

Special meeting minutes from 2/3/05

Pat Ilderton: Do we have the prevue to look at all major construction on the whole island? I don't know if we want to do that I am just saying we want to do that. When we were talking about forming a board a couple of years ago we were talking about a board that would look at everything but we may not want that, as opposed to just historical houses and historical footprints. The whole idea of a board started because we were having these large houses built the idea was to give the town some architectural flexibility that could be built with some guidelines or some suggestions.

Duke Wright: What house are you talking about?

Pat Ilderton: The one on front beach station 22 the one with the red roof.

Kent Praise: Kat does everyone have the January 19 memo from Andy?

Kat: Yes

Andy Benke: the planning commission made some suggestion that are in dark print which are particularly 21—94 they have gone through the entire Article 11 the Design Review Board. The planning commission has revisited some things they though needed to be fine-tuned. Town council specifically wanted you to look at that and comment on what the planning commission said.

Duke Wright: In the articles if you look at the outline I made I tried to capture under each one under the January 15 draft under article eleven the first one section 21-91 B (1) powers of the board- proposed language empowers the DRB to control design of virtually any project on Sullivan's Island.

Kent Praise: Where are you reading?

Duke Wright: article eleven sections 21-91-B

Kent Praise: but it doesn't do that.

Duke Wright: It's not clear in my opinion.

Kent Praise: In mine its clear. It says the operative phrase is governed by the zoning ordinance. If it's not specifically listed in the zoning ordinance that you have the authority to do something with respect to it but you don't. I think it is misinterpreted when it gives you authority to review everything in any manner.

Pat Ilderton; That is one of the things we have to address do we want to specify in the ordinance or do we want to keep it as it is. Do we want to look at the draft from Andy first or do we want to look at the Design Review Manual first? One might make the other less significant in our consideration when we meet.

Duke Wright: Does the Design Review Manual is its intent to deal with work on Historical Homes and historical overlays? It doesn't necessarily talk to properties at the rest of the island.

Steve Herlong: that one clearly is for the Historical properties and overlays and clearly has nothing to do with the other properties. The town council has specifically asked us to review these three articles of the purposed ordinance of the community commercial District, RS – Single Family Residential District and the Design Review Board. As well as the design review manual for historic resources. There are general concepts of how we are to set up is on the table. Do we think that we should be reviewing all properties would we recommend to town council that we look at all properties?

Pat Ilderton: They may not agree with us. They are looking to us for advice. They see us with more construction design and land expertise than most other bodies on Sullivan's island, At least a help to the zoning board.

Steve Herlong: Maybe Kent knows better than we do, The proposed ordinance is it intended for a property owner that is building a new house that is not asking for any additional relief, do they have to come to the review board? I am not clear on that.

Kent Prause: the consultants have recommended it one-way and the council has additional elements to it is almost like apple and oranges. You need to decide what role you want to have and once that role has been established craft the ordinance to achieve that. Currently in the single-family residence part the design the way the cooper consultants have structured it is the design review board has a role in altering design or zoning standards. If you come in with a plan that meet all the standards as set forth in the ordinance you get a permit. If there is any question if it meets the standards it comes to you for interpretation. Or if they want to employ any techniques to modify the standards than that comes to you all and you make a determination to if they have met the neighborhood compatibilities, or utilize these other design guidelines because they are not standards, grant them the modification.

Steve Herlong: this is very different than the way other review boards in the area are set up, and it seems very confusing.

Kent Prause: if you view that in the context of what it is it is straightforward. Is that the role that you perceive for yourselves? Is that the role that council wants for you? Is that what the people want.

Pat Ilderton: I feel what the zoning board has drawn up is to strict and to let someone use those standards will cause some bad architecture and you are giving them a license to do that.

Steve Herlong: I think you can meet the intent of zoning and still build an offensive house in the neighborhood.

Michael Daly: the last meeting we were at I understood that they were going to make the standards strict and than coming to us to review every plan and we would interpret and they would give some leniencies to set backs, different standards, but everyone would have to come to us. We could start off with set backs and lot coverage's as strict as they are, they are too strict.

Pat Ilderton: We are going in opposition to what the zoning board has suggested, not really opposition but in a different tact and I don't know if that is our mission but I felt like they were looking for ideas from people.

Kent Prause: what do you want to do with it?

Steve Herlong: I am concerned. A general concern is that there are a lot of speck builders designing to the maximum and those houses don't seem compatible to the neighborhood so you will be able to take those new purposed ordinances still do that and still not have to come before the board.

Kent Prause: So you view your role in oversight as having more flexibility and you should look at everything that comes along. And you should have the flexibility to make determinations as to

Pat Ilderton: to Setbacks, coverage shapes. I would prefer not to get into details as to what color or metal roof.

Steve Herlong: I would want to look at it as neighborhood compatibility issue that I would want to look at it.

Pat Ilderton: That is going to open a lot for interpretation but everyone says your setting a president and Sullivan's Island, but how many times has Sullivan's Island been sued

over zoning issues. Not enough that it has changed the nature and the substance of Sullivan's island. Agree with Steve to give us more flexibility and to review everything but giving more flexibility to the limitations. There are three issues: set backs, lot coverage and square footage requirements I think that square footage requirements have no business being in here at that doesn't mean anything because it doesn't have anything to do with good architecture. On station 9 or ten you may allow a closer set back because there are a lot of older homes with minimal setbacks and that is a great look down there. It may be less appropriate in the middle of the island. We would be able to allow and comment on those things.

Steve Herlong: We would be able to allow it within our authorization there has to be limits.

Pat Ilderton: Yes there does have to be limits and everyone have limits. And they are all different. (Gave examples)

Steve Herlong; As I said in the last Design Review Board meeting I think that when a property is historic or in a historic district even a new home should be judged in a completely different way, more closely we may speak on the materials that are going on those homes and that is what we have been requested to do the way its set up. But I don't think we (the Design Review Board) should be to concerned on the materials on a new home, we should be more concerned about setbacks, and lot coverage.

Pat Ilderton: We wouldn't want to see hardy plank on one of the officer's quarters, if it is severely damaged and rebuilt we wouldn't hardy plank

Kent Praise: do you all feel that way?

Duke Wright: I think that we are all saying the same thing. Betty don't you feel that way?

Betty Harmon: Yes I think so.

Duke Wright: The perimeters are set such as the setback, let coverage, height.

Kent Praise: Let me offer a couple of comments on that one way to look at it. They like these prescriptive standards because it tells you what you can and cannot do. What they are saying is that if there are no standards there is no way to tell what is going to be approved. And therefore we don't know what to design and it cost a lot of money to design and if it may not be approved or drags the process out. It is also easier for Randy and I who look at the plans it's easier for us to say yes it meets the setbacks or height because they are set. In the prescriptive standards even they may be difficult and we have to measure to see if the length of the side is two thirds the width of the lot its black and white you either meet the requirements or you don't. That gives everyone involved an idea where they stand.

Pat Ilderton: you mean initially but they would still have to meet with us..

Kent Praise: that is just one-way of looking at it. The other way which all of you seem more favorable to is with out putting any value judgment on it you look at things that are more general context of a size, scale mass does it fit and it doesn't have to be exactly like and may have elements different from the houses around it but you like it and it works. But its more subjective interpretation. That is a legitimate approach I understand that's what the DRB downtown does. They have no rigid guidelines for their historic district. The historic homes and district have to be treated differently. With existing homes and new houses that can compromise the district it self and you have to be careful not to let that happen. But outside the district you have pretty much free rein on what you want to

happen and what I am hearing is that you want to concentrate more on size, scale, mass something that fits and not architectural detail, material.

Pat Ilderton: That is how I feel.

Duke Wright: Isn't that pretty much how it is written?

Michael Daly: it is.

Pat Ilderton: the problem is the limits they have put on them the 20 foot set backs.

Kent Prause: I would say that at least in the RS-district it is extremely prescriptive. Randy and I have talked about this to I fell like they have given enough of a (you say to restrictive) in our opinion its lenient enough where the speck builders will figure what they need to do and they will do it so that they wont have to the DRB in other words it is not restrictive enough to force them to come to you to get these modifications. Its like 15% modification on a size of the house is like a couple hundred feet.

Randy Robinson: what is in there now is like a 10% modification.

Duke Wright: I am confused now you say it's too prescriptive on one hand and than you say it's not prescriptive enough on the other hand.

Kent Prause: what were saying it's not prescriptive enough to force them to come to you. I think that your perspective is what is there now is to restrictive.

Pat Ilderton: number one do we want all construction to come to us? That is the question we have to ask ourselves?

Michael Daly: I think that council wants us to review all construction.

Kent Prause: but that's not the way it's written, if you think it is please show me where.

Pat Ilderton: that is not the way it is written. Do we want that and I think we should talk about if they want a momentary quality change or a small (? could not understand) that they wouldn't have to come to use. I think we should look at eliminating little things to their homes. But do we want all major construction to come to us. Do we want to suggest getting some out lines we still need to have setbacks, but do we want to suggest less difficult setback or leave them as long as we have the power to say these work well and understand your argument we agree its ok to do this house.

Steve Herlong: I think that Kent and randy have a point the prescriptions that are in this single family residential district guidelines something we might want to go through and read it together to see what it says we may not agree with all of them but having that limitation make sure that speck builders that move over here have to design a generally smaller home. The question is if you meet those entire prescriptive requirements and still have to come to us, what power can we have to day yes you meet the prescriptive but we don't agree with it

Kent Prause: currently No. Why do you want to have those prescriptive if they don't mean anything?

Pat Ilderton: why would you want those difficult prescriptive if we are going to review everything and make comments on everything.

Steve Herlong: if a homeowner comes to us and wants to do a house and has reasons that they want some relief from the prescriptive they can come to us and we can agree or not to give them relief. But a speck builder will be forced to keep the houses smaller and in scale and a homeowner will have a point to argues of course so would a speck builder but we could agree or disagree. But there a lot to be said for the way its set up. Maybe we should read through this.

Pat Ilderton: Lets go through this. Article three

Duke Wright: Go to article eleven for just a minute. I think it gives authority now but Kent says it doesn't because it says governed by the zoning ordinance in A-3 It says Governing the erection, demolition removal in whole or in part, or alteration, of buildings, structures and /or grounds. It doesn't say just in the historic district.

Pat Ilderton: but if you look farther down as Kent said that's just the purpose.

Kent Prause: that is just the purpose.

Duke Wright: your being too picky.

Kent Prause: that's what lawyers do when it goes to court.

Duke Wright: than to make it right you would strike out governed by the zoning ordinance.

Kent Prause: I would suggest to you decide how you want to do it and than craft the ordinance to achieve that goal. It appears what is happening now the consultants have established one format. And now we are trying to shove something else into that structure Whereas if that's not the venue to review this stuff than scrap it and do what you want to do to achieve your goals. I would kind of restructure 21-91, as an intent I would because it goes on to say establishment and purpose and powers and composition of board they are all under intent maybe they should be listed differently the powers is the most important part it operation.

Duke Wright: that's what I said if you look at what is in bold print and took out governed by this zoning ordinance.

Kent Prause: than what is the effect of someone who comes to you and they have met all the design standards than what is your role? You are going to look at it

Duke Wright: approve subject to modification or deny approval subject to the standards.

Kent Prause: by what standards are you going to do that.

Duke Wright: the ones we are getting ready to look at.

Kent Prause: so you would leave the prescriptive standards

Duke Wright: if we decide to leave the prescriptive standard that is what we are going to do right now.

Pat Ilderton: we are going to have to have some standards.

Steve Herlong: if someone comes to the board meeting all of the prescriptive standards than how are we going to judge them?

Duke Wright: we don't want to have someone come in and build a structure within the prescriptive standards here. That we say is not compatible or doesn't fit in with the nature of the island.

Pat Ilderton: the thing is we have to have something to base that on are observations such as why is this good architect.

Andy Benke: don't you feel that zoning ordinance itself should drive the construction? Like Steve just said you could build a large ugly house and never come before the design review board so if the prescriptive standards of the zoning ordinance are tight it we Could force everyone to come here and than the design review board would look at the guidelines and say you have achieved these guidelines but we are going to give you 15 % more square footage.

Pat Ilderton: You make a good point what you might want to is that but still say that everything has to come before us

Kent Prause: than maybe those should not be prescriptive standards but more in the way of guidelines.

Steve Herlong; but than someone meets the prescriptive standards and they come to us and they meet al the standards but cant we say that they don't meet the neighborhood compatibility standard, may meet the prescriptive standards but may not be compatible.

Kent Prause; than why do we want to have those prescriptive standards what is the purpose why wouldn't you just use the neighborhood compatibility standards to judge all the plans.

Michael Daly: I don't think that council would pass that.

Steve Herlong: if you have the prescriptive standards at least everyone has to have made an effort to comply with something before they come to us and than it will be easier to judge it.

Duke Wright: the other way makes everything subjective each individual has there own likes and dislikes. That would be a confrontational situation in almost every admission.

Kent Prause: you would run into a confrontational situation if someone designed something according to prescriptive standards and than the board did not approve it

Steve Herlong: except that it may not meet the neighborhood compatibility standards.

Kent Prause: That is subjective.

Pat Ilderton: our neighborhoods on Sullivan's Island are so many different structures spread out all over the island. it has always been that way and that's the charm of it and that is what we are trying to preserve.

Duke Wright; How do you prevent someone from coming in on a 10,000 square foot lot without standards (lot coverage) and prevent them from putting a house there that covers ninety percent of the lot?

Steve Herlong. I think basically the setbacks and lot coverage percentages; we have some prescriptive standards for that.

Kent Prause: what you are seeing more and even in that situation with 10,1100 sq ft lot and you all know this as designers and builders as far as the investment people make in their property its not on a per square foot basis, and people think they are buying the location they want to be on Sullivan's island and they are paying the money to be here.

And they are going to want just as large and swimming pool as the gut next to them. It all depends on how you view it. If you think the general perception among the public is where are theses lots should the houses be more like each other or should there be smaller houses on smaller lots of course these people buying the lots are going to want to build as big a house as possible and it is almost required for the amount of money they are paying for the land. When you get into a situation like Duke says with lot coverage and setbacks, that is a more descriptive way to dictate you have to have smaller homes on smaller lots. You want a larger home you have to have a larger lot. That is just one way of looking at it.

Duke Wright: is that good?

Kent Prause there is two different ways to look at it.

Duke Wright: than you have to look at the neighborhood compatibility issue.

Kent Prause: true but than do you want variety in your neighborhoods that is also a part of the charm of any neighbor hood; any of the older neighborhoods have variety. There different size lots, different size houses, different architectural styles, if you make it that everything starts to look the same and is the same size you start to loose that charm.

Pat Ilderton; it seems to me why we wouldn't want more lenient. As you say neighborhood compatibility and we interpret it and the board interprets it and if the board

change in two years and changes it a little bit. The nature of Sullivan's island has been that. Town council has been one way and the zoning and planning another way. Planning and zoning has been lenient at times and than at other times they have been stricter. if this board changes in five years and they change what they are allowing or not allowing something it always changes. At some point it is going to slow down.

Steve Herlong: the prescriptive standards being so restrictive and than we are in the position of giving the applicants some relief. it's a much position to be in than having to say not no try again its not working. Maybe we can suspend that little notch you have so it looks better,

Kent Prause: maybe those things should be in the line of guidelines than prescriptive standards. The way it is currently written you can offer some modifications (maybe that would work

Pat Ilderton; it might be. What happens when they have to go to us but also the board of zoning and appeals? What about our recommendations how does that weigh with the board of zoning appeals> maybe that's why they should be suggestions but not hard and fast that way they wouldn't have to go the board of zoning and appeals.

Steve Herlong: if it is a suggestion it still comes to us but we have the power to say you didn't meet the prescriptive requirements and we think that you need to in this case. Or no you need to apply this one at least it gives us a guideline to work under. As apposed to four or five of us sitting there going with subjective opinions

Pat Ilderton: I think what we should suggest is that these are guidelines and maybe we need to suggest what the guidelines are we need to be specific.

Steve Herlong; and with them being guidelines than everyone comes to this board and we use these guidelines as a structure for analyzing the submittal.

Michael Daly: that's good.

Steve Herlong; I just really am concerned about???

Pat Ilderton: In the mean time there has to be some limits there has in the ordinance, some setbacks some lot coverage some basics. They have limitations all over the area.

Kent Prause: I would recommend that.

Duke Wright: if you look at page eleven (11) a minimum front yard setback that is where it starts

Steve Herlong: Section 21-22 is where we get into it. So what we have there is a guideline what is an absolute requirement is it a guideline or a standard?

Kent Prause: it is a standard. They are called zoning standards.

Duke Wright: where it says encroachments into yard setbacks for example it doesn't say anything about guidelines or standards there.

Steve Herlong: so that is no different than it is now

Kent Prause: that just provides some exceptions right off the top.

Duke Wright: minimum front yard setback,

Kent Prause: and you will see at the end of it you can grant up to a 15% modification.

Duke Wright: but those are all standard that means no if ands or buts those are standards. Unless we grant a modification.

Pat Ilderton: if this were adopted like this where would it leave the board of zoning and appeals? Would they be in this process for a homeowner?

Kent Prause: only to extend they would want something more than a 15% modification. In other words they couldn't go to the board of zoning appeals I want a variance with in

that 15% they would tell them that they need to go to the DRB first. If they wanted something greater than what you could grant they would have to go there. as it is currently structured if they do the design standard they don't come to you . If you want all the to come to you it almost seems like its two separate things. Why do you have this design standard and now your telling me???

Pat Ilderton: they should be guidelines and not standards. There needs to be some standards.

Steve Herlong: I don't see how you can deal with the front yard setback being a suggestion. Certain things have to be given as a minimum.

Kent Prause: it seems like than. I think the things that Michael said that the council will be unwilling to wavier too much on would be like setbacks, height and lot coverage.

There would have to be some minimum standards.

Michael Daly: I do think that some of the standards are too strict.

Pat Ilderton: we could do one of two things: we could go through the standards and suggest and be liberalized or we can go and suggest that the percentages be liberalized.

Michael Daly: percentage would be fine.

Kent Prause: Just grant a greater percentage of digressions to the DRB.

Michael Daly; there seems to be 15%.

Kent Prause: than what your saying is that would provide more incentive to come to you. Because if we do these other things than they will be able to give us more than 15%? Or would you prefer everything comes to you and than you have.

Pat Ilderton: I think that everything major should be coming to us.

Steve Herlong: if it is so restrictive that it can't be offensive because its not pushing any boundaries anywhere, maybe that is the way to go. Keep it very restrictive but give us the ability to grant larger modifications.

Pat Ilderton: but they still have to come before us.

Steve Herlong: No. Maybe we don't have to require them to come before us, and that would mean less wholesale changes in this ordinance. It would be just tweaking the ordinance because it's already here. It would be easier for the town to move forward.

Duke Wright: If I hear you this first DRB on page 12 talking about setbacks for example are you saying where it says the design review board may grant up to a 15%

Modification changes that to 25%? Just increase it?

Steve Herlong: As an example, it is debatable whether the DRB should be granting 20% on front yard setbacks and corner lot issues.

Pat Ilderton; they are suggesting 20feet on side yard issues.

Steve Herlong: But that is not in this section. This section only covers shallow lot, corner lot.

Kent Prause: I think one of the main issues is the additional front yard setback over a height of a certain feet that is something we don't have right now. It is similar to what we have for the side yard setback. It requires that portions of the building set back further the higher it is..

Steve Herlong:??? For twenty feet every foot above that you set back a foot.

Kent Prause: One to one currently along a forth five-degree slope. Even there if you grant a fifteen percent modification what does that really mean?

Pat Ilderton: that is limiting so much to possibly good architecture or good ideas that maybe be a facet. But than their might bee a vertical facet that might look great. Again there trying to say houses should look like this and not all houses should look the same.
Steve Herlong; Number four a seems to be saying about the same thing as? Are there two a's, b's c's

Duke Wright: are you on page eleven?

Steve Herlong: bottom of eleven and top of page twelve. Some wrong numbering.

Kent Prause: they should be the first a and b are in parentheses and the second ones are not

Duke Wright: the next set of a, b, c are subsets of bowleg b there.

Kent Prause: it should be like a one, two, three. The way it is innumerate is incorrect.

One and two would be under b and c would be its own in bowleg.

Steve Herlong: so does that mean c only applies to only four additional front yard setbacks? I think that is the intent.

Pat Ilderton: than they have the same thing under principal building, they have that saying in other areas and we might want to add more areas.

Kent Prause; for example there is no relief for the twenty five foot front yard set backs under one or under the corner lot number two

Pat Ilderton. We want it to refer so they could have that relief, if we wanted to grant it.

Duke Wright for the twenty-five feet is you talking about

Steve Herlong; in order to do that this has to be a guideline and not a standard isn't that correct?

Kent Prause: no they are providing a modification to these entire zoning standard that is how it is set up.

Duke Wright: than couldn't the language be. Than the design review board is issue here wouldn't that address everything under big paragraph B: minimum front yard setback.

That should not be restricted to additional front yard setbacks?

Pat Ilderton: Maybe certain areas need to be different percentages?

Steve Herlong; someone could come to us and say I want our front yard to be ten feet and we may find an instance where that is compatible with the neighborhood.

Pat Ilderton: I think in certain areas that is a possibility.

Steve Herlong: we are saying that the design review board should have a lot of control of zoning issues and that is very much a zoning issue compared to a architectural issue.

Pat Ilderton maybe we don't. I think it will be fine. There have to be reasons why we do certain things and during our discussions we will have to enumerate our reasons.

Steve Herlong; I wonder how this will be viewed by town council and planning commission

Pat Ilderton: I think what we just need to say what we need to have and than be heard, we won't be agreed on in every instance because we are not going to be supported by planning and zoning board.

Steve Herlong; do you tend to agree with that. The Design Review Board should have authority to grant an increase. I think currently it says only for number four.

Duke Wright: I think to clean up that format that should be paragraph bowleg five.

Kent Prause; it should be its own separate subparagraph.

Steve Herlong: should we keep in going through it. Principal building construction adjacent to post

FEMA so when you are building a house next to an older house

Duke Wright; did we go with a twenty-five foot front yard setback? We could go up to fifty percent.

Steve Herlong: once you get to that you may be dealing with a property that has a hardship and they have to go to the other boards.

Kent Prause: you are talking about a front yard setback too. And all the buildings are elevated.

Pat Ilderton: basically well stay with in the fifteen-foot setback like we have now.

Kent Prause: when you start talking about bringing elevated buildings up closer to the street than they seem a lot higher when they are set back on the lot.

Steve Herlong: we can't solve every problem here some of them are hardship conditions

Kent Prause: than they have to go for a variance.

Duke Wright: so shall we leave it at fifteen feet? The next one leave at fifteen as well it's a side yard setback.

Michael Daly: the side yard setback should be more.

Kent Prause: as it stands now there is no.

Duke Wright: it doesn't give us any authority in paragraph c.

Pat Ilderton: no but we need to add our authority there. Than do we want to change the total forty foot? Or do we want to suggest a change there.

Steve Herlong: or do we keep it and just suggest a higher percentage.

Pat Ilderton: let's keep it and just suggest a higher percentage.

Michael Daly: right now they have fifteen percent and if we bring it down to thirty feet so if we went to twenty percent we would be closer to getting to ten.

Duke Wright so we say that the Design Review Board may grant up to what percent twenty-five of forty. Minimum principal side façade set back. Is fifteen percent all right for that?

Steve Herlong: I think that this one is tough this is the one where I am starting to have trouble with this one what if you have a situation of vertical walls you have stairwells and now you have steps to deal with.

Pat Ilderton: I don't think that steps ought to be in there, but that is another issue altogether. I think that we just need to say that this is just too difficult to deal with because some sides of houses could be vertical all the way up and look great. They are trying to say all the houses should be shaped a certain way.

Kent Prause: than maybe what you want to do is put the percent modification to nothing so that you could have a vertical wall.

Steve Herlong: up to one hundred modifications is that what you are saying.

Duke Wright: minimum rear yard setback.

Steve Herlong; again that forces everyone to come to us unless they want to meet that.

Kent Prause: in that instance that's where it makes sense. If people want to have a vertical wall than they have to come to us you have to do these other things to demonstrate compatibility.

Duke Wright: under e it is already granted there.

Michael Daly: you get into all kinds of different things like rc-1 and rc-2.

Duke Wright; that has to do with the oceanfront and marsh.

Pat Ilderton: we could go to fifteen or twenty percent there.

Steve Herlong; I think that you need to be real careful there.

Pat Ilderton: we are still on minimum rear yard what about rear yard.

Kent Prause maybe you just want to do it on rear yard and shallow lot. Leave out rc-1 and rc-2. I don't think that council would let you deal with that.

Duke Wright: why don't we put in a paragraph three inserted there that the only on paragraph one and two and make the others four and five? What percentage are we talking about there fifteen percent?

Michael Daly; no we left it alone. .

Kent Prause is there any instances where you would want it any closer to a rear lot?

Pat Ilderton there are peculiar lot shapes and houses all over this island.

Duke Wright: so we make the rear twenty-five?

Steve Herlong: that seems right to me.

Kent Prause: is that feet or percent? Okay twenty five percent modification.

Duke Wright: under section twenty-three we are no going to fool with those. Twenty for building height that hasn't section twenty-four building height that doesn't have a percentage at all.

Steve Herlong: I don't see any change here it gives us the ability to tell them they need to be lower

Kent Prause: I think they were leaving that up to the individual that if they did reduce the height that would provide the neighborhood compatibility that would allow modifications to other standards. What ever you do in the way of making greater neighborhood compatibility goes toward modifications in any of the standards that allow modifications.

Pat Ilderton: maybe they could cover there lot thirty five percent because the flow of the house the house may flow so we are able to give them more lot coverage.

Kent Prause: that was one of the things that they voiced what if they wanted to have a single story house should they be able to get some relief from some of the other requirements and they thought that they should.

Duke Wright: are we going to leave this like it is?

Yes.

Duke Wright: section twenty-five, do we want the Design Review Board like it is on page fifteen?

Kent Prause: that is the one that they really struggled with a lot. 21 -25 B

Pat Ilderton: Kent how would you simplify that so that you could look at a lot the town council, designers, builders and prospective buyers to say it is going to be easier to figure.

Kent Prause: you are the ones who design and build these houses so I would think you know as well as anybody what size house is right for the right size lot. As a maximum that is where it will be really tough to have a degree of flexibility or subjectivity that is one issue that people are most concerned about is how big a house can I build.

Pat Ilderton: I think they are talking about mass and not square footage.

Michael Daly: I think it seems unfair that you have 1/2 acrea lot and you have 1/4 acre lot and you get 3 more percent.

Kent Prause: there again you build houses on the lots and Steve you design them what do you think is fair.

Michael Daly: for a smaller lot it seems unfair that if you are half the size of a half-acre lot you get three percent more.

Steve Herlong: again if we hold these tight and grant the higher percent increase it seems like there is more control over what is happening in those instances. In (a) ½ acre lot that is fifteen now and that's fine if someone wants more than they can come to us for more.

Pat Ilderton; what percentage would we want to put in there for us?

Steve Herlong: as the lots go smaller the percentages should get a little higher. In a consistent way.

Pat Ilderton: Up to a graduated percentage increase that we could allow.

Kent Prause: They have done that than you can bump it up an additional 12 1/2 percent.

Duke Wright: How did this formula get so precise?

Kent Prause: Bobby Thompson.

Michael Daly: I don't know why it can't go fifteen or twenty or even twenty-five.

Pat Ilderton: why don't we just go fifteen, fifteen, and twenty and keep the twenty-five or should we go to thirty or is that too large?

Steve Herlong: I think that if it stays twenty-five and we talk of adjusting the percentage we are allowed to make.

Duke Wright: and then we can say that the Design Review Board may increase by no more than twenty.

Kent Prause: Bump the twelve and a half to twenty?

Duke Wright: yes and try to keep all the decimals out of it.

Michael Daly: It was four thousand square foot on a half acre lot and if you did everything required you could get up to forty-four hundred square feet.

Kent Prause: keep in mind too that this is just the square foot coverage.

Pat Ilderton: It's just the lot coverage of the structure.

Duke Wright: It's not the livable space.

Michael Daly: It still sets with the first floor to convey?

Kent Prause: Correct.

Steve Herlong: this is going to be one of those areas that I think the adhoc committee wanted a little more liberal coverage so that you aren't forced into the box homes but our holding the coverage if we have the ability to grant twenty percent relief.

Duke Wright: does that second paragraph under the Design Review Board in cases of interpretation of enclosed principal building coverage area, the Design Review board shall determine what portion of the enclosed principal building coverage area shall be included or excluded in the calculations what does that mean?

Steve Herlong: I think that it becomes a little subjective as when does a screen porch becomes heated area or sunroom.

Duke Wright: so that should stay there.

Kent Prause: I think so.

Pat Ilderton: how about 21-26

Duke Wright: we can go to twenty five percent

Michael Daly: again I think it's restrictive on a smaller lot. I think it should be a larger percentage for lot coverage than 31.3 percent for lots less than fifteen thousand square feet, you can't have a driveway and you cant have a shed.

Pat Ilderton; do you suggest we increase that to thirty-five or forty percent? We could also enlarge it to thirty-five and give the Design Review Board a percent swing in the too.

Kent Prause: there are two different ways of looking at it, some people lot at the lot coverage and this is impervious coverage once you start moving up on it you start

affecting drainage and water quality and that has a bearing on it. This deals with extra like driveways, out buildings and pools.

Michael Daly: if you have a lot size the half the amount of a half acre lot and your covering impervious it seems to be restrictive.

Kent Prause: it is for people who move out to the island

Randy Robinson: you can take a lot and have thirty percent coverage and you than if they want to do twenty percent more impervious coverage they can create a pervious by putting a drain pipe under their driveway.

Pat Ilderton: is that provision in the article III if not is there a way to insert it into the document?

Kent Prause: in some ways it is almost implied because this is a restriction on impervious surfaces. What we have looked at is you bring us what you propose in a pervious or semi pervious material and we will look at it and if it is that than this doesn't apply to this. You can actually go up to fifty percent of coverage. We have thirty percent impervious but you could do an additional twenty percent of a pervious surface treatment up to fifty percent.

Michael Daly: the fifty percent also covers their lot.

Steve Herlong: under 21-26 under C. Design Review Board. (2) It almost as if you have a special condition or special solution you need to come to the board and present it and we can grant you some relief.

Kent Prause: that is correct you can grant up to 25% that is a quarter and that's a lot.

Duke Wright: so we leave that as written. 21-27

Pat Ilderton: Principal building square footage.

Duke Wright: now that is livable heated and cooled space.

Pat Ilderton; I think that whole section should be removed. If we do our job right square footage becomes irrelevant.

Kent Prause; one example is sooner or later someone is going to come over here and buy several lots and abandon lot lines and make one extra large lot if you have discretionary authority to be able to say you cant have a 20 thousand square foot house

Michael Daly; lets put a higher percentage on how much square footage we can allow.

Kent Prause: I would suggest you have a cap on how large a house you can build on Sullivan's Island and not just leave it to lot coverage.

Steve Herlong:The equation of section B #3 the consultants stated 12 sq but the town has lowered it to 10 feet I think that it should stay 12

Duke Wright: you would have to do the equation of 21-27 B: #3

Kent Prause: a couple of comments in reference to that one of the council members was in favor of holding down the size of the house and putting the extra in making them come to the Design Review Board, and another one supported having a minimum standard of square footage for a half acre lot, another member his concept of you can have a certain size house and you can put it anywhere on the lot that you want and the Design Review Board can do is to increase the size if you do the requirements. If the board reviews all plans they can solve that situation.

Steve Herlong: the argument than is maybe we keep t he formula at 10 where the planning commission wanted it but we want to increase the percentage that we can provide for adjustment.

Betty Bragg Harmon: I agree to that.

Steve Herlong: we could make it 25% if someone wants to build a very large house it should not be very easy.

Michael Daly: That would mean a 5200 square foot house.

Kent Prause: If they put this to 25% what would that mean Andy

Andy Benke: 5517 square feet.

Michael Daly: Does this 44 already take in the 10 % I thought that it was 4000 and than if you did everything it would be 4400. Lets change the 12 to 10 and than increase the 10% to a maximum to 25% on a half acre lot.

Betty Bragg Harmon: they would only get that extra if we granted it, is that right.

Kent Prause I think I understand that you are saying you would be reviewing each application to enforce the neighborhood compatibility issue it would have to be designed so that it would blend in with the other houses.

Duke Wright: now 21-28 Third Story

Kent Prause: the third stories were beginning to look like pillbox houses. Maybe if you had some discretion in that regards that could be handled. If we had a prescriptive requirement to enhance there square footage and it ended up being a distinctive architectural element.

Steve Herlong: This limits anyone from building a tower like structure but 20x20 third story. It's very hard to do and do well so that it looks good for a third story. people want to maximize

Michael Daly: if you have stairs going into it that eats up about 80 foot of it.

Steve Herlong: So we are allowed to grant a 15% modification so that we can say 400 square feet is excessive in certain issues should it prescribed that half is wall area within the existing roof area.

Duke Wright: I don't understand its says and shall only fifty percent of its wall area projecting outside the roof area as measured from the outside of the wall studs. What does that mean?

Steve Herlong: The intent is to hide it down inside the roof the main roof.

Duke Wright: Do we leave that as is.

Steve Herlong: Kent do you recall planning commission debate on this area section 21-29 Principal building front and side façade. Section C. design standards

Kent Prause: They struggled with that I think there were some initial thoughts of eliminating it also, than they came back around saying that the Design Review Board can grant modification we will leave it. There also was some discussion on the four feet that's just a decorative treatment.

Steve Herlong: I have tried that and it doesn't look right. (4-foot porch #2 principal buildings side façade) this is really not very clear.

Kent Prause: well B does say side porch.

Pat Ilderton: it will be our decision where the porch goes.

Steve Herlong: this next one gives us a 15% modification we can change that to a 100%.

Kent Prause: That way the decision is the Design Review Board.

Duke Wright: the next section is 21-30 orientations

Kent Prause: this is just a thought and I would have to talk to Larry Dodds about it this the wording say s the Design Review Board may grant up to perhaps more appropriate language should be the Design Review Board may have the authority to modify by up to

x amount. This is permissive to give someone an incentive but again these are more like guidelines.

Randy Robinson: you do have the word excluding principal buildings on lots adjacent to the ocean or marsh.

Pat Ilderton: I am building on a house now that has no street frontage I have a 20-foot access.

Steve Herlong: but than go letter C almost lets them do whatever they want. I think what is saying that if you want to do something different they just have to come to the design Review Board for approval.

Duke Wright: is that ok as it is than?

Michael Daly: The foundation height is another one where the two feet above the FEMA base flood elevation because in an A zone it doesn't allow you to put your heat and air unit under your house.

Steve Herlong: You could put it up in the ceiling

Duke Wright: What do you want removed Michael? The two feet above FEMA.

Steve Herlong: the intent there is to keep people from building four or five feet up

Michael Daly: there is a thirty-eight foot height limit.

Steve Herlong: We could go to C. and raise the fifteen percent to one hundred percent.

Duke Wright: on B#1 are we going to change the bottom elevation say the first floor above fema

Kent Prause: You can't say that .If you have to go above seven you cant go over two feet what FEMA requires in number 1 they are talking about the v-zone and in number 2 they are talking about a zones.

Michael Daly: I think that we should get rid of both of them. Maybe they could put it as a suggestion and not a standard.

Pat Ilderton: I think we should suggest that they strike the whole section.

Betty Bragg Harmon: it should be a guideline.

Duke Wright: the entire section of 21-31 should be eliminated. Section 21-32 is ok the way it is.

Michael Daly: in section 21-32 #2 limited to 4 feet unless it's a fireplace. You can't have a fireplace unless you pour a slab on four piers.

Steve Herlong: The design review board has the ability to modify this. What can we modify its 15%. The intent is for us to meet the code of breakaway walls, it is also saying you have to have lattice.

Michael Daly: you can't have solid walls higher than four feet. What about a house on stilts it doesn't look very nice and may not be neighborhood compatible at least I think what the intent is. Maybe the modification would be for the backside or ocean side of the house so that you could sit under the house and see the house. Maybe we should have more of an ability to modify it but not necessarily a percent issue maybe they need to come to the Design Review Board for different solutions.

Duke Wright: so in Section 21-31 under C. the Design Review Board may grant modifications to this design standard. Although the four feet is really a code issue not a design review issue so we can only modify the slats.

Duke Wright: Do we need to talk about site lighting section thirty-four? Just leave out grant up to a fifteen percent modification .Now we are finished with the standards.

Kent Prause: yes now we are at Design Guidelines. Initially they thought that they were to intrusive but than we discovered what Cooper Consultants were trying to do here and these are guidelines that affect the neighborhood compatibility issue they are not standards if you utilize them than you can get these modifications to the design standards to your discretion.

Steve Herlong: Would we be in a position to make people do these in orders to get relief in the previous sections?

Pat Ilderton: I think that these will give people ideas where we are hoping to go with these issues.

Kent Prause:it says it's a guideline and not binding on the applicant. And that the design review board may encourage the use of this guideline for achieving greater neighborhood compatibility. I don't believe you can force anyone to do them it but for people to use as a guideline.

Pat Ilderton: so everything from here is just guidelines cant we leave them alone.

Duke Wright: go to section 21-43 Preservation of historic properties.

Andy Benke: don't you see the guidelines as a yardstick to

Kent Prause: and it say s they y have the authority to grant it doesn't mean that the board has to grant, they will look at everything combined .You also have the section under neighborhood compatibility under the Design Review Board. Section.

Steve Herlong: Now we go to 21-43 Historic Properties

Betty Bragg Harmon: maybe we could talk about it having to be family renting in the accessory building they have to show some kind of hardship.

Steve Herlong: what is the zoning ordinance's definition of family?

Kent Prause: I believe it is either six or eight unrelated people and any numbers of related people by blood or marriage, plus not more than two domestic servants, living and cooking together as a single household unit.

Betty Bragg Harmon: six or seven unrelated persons

Randy Robinson: If you had three or four college kids living in the house and a couple more living in the accessory

Pat Ilderton: that is only if and when the accessory buildings exist. It may prove that a historic house may be able to have an accessory building or the historic home may become the accessory building.

Duke Wright: are Heidi Brown and Jerald Scheers homes examples of these?

Kent Prause: Jerald Scheers is a little different because t here is already two homes on his lot. If he tears the little one down. Lets use Heidi Brown as an example if she builds a new home on that lot than both of those homes could be used as a single family residence.

Pat Ilderton: Because that was deemed a historical residence now what happens when a large historical residence like a officers quarters and says I cant tear my home down so can I build a littler house in back?

Kent Prause: it says you shall make a case-by-case decision. Efforts are made to retain the historical structure in that instance you would not be obligated to say that they could put up another structure.

Steve Herlong; we also talked about non conforming existing structure and you want to do some additions to it that is possible in items number two, to use the principal building to be used as the dwelling unit.

Kent Prause: I think it is implying that it will be a smaller building. The house that you are retaining will be the larger house. You would not allow a larger house to be built

Steve Herlong: will it be an issue if it is larger structure?

Duke Wright: So what are we saying that the smaller structure has to be the accessory structure?

Kent Prause: you want to preserve some of these smaller homes that will maintained.

Pat Ilderton: hopefully people will just do a nice looking larger addition to these houses that will give them the square footage they need.

Duke Wright: so is that language ok as written.

Pat Ilderton; yes but I think that the language in the entire document needs to be looked at.

Steve Herlong: there is another area in the ordinance that looks at the accessory structures that does allow some additional uses for accessory structures.

Pat Ilderton: I think that we should be able to allow some outbuildings.

Randy Robinson: let me throw something out there on out buildings so that they don't affect the mass.

Kent Prause: accessory use or structure subordinate to the principal building on a lot and used for purposes incidental to the main building. A home office would meet those requirements.

Steve Herlong: That sounds like a mother in law suite would meet those requirements.

Kent Prause: there are some members on the planning commission that are pretty dead set against increasing the density on the island of multiple dwelling places they say the validity of preserving historic structures but not allow it for all people on the island.

There should be more affordable housing on the island. Maybe you should be allowed to rent some of these and have a rental control where you could not ask only a limited amount of rent money

Pat Ilderton: I think that we should recommend that to council.

Kent Prause: I think it should be specified that it should be subordinate to what ever else is built. You need to decide where you want to put your focus on preservation, rehabilitation, reconstruction and additions.

Duke Wright: do you want me to get the suggested changes made and submit them to council before their next meeting.

Steve Herlong: I think one of the questions was do they want the Design Review Board to review everything?

Kent Prause: the board wants you to look at all the commercial plans.

Pat Ilderton: as an owner they have liberalized the commercial district.

Duke Wright: I will get the suggested changes made and written up so that you can submit them to the council.

Kent Prause; you can meet as long as there is not a quorum. But a public meeting should be held in public and you only have to give a twenty for hour notice to meet.

Duke Wright: I motion to adjourn the meeting.

Steve Herlong I second the motion unamous.

