requesting approval for construction of an elevator structure connecting the pre-school and fellowship hall buildings.

Ms. Kelly said the applicant wishes to construct a new elevator structure to connect the fellowship hall and pre-school buildings. The footprint is just under 600 square feet. It is a link between the buildings and space for an elevator, she said.

Size, mass, and scale, proportions and materials are compatible with the Historic District, Ms. Kelly said. Staff recommends final approval.

Joe Dean said this is to make the buildings more accessible, and it will blend in with the existing buildings. Mr. Peitz asked if there would still be access to the back lot. Mr. Dean said yes, by walking into the building.

Maxine Lutz feels this is “a nice treatment to achieve the” church’s goal.

Chairman Newman said this seems like a space that would be a place where information would be collected, so he suggested eliminating windows on the longer elevation to the right upstairs and downstairs for wall space for that purpose. The window on the lower,
narrower elevation could also be removed. Mr. Dean said there are further renovations planned campus-wide that will accommodate what Chairman Newman suggested.

**Mr. Peitz made a motion for final approval of the project as submitted, seconded by Mr. Symes. The motion passed unanimously.**

**918 CRAVEN STREET, Identified as R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 850**

Parking garage

Applicant: 303 Associates, LLC (HR17-23)

_The applicant is requesting approval to construct a new 4-level structured parking deck with 484 spaces._

Ms. Kelly said the parking garage is being reviewed under the city’s old UDO. She reviewed the staff report and described historic buildings that had been around the site. The parking garage would have 4 stories and 484 parking spaces. The board granted preliminary approval to the project in August 2016 on the condition that the comments made at the meeting would be considered as the project moves forward, she said.

**Zoning requirements** – All the setbacks are met, as are all height requirements because the heights vary along the building through a series of step-backs, Ms. Kelly said. The removal of two structures on the property has been approved by the HDRB.

**Applicable guidelines** – Staff provided these at the August 2016 meeting, Ms. Kelly said.

**General comments** – Most comments from last year pertained to the architectural problem of the “large form . . . in a fine-grained historic context,” Ms. Kelly said. She reviewed the comments and suggestions made at that meeting about the “architectural problem” of the large form of the building in a historic context.

**Site plan** – There was a discussion last time about setting the building back for a linear park, Ms. Kelly said. The setback on Craven Street ranges from 6.4’ to 9’. There are awnings, plantings, etc. and some existing trees within that setback, which are things the board should consider to determine if the intent of the previous comments has been met.

A bike rack is required, as is screening of all mechanical equipment and dumpsters, and a lighting plan with full cut-off fixtures. Ms. Kelley said the applicants should discuss undergrounding all overhead utilities with SCE&G.

**Building** – It is critical that the building address the street appropriately, Ms. Kelly said.

- The aesthetics of the building are not compatible with the surrounding context; “there is a lot happening on each of the elevations,” she said, which is listed in the staff report.
- Staff recommends surveying the diversity of a typical block in this district (e.g.,
Bay Street) to better understand how and why the materials are used in the Historic District. Buildings built at different periods still relate to one another, Ms. Kelley said.

- “The balance of plantings versus protection” should also be studied, Ms. Kelly said. A linear park on Craven Street was discussed, and awnings, etc. may provide shade that is undesirable for plants.
- There is no cohesion, composition, or relationship among the façades themselves or as they relate to their surroundings, Ms. Kelley said. The most successful portion is the bay that is “repeated several times.” The facades could be simplified, but a good starting point could be “something that makes sense and . . . relates to Beaufort,” she said.
- Ms. Kelly said there had been a discussion at the last submission of “providing authenticity and true articulation, whether . . . that’s being able to bring portions of the building forward or bring them back.” In the renderings, “a lot of this façade treatment is really kind of like a wallpaper,” she said, in that “there’s not a lot of relief in one way or the other.” It is “one flat plane with a series of different applications on it.”
- The half-barrel vaulted roofs on the corner entries aren’t typical of Beaufort and should be studied.
- Specific comments are in the staff report about bays, windows, doors, massing and orientation, she said.
- There should be a hierarchy of treatments to the sides, Ms. Kelley said. All frontages should relate to their context.
- Ms. Kelley said new materials are appropriate, but their color, scale, function, and craftsmanship should be “compatible and sympathetic” with the surrounding context and the overall Historic District.

Staff feels that the problems with the architecture of the building still need to be solved, Ms. Kelly said. This proposal is not what is best for the Historic District, and it should be studied and calibrated to the locality, she said.

Mr. Peitz said today’s discussions should be about the aesthetics of the building, not its size, mass, and scale, which have been approved. Ms. Kelly said the board couldn’t dictate what the public’s comments are.

Chairman Newman said the staff report is good, and the public comments can be about “whatever,” but conceptual approval has been given for this building to happen on this site, and the aesthetics that are in the staff report are what the HDRB is considering. Mr. Peitz noted that this is the second public hearing on this project.

**Mike Richardson** said the garage has been pulled farther from the house on the lower left elevation. He showed the progression of the parking garage’s design. He described the two ways parking garages can be done, and said they have chosen “wall panels.”
There is “an 8” setback each time,” as the panels are set on each other. Because the HDRB had “asked for more variation than that” at the last submission, he “put in a couple of bays.” There is a 2’ depth “where that sets back into that outside edge,” he said.

Mr. Richardson said the board had suggested “little monuments that told about the history of Beaufort” on Craven Street, and that is being done “where the trellises” and “little canopies are,” as well as benches.

Mr. Richardson said there needed to be more variation and less repetition, so they developed something with more variation in the panels and their heights. The panels have railings on them for fall protection and to vary the heights. There are also parapets of different heights to address that comment, he said. Awnings were added per board suggestion, and a residential-style shutter was eliminated and replaced with a Bahama-style shutter.

There were not stair towers in the previous plan, Mr. Richardson said, but they have been added into this plan and are “a little bit more modern element.” The stair towers are “transparent“ to deter crime in the parking garage. The stair towers are meant to be more modern and “draw attention . . . so you know that’s where the circulation is,” he said.

Mr. Richardson said staff commented that the design didn't follow the pattern in the surrounding area, but there are 3 buildings on Bay Street with “almost the exact same rhythm” that they have in this plan. Bay Street is the one in the area “with buildings of sufficient mass.”

Chairman Newman asked where the mass has been reduced on the southwest corner. Mr. Richardson discussed what was there and explained what they had done to remove an 18’ piece and make it “that much further” from the house that is in that corner.

Mr. Richardson described to Mr. Peitz how they are trying to relate to the buildings in the Historic District, including the “multitude of different brick colors“ downtown. He showed a sample of brick that will be set into the concrete, which he said would make maintenance easy. He told Chairman Newman how it is placed into the form with the concrete cast over it. There is “really nothing white,” Mr. Richardson said, which he had heard in a comment. It’s “a tinted white,” he said, “a white cement base.”

Mr. Richardson showed the rendering of the “most exposed” corners. The HDRB had directed them to do 6 renderings, he said, but only 2 gave “a really good view of the garage.” He asked Ms. Kelly to project the other renderings to show that it is not easy to see the garage from some different locations.

Mr. Peitz said there are 8 different structures broken up across the north streetscape,
and he asked what the origin of the plan was to have the multiple facades. He understands the applicants heard the HDRB say to “break it up” instead of the building being “one mass.” He doesn’t feel that the various colors “pick up Bay Street” or “relate to the City of Beaufort.” The envelope of the building is improved, and there are options to do a variety of elements, he said, but he is having trouble understanding “so much variety” that “says nothing about a parking garage.” The Civic Master Plan calls for a parking garage and this number of spaces, Mr. Peitz said, but “the design of this building has serious issues that can be resolved” if it relates more to “who we are . . . at this point in time.”

Mr. Richardson said there are “geometry issues” with the panels because only a certain size opening can be put in them. The amount of variation was in response to the HDRB’s comments, he said, and because the applicants don’t want it to look like a parking garage.

Ms. Lutz said the board had told Mr. Richardson to create more facades and to break it up more, but now there are too many facades, and it’s “too broken up” and “too busy.” The Historic Beaufort Foundation (HBF) Preservation Committee decided “maybe it should look more like a parking garage,” and it would be “more authentic” if some cars were visible. The committee concurred with Ms. Kelly’s comments in the staff report, Ms. Lutz said.

Mike McNally, 301 Laurens Street, said he sees how the applicants have tried to change the structure, but it appears “they’ve cut it vertically.” On Bay Street, the storefronts have awnings that create a “sort of horizontal base.” He understands that there has to be “some of this vertical” (e.g., in the stair towers) in this structure, but for some of the other elements, if they “use more of a Beaufort eye-level streetscape” for the base, with “other stuff that goes on above that,” it might work.

Scott Myers, Beaufort Clothing Company, said he supports this project “strongly.” He has seen parking structures in other towns and thinks this garage should look like one in Summerville, not like “little houses.” With this design, the eye doesn’t know what to look at, and it doesn’t really look like homes; it looks tacky, he feels. In Summerville, the parking garage is all brick and not as big as this structure, Mr. Meyers said. In Winter Garden, Florida, “the perfect parking structure” is broken up into “2 or 3 things” and has LED lighting around the top outside, which makes parkers and pedestrians “comfortable” and breaks the structure up into 3 pieces. It’s clear where the parking garage is, and it feels safe, Mr. Meyers said. On Craven Street, “a continuous look works” for him, as long as there is “some variation.”

Peggy Simmer, 915 Port Republic Street, supports Dick Stewart and those involved with this project. She thanked Mr. Richardson for moving the structure back from her house and said because she will be looking at it a lot, she would like “a little more” landscaping. She supports the garage and knows it is “much-needed.”
Fred Washington, Jr. agrees there is a need for a parking garage, but his concerns are with the color and ensuring that it looks like “old Beaufort design.” He doesn’t want Beaufort to look like any other city. He would like the city to retain “as much of the old look downtown as possible.” Mr. Washington hopes the applicants consider “the color of things across the street.” There were white houses across the street from the site when he was growing up, and he hopes they will retain some of that and bring elements of “that history” into the structure’s design.

Beth Grace, who is on HBF’s Preservation Committee, said after the applicants met with the committee, she thought about “authenticity.” A brick structure with large openings “architecturally done” would open the building up and bring in light, she said. Historic and artistic panels relating to Beaufort’s history could be incorporated into the facades, Ms. Grace said. She thinks the applicants should “open it up more” and “admit what it is.”

Edie Rodgers said she agrees with Ms. Grace. The plans remind her of Charleston in 1975, when there were “authentic historic facades” that “one group wanted to tear down” to build the OMNI hotel, but the city decided to keep them and let the hotel “build whatever [they] wanted to behind them,” she said.

Ms. Rodgers asked that the following comments, which she submitted in writing during the meeting, be entered into the record: “That block was filled with Victorian houses.” To the question of “Beaufort style,” Ms. Rodgers suggested “arches, wrought iron, balconies, porches, large windows, stucco, tabby, wood shutters, gardens, [and] benches.”

Rikki Parker, Coastal Conservation League, said this building is in the heart of the Historic District, and its neighbors have invested in the district’s buildings. Their work helps the neighborhood and downtown Beaufort. One of the most important aspects of the Historic District is “a walkable vibrant community.” A building this large without liner buildings or first-floor retail is difficult to fit into the interior of the neighborhood, Ms. Parker said.

Erica Dickerson, Charles Street, said Greg Darden had explained at a previous meeting that liner buildings “change the entire structure of the building,” are expensive, and would become “a concrete tomb.”

Chairman Newman said the board had received a number of email responses to the submittal. The consensus was “overwhelmingly” supportive of the idea of the garage but concerned about the interpretation of the board’s comments in the current architecture.

Mr. Peitz said some of the direction the HDRB gave the applicants at the previous
meeting has “evolved” and is “different” than what the board intended. To mitigate the size and mass of the parking garage, it was designed as “a series of buildings” that were “broken up.” Mr. Peitz said he now realizes that this is not the best solution because it is “false.” So he researched parking garages and showed one in Savannah, one in Charleston next to the Mother Emmanuel Church, and a larger one on Wentworth Street “that says ‘parking garage.’” He feels the HDRB is “partially at fault” for this design because, while the board agreed with the concept of the parking garage, they had wanted the mass to be broken up.

Mr. Peitz showed a parking garage that picked up the major facades of 2 major buildings for its façade. He suggested the applicants look at the facades of the buildings around this parking garage and “pick up those things,” such as the Tabernacle Baptist Church façade, and “relate it to the City of Beaufort.” He said he’s prepared to postpone this application for the applicants to look at alternative designs.

Ms. Laurie asked what role the public comments play in the decision-making process. She asked if the comments should be considered in the board’s decisions. Chairman Newman said it’s impossible for anyone to divorce their decisions from their own feelings and community feedback. The applicants need a decision and a motion today, he said.

Mr. Symes said after the presentations and seeing the options available in concrete and what can be incorporated into it, he feels “more optimistic” about “how we can get there.” He feels the architecture should have more of the feel of the Historic District in it, and he agrees with Mr. Peitz that the board’s direction was not as simple as it should have been. He thinks the design needs to be “a little less busy.”

Mr. Symes said the applicants should look at the stairwells again; the curved roof and glass don’t fit in. If they “go to 3,” it would help. The entrances and exits of the garage need to be clear to those driving past it, so people can know where to pull in, he said. Mr. Symes is also concerned about the need for “green space along Craven Street” to “soften the building,” and he shares Tabernacle Baptist Church’s concerns. He suggested brick on the plain façade that is behind Tabby Place.

Mr. Dickerson said at the 2016 meeting, there was support for the linear park. He suggested the applicants draw from the “look and feel across the street” and think about how people move through the space. The linear park would be an opportunity to “make a significant statement,” Mr. Dickerson said. The focus then is not on the parking garage but on the items in the park and the history they portray. Focusing on that will help people “enjoy this section of Craven Street a whole lot more,” and they will be “basically unaware” that the parking garage is there.

Fred Mueller said he gets nervous when he goes in parking garages sometimes, and other people do, too, so it should be well-lit and well-cared for inside, which will be as
important as the outside. Chairman Newman said initial discussions about the parking garage focused on security, so the applicants know about it.

Chairman Newman said a year ago, people were convinced they would be able to see the parking garage “from space,” and today’s comments are more “sober” and focused on what the building will look like.

At the previous meeting, the HDRB gave the applicants a lot of ideas to look at, Chairman Newman said. It’s “misdirection” to try to relate this building to the articulation of Bay Street, he said. There is not a “Beaufort look” in the commercial element of Beaufort. To find their expression, Chairman Newman said, the most important thing to look at is Craven Street, considering the church across the street and the history of the street. The linear park is “the strongest piece you have to work with” to “integrate this into Beaufort specifically,” he said.

Chairman Newman said he disagrees strongly with Mr. Peitz about the example of the 3 buildings as a façade. He’s seen examples of that, and they were “not successful.” He thinks the applicants should use Beaufort textures and coloration. The explanation of this is well done in the staff report, he said.

The elements that work in this plan are the shuttered elements, which keep the façade from being flat and give it articulation, Chairman Newman said. The attempt to do the push-in and push-out for a couple of feet of offset would enhance the linear park, he said, and they have done this successfully in terms of how it works, if not how it looks. He feels pulling back the tower from the corner “decreases the Charles Street face” and is successful.

The issue, then, is Craven Street, Chairman Newman said: how to articulate the face with the most mass when they know that will determine how it is on West Street. He feels the plan ideas, the setbacks, and “the idea of awnings, trellises, and shutters” are all successful. The applicants “need to pull back a little more” to using just 2 or 3 colors in the building, he said, not making it look like “these many buildings” and using such a variety of materials, which he agrees with staff “aren’t successful.”

This is not a series of houses or businesses, Chairman Newman said, and he agrees with others that it’s okay for the structure to look like a parking garage. He also agrees with the open stairways and “the security element of that.” The “best opportunities for green” are on the south face behind Ms. Simmer’s house, he said; “the toughest” is on Craven Street. The trees there and their survival, he feels, are critical. Chairman Newman said he doesn’t “think anybody’s taken into account [that] the power lines that go along there . . . are going to go away.”

Chairman Newman agrees with staff about the arched tops, but he’s okay with them on the stairways.
Mr. Stewart said there are some significant trees in the 6’ – 7’ gap between the building and the property line. He supports the idea of the linear park, but he also feels the façade will “increasingly incorporate” plants over time. He agrees with the idea of using just 2 or 3 colors and that Craven Street is the most important façade. Mr. Stewart said he doesn’t support “recreating historic facades.” He feels it should be “uncomplicated” and people can be engaged with plaques, trees, etc. on Craven Street. Mr. Stewart said the power lines might not come down, as they are still negotiating with SCE&G.

Chairman Newman said the applicants should create “a sense of a first floor”; that is the piece of the building people will relate to: what they can see as they are walking along there. The built and green zones are what will be perceived. He definitely favors “the greenscape along there” to connect the building to the ground, the trees, etc., and that will diminish the building’s impact the most.

Mr. Symes said on the original plan, he didn’t “like the repetition,” and “a simpler number” might help with that. He agrees with Chairman Newman about the greenery and about pushing back and opening up certain faces of the building. He said he likes the roofline, except for the curved pieces.

Mr. Dickerson re-emphasized the need to stress the “great story” of Beaufort. Mr. Stewart told him, “We support that,” but he doesn’t not want to determine whose story gets told and whose doesn’t, so they will put plaques up. Ms. Lutz said that is already “done beautifully” in Waterfront Park. Mr. Meyers said it could be about Reconstruction or could be done with artwork.

Mr. Washington said this is a great opportunity to work with the Reconstruction Era monument and others, and what’s in the park could keep the structure from making this historic area appear to be in “Anytown, USA.” He said the community needs to “develop the will to . . . embrace all the greatness” in Beaufort.

Mr. Symes said this is a parking garage first and foremost, not a monument or a tribute to Beaufort history, etc. If it works out that there are spots in which this could be done, “that’s great,” but this shouldn’t be thought of as “an opportunity to show more of the history of Beaufort.” Chairman Newman agreed with Mr. Stewart that it’s not the developer’s responsibility to create this, but perhaps to create the space to accommodate it.

The board reviewed its comments to the applicants: simplification/simplicity, reducing the number of elements, including the linear park as part of the plan and having that “brought forward by the community,” having Craven Street be “the primary relationship” rather than Bay Street, having the stair towers continue to be open, visible, well-ventilated, and safe, and softening the building with greenery.
Chairman Newman made a motion for the design to go back for revisions and improvements; what works in the current design is the way the building is articulated more on Craven Street, the reduction of the mass on Charles Street, and the incorporation in the articulation of the face of the building with Bahama shutters, trellises and awnings, and planned stepping using 2 different building techniques. The board recommends the applicants simplify the material pallet and expression; create a more clearly defined base along the lines of a main floor on Craven, Charles, and West Streets, but most importantly on Craven Street; develop the sense of a linear park; incorporate a greenscape, which was a key idea in the initial presentation, on the southwest face of the parking garage and on the other 3 faces as well, to the extent that is possible, and bring back a simpler design to the HDRB. Mr. Peitz seconded.

Chairman Newman amended the motion to add the HDRB’s support of a more transparent, open, and secure stairway expression. Mr. Peitz seconded the amendment. The amended motion passed unanimously.

812 PORT REPUBLIC STREET AND 212 SCOTT STREET, identified as R120, Tax Map 4, Parcel 984

New construction

Applicant: Goff D’Antonio Associates (HR17-22)

The applicant is requesting approval for a new mixed-use building with retail/commercial space on the ground floor and a hotel above.

Ms. Kelly said this is a proposal for new construction of a 77-unit hotel building on Port Republic and Scott Streets. One noncontributing structure on the property would have to have a public hearing for demolition. The application for this project came to the board in 2016 and received preliminary approval; many of the details have changed, she said.

Ms. Kelly said the property is being evaluated under the new Beaufort Code. There are no zoning issues with the project. It’s proposed to be 3 stories at the sidewalk and 4 stories at the lot’s interior. The ground level may have several interior parking spaces, and on the Scott Street side, there is some space for retail that is to be flood-proofed, she said.

The direct context around the site is varied, Ms. Kelly said, and the applicant has done context and precedent studies. There is a historic tabby wall next to the trash enclosure, and it will be protected. The building is set back on the south and west sides from the property line to provide the adjacent property owner with the appropriate easement, she said.

The porte cochère along Port Republic Street is an appropriate, urban way to handle hotel pick-up and drop-off, Ms. Kelley said. Beaufort’s city manager and the developer have a memorandum of understanding that the city will take over the sidewalk in this
area when the developer applies for a building permit for this structure, to allow for the encroachment of a colonnade on Scott Street, she said. This should not be a problem with SCDOT, she said, but the applicant has provided an alternative design in case it doesn’t go through.

Staff’s main comment on the architecture is about the proportions of bays, Ms. Kelly said. Generally, the goal is to achieve square, vertically proportioned openings. This is achieved on the ground floor, but the openings on the second and third floors are “less and less vertically proportioned,” she said. Staff has talked to the applicant about “emphasizing these by use of materials within the bays,” and the use of iron railings mitigates this “somewhat,” Ms. Kelly said, but the board should discuss the bays.

Ms. Kelly said lot consolidation and the demolition hearing will be required. Staff recommends preliminary approval as submitted, with board and staff comments to be addressed at the final submission.

**Hank D’Antonio**, of Goff D’Antonio in Charleston, said his firm classifies this as a “boutique hotel.” These kinds of projects usually occur in this kind of area and are his firm’s specialty, he said. There are not a lot of opportunities in historic districts like this one to be able to get a hotel of this size, so it is “kind of unique” and a “great opportunity” for Beaufort, Mr. D’Antonio said.

**Karo Wheeler** showed images with elements that had been incorporated into the design. She reviewed plans including entries, discussed options for flood proofing, and use of awnings if the colonnade were not approved by SCDOT.

Ms. Wheeler said the bay width is in line with the guest room spacing, so they might be able to create a more vertical expression by combining the second and third floors. She discussed the elements on the corners and showed the alternative to the colonnade if necessary. The colonnade is continued inside, she said, and she showed images and building sections. The mechanical elements will be on the roof and set back far enough that they will not be visible.

Ms. Lutz said after a meeting with HBF and “this group,” HBF prefers “the alternative view on Scott Street.” The Preservation Committee wants the HDRB to discuss “the arches marching down Scott Street,” which the committee thinks may be “too dominant,” given the surrounding buildings, she said. At the meeting, how runoff is being handled was discussed, Ms. Lutz said, and HBF wanted to know if pilings would need to be driven. Mr. D’Antonio said the soils report seems to indicate that they will not. They will have to build up the soil, and there are some “liquefaction issues with earthquake[s]” that need to be considered, he said, so some things about the foundations are still being studied. They will get more into the structural way it’s being built in the future, Mr. D’Antonio said.
George O’Kelley said his office is downtown, and he wanted to comment about the easement on this property between the City of Beaufort and 303 Associates for 27 parking spaces in “the old Western Auto portion.” Mr. Stewart’s company can move the spaces, Mr. O’Kelley said, but the city is guaranteed 27 parking spaces “somewhere.” He said he couldn’t see any parking spaces in this design. Ms. Kelly said 4 parking spaces are proposed as part of a different agreement. There is a mechanism to move the spaces that Mr. O’Kelley referred to, she said; they could be in the parking garage or in a surface parking lot. Mr. O’Kelley said if this structure and the parking garage are built, the spaces will go away, and “at some point in time, the city won’t have them.”

Mr. Stewart said he will always honor his legal agreements, and there is an agreement with the city that will be honored with parking spaces in the parking garage when it’s built. Mr. O’Kelley said that’s when the parking garage is built, and he is talking about before that. He said that this is Mr. Stewart’s property, and he benefitted financially from this agreement with the City of Beaufort. Mr. Stewart said, “We will honor the terms of the easement.” Ms. Kelly said the city manager would contact Mr. O’Kelley about how this is happening because negotiations are underway.

Mr. Meyers said he likes the building and disagrees with Ms. Lutz because he feels individual awnings would be “pretty tacky,” and he supports the colonnade. He said he has an issue with the columns; the Beaufort Inn is across the street, and the columns on it are “geared toward . . . that small Victorian home.” Mr. Meyers thinks using those kinds of columns on this building looks “cheap” because they are thin, so he feels the applicant might consider more massive, rounded columns for the sake of scale.

Charles Aimar, an adjacent property owner, said his building is a historic brick building, and he’s concerned about pilings. Also, runoff from his building goes to the ground, and it would probably be at a lower grade than this building, he said. Mr. Aimar’s neighbor, Kevin Cuppia, and The Verdier House also might have concerns.

Mr. Cuppia said he agrees with Mr. Aimar because runoff is “a big issue now.” Water runs under the building, so he is very concerned about this being solved “before this big building is built.” Mr. Cuppia would like the Beaufort Inn and this project’s engineer and architect to look at extending the property line back farther on the back side of the building for more “wiggle room” and so he can get service into his building. If Mr. Cuppia does something with the upstairs of his building, when the proposed wall is put up, “we’re closed off,” he said.

Mr. Dickerson asked, with the access easement on the back side of the property, how firefighting equipment could be gotten in there. Chairman Newman said, “They don’t ever do that”; firefighters don’t bring trucks in that close. Mr. Cuppia said the fire marshal has said there can be a hydrant placed so a truck doesn’t need to be driven to the back of the building.
Ms. Laurie said she thinks a hotel in downtown Beaufort is a great plan, and she hopes the issues raised can be worked out so the project can proceed.

Mr. Peitz pointed out the secondary entry and asked Ms. Kelly to show the Hotel Royale photo. He suggested that on this building, the cornice be removed and the shed roof rounded around the corner. He said he doesn’t like the central tower.

Mr. Symes said he has “a similar concern . . . about the corner entrance,” which he doesn’t feel is “integrated enough into the rest of the building.” He likes the entrance and said he doesn’t “know if it would look better if it was a standard 90-degree entrance on the second and third floors, and you had the overhang and the truncated entrance in there.”

Mr. Symes thinks where the car entrance is on Port Republic is “very well done.” On Scott Street, he is somewhat concerned about the number of columns and thinks the curvature and number should be reduced. Having too many columns makes it feel too closed in, he said.

The south side of the building will be visible all the way to Bay Street, Mr. Symes said, and he suggested a window in each room to “break up that wall” for “a better picture” on the Bay Street side. Chairman Newman said, alternatively, the wall could be articulated with shuttered openings.

Chairman Newman said this is by far the most successful plan for a building on this site. Columns in the Beaufort style are simple and without a lot of detail. He wouldn’t “borrow in any way” from the Beaufort Inn, which is not historic and which he feels is “appalling.” There’s also “a sensitivity in Beaufort to borrowing from” Savannah and Charleston, Chairman Newman said, but he thinks it’s important to keep the elements that are more like those cities’ architecture and Beaufort’s architecture than New Orleans architecture. He thinks the architecture could be simplified, and he feels there is no need for arches. The columns and porches could be “simple,” he said.

Chairman Newman said the tabby wall is “cool” and “extremely unique and extremely local,” so he suggested combining the easement and a way to incorporate it into what can be seen from the pool, instead of guests seeing another wall with 5’ of “no man’s land.”

Chairman Newman said he prefers the “covered arcade idea” to the awnings, and he hopes SCDOT will allow the city to take over the street so the colonnade can be done.

Chairman Newman said he would separate the porches with screens, and Mr. D’Antonio said that is the plan. That will give more texture and delineation to the façade, too, Chairman Newman said.
Chairman Newman feels the entrance on the corner is an important idea. A member of the public had made a comment similar to Mr. Peitz’s via email, Chairman Newman said; he feels the entrance is not yet integrated into the building. The arcade in that corner could be a covered entry, he said. He likes “the idea of some break” from the colonnade. He feels this design reflects the HDRB’s comments at the last meeting.

Chairman Newman told Ms. Lutz that he would not keep the arches on the arcade. He likes the use of the shutter panels to cut down the porte cochère entry, but he could also envision “simple columns and beams and the porches stacked up.”

Mr. Symes feels it would be “cleaner” and “look better without” the Scott Street “arches,” which “fit and look well” on the Port Republic side and accentuate the entrance there. Removing some of the columns on the first floor might “make it look a little bit better, too,” he feels.

Mr. D’Antonio said things like drainage concerns and pilings are all being looked at, so those issues will be addressed, but he doesn’t know how yet. Concerning the columns, he agrees that “simpler looks better,” but they want this building to be part of the “Beaufort Inn complex of buildings,” so he thinks a relationship between the buildings is important. Beaufort Inn guests (e.g., in the cottages) will check in at this building, Mr. D’Antonio said.

Mr. D’Antonio said the arched area was a suggestion from someone not working on the project, though “we don’t disagree.” There’s an interruption in the columns on the Port Republic side, “so you can get under the building in a car;” he said, but they would like not to have “the big openings” if they could. If they got rid of the arches, that “might lighten it,” but he wanted to explain what they were thinking about with the arches, he said. The colonnade could be wrapped on the first floor, but Mr. D’Antonio said he wouldn’t necessarily do so on all 3 floors. They could “look at wrapping the ground floor” where it “provides protection,” he said.

Mr. Stewart said SCDOT has “indicated that [it] will give [permission] to the city” to take over the sidewalk for the colonnade, but the person who said that has “no authority.” When asked about taking over “this block,” SCDOT may say the city has to take responsibility for “all of Scott Street” and “all of Port Republic Street,” he said.

The building is set back 2’ from the property line on Scott Street, Mr. Stewart said, to enable them to “provide a 6’ sidewalk,” which will be “a wide enough area under the colonnade for 2 people to walk” side-by-side. They will still provide that whether the colonnade is approved or not. He said he needs the board’s approval of both options in case SCDOT does not approve the deal.

Mr. Dickerson said he likes the main entryway very much and likes that retail is available in the building. He supports the project.
Mr. Cuppia asked for the view from the Greyhound Flats and the aerial view of the wall. He asked about putting in Bahama shutters for the length of the wall to block the view from Greyhound Flats. Mr. Stewart said they would screen it somehow, but he wouldn’t commit to doing so with Bahama shutters.

Mr. Stewart said he’d like as much specific approval as possible from the HDRB. Chairman Newman said he’s not comfortable with directing what the architects “have to do.” Mr. Stewart said he’d like the building’s scale and mass approved, comments on the balconies, “shed porches or not,” etc.

Chairman Newman made a motion to approve both the submittal with the colonnade which the HDRB supports “robustly” – and the submittal without the colonnade, if that design must be followed because of a decision by SCDOT; the HDRB encourages the study of the corner and the possible incorporation of the colonnade around the corner if having the colonnade is possible. The applicant should consider the following: using simple porch roofs on top of the porches on Scott and Port Republic Streets; a careful study of the southeast corner elevation, as seen from Bay Street and Greyhound Flats, to articulate that face in a way that’s sympathetic to the scale of the building and not a blank wall; the access easement and any increase that could be made to it for maintenance of this building and its adjoining neighbors. Mr. Peitz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Dickerson made a motion to postpone discussion of item “C” on the agenda. Mr. Peitz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Kelly said this is Chairman Newman’s last meeting as the chair of the HDRB for at least one year, so she thanked him for his service.

There being no further business to come before the board, Chairman Newman made a motion, second by Mr. Symes, to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m.