

1 SULLIVAN'S ISLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

2 TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

3 JUNE 20, 2007

4

5

6 BOARD MEMBERS:

7

8 PATRICK ILDERTON, CHAIRMAN

9 FRED REINHARD

10 BETTY HARMON

11 CYNDY EWING

12 WILLIAM CRAVER

13

14

15 STAFF:

16

17 KENT PRAUSE

18 RANDY ROBINSON

19 KAT KENYON

20

21 TOWN ATTORNEY: ANDREW COUNTRYMAN

22

23 REPORTED BY: J. LYNN CLARK, RPR, CSR (Iowa)
CLARK & ASSOCIATES, INC.

24 843.762.6294

25

♀

2

1 CHAIRMAN: This is the June 20th, 2007
2 meeting of Sullivan's Island Design Review Board.
3 It is now 6:05. The members in attendance are Pat
4 Ilderton, Betty Harmon, Cyndy Ewing and Fred
5 Reinhard. And Billy hopefully is coming. The FOIA
6 requirements have been met for this meeting. The
7 items on the agenda are, approval of February 2007
8 minutes. We have the minutes. Does everybody feel
9 good about them?

10 MS. EWING: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN: Do I hear a motion?

12 MS. EWING: I make a motion that we
13 approve the February meeting minutes.

14 MR. REINHARD: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN: Everybody in favor?

16 ALL: Aye.

17 CHAIRMAN: All right. Approval of May
18 2007 minutes.

19 MS. EWING: I don't have any questions
20 on the May minutes. Do you have any questions?

21 CHAIRMAN: Do I hear a motion?

22 MR. REINHARD: Move for approval.

23 CHAIRMAN: Second?

24 MS. HARMON: Second.

25 CHAIRMAN: Everybody in favor?

3

1 ALL: Aye.

2 CHAIRMAN: Fine. 401 Station 20,
3 Heinauer residence, pool accessory structure. We
4 have a letter to be read. We have a couple letters
5 actually. To whom it may concern. Oh, no, no. I
6 can't read those. I will do that for public -- in
7 public comment.

8 Kent, what do you think?

9 MR. PRAUSE: It's an application for a
10 pool with accessory structure, and it looks like it
11 consists of a pool and a spa to the rear of the
12 residence. And the reason why it's here is that
13 you have to approve all accessory structures.

14 CHAIRMAN: Right. Thank you. Thank
15 you. Yes, ma'am. Mrs. Heinauer. You just want to
16 present this, right? And we've got the plans and
17 this is the plans, and I think that's all the
18 Heinauers need to say. But I'll read this during
19 public comment. I'm going to read the letters when
20 I ask for public comment. All right.

21 Public comment, is there anybody here
22 that would like to comment pro or con or whatever

23 on this application?

24 All right. I've got a couple of

25 letters.

♀

4

1 "To whom it may concern, we have
2 reviewed the plans for the new pool at the Heinauer
3 residence at 401 Station 20 and have no objection
4 to the proposed design and construction. Michael
5 and Lilly O'Shaughnessy, next-door neighbors."

6 Do we have one more letter? Right.
7 For the other side of the neighbors. Can I have
8 that, please, so they can add that in the public
9 comment section.

10 "To the Sullivan's Island Design Review
11 Board. We support the plans for Paul and Paula
12 Heinauer's pool as part of their home construction.
13 We are their next-door neighbors at 403 Station 20
14 and feel that their plans for a pool are
15 appropriate and consistent with the feel of the
16 neighborhood. Please feel free to contact us at
17 883-0204 with any questions. Paula and Louise
18 Colmier."

19 All right. Public comment section is
20 closed. Kent, anything to add or --

21 MR. PRAUSE: I guess it's an elevated

22 pool?

23 CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's correct.

24 MR. PRAUSE: That's all.

25 CHAIRMAN: Randy, anything?

♀

5

1 MR. ROBINSON: I don't have anything

2 except it sits in an existing deck that was

3 permitted originally.

4 CHAIRMAN: Right. The deck and all was

5 permitted. What does the Board think?

6 MR. REINHARD: I think it's nicely

7 located and I think we should approve it.

8 MS. EWING: My only question is, Randy,

9 I thought you'd mentioned we are not doing elevated

10 pools anymore? Or is it infinity pools?

11 MR. ROBINSON: It's an infinity edge.

12 You can still do them. It's just how you do them.

13 MS. EWING: So we don't have any

14 problems. I don't have any problems with it.

15 MS. HARMON: I think it looks nice.

16 CHAIRMAN: Do I hear a motion?

17 MR. REINHARD: Move for approval.

18 CHAIRMAN: Second?

19 MS. HARMON: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN: Everybody in favor say aye.

21 ALL: Aye.

22 CHAIRMAN: 2714 I'on, Anderson
23 residence addition. Kent, what do you think?

24 MR. PRAUSE: Proposal is for a
25 five-foot-by-five-foot-four elevator shaft to the

♀

6

1 rear of the residence.

2 CHAIRMAN: I tell you what. I was not
3 involved with that last one, but I need to recuse
4 myself, but this has to be probably put on hold
5 because we don't have a quorum if I recuse myself.
6 So hopefully Billy is going to show up because
7 there's only four of us; is that correct? Can we
8 postpone it until later in the meeting? Hopefully
9 that Billy will show up?

10 MS. HARMON: I make a motion that we
11 postpone it.

12 MR. MCCULLOUGH: Let's postpone it.

13 CHAIRMAN: We'll hear that later on.
14 2708 Middle Street, the Caldwell residence
15 demolition. Excuse me. Oh, it's Hamrick? Okay.
16 Hamrick. I'm sorry. The Hamrick residence, new
17 construction. Or -- right. 2708 Middle Street.
18 Kent, what do you think?

19 MR. PRAUSE: Well, we've got two things

20 listed on the agenda, one's for demolition and
21 one's for new construction.

22 CHAIRMAN: Right. Do we have to
23 hear -- do we have to hear them separately or can
24 we --

25 MR. KENT: I don't know. I'm confused.

⊕

7

1 CHAIRMAN: Let's hear them both at the
2 same time in the interest of time. So let's
3 address --

4 MR. PRAUSE: Well, what they're
5 proposing to do is to demolish an existing lawn
6 grade concrete block apartment and a kitchen
7 addition rear of existing wood frame structure.
8 And they are proposing to add a
9 one-and-one-half-story single-family dwelling and a
10 garage at the side rear of the main structure.

11 They are asking for some modifications
12 to the design standards that you're allowed to
13 grant. They ask for 100 percent modification for
14 the north side second floor facade. And also a 100
15 percent modification for the north side. The
16 facade of the principal building and an additional
17 one-foot modification to increase the finish floor
18 height three feet to four feet above the base level

19 elevation. That's it.

20 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Yes, sir.

21 MR. CLOWNEY: My name is Beau Clowney
22 and this is Kate Campbell. And the Hamricks are
23 here this evening. The demolition that we're
24 talking about, first of all, the main structure is
25 a 1935 sort of center hall box island style sort of

♀

8

1 cottage. This was added a long time ago; I guess,
2 what, in the '50s or '60s. Maybe. We're not real
3 sure. It's cement block on slab. So we're taking
4 that down and actually adding something in largely
5 the same footprint.

6 In terms of the plan -- just
7 conceptually, what we've done is we've tried to
8 just hinge off of one corner of the house basically
9 and leave the mass of this house alone while
10 pulling everything along this property line, which
11 is in the same location as the addition that we're
12 tearing down, creating, you know, just sort of a
13 wrap-around porch. There's a two-story piece back
14 here, and a detached garage. All very much in the
15 spirit of the island architecture. We're trying to
16 in many ways not diminish the scale of the existing
17 structure, and I think this is an important drawing

18 to look at right here because -- and the other
19 elevation, because you'll see how far this
20 two-story piece is from the existing house right
21 here. This is the existing house. And then we've
22 got this piece here. So this little house goes
23 like that, and then we have this piece here that
24 acts as sort of the hinge for the new wing that
25 moves out in that direction. It's pretty

♀

9

1 straightforward. I think we're asking for a few
2 things.

3 Kate, do you want to go through some of
4 that?

5 MS. CAMPBELL: I think Kent kind of
6 covered it, but basically because we're only along
7 the side property line, we've got to get the 1
8 percent variance on the length of the side facade
9 and also the setback at the second floor. The
10 other -- the request for the flood -- or the finish
11 floor high variation is to really -- the existing
12 -- match the existing level of the existing house,
13 which is about four feet up from flood.

14 MR. CLOWNEY: One thing that's
15 different here, what you're looking at, that we
16 made the garage a bit smaller by six feet.

17 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Is there any
18 public comment on this application? Public comment
19 section is closed. Kent, anything?

20 MR. PRAUSE: No. I just -- well, just
21 one thing. Apparently it's not contributed to the
22 district. Is it in --

23 MR. ROBINSON: It's not in the
24 district.

25 MR. PRAUSE: It's not in the district.

♀

10

1 So the only thing that they're here is for those
2 modifications that you're allowed to grant based on
3 neighborhood compatibility.

4 CHAIRMAN: All right. What does the
5 Board think? Questions or --

6 MS. EWING: I think it's a nice plan.
7 I think it's great that you're keeping the 1935
8 structure as it is on Middle Street. I have
9 concerns about the size. And when you look at it
10 in comparison to the homes in the rest of the
11 neighborhood, which are, for the most part, all
12 under 2,000 square feet, I think it's a -- it's a
13 real jump to go up to this square footage. So I
14 have concerns with that.

15 CHAIRMAN: Fred, what do you think?

16 MR. REINHARD: According to the
17 calculations, you're allowed by formula to build
18 4,105 square feet principal building square
19 footage. And you're coming in at 3,733.

20 MS. CAMPBELL: Yes.

21 MR. REINHARD: Which is I guess 91
22 percent --

23 MS. CAMPBELL: Of that.

24 MR. REINHARD: So you're building 91
25 percent of what's allowed. Floor plan to floor

♀

11

1 plan, there really isn't that much of a change.

2 So -- and the two-story element --

3 MR. CLOWNEY: Yeah. The plan -- I've
4 got that too. It's right there. The plan of the
5 two-story piece.

6 MR. REINHARD: Yeah. Could I see the
7 other -- the other elevation?

8 MR. CLOWNEY: The other side elevation.

9 MR. REINHARD: The front elevation.

10 MR. CLOWNEY: If you look at this
11 roofline right here is the roofline of that house
12 and then that one there. So we --

13 MR. REINHARD: On the bottom right
14 there, is that kitchen?

15 MR. CLOWNEY: Yes. That's sort of a
16 pod right over there.

17 MR. REINHARD: Which is a hip roof?

18 MR. CLOWNEY: Right. If you look at
19 this elevation, you'll see through and beyond to
20 that kitchen piece there. So --

21 MR. REINHARD: Well, that helps
22 mitigate the mass of the structure behind it by
23 looking like a traditional turret element on the
24 classic Sullivan's Island house design. So it
25 works for me.

♀

12

1 MR. CLOWNEY: The way we saw that was
2 is that that's sort of like pin to the hinge, and
3 so you're adding --

4 MR. REINHARD: It looks like it should
5 have been there in the first place. I'm okay with
6 it.

7 CHAIRMAN: Billy?

8 MR. CRAVER: Yeah. I'll speak from two
9 perspectives. One is, I live right across the
10 street from it, and, Cyndy, our house is 4,100
11 square feet. So I think -- and there are a number
12 of other houses in the neighborhood that are, you
13 know, in the same size range. So I don't think

14 this is out of line with the neighborhood. And I
15 agree with Fred. I mean I think it's doing a good
16 job of upgrading something that's there and
17 preserving a lot of the character that's there. So
18 I'm for it.

19 CHAIRMAN: Betty?

20 MS. HARMON: Well, I appreciate the
21 fact that they're keeping the front of the house on
22 Middle Street the same. And essentially for me,
23 the only thing that changes is the second roof
24 because of the apartment -- is it cinderblock?

25 MR. CLOWNEY: It is.

♀

13

1 MS. HARMON: It's a second story. So I
2 think it's compatible with the neighborhood, and
3 I'm fine with it.

4 CHAIRMAN: I think this is what really
5 needs to be done, whenever we can, to these little
6 cottages we're trying to save. It's a nice
7 addition, and that's what it is. And it's going to
8 be part of the house. And it's going to be really
9 nice, I think. I think it's a great design or a
10 good design, and I'm all for it. Do I hear a
11 motion?

12 MR. REINHARD: Move for approval.

13 MR. CRAVER: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN: Discussion? Everybody in
15 favor?

16 ALL: Aye.

17 CHAIRMAN: The 2708 Middle Street --
18 no. Excuse me. I'm sorry. 2108 Pettigrew Street,
19 Robinson residence, accessory structure --

20 MR. PRAUSE: Don't you want to go back
21 to Anderson?

22 CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. Let's do the
23 original one that I've got to recuse myself for.
24 Betty, you can take over.

25 MS. HARMON: Okay. Kent?

♀

14

1 MR. PRAUSE: Sure. It's for an
2 addition for a five-by-five-foot-four elevator
3 shaft to the rear of the existing residence.
4 They've included some photographs of existing
5 residence, and also drawings that show the proposed
6 elevator. And I believe that's the only change
7 that they are addressing.

8 MS. HARMON: Randy?

9 MR. ROBINSON: I don't have anything.

10 MS. HARMON: Is the applicant here?

11 MR. SMITH: Yes. I'm Doug Smith with
Page 14

12 Ilderton Contractors. I'm here with the Andersons
13 who are the owners of the house, and this is an
14 older home. It was built in 1908 by Mr. Anderson's
15 father, and he's currently planning to pass -- he's
16 already started the process of passing it down to
17 his children. So it will stay in the family. But
18 he is getting to the point where he cannot navigate
19 his stairs with luggage and groceries and that kind
20 of thing, and necessitates the addition of an
21 elevator.

22 And I went over there and tried to find
23 a place within the footprint of the house to put
24 the elevator, but without taking up necessary
25 space. It's a pretty small house to begin with.

⊕

1 And without taking up necessary space, I just
2 couldn't find a good place to do it. So if you'll
3 look at the fifth picture closer-up view of the
4 house. This is the Middle Street elevation, the
5 rear of the house. There's an existing stoop with
6 a roof over it, and that roof can be extended to
7 the left five feet to cover the addition of an
8 elevator shaft. We can keep the siding and lattice
9 line the same. In other words, put the siding from
10 eight feet up, same material, same color.

11 The foundation walls can be plywood
12 blocked out, and then white lattice put over the
13 outside of it. So this addition will pretty much
14 disappear. The other four pictures were taken from
15 Middle Street that show not much view of this area
16 due to trees and foliage and that kind of thing.
17 And if so desired, we could add another palm tree
18 right in front of this to further obscure the
19 addition.

20 MS. HARMON: Thank you. Public
21 comment?

22 MR. ANDERSON: Henry Anderson. I
23 started to say, I have hearing aids so you'll
24 forgive me if I miss some of it. But I wanted to
25 quickly add this to the presentation. That house

♀

1 has been in the Anderson family since my father
2 built it in 1908. We intend that it will stay in
3 the Anderson family. There's no intent to sell.
4 We've got one grandson and a great-grandson who we
5 hope will continue Anderson ownership.

6 Now, as for the effect of the change,
7 the addition, what most people on the island don't
8 realize is after Hugo, that house was changed very
9 much in that we added a stand on the exterior on

10 the east side for the benefit of dual
11 air-conditioning and heating units. We bulldozed
12 off the front porch. We bulldozed off the rear
13 because the house was on the ground, and we had to
14 have hydraulic jacks to get the house back up in
15 the air. But to meet flood requirements, we had to
16 change the elevation of the house, which meant
17 changing the entrance and exits both front and
18 back.

19 So these -- this change is very minor
20 compared with changes that have been forced upon us
21 because of conditions such as Hugo. If there are
22 any questions, I happen to be the oldest and the
23 only son left, but it was my father who built it.
24 I can navigate those stairs as well as anybody, but
25 not when carrying groceries.

♀

17

1 MS. HARMON: Thank you very much. Any
2 more comment?

3 MR. WILLIAMS: Roy Williams, 2513 I'on
4 Avenue. This is the -- it's called the Arc, is one
5 of the classic island houses. In spite of Hugo, it
6 still survived and it's part of that community that
7 we know as Andersonville. And it has a special I
8 think import for Sullivan's Island, and I would

9 think that adding the elevator is a wonderful,
10 adaptive modern change that is necessary for many
11 of us as we begin to add the years. So I think
12 the -- I think it's not a problem at all.

13 MS. HARMON: Thank you. Any more
14 comment? Public comment closed. Kent, any final
15 comment?

16 MR. PRAUSE: Just wondering if they
17 even need to be here. It's listed as not being
18 contributive, and it's not in an historic district.
19 So if it's neither, then there's no point for them
20 to be here. And there seems to be some question as
21 to whether or not it's on there.

22 MR. ROBINSON: It's on the map as a --

23 MR. PRAUSE: Contributive?

24 MR. ROBINSON: Yes. It's a --

25 MS. EWING: It's a landmark.

⊕

1 MR. PRAUSE: So it's on the list.

2 MS. EWING: It's a very important home
3 according to David Schneider.

4 MR. PRAUSE: Yes. I'm just confused
5 because it's listed as not being contributive.
6 There's no survey number on it, and we can't seem
7 to come up with a survey number right now. So --

8 MR. ROBINSON: I have a survey number.

9 It's 004.

10 MR. PRAUSE: Which is the historical
11 designation? 004 on here -- I don't even see it.

12 MR. PRAUSE: 2710. Okay. So that's
13 what it is? 004?

14 MS. KENYON: (Nodded.)

15 MR. PRAUSE: Okay. That was my
16 question.

17 MS. HARMON: So it is on the list?

18 MR. PRAUSE: It would be helpful if
19 these applications were filled out correctly.

20 MS. HARMON: So it is contributive.

21 MR. PRAUSE: Put survey numbers on them
22 if they are contributive. Apparently it is. Thank
23 you.

24 MS. HARMON: Randy, do you have
25 anything?

♀

1 MR. ROBINSON: I don't have anything.

2 MS. HARMON: Billy?

3 MR. CRAVER: As a resident of
4 Andersonville, and having grown up in the Arc,
5 knowing the house well, knowing all the changes
6 after Hugo, I don't think that the addition of the

7 elevator hurts it. I think it helps it. I think
8 it will help ensure that it remains as it is for a
9 long time. And I would support us letting the
10 Andersons do what they want to do.

11 MR. REINHARD: I'm okay with it. Sure.
12 There's two things that I like about it. One is
13 you're not going to be able to see it. And the
14 second one is it's totally reversible, the way that
15 they're building it. So if your grandson decides
16 he doesn't want it, it can be taken off. I'm okay
17 with it.

18 MS. EWING: That's absolutely true. So
19 it doesn't diminish the historic value so I'm for
20 it.

21 MS. HARMON: I think it's a great idea.
22 It looks good. And I hope that this will help you
23 get your groceries up. Okay.

24 MR. CRAVER: Move for approval.

25 MR. REINHARD: Second.

♀

20

1 MS. HARMON: All in favor?

2 ALL: Aye.

3 CHAIRMAN: Now, we're the 2108
4 Pettigrew Street, Robinson residence, accessory
5 structure.

6 MR. PRAUSE: Number five. Without
7 numbers on the agenda, but the fifth one down is
8 2602 Jasper Boulevard.

9 MR. KENT: This application is for 2108
10 Pettigrew Street.

11 CHAIRMAN: Right. Robinson.

12 MR. PRAUSE: Accessory structure. It's
13 for 8-by-16 poolside shelter, as explained on the
14 application.

15 CHAIRMAN: Correct.

16 MR. PRAUSE: And it's shown on
17 elevation drawings and a site plan submitted.

18 MS. EWING: We're confused.

19 MR. REINHARD: Aren't we supposed to be
20 on 2602 Jasper?

21 (Off-the-record discussion.)

22 CHAIRMAN: We're hearing Robinson right
23 now; is that correct?

24 MS. EWING: We can do that.

25 CHAIRMAN: It's a pool accessory

♀

1 structure, and do we have the applicant here? We
2 do not have the applicant here. Can we hear these
3 without the applicant?

4 MR. MCCULLOUGH: Sure.

5 CHAIRMAN: All right. Let's hear it
6 without the applicant. A presentation should be
7 self-evident. It's in the drawings, in the
8 application. And I guess we'll go to public
9 comment. Is there any public comment for this --
10 all right. Public comment section is closed. And
11 there's no more comments from Kent or Randy on this
12 pool accessory structure? Not the pool.

13 MS. EWING: Should we just wait until
14 the applicant shows up?

15 CHAIRMAN: I don't know if they're
16 going to show.

17 MR. MCCULLOUGH: Sure you can.

18 CHAIRMAN: I'm being told by legal
19 counsel we can hear it. I'd say we hear it.

20 MR. MCCULLOUGH: You can.

21 CHAIRMAN: I mean if we don't like the
22 fact that they're not here, we can do something
23 about it, I guess. But -- what does the Board
24 think about the cabana or whatever you want to call
25 it?

♀

1 MS. HARMON: I'm fine with it.

2 MR. CRAVER: I don't have a problem
3 with it at all.

4 CHAIRMAN: I don't have a problem with
5 it either. Fred?

6 MR. REINHARD: No problem.

7 CHAIRMAN: Cyndy?

8 MS. EWING: Huh-uh.

9 CHAIRMAN: Do I hear a motion?

10 MR. CRAVER: Move to approve it.

11 CHAIRMAN: Second?

12 MR. REINHARD: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN: Everybody in favor?

14 ALL: Aye.

15 CHAIRMAN: Now we're on 2602 Jasper
16 Boulevard, Linder residence, fence to a historic
17 structure.

18 MR. PRAUSE: Right. This one is
19 contributive to the district. Historic survey
20 number is number 90. You've been provided a copy
21 of the historic survey card. It was prepared by
22 Preservation Consultants for it, and the
23 application with a picture of -- I assume this is
24 similar to the -- what fence they want to build, or
25 exactly like it. It seems to match the fence

♀

1 detail on the plat that shows the location of the
2 proposed fence. That's it.

3 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Is the applicant
4 here? Yes, sir. Yes, ma'am. Do you-all need to
5 say anything? It is pretty much self-evident.

6 MR. BLANCHARD: It's fairly
7 self-evident. If you have any questions, I'll be
8 glad to answer it. The fence that's up there now
9 is chicken wire. That's about six feet, and it's
10 very unattractive. So I think this would add a lot
11 to it.

12 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Teddy.

13 MR. REINHARD: I have a question. The
14 1-by-4 pickets, are they facing out or in? They're
15 only on one side of the stringers. Are they facing
16 out or in?

17 MR. BLANCHARD: Out would probably look
18 better.

19 MR. REINHARD: That's a good answer.

20 MR. BLANCHARD: Whatever you want, sir.

21 MR. REINHARD: You're supposed to show
22 your neighbors the best side of your fence.

23 CHAIRMAN: Now, let me ask, public
24 comment on this? Kent? Randy? Nothing to add or
25 subtract. All right. Now you can go forward.

♀

2 MS. HARMON: I'm fine with it.

3 CHAIRMAN: I'm fine with it also.

4 MS. EWING: It looks great.

5 MR. REINHARD: I move for approval with
6 the pickets facing out.

7 CHAIRMAN: Do I hear a second?

8 MR. CRAVER: Second

9 CHAIRMAN: So noted. Everybody in
10 favor?

11 ALL: Aye

12 CHAIRMAN: We have 415 -- this
13 applicant is back again bothering this Board,
14 taking up this board's time. The Stith residence
15 at 415 Station 22.

16 MR. PRAUSE: Application to install
17 gravel driveway with brick border as shown on the
18 site plan on 415 Station 22 Street.

19 CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir. Mr. Stith.

20 MR. STITH: Mr. Chairman, members of
21 the Board. I'm not so sure that the previous
22 council is wise in appointing some of these members
23 to the Board, but having said that nevertheless --
24 I think it's pretty cut and dried. I'd just like
25 to put a gravel driveway in.

♀

1 CHAIRMAN: All right. Kent? Randy?

2 Nothing? Public comment? Great.

3 MS. HARMON: Fine by me.

4 CHAIRMAN: Fine by me.

5 MR. CRAVER: Fine by me.

6 MR. REINHARD: Quick question. I know

7 we're on a roll. I recall -- didn't we remove a

8 portion of the back of that house so that the

9 driveway could come through.

10 CHAIRMAN: Yes.

11 MR. REINHARD: All right. I'm all

12 right with it.

13 CHAIRMAN: Do I hear a motion?

14 MR. CRAVER: Move for approval.

15 MR. REINHARD: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN: Everybody in favor?

17 ALL: Aye.

18 CHAIRMAN: Number 10, 1002 A and B

19 Middle Street, Rittenberg residence, raised

20 structure. Kent?

21 MR. PRAUSE: This is also contributive

22 to the district. The survey number is 344. I have

23 been provided an information with a survey card.

24 What they propose to do basically is to elevate the

25 house, remove the chimneys, move the house back

1 from Middle Street, extend the front stairs and a
2 porch at the rear. And remove a portion of the
3 rear roof to allow construction of a roof deck, and
4 do something to the windows and skirting around the
5 perimeter piers. But this one though is -- it's a
6 nonconforming use on a lot with two houses on it.
7 The larger of the two is a conforming use which is
8 a new residence. And as such, this thing can only
9 be enlarged if it decreases the extent to the
10 nonconformity. And adding a porch onto it, at
11 least in my opinion, as the zoning administrator,
12 would increase the extent of the nonconforming
13 because it's making it an existing nonconforming
14 use bigger. So they need a variance for that.

15 CHAIRMAN: Right. So we can't really
16 rule on that part, is what you're saying, in your
17 opinion.

18 MR. PRAUSE: Well, no. You can -- the
19 ordinance provides that in the event that they
20 require a variance, you can make any approvals --
21 if you have a mind to approve it, you can approve
22 it with a condition that they go get a variance.

23 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. All right. Yes,
24 sir.

25 MR. PECCINI: My name is Fred Peccini,
Page 27

1 and I'm the architect on the project. I'm here
2 with Charles Rittenberg, the owner of the
3 structure, as well as Patrick Ryan, my associate.
4 This cottage is located right on the corner --
5 right up against the corner of Station 10 and
6 Middle Street, right here. And what Kent was
7 talking about was this house. If you see the dark
8 line there, that's where the house is in its
9 existing location. What we're doing here is moving
10 it back off of Middle Street. And I'll tell you
11 why to begin with.

12 Right now the house is down to about
13 two feet from grade. The owner would like to
14 protect this asset. Right now, or in the recent
15 past, it was essentially two apartments that were
16 rented, and the owner wants to turn this into a
17 guest cottage. And in doing so, he has to raise it
18 up to current FEMA requirements, which means
19 raising it up to elevation 16. So it will be
20 about -- I think it was 16 feet off of -- I'm
21 sorry. About 11 feet off of existing grade. But
22 at elevation 16 above mean sea level.

23 So once you raise the structure,
24 because this structure is so close to Middle

♀ 25 Street, you don't have any room for stairs to get

28

1 up to it. Because you only need several stairs to
2 get up two feet, but you need a number of stairs to
3 get up 11 or 12 feet. And that's what shows on the
4 plans here, this extension of a stair past what is
5 shaded, which is existing. And in profile, those
6 are the stairs here. So in relation to the street,
7 the existing house is just about right there, and
8 we're moving it back -- 15 feet?

9 DR. RITTENBERG: 15.

10 MR. PECCINI: Now, giving a little
11 history of the project, and I'll explain what we're
12 doing to the rear of the project as well. If you
13 look at the profile along Station 10, what you see
14 here is a gable roof form and then a shed roof form
15 attached to it. If you look at the structure
16 inside, it reveals that the gable structure was the
17 original structure because you can see in the attic
18 that there are rafter tails that were very neatly
19 cut that match the front.

20 So it's a simple single gable, probably
21 a hall and parlor house. And then sometime in the
22 postwar era, 1950, say, the shed addition was added
23 on. The lumber in the shed addition is all dressed

24 and factory made, where the lumber from the
25 original structure probably came from the

♀

29

1 lumberyard on Shem Creek. So what we want to do to
2 the back of the structure, when we raise it, since
3 that's not the original part of the structure and
4 that's the only part of the structure that will
5 really affect anything other than raising it, is to
6 add on a deck here and stair, which accessed this
7 roof deck, which is built into the roof.

8 Now, the reason we want to build it
9 into the roof is so you couldn't see it or any part
10 of it from Middle Street. So it's tucked and cut
11 back into the newer roof, but it's not affecting
12 the older higher roof, right there, in profile.
13 You can see that the roof is -- the roof deck would
14 just be cut into this shed roof here.

15 And some of the other work that we want
16 to do is to remove these -- if you see in these
17 photographs, there's a coal chimney that was
18 probably added on when it was winterized, probably
19 after the Second World War, on both sides of the
20 house. We want to remove that. Another reason we
21 know that that's -- that that was so is because
22 this window was taken down to a single window from

23 a double window as it is on this side. The framing
24 is still there for the double window. So what we
25 want to do is to restore that window to a double

♀

30

1 window on both sides of the house as well.

2 And then this window right here,
3 there's another window that was relocated because
4 that's where one of the two kitchens was on both
5 sides of the house. And we just want to repeat
6 that same form. I think that just about covers the
7 scope of it, if you have any questions or do we
8 have anything else --

9 MR. RITTENBERG: I just have two things
10 to add that I think are appropriate is that the
11 rear stair is adding a porch, but also allows space
12 underneath to put the second access that I think
13 you need for a fire code. And the other is where
14 the house sits now, there are about five palm trees
15 that are literally growing into the house that
16 we'll be able to move by removing the structure.

17 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Is there any
18 public comment on this application? Public comment
19 section is closed. Kent? Randy? Do you-all have
20 anything to add?

21 MR. PRAUSE: It's being elevated

22 because why?

23 MR. PECCINI: Because the owner wants
24 to restore it to a guest cottage, and in doing so,
25 he has to bring it up to current flood elevation,

♀

31

1 which is 16 feet.

2 MR. KENT: Why?

3 MR. RITTENBERG: I had a tenant move
4 out recently, and there was a hole in the floor,
5 and literally we went investigating the hole in the
6 floor. It turns out that all of the floor is
7 rotten, and several of the joists need to be
8 replaced.

9 MR. PRAUSE: But why would that
10 necessitate elevating the house?

11 MR. CRAVER: Over the 50 percent rule?

12 MR. PRAUSE: Okay. That's the answer I
13 was looking for.

14 CHAIRMAN: Okay. Randy?

15 MR. ROBINSON: I mean it's possible
16 this house could be individually listed and be
17 exempt from FEMA requirements. And that avenue
18 probably should be taken before we just elevate a
19 home from -- just because of the FEMA requirements.
20 And the comment was made to the second access is

21 required, that's not true on a single-family
22 dwelling. You only have to have one access.

23 CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you.

24 Board comment? Billy?

25 MR. CRAVER: I don't have a problem

♀

32

1 with what they want to do. I would approve it.

2 CHAIRMAN: Fred?

3 MR. REINHARD: I respectfully disagree.

4 It's a really interesting little piece of history.

5 I too don't understand why it needs to be raised up

6 unless it's to put that roof deck on, and you know

7 all know how I feel about roof decks. I'm not

8 going to support it.

9 CHAIRMAN: Cyndy?

10 MS. EWING: I can't support it either.

11 This is an incredible piece of -- it's exactly what

12 this Board was set up to do is to preserve and

13 protect buildings like this. And exactly where

14 it's situated, it should not ever be moved from

15 where it is. It should not ever be elevated. I

16 have a Sanborn map from 1912, so it dates at least

17 to 1912. And you may want to take a look at some

18 of the parts that you're saying are not built --

19 that they were built in the '50s. So I just -- I

20 strongly -- I would never approve this.

21 CHAIRMAN: Betty?

22 MS. HARMON: I concur. I would not
23 approve it.

24 CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm in sympathy with
25 the owner and the architect because I've raised

♀

33

1 enough houses myself over the years to get them
2 above flood and everything else. I do feel for
3 this house because it does have a good street
4 presence when you go down Middle Street, and it is
5 so close, it sort of makes it -- that's why I think
6 I would love to see our zoning code change so we
7 could do some more of that. Because it's just
8 really sort of tucked in there and it makes the
9 street and streetscape very comfortable. Right now
10 nobody would even put a house back like that, but
11 that's one of the great things about this island
12 that they did originally that we can't do anymore,
13 being built so close to the line. But it does feel
14 good. And so --

15 MS. HARMON: It's part of the history.

16 CHAIRMAN: So I guess I'd have a tough
17 time. I think the house probably could be
18 renovated with treated joists underneath and

19 everything else where it -- where it sits. I don't
20 have a problem with the roof deck so much because
21 it is not on Middle Street and all. I wouldn't
22 have a problem with that, but with what you want to
23 do renovationwise as far as the layout and
24 everything else. But I probably would not like to
25 see it elevated also. I just -- it's got a great

♀

34

1 feel to it. I think it could be a neat cottage in
2 place.

3 MR. RITTENBERG: I just wanted to get
4 some guidance from what Randy is saying is I should
5 apply to be historic in order to not have to raise
6 it if the --

7 CHAIRMAN: Right. I think there was
8 some -- and I guess we're allowed to do that now?
9 We're in the zone where we can do that?

10 MR. ROBINSON: Well, you can always get
11 in touch with State Department of Archives and
12 History to see if you can get this house
13 individually listed.

14 MR. RITTENBERG: Because, as I
15 understand, my block was originally in the
16 district, but only the other end of the block is
17 currently in --

18 CHAIRMAN: If you're very careful, I
19 know you might be able to get under the 50 percent
20 rule. I mean I -- I've seen that happen if you're
21 just very careful with your -- how you approach it.
22 So -- enough said. Do I hear a motion?

23 MR. REINHARD: Move for disapproval.

24 MS. EWING: Second.

25 CHAIRMAN: Discussion? Everybody in

♀

35

1 favor of the motion? Aye?

2 MS. HARMON: Aye.

3 MR. REINHOLD: Aye.

4 MS. EWING: Aye.

5 CHAIRMAN: Everybody opposed to the

6 motion?

7 MR. CRAVER: Aye.

8 CHAIRMAN: 405 Station 22, Fisher

9 residence, and can we hear these together too? 11

10 and 12?

11 MR. BARR: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN: Or not?

13 MR. MCCULLOUGH: As long as your motion

14 covers both applications, or you can do two

15 separate motions.

16 CHAIRMAN: Right. When the motion

17 comes up. Well, let's hear them both, 11 and 12.

18 MR. BARR: This is the Brown-Fisher

19 residence.

20 CHAIRMAN: Let me have his comments

21 first.

22 MR. PRAUSE: What's proposed here is --

23 you want to deal with them both at the same time

24 rather than separately?

25 CHAIRMAN: Well, if they're

♀

36

1 complicated, maybe we ought to go ahead and deal

2 with them separately. Let's just do them

3 separately. We'll just hear 11.

4 MR. BARR: If we can do the second one

5 first then, which was the --

6 MR. PRAUSE: Well, I think the first

7 one's more important because the only way you can

8 get a second one on there is if -- is if this Board

9 makes a finding that the building can't be

10 elevated.

11 MR. BARR: You know, I don't know which

12 one's first and second anymore.

13 MR. PRAUSE: Elevating the building is

14 what's on there first. So seeing I guess we're

15 elevating the building. This particular house

16 is -- it says it's not contributive to the district
17 but that's clearly an error. And I -- oh, but
18 here, it has the survey number, number 214.
19 You-all are very familiar with the house, but
20 anyway, I just want to get it on there. It is
21 contributive to the district and its survey number
22 is number 214.

23 What they want to do here is elevate
24 the house. It says, raise it approximately six
25 feet. But there again, I mean maybe it needs to be

♀

1 heard at least in context with the second
2 application because the other application is to put
3 a second house on the lot. But one of the things
4 that you have to do in order for a special
5 exception to be approved by the Board of zoning
6 appeals to allow a second house on the lot is to
7 make a finding -- it will make a lot of findings,
8 but I guess the most important one is that in the
9 event -- this would be under 2120 C, 2C. In the
10 event the historic structure does not meet FEMA
11 elevation requirements, the design review Board
12 finds that bringing it into compliance would
13 significantly impair the historic and architectural
14 character of the structure. So you have to make a

15 finding that elevating it would significantly
16 impair the historic and architectural character of
17 the structure in order for a second house to even
18 be allowed on the lot.

19 CHAIRMAN: Right. Okay.

20 MR. PRAUSE: So I just want to bring
21 that to your attention.

22 CHAIRMAN: All right. Bill?

23 MR. BARR: As Kent said, you-all are
24 familiar with this. We were actually back before
25 this Board in November of last year, and that was

♀

1 right on the eave of the pending ordinance to
2 change the regulations concerning this 1,200 foot
3 limitation. And at that meeting we asked to
4 demolish some portions of this house which were
5 considered not to have been historic. And if you
6 recall, we went out to the house and went through
7 the house, and then came back and had the meeting.
8 And at that meeting these portions of the house,
9 which are basically shed roofs off of the historic
10 structure, were allowed to be removed.

11 This new ordinance is now in place, and
12 I think that as Kent has indicated, you really sort
13 of need to look at these things together because

14 primarily, if I recall, you've had some plans there
15 of what this house -- what we want to do with the
16 property and that is, once these additions are
17 taken off, we get down to the 1,180-something
18 square feet of heated square footage, which would
19 then allow us under the ordinance to build a new
20 primary residence on-site. And Heide has actually
21 prepared a plan. And if my recollection is
22 correct, I think the Board thought that of the two
23 avenues, and that is taking the historic structure
24 and raising it, which would be necessary because of
25 the 50 percent rule, or leaving the historic

♀

1 structure intact and building a small single-family
2 residence on the same structure was the most
3 advantageous to the property.

4 This property is not in the district.
5 It is considered -- it's actually considered a
6 landmark under the code. So essentially what we're
7 asking then is to -- of course, we're going to
8 continue with the demolition of the shed roofs on
9 the whole structure. But we would ask the Board to
10 allow us to build the second primary structure on
11 the property in accordance with the plans that you
12 have before you tonight.

13 We feel that the raising of the
14 historic structure would completely diminish its
15 historic integrity much like the application that
16 you just saw before you.

17 We're essentially asking that the
18 opposite occur here. We're asking to be able to
19 keep this house down on the ground, the historic
20 structure, down on the ground, preserve it in its
21 historic -- in its historic integrity and build the
22 second structure on the property as their primary
23 residence.

24 Now, Heide is the designer, architect
25 involved with the drawing of the plans, and is here

♀

40

1 if any members of the Board have any questions
2 concerning that.

3 CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

4 Public comment on this application?

5 Yes, sir.

6 MR. WILLIAMS: Roy Williams, 2513 I'on.

7 I just think that this property needs to be very
8 careful. This house was rolled -- my
9 understanding, this house was rolled from the Fort
10 Moultrie area. It was expanded in 1902 by
11 Mr. Blanchard, who was a contractor, as well as a

12 house in front. So you've got two houses that were
13 rolled from Fort Moultrie up to that present
14 location. And this was an old schoolhouse. And I
15 think I'd be very careful about what I do with this
16 piece of property so that it still retains its
17 historic integrity.

18 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. Anybody
19 else? Comments? Public comments section is
20 closed. Kent? Anything else to add?

21 MR. PRAUSE: I'm just a bit confused.
22 Under the application says they want to raise the
23 house an additional six to seven feet to satisfy
24 the FEMA requirement, and then colon, 50 percent
25 rule. So I think what the application says kind of

⊕

41

1 contradicts from what Mr. Barr just said. They're
2 not going to leave the house down. This is
3 actually elevating the house because they want to
4 do more than a 50 percent improvement to it.

5 CHAIRMAN: Well, that's the way it
6 reads, but that's not what Bill said. You're
7 right, Bill.

8 MR. BARR: I think that what happened
9 is that we didn't determine the order of priority
10 of the matters to be placed on the agenda. And if

11 you look at the order prior to your matters to be
12 placed on the agenda, the first item on the agenda
13 would be to construct the second residence on the
14 property and leave the historic structure alone.
15 In the alternative, if the Board did not approve
16 the construction of the second structure on the
17 property and leaving the historic structure down,
18 then we would ask that we be allowed to renovate
19 the historic structure which would necessitate us
20 raising it. That articulates what we were looking
21 for on the application.

22 CHAIRMAN: So maybe we ought to hear
23 both at the same time.

24 MR. PRAUSE: So in other words, just to
25 be abundantly clear, I guess, if you get to build

♀

1 the second house on it --

2 MR. BARR: Then the second one, we
3 would just withdraw it.

4 MR. PRAUSE: Okay. Because the point I
5 was trying to make to you that the whole rationale
6 behind this having a second house on it, you need
7 explore whether or not you elevate the existing
8 historic house and can add on to it in a sensitive
9 fashion. If it's got to be elevated to accommodate

10 the 50 percent rule, then perhaps you would want to
11 look at it in the sense of an addition rather than
12 a second house. That's what this ordinance
13 provision contemplates. But if you are -- in the
14 order that Mr. Barr has spelled out, if you think
15 that it shouldn't be elevated and it can be kept
16 down, and it doesn't exceed the 50 percent rule so
17 it doesn't have to be elevated, then it would be
18 more appropriate to allow a second house on the
19 lot. Does that make sense?

20 CHAIRMAN: Right.

21 MR. REINHARD: You should have been a
22 lawyer.

23 CHAIRMAN: So let's primarily focus on
24 the second application, which is -- the first
25 application well may become moot, may not be even

♀

1 be necessary if the second application is -- we can
2 talk about both of them, but it doesn't make any
3 sense to talk about them both. Randy, do you have
4 anything to add?

5 MR. ROBINSON: On the structures
6 themselves or --

7 CHAIRMAN: Well, on the proposed
8 structure. The new structure or anything on --

9 because on the second -- on the second part, like
10 anything on the new structure that you see that
11 could be a problem or is a positive, negative,
12 good, bad, whatever. I mean --

13 MR. ROBINSON: I was a little confused
14 on this application because when the house -- when
15 you-all approved the house being taken back or
16 removed some of the additions on this house, it was
17 1,200 and some change square footage. And now the
18 plan comes in and it's -- I mean 1,200. And now
19 the plan is 1,180 square feet. And I just want to
20 know where that extra square footage went to. It
21 just kind of vanished.

22 MR. BARR: On the original application,
23 we just measured the exterior dimensions of what
24 was remaining. The ordinance calls for the heated
25 square footage, and we basically went in and

♀

1 measured it room by room and came up with a lesser
2 number.

3 CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

4 MR. ROBINSON: I just contend the first
5 application is in error. But --

6 CHAIRMAN: Board, comments?

7 MS. HARMON: I have a question under
Page 45

8 the minutes. It says that the application be
9 approved contingent on the owner's returning to
10 advise the Board of conditions found during further
11 detail structural designs, during the alterations
12 of the building and demolition of the addition.

13 CHAIRMAN: They haven't done those.

14 MS. HARMON: They haven't done that.

15 CHAIRMAN: There's nothing to be
16 commented on because they haven't done that.

17 MR. BARR: We would clearly -- if the
18 Board approves conceptually the retention of the
19 historic structure on -- essentially on the ground
20 and the secondary structure, we're going to have to
21 come back before you with plans and drawings that
22 show exactly what they look like.

23 MS. HARMON: So how can we even
24 consider it at this point tonight?

25 CHAIRMAN: Well, that's already been

♀

1 approved. That demolition's been approved by
2 last --

3 MS. HARMON: But we --

4 CHAIRMAN: But they're not asking to do
5 work on the structure, from what I understand.

6 They're asking primarily can they leave the

7 structure on the ground and build a second home. I

8 mean that's what they're primarily asking.

9 MR. BARR: And at that time we would

10 come with exactly what --

11 CHAIRMAN: The second home plans are

12 attached. So they're basically asking to build

13 that second home and to leave the house on the

14 ground, which I think most of the Board would

15 prefer to see the house on the ground because I

16 know we don't want it elevated.

17 MS. HARMON: Well, I'm not sure the 50

18 percent rule would apply here then being as it's on

19 the historic list now.

20 MR. PRAUSE: It does.

21 MS. HARMON: It does? You don't get

22 any special exemptions?

23 MR. PRAUSE: No.

24 MS. HARMON: What do you get exemptions

25 on?

⊕

1 MR. PRAUSE: The only way that you

2 could get an exemption from that requirement is to

3 meet one of the requirements in our ordinance and

4 apply for a variance. And generally it's to have

5 it individually listed or eligible for individual

6 listing on the National Register. They can pursue
7 that if they wanted to just like the other fellow
8 was instructed to do. But absent that --

9 MS. HARMON: That's what I meant --

10 MR. PRAUSE: It has to. And since
11 you're on that subject, I can wait or I can express
12 the concern now. At you-all's pleasure.

13 CHAIRMAN: Okay.

14 MR. PRAUSE: That what I think you
15 would want to be very careful about that we've run
16 into before is if in the process of accomplishing
17 what they want to do with the smaller house, they
18 don't run afoul of the 50 percent rule. Then
19 they've got no choice but to elevate it. So, you
20 know, I mean that's a consideration. If you allow
21 something to be done and perhaps maybe you ought to
22 approve it in a conceptual fashion, that the other
23 work be accomplished on the smaller building first
24 so that you know that they're not going to surpass
25 that and then have to elevate the house. Because

♀

1 if -- you know, if they get approval for the other
2 and they build the other, and then they're doing
3 this, and all of a sudden it goes over 50 percent,
4 they're going to have to elevate this house too.

5 And it kind of defeats the whole purpose of keeping
6 it low.

7 And the 50 percent would include
8 demolition cost to remove the existing components
9 in addition to whatever they propose in the way of
10 improvements. So you add the two of those together
11 so they're -- you've got to look at the whole
12 picture, and that's just the concern that I have is
13 I'd hate to see you run into a situation where
14 something gets approved and then, oh, gee, we tried
15 to do the best we could but now we're over 50
16 percent, we've got to elevate this building too.

17 MR. CRAVER: Kent, if they were allowed
18 to build a new house, and they demolished the
19 portions of the old house that they want to remove,
20 how long -- how long do you aggregate work to get
21 to the 50 percent?

22 MR. PRAUSE: Three years.

23 MR. CRAVER: Three years? Okay.

24 MR. PRAUSE: But I don't think you'd
25 want to hold it in abeyance for three years to

♀

1 accomplish whatever they want to do on the smaller
2 house --

3 CHAIRMAN: From what I understand

4 though they're not really asking to do -- they've
5 already been approved to take -- to take some of
6 the house away. That's not what's on the Board.
7 Primarily what's on the Board is they want to build
8 a second home.

9 MR. CRAVER: Can we build a second
10 home, right.

11 CHAIRMAN: And do we like that or not
12 like that or do we want to -- how do we want to
13 critique the idea of the second home, the
14 architecture, primarily what we do. It seems to me
15 that's the primary question. This other stuff,
16 whether it's going to stay on the ground and all,
17 that's got to be determined later on. We want it
18 to stay on the ground I think by virtue of our last
19 discussion of the last house. So we would probably
20 try to work with whoever, other boards or the
21 owners to try to figure out how that could be done.
22 But primarily I think what we need to talk about is
23 the second home, is it going to fly with us or not.
24 So I think that's what we need to look at, from
25 what I can gather.

♀

1 MR. BARR: Yes, sir.

2 MS. HARMON: Kent, I'm confused. The
Page 50

3 new ordinance supersedes the old ordinance. It
4 does?

5 MR. PRAUSE: Uh-hum.

6 MS. HARMON: Would you clarify the
7 ordinance for me?

8 MR. PRAUSE: How -- I'm not sure I
9 understand.

10 MS. HARMON: The new ordinance about
11 being able to reduce the house in order to get --

12 MR. PRAUSE: Oh, you mean the
13 amendment?

14 MS. HARMON: Yes.

15 MR. PRAUSE: Previously it was 1,200
16 square feet and that was a cutoff, a limitation,
17 but now there's a new provision that allows it to
18 even be bigger than 1,200 square feet at you-all's
19 discretion pursuant to certain requirements you can
20 pull out to be reduced. But from what I'm
21 understanding, previously -- your previous approval
22 and even what they have now, it's going to be under
23 1,200 square feet.

24 MS. HARMON: Okay.

25 MR. PRAUSE: But they've already been

♀

1 approved.

2 CHAIRMAN: That's already been
3 approved. That's discussion we don't need to be
4 doing. We need to be looking at the architecture
5 or whatever else on the second house.

6 MS. HARMON: I just wanted to get that
7 ordinance clear in my brain.

8 CHAIRMAN: So Billy, what do you think?

9 MR. CRAVER: I would let him build the
10 second house. I think preserving the first house
11 and not mucking it up with having to make it a big
12 house and -- I mean all the issues that we went
13 through before, it all aims, to me, allowing him to
14 build another house and putting it on the other end
15 of the lot. I don't think it will detract from the
16 historic significance of the existing house at all.

17 CHAIRMAN: Fred?

18 MR. REINHARD: I'm okay with another
19 house. And that other house, according to the
20 formula, could be 4,982 square feet principal
21 building square footage, could be a 5,000 square
22 foot house; is that correct?

23 MR. ROBINSON: No. Fred, you would
24 have to subtract the small house from the --

25 CHAIRMAN: Square footage.

♀

1 MR. CRAVER: 3,700 square feet.

2 MR. REINHARD: What have you submitted?

3 Do you have the square footage of the house that's
4 been submitted?

5 MS. ROBINSON: It's right above 3,000
6 square feet. It is on the floor plans. I mean the
7 house that --

8 MR. REINHARD: I see it. 3,128.

9 MS. ROBINSON: It's smaller than we're
10 allowed.

11 MR. REINHARD: Okay. The lot's big
12 enough to handle it. It's almost two-thirds of an
13 acre.

14 CHAIRMAN: Right. It's a big lot.

15 MR. CRAVER: They're asking for
16 conceptual approval, right?

17 MR. BARR: Yes, sir.

18 CHAIRMAN: Cyndy, what do you think?

19 MS. EWING: I can't think of any
20 reason -- I think we have to grant it to them. And
21 so conceptually what are we going for? Mass and
22 scale?

23 CHAIRMAN: Same as always.

24 MS. EWING: Are we just deciding on the
25 house, whether or not --

1 CHAIRMAN: The new house.

2 MS. EWING: Whether or not to allow it
3 or these exact --

4 MR. REINHARD: Concept.

5 CHAIRMAN: It's conceptual.

6 MS. EWING: I think the mass and scale
7 is -- it's a little boxy, and I would be more
8 inclined -- I would like to see something that
9 is -- shows less mass and scale. But that's the
10 only thing. So conceptually -- but the shape of it
11 and the setting on the lot looks good.

12 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Betty?

13 MS. HARMON: I agree with Cyndy.

14 CHAIRMAN: All right. I think it's
15 fine. I think you should be able to work with what
16 she wants to try to do. Do I hear a motion?

17 MR. REINHARD: Move for conceptual
18 approval.

19 CHAIRMAN: Second?

20 MR. CRAVER: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN: Discussion? Everybody in
22 favor? All in favor?

23 ALL: Aye.

24 CHAIRMAN: Anybody opposed? No hands.
25 So does the second --

1 MR. BARR: The second gets withdrawn.

2 CHAIRMAN: Withdrawn. 2708 Goldbug.

3 Cook residence, additions to an historic structure.

4 Kent? What do we have on this one again?

5 MR. PRAUSE: Well, first off it is

6 listed as being contributive to the district. The

7 survey number is number 50. Apparently what they

8 are proposing to do is to make alterations to the

9 existing historically significant building, and

10 then add onto it in a fashion, as shown on the

11 plans.

12 However, I would like to make at least

13 a couple comments with respect to that. There's no

14 north arrow on the site plan and none of the

15 streets are identified, or any of the adjoining

16 properties. So it makes it kind of difficult to

17 figure out what the elevations are. And in fact,

18 there are only two elevations that are labeled.

19 And you've got two other elevations that have no

20 label on them at all and no sheet number. So I

21 guess you just kind of have to try and discern from

22 the plan view and link it to the architectural

23 views of it. But I think the north elevation's to

24 the rear, to the marsh, and the next one that's not

25 labeled is probably the west. And the next one

♀

54

1 that's not labeled is probably the street front
2 elevation to the south, and then the last one is
3 labeled the east elevation on A-201. And those are
4 my comments.

5 CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir.

6 MR. HENSHAW: Jim Henshaw with Herlong
7 Architects, and also with me tonight is Tim Cook,
8 who's the owner of the property. This property has
9 been before the Board -- this property has been
10 before the Board a number of times. I believe this
11 is the fourth time, dating back to the Michael
12 Daily days of the Board. And the most recent
13 presentation was in November of last year, of '06.
14 And at that meeting, when we were -- we brought
15 this house before you, we proposed to rotate the
16 existing cottage 90 degrees basically. And we got
17 some good feedback from the neighbors, got a lot of
18 good feedback from the Board. And I believe the
19 consensus of the Board at that time was that you
20 preferred to keep the orientation of the existing
21 cottage as it is currently and move it forward on
22 the lot and construct the additions to the back.

23 Based on all this feedback, we've been
Page 56

24 developing a design that addresses the concerns of
25 the neighbors and of the Board, and have created a

♀

55

1 renovated home that fits very well into this
2 neighborhood. We have developed a list of
3 concerns, and I think that was just passed out
4 among you, that were raised at the previous meeting
5 by the neighbors. And we'd like to explain or
6 summarize how we addressed those concerns. And of
7 course, you can be reading those as I go through
8 this.

9 Before I go through that list, I'd
10 first like to explain a few things about the
11 submittal that would clear up why we're before you
12 tonight. First, because of the historic nature of
13 this property and the existing cottage, we are
14 presenting the project under 21-43 of the zoning
15 ordinance, which outlines exemptions to the zoning
16 ordinance for properties like 2708 Goldbug, which
17 have an existing structure, an existing historic
18 structure. The request that we're making tonight
19 are under the guidelines of this section. As you
20 probably know, this section of the ordinance allows
21 the owner some exemptions and some relief on
22 coverages while keeping in mind the historical

23 character of the existing structure and the
24 property.

25 Second, we were planning to present

♀

56

1 this project a couple months ago. We had it on the
2 agenda and we ended up pulling it because we
3 thought it needed a little bit more study, and we
4 needed to take some more square footage out of the
5 house to look at the concerns of the neighbors. So
6 we've done that over the past couple of months.
7 And the drawings that you see in your packet
8 reflect that smaller square footage number, and we
9 believe that this house is much more appropriate
10 with the neighborhood in terms of its massing and
11 its detailing and its orientation.

12 Third, we plan to study ways to keep --
13 to make this house more energy efficient. Not only
14 because we're environmentally responsible but also
15 because we, as architects, and Tim, as a homeowner,
16 feels that any renovations on this island that are
17 creating medium or large homes should have the same
18 energy consumption as a smaller home on the island.

19 And fourth, keep in mind that this is a
20 preliminary submittal, and we're taking some ideas
21 that we had from the past three presentations to

22 the Board and the feedback that we got from the
23 Board and from the neighbors. And this project is
24 in development right now. We're requesting
25 approval tonight so that we can continue to develop

♀

57

1 the drawings based on the information in your
2 packet, and come back for final approval with a
3 complete design.

4 You see, the comments that we have
5 there from the neighbors and the response to those
6 comments, that just as a summary of those comments
7 and the responses, most of the comments from the
8 neighbors dealt with the massing and the height and
9 neighborhood compatibility. We believe that we
10 have addressed these concerns in the design. The
11 design is very understated, and it was designed as
12 if it was an older house that has gone through a
13 number of appropriate renovations over the years.
14 The height is about three feet below the maximum
15 height limit, and there's no roof deck or crows
16 nest in the design. There are many one-story
17 elements in the design and second floors primarily
18 within the roofline.

19 I think Pat's going to read the letters
20 from a number of neighbors, and you can see in this

21 document that we passed out about the concerns of
22 the neighbors. Tim's been very diligent about
23 taking the plans and his plans for an addition to
24 this house and the renovation of this cottage to
25 his neighbors and getting their feedback.

♀

58

1 So to summarize what we're asking for
2 tonight, we are going -- presenting this under
3 21-43, the section of the zoning ordinance where
4 the DRB is allowed to exempt 50 percent of the area
5 of existing historic structure for the purposes of
6 establishing the new principal building square
7 footage, building coverage and impervious coverage.
8 And our application lists this 440 square feet,
9 which is 50 percent of the heated area of the
10 renovated cottage. And that's the basis of our
11 request, and our requests are all within this
12 allowance.

13 Based on the feedback from the Board
14 and the neighbors, we're proposing to relocate the
15 cottage towards Goldbug Avenue, this being Goldbug
16 Avenue, forward on the lot in its same orientation,
17 but there are a number of issues with that that I'd
18 like to briefly go into. And we would restore this
19 cottage to more of its original historic state,

20 which would mean removing a porch that was infilled
21 as heated space a number of years ago. We think it
22 was about 25 years ago. But that's in this area
23 here.

24 The addition will be on the marsh side
25 back here, and the addition would be 3,507 square

⊕

59

1 feet. We're also requesting the setback relief as
2 outlined in 21-22, and requesting that the total
3 side setbacks be 30 feet with 10-foot minimum each
4 side. One thing to note on this site plan, on the
5 one in front of you, we did place the existing
6 cottage seven feet from the property line. It
7 needs to be 10-foot minimum so we would adjust that
8 for the final submittal. But we have attempted to
9 mass and orient this house to respect the
10 neighboring properties, especially the ones
11 immediately to the west and east of this property.
12 And the setback relief will allow this to occur in
13 a very compatible manner.

14 At the last presentation of the
15 property, we showed the cottage rotated, as I
16 mentioned earlier, the existing cottage. And if we
17 did rotate the cottage, it would be allowed to be
18 about 15 feet off of the property line, which I

19 think is a more appropriate solution, but of
20 course, the Board -- the majority of the Board at
21 the last meeting was saying to keep the
22 orientation. I do have a sketch of what that would
23 look like if we did rotate the structure view from
24 the east and the south that you can see opens up
25 the entry to this -- to the newer structure a

♀

60

1 little bit more and, of course, it allows some more
2 room off of this property line. And if we would
3 like in the discussion to go through that, I've got
4 the sketches right there.

5 So we're requesting that the DRB use
6 section 21-43 to grant an exemption of the existing
7 cottage and grant preliminary approval so that we
8 can develop the drawings for a final submittal.

9 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Is there public
10 comment on this project? Yes, sir.

11 MR. SNYDER: Dale Snyder. I reside at
12 2714 Jasper. It's across the street and to the
13 east one lot. And I spoke at the last meeting
14 during the submission, and my concern stems from
15 living in a house that I bought in 1993, and have
16 watched neighbors build large houses next to mine.
17 I've seen my view disappear, I've seen my wind

18 disappear, I've seen my privacy disappear. And I
19 think that if this house were submitted today, it
20 would not be approved. So I speak as someone who
21 feels this kind of application acutely, knowing
22 that across the street from me a house might be
23 built that is unlike any other house in the
24 neighborhood except for the house that would not be
25 approved today.

♀

61

1 So if you look along our street, it's
2 one Sullivan's Island cottage after another. And
3 then if we approve this house along with the one
4 that's there, it will have a tent pole effect. So
5 that instead of a neighborhood with a lot of
6 cottages and one big house, it will be two big
7 houses and a few cottages. And then it seems to me
8 that the flood gates are opened. I hope you'll
9 accept my application right away to build a great
10 big house. Let me demolish my cottage, and then we
11 can get the next neighbor and the next neighbor.
12 So that's my objection to this plan.

13 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Yes, sir.

14 MR. GEAR: I'm David Gear, and I
15 would -- I guess I'm on the west side of, facing
16 the marsh, I'm on the left side. Just a couple of
Page 63

17 numbers. I think we kind of concur that the mass
18 is inappropriate for compatibility of the
19 neighborhood. Of the 21 houses in the two-block
20 area, 19 of those are under 3,000 square feet.
21 This house is going to be 4,300, 4,400 plus, give
22 or take a little bit. The two houses on either
23 side, the Hiers house and our house, are going to
24 be -- if you add the two together, are going to be
25 less than the square footage of this house. 75

♀

62

1 percent of the houses constructed in this area were
2 constructed before 1942, which lends a historic
3 value to the property. And 15 of the 21 were
4 constructed before 1942, which are all small.

5 There are -- you've said there are two
6 large houses, one on one end and one sitting next
7 to the gentleman that just spoke. And we just feel
8 that the mass of the structure at 4,500, 4,300,
9 whatever the number happens to be, is incompatible
10 with what we're looking at along Goldbug Avenue.
11 And it destroys the oaks, the setting, the
12 compatibility of the neighborhood, and we would
13 like not to see that take place at this mass.

14 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Yes, sir.

15 MR. HIERS: I am Jim Hiers. I live at
Page 64

16 2714 Goldbug. I'm to the east of this property,
17 and I sent a letter in today. I assume that the
18 members of the Board have the letter from me. And
19 rather than read the whole thing, I'd just objected
20 to the -- I felt that the height, scale, mass and
21 placement of the proposed new structure would be
22 incompatible with the neighborhood. The total
23 heated square footage of 4,400 square feet would be
24 larger. I mentioned the placement of the proposed
25 new structure on top of an existing dune that I

♀

63

1 feel is a very, very important issue to consider
2 here. We've heard that -- and I think this is a
3 very well-designed house. It's a very attractive
4 house. I think it's inappropriate for the
5 neighborhood, and one of the reasons that the house
6 that's there now, this old cottage, I believe it
7 meets flood as it sits now. And it's probably only
8 elevated above the dune by about five feet. I know
9 I can't walk underneath the house. So it meets
10 flood, and the reason it meets flood because the
11 dune obviously must be seven, eight feet above the
12 street. And your measurement I believe on your
13 elevation perhaps, when you look at your drawings,
14 the elevations can be -- you know, it's a little

15 bit -- I certainly don't want to say deceptive, but
16 I think it can be misconstrued easily because if
17 you look at the elevation from the front, you
18 obviously have your two-car garage on the east,
19 that certainly has to be on the ground. You have
20 your cottage on the west side, the existing cottage
21 that has been moved. And from the drawing it would
22 appear that is also on the ground or may be
23 elevated a foot or two feet. And that certainly
24 can't be the case because when you move it off the
25 dune, you move it down to a much lower part of the

♀

64

1 lot. And so that's going to have to be elevated
2 eight feet or so. And then you've got a house, a
3 large house, at the back of the lot.
4 And just to sum up, I think big houses
5 are fine on the island where they're appropriate.
6 I think this is an area where we have a lot of
7 smaller houses. I feel like the reason homeowners
8 that buy houses, that want to build big houses
9 certainly have their rights, but I think that those
10 of us that have been here and have bought houses
11 because we like our view, we like our breeze, we
12 like our light, and we like the feeling of openness
13 that you have on Sullivan's Island. I feel like we

14 have -- our rights should be protected also and I
15 think that's what the Board -- the Board does. So
16 I just think 4,400 square feet and with all the
17 exceptions that would need to go in, I think it's
18 too large and would infringe upon the neighborhood.
19 So thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Yes, ma'am.

21 MS. RICHARDSON: Betsy Richardson, 2678
22 Goldbug, which is two doors down. And from the
23 plans that I have seen, number one, this lot is not
24 flat, as Mr. Hiers said. It's a very large dune in
25 the back with very big trees which really protects

♀

1 us during hurricanes, high tides, et cetera, which
2 probably none of you-all were here during Hugo, but
3 I was, and nevertheless that doesn't need to be
4 messed with. That lot has a very significant dip
5 in the middle, and as you move the old house
6 forward and to the side, it is completely
7 overshadowed by this monstrosity. And as everybody
8 else has said, we have enough of those in the
9 neighborhood. We certainly don't need anymore.
10 It's totally incompatible with the whole
11 neighborhood, and I don't think any of these
12 variances that have been asked are warranted and

13 should not be granted.

14 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ma'am. Anybody
15 else? I've got several letters to read so I will
16 be reading these letters. But yes, sir.

17 MR. HAYNES: Ashley Haynes. I live at
18 2720 Goldbug, two doors down. I would disagree
19 with the rest of the public comments. I actually
20 love the plans. I think they'd be great for the
21 neighborhood, and I think they should be approved
22 as submitted.

23 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Anybody that's
24 commented, I'm not going to read their letters
25 because pretty much what they said was in the

♀

66

1 letter. So these letters that I have here to read
2 as part of the public comment section, I will read
3 except for -- there's a group of letters that
4 essentially are saying they like the plans, and the
5 various people that -- their addresses and their
6 names are here. So I'll read the letter and I'll
7 give all the names and addresses of those people
8 that have written the same letter essentially. But
9 there are three letters that are different as far
10 as what they say.

11 "Dear DRB members. Mr. Cook has been
Page 68

12 in contact with me regarding the redevelopment of
13 this property at 2708 Goldbug Avenue. I am aware
14 that this is his fourth submittal to the DRB, and
15 he has removed it from previous DRB agendas to
16 address concerns and comments from his neighbors.
17 I believe that he has gone above and beyond the
18 attempt to satisfy his neighbor's comments, whether
19 they merit it or not. I have no objections to Mr.
20 Cook moving the existing house forward, and
21 building a new house behind toward the marsh which
22 is logical. He intends to keep the existing
23 cottage as a separate structure and will maintain
24 the cottage's individual integrity and should meet
25 spirit of the ordinance regarding historical

♀

1 structures. The overall size of the house is
2 appropriate for the island, and the architecture is
3 certainly neighborhood compatible. I'm aware of
4 several houses in that vicinity that have been
5 modified, added onto and moved onto the lots. So
6 Mr. Cook's request is in line with the practices in
7 the neighborhood. Smaller historic structures on
8 the island should have their own identity following
9 new construction and/or additions instead of being
10 incorporated into the additions where they may lose

11 their cottage-like character. Sometimes as in this
12 case, keeping them as annexes, a guesthouse or wing
13 of the main house makes perfect sense. I fully
14 support the applications. Sincerely Gray McSweeney,
15 2402 Jasper Boulevard.

16 I have another one here.

17 "Dear Sullivan's Island DRB, as owner
18 of 2720 B Goldbug, I am naturally concerned about
19 what will be built at 2708 Goldbug. In reviewing
20 the plans proposed by Tim and Kim Cook, I can't
21 imagine a more appropriate design. Rather than
22 bury the small cottage at the rear of the lot,
23 never to be seen again, the cottage is brought to
24 the street -- to the street side of the property,
25 and is made a focal point. This is a beautiful

♀

68

1 home and should be a great addition to our
2 neighborhood. Thank you. Paul Boehm, East Island
3 Real Estate."

4 And then I have a letter, and I'll read
5 the various people that have written this -- the
6 same letter. "Dear Sullivan's Island DRB, we are
7 aware that Kim and Tim Cook are submitting to the
8 DRB for approval of their site plan and
9 architectural design for their home located at 2708

10 Goldbug Avenue. The Cooks have met with us and to
11 review their plans of 2708 Goldbug Avenue, and we
12 have no objections to the designs. We are aware
13 that there are several allowances that are being
14 requested, and are in support of these allowances."

15 Our property is -- this particular
16 individual's property is at 2728 Goldbug Avenue,
17 and it's David -- I'm not sure -- Iacco, at 2728
18 Goldbug. Also at 2668 Jasper Boulevard, David
19 Spurgin has written the same letter. Also at 2724
20 Jasper Boulevard -- Holdlan? It starts with an H.
21 Diane. Michael and Diane something. I can't read
22 it. Also at 2830 Jasper is Jose and Raquel
23 Biascoechea. And at 2824 Jasper Boulevard is
24 Dottie Forester. And at 2618 Goldbug is Kelly
25 Heath and Dylan Heath, I think. And at 2850 Middle

♀

1 Street, Michael Arthur. And I'm not sure who that
2 was. So those are all written in support of the
3 applicant.

4 MR. HENSHAW: Can I respond?

5 CHAIRMAN: I don't think so, not yet.

6 I mean when we open it back up again, you will --
7 you will be able to say something again. But let
8 me get through this process. All right. The

9 public comment section is closed. Kent, any final
10 comments?

11 MR. PRAUSE: No.

12 CHAIRMAN: Randy?

13 MR. ROBINSON: Yeah. I've got a few
14 comments. The plan is not to scale so I can't tell
15 how high this -- how high above the grade that this
16 structure is. But I would think that it would have
17 to be higher than one foot above grade. When I
18 scale it to the scale that's on here, it shows that
19 it's only one foot above grade.

20 MR. HENSHAW: The new first finished
21 floor is one foot above BFE. It's not one foot
22 above grade.

23 MR. ROBINSON: Well, it shows -- if I
24 scale it, it shows --

25 MR. HENSHAW: The garage is at grade.

⊕

1 MR. ROBINSON: No. I'm talking about
2 the existing cottage that you're moving forward.

3 When I look at the plan, and scale it to a
4 quarter-inch per foot, it comes one foot --

5 MR. HENSHAW: It wouldn't be a
6 quarter-inch anyway. It would be a half-inch, but
7 if it's not to scale then. Excuse me.

8 Eighth-inch.

9 MR. ROBINSON: The scale was on the
10 plan. The other thing that I'm looking at is the
11 existing cottage is moved forward and it's attached
12 by this attachment, which isn't like heated space
13 or something like that. If this cottage was a
14 historic structure and they were able to build a
15 second house on this lot, they would not be able to
16 get increases. Right? So this attachment is -- in
17 my opinion, is just to get the increases. So I
18 mean --

19 CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

20 MR. ROBINSON: My opinion.

21 CHAIRMAN: All right. You need to --
22 feel like you need to respond to anything?

23 MR. HENSHAW: Well, mainly with the
24 issues that were brought up by Jimmy and the others
25 in the audience, if you look at the handout that I

♀

1 passed out that shows the existing cottage, it
2 shows the height of the existing cottage. It shows
3 the base flood elevation. It shows where that new
4 structure is going to be, the peak of the new
5 structure, which is only this ridge here. In
6 your -- this is the south elevation facing Goldbug

7 Avenue. This is the only part that approaches that
8 level, which is still three feet below the maximum
9 height for Sullivan's Island and for this area.

10 Everything else at the second floor of
11 this house is contained in the roofline primarily
12 of that main roof. So a lot of effort was taken to
13 make sure that we didn't build a monstrosity here.
14 It was designed to have a primary roof structure
15 that was not even maxing out the height limit. And
16 enclosing second floor space, in that roofline, if
17 you look at the response to the neighbors'
18 concerns, there are other houses that are taller
19 than this in the area. One listed on the form that
20 you have here, this illustration shows 2707 has a
21 cupola that's at 55 feet, which was -- you know,
22 years ago, was higher than that. What's allowed
23 today.

24 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Betty, any
25 comments?

♀

1 MS. HARMON: I think it's a nice
2 design, but it does not meet neighborhood
3 compatibility, and I don't have to -- and it's very
4 similar to the one that you presented last time.

5 And that there are changes, but you've moved the
Page 74

6 house, the cottage. And I think from the
7 neighbors, they very definitely do not want that.
8 So I would have to vote against.

9 CHAIRMAN: Cyndy?

10 MS. EWING: Yeah, I have a couple of
11 issues. First of all, I was -- I don't think the
12 Board was saying that we thought you should move
13 the structure. I think a lot of us felt that a
14 wonderful Sullivan's Island resource like this
15 should never be moved from the sand, from the dune
16 line that it's on. And it -- so I'm concerned
17 that -- I don't agree with moving it. And I think
18 it's very clear when you look at -- the neighbors
19 gave this to us.

20 If you look at 4,300 square feet,
21 almost 4,400 square feet, and then the size of the
22 other structures from the GIS here, I mean it's
23 over double the size of any of the homes in the
24 neighborhood with the exception of the one right
25 across the street. And the one down there that

♀

1 sits on the corner. It's for sale all the time.
2 Anyway, I -- it just does not at all fit in with
3 the neighborhood, and I think this Board -- this is
4 a perfect example for this Board to -- I mean the

5 reason we're here is to preserve island integrity.
6 And this is a perfect, perfect example for us to do
7 the right thing. And I could not agree to approve
8 this the way it is.

9 CHAIRMAN: Fred?

10 MR. REINHARD: I agree with those
11 comments. I don't think that this little house
12 should be moved from its current location. And I
13 think that the addition's too big.

14 CHAIRMAN: Billy?

15 MR. CRAVER: Just because I like to be
16 the contrarian, I'm not opposed to moving the
17 house. I think that the -- clearly it is an issue
18 of neighborhood compatibility. I think to
19 realistically get approved, the -- that you're
20 going to have to -- I think the link to hook it up
21 to get the bigger space is a pretty neat idea, but
22 I don't think it's going to work, not with -- not
23 in this neighborhood. So I think you're going to
24 need to scale it down. If -- I'm not opposed to
25 moving the house if it makes sense in what you

♀

1 would add to the lot. But I don't -- I don't think
2 it's going to get past the rest of the crowd. I'd
3 like to see the whole thing make sense on the lot.

4 And so if moving the house makes sense so that you
5 can still see that house and preserve its character
6 and build another house that will be compatible
7 with the neighborhood, I'm okay with that. But
8 this obviously isn't going to get approved by the
9 Board and it -- the neighbor -- you know, the size
10 is an issue.

11 CHAIRMAN: I also wouldn't mind moving
12 the house. I think this is a difficult one because
13 the house is going to be -- if the house stays
14 where it is and the new house is built, then it
15 effectively could be obliterated because the new
16 house would be completely blocked. Our little eyes
17 wouldn't be seeing it anymore, essentially, most of
18 it. But I think the house is too large. I'd like
19 to see the little house closer so I could admire it
20 and -- this is a difficult one, I think, because
21 we -- because I'll go both ways. But this is a
22 view-oriented lot. I don't think we should ignore
23 the assets of this lot. And it's going to be
24 difficult to get any kind of view out of anything
25 on this. And I think -- I think it's -- you need

♀

1 to address the qualities of the lot and the
2 qualities of the people who are going to look for
Page 77

3 living in this, whether this is a speculative house
4 or not. I wouldn't vote for it now as it is
5 because the house is too big, but I don't have a
6 problem with moving the house, if it's done right,
7 in context with a smaller structure that's well
8 designed, that is going to perhaps capitalize, and
9 the owners are going to be able to appreciate that
10 magnificent view across the marsh and all. But I
11 do think the scale is -- the size of the home
12 proposed is too large. So that's why I would vote
13 against it.

14 Do I hear a motion?

15 MS. HARMON: Well, I make a motion that
16 we disapprove this application.

17 MS. EWING: I second.

18 CHAIRMAN: Discussion? Everybody in
19 favor?

20 MS. HARMON: Aye.

21 MS. EWING: Aye.

22 MR. REINHOLD: Aye.

23 CHAIRMAN: Aye.

24 MR. CRAVER: Opposed.

25 MR. COOK: Can I say something?

♀

1 CHAIRMAN: I don't think so. I think
Page 78

2 the time for saying stuff is over.

3 MR. COOK: I've got to say something.

4 CHAIRMAN: Fine with me, if it's all
5 right with everybody else.

6 MR. COOK: This is the fourth time I've
7 been in front of the Board and I've gotten mixed
8 signals every single time. And this is the second
9 time -- last time and this time -- I've got no real
10 direction. You know, I've tried to apply and get a
11 certificate of appropriateness just to move the
12 house on the lot. And I haven't been able to do
13 that. So I can't tell, can I move it, can I not
14 move it, do I build a house in front of it -- I
15 mean I need more direction.

16 CHAIRMAN: Well, I think you've got a
17 split Board. I mean you've got two people on the
18 Board here saying, I think you should be able to
19 move it. You've got three people on the Board
20 saying, you know, they don't think you should move
21 it. And that's on the five people that are sitting
22 here tonight. So you do, you definitely --

23 MR. COOK: If I don't move it, and is
24 the Board saying that, yes, I could build a
25 structure in front of it and block it? I mean that

♀

1 doesn't make any sense to me.

2 MS. EWING: No. We're not saying to
3 block it. We're saying, this is a perfect -- we're
4 saying this is a perfect opportunity -- I'm saying
5 this is a perfect opportunity to take a wonderful
6 home in a wonderful neighborhood that still looks
7 like Sullivan's Island, keep the house where it is,
8 and it doesn't need to block it. Your design does
9 not need to block the house. It doesn't. There's
10 great designs. I have total confidence in your
11 architects that they will be able to come up with a
12 wonderful design that would be completely livable,
13 and would not block that cottage. I've seen --
14 there have been many applications here on the
15 island where people have done just that.

16 MR. COOK: There's no room to come
17 back. You can only come forward.

18 MS. EWING: That's right. You don't
19 need to block it. It's lower down, it's -- there's
20 ways to do it, definitely. I mean, that's my 2
21 cents. That would be my very clear direction, and
22 I really think it's a great opportunity --

23 MR. COOK: So am I to understand under
24 no circumstance would you be in favor of moving it?

25 MS. EWING: And I am -- no --

1 MR. COOK: And Betty also.

2 MS. HARMON: No.

3 MR. COOK: So for me to please you two,
4 I would have to leave it exactly where it is.

5 MS. EWING: To please what we're
6 charged with, we should not be moving structures
7 around when they're historic. We're just not.
8 So -- it's not just us.

9 MS. HARMON: And you've heard from the
10 neighbors and --

11 MR. COOK: I've heard from 12 other
12 neighbors too.

13 CHAIRMAN: This is getting -- we need
14 to get on. I mean this is not doing anybody any
15 good. Like you say, you've got a split Board.
16 Half of us think you should be able to move it.
17 Half of us don't. Tim, I'm sorry, but that's just
18 sort of the nature of the thing.

19 Let's get on with the last, 425 Station
20 22, Scheer residence. Design change. Kent?

21 MR. PRAUSE: I didn't get anything in
22 it, the outlines, the design review Board request
23 that's pertinent to this particular address, but
24 there is a letter in here. And it says, "your
25 request for a roof pitch change in this referenced

1 property will be heard by the Sullivan's Island
2 Design Review Board," et cetera, et cetera, et
3 cetera. So I guess what they're asking for here is
4 roof pitch change. As you remember, they came last
5 time and apparently they built according to a
6 building section and didn't take into account the
7 elevations. And when they got to putting on the
8 roof that they were going to bust the height
9 limitation. And it resulted in a lower pitched
10 roof than what was allowed on the plans. And they
11 were instructed to come to you-all to seek some
12 type of remedy.

13 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Is the
14 applicant -- yes, sir.

15 MR. BUNDY: Mr. Chairman, ladies and
16 gentlemen, good evening. My name is Bill Bundy.
17 I'm a lawyer, and I represent Jerry Scheer. He's
18 asked me to come and assist him this evening. I
19 wasn't at the last hearing, but I was able to get a
20 transcript. And Mr. Chairman, I think the last
21 thing that was said, "you know, I think -- "
22 Prause, is your words, I believe -- you know, I
23 think probably the owner needs to hire a first rate
24 architect and come back with a different plan.

♀ 25 It's not that we approve fine, but something that

80

1 we can see and maybe it's not, maybe it will even
2 be better." Just to back up and give you-all a
3 little bit of history. As I read the transcript,
4 what occurred last time was is that the contractor,
5 Mr. Moriarity, who's building this house for
6 Mr. Sheer, came in and -- let me back up. And we
7 have hired a first rate architect. I'm going to
8 present what we consider to be a first rate
9 architect, Mr. Denton, to go over this with you in
10 a minute. But I feel obligated to give you a
11 little background.

12 As I read the transcript, what occurred
13 at the previous meeting was that Mr. Moriarity
14 showed you some drawings and explained that the
15 plans that were prepared and approved and for which
16 a building permit was issued, when followed in the
17 details, in the structural drawings, did not result
18 in the elevations shown on the drawings. And he
19 showed you and will show you again tonight that the
20 difference is minor. It's not a major difference.
21 And one issue is I guess would you have approved it
22 that way if it had been shown that way to start out
23 with. And I believe that's the issue before

24 you-all is in this circumstance, since the owner
25 had a set of plans which were approved by the

♀

81

1 building official, and they were followed and
2 resulted in a minor design appearance at the end,
3 whether or not it's appropriate to allow that minor
4 change.

5 The reason I'm here I guess is because
6 at the last hearing there was some public comment
7 to the effect that these were preliminary drawings
8 and that Mr. Sheer had not paid for them. And that
9 therefore there was a dispute, a good faith
10 dispute, between the architect and the owner. One,
11 Mr. Sheer has paid for the plans he received in
12 excess of \$90,000. There is a dispute between
13 Mr. Herlong and Mr. Sheer about additional
14 compensation. That dispute is, I don't believe,
15 properly before this Board nor is it relevant to
16 the issues before you. Although I feel as though,
17 in reading the transcript, it may have somehow
18 worked its way into your consideration.

19 Mr. Sheer had asked me over a year ago
20 to try to resolve that dispute with Mr. Herlong,
21 and we have tried diligently to resolve it with
22 Mr. Herlong, and we still intend to resolve it if

23 at all possible. And that is going to run its
24 course. Right now we're still in negotiations
25 trying to figure it out. So what I'd like to do,

♀

82

1 since you-all have requested us to provide you with
2 a first-rate architect to come in and explain it to
3 you, Mr. Sheer has now hired another architect to
4 finish his house. And so Mr. Denton is going to
5 come up and with you-all's permission and explain
6 to you what the differences are and, in his
7 professional opinion, how this occurred. And
8 that's essentially what I'd like to present to
9 you-all.

10 CHAIRMAN: Okay.

11 MR. DENTON: I was asked by actually
12 the builder several weeks ago to help him out with
13 a roof problem. I didn't at the time know all the
14 whys and what fors of how we got there, and I don't
15 really care. I met Mr. Sheer for the first time
16 yesterday and thought it was a good idea to meet
17 before we presented.

18 I studied the plans at great depth
19 because when looking at the existing roof plan or
20 the Herlong set of roof plans, there obviously were
21 some conflicts that had to be addressed. We have

22 drawings that indicate a contiguous fascia line and
23 roof pitches which, if executed, would create or
24 result in a disjointed fascia line. That was one of
25 the first clues that there were some issues. So I

♀

83

1 set to try to then browse the entire set of
2 documents to try to get a feel for what could be a
3 typo, a typographical error, what could be an
4 intent of the designers. And really just try to
5 solve the roof as simply as possible.

6 Obviously, we've got walls that are
7 built on the second floor that are built at around
8 10 feet, as indicated on the wall section. And I
9 have no disagreement with that decision. It is the
10 only clearly defined dimension on the plans in
11 terms of wall height or roof bearing height.
12 However, when looking at the 10-foot bearing height
13 and creating roof structures, we could potentially
14 increase or be in excess of the 38-foot building
15 height.

16 Quickly, this -- to show you what we've
17 done, the first step for me was to try to find a
18 regulating line. In architectural design, there
19 are regulating lines horizontally throughout a
20 house. Windows and doors generally hold a

21 consistent line throughout a house, whether that be
22 six feet, eight or eight feet or any other number
23 that you so desire. I used that same analogy and
24 worked with that 10-foot roof bearing height as a
25 place to begin to solve the roof issues.

♀

84

1 The side that really plays the most
2 critical departure point is the right side, the
3 side that faces the road. Obviously we have a
4 gable that intersects with a hip roof, very strong
5 elements. On the side elevations these are then
6 truncated by a series of three more gable ends all
7 of which intended in the elevation to have
8 contiguous fascia lines. This couldn't happen.

9 To show you how, this is the roof plan,
10 and we could see -- this being the ridge line of
11 that gable, we could see where it intersects the
12 hip, and these lines correlate. They line up.
13 This establishes the ridge from this part of the
14 roof. The original drawings by Herlong had insets
15 coming in here with roofs terminating about this
16 point. It's just not physically physics or
17 Euclidly possible to create a ridge line that's
18 contiguous with this -- not ridge line, a fascia
19 line that's contiguous to this fascia line when you

20 have a much shorter distance. And then the result
21 would be, as shown here, you have an engaged roof
22 that actually truncates one of those gables. In my
23 mind, I saw that as being something that I don't
24 think a Board would want to have.

25 Previously that fascia line could have

⊕

85

1 ended up occurring way up here. And what you would
2 have had is three gables with this much taller
3 truncated interior element.

4 The walls serendipitously -- I don't
5 know whether it was intended or not -- were brought
6 out. It allows us to bring this roof down. Still
7 even with roof overhangs, we can't overcome the
8 ability to line those facias up.

9 This is a scenario looking in this
10 direction of those roofs. This being the outer
11 roof and this being -- or the outer bearing wall,
12 this being the inner bearing wall, this being the
13 fascia line that exists through the house, and this
14 being that same roofline, we don't have enough
15 space to bring that roof all the way up without it
16 exceeding past this line to get the facias to
17 align. So in this plan I made the decision to,
18 instead of having facias that offset kind of in

19 between, creating a near miss, I purposefully now
20 have staggered the fascia lines so that the top of
21 the main fascia line aligns with the bottom of the
22 truncated fascia lines in these two center portions.
23 It's a lot of talk, but this is all basic math from
24 a lot of studying.

25 Now, getting to height, we have to

♀

86

1 establish where this ridge can go and, of course,
2 the drawing said that -- or the roof plans said
3 that all the pitches were 12-12 pitch, 45 degree
4 angle. In the elevations, the front elevation, it
5 does not occur with that roof plan. The drawings
6 provided actually show roof pitches more akin to
7 10-in-12 pitch, which is I believe 37 degrees.
8 Don't quote me on that. I guess you are.

9 I couldn't get the 10-in-12s to fit
10 with the 10-foot bearing height. We had to go to a
11 9-in-12 pitch. And so the difference is, from the
12 intent of the drawings, the elevations, the image
13 that you approved, we never had 12-12 roof pitch.
14 We had 10-in-12 roof pitch, at least in this major
15 section here. And without rebuilding anything
16 that's there, we provide the very same character
17 roof with a 9-12 pitch. That equates to nine

18 inches of vertical rise of the roof that we lose.

19 And again, that's a very, I think, justifiable

20 compromise, if you will.

21 Getting back to the elevations, this

22 being now a 9-12 pitch where before it was a 10-12

23 pitch and bearing the roof at 10 feet, not at nine

24 feet -- I presumed nine feet from the drawings I

25 scaled, which the Cardinal rule, architects tell

♀

87

1 every builder, don't scale drawings. I can do it

2 because I'm a design professional, apparently first

3 rate.

4 I had scaled Herlong drawings and he

5 had indicated the regulating line of his windows at

6 seven feet, eight inches; roughly eight feet, let's

7 call it for easy math. Using the scale at an

8 eighth-inch it appeared that the roof was really

9 springing from nine feet, not from, of course, the

10 10 feet that I'm asking for, certainly not the

11 seven feet that was brought up in last month's

12 transcripts. I think what happened, you know, we

13 saw this one roof. This roof, we never really had

14 a problem with on the other side of the house.

15 The next big roof issue is the main

16 center roof. John Moriarity had found this ridge

17 line. Of course, it's creating the end point for
18 the rooftop deck, which I'm sure you're despising
19 now, but they've done it. It was approved years
20 ago. And to take the roof from here down at a
21 12-12 pitch to the bearing wall, that's where you
22 get that seven-foot plate height that kept on being
23 talked about last month. I don't think that was
24 the intent and, if anything, I would presume the
25 roof plan had a typo error on it. I went back and

♀

88

1 just calculated what would fit, keeping that
2 roofline -- that ridge line just below that 38-foot
3 allowable roof pipe and established a 12 -- or
4 excuse me -- a 4-in-12 pitch roof. You know, what
5 does that mean in the end? Well, in elevation, it
6 looks no different really than what Steve had
7 drawn. Just about the same amount of roof there as
8 we had before. The difference is truly in
9 perspective, in real life. We can't have those
10 drawings unless that's all we do is have the
11 drawings.

12 CHAIRMAN: Ron, we're well over the 10
13 minutes allotted so we need to wrap it up. Go
14 ahead.

15 MR. DENTON: This roof is 4-in-12

16 pitch. These roofs are now primarily 9-in-12 roofs
17 with a 10-foot bearing height. We're talking about
18 this line here of the fascia differing from the
19 original drawings by one foot. We're talking about
20 a loss of total roof height of about nine inches --
21 or excuse me -- three inches -- no. Nine inches.
22 We've gone through this. You know, I've studied --
23 I certainly didn't want to wreck Steve's drawings
24 because it's a pretty house, and I think this is a
25 very viable solution to a difficult problem that

♀

89

1 doesn't affect the character or the intent of the
2 original design.

3 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any public
4 comment on this application? Yes, ma'am.

5 MS. NELSON: Lane Nelson with Herlong
6 Architects, and I just want to say briefly that we
7 appreciate all the work that Mr. Denton has gone
8 through to bring these drawings to this point.
9 From Herlong and Associates, it was always our
10 intent to bring those drawings to this point.
11 Mr. Sheer was very aware that we had not taken it
12 to that level and chose to construct from those
13 documents. The bottom line is, a qualified
14 architect has taken them to that level, which was

15 always our intent, and we're glad to see that
16 that's happened.

17 CHAIRMAN: Any other public comment?
18 Public comment section is closed. Kent, do you
19 have anything to wrap this up with?

20 MR. PRAUSE: No.

21 CHAIRMAN: Randy? All right. Billy,
22 what do you think?

23 MR. CRAVER: I think that the question
24 I have is are they asking for any -- are they
25 asking for anything that wouldn't have been

♀

90

1 approved if this had been included in the original
2 drawings that were submitted? Kent? I mean I
3 guess -- I'm asking -- I'm looking for some help
4 from you to understand what it is they're asking to
5 change and does that really make a difference to
6 us?

7 MR. PRAUSE: According -- if I
8 understood what Mr. Denton said, yes, there are
9 some changes. However, they're fairly
10 insignificant. It has to do with roof pitch and
11 the overall height of the roof. Is that correct
12 essentially?

13 MR. DENTON: Depending on which aspect
Page 93

14 of the drawings you hold tight to. Of course, this
15 is a design Board so they're going to concentrate
16 on elevations. In construction, I don't know if
17 builders really ever look at elevations.

18 MR. PRAUSE: Yeah. Randy and I
19 probably deal more with that aspect of it. But
20 from the design perspective, I mean -- it's -- you
21 can decide for yourself on that issue.

22 MS. HARMON: What is the elevation now?

23 MR. CRAVER: I mean it's still at 38
24 feet, isn't it? I mean --

25 CHAIRMAN: Well, it has to be.

♀

91

1 MR. CRAVER: You're essentially saying
2 we're changing the roof pitch a little bit?

3 CHAIRMAN: They're flattening that roof
4 out.

5 MR. CRAVER: I don't care.

6 CHAIRMAN: Fred, do you care?

7 MR. REINHARD: Of course I care.

8 CHAIRMAN: I knew you did.

9 MR. REINHARD: Euclid would be proud of
10 you. It's a very good solution to a very difficult
11 problem. I'm okay with it.

12 CHAIRMAN: Cyndy?

13 MS. EWING: Yeah. I don't -- I mean

14 what are we going to do? It's fine.

15 MS. HARMON: As long as we're at 38

16 feet.

17 CHAIRMAN: All right. Do I hear a

18 motion?

19 MR. CRAVER: Move we approve the

20 requested change.

21 CHAIRMAN: Second?

22 MR. REINHARD: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN: Everybody in favor?

24 ALL: Aye.

25 CHAIRMAN: All in favor.

♀

92

1 We are adjourned.

2 (The hearing was concluded at 8:08

3 p.m.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

♀

93

1

2

3 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

4

5 I, J. LYNN CLARK, Registered Professional
6 Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of
7 South Carolina at Large, do hereby certify that I
8 correctly reported the within-entitled matter and
9 that the foregoing is a full, true and correct
10 transcription of my shorthand notes of the

11 testimony and/or other oral proceedings had in the
12 said matter.

13 I further certify that I am neither related
14 to nor counsel for any party to the cause pending
15 or interested in the events thereof.

16 Witness my hand, I have hereunto affixed my
17 official seal this 17th day of July, 2007, at
18 Charleston, Charleston County, South Carolina.

19

20

21

22 J. Lynn Clark
23 Registered Professional
24 Reporter, CP, CM
25 My commission expires
FEBRUARY 5, 2017

25