

A meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held on **April 17, 2019 at 2:06 p.m.** in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were Chairman Chuck Symes, board members John Dickerson, Bill Allison, Quinn Peitz, and Ken Meola, city staff. Katherine Pringle, board member was absent.

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

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Symes called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

MINUTES

Mr. Peitz made a motion, second by Mr. Dickerson to approve the minutes of the March 13, 2019 HDRB meeting. The motion to approve the minutes as submitted passed unanimously.

1611 NORTH STREET, PIN R120 003 000 0229 0000

Change-After-Certification

Bill Allison recused himself from this project.

Applicant: Jeremiah Smith, Allison Ramsey Architects (19-06 HRB.1)

The applicant is requesting approval for a change in the design already approved elevations including columns and pickets at the front porch only.

The applicant, **Jeremiah Smith**, said the packets says pickets and columns, but we are now just asking to change the design of the columns. We have 12 x 12 with some wood "X" design and brackets. It may be a little more fun and flamboyant but it's essential on Bay Street (on North Street technically) and feels its deserving of something more special needs We looked all along Bay Street and there are number of interesting malefic columns and different design throughout the times. Chairman Symes asked for clarification because from seeing the blow ups he's under the impression they seemed like to have "see thrus". Mr. Smith said they are "see thrus". Chairman Symes asked if they were structural strong enough to hold a deck and a roof. Mr. Smith said he is working with the structural engineer. The point is to keep the views open, he said.

Chairman Symes asked if there were any public comments.

Heather Seifert, Director of Historic Beaufort Foundation (HBF), said there has been some questions as to whether 1611 North Street is a contributing property to the National Register. And although the National Register nomination which was amended in 2000 shows it as a contributing property, in fact it is not. Based on a title search, the lot was vacant in 1990. But the house is then shown on a plot map dated 1999. So, we

can assume the house was built between 1990 and 1999. The National Register Listing of 1611 North Street as a contributing property to the district is a mistake.

Historic Beaufort Foundation is appreciative of the example photographs provided by the applicant showing "cross pattern" columns as a way of setting precedence. HBF would suggest that this cross pattern only be used at the threshold, as is shown in the photographs. And not use this cross pattern across the entire facade. HBF suggests applicant look to Milner Guidelines for examples of columns and balustrades, page 34-40. Ms. Seifert passed out the two plot maps.

Mr. Peitz said he doesn't like the proposed change, but doesn't mean he won't vote against it. He said the point is not that it is not historic because that was taken off the table but that it's brand new construction. Regarding the comparisons that the applicant provided, he's not sure how the other structures with columns came about over time. Did they have to come to the Board for approval? He said, "I've been on the Board for five years and haven't seen anything like this with new or old construction and contributing or not. Mr. Peitz doesn't feel it is not appropriate for the area. Mr. Peitz would like to hear other opinion from people. Mr. Dickerson he is glad the confusion has been cleared up of between 1940 and 1990+. It's not even close in terms of its contributing position. We have to consider, since it's new construction and they are revising new construction, what are we to do in terms of being inside the envelope of appropriate action from the Board. He referred to the work of Goudy and said it's far out there and this is not that far out there. He feels this is an expression of personal preference. Mr. Dickerson feels it might not be appropriate to not let them do this. This is the owner's preferences and it's not offensive. Mr. Dickerson said he likes the proposed change; he wants creativity. Mr. Dickerson said he accepts the new design and supports it. Chairman Symes feels this house is unique that holds a very prominent place on North Street for everyone to see, but has two concerns: (1) structural concern with these being see thru and being stronger enough to support a 2nd story porch and a roof and (2) the pattern because two of the examples provided are outside the historic district, so I don't consider them. He is concerned about the historic district character and how this fits into historic district". Chairman Symes feels it is elaborate and is not the character of the rest of the homes in the historic district. Chairman Symes feels it more elaborate than it should be and not in the character of the historic district. Chairman Symes is against the proposed application.

Mr. Peitz asked what is the purpose of the change? Mr. Smith said the homeowner wanted something more. It's an expression of the owner, he said. Mr. Peitz asked what the use of the property is. Mr. Smith said, a short term rentals. Will there be signage, Mr. Peitz asked. Mr. Smith said no. Mr. Peitz asked about a lighting plan and if it's illuminated at night. Mr. Smith said he's not sure.

Mr. Dickerson made a motion for approval as it's drawn. Mr. Peitz seconded the motion.

Further Discussion:

Mr. Peitz said he doesn't believe the adverse impact in this area is so great that the change of the columns and the top cornices is a detrimental influence on the historic district because it's on the fringe. The post office is there, and a variety of buildings types are there; it was built after 1990. He said he would not consider this elsewhere in the district, but would consider it on the fringe.

The motion passed 2 to 1 with Chairman Symes being opposed.

OLD BUSINESS

504 PRINCE STREET, PIN R120 004 000 0642 0000

Major Demolition

Mr. Allison returned to the board meeting.

Applicant: Construction Partners, LLC (19-05 HRB.2)

The applicant is requesting approval for a change in the design already approved elevations including columns and pickets at the front porch only.

Chairman Symes stated all board members did receive the Structural Assessment Report.

The applicant, **Jeff Peth**, asked if any of the board members were able to go to the house. All board members were able to go by the house. Mr. Peitz said the Structural Assessment shows there are a lot of issues, and feels some issues haven't been discovered yet. He asked who supersedes who; State versus National. Heather Seifert with HBF said she's confident if placed on the National Register of Historic Places as a contributing property. There is a State Register and a National Register; National Register takes precedence. Usually if you are on one, you are on the other automatically.

Chairman Symes asked if there were any public comments.

Heather Seifert, Historic Beaufort Foundation (HBF), said HBF Preservation Committee does not support this demolition. This decision was made based on the Beaufort Code. Page 4-F. Which states – Contributing buildings to the National Register of Historic Places should not be demolished to create infill opportunities. This is a contributing structure, See National Register of Historic Places, List of Contributing Resources, page 7-29. It is obvious that the applicant purchased the property with the intentions on tearing it down. This is clearly stated in the original application, which says, "Request is hereby made to tear down the existing structure to make way for a new home." Demolition is irreversible. Allowing demolition to recreate infill goes against the City's own ordinance. Any suggestion that buying a property with the intent

of demolition creates a dangerous precedent.

Mr. Peitz commented that citizen, Maxine Lutz, at the last meeting said at one point in time we considered as part of the demolition process was that the Board decided what the replacement would be and asked if that is, they way is now or not. Chairman Symes said yes if a building was going to be demolished there had to be an updated architectural plan of what the replacement was before demolition. Mr. Peitz asked if this was still in effect. He asked if we can make a decision today if we don't have a conceptual plan of what's going to take its place. Mr. Dickerson said we may need to step back and look at what is the grounds that would grant or deny demolition. If we go back and look at the wide variety of properties that came before the HRB and the guiding principle that is most important is this structure at risk of injuring people. Mr. Dickerson referred to Newcastle & Prince a "Demo by Neglect" building that's been going on for a decade. This structure was dangerous. Mr. Peitz asked do we need a conceptual plan or replacement and was this the case in the past. Mr. Dickerson said demolitions in the past it was either because they were dangerous, or a replacement plan was done. Mr. Dickerson referred to the Civic Master Plan and infill. Chairman Symes commented he doesn't remember too many demos. Chairman Symes agreed with Mr. Dickerson. The Milner indicates a demo to be the last resource. If there is no public danger, then the Milner takes precedent and the structure needs to be renovated instead. Mr. Allison agreed with Chairman Symes and said we have turned down houses that need more than renovations. Mr. Allison is not in favor of the demolition. Chairman Symes referred to hurricanes and flooding. Maybe move 3' off ground so it is protected from the water, he suggested.

Heather Seifert, Historic Beaufort Foundation (HBF), said HBF is not in favor of the demolition. Mr. Seifert referred to the Beaufort Code, Page 4-F. This property is listed as contributing on the survey. Ms. Seifert said HBF's concerns feels its only the reasons there is a request for demolition is for infill. She referred to Zillow and the ad that has been on this website for 80 days, which was well before the applicant came to the HRB.

Mr. Peth said the back portion was added on and doubts there was a building permit issued at that time. He asked the Board if he could take the back addition off and put in a deck instead. Mr. Dickerson said in the past, the Board would ask to see a plan and then move forward. He referred to the Segregated Barnwell House. Mr. Peitz asked if there was a 50% rule. Chairman Symes said yes, on the Code compliance side. Chairman Symes said if you want to remove the back portion, you will need to submit information to the Board since it's not contributing. Mr. Peitz asked when it was built. David Prichard, Director, said 1945. What about the addition, Mr. Peitz asked. Mr. Dickerson said 1995. Mr. Peitz commented that the addition is more than 50% of the structure.

Ken Meola, City Staff, went over the last meeting minutes (March 3, 2019) for this project. He also addressed the Board's questions regarding the historic significance and

Structural Assessment Report. Mr. Meola explained that the 1997 Historic Site Survey said the property “is” in the historic district, but comments say it does not contribute to the list. Then the 2000 Historic Site Survey said it is contributing now.

Mr. Meola presented information relating to the project.

Mr. Meola said staff feels it lacks a “recommendation”.
Chairman Symes asked if there were any public comments. There were none.

Mr. Peth confirmed that his next step is to come back before the HRB with plans for the back portion. Chairman Symes said we will deny the demo today and you can come back with what you believe is appropriate. Mr. Dickerson said we will be looking at the entire property not just the back. Mr. Peth commented that we are just doing the back. Mr. Dickerson said yes, but we need to preserve the historic fabrics of the entire structure. Mr. Peitz said it’s a 1942, what is historic? What history do you want to preserve? Mr. Dickerson said 1700 versus 1800 versus 1900; big difference with 1940 cottages post war. Mr. Peitz feels the only good part about it is the cottage. Mr. Allison referred to the guidelines staying within the mass/scale. Board members agreed with Mr. Allison and Mr. Peitz comments. Mr. Allison said from an architect point of view, this type brings the light into the neighborhood.

Mr. Allison made a motion, to deny the application for demolition. Mr. Pietz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Peitz reminded the board members that his term expires in June and he will only be at the May and June meeting.

There being no further business to come before the board, **Chairman Symes made a motion, second by Mr. Peitz, to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously,** and the meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.