

A meeting of the Historic District Review Board was held on **September 25, 2019 at 2:00 p.m.** in the City Hall Planning Conference Room, 1911 Boundary Street. In attendance were board members Bill Allison, John Dickerson, and Katherine Pringle, and Joan Furlong 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

Mr. Dickerson called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

MINUTES

Ms. Pringle made a motion, second by Mr. Allison, to approve the minutes of the July 10, 2019 HDRB meeting. Maxine Lutz said on page 7, in the second paragraph from the bottom, “indicted” should be “indicated.” The motion to approve the minutes as amended passed unanimously.

REVIEW OF FULL BOARD PROJECTS

1120 DUKE STREET, PIN R120 004 000 1033 0000

New Construction

Applicant: Labi Kryeziu (19-16 HRB.1)

The applicant is requesting approval for new construction for a single-family dwelling.

Ms. Spade read from the staff report. The lot subdivision was given final approval in September 2016 under the UDO (unified development ordinance); that approval has since expired, and the extension deadline wasn't met, so the current approval will be reviewed under the Beaufort Code.

The setback requirements of the Beaufort Code need to be met, Ms. Spade said. The submitted plans depict a 6' side setback, “but this does not look proportional,” she said. Since that submittal, the applicant has given staff plans to “conform to those setbacks,” so staff is “satisfied” that the setbacks would be met, Ms. Spade said.

Mr. Allison said the lot is 40' wide, and the house is 28', “so the house should be right in the middle of the lot” per the zoning, but this is “not indicated on the plan he gave us.” Ms. Furlong said staff spoke with the applicant, **Labi Kryeziu**, and they need a more clearly drawn plan that shows all of the setbacks and the placement of the building on the site. There is sufficient room, but the documentation that the city has received doesn't support that, she said.

Mr. Dickerson asked if there is anything in the code that addresses the concern Mr. Allison raised. Mr. Dickerson asked the number of square feet on the lot. The ZBOA gave its permission if the applicant met the 6' setback on the side, Mr. Allison said. Mr.

Dickerson said the stoop issue has not been addressed. There was general discussion among the board members.

Ms. Furlong read about “private frontage types” in the Beaufort Code. Mr. Allison said it’s an uncovered stoop, not a front porch. Mr. Dickerson asked if “there [is] anything that addresses stairs for the side setback.” There was no audible reply. Mr. Dickerson said, “There is adequate space to move the primary structure and then allow the steps of the stoop to be closer to the line.”

Mr. Allison told the applicant that the lot has a 6’ side setback, and if the setbacks are met, the house will fit in between them. He showed the applicant what he could do to meet the setbacks. Mr. Dickerson and Mr. Allison discussed the setbacks with the applicant using his submitted plan.

Mr. Kryeziu asked if he would “have to do more” if his architect “shows the exact measurement as required.” Mr. Allison said Mr. Kryeziu couldn’t meet the 6’ setbacks for both sides with a 28’ house unless he takes the stoop off.

Ms. Lutz asked Mr. Dickerson to relate what the board members had discussed with the applicant at the end of the conference table. Mr. Dickerson said that on the plan that the applicant submitted, the setback on the Church Street side is “much less than 6’ from the lot line,” which is what they’d discussed with the applicant. On “the side that is away from Church Street, the stoop . . . and short stairs are 6’ away from the lot line,” he said, so “the proposal would be to shift the entire structure, so that the Church Street side matches up with the existing house to the right,” Mr. Dickerson said, so the board “would give one foot,” and the stoop would remain but would be pushed closer to the lot line on the back side of the house,” so it wouldn't be visible, except on the Duke Street side, and then “only marginally.”

Ms. Lutz said HBF has no comments on the project because they did not receive the packet until Monday, and the Preservation Committee meets on Fridays. She asked that the city send out packets in a timelier manner.

Ms. Pringle said when she looks at the plans and compares the window locations and sizes, they are “inconsistent” with the line drawings and the computerized elevations. For example, she indicated where three windows are shown in the plans, but the elevation doesn’t show three of the same, larger size.

Ms. Pringle said there was not a lot of information on the details.

Mr. Allison made a motion to table the application until the October HDRB meeting to get an updated site plan, continuity between the perspectives and the elevations, and for HBF to have a chance to look at the application and give its opinion. Ms. Pringle seconded the motion.

Mr. Dickerson asked if Mr. Kryeziu could make it to the October HDRB meeting with his architect, and Mr. Kryeziu said he could.

In response to Mr. Kryeziu, Mr. Allison clarified that he had been talking about window and door locations and the door design, not the “finishes.” **The motion passed unanimously.**

1307 BAY STREET, PIN R120 004 000 0766 0000

New Construction

Applicant: Robert Schlau and Janet Clouse; Allen Patterson Residential (HRB 19-17.1)
The applicant is requesting approval for construction of a one-car garage with studio space above.

Ms. Spade read from the staff report.

Ms. Lutz said HBF was not able to discuss this application because the packet was not received before the Preservation Committee met.

Ms. Pringle said in her opinion, the windows on the garage should have no division, like they are on the addition, rather than attempting to replicate the original house; she said she feels the same way about the doors. Mr. Allison said he was going to suggest the same thing.

Ms. Pringle said she assumes they are using a plastic composite, and **Allen Patterson**, representing the applicants, said they are.

Ms. Pringle asked if the setback is good along where the fence is now. There was a general discussion about this. Mr. Dickerson said there are setback issues, and he wants to know what is going to be used as the back and the side “to go against the setbacks.” The existing house looks very close to the lot line, he said. Mr. Patterson said it’s probably about 5’.

Mr. Dickerson asked what the back and the side are for this structure. Mr. Patterson said he didn’t think about that; there’s one side facing the street. Mr. Allison said that’s technically the rear. On North Street, there is a precedent of garages being very close to the street, he said. Mr. Dickerson said it’s 3’ where it says, “silt fence,” and that’s too close. Mr. Patterson said they could move it to 5’.

Mr. Dickerson read the setback requirements. The rear and side have a 5’ minimum setback, and if it’s at 3’, it needs to be 2’ more to comply with the setback requirements. Mr. Allison said he agrees. If Mr. Patterson could show that there is a precedent nearby where it is closer to the street, he would be more inclined to approve this, he said.

Mr. Allison said he thought North Street ran along the back, but Mr. Patterson said it's the neighbor's yard. There was a general discussion about appealing the setbacks before the ZBOA, which Mr. Patterson said the homeowner might want to pursue because of his landscaping plans.

Ms. Lutz said, "It appears on this plan that the east wall of the proposed garage does line up with the east wall of the existing residence," and she asked if this is "important." Mr. Dickerson said on the east side, there is "substantially more than 5'" of setback. Ms. Lutz said she isn't talking about setbacks but "visually, we try to think about at least the street-facing buildings on blocks."

Mr. Dickerson said there's 35' from the house back to "the first whiff of a garage" at the bump-out. Mr. Allison asked if Ms. Lutz meant that the garage should be closer to the corner. Ms. Lutz said no, she means that the garage "should line up with the east wall of the house, if you went straight back." If he did that, Mr. Patterson said, the homeowners "wouldn't have any parking." Mr. Dickerson said he's not sure what Ms. Lutz is saying is relevant here. Ms. Lutz said it "appears that it does line up." It's a relevant point to prevent the houses within a block from being "back and forth, back and forth," she said. There are approximately 125' from "Bay Street back to that," Mr. Dickerson said, so a 6" adjustment doesn't seem to "make any sense here."

Mr. Allison made a motion to grant approval of the application, based on the house being set back 5' off the site; the windows could be simplified if the applicant chooses to, and staff should review the kind of garage door the applicant is submitting because "the drawing's a little bit vague." Ms. Pringle seconded the motion.

Mr. Allison reiterated that the board prefers that the windows do not have lites. **The motion passed unanimously.**

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Dickerson said applications have been submitted for the open positions on the HDRB, and there are people in the queue to appear before city council for interviews, but he doesn't know when council will appoint new board members. The city manager has told Mr. Dickerson that the matter of more board members would be resolved.

There was a general discussion about the HDRB process and staff approvals.

There being no further business to come before the board, **Mr. Dickerson made a motion to adjourn the meeting**, and the meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.