

0001

1
2
3
4
5
6

7 MEETING OF THE SULLIVAN'S ISLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

8
9
10
11
12
13

14 DATE: March 21, 2007
15 TIME: 6:00 p.m.
16 LOCATION: SULLIVAN'S ISLAND TOWN HALL
1610 Middle Street
17 Sullivan's Island, SC 29482

18
19
20
21
22

23 REPORTED BY: NANCY ENNIS TIERNEY, CSR (IL)
CLARK & ASSOCIATES
24 P.O. Box 73129
North Charleston, SC 29415
25 (843) 762-6294

0002

1
2
3
4

A P P E A R A N C E S

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS:

5
6
7
8
9

PAT ILBERTON - Chair
STEPHEN HERLONG - Vice Chair
DUKE WRIGHT - Secretary
BETTY HARMON - Member
FRED REINHARD - Member
BILLY CRAVER - Member
CYNDY EWING - Member

10
11
12
13

14 ALSO PRESENT: Kat Kenyon - Administrative Support
Randy Robinson - Building Official
15 Kent Prause - Zoning Administrator
Trenholm Walker - Board Attorney

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

0003

1	I N D E X	
2		Page
3		
4	Certificate of Reporter	146

5
6
7
8
9

E X H I B I T S

No exhibits were marked.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

0004

1 MR. ILDERTON: This is the March 21st,
2 2007 meeting of the Sullivan's Island Design
3 Review Board. It is now 6:00.
4 The members in attendance are Cyndy
5 Ewing, Betty Harmon, Fred Reinhard, Steve Herlong,
6 Pat Ilderton and Duke Wright, and we think Billy
7 Craver is coming. The Freedom of Information
8 requirements have been met for this meeting.
9 First of all I want to say that one of
10 our members is down a little bit with some
11 difficulty, and she won't be speaking too much
12 tonight, but she will be voting. So we want to
13 make sure everybody knows she will be voting. So

14 Betty is not going to probably be saying too much
15 tonight. And I would like everybody to follow her
16 course and not say anything so we can get out of
17 here in about half an hour, but that is not going
18 to happen.

19 But I would like to say that we have a
20 lot on the agenda tonight, and if people, even if
21 your allotted time is ten minutes or whatever, if
22 you have a way to shorten it or to be considerate
23 and -- and that includes the board and everybody
24 because we have a lot to get through tonight. And
25 so if everybody could be as short and to the point

0005

1 as possible, I know everyone would appreciate it.
2 So, thank you.

3 Fred, did you have something?

4 MR. REINHARD: Yes, sir. I have gone
5 through these applications tonight and found a
6 couple of things that I wanted to bring to the
7 Board's attention that we should, I think, keep in
8 mind as we deliberate on these applicants.

9 The first one is, within the 15
10 applications there are four of them that are
11 requesting increases in the principal building
12 coverage with the expectation that the board
13 could, by virtue of the zoning ordinance, allow a
14 25 percent increase in the principal building
15 square footage.

16 I am a little concerned that there are
17 so many, and I would like the board to just be
18 aware that there may be a trend here that people
19 are applying with the expectation that they are
20 going to get more than what the zoning ordinance
21 allows because we can listen to their appeal and
22 make that decision.

23 However, the zoning code says that it
24 must -- there must be some neighborhood
25 compatibility issues in order for us to grant that

0006

1 extra square footage. So I think that we should
2 request the applicants who are asking for that
3 additional square footage to somehow explain how
4 it makes their house more compatible in the
5 neighborhood. That's the first one.

6 The second one is, we are getting more
7 and more drawings, CAD-oriented drawings that
8 don't have dimensions on them. Now, I know how to
9 use an architect's scale and an engineer's scale,
10 and it's not hard for me to figure out what the
11 size of these buildings are.

12 But I think, at the very least, if it's
13 a final application, which means it's a drawing

14 that is going to be certified for this board and
15 go on file and to be used by the building
16 inspector to go out and look at a building, that
17 the building inspector shouldn't have to carry an
18 architect's scale to find out if the front of the
19 house is 12 feet wide or 14 feet wide.

20 So I would be willing to overlook it on
21 preliminary applications. But certainly, when you
22 come in for final, these are architectural
23 drawings and they are deserving of dimensions and
24 we would like to see those dimensions. That's
25 all.

0007

1 MR. ILBERTON: Thank you.
2 The approval of the February minutes. I
3 have read them. We got them. Has everybody read
4 them, or is there any comments or any difficulties
5 with them?

6 MS. EWING: I have some comments, and I
7 actually have some additions, and they are kind of
8 apropos of what Fred was just talking about.

9 And it's kind of -- I also -- and with
10 the minutes being the record of the meeting, I
11 think that we need to include as much information
12 so that if somebody wants to find out what is
13 going on in the meeting they can just go to the
14 minutes and read it.

15 So here are the changes. I will read
16 them and give you a copy. This is in the Cox
17 residence, 1807 Atlantic Avenue, and after the
18 second paragraph -- or at the end of the second
19 paragraph I would like to add, they are seeking
20 relief in three areas.

21 Number one, 13 percent relief, 533
22 square feet on the standard principal building
23 square footage allowed of 4,100 square feet for a
24 total of principal building square footage of
25 4,620 square feet.

0008

1 Number two, 23 percent relief with a
2 3.5 foot on side yard setback for the porch.

3 Number three, 100 percent relief on
4 side-to-side setbacks with two elevations.

5 And then it says Pat Ilderton asked for
6 public comments, there were none, and I would like
7 to add in two paragraphs here, because I believe
8 there was some discussion that is important to
9 note.

10 Neighborhood compatibility height, mass
11 and scale concerns were expressed by Cyndy Ewing
12 and Betty Harmon citing the average size of homes
13 in the neighborhood at 2,047 square feet, and that

14 the surrounding historic district neighborhood
15 homes were lower to the ground and typically lower
16 one-and-a-half story structures.

17 Cyndy Ewing requested -- a new
18 paragraph. Cyndy Ewing requested that in the
19 future all applications should have measurements
20 on plans for them to be considered complete. A
21 discussion by the group followed, agreeing that
22 applications would not be considered complete
23 unless they included to-scale measurements of
24 floor plans and elevations submitted with a
25 licensed survey of property.

0009

1 On further discussion it was agreed that
2 Kat Kenyon had the DRB's authorization to reject
3 any and all applications that were not complete.

4 I think this is important to note
5 because, again, as Fred was saying, we have
6 received any number of applications that do not
7 have any measurements on them.

8 And it's not something that we are
9 asking for in addition. It is something that is
10 already on -- that the client sees, and we can't
11 be making decisions without the proper numbers.
12 That's it.

13 MR. ILDERTON: So we are clear on the
14 change to the minutes?

15 MR. CRAVER: I'm not sure I am clear on
16 the change. I listened to what she said, but
17 without being able to listen to the tapes and
18 confirm that those were -- that that is what was
19 said in the meeting -- I mean, I assumed that when
20 Duke and Kat made the minutes that they were doing
21 them based on Kat's notes and to the extent they
22 needed to listen to the tapes, they did.

23 I am not really in favor of adding
24 voluminous stuff to minutes without having it
25 verified that, you know, that is exactly what was

0010

1 said at the time.

2 MS. KENYON: We have not been doing the
3 minutes verbatim.

4 MR. CRAVER: Right. No, I understand
5 that. But, I mean, I am concerned with having
6 somebody come in and add paragraphs to minutes to
7 try to show intent on stuff without it -- if we
8 are going to do that, then it needs to be verified
9 that that is exactly what was said in the meeting
10 and that it's not something composed after the
11 fact. Because, I mean, you did compose it after
12 the fact. So --

13 MR. ILDERTON: Well, I guess the biggest

14 difficulty is if we are trying to make policy in
15 these minutes, which I don't know that we even can
16 make policy by having opinions in the minutes. I
17 don't know that that establishes policy of this
18 board.

19 That is our biggest concern, that it may
20 be the opinion of a couple of people on the board,
21 or whatever, where it should be done. But if we
22 are establishing policy, whether the minutes are
23 the place to establish policy or whether another
24 time of this meeting we should establish policy of
25 how we receive these applications.

0011

1 And I guess that is the difficulty, are
2 we -- you know, I don't know that we can establish
3 policy on a particular -- as general policy, a
4 blanket policy, on a particular application.

5 MS. EWING: Well, how about we defer
6 this and we will just listen to the tapes and then
7 decide.

8 MR. ILBERTON: Great. Okay. That's
9 great.

10 MR. REINHARD: I don't want to drag
11 this --

12 MR. WRIGHT: This is Duke Wright, who
13 wrote the minutes. Based on what Kat gets from
14 the jibber-jabber that goes on here, and it's very
15 difficult to capture the essence of a
16 conversation, and I think Billy is right on, that
17 we need to go back and look and review the
18 transcript.

19 I have purposely tried to keep the
20 minutes as short as possible to capture the
21 essence of what occurred in the meeting rather
22 than the language of each person's conversation,
23 and I think that is apropos to Pat's comments of
24 trying to determine whether or not the minutes are
25 making policy or transcribing what occurred at the

0012

1 meeting.

2 MR. CRAVER: It seems to me that the
3 minutes ought to be laying out actions taken, and
4 that it is not an attempt to get the discourse
5 going back and forth.

6 MR. WRIGHT: That's right. Let me
7 continue for a minute, Billy, and I will pick you
8 up. I have one other point I want to finish
9 here.

10 And, as we know, tonight we now have a
11 verbatim transcript being taken of the minutes,
12 which leads me to assume that the minutes are
13 going to end up verbatim and will be extremely

14 lengthy and detailed in the future.
15 MS. KENYON: Correct.
16 MR. CRAVER: Golly, that's a mistake,
17 but anyway.
18 MR. ILDERTON: Shall we vote on the
19 minutes? Anybody?
20 MR. CRAVER: This is as amended or --
21 MR. ILDERTON: This is as written.
22 Well, we haven't really amended them, right? We
23 are going to wait and review the transcript and
24 then amend them.
25 MS. EWING: Right.

0013

1 MR. WRIGHT: Do we need a motion?
2 MR. ILDERTON: I hear a motion -- I move
3 that the approval of the minutes be deferred until
4 Kat and Duke Wright can review the transcript to
5 determine precisely what was said.
6 MR. REINHARD: Second.
7 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion? Further
8 discussion? Everybody in favor?
9 (All hands were raised.)
10 MR. ILDERTON: Okay. Do we have to
11 approve the special February minutes?
12 MS. KENYON: Yes.
13 MR. ILDERTON: Okay. We have to approve
14 the special February minutes. Do we hear a motion
15 to approve?
16 MR. HELONG: I make a motion that we
17 approve the 12 -- the 21st of February -- no, the
18 12th of February minutes.
19 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a second?
20 MR. WRIGHT: Second.
21 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion? Everybody in
22 favor, aye.
23 (All hands raised except Ms. Ewing.)
24 MS. KENYON: It wasn't unanimous.
25 MR. ILDERTON: It wasn't unanimous?

0014

1 Anyone opposed?
2 (Ms. Ewing raised her hand.)
3 MR. ILDERTON: Duly recorded.
4 1723 Middle Street, the Stith residence,
5 demolition of a house. Kent?
6 MR. PRAUSE: It's a request to demolish
7 the home. They filled out a DRB application form,
8 and we have also some information from the
9 Charleston County Tax Assessor's office which
10 indicated that the house was built in 1966, it's
11 41 years old, so it's not 50 years old. It's here
12 because it's in a historic district. There are
13 also two pages of photographs of the existing

14 residence.

15 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you. Yes,
16 sir?

17 MR. STITH: Anthony Stith. I represent
18 the family, 1723, LLC. Basically we are trying to
19 sell the house. The house hasn't moved for three
20 years. Dad and mom both have been dead for three
21 years.

22 The only inquiries we have gotten was
23 whether the house could be removed, so we are
24 asking for a demolition permit so we can sell the
25 house and move on with our lives.

0015

1 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, sir. Public
2 comment? No public comment. That section is
3 closed. And, Kent, anything to add?

4 MR. PRAUSE: No.

5 MR. ILDERTON: Randy?

6 MR. ROBINSON: No.

7 MR. ILDERTON: Duke?

8 MR. WRIGHT: I recommend we approve the
9 application as submitted.

10 MR. ILDERTON: Steve?

11 MR. HELONG: I also recommend we approve
12 it. I see no -- clearly no historic character to
13 the home, so I would have no trouble with the
14 application to demolish.

15 MR. ILDERTON: Fred?

16 MR. REINHARD: I agree with demolition.

17 MR. ILDERTON: Cindy?

18 MS. EWING: Approve.

19 MR. ILDERTON: I won't call on Betty.

20 She shook her head. Billy?

21 MR. CRAVER: I agree.

22 MR. ILDERTON: I agree, also. Good.

23 MS. EWING: I make a motion that --

24 Cyndy Ewing makes a motion that we approve
25 demolition.

0016

1 MR. ILDERTON: And I don't really
2 think -- I think the board has established the
3 names.

4 MR. WRIGHT: I second it.

5 MR. HELONG: Second.

6 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor, aye.

7 (All hands raised.)

8 MR. ILDERTON: 415 Station 22, Marshall
9 Stith, reduce historic structure on nonhistoric
10 addition. Kent?

11 MR. PRAUSE: It's an application to
12 demolish a 10x12 foot addition to the original
13 historic structure and, according to the

14 application, to install a gravel driveway.
15 You have the Design Review Board request
16 and a copy of the original permit that was
17 submitted 10-26-86 for the drawing of the existing
18 house and the addition. Also, a letter from the
19 applicant requesting the demolition, and four
20 pages of photographs from said property and a site
21 plan drawing.

22 And basically it goes, as the original
23 cottage was built in the 1930s. The addition was
24 built in 1986. The original cottage dimensions
25 are 34 feet wide by 23 feet deep and the addition,
0017

1 as mentioned, is 12x10, and a 7x27 foot front
2 porch, and the request, as stated, is to remove
3 that 10x12 addition.

4 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Yes, sir?

5 MR. STITH: I am Marshall Stith and I am
6 making this request. Mr. Chairman and ladies and
7 gentlemen of the board, I would just like to put
8 the cottage back to the original cottage size and
9 also install a driveway, a gravel driveway.

10 The cottage was built in 1938. And, as
11 Kent mentioned, the addition was put on in '86,
12 and it really doesn't -- it's not very appealing
13 looking, no offense to whoever built it.

14 MR. ILDERTON: I would hope not. Is
15 that it?

16 MR. STITH: Yes, sir.

17 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, sir. Public
18 comment? Does anybody have any comment on Mr.
19 Stith's application? Public comment section is
20 closed.

21 Kent, anything?

22 MR. PRAUSE: No.

23 MR. ILDERTON: Randy?

24 MR. ROBINSON: No.

25 MR. ILDERTON: Duke?

0018

1 MR. WRIGHT: Does that include that
2 little deck behind there?

3 MR. STITH: Yes, sir, it does.

4 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. I recommend that the
5 application be approved as submitted.

6 MR. ILDERTON: Steve?

7 MR. HERLONG: I also recommend approval.

8 As you look at the photographs and view the
9 addition, it is clearly not part of the original
10 structure, and it would be much more compatible
11 without that addition.

12 MR. ILDERTON: Fred?

13 MR. REINHARD: I agree.

14 MR. ILDERTON: Cyndy?
15 MS. EWING: Is this -- we are not
16 approving the driveway? That is not part of the
17 process?

18 MR. REINHARD: The demolition issue,
19 just demolition.

20 MR. ILDERTON: Yes, demolition.

21 MS. EWING: Okay. I agree to demolish.

22 MR. ILDERTON: Billy?

23 MR. CRAVER: Demolish.

24 MR. ILDERTON: I think that is a good
25 idea. It really hurts me. Do I hear a motion?

0019

1 MR. HERLONG: I make a motion to approve
2 the submittal as submitted.

3 MR. REINHARD: I second that motion.

4 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion? Everybody in
5 favor?

6 (All hands raised.)

7 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, sir.

8 MR. STITH: Thank you very much.

9 MR. ILDERTON: 425 Station 22, the
10 Scheer residence, moving a historic structure.

11 MR. HERLONG: I am going to excuse
12 myself because I was involved early on in that
13 project.

14 MR. ILDERTON: Kent, what do you think?

15 MR. PRAUSE: This is an application to
16 move the existing historic structure on the lot.
17 And, as you all probably recall, it was approved
18 previously.

19 There were two houses on the lot. One
20 was approved for demolition. This one, however,
21 was slated for retention and it was allowed to be
22 reduced in size and converted into a garage
23 building and the new house was approved to be
24 built on the lot.

25 The proposal now is to move it within

0020

1 five feet of the front setback to the front street
2 property line and, as it's stated on the site
3 plan, 15 feet towards the street, 5-foot setback
4 and a 10-foot side yard setback. That is the
5 application.

6 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you.
7 Applicant or representative?

8 MR. MORIARTY: John Moriarty
9 representing Jerry Scheer. He's out of town.

10 We actually put the house -- just to go
11 a little quicker, and I will try to make it as
12 quick as I can.

13 We put the house exactly where the plans

14 were approved, where they stated. Randy grabbed
15 me and said, I think the house is supposed to be a
16 little bit further to the front. We went back and
17 listened to the minutes, read the transcript or
18 the minutes that Kat did, and it sounded as if the
19 board wanted the house moved closer to the street,
20 so we kind of stopped where we were, left the
21 house where it was until we could get a
22 clarification.

23 The owner is fine with moving the house
24 closer to the street, which kind of keeps it in
25 better rhythm with the historic smaller houses,
0021

1 and also where the house was originally was a
2 little bit closer to the street than it is now.

3 So we would be willing to move it
4 forward to the 5-foot line, which Mr. Stith's
5 house next to us has that adjacent cottage about
6 five or six feet from the property line. Thank
7 you.

8 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Public comment on
9 this item? No comment. Section is closed.

10 Kent, anything to add?

11 MR. PRAUSE: No.

12 MR. ILDERTON: Randy?

13 MR. ROBINSON: I have a little bit to
14 add. You know, I probably did instigate this
15 moving forward because I felt when I went and saw
16 it sitting back on the property like that it was
17 really so far back that it was lost, and I felt
18 like moving it forward would be the thing to do.

19 One thing I would suggest, that it move
20 no closer to the street than the Stith residence
21 next door. And I just got on the -- it's kind of
22 ironic the Stith residence came up right before
23 this one.

24 The Stith residence from scaling on the
25 plan is six feet from the property line, and I
0022

1 think these two houses ought to be even right
2 there. So instead of being five feet from the
3 property line I feel like it ought to be six.

4 MR. ILDERTON: Great. I will start at
5 the opposite end this time. Billy?

6 MR. CRAVER: It sounds very reasonable
7 to me. I would approve it the way -- what they
8 are asking to do.

9 MR. ILDERTON: Cyndy?

10 MS. EWING: I agree.

11 MR. ILDERTON: Fred?

12 MR. REINHARD: Although I don't agree
13 with the concept of taking a historic house and

14 turning it into a garage, which was done before I
15 got on this board, I do agree that Randy has a
16 good idea to bring it forward to the street and
17 line it up with the adjacent houses, which
18 improves the neighborhood compatibility. I
19 approve.

20 MR. ILDERTON: Duke?

21 MR. WRIGHT: I agree.

22 MR. ILDERTON: I also agree. Do I hear
23 a motion?

24 MR. CRAVER: So moved.

25 (Ms. Harmon raised her hand.)

0023

1 MR. ILDERTON: Do we have a motion?

2 MR. CRAVER: I move that we approve it.

3 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a second?

4 MR. REINHARD: Second.

5 MS. EWING: Well, wait. We have to
6 change it to the six feet.

7 MR. ILDERTON: We can do that in the
8 discussion phase.

9 MR. CRAVER: Well, no. The motion is to
10 do it at six, to make it six feet to line up with
11 the house on the adjacent lot.

12 MR. REINHARD: I second that motion.

13 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion? Everybody in
14 favor?

15 (All hands raised.)

16 MR. ILDERTON: Anyone opposed?

17 (No hands raised.)

18 MR. ILDERTON: 412 Station 14, the Cook
19 residence, new construction.

20 MR. HERLONG: I excuse myself from this
21 one, too.

22 MR. PRAUSE: This is an application for
23 final approval for new construction of the
24 residence located at 412 Station 14 Street.

25 The reason why it's here before you is

0024

1 that they are requesting some modifications to the
2 design standards as outlined in the Design Review
3 Board request for new construction and additions.

4 They basically relate to principal
5 building coverage, principal building square
6 footage, and for a small portion of side setback
7 relief at the corner of the garage as stated on
8 the application.

9 You have that application form and a set
10 of drawings consisting of a site plan, elevation
11 drawings and a floor plan.

12 In looking the plan over with Randy --
13 and I will just go ahead and he can fill in as he

14 sees fit, as well. We had some concerns with
15 respect to these drawings, and some of it is
16 mirrored, is reflected on what has been said
17 already.

18 You can't really discern the scale to
19 it. The drawings have been reduced. And there
20 are no dimensions on the floor plans, so we can't
21 really verify the square footages that are set
22 forth in the application.

23 But there are two -- actually three
24 things that came to our attention. It appears
25 that on the north elevation and also the south

0025

1 elevation there are dormers on the south elevation
2 drawing and on the north which appears to be a
3 porch that strongly suggests a third floor
4 element, and there is no third floor floor plan,
5 so we don't know whether there is a third floor or
6 not.

7 I mean, these are pretty extensive
8 treatments for cosmetics, so we can only assume
9 that there is a third floor, but it's not shown,
10 and we don't know whether these calculations
11 include that or not.

12 In a similar context this, I guess, what
13 is termed -- well, it's termed the garage on the
14 plans with the three cars in it. On the second
15 floor plan it shows attic storage space, but we
16 don't know if it's -- what that is exactly.

17 There appears to be steps that go up
18 from the laundry room, and if that is to be
19 converted into heated or living space, we don't
20 know. And there is a concern with respect to that
21 as well, because the garage is attached to the
22 building. It appears to be part and parcel of the
23 main structure, so then it's not a detached
24 accessory building, which then allows it to exceed
25 the size and the height limitations that are

0026

1 placed upon that.

2 But if it's part of the main building,
3 then it's an elevated building, and the area below
4 the base flood elevation can only have open
5 lattice or mesh screening around it.

6 If it's a detached accessory use
7 building, and it appears to be just sort of tacked
8 on to the main building, to get around that then,
9 if it's considered that, it's going to have to be
10 an accessory building that is limited with respect
11 to the size and the height of that building.

12 Those are the concerns that we pretty
13 much came up with. Anything, Randy, to add?

14 MR. ROBINSON: No. I have one thing to
15 add after.

16 MR. PRAUSE: Thank you.

17 MR. REINHARD: Question.

18 MR. ILDERTON: Yes, sir.

19 MR. REINHARD: Is this the first time
20 you have seen this application?

21 MR. PRAUSE: Yesterday was when we
22 reviewed it, yes.

23 MR. REINHARD: Yet it's marked final,
24 correct? Not preliminary and not conceptual, but
25 final?

0027

1 MR. PRAUSE: Our understanding is they
2 want final approval on this.

3 MR. REINHARD: I wanted to be sure that
4 was not a mistake.

5 MR. PRAUSE: That is our understanding.
6 That is what is marked on the form.

7 MR. ILDERTON: Applicant or applicant's
8 representative? Yes, sir?

9 MR. HINSHAW: Jim Hinshaw with Stephen
10 Herlong & Associates. And, Pat, I think you have
11 some letters from some neighbors.

12 MR. ILDERTON: Did we all get those or
13 just me? Do we all have copies of the letters?
14 Everybody on the board got copies? Okay. That
15 will be part of public comment phase. I can read
16 those out in the public comment phase.

17 MR. HINSHAW: Like I said, I'm Jim
18 Hinshaw with Stephen Herlong & Associates, and
19 also here tonight are Tim and Kim Cook. I didn't
20 know Kim was coming.

21 Tim and Kim and their four young sons
22 who are ages, I think, three months to six years,
23 will be making this home their permanent home on
24 Station 14, and came to us to design a home that
25 would be their permanent residence and meet the

0028

1 needs of their growing family. As they said, for
2 the rest of their lives they want to live in this
3 house.

4 As Kent mentioned, the home is not in a
5 historic district. The only reason we are here
6 tonight is because the program of the home
7 requires that we request DRB allow increases to
8 the principal building coverage, principal
9 building square footage and approval to allow a
10 small corner of this attached garage building here
11 to extend into what is termed the side setback.

12 We are requesting final approval because
13 we do feel the design has developed to the point

14 and standards of neighborhood compatibility, and
15 we feel that this particular design on this lot
16 justifies the request that DRB approved increases
17 to principal building coverage, which we are
18 requesting 18.9 percent while the DRB can grant up
19 to 20, to principal square footage where we are
20 requesting 21 percent while the DRB can grant up
21 to 25, and the small amount of side setback relief
22 as illustrated on the site plan.

23 Again, we will get into the design, but
24 mainly because we pulled the house back from these
25 large oaks here, and the lot is somewhat irregular

0029

1 in that that corner is cut off, so it's just the
2 corner of the garage building that we are asking
3 for.

4 And, honestly, we feel that this type of
5 lot, which is a marshfront lot and is not in a
6 historic district, is a prime example of why the
7 DRB is allowed to grant such increases to the
8 things that we described.

9 Tim took the design or took the
10 submittal around to the neighbors and showed them
11 what we are proposing here. And I think in the
12 letters that you have, I'm assuming that Pat will
13 read after I explain the design a little bit more,
14 you will see the support that he has from his
15 neighbors.

16 I would like to briefly go through the
17 standards of the neighborhood compatibility,
18 Section 21-111 of the zoning code, and show you
19 how this design meets those standards and
20 justifies the increases that we are requesting.

21 We are fortunate enough that the lot is
22 high, and this enables us to bring the first floor
23 of the house very close to the ground so there is
24 no handrails on the decks. It helps anchor the
25 house to the ground and creates a much more

0030

1 inviting pedestrian scale.

2 As far as the height goes, I know there
3 was a concern about the height and not having
4 dimensions. The dimensions of the main roof ridge
5 are shown as 38 feet. But that is the only item
6 on the house, that main ridge at the primary roof
7 here that approaches that 38-foot level.

8 Everything else is complementary to that main roof
9 ridge and is much lower. All the other roofs are
10 much lower than that.

11 The massing and the orientation of the
12 home was very important in the design. The home
13 is a combination of smaller pieces to create a

14 sort of added-on effect, and it doesn't look,
15 necessarily, like we just put a new house on this
16 lot.

17 Certainly a lot of care was taken to
18 address the views and capture the light and the
19 views and the breezes towards Cove Creek, but we
20 also addressed each side of this house, Station
21 14, and this side and this side to make it more
22 compatible with the neighbors, and I think you see
23 that in the elevations with a lot of low elements,
24 a lot of low group elements.

25 The window patterns on the house are
0031

1 generally -- the grid pattern was generally four
2 over one, double-hung windows with colonial
3 shutters, which is a very traditional look.

4 The doors, you have a lot of doors on
5 this first floor, double wood and glass doors,
6 again, very reminiscent of older Sullivan's Island
7 architecture.

8 Most of the porches that you see on the
9 elevations are very close to the ground, as we
10 mentioned earlier, and are visible from all sides
11 of the house. The porch roofs themselves are
12 carefully articulated.

13 The driveway, as you can see on the site
14 plan, enters off Station 14, at the end of Station
15 14, and it comes past an existing building that we
16 talked to Kent a little bit about and we are going
17 to rotate that building 90 degrees so the opening
18 is facing to the interior of the lot. It looks to
19 be a '70s, '80s addition to this site. It has
20 vinyl siding, older windows.

21 We are proposing to remove all of the
22 old materials and re clad it in a way that is
23 complementary to the overall design. But you come
24 past this older structure here into a court and
25 across to a three-car garage that is an attached
0032

1 structure. It is, I believe, above the base flood
2 elevation. Like I said, the lot is very high.
3 And this structure is going to be a brick material
4 here. So while it is attached, it's detailed, and
5 the use of materials allow it to be very
6 complementary to the overall design.

7 The front facade of the house is
8 actually on Station 14, and that is defined by the
9 zoning code. This is defined as the front for
10 setback reasons. This is the rear and these are
11 the sides. Technically, we view this side as the
12 front, but it's Station 14. But we did take care
13 to look at all sides of the house, not only the

14 Station 14 side, but the front, the rear and the
15 sides.

16 The roof design was very important,
17 including the configuration of the pitches. The
18 gable and shed dormers break up the primary gable
19 roof, and many low roof elements help to bring
20 down the scale of the house and reflect the lower
21 porches as we mentioned a little while ago,
22 reminiscent of older porches.

23 The last standard of neighborhood
24 compatibility is dealing with the architectural
25 style of the home. The design, again, is very

0033

1 reminiscent of older Sullivan's Island
2 architecture. Traditional materials like lap
3 siding, metal roof, brick piers, lattice infill
4 all make the home fit into the neighborhood and
5 make it a timely design.

6 Overall, the design response to the site
7 is compatible with the neighborhood, and we,
8 again, request final approval with the requested
9 increases to principal building coverage,
10 principal building square footage and approval of
11 the minor encroachment in the side setback. And I
12 think the letters that Pat will read are further
13 testimony that those with neighboring homes
14 support this design.

15 I don't know how I'm doing on time, but
16 I have some things to say on --

17 MS. EWING: Three minutes.

18 MR. HINSHAW: I have three minutes left?

19 MS. EWING: Yes.

20 MR. HINSHAW: Okay. Kent mentioned the
21 garage structure, the three-car garage structure.
22 We wanted this house to be low to the ground. We
23 could have lifted the house up and parked
24 underneath the house, but we thought that the site
25 would be better suited to have a house that is low

0034

1 to the ground and kind of flow out to the marsh.

2 By doing that, we don't have any storage
3 under the house like is typical in most of the
4 houses that are being constructed today, so we
5 have the parking in the rear of the site in this
6 three-car garage.

7 We also have no room for mechanical
8 units underneath the house. All of the mechanical
9 units, and we might use geothermal units, are
10 going to take some square footage inside the
11 house, in the attics, wherever we could find it in
12 that area over the garage over here.

13 Not only mechanical space would go in

14 that area, but also storage, because there were
15 tons of things that they don't have storage for on
16 this lot that are typically shoved under the
17 house. So that addresses some of what you were
18 talking about with the attic space.

19 What were your other things, Kent?

20 MR. PRAUSE: Is there a third floor
21 element?

22 MR. HINSHAW: The third floor element.

23 We did break up this roofline. You can see it
24 really on all four elevations, here and here, with
25 some dormers, and there is a possibility of

0035

1 including some third floor space.

2 I went ahead and -- of course that third
3 floor space cannot exceed 400 square feet by the
4 zoning code. But that third floor space happened
5 by articulating the roof more than anything, and
6 it seemed like a good opportunity to put a small
7 office or a small room up there. But, again, it
8 will not exceed 400 square feet, and I have that
9 third floor plan to show you where it is. It's
10 very, very brief.

11 MR. PRAUSE: I guess that is a yes,
12 there is a third floor element?

13 MR. HINSHAW: Yes.

14 MR. PRAUSE: Is it included in these --

15 MR. HINSHAW: Yes, it is. The third
16 floor number is included in those calculations,
17 and I think it's 396 square feet.

18 MR. ILDERTON: All right. I think we
19 are done. Thank you. Randy -- I mean, Kent, do
20 we have -- well, public comment? Do we have
21 anybody speaking for or against or --

22 MR. CAGLE: John Cagle, a neighbor, five
23 docks down. I reviewed the plans. I think it
24 would be a great addition to our street and in
25 keeping with the neighborhood.

0036

1 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Would anyone
2 else like to say anything? I have some letters
3 that I could read.

4 From Roy and Carol Morris. We are the
5 property owners of 1402 Thompson, adjacent to the
6 Cook property, 412. Due to out-of-town travel we
7 are not able to attend the meeting. We have
8 reviewed both the site plan and the elevation
9 drawings of the lot, new house and existing
10 structure.

11 We fully support the Cooks' plans for
12 the property and deem it to be a vast improvement
13 both of the property and the neighborhood. Tim

14 Cook has been in excellent communication with us
15 on the plans at 412 Station 14.

16 And we have another letter from Andrea
17 Zoot Cooper. This letter is to support the
18 architectural renderings of the proposed Cook
19 residence at 412 Station 14. The exterior
20 elevations are aesthetically pleasing and will
21 benefit the streetscape neighborhood. As
22 neighbors across the street from the proposed
23 residence we are supportive of the Cooks' plans.

24 From Bobby Cummings at 1610 Middle
25 Street. To whom it may concern: Please accept
0037

1 this letter of support from my wife and me
2 regarding the board granting the Cooks relief
3 they are requesting from the square footage as
4 well as the lot coverage restrictions. Please
5 feel free to contact me with any questions.

6 And from Richard Browder, doctor, M.D.,
7 I am writing in support of Mr. Tim Cook's
8 application for a residential construction
9 variance. I have reviewed the construction plans
10 and feel that the home, as well as the Cook
11 family, would be a valuable asset to our
12 neighborhood.

13 And from Loren and Mindelle Ziff. The
14 Cooks have met with us to discuss their plans to
15 construct a new house at 412 Station 14 on
16 Sullivan's Island.

17 We supported the demolition of the
18 existing house and support the construction of a
19 new house. The design by Herlong & Associates is
20 very appropriate and compatible to the
21 neighborhood. The house design is classic
22 Sullivan's Island style and fits beautifully into
23 the existing homes in the neighborhood.

24 We are aware the Cooks are requesting
25 additional square footage above maximum permitted
0038

1 by the ordinance and we support their request. We
2 look forward to them moving into the neighborhood.
3 Please let us know if we can be of additional
4 assistance in this matter.

5 Those are all the letters written
6 concerning this property. That is the end of
7 public discussion.

8 Kent, anything to add?

9 MR. PRAUSE: Well, just to get something
10 into the record. I don't know exactly what this
11 board can do about it. It's an issue Randy and I
12 have struggled with from time to time when we see
13 that much attic and mechanical and unfinished

14 space that is just in a building that is already
15 pretty much at the top limit of what it can be.
16 There is always cause, and I'm not
17 saying these guys are going to do it, but of
18 people going in and finishing it off later on and
19 it becomes way more than what -- but, as I said, I
20 don't know. We just have to keep an eye on it.

21 MR. ILDERTON: Correct. Randy?

22 MR. ROBINSON: I just -- you know, I
23 don't have dimensions on the plans, so I can't
24 tell a whole lot. The other thing is, I mean, it
25 is a very large home. I don't know -- in order to
0039

1 give increases we are supposed to look at
2 neighborhood compatibility, and I don't know if
3 the other ones in the neighborhood are this large
4 or not.

5 The one thing that I noticed that we
6 hadn't talked about was this garage that is going
7 to be relocated. It's right up on the street, and
8 I would like to see it in relation to the garage
9 next door.

10 I mean, the way -- it's not shown on any
11 elevations, I don't believe, so it will probably
12 just be a big flat wall sitting right on the
13 street, which is something to deal with.

14 MR. HINSHAW: This is the garage here.
15 This is a small picture of it. It's not a very
16 big structure, but it is a nonconforming use, and
17 we have talked to Kent about it.

18 We are actually bringing it back into
19 conformity a little bit by rotating it and pushing
20 it into the site slightly and squaring it up with
21 the new house here.

22 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Duke, what do
23 you think?

24 MR. WRIGHT: Well, I, too -- I want to
25 say that I, too, have concerns with creeping sizes
0040

1 of homes on Sullivan's Island beyond what the
2 ordinance allows and what we can allow.

3 However, in this case, I think the
4 architect has done a good job of maintaining a low
5 profile. And in the instance of creeping size,
6 most of it deals with neighborhood compatibility
7 in my judgment. And I think given -- and I walked
8 around this area myself at some length -- that the
9 size of this house, given the profile, is not
10 objectionable in terms of neighborhood
11 compatibility, so I support it.

12 MR. ILDERTON: Fred?

13 MR. REINHARD: Well, certainly the

14 letters from the neighborhood attest to the fact
15 that there is some compatibility with regard to
16 this design, and it's a very attractive house. I
17 really like the way it has developed. All the
18 efforts that you made to anchor it worked very
19 well.

20 I am a little concerned that it appears
21 as though the front of the house faces the marsh
22 and doesn't really address Station 14, which is
23 the address. Standing at Station 14 you will see
24 the back of the existing garage renovated and the
25 west elevation of the house, which is essentially

0041

1 a few windows and the back of a fireplace.

2 There is no sense of arrival, other than
3 the driveway, which is after the existing garage.
4 It's one of those issues which, obviously, if you
5 are on the beach, a lot of times the fronts of the
6 houses are on the beach or facing the street,
7 probably more times the street than the beach.

8 This is one of those questions. How do
9 we respect Station 14 with the prettiest side of
10 the house facing the marsh, which you really can't
11 see unless you go out to the edge of the marsh and
12 turn around. Do you want to comment on that?

13 MR. HINSHAW: Sure. That is probably
14 best seen in this elevation here, which the plan
15 is to have landscaping on that side to direct you.

16 MR. REINHARD: Don't say that. Don't
17 say landscaping.

18 MR. HINSHAW: Let me go to another
19 point.

20 MR. REINHARD: Let's talk about the
21 architectural.

22 MR. HINSHAW: Let me go to another
23 point. The main body of the house is back here,
24 is back here, this structure here. By using the
25 low elements on the street it is inviting. It

0042

1 brings you in as opposed to putting a large mass
2 on the street. The entry to the house, when
3 people come over, there probably will be a way
4 around this way, but I would imagine that they
5 will be coming in through here and into the front
6 door, but they are walking by a one-story element,
7 a nice element with exposed rafter tails with a
8 metal roof and nice materials. They are walking
9 by a nice element that could be back on I'on
10 somewhere, but not overwhelmed as they are walking
11 into the house.

12 I think sometimes when you walk into a
13 larger house, even on this phase, it's a little

14 overwhelming and the scale is not right. I think
15 this is going -- this isn't formal, but it's
16 pedestrian friendly to approach the house.
17 MR. REINHARD: I would, under the
18 circumstances, I would be willing to go along with
19 conceptual approval because I like the design of
20 the house. I have already expressed my concern
21 about some of the other things. I agree with
22 Duke. I don't have a problem with this particular
23 house on this half-acre plus lot in this location
24 being a little bit bigger, but I would like to see
25 it come back.

0043

1 MR. ILBERTON: Cyndy?
2 MS. EWING: I think the design is
3 beautiful and it's creating -- it's like a
4 compound, and so it is a little bit different.
5 And, actually, I think it says in the ordinances
6 that a house that is on the marsh can have its
7 front facade facing the marsh.
8 But, anyway, I have big concerns over --
9 I don't feel comfortable approving this certainly
10 in the final stages without any of the numbers,
11 and I have the same concerns with the size that
12 Fred has. So, while I like the design, I would
13 not be able to approve it today.
14 MR. HINSHAW: The square footage numbers
15 or the heights and the widths of individual
16 items?
17 MS. EWING: All the square footage, the
18 third floor. The third floor just could easily be
19 built out. I would be interested -- I would like
20 to see a full set of plans. So I don't feel
21 comfortable making a decision when I have no
22 numbers to base that decision on.
23 MR. HINSHAW: I have square footage
24 numbers. I just don't have dimension plans.
25 MS. EWING: I am saying on here.

0044

1 MR. HINSHAW: Do we need to submit
2 plans?
3 MS. EWING: Yes.
4 MR. HINSHAW: But is that in the
5 requirements for the DRB?
6 MS. EWING: Yes. We have discussed this
7 numerous times.
8 MR. ILBERTON: How detailed are we
9 supposed to get these?
10 MR. PRAUSE: It can be as detailed as
11 you want. It basically says that they submit
12 requirements pursuant to the requirements on your
13 application. And I was going to address that

14 earlier. I don't think it -- Trenholm can
15 probably help me.

16 I don't know if it needs to be so formal
17 as to be in the rules, but I would suggest that,
18 at the very least, you need to come up with a
19 motion and a vote that goes on the record of what
20 it is that you want in the way of submittals.

21 The way it was handed to me is that
22 that's 11 sets of elevations, 11 sets of site
23 plans, photographs of existing structure and a
24 complete scope of work. But, I mean, it's silent
25 to --

0045

1 MR. WALKER: There is no requirement
2 that there be construction drawings. But given
3 that the board is going to consider an adjustment
4 to certain standards, it would be appropriate, and
5 I think comply, that the drawings have the square
6 footages and the necessary dimensions to
7 calculate.

8 MR. ILDERTON: At least to a certain
9 point?

10 MR. WALKER: Exactly, because you cannot
11 verify the dimensions and what is being asked for
12 without those. Certainly it wouldn't be expected
13 to go beyond that, except to call out the
14 materials in those instances where you think that
15 is important and other elements where you find it
16 to be material to your decision.

17 MR. REINHARD: There is really no
18 hardship on the part of the architect here because
19 the architect knows exactly what the dimensions
20 are, otherwise they couldn't make the drawing.

21 The computer used to make the drawing
22 knows exactly what the dimensions are, otherwise
23 they would not be able to create the drawing.

24 Why don't we know what they are?

25 MR. HINSHAW: Oh, I am agreeing.

0046

1 MR. REINHARD: I am not asking you.
2 It's rhetorical. Why don't we know what they
3 are? Because you didn't put them on there. Why
4 didn't you put them on there?

5 It is somehow you feel as though we
6 don't need to know that or you didn't have time?
7 I am not picking on you, because we have lots of
8 drawings like that. That is why I started my
9 comment with it's really something that we need to
10 know.

11 MR. ILDERTON: And this might be more
12 appropriate if it was in the preliminary approval
13 as opposed to final approval.

14 Billy, what do you have?

15 MR. CRAVER: Several comments. If they
16 have complied with our requirements by filling in
17 the required blanks, and we have not stated
18 previously that in order to make an application
19 like this that they have to provide full plans
20 with all the dimensions on it, then I think,
21 especially where you have a good reputable
22 architectural firm that is putting on an official
23 application what the numbers are, if the numbers
24 end up being different than what they put on here
25 then it wasn't approved. If we approve what they
0047

1 applied for, and the numbers are different, then
2 they didn't get the approval.

3 So I don't have -- I understand what
4 you-all are saying, that you-all would like to
5 have dimensions on the plans. But if we haven't
6 specifically required that before, I have a
7 problem with saying, okay, as of right now what
8 you have provided us, which gives us the numbers
9 that we have asked for, is inadequate. I just
10 have a problem with that.

11 I think that the design is good. I
12 think the fact that the neighborhood has come in
13 and has supported it makes me say -- I mean, who
14 the hell am I to say no when the neighborhood says
15 okay?

16 Fred, I understand your issue with
17 Station 14, I mean with the front of the house,
18 but I don't think it's an issue that has any
19 impact here because it's -- if the front of the
20 house were facing Station 14, who is it facing?
21 It's at the end of the street.

22 It's not the same issue if you have
23 street-to-street lots and you have one house that
24 is oddball and it's throwing everything off. So I
25 don't really have that same issue.

0048

1 I am concerned that where there is
2 additional attic space that people can use for
3 storage that we are somehow now raising the issue
4 of maybe they would go in and improve it.

5 I have a ton of attic space. We are not
6 going to improve it, but we sure as heck need the
7 storage. I think good architects recognize that
8 people accumulate junk and they need space to put
9 it in.

10 So I don't -- just since we are all
11 talking about all of these issues, I don't have a
12 problem with that, and I'm not going to assume
13 that they are going to do something illegal. I am

14 assuming that they are going to abide by the law.

15 I would approve it and give final
16 approval to the submission. I think they have
17 done a good job.

18 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. I like the
19 plan. I love the fact that it's just a few feet
20 off the ground. It's a good-looking house.

21 I also don't think we can consider the
22 possibilities of what a homeowner may or may not
23 do with space that is not habitable on the plans.
24 That is not a consideration.

25 Our consideration is good architecture

0049

1 and does it fits on Sullivan's Island. That is
2 our main consideration here and not what could
3 happen or whatever else. I think it's a good set
4 of plans.

5 I would like to have more detail if
6 there is any question about that. I think the
7 board needs that. It's just a matter of
8 dimensions. I think Fred is right. It's just a
9 matter of -- I mean, the dimensions are somewhere.
10 They are accessible somewhere. If they are not on
11 the page, we don't have them, then it would be
12 easy to put on.

13 After the fact, though, for us to ask
14 for this, and if it wasn't stated before, maybe we
15 just need to go on the record saying any future
16 applications that come in need to have all the
17 dimensions and all.

18 I know we have all the square footage
19 dimensions and the calculations because that is
20 what they are asking for. All of that has been
21 done. But there is more dimensions as far as just
22 regular what are the size of the rooms and
23 everything else, and I don't think that would be
24 too much to ask an architect or an applicant to
25 put on the plans. But I think it's a good-looking

0050

1 house.

2 MR. HINSHAW: Can I answer a question in
3 regard to that, to putting dimensions on the
4 plans?

5 If I can see where this is going, it's
6 looking like more of a conceptual approval with
7 the contingency -- the only thing you really want
8 to see is dimensions on the plans. So are we to
9 study any design elements? As you have talked
10 about, it sounds like everybody likes the design.

11 MR. ILDERTON: We haven't gotten to that
12 point yet. Does anyone want to make a motion to
13 what we do with the application?

14 MR. CRAVER: I would move to approve it
15 as submitted. That is my motion.

16 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a second?

17 MR. WRIGHT: When do we talk about the
18 motion?

19 MR. ILDERTON: After we get a second.

20 MR. WRIGHT: I will second it.

21 MR. ILDERTON: Now we have discussion on
22 the motion, which is to approve it as submitted.

23 Fred?

24 MR. REINHARD: I would like to hear a
25 little bit more about the issue of the attached

0051

1 garage and how it impacts the concerns that you
2 guys have. Could you address that?

3 MR. PRAUSE: Sure. If it's part of the
4 house then it's an elevated building. It will
5 have a finished floor. Our flood code does not
6 allow solid walls below the finished floor. It's
7 only lattice or mesh screening.

8 MR. REINHARD: Does that mean it can't
9 be attached as a garage?

10 MR. PRAUSE: No. It doesn't mean it
11 can't be attached, but it would be as if it were
12 an elevated building like people park under it.

13 MR. REINHARD: Like a breakaway
14 construction?

15 MR. PRAUSE: Lattice or mesh screen, no
16 solid walls, if it's part of the building. If
17 it's not part of the building, to have solid walls
18 then it has to be treated as a detached accessory
19 building, and it's just sort of on the building.
20 Then there is -- it has size and height and square
21 footage limitations that it exceeds.

22 So if it's a detached accessory building
23 it can't be built that size, that height. If it's
24 part of the building it has to have lattice or
25 mesh screen under it.

0052

1 MR. REINHARD: These are FEMA
2 regulations.

3 MR. PRAUSE: The flood regulations
4 dictate the treatment below the finished floor.
5 But it's shown now as just attic space, unfinished
6 space. So that would lead me to classify it from
7 a zoning perspective as a detached accessory
8 building, which exceeds the height and size.

9 MR. REINHARD: It's my opinion that it's
10 not ready for final; that the presenter, I think,
11 has gotten enough information from us regarding
12 the garage.

13 And I'm going to say I'm okay with the

14 house facing the marsh. You straightened me out
15 on that, and the dimensions. So I think if they
16 come back with a resolution to the garage and some
17 dimensions that we can use to properly evaluate
18 this, like I said, it's a lovely design, but it's
19 just not ready for final, in my opinion.

20 MR. WRIGHT: Am I the only one that
21 doesn't understand the garage problem completely?

22 MR. CRAVER: I don't understand it
23 either.

24 MR. WRIGHT: Are we saying that the
25 garage, as designed, does not meet code?

0053

1 MR. HINSHAW: It is classified as an
2 attached garage. The one that is going to be out
3 here is the detached accessory structure.

4 MR. WRIGHT: I understand that.

5 MR. HINSHAW: The other one is not.

6 MR. WRIGHT: But we are talking about
7 the one that is attached to the house --

8 MR. HINSHAW: That's correct.

9 MR. WRIGHT: -- that has space up above,
10 Kent? Is that your concern?

11 MR. PRAUSE: Yes.

12 MR. WRIGHT: If that space is enclosed,
13 heated and cooled, then you are saying that
14 underneath that has to be breakaway or lattice?

15 MR. PRAUSE: Well, not breakaway, but
16 lattice or mesh screening. It can't be solid
17 walls as currently shown.

18 MR. WRIGHT: So what we are doing is
19 questioning what is going to occur on the second
20 level above the garage?

21 MR. PRAUSE: Right. And to their -- if
22 it's finished, then I assume that it would go over
23 the allowed square footage.

24 MR. WRIGHT: It's not in the computation
25 of the square footage, as I understood it.

0054

1 MR. HINSHAW: That's correct. The area
2 above that garage is not heated or cooled and not
3 in the computation.

4 MR. WRIGHT: Well, I still don't see the
5 problem, but I stated my thoughts. Do we have a
6 motion on the table? Then I second it.

7 MR. ILDERTON: I guess, again, I don't
8 know that we can legislate on what we think
9 someone might do in the future.

10 MR. PRAUSE: It's just something I will
11 have to struggle with. It's kind of a gray area.
12 It's not that clear.

13 MR. ILDERTON: I think there is a garage

14 being built now back on -- that we approved --
15 that had dormers in it and that is being built now
16 or is built that we approved that has space above
17 there that has windows and stuff. I mean, I
18 think --

19 MR. PRAUSE: I believe it's finished
20 space.

21 MR. ILDERTON: Oh, that was okay?

22 MR. PRAUSE: Yes. But Town Council,
23 actually last night, amended our -- or passed a
24 resolution to amend our ordinance yet again with a
25 pending ordinance that profoundly changes that.

0055

1 You can't do it anymore.

2 MR. ILDERTON: That wall type of thing?

3 MR. PRAUSE: Correct. I will just have
4 to look at it. And part of this is mainly to get
5 this stuff in the record. As I mentioned, I don't
6 know that there is a solution that you-all have
7 with it.

8 It's a determination that I have to make
9 as the zoning guy, but it could possibly have an
10 effect on that design.

11 MR. REINHARD: Which we have to
12 approve.

13 MR. PRAUSE: Correct. So then if you
14 approve a final approval and it comes out that I
15 don't agree with whatever aspect, that is
16 approached and it has to be changed, then they
17 will have to bring it back to you.

18 MR. ILDERTON: The dormers give
19 articulation. They are a pleasing aspect of
20 that. I mean, they look nice.

21 MR. PRAUSE: I don't dispute any of
22 that.

23 MR. ILDERTON: And we are primarily
24 concerned with -- I mean, that is why this board
25 really was originally -- was the aesthetics of how

0056

1 houses sit on Sullivan's Island, and that is one
2 of our primary concerns.

3 What happens to it is a matter of
4 enforcement, and we are not an enforcement
5 authority and really enjoined with that kind of
6 idea.

7 MR. PRAUSE: I agree.

8 MR. ILDERTON: We are enjoined with the
9 idea of what is good architecture for Sullivan's
10 Island. And so, you know, I don't see a problem
11 with it myself.

12 MR. HINSHAW: We are still talking about
13 two issues, am I correct?

14 MR. WRIGHT: We got back to the main
15 structure, I think.

16 MR. HINSHAW: Okay, yeah. The second
17 floor is storage. We articulated it to bring some
18 light into that storage, actually. But there is
19 no good storage place on the lot. I think the
20 detail of the garage and the requirements that are
21 required by this island and by FEMA would be
22 addressed with Kent.

23 MR. ILDERTON: Right. And the idea that
24 it is three feet off the ground, so you don't have
25 that added storage that everyone else has with the
0057

1 raised houses. So they need storage, I mean,
2 because it is -- and that has been the dilemma for
3 all of these houses that have been raised as far
4 as storage and all.

5 Anybody else have any discussion on the
6 motion?

7 MS. EWING: Well, I just want to discuss
8 the storage issue. First of all, it's a three-car
9 garage, and then there is another two-car garage
10 on top of that, and so I think that kind of
11 negates whether there is an issue of not having
12 the proper storage. But, anyway, I think --

13 MR. WRIGHT: That is not our business,
14 is it?

15 MS. EWING: Well, if we are using it to
16 justify, I think that -- if it's a justification,
17 I think there is storage there. That is what I'm
18 saying. There is very clearly. It's, you know,
19 within -- that is all.

20 MR. WRIGHT: I think we are getting off
21 track.

22 MR. ILDERTON: So we have a motion to
23 approve as submitted. With this discussion do we
24 want to consider that, or do we want to consider
25 an amendment to the motion? It was seconded, and
0058

1 we had discussion. I guess we just have to vote
2 yes or no on that motion.

3 And just to reiterate, Fred, you are
4 thinking that it would be good to have preliminary
5 approval here but not as final approval?

6 MR. REINHARD: Correct.

7 MR. ILDERTON: And Betty looks like she
8 is sort of thinking that way.

9 MS. HARMON: (Nods head affirmatively.)

10 MR. ILDERTON: Cyndy?

11 MS. EWING: I am ready to vote on this
12 motion. I think that is what we need to do, is
13 get this motion cleared and make that decision and

14 then we can go further down this road.
15 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor of the
16 motion, raise your hands.
17 (In favor were Mr. Wright, Mr. Ilderton,
18 Mr. Craver.)
19 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody against the
20 motion?
21 (Against were Mr. Reinhard, Ms. Harmon,
22 Ms. Ewing.)
23 MR. ILDERTON: Okay. So it does not
24 pass. We are still discussing it. Do I hear
25 another motion?

0059

1 MR. REINHARD: I move for preliminary
2 approval.
3 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Do I hear a
4 second?
5 MS. HARMON: Second (by raising of the
6 hand.)
7 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear discussion of
8 preliminary approval?
9 MR. REINHARD: I just want to explain
10 why. I just think there has to be a compelling
11 reason why we would get a drawing, a set of
12 drawings that are really not complete, at least in
13 terms of a review by city staff, or town staff,
14 and ask for final on the first go-around.
15 I don't understand the reason to just
16 rush through this and put us in a position where
17 we have to approve it right away.
18 MR. ILDERTON: You have a good point.
19 MR. REINHARD: That's it. I like the
20 design.
21 MR. CRAVER: My response to that, Fred,
22 is I'm not sure that we have to have that in order
23 to give the approval as asked for, and the reason
24 to ask for a final and not to have to come back is
25 it costs a pile of money to crank these architects

0060

1 through and bring them to these meetings.
2 And I do think we have to -- I know that
3 there are people who think that money is not our
4 issue, but my neighbor's money is my issue. And I
5 have just spent a ton of money on architectural
6 fees, and every time we make someone come back and
7 go through a new gyration they have to spend a
8 bunch more money, and that is my reason. I have
9 enough information to make a decision here.
10 MR. REINHARD: Can I counter that?
11 There is a reason, Billy, that there is three
12 levels of conceptual, preliminary and final. And
13 the reason is, if you come in with a concept,

14 which means you spent a minimum amount of time and
15 a minimum amount of money to find out if it's
16 something that will work on Sullivan's Island,
17 that is the process.

18 I agree that once you have gone this
19 far, you have spent all this money to get to
20 final, you are rolling the dice, buddy. That is
21 what we are doing here. Fortunately, they have a
22 good design.

23 But what if someone came in here with
24 something that was horrendous? You don't know.
25 So you give the people the opportunity to test the

0061

1 water first to find out how we think about it.
2 That is why we have three levels.

3 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor of the
4 motion say aye.

5 MS. EWING: Can we state the motion
6 again?

7 MR. REINHARD: Preliminary approval, not
8 conceptual.

9 MR. CRAVER: Are you saying they come
10 back once more or twice more?

11 MR. REINHARD: Once more, preliminary,
12 not conceptual.

13 MR. HINSHAW: Can you state what we come
14 back with other than --

15 MR. REINHARD: Address the issues of
16 city staff, whatever they might be.

17 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor?
18 (Aye by Mr. Wright, Mr. Ilderton, Mr.
19 Reinhard, Ms. Harmon, Mr. Craver.)

20 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody opposed?
21 (Hand raised by Ms. Ewing.)

22 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, sir.
23 2502 Middle Street, Spelman residence,
24 renovations and additions.

25 MR. HERLONG: I will excuse myself for
0062

1 this one, also.

2 MR. ILDERTON: Kent?

3 MR. PRAUSE: Well, this one is a bit
4 unusual as well. They came before you in
5 September of 2006 and they received a certificate
6 of appropriateness for certain items.

7 They have come back now for a final
8 approval. And one of the main issues that they
9 are looking for here is additional DRB relief in
10 the way of a modification for principal building
11 coverage as indicated in the zoning standards
12 worksheet that they have provided.

13 This property is -- it was formerly a

14 historic property called the VanDolan house and
15 Mertin's (phonetic) house, but it has been
16 demolished and a new house was built in its stead.
17 You have received the Schneider workup of the
18 preservation standards, and I think that was
19 in '87.

20 One aspect of it, though, is that it
21 mentions on here the rear building is said to have
22 been the old post office, but that building is not
23 listed. If it were a request to put an additional
24 building on this lot because of the small historic
25 structure, then you wouldn't be allowed to give

0063

1 this type of relief.

2 However, that building is existing.

3 It's similar to one that came before you before
4 with two houses on one lot. It's a nonconforming
5 use. There is no prohibition against you giving
6 relief to this principal building coverage under
7 that scenario. I just wanted to explain it.

8 There might be some difficulty, and some
9 folks thinking, well, how do they get to have
10 extra with two buildings on one lot, and that is
11 why. And you can look at the drawings that have
12 been submitted and listen to their explanation of
13 what they are asking for to justify the addition
14 and modification.

15 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Applicant?

16 MS. COCHRAN: I'm Sabrina Cochran with
17 Stephen Herlong & Associates, and I'm representing
18 Richard and Tammy Spelman and their house at 2502
19 Middle Street.

20 As Kent said, we presented this house in
21 September and received preliminary approval for
22 the issues in the zoning worksheet you have, and
23 also the approval to move forwards with the
24 conceptual design intent.

25 Now that we have had a few months we

0064

1 have fully developed the plans, site plan
2 elevations, and we are here before you requesting
3 a final approval for the additions and renovations
4 as submitted.

5 Like we said at the last submittal, the
6 Spelmans recently purchased this home from a
7 relative, but the property has been in their
8 family for over 30 years. Richard and Tammy would
9 like to make this their permanent home. They have
10 two children. But in order to fit their family of
11 four they do need to make modifications and
12 additions and renovations to accommodate them.

13 Since this last submittal we have

14 further studied the details, the plans, the
15 elevations, and in studying those in the last few
16 months we discovered one of the things we did need
17 was to ask for principal building coverage relief
18 as indicated in the forms that you have as well.

19 We do have an existing home that is
20 1-1/2 stories. Having this house that is 1-1/2
21 stories, we kind of found it difficult to add all
22 the space they needed on this lot. The Spelmans
23 wanted to create a comfortable master suite, and
24 they also wanted to create a little more privacy
25 between them and the church next door.

0065

1 As you can see, this is part of their
2 property, but this is the church next door, and
3 they were trying to create a little more privacy
4 between them and the church. We thought creating
5 that would probably be beneficial to both
6 properties.

7 We could have tried to make this home a
8 two-story space, really change that, raise the
9 roof and put the master upstairs, but we really
10 wanted to minimize the change in the roofline of
11 the existing home. Plus, if we did that, we
12 wouldn't be gaining that privacy and that buffer
13 zone that we wished to originally create anyway.

14 Making the addition a one-story space
15 and locating it as we have, as you can see in the
16 side elevations this is a one-story addition
17 located back here in the site plan. Locating it
18 there, we minimized having to change the existing
19 structure, we kept the roof lines low, and we are
20 able to create that little bit of noise buffer
21 between them and the church.

22 However, locating this addition where we
23 did locate it required us to ask for a small
24 amount of principal building coverage relief, 321
25 square feet to be exact, which is about 11

0066

1 percent. I believe the board is able to grant 20
2 percent.

3 This set, I would like to briefly review
4 these neighborhood standards of compatibility and
5 how we have made this house with these additions
6 and renovations more compatible.

7 The first standard is setback pattern,
8 foundation elevation and building height. Like I
9 said, the existing structure is 1-1/2 stories
10 tall. We are keeping it that way. The new
11 addition is a one-story addition.

12 The existing structure, as it exists, is
13 just about under 35 feet, and the new addition,

14 the maximum height, this maximum peak, is about 27
15 feet 6 inches, so well below the 38 feet mark.

16 Also, we presented this in the
17 preliminary. But we are using architectural
18 treatments along the base of the house to lower
19 it. It's a real tall, spindly house as it exists,
20 and we were trying to visually lower that, anchor
21 the house a little better, so we used
22 architectural treatments all the way around to
23 kind of bring that foundation elevation lower.

24 Massing and orientation, like I said,
25 the addition is a one-story addition, and it is
0067

1 set back about 23 feet from that front facade, so
2 pretty far back.

3 Fenestration and doorway spacing and
4 alignment, the fenestration is compatible with the
5 historic district. We are using two over two
6 vertical grids as you can see in the elevations.
7 And we also have the additional use of exterior
8 French doors, which will be across this front
9 elevation, the front porch.

10 Placement and use of porches, decks and
11 patios. We talked about this at length in the
12 first submittal. But the porches were deepened to
13 give the Spelmans more and create a more welcoming
14 street facade and a more pedestrian friendly entry
15 as you are going by that house.

16 Placement and alignment of driveways.
17 As you see in the site plan, the driveway access
18 is off of Station 25 as it is now. This is the
19 driveway pattern, and it will be 100 percent
20 pervious pavers.

21 Treatment of front and side facades.
22 The elevations show the front and side facades
23 retain the scale of island architecture in the
24 historic district.

25 And, also, like I said, the additional
0068

1 porches create a pedestrian friendly facade.

2 As far as the roof, we are upgrading the
3 roofs to metal roofs, but they are predominantly
4 gable roofs with shed dormers as you can see in
5 these elevations, also.

6 Architectural style is the next standard
7 of neighborhood compatibility. Like I have
8 mentioned, we have gable roofs, deep front
9 porches. These are all things that are
10 predominant in the surrounding neighborhood.

11 And other relevant factors, like we have
12 discussed, this property is challenged by having a
13 large church next door as its only immediate

14 neighbor on all four sides. There is a lot of
15 activity, parking, and we are hoping to create
16 that buffer between them.

17 So with that said, coming here tonight,
18 we are requesting a final certificate of
19 appropriateness for these additions and
20 renovations with the principal building coverage
21 relief we have described.

22 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Is there
23 public comment on this application? The public
24 comment section is closed.

25 Kent, anything?

0069

1 MR. PRAUSE: No.

2 MR. ILDERTON: Randy?

3 MR. ROBINSON: No.

4 MR. ILDERTON: The board. Billy, what
5 do you think?

6 MR. CRAVER: I think they have done a
7 great job. We approve that 321 foot increase,
8 approve it as requested.

9 MR. ILDERTON: Cyndy?

10 MS. EWING: I have a question. Have you
11 changed the square footage? Is this the same plan
12 that we saw originally?

13 MS. COCHRAN: Yes.

14 MS. EWING: With the same dimensions?

15 MS. COCHRAN: Yes, it is. We just
16 hadn't developed very far -- in the beginning we
17 knew we had to have some setback relief, so we
18 just came in conceptually with the conceptual
19 design, and since then we have gone and further
20 developed it, but the footprint has not changed
21 from that preliminary submittal.

22 MS. EWING: Well, again, I have concerns
23 without having the numbers on it giving a final
24 approval.

25 And then I have another -- as far as the

0070

1 total square footage, do you include -- I guess
2 what it is, what is the square footage of the
3 house?

4 MS. COCHRAN: The essential building
5 coverage or the --

6 MS. EWING: Square footage.

7 MR. REINHARD: Principal building.

8 MS. COCHRAN: Is it on that sheet?

9 Allowed is 3,803 and we have 3,795.

10 MS. EWING: Okay. And then --

11 MR. ILDERTON: Are we good? Good. I'm
12 sorry. You are not finished?

13 MS. EWING: Go ahead.

14 MR. REINHARD: Are you finished?

15 MS. EWING: Yes.

16 MR. REINHARD: Sorry about that. So you
17 were able to put all of these additions --

18 MS. COCHRAN: One addition.

19 MR. REINHARD: Yes, but it's a
20 significant addition, and still keep it under the
21 principal building square footage required by
22 code?

23 MS. COCHRAN: Yes. I mean, the original
24 structure isn't very big. It's 1,716. We just
25 put in some small bedrooms for their children

0071

1 upstairs.

2 MR. REINHARD: I think it's a wonderful
3 example of what you can do within the zoning code
4 the way it's written. I would approve it.

5 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Duke?

6 MR. WRIGHT: I have no problem.

7 MR. ILDERTON: I also don't have any
8 problem. I know the Mertins. We lived down the
9 street from them. We live up the street from them
10 now as they are no longer there. But we knew the
11 family there, and their son for a long time. I
12 think it's a great improvement on what is there.

13 It will make that corner even better. It's going
14 to make that house shine, so I don't have a
15 problem with it either.

16 MR. CRAVER: Vote for approval?

17 MR. REINHARD: Second.

18 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion? Everybody in
19 favor of the motion?

20 (All hands raised except Ms. Ewing.)

21 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody opposed?

22 MS. EWING: Opposed.

23 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, ma'am.

24 1807 Atlantic Avenue, Cox residence.

25 MR. HERLONG: I excuse myself from this

0072

1 one.

2 MR. PRAUSE: This one is a request for
3 final approval, although it's not circled on the
4 Design Review Board request form. It's mentioned
5 in the written description of the project. They
6 have come back with a final set of plans and are
7 here for final approval.

8 MR. REINHARD: These plans were all
9 marked conceptual, though.

10 MR. PRAUSE: Excuse me?

11 MR. REINHARD: The plans are marked
12 conceptual.

13 MR. PRAUSE: They are. One thing before

14 we go on that I had mentioned previously, and just
15 to get it on the record again, that the position
16 of this house has been granted a variance by the
17 Board of Zoning Appeals, but it's contingent upon
18 the next-door neighbors, the Osbornes, who are
19 also here tonight, to reach, I guess, a mutually
20 acceptable setback.

21 It's not in closer than 30 feet from the
22 front lot line. That has not been signed off on
23 by both parties, and the Osbornes are here for an
24 addition to their house.

25 But what I have been told is if it's

0073

1 approved, at least in the conceptual stage, to put
2 that house where they want to put it and they will
3 be happy with this, and the agreement will be
4 executed and the ordinance will become effective,
5 and these folks can get a permit, and then once
6 the Osbornes are further approved they can get a
7 permit as well. But whenever you approve --

8 MR. ILDERTON: So the motion has to be
9 framed in that context?

10 MR. PRAUSE: Yes. It's contingent upon
11 that variance being effected.

12 MR. ILDERTON: Yes, ma'am?

13 MS. NELSON: Lane Nelson with Stephen
14 Herlong & Associates. Just a couple of things to
15 clarify a little bit. The actual agreement that
16 was drawn up between the Osbornes and the Coxes,
17 that agreement is contingent upon this approval.

18 So I'm not sure that both have to be
19 contingent on the other. The agreement itself,
20 even if all parties have signed it, if both
21 parties do not receive approval from the DRB the
22 agreement is null and void. So I'm not sure that
23 it has to be part of the motion here. That, I
24 guess, is your call or a legal call.

25 MR. PRAUSE: Well, they can approve with

0074

1 conditions. As it stands right now this house
2 can't be built where it's proposed to be built.

3 MS. NELSON: Exactly. We discussed that
4 last month.

5 MR. PRAUSE: And I just want to keep
6 that in the record.

7 MS. NELSON: Okay. My way of bringing
8 it up was just to notify you that the letter is
9 there and it's contingent on approval here.

10 And, Fred, to address your comment.
11 Yea, I am sorry, it does say conceptual set here.
12 Under today's date, the meeting date or submittal
13 date, it's checked under final DRB for the

14 drawings. So forgive me. I didn't remove
15 conceptual set off the drawings.

16 MR. REINHARD: But there was no
17 conceptual or preliminary approvals.

18 MS. NELSON: Oh, yes. We received
19 preliminary approval last month.

20 MR. REINHARD: You didn't put the dates
21 on it.

22 MS. NELSON: Oh, no. We received
23 preliminary approval for this last month. So I
24 was hoping, in the interest of being brief here,
25 to just go through what we have changed about

0075

1 these drawings instead of the whole design intent
2 again.

3 We did go through our various requests
4 to the board last month and were given preliminary
5 approval for those. It's on your DRB application
6 here. There have been no changes to those
7 requests from preliminary until now.

8 Now, as Sabrina said earlier, we just
9 finished developing the plans. We brought them to
10 you and received enough support from the board
11 that we felt that the design we had in the
12 neighborhood compatibility was approvable by this
13 board.

14 We then met with the clients and worked
15 out some of the finer details, the windows, the
16 materials, such as you have on your scope of work
17 document in front of you, the railing styles, a
18 few minor things.

19 In doing so, I did find a few things
20 that I need to clarify, two things in fact that I
21 need to clarify with this submittal, and I had a
22 conversation with Kent about it yesterday.

23 The first clarification deals with this
24 master deck off of the master bedroom here that is
25 shown as a curved deck. The edge of that curved

0076

1 deck extends about one foot outside of the side
2 setback. I mistakenly understood that an overhang
3 of a deck was treated the same as an overhang of
4 the roof, which is allowed to encroach into the
5 setback up to 30 inches. In my conversation with
6 Kent yesterday I was told and realized that that's
7 not the case.

8 And so that in order to keep this here
9 we would have to additionally ask the board for
10 one foot of side setback relief in order to allow
11 that curve on that deck to remain.

12 The other clarification I have is in
13 regards to this porch that we received preliminary

14 approval to add to existing structure.
15 On the documents that you have for your
16 submittal, somehow this porch was shifted. And I
17 noticed, as I looked at it this week, that what
18 you have in there shows that that porch is
19 actually about eight inches forward of the front
20 setback line. It was never intended to be, and
21 cannot be, forward of the front setback line.

22 I have changed it on this drawing and on
23 this drawing here. I have discussed it with Kent,
24 and I do actually have a set of drawings that can
25 be submitted to the town that are the

0077

1 architectural drawings.

2 And, as we discussed yesterday, it would
3 be up to the board and to Kent. We will do
4 whatever we need to do to make certain that the
5 correct drawings are on file with the town so that
6 this does not show as being outside of that front
7 setback, which it is not intended to be.

8 MR. REINHARD: That is attached to the
9 existing structure?

10 MS. NELSON: Yes. It is attached to the
11 existing structure. That being said, I would like
12 to go through a few of the changes, or all of the
13 changes, really, from what you saw last month
14 until now.

15 There are two changes to the plan, one
16 of which is the rear decks and pool. What we
17 submitted to you last month has a different
18 configuration here, but in our presentation we
19 did, in fact, show you this deck configuration
20 with this pool.

21 This is a result of working with the
22 neighbors to come up with a design that was
23 compatible with both neighbors, and we have
24 changed those drawings to reflect what you saw in
25 the meeting last month.

0078

1 The other change is regarding the guest
2 bedroom and guest bath here. The drawings that
3 you saw last month had the guest bedroom actually
4 off to the side with the bathroom out to the
5 front.

6 I think, as Randy stated in the last
7 meeting, the Coxes are working with an arborist.
8 They have a lot of great trees here. And we
9 realize that with the bedroom coming out farther
10 to the side, we are fairly close to these trees,
11 and it was a very simple switch to pull the
12 larger, longer element out front and the shorter
13 element to the side to stay away from those trees,

14 and so we did just simply flip that. It did not
15 adjust the square footage in any way. Everything
16 is exactly the same. It was just pretty much a
17 clean switch.

18 You will see that reflected in the
19 elevations. It is there, and it is virtually --
20 visually makes no impact on the style or design of
21 the home as you saw it last month.

22 Looking at the elevations here, just
23 taking them kind of one by one quickly, the front
24 elevation you will see here, this is where those
25 elements were flipped. Originally the guest

0079

1 bedroom came out as far as this element and now
2 it's drawn back to be the bathroom.

3 What you saw had a straight stair with
4 an angle at the second tier, and we have made it a
5 straight stair completely because it was in
6 conflict with the porch that is here. We showed a
7 crossed railing on the original drawings you saw
8 last month, and they have decided to simplify them
9 to vertical pickets, and you will see that
10 reflected through all the elevations.

11 As I said and discussed with the
12 clients, the windows, we originally showed you
13 window locations where we knew we were going to
14 put windows but hadn't really discussed with the
15 clients how much light, how many windows.

16 So you will see minor window changes
17 through here, not changes really in the location,
18 but instead of one window we have two. I think
19 these two were separated and they are now pulled
20 together.

21 As you go around the side elevation
22 here, this is the west side elevation where the
23 neighbors are. Again, you see the change here
24 where we flipped the bedroom and the bath, and you
25 will see windows here that were added to that

0080

1 bedroom.

2 Again, you will see the revision of the
3 back deck to coincide with the way we have changed
4 it here. You will see additional windows again.
5 They are in the same location, but now here we
6 have three windows and now here we have two
7 windows.

8 As you go around the back elevation, the
9 decks, again, have been revised with the stair
10 coming down on the west side. Originally we had
11 it coming down in the center. Now the pool is in
12 the center and the stair is off to the side, the
13 railing style.

14 Again, a few window changes there. We
15 had pulled three windows together and have just
16 two here now. The biggest change probably here is
17 that we showed originally this hip roof over this
18 bankhead area, and we have carried that roofline
19 across this facade; one, to break up that facade;
20 and, two, to provide some protection to the doors
21 that are below it. They were somewhat exposed and
22 we thought it would be a good idea to protect
23 them.

24 And then the last, the side elevation
25 here, which is the lighthouse side, other than the

0081

1 railing change, I think we showed these windows
2 maybe together and now they are separate, but no
3 other change to that elevation.

4 MR. REINHARD: Can you explain that
5 little inverted eyebrow over the roof dormer?

6 MS. NELSON: This right here? It's
7 actually a curved wall, and that was shown last
8 month as well, and that's just a little curved
9 shed dormer up there.

10 MR. REINHARD: Okay. I see it now.

11 MS. NELSON: So, again, as I said, we
12 went pretty heavily through the standards of
13 neighborhood compatibility last month. I won't go
14 one by one by them now. I will be happy to answer
15 any questions if you have them.

16 But we are here before you requesting
17 final approval of the plans as submitted, with the
18 additional request for the one foot of side
19 setback to allow that curve to remain on the
20 master porch, and with the condition that
21 corrected drawings be submitted to the town to
22 reflect this new porch remaining within that front
23 setback, and whatever other requirements the town
24 has.

25 MR. REINHARD: Do you not have the same

0082

1 issue with the fireplace?

2 MS. NELSON: No. The fireplace is
3 allowed to encroach.

4 MR. REINHARD: Okay. I just wanted to
5 make sure.

6 MR. ILDERTON: Public comment? Anybody
7 need to say anything about this one way or the
8 other? Public comment section is closed.

9 Kent, anything?

10 MR. PRAUSE: I have nothing further.

11 MR. ILDERTON: Randy?

12 MR. ROBINSON: The only thing, I just
13 don't see materials, like a list of what

14 materials.

15 MS. NELSON: The scope of work document
16 has all the materials listed in the submittal.

17 MR. ILDERTON: Duke, what do you think?

18 MR. WRIGHT: I think it's a very good
19 design, and the fine-tuning that has been done
20 since the last meeting is good as far as I'm
21 concerned. I think I am ready to approve it as
22 submitted.

23 Do we need to talk about the issue of
24 the frontage with the Osborne house next door?

25 MR. ILDERTON: No. I don't think that

0083

1 is an issue. They will settle that. We will make
2 a motion that it's contingent on --

3 MR. WRIGHT: Then I'm fine with the
4 design.

5 MR. ILDERTON: I am also fine with the
6 design as submitted. Fred?

7 MR. REINHARD: I really like the gables,
8 and I know they were on there last month. I like
9 that center bracket detail on not all the gables,
10 but the major gables. I think you have done a
11 good job.

12 Again, it's a perfect example of how it
13 takes more than one presentation to get it right,
14 because if we had gone with the one you gave us
15 last time, which I forgot about, it wouldn't have
16 been as good. Good job.

17 MR. ILDERTON: Cyndy?

18 MS. EWING: No comment.

19 MR. ILDERTON: Billy?

20 MR. CRAVER: I would approve it. I
21 think they have done a good job.

22 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a motion?

23 MR. WRIGHT: I move that it be approved
24 as submitted.

25 MR. ILDERTON: Second?

0084

1 MR. REINHARD: I second that. Do we
2 need to mention that one-foot encroachment of
3 the balcony?

4 MR. ILDERTON: And in the motion, also,
5 do we need to mention the agreement with the
6 Osbornes? Do we need to mention that?

7 MR. WRIGHT: I will restate the motion.
8 I move that it be approved along with the one-foot
9 encroachment and contingent upon the agreement
10 with the Osbornes regarding the ocean side
11 setback. Is that the right terminology?

12 MR. ILDERTON: I think so.

13 MR. REINHARD: Second.

14 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion? Everybody in
15 favor?

16 (All hands raised except Ms. Ewing.)

17 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody opposed?

18 (Ms. Ewing raised her hand.)

19 MR. ILDERTON: All right. The Osborne
20 residence, 1801 Atlantic Avenue, additions and
21 renovations to the existing home.

22 MR. HELONG: I am excusing myself one
23 more time.

24 MR. ILDERTON: What else is new?

25 MR. PRAUSE: This is a request for 1801
0085

1 Atlantic Avenue. I'm not sure if it's conceptual,
2 preliminary or final. It just says they are
3 requesting a certificate of appropriateness for
4 the additions and renovations to the property
5 located at that address per the submitted
6 drawings.

7 It's located in a historic district and
8 is classified as a traditional island resource.
9 They have delineated the piers. The front setback
10 and the side setback modifications are
11 delineated -- or that are requested are delineated
12 on the Design Review Board request form. They
13 submitted a scope of work. The drawings are
14 attached with pictures of the existing residence.
15 And you also have a copy of the preservation
16 consultant's historic district survey card that
17 was prepared in 1987.

18 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you.

19 MR. HEINLEN: My name is Rodd Heinlen.
20 I'm with Steve Herlong & Associates. We are here
21 representing Ray Anne and Granger Osborne and
22 their application to renovate and add on to their
23 home at 1801 Atlantic.

24 The existing house is within the
25 historic district and is classified as a
0086

1 traditional island resource. It is a one-story
2 cottage just over 1300 square feet and was built
3 in 1937. It was purchased by the Osbornes in 1985
4 and in 1987 was raised to its present elevation.
5 The Osbornes have used it as a summer beach house
6 for many years and have recently decided to live
7 in it full time.

8 On the site plan the original house is
9 delineated in green. It's just over three feet
10 off the property line on Atlantic and just over 11
11 feet off the east property line. It has clapboard
12 siding, two-over-two window configuration, open
13 tail rafters, a combination of colonial and Bahama

14 shutters.

15 From the beginning of the design process
16 the Osbornes made clear to us that they did not
17 want the addition to overpower the existing
18 structure.

19 Secondly, they wanted to configure the
20 addition in such a way that the house still
21 captured the sea breezes.

22 And, lastly, they wanted to keep the
23 look of the house from the beach the same.

24 So what we have done to the existing
25 house is we have removed the lookout tower and all
0087

1 of the stairs that go up to it. We have also
2 removed about 10 feet of the portion of covered
3 screened porch.

4 The old and the new house are now
5 separated by a low link, which now serves as the
6 entry. The old portion is here and the new
7 portion is here.

8 The addition has a cross gable roof and
9 is wrapped on three sides by a covered screen
10 porch. The architectural vocabulary of the
11 existing house is carried through in the addition
12 with the use of clapboard, the two-over-two
13 windows, this traditional handrail and narrow
14 exterior columns.

15 The asphalt roof will be replaced by a
16 5-V crimp roof which was on the house pre-1987.
17 We have also skirted the ground level using 1x6
18 vertical boards around the entire piece.

19 In total, the build-out for the old and
20 new is still under 2400 square feet. We feel the
21 addition is both understated and complementary to
22 the existing house; that this particular homeowner
23 has chosen to do less rather than more, and that
24 it's a positive example for additions in the
25 historic district.

0088

1 MR. ILBERTON: Great. Thank you. Any
2 public comment on this addition or renovation?
3 The public comment section then is closed.

4 Kent, do you have anything to add, or
5 Randy?

6 MR. PRAUSE: No.

7 MR. ILBERTON: All right. Duke?

8 MR. WRIGHT: I like it. I think the
9 design is well done. I think the two houses, the
10 Cox residence and the Osborne residence,
11 complement one another, and I believe that these
12 two will set the stage for maybe what can be done
13 with that third house at the end of the street,

14 across the street from the Cox residence, and make
15 that a very compatible, neat ending to Atlantic
16 Avenue in that area. I think it's a good design.

17 MR. ILDERTON: Great.

18 MR. REINHARD: It's wonderful. It's a
19 perfect example of how you can put a nice
20 addition, a really nice addition on an older
21 house. It's sensitive. It's great. What can I
22 say? Congratulations.

23 MR. HEINLEN: Thank you.

24 MR. ILDERTON: Cyndy?

25 MS. EWING: It's a great -- you nailed

0089

1 it on this one. I just have one question as far
2 as materials. On the windows, are they going to
3 be divided lights, true divided lights?

4 MR. HEINLEN: Two over two.

5 MS. EWING: They are two over two. And
6 are they true divided lights?

7 MR. HEINLEN: The typical Marvin.

8 MS. EWING: And my one concern there is
9 if this is considered a historic home we need to
10 make sure that they are going with the same type
11 of window as opposed to the ones that have those
12 little snap-in --

13 MR. HEINLEN: No. These wouldn't be
14 snap-in. The Marvin window has a divider. It is
15 a full piece of glass, but it is close to a true
16 divided window.

17 MR. ILDERTON: Yes. I think the divided
18 windows are really --

19 MS. EWING: Okay. So it's not a true
20 divided light that we are putting in.

21 MR. ILDERTON: By definition.

22 MR. HEINLEN: True, in the sense that it
23 doesn't have individual panes.

24 MS. EWING: Okay.

25 MR. HEINLEN: But it has the traditional

0090

1 detailing.

2 MS. EWING: No, I know. And when you
3 are working on historic homes you should replace
4 them with -- that's all, with the true divided
5 lights. But I think it's incredible, an
6 incredible design, and it's less than 2400 square
7 feet.

8 MR. ILDERTON: Billy, anything to add?

9 MR. CRAVER: I like it. I approve it as
10 requested.

11 MR. ILDERTON: I do, also. Do I hear a
12 motion?

13 MR. CRAVER: I so move.

14 MR. REINHARD: Second.
15 MR. IDLETON: Discussion? Everybody in
16 favor?

17 (All hands raised.)
18 MR. ILDERTON: Anybody oppose it?

19 (No hands raised.)
20 MR. ILDERTON: 2850 I'on, Martin
21 residence, new construction.

22 MR. PRAUSE: Again, I don't know if it's
23 conceptual, preliminary or final.
24 For new construction they are asking for
25 some modifications. Definitely under H, 19

0091
1 percent of principal building square footage
2 increase to 3873 -- oh, for an additional 639
3 square feet.

4 And it also appears that under D there
5 is maybe a proposed adjustment to a standard
6 awning on the east wall. But they submitted
7 drawings to you, site plan, floor plans and
8 elevation drawing for your consideration.

9 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you.
10 Yes, sir?

11 MR. ADRIAN: Let me give this to you.
12 These are just a couple of letters of neighborhood
13 approval. My name is Joel Adrian, and I'm here
14 with MC3 Designs on behalf of my client, Mr.
15 Martin, in consideration of 2850 I'on, the new
16 construction that we had.

17 As I stated, there is only two items
18 that we are seeking. They are not in a historic
19 district. They are looking to get an increase to
20 the base square footage of 19 percent, in other
21 words, 639 square feet. The maximum that you-all
22 could approve would be 800 square feet, pushing
23 the house over 4,000. That is not required to
24 meet the program for our client, although we do
25 feel that 639 square feet is.

0092
1 And we will take the neighborhood
2 compatibility in two stages. The first will be on
3 the square foot stage. And this board just
4 illustrates that with that wide variety of sizes
5 of houses on the street and in the neighborhood.
6 They range anywhere from, on the small side, of
7 1,319 square feet all the way up to almost 40 --
8 you have 4,679, almost 4,680 square feet of
9 house.

10 So we are not pushing the upper limit of
11 what is currently existing on the street and in
12 the neighborhood, and we are certainly not down on
13 the lower side. We feel that when you look at the

14 drawings and see the elevations, the site plan and
15 layout, that the house is certainly compatible in
16 square footage, really in the square footage in
17 that area.

18 The second part of compatibility goes
19 with the architectural elements, the styling and
20 detailing. And this is just pictures of the
21 adjacent homes in the area. We feel we have done
22 a good job of walking the property and -- let me
23 back up and state that, first, you can see there
24 is an array of styles. It's a very diverse area.

25 There is nothing on the street that

0093

1 states that every house is one story, two stories
2 or one and a half stories. We have a good picture
3 of each, which relates back to why we have such a
4 diverse square footage arrangement.

5 So as you look at the elements, though,
6 they are consistent and they are consistent with
7 Sullivan's Island architecture. You will note
8 that on our house we have proposed horizontal
9 siding. It's going to be novelty siding. We have
10 board and batten. And those are two very typical
11 exterior treatments.

12 Again, the windows are going to be
13 double hung windows, two over two. The lights,
14 light grids with raised metal roof. The roofing
15 style is it's a hip roof, so it's consistent again
16 with the vernacular of Sullivan's Island.

17 The foundation is going to be vertical
18 one-by-four lattice, stucco piers, exposed rafter
19 tails and porches. So we feel we have done a good
20 job of taking elements that are in each of the
21 houses, molding them and putting them into our
22 proposal. And probably the biggest key to
23 everything is the wraparound porches that we have
24 designed on the streetscape.

25 As we studied the site, the site

0094

1 setbacks and restrictions, it became clear that we
2 weren't going to be able to tolerate the program
3 needs in a one-story home, therefore we needed to
4 go to two stories.

5 In order to get the mass of the house
6 and to be more friendly to pedestrians and bring
7 the scale down, we have used the porch element and
8 wrapped it around on the street fronts. So we
9 have 25-foot setbacks pretty much around the
10 entire house, and then the porch depth is 12
11 feet.

12 So we are stepping that two-story mass
13 back another 12 feet from where the pedestrian is

14 spending their time as they are approaching the
15 house. They have a one-story home, we will call
16 it, with the porches to get up to the entry, and
17 they go inside and then you have the two-story
18 mass.

19 I feel that is really what pulls this
20 scale of the house down and the massing of it,
21 also. So as you look at the house and the designs
22 and the elevations, you will see there aren't
23 random window placements. The windows are all
24 logically placed.

25 The second floor windows are related to
0095

1 the first floor windows. The massing of the
2 house, there are features. There is depth to the
3 elevations. The porches certainly help with
4 that. And there is balance. There is symmetry.

5 We feel we have designed a house that is
6 very compatible with the neighborhood and will be
7 an addition that Sullivan's Island can certainly
8 be proud of in the future.

9 Concerning the second item, it's the
10 request that you consider relief on the setback or
11 the side facade setback. We have a section of the
12 house on the right side elevation. If you turn to
13 that you will see that there is a portion at the
14 very back right corner of the house.

15 The wall is 18 feet, and it is two
16 stories, and there is now a two-foot inset above
17 that to break up the mass of that two-story
18 element. We just ask for your consideration for
19 approval of allowing that.

20 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you.
21 Public comment on this? Yes, ma'am?

22 MS. PERKIS: My name is Linda Perkis. I
23 live at 2871 Brownell. I have a petition here
24 with over 50 signatures by local residents
25 requesting that you deny the application for a
0096

1 variance of this property.

2 Would you like me to read the petition
3 to you?

4 MR. ILDERTON: That's fine.

5 MS. PERKIS: The following residents of
6 Sullivan's Island object to the granting of a
7 variance to the property located at 2850 I'on.

8 We feel that the proposed 3,873 square
9 foot home is far too large for the lot; and, more
10 importantly, for the neighborhood. The proposed
11 house would be 37 percent larger than the larger
12 of the two adjacent homes and 61 percent larger
13 than the average of the surrounding homes.

14 In fact, the mass and scale allowed
15 under the zoning ordinance of 3,234 square feet
16 would still be larger -- would still be 14 percent
17 larger than the adjacent homes and 35 percent
18 larger than the average for the immediate area.

19 Also, I wanted you to note that when I
20 passed this petition around I specifically asked
21 for the local residents that this house would
22 affect to sign it. Some other residents did sign
23 it, but even with that I was able to get over 50
24 signatures with just the local square block areas.
25 Please do not grant this request for a variance.

0097

1 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, ma'am. Please
2 submit that. I think we probably need that in the
3 material.

4 All right. Public comment? Anybody
5 else?

6 MS. CURTIS: I am Kathy Curtis. I live
7 at 2824 I'on. What I am worried about is that the
8 2800 Street, I mean, there are some other
9 properties on that that are going up for sale and
10 things, and I am just scared that that is going to
11 turn into like a canyon with these huge houses
12 right on these very small lots, and that, you
13 know, it will really change the whole aspect of
14 our neighborhood.

15 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, ma'am.
16 Anybody else have a comment? Public comment
17 section is closed. Kent, anything?

18 MR. PRAUSE: No further comments.

19 MR. ILDERTON: Randy?

20 MR. ROBINSON: No.

21 MR. ILDERTON: The board deliberation.
22 Billy?

23 MR. CRAVER: Even at 3200 square feet it
24 would still be the biggest house in this whole
25 area. Now, that is Vivian's house, but hers sits

0098

1 on this end of the lot. This house is big, but
2 it's way back here up against Bill Haskin's house,
3 and they are sort of secluded, so that really is a
4 different impact on that neighborhood.

5 As much as I'm for letting people do
6 what they want to with their houses, I don't think
7 that matches up with the neighborhood. I would
8 have to deny -- I would have to vote against
9 giving that variance.

10 MR. ILDERTON: Cyndy?

11 MS. EWING: Yeah, I am not in favor of
12 it, and I want to say for two reasons. First of
13 all, because of the strong concern that the

14 neighbors have, and when that many people come
15 forward I think we really need to listen to what
16 the neighbors feel. And that is an overwhelming
17 amount of neighborhood participation, which we
18 don't get often.

19 And the other thing is that this is
20 another case of really we have no -- to make a
21 decision on this, even if the neighborhood didn't
22 complain, we have no measurements, nothing on
23 these plans. The plans are incomplete, so I would
24 have to deny it.

25 MR. ILDERTON: Fred?

0099

1 MR. REINHARD: With respect to the
2 variance, it clearly does not meet the
3 neighborhood compatibility test, so I would not be
4 in favor of the size of this building.

5 Speaking to the architecture, it's not a
6 bad design. The roofline is consistent -- the
7 roofline and the porch lines -- the porch roofs
8 and porch percentages are very good with respect
9 to the neighborhood, although too big.

10 I don't really like the twin baroque
11 columns, which you would find on The Louvre in
12 Paris or St. Paul's Cathedral in London. But this
13 design has potential, and I wouldn't want to
14 discourage the applicant from two things.

15 One, bring it down to a more
16 neighborhood compatible size; and, two, try to
17 simplify those porches.

18 MR. ILDERTON: Steve?

19 MR. HELONG: Well, as far as the design
20 goes as well, I think there has been an attempt to
21 break up the massing, and I commend you guys for
22 trying to do that. I think that you just -- you
23 are going to have to do more of that in order to
24 get it passed.

25 I think part of the solution may have

0100

1 been to just add the porches so that you don't
2 have the setback issue and so there are a lot
3 of -- although I like -- a lot of porches are a
4 nice thing. Nothing wrong with porches.

5 But I just do think that you heard some
6 overwhelming concern in the neighborhood, and we
7 are just not going to be able to ignore that at
8 all. I have to impress to additionally find ways
9 to reduce the mass of the various facades.

10 MR. ADRIAN: Okay.

11 MR. ILDERTON: I like the porches. The
12 porch presence makes a huge difference on this
13 house. You have porch presence on both

14 streetscapes, and that is a nice effect.
15 Now, the board does have to wrestle
16 with -- I mean, we are enjoined to look at good
17 architecture and what is going to fit neighborhood
18 compatibility and what is going to fit Sullivan's
19 Island in general.
20 And, you know, even if -- I mean, I
21 think there may be times when the neighbors may
22 object and that we may need to say, no, this is
23 good architecture. I don't know if this is the
24 case, but I think there may be times in the
25 future. But it's a good effort.

0101

1 I guess the square footage -- maybe not
2 so much the square footage, but how it's laid out,
3 to bring it down a little bit to have maybe more
4 of the square footage within the roofline or
5 something would make a difference in bringing the
6 whole scale of the house down.
7 Again, these houses need to be
8 considered not just on square footage, how big a
9 house it is, but how they look and how they
10 present themselves to the street and what is good
11 architecture. It's not just square footage. It's
12 how it presents itself. But it's a good effort.
13 I don't think it's without merit.

14 MR. WRIGHT: I agree with everything
15 that has been said. I believe that, obviously,
16 the scale and mass of the house is the issue. The
17 neighbors have nailed it pretty well.

18 So I think that the architect and the
19 owners need to take a look at reducing the size of
20 this house.

21 MR. ADRIAN: Can I just ask a question
22 so I will have direction? When you say reduce the
23 size of the house, is that reducing square
24 footage, or if we can come up with another
25 solution with the rooflines to still have 3800

0102

1 square feet of house but with bringing some of
2 those fascias down close to the street level, or
3 is the objection 3800 square feet?

4 MR. ILBERTON: I think you might want to
5 consider a neighborhood meeting or something just
6 to get some input and to work with some of the
7 neighbors that have some difficulty with it. And
8 because I think those all -- I mean, you could
9 almost -- I don't know that you could keep the
10 same square footage but with a different design,
11 again, making it softer. I just think it's a
12 possibility.

13 But you certainly still may need a

14 square footage variance when you come, if and when
15 you come back again. But I think a little of that
16 and a little reduction, and to work with the
17 neighborhood a little bit and really to meet with
18 them.

19 MR. CRAVER: I think, to be fair to
20 you-all, I will make where I come from very clear.
21 I don't think I could vote to give you any
22 variance on the square footage on that lot given
23 that you can go 3200 square feet, just to be
24 bluntly honest with you. Now, I am only one vote.

25 MR. REINHARD: I agree with that.

0103

1 MR. CRAVER: I mean, just knowing that
2 neighborhood and knowing the size of the houses
3 and everything, at 3200 square feet you are going
4 to be on the high end of that in that area, and so
5 I would rather give you definitive input from my
6 viewpoint.

7 MR. ADRIAN: And I certainly don't want
8 to argue with you, because I understand what you
9 are saying. But I believe that when you look at
10 the graphic, it shows there are houses that are
11 clearly larger than what we are proposing that
12 exist in the neighborhood now.

13 How they have achieved that may be
14 different. Our house is an elevated house to meet
15 FEMA code, and all the space occurs on that first
16 and second floor. Some of the houses in the
17 neighborhood have an enclosed area on the ground
18 level, and that is how they have gotten up to the
19 square footage they are at. So I just wanted to
20 make that point.

21 MR. HELONG: One thing. This is
22 basically a full two-story collection of boxes
23 with porches wrapping around sections of it, and I
24 think varying that to some degree, which will help
25 break up the scale, can be very effective.

0104

1 Maybe all of it shouldn't be two story.
2 I think that that might be part of the solution.
3 I think there is a lot of issue regarding the
4 scale of that house on that piece of property.

5 And I can't say that 3300 isn't okay.
6 To me, it's not necessarily the square footage.
7 It's how it presents itself in relation to all the
8 other homes. And you have some one-story, some
9 two-story homes, and maybe this should reflect the
10 variations that are going on.

11 I do know from history that there was a
12 house about a block away that came before the
13 board that had a lot of opposition to increases in

14 square footage, so I think you do maybe need to
15 set up a meeting with a group of neighbors and try
16 to come up with some ideas and some feedback.

17 MR. ADRIAN: Thank you.

18 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a motion?

19 MR. REINHARD: Move to disapprove.

20 MR. ILDERTON: Second?

21 MS. EWING: I second.

22 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion? Everybody in
23 favor.

24 (All hands raised.)

25 MR. ILDERTON: Anyone opposed?

0105

1 (No hands raised.)

2 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you for your time.

3 I will excuse myself for this one.

4 MR. REINHARD: 2215 I'on, Ilderton
5 residence, demolition and new construction.

6 MR. PRAUSE: Application is for
7 conceptual approval regarding new construction,
8 2215 I'on Avenue.

9 You have the Design Review Board form in
10 which the various modifications are delineated
11 that they are asking for. You also have a scope
12 of work, photographs, two sets of photographs of
13 the existing residence and a full set of plans,
14 including site plan, floor plans and elevations.
15 That's all I have.

16 MR. HERLONG: The applicant? You have
17 ten minutes for your presentation.

18 MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. My name is
19 Hunter Kennedy. I'm with Beau Clowney Design.

20 What we are proposing before the board
21 today is the demolition of an existing one-story
22 house from the 1970s, non-historic, at 2215 I'on
23 and replacing that with a traditionally designed
24 two-story beach house which conforms to the
25 setback and height requirements in the district.

0106

1 This house would incorporate front and
2 rear porches and have narrower rooms to better
3 take advantage of the light and prevailing
4 breezes. We have also -- we have a very small
5 lot. It's less than 8800 square feet. And the
6 setbacks, we have been allowed some adjustments to
7 the setback requirements because of that.

8 Essentially, we sited the house to the
9 east side of the property to better take advantage
10 of the light and air. We have a 23-foot setback
11 on this side and 10 foot on the eastern side of
12 the property line.

13 Essentially, the second floor is

14 designed with dormers and low knee walls to reduce
15 impact of the massing of the building. And I am
16 going to show you all the elevations, which I
17 think tell the story a little bit better.

18 The house is broken into distinct
19 volumes. There is a main volume here, which is a
20 longer volume, and it's connected to a smaller
21 volume by a subservient hyphen which houses the
22 stair and sitting room upstairs.

23 All of these roofs have -- there are
24 gable roofs on all the volumes, traditional
25 materials, standing seam metal roof, wood siding.

0107

1 We are really trying to use the vernacular of
2 Sullivan's Island and really kind of trying to
3 take advantage of this opportunity to do a more
4 appropriate house.

5 However, we do have a -- we are
6 requesting three adjustments. These concern the
7 rules governing side facades and principal
8 building square footage.

9 The house has a footprint of 1586 square
10 feet. That is within the permitted cap. I think
11 the total lot -- the heated lot coverage cap is
12 1629. We are also within the impervious lot
13 coverage cap requirements. However, by building
14 on the second floor over the first floor we are
15 over the principal building square footage cap,
16 which is 2779.

17 We are requesting an adjustment of 509
18 square feet. This would allow us to include some
19 bedrooms on the second floor, despite the fact
20 that we have been trying to make adjustments to
21 the massing, really minimize that massing by
22 lowering the knee walls and using gable roofs and
23 dormers.

24 We have still run into this problem
25 where we are -- we feel that it's most appropriate

0108

1 for this house to really have a full second floor
2 on both of these volumes. And, in addition, there
3 is the question of an enclosed entry on the ground
4 floor. That is 209 square feet, I believe, and
5 this can be adjusted as needed depending on, you
6 know, the opinions of the board. But that is
7 reflected in our request for the overall
8 adjustment of 509 square feet.

9 Additionally, we are asking for
10 adjustments to the second floor side facade
11 setback to allow for the longer dormers that we
12 have shown in this elevation here, which is along
13 the east side of the house, and on the west side

14 for this dormer as well in the smaller volume.
15 Additionally, these dormers are 19 and
16 22 feet wide, and we feel that it's appropriate to
17 the overall design of the house, though it does
18 not conform to the required maximum length in the
19 code, and we hope that aesthetically you will see
20 it does complement the house, and we feel
21 complements the neighborhood.

22 In the last adjustment that we are
23 asking is also a side facade adjustment, and it
24 concerns this volume because there is a maximum
25 length of 30 feet with a four-foot setback

0109

1 required.

2 But this long -- with this main volume
3 here and here it's very simple -- a simple volume,
4 and we have narrowed it to take advantage of light
5 and prevailing breezes. But by incorporating --
6 because the house is in an L shape, and
7 incorporating a porch on this side, which kind of
8 takes advantage of the siting of the house, it
9 essentially requires, because of the proportions
10 of the design that this house essentially -- this
11 volume becomes a little bit longer.

12 And so we are requesting an adjustment
13 to allow for a 44-foot volume, essentially, to a
14 50 percent adjustment.

15 I would, in closing, just ask that you
16 note that the existing house on the property has a
17 side facade of 46 feet, and so we are hoping that
18 it would not unduly impact the adjacent neighbors.
19 Thank you very much.

20 MR. HELONG: Is there any public
21 comment? The public comment section is closed.
22 Kent, do you have any final comments?

23 MR. PRAUSE: No.

24 MR. HELONG: Randy?

25 MR. ROBINSON: I would like to

0110

1 compliment the building on having a set of plans
2 to scale and dimensions. But did you say you
3 included the square footage on the ground floor in
4 your --

5 MR. KENNEDY: I realized, coming into
6 the meeting, that that ground floor square footage
7 may not be allowed to be heated, per se. So, if
8 that is the case, then our request for adjustment
9 is actually substantially less than what has been
10 included.

11 MR. ROBINSON: It cannot be heated and
12 cooled.

13 MR. KENNEDY: And that's my mistake,

14 which I realized as I was coming in. But what I
15 can tell you is the square footage of that ground
16 floor which is enclosed is -- and if you will bear
17 with me one second. It's 203 square feet.

18 So, essentially, that brings it just
19 over 3,000 square feet is what we are requesting.
20 So it would be a 300 and change square foot
21 variance.

22 MR. ROBINSON: Other than that I don't
23 have anything.

24 MR. HERLONG: Deliberation of the board.
25 Duke, do you have any comments?

0111

1 MR. WRIGHT: No. I -- yes. The square
2 footage coming down to 3,000 takes away a concern
3 I had. I think the design is good. I was a
4 little concerned about the size of the square
5 footage on that size lot, but I did not pick up on
6 what Randy had said, and that pretty much removes
7 my concern.

8 I think the design is fine for a
9 traditional island house, so I don't have any
10 concerns about that.

11 MR. HERLONG: Fred?

12 MR. REINHARD: Well, I see that the
13 application is marked conceptual, yet the drawings
14 are extremely well detailed in dimension, thank
15 you for that, and I would think that it's at least
16 a preliminary.

17 There is enough information here that we
18 could give preliminary approval on this. I would
19 like to see it refined for final to get in under
20 that zoning principal square footage.

21 MR. KENNEDY: Certainly.

22 MR. REINHARD: If you could nail that,
23 if you could find the other 200 square feet, or
24 whatever it is --

25 MR. KENNEDY: 203. We could take care

0112

1 of that.

2 MR. REINHARD: Then this would be a slam
3 dunk, okay?

4 MR. KENNEDY: No problem.

5 MR. HELONG: Cyndy?

6 MS. EWING: I agree that it's a great
7 design. And I want to reiterate what Randy said,
8 that this is exactly the type of plans. These I
9 consider full plans, with the exception of on the
10 elevations there is no dimensions. But,
11 otherwise, this is a good deal and I would approve
12 it, and certainly at the preliminary stage.

13 MR. KENNEDY: We are happy to accept the

14 preliminary approval, and we will certainly come
15 back to the final with these other issues
16 resolved.

17 MR. HELONG: Billy?

18 MR. CRAVER: I would approve it.

19 MR. HELONG: I, as well. I love the
20 articulation of the exterior elevations. I agree
21 with the side -- two side facade setback issues
22 that we have to deal with. And it is almost all
23 but impossible to meet those and do anything that
24 is considered good looking architecture, so I
25 think you have addressed it well enough on the

0113

1 side setbacks. So I would agree. I would approve
2 it as well.

3 MR. REINHARD: I move for preliminary
4 approval.

5 MR. CRAVER: Second.

6 MR. HELONG: Is there any discussion?
7 All in favor?

8 (All hands raised.)

9 MR. HERLONG: Opposed?

10 (No hands raised.)

11 MR. ILDERTON: 2850 Jasper Boulevard,
12 the Biascoechea residence, modification to
13 existing house. Kent, yet again.

14 MR. PRAUSE: Exactly. This is a request
15 for the removal of what are termed the modern
16 renovation of porches of a historic structure.
17 And, as I recall, it has gotten at least the
18 extent of approval that you can have two houses on
19 one lot. That received approval from the Board of
20 Zoning Appeals with special exception to have two
21 houses on the lot.

22 They are not here for the second house,
23 just for the renovations of the existing cottage
24 on the lot. And as you mentioned, Mr. Chairman,
25 yet again.

0114

1 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Applicant?

2 MR. DENTON: I'm Ron Denton here to
3 present the Biascoechea house.

4 Today we are just going to take a look
5 at the cottage. While it is fresh in everybody's
6 mind, we had the special meeting, whatever you
7 want to call it, out there a couple of weeks ago
8 to assess the historic value and nature of the
9 structure.

10 What I presented, since there was only a
11 two-day period between when I presented last on
12 the next submittal, were the comments that we had
13 from that previous meeting, trying to incorporate

14 them into the next iteration.

15 We are still taking the position that we
16 would like to restore what we feel is restoration
17 of the side and rear porches back to side and rear
18 porches from one being an enclosed, perhaps,
19 sleeping porch, if you want to call it that, and
20 the rear being a very modern infill hallway.
21 There is not much value or quality to that space.

22 Some of the comments that were made from
23 our previous presentation, we had provided a
24 little bit more of a modern exterior appearance on
25 that front screen porch. We had wider columns.

0115

1 We had pickets and handrails.

2 Most of the comments of the board were
3 that you would like to see that half partition
4 height wall with smaller columns, so we went back
5 to 4x4s. We do have the lap siding skirt going
6 around the base of the house, keeping it at that
7 same level that it is now. Of course the screen
8 that we will be providing is new.

9 When we turn the corner on the
10 elevation, we would end that screen porch at the
11 first bay area and then continue with the open
12 covered porch. Of course that roof framing would
13 be existing. We have shown a 5-V metal crimp
14 roof.

15 We debated when we were there, and we
16 can discuss more this evening, whether or not that
17 house ever had a metal roof. Of course, whatever
18 we do on this house ought to relate to the new
19 primary structure. It should be -- if we ever get
20 there.

21 The other articulation that was brought
22 back that I had deleted were the little -- I will
23 call them awnings for lack of a better term,
24 that's what they are, over the screen porch, this
25 little eyebrow shed awning that was basically made

0116

1 out of 2x4s, plywood, and then we employed the
2 metal crimped roof again.

3 So this is just, you know, a small
4 segment, maybe digestible and easy to discuss, and
5 that is all we have to talk about.

6 MR. ILDERSTON: Great. Thank you, sir.
7 Is there anybody in the audience that would like
8 to make a statement? Yes, ma'am?

9 MS. PATURZO: I'm Pat Paturzo. I moved
10 to the island in 1929. I don't remember the first
11 three years. I was too young. But ever since I
12 can remember, way back, Judge Lymes' (phonetic) or
13 the Dorsey's house looks like it does now except

14 for the color. The fence is different because the
15 pickets are gone, and that ramp in the back.
16 And I would like to see it stay that
17 way, because I know I would like my house to stay
18 that way. It's one of those facial historic
19 things, and I wouldn't want someone coming in and
20 changing that, not after it's been there that
21 long. I would like to see it stay. Thank you.

22 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, ma'am.

23 MS. MIDDGAUGH: I had a question. You
24 will probably clarify it when you discuss, but I
25 couldn't tell from the presentation what was going

0117

1 to happen --

2 MR. ILDERTON: State your name, please.

3 MS. MIDDGAUGH: Oh, Susan Middaugh, 2420
4 Raven Drive.

5 And I couldn't really tell what you
6 planned for the front of it, whether you are
7 keeping the awnings and keeping the enclosed --

8 MR. DENTON: They are staying. They
9 will have to be restored, but they are staying.

10 MR. ILDERTON: Anybody else need to --
11 all right. The public comment section is closed.

12 MR. WRIGHT: My turn?

13 MR. ILDERTON: No. Final comments?
14 Kent or Randy, do you have anything? All right.

15 Now --

16 MR. WRIGHT: Pat, I didn't understand
17 your comment. Would you address -- was that
18 addressing your concern about --

19 MS. PATURZO: Are you adding the years
20 to see how old I am? I remember the house just
21 like it is except for the picket fence, and I
22 don't remember when the porch had that apron put
23 on it, the border porch.

24 The house really is the same as what I
25 remember it from way back in the 1930s.

0118

1 MR. WRIGHT: Including the enclosed
2 portions of the porch?

3 MS. PATURZO: No. That's what I say.
4 See, I don't remember when that was put on, but
5 it's been there for a good many years.

6 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

7 MS. ILDERTON: Thank you, ma'am.

8 MR. WRIGHT: I did not make the site
9 visit, so I will have to defer. I am sure there
10 is discussion relevant to this.

11 MR. ILDERTON: Yes?

12 MR. HERLONG: I have walked the
13 property. I didn't make that same official site

14 visit. But what I see is that the street facade
15 will remain essentially as it is, I think just
16 renovated or, rather, restored. It would have a
17 metal roof. It would retain the awning. That was
18 probably an addition later on at some time.

19 The way it's drawn it would retain the
20 solid bottom apron of boards from the railing
21 down. And then only as it returns to the side
22 would it go to some open pickets and railings side
23 and back.

24 And it just appears, from what I can
25 see, that it was originally a side porch and

0119

1 possibly the back porch. It could have been
2 original, but it just seems that -- it's probably
3 very debatable as to what era one should take that
4 house to.

5 I think because it's a private residence
6 there are several eras that would be acceptable.
7 There are several ways you could take it back, and
8 how far back you take it, it's debatable.

9 But I think this is an acceptable
10 solution for sure, retaining the front facade. We
11 have heard people discuss the solid apron, the
12 fact that we see that around the island, and the
13 awnings. The awnings are very typical. So this
14 seems like a pretty good solution as a direction
15 to take in restoring and renovating this house.

16 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Fred?

17 MR. REINHARD: I totally agree. I think
18 a real good effort has been made here both by
19 applicant and the board to come up with a
20 compromise that will work for this very lovely old
21 house that is in bad shape. And the net result is
22 going to be soon it will be in very good shape and
23 it will look a lot like it did in the 1920s, so I
24 totally support it.

25 MR. ILDERTON: Cyndy?

0120

1 MS. EWING: When we did the walk-through
2 I think we discovered a few things, and one of
3 them was that the sunroom had doors that date at
4 least, at least 1930, and probably back to 1910,
5 1920s. And they are not exterior doors. They are
6 interior doors. And the entire room was bead
7 boarding.

8 So -- well, I have a strong conviction
9 that the side elevations -- that the sunroom
10 remains the way that it is. And the only thing
11 that I would be willing to vote to approve would
12 be the porch in the back that has obviously been
13 enclosed at a different time, and that is how I

14 feel.

15 I think that if we take it back and use
16 these vertical pickets that it will dramatically
17 change and, actually, ruin the historic value.
18 And we talk about altering a building beyond what
19 it can tolerate, and I think by doing what the
20 applicant is requesting, we will actually be
21 taking away the historic value and this will no
22 longer belong on the historic list.

23 MR. ILDERTON: Billy?

24 MR. CRAVER: I agree with Steve and
25 Fred, and I think they have come up with a real

0121

1 good compromise here. I think it will retain its
2 historic value. I don't think making the changes
3 will destroy it. I would approve it.

4 MR. ILDERTON: There has obviously been,
5 like you said, additions and changes at various
6 times over the years. And I said I knew
7 Judge -- somewhat related to the Lymes way back
8 when by marriage, I guess, and knew them owning
9 this house.

10 Probably the main structure was done at
11 one point and then additions were made. And
12 whether they were enclosed or not, it's hard to
13 say, but it is old. Cyndy, you are correct. It's
14 definitely -- the addition has some age on it.

15 But I would probably say the central
16 core of the house is older because of the type of
17 bead board. The bead board on the central core of
18 the house seems to me was beaded and the other
19 board was a V-groove. Still old, but probably of
20 a different era.

21 The overall integrity of the house is
22 still going to be kept, it looks like to me on the
23 design, if they are careful. So in the interest
24 of trying to preserve the original house, I could
25 probably live with it.

0122

1 Do I hear any kind of motion?

2 MS. EWING: I actually have another
3 comment. I would like to comment on what you
4 said.

5 The original house, depending on what
6 you -- I mean, it says on the historic survey that
7 it dates 1850. And, if you look, the bead board
8 is different and the doors are different on the
9 interior, and that is not disputed.

10 But I want to get this into the record
11 that under the Secretary of Interior standards we
12 need to look, as a Design Review Board charged
13 with preserving the historic character of

14 properties on this island, that we would be in
15 violation of the Secretary of Interior standards
16 Number 2, Number 4, Number 5 and Number 9.
17 Number 2 says the historic character of
18 the property shall be retained and preserved. The
19 removal of historic materials or alteration of
20 features and spaces that characterize the property
21 shall be avoided.

22 Number 4 says most properties change
23 over time. Those changes that have been
24 acquired -- that have acquired historic
25 significance in their own right shall be retained
0123

1 and preserved. And I think -- I'm sorry. I
2 forgot your name.

3 MS. PATURZO: Pat Paturzo.

4 MS. EWING: She speaks to that. And,
5 Number 5, distinctive features, finishes and
6 construction techniques are examples of
7 craftsmanship that characterizes historic
8 properties shall be preserved.

9 And, Number 9, new additions or exterior
10 alterations related to new construction shall not
11 destroy historic property.

12 So I just wanted to get that in because
13 I feel like we need to really stand tough on this
14 building. It was said when we were out there this
15 is a gem, and the alterations that we are doing --
16 these are going to be seen from the road, and it's
17 a very, very bad precedent.

18 This structure -- it's very unusual for
19 us to find a building that maintains this much
20 historic value, and I just would ask people to
21 take a look at this, because to change it the way
22 that they are asking is wrong.

23 MR. ILDERTON: Anybody else have any
24 comments?

25 MR. WRIGHT: I have a question. I am
0124

1 still, having not -- I have walked the site and
2 visited the building, but was not there at the
3 site visit. What changes, again, Cyndy, are
4 significant enough to cause you --

5 MR. ILDERTON: The sunroom removal.

6 MR. WRIGHT: Which is the enclosure on
7 the south side?

8 MS. EWING: Right.

9 MR. REINHARD: It's on the west side.

10 MS. EWING: Pat was saying that he felt
11 it was just an addition that was added. And, you
12 know, additions did happen oftentimes to these
13 buildings, and I think --

14 MR. ILDERTON: It's an old addition.

15 MS. EWING: It is an old addition. And
16 the doors -- this is not a 1940s addition. This
17 is clearly -- the doors -- and the reason I know
18 it is because I have doors like that on an
19 addition that was put on our house back in
20 the '20s, so I can date that pretty clearly.

21 I just feel very strongly that we need
22 to look really, really carefully before we tear
23 this off because we could be actually destroying
24 the historic value of a home that has -- being
25 that it is a gem.

0125

1 MR. REINHARD: Have you calculated the
2 principal building square footage after these
3 changes?

4 MR. DENTON: I will not be that
5 presumptive.

6 MR. ILDERTON: I guess the significance
7 on this square footage that either is taken off or
8 added is this added square -- heated square
9 footage they can build to the new house, is that
10 correct, that is if --

11 MR. REINHARD: That is why I asked the
12 question.

13 MR. DENTON: There is a difference of
14 around, off the top of my head, about 400 square
15 feet. I believe the original structure was about
16 1100 square feet, something like that. And
17 according to the site plan, the calculation of the
18 revised heated square footage is 708.

19 MR. REINHARD: So you could leave the
20 sunroom and still meet your criteria?

21 MR. DENTON: Well, we are not trying to
22 meet -- I mean, this house was never a part of --

23 MR. PRAUSE: It's under 1200.

24 MR. REINHARD: That's not the issue.

25 MR. DENTON: There is livability issues.

0126

1 I mean, we are proposing this as a secondary
2 structure on the property, so then you have to
3 question how is the house going to be used.

4 A eleven hundred and whatever square
5 foot building with four good-size rooms and a
6 kitchen, it could be used as a dependency, a
7 two-bedroom apartment. Is that really what the
8 island wants? Is that really what the person who
9 lives in the main house is going to want?

10 A smaller structure might be better
11 utilized as a home office or, you know, something
12 along those lines, a true guest house. That would
13 work better in smaller scale, and that is --

14 really we are trying to keep the house active,
15 being used. We don't want it to be this fixed up
16 little thing that you put on the shelf and forget
17 about. I would like the house to be used. I
18 mean, that is what it's for.

19 MR. REINHARD: How do you feel about
20 having or not having the sunroom?

21 MR. DENTON: I don't feel -- my
22 impression of how that house would be used, I
23 don't find that space to be valuable to how I
24 would use the house. And my notion is that I
25 would either have -- I would see it as a home

0127

1 office or perhaps a guest house.

2 And I would rather have more porches and
3 decks, open space. You know, the roofline, to me,
4 calls for or embraces the porch element, and there
5 are all sorts of houses on this island, even a few
6 actually on Isle of Palms, that are not huge
7 houses, but the porches are really what makes the
8 character of the house.

9 MR. REINHARD: Thank you.

10 MR. BIASCOECHEA: Mr. Biascoechea. Two
11 things. I spoke with Darcy (phonetic) today, and
12 the actual backboards were enclosed after they
13 bought the property, so it wasn't enclosed in the
14 old days. So it was after '68, '70, and there was
15 no house on record, Cyndy. You keep going back to
16 1850.

17 If you go back to the tax records, there
18 was no house there until actually the 1900s. So
19 you have a discrepancy there by about 50 years.

20 MR. DENTON: It's still old.

21 MR. BIASCOECHEA: Yes, be that as it
22 may.

23 MR. ILDERTON: We are out of sync here.

24 Let's stay with the discussion of the board. I
25 mean, we can discuss it -- we can make a motion

0128

1 and then we can discuss it more, or we can discuss
2 it more and then make a motion. I know we are
3 trying to find --

4 MR. CRAVER: I make a motion that we
5 approve the requested changes on this application
6 as shown.

7 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a second?

8 MR. HELONG: I second that.

9 MR. ILDERTON: Okay. Discussion of that
10 motion. Fred?

11 MR. REINHARD: I think Steve has come up
12 with a very valid point, and that is that this
13 house has been changed any number of times, and

14 it's hard to tell when you are restoring it what
15 to keep, what not to keep, what to put back that
16 wasn't even there, what may have been there that
17 we don't know about.

18 And as I said early on, it's a
19 compromise. It's a compromise between us wanting
20 to keep this charming old house looking, at least
21 from the street, like it did before, and that has
22 been accomplished.

23 What is happening on the side with the
24 side porch, it's rather nebulous. You know, we
25 ran in there. We saw the structure certainly

0129

1 different than a porch floor structure. But, as
2 you say, the porch roof is a continuous flow all
3 the way around, and it looks like it should be a
4 porch.

5 It could have been a sunroom. It could
6 have been a porch and a sunroom. We don't really
7 know. So we can't keep debating this thing. We
8 have to move forward with it. It's a good design
9 and I would support it.

10 MR. ILDERTON: More discussion?

11 MS. EWING: I feel that granting the
12 approval is wrong. I don't think we should be
13 making a decision on a historic home based on the
14 applicant's request to use it as an office.

15 And I disagree with Fred because we can
16 date this, and we do know that this is a
17 historic -- there is no question that even this
18 sunroom that we are discussing to tear off, it's a
19 historic structure. It's over 70 years old.

20 And, again, I urge everybody to look at
21 the standards that we are supposed to make
22 decisions on, and we are going against four or
23 five of those standards. So every single house on
24 this island has had an addition put on it if it's
25 a historic home.

0130

1 And, you know, if something is put on in
2 1950, 1960, I don't see a problem taking it off.
3 I do have a problem with removing them so that
4 people can have basically extra square footage for
5 a secondary structure.

6 I think we need to look at this house
7 and consider it on its own and have it stand on
8 its own merits, that we are making this decision
9 for the best interest of this historic home and
10 for the continuity of the island and integrity of
11 the homes. That's it.

12 MR. DENTON: Can I make a philosophical
13 comment? I don't know if that is allowed.

14 MR. ILDERTON: No. I am going to call
15 for a vote, unless you want to discuss this some
16 more.

17 MR. HELONG: Well, again, I feel like if
18 we were dealing with a public building we would
19 certainly be able to debate, and in Charleston
20 that is a continuous debate, what area a structure
21 should be held to or taken to, and I think that is
22 very debatable here.

23 Yet, this is a private residence.
24 Someone owns it, and I think they should have some
25 rights and influence as to what they would like to

0131

1 do as long as it is sympathetic to the original
2 intent and historic nature, and I think this
3 achieves that.

4 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor, aye.
5 (In favor were Mr. Herlong, Mr.
6 Reinhard, Ms. Harmon, Mr. Craver raised.)

7 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody opposed?
8 (Opposed were Mr. Ilderton, Mr. Wright,
9 Ms. Ewing.)

10 MR. ILDERTON: What is the vote? What
11 is the vote, four to three?

12 MS. KENYON: Yes.

13 MR. DENTON: Thank you.

14 MR. ILDERTON: 1914 Middle Street,
15 Rhodes residence, landscape and pool.

16 MR. PRAUSE: This one is coming back to
17 you. You heard it once before and kind of gave
18 some direction to the applicant who wanted to make
19 some modifications to come back and see if he
20 could get it approved.

21 MR. RHODES: Not this one.

22 MR. PRAUSE: Oh, excuse me. I got them
23 mixed up.

24 This is the addition of 4-foot wooden
25 picket fence and addition of a 16x22 foot pool

0132

1 with eight feet of decking around, and both
2 detailed on a set of plans submitted with the
3 application. That's it.

4 MR. ILDERTON: Yes, sir?

5 MR. RHODES: The picket fence goes with
6 all the neighbors around. It's compatible with
7 the neighborhood. The pool is set behind the
8 guest house, so it really won't be visible from
9 Middle Street, we don't think. Instead of putting
10 it out here in the open, we tried to slide it in
11 between the guest house. And we have included the
12 landscape so you could see how we would try to
13 make the pool blend in.

14 We are not asking for any coverage
15 overage. We are still in our coverage. But,
16 according to Randy, we still have to get approval
17 from you-all to do a structure like this. So we
18 are still under our 30 percent coverage. I just
19 want everyone to be aware of that.

20 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Public
21 comment? Public comment is closed. Kent,
22 anything, or Randy?

23 MR. PRAUSE: No.

24 MR. ILDERTON: All right.
25 Billy?

0133

1 MR. CRAVER: Is there anything being
2 violated here? They are not asking for any
3 allowances or anything. I would approve it.

4 MR. ILDERTON: Cyndy?

5 MS. EWING: What kind of pervious
6 pavement surface is around the pool?

7 MR. RHODES: Those are pavers. It
8 passes the code for Sullivan's Island, also.

9 MS. EWING: Okay.

10 MR. ILDERTON: Fred?

11 MR. REINHARD: Okay.

12 MR. ILDERTON: Steve?

13 MR. HERLONG: I think it's fine.

14 MR. ILDERTON: I also think it's fine.

15 Duke?

16 MR. WRIGHT: I think it's fine. What
17 threw me -- I think what threw Cyndy is the
18 drawing shows concrete.

19 MR. RHODES: Oh, does it? It's not
20 going to be concrete.

21 MR. WRIGHT: The narrative shows
22 decking. You write decking. The question I would
23 have, you weren't talking about wood decking, were
24 you?

25 MR. RHODES: No, sir, pavers.

0134

1 MR. REINHARD: Betty says excellent.

2 MR. ILDERTON: Do I have a motion?

3 MR. WRIGHT: I move that it be
4 approved.

5 MR. ILDERTON: Second?

6 MR. REINHARD: Second.

7 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion? Everybody in
8 favor.

9 (All hands raised.)

10 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you.

11 MR. RHODES: Thank you.

12 MR. ILDERTON: 1908 Middle Street.

13 MR. PRAUSE: Addition of a stucco knee

14 wall, addition of a four-foot wooden picket fence,
15 in addition to a four-foot living fence, wood and
16 wire, as detailed on the submitted plans, and we
17 also have a set of plans in which you had
18 previously approved what is referred to as
19 mirroring or flipping of the house, and the
20 landscape plan.

21 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Yes, sir?

22 MR. RHODES: I'm back before you with
23 1908 Middle Street. We had a problem --

24 MR. WRIGHT: Excuse me. I have a
25 question of Kent. Is this the right time?

0135

1 MR. ILDERTON: I guess if you want to
2 question Kent.

3 MR. WRIGHT: Did we approve last time
4 the mirroring of the house as well as the swimming
5 pool? That is the only thing that was approved?

6 MR. PRAUSE: Yes.

7 MR. WRIGHT: There are still some issues
8 outstanding?

9 MR. PRAUSE: Yes, sir.

10 MR. WRIGHT: I wanted to clarify.

11 MR. RHODES: We are back before you
12 showing the landscape plan and some hardscape.
13 And what we did, we took the house back to the
14 original plans. We took everything off that we
15 thought you-all had an issue with.

16 We took the door off that went into the
17 porch, and we took the lattice work off. The only
18 thing we kept that was different from the first
19 plan was the stairs, which I think you-all said
20 you were okay with.

21 And the pool, of course, is still the
22 same as it was. So we have a new updated
23 landscape plan to try to mass the look from Middle
24 Street. You-all have the landscape plan. This is
25 the actual plan right here that shows just the

0136

1 landscape so it wouldn't confuse you.

2 So we took the landscaping off of this
3 plan to show the pavers and stuff like that. And
4 the fences, we have three different types of
5 fences on this picket fence, a living fence, which
6 if you have ever seen it it's real nice. It lets
7 vines grow through it. It's very nice.

8 And we also have a mock-up of the small
9 little concrete wall we want across the front
10 right here. Do you want me to bring that up?
11 This is Steven Zucas. He will be the new owner of
12 the house.

13 There is just a small fence that would

14 run right along the sidewalk. It's something that
15 was an architectural design that they really like,
16 and I was hoping you would approve. It's
17 something different, but it brings it back to an
18 era of the old days and it's going to be real
19 nice, we think.

20 MR. ILBERTON: Great.

21 MR. REINHARD: Can you show us on the
22 drawing where that exists?

23 MR. RHODES: It exists along the front
24 of the thing, and then there is a walkway up to
25 the existing house and it comes around here.

0137

1 MR. REINHARD: That is what you call the
2 knee wall?

3 MR. RHODES: Yes, sir.

4 MR. REINHARD: It's right at the
5 sidewalk?

6 MR. RHODES: Right at the sidewalk, yes,
7 sir.

8 MR. REINHARD: And there is picket fence
9 on top of it?

10 MR. RHODES: No.

11 MR. REINHARD: What is this detail here
12 that says picket fence, stucco knee wall detail?

13 MR. RHODES: The picket fence is behind
14 it. I think he's just showing it through. The
15 picket fence is back here, so the idea is to
16 create a front yard.

17 MR. REINHARD: I got it. Because it
18 looked like it was sitting on top of it, which I
19 was going to criticize.

20 MR. ILBERTON: Is there any public
21 comment? Public comment section is closed. Kent,
22 final comments? Randy, final comments?

23 MR. ROBINSON: No.

24 MR. WRIGHT: I have no trouble with it.

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

0138

1 with it. Steve?

2 MR. HELONG: I am fine with it. Duke?

3 MR. REINHARD: So that wall is where the
4 people sit while they are watering their dog at
5 the dog water station?

6 MR. RHODES: That's it.

7 MR. REINHARD: You are a real citizen.

8 MR. RHODES: We are trying.

9 MS. HARMON: Perfection.

10 MR. CRAVER: Fine. Let's rock and roll.

11 MR. WRIGHT: One more comment to make it
12 clear. We are also approving the changes that he
13 made to the house and the louvered enclosures at

14 the top by the swimming pool, as well as the fence
15 on the deck?

16 MR. RHODES: I just went back to the
17 original which you had already approved.

18 MR. ILDERTON: Do we hear a motion?

19 MR. REINHARD: I move it be approved and
20 submitted.

21 MR. ILDERTON: Second?

22 MS. HARMON: Second.

23 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion?

24 MR. RHODES: Can I ask the board one
25 question? Have you already voted?

0139

1 MR. ILDERTON: What is your question?
2 It might go against you. Go ahead, Sammy. Roll
3 the dice.

4 MR. RHODES: On the front of the house
5 we would like to put optimal shutters, and I don't
6 know if I need to do a different drawing on that.
7 We want to order some shutters on the original
8 house, operational, you know, the old-timey ones
9 that actually shut.

10 MR. CRAVER: You have to come back for
11 that.

12 MR. RHODES: We would just like to get
13 them. It just takes two months to get them in. I
14 didn't know if you could say yes or no.

15 MR. REINHARD: Where are they going?

16 MR. RHODES: There are two windows on
17 the side of the front house and then right there
18 and right there, and then one there and there.

19 MR. WRIGHT: On the cottage, the
20 original cottage?

21 MR. RHODES: On the cottage.

22 MR. REINHARD: On the cottage.

23 MR. RHODES: If you look at the cottage,
24 the cottage looks kind of plain now with the
25 siding and the big windows and all. We think it

0140

1 would add to it. But we can bring that back
2 another day if you don't feel comfortable with it.

3 MR. HERLONG: I think we would like to
4 see a cut sheet or the detail on that.

5 MR. REINHARD: You are actually going to
6 work?

7 MR. RHODES: Yes, sir.

8 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion on the
9 motion? We are all good? Everybody in favor?

10 (All hands raised except Ms. Ewing.)

11 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody opposed?

12 (Ms. Ewing raised her hand.)

13 MR. ILDERTON: 405 Seabreeze, Lucas

14 residence, demolition.

15 MR. PRAUSE: 405 Seabreeze Lane. I
16 imagine it's a request for demolition, although
17 they haven't actually applied for a demolition
18 permit. I believe they are trying to sell the
19 house, and the question that comes in is if it can
20 be demolished, and she would like the board to
21 make a determination as -- you are familiar with
22 it.

23 It's over 50 years old, and anybody who
24 wants to demolish the structure, relocate it, move
25 it, even alter it, it needs to come to you to make

0141

1 a determination as to whether or not it should be
2 placed on -- considered for placement on the
3 historic district list.

4 And if you decide that it is, then they
5 get their notification, have an opportunity for a
6 hearing, and you then consider whether or not it's
7 going to be placed on the list.

8 What Town Council did last night at
9 their meeting, there is a pending ordinance on
10 that current ordinance provision. They amended it
11 during second reading last night to include the
12 provision that any such determination that would
13 be made by this board that it would not consider
14 the house to be eligible to be placed on the list
15 is only good for one year.

16 So, in other words, if they don't take
17 out a demolition permit, or a relocation permit,
18 or a permit to alter the building within that
19 one-year time frame, then it goes away and they
20 have to come back again after a year, so I just
21 wanted to make you aware of that.

22 In other words, it's just not on the
23 list forever and ever and it's good until time
24 ends.

25 MS. LUCAS: You have pretty much summed

0142

1 up why I'm here. The house is over 50 years old,
2 and when my husband bought it in the early '70s he
3 increased the size of it dramatically as you can
4 see in the photographs, and also added on a second
5 floor.

6 And then after Hugo we had to completely
7 repair the whole house and raise it up. So right
8 now there is really none of the original house
9 that still exists. It is up for sale, and I have
10 had potential buyers ask if it could be
11 demolished. So that is why I'm coming to you-all,
12 I can honestly give these potential buyers the
13 truth.

14 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Public comment?
15 Public comment section is closed. Kent, Randy,
16 anything?

17 MR. PRAUSE: Nothing further.

18 MR. ILDERTON: Duke?

19 MR. WRIGHT: I don't have any trouble
20 with the application.

21 MR. ILDERTON: Steve?

22 MR. HELONG: So it's just sort of a
23 technicality, right? The applicant has not asked
24 for an actual demolition permit, is that correct?

25 MS. LUCAS: Correct.

0143

1 MR. HERLONG: But we are allowed to make
2 the ruling? We are okay with that? That is not a
3 problem?

4 MR. ILDERTON: We will go on record as
5 making the ruling if we deem so.

6 MR. HERLONG: I have no trouble with the
7 application. I agree. It has substantially
8 changed in every way.

9 MR. ILDERTON: Fred?

10 MR. REINHARD: It's too bad somebody
11 won't buy it the way it is, but I don't have a
12 problem.

13 MS. EWING: What are we determining,
14 whether it's on the historic list or not?

15 MR. PRAUSE: Whether you want to place
16 it on the list.

17 MR. ILDERTON: Whether we would permit
18 if to be demolished or not, or whether we placed
19 it on the historic list we --

20 MS. EWING: Okay. It's not currently on
21 the historic list?

22 MR. ILDERTON: No.

23 MS. EWING: I would not vote to put it
24 on the historic list.

25 MR. CRAVER: I wouldn't vote to put it

0144

1 on the historic list, and I would vote to let them
2 tear it down if they wanted to.

3 MR. ILDERTON: Also my feelings are the
4 same. Do we have a motion?

5 MR. REINHARD: Second.

6 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion?

7 MR. CRAVER: So moved.

8 MS. EWING: Well, let's be clear on the
9 motion.

10 MR. WRIGHT: Approve the application.

11 MR. ILDERTON: Approve the application
12 as submitted.

13 MR. PRAUSE: Well, make a determination

14 as to whether or not you think it should be put on
15 the historical list. You don't deal with anything
16 that --

17 MR. CRAVER: I make a motion that we not
18 add it to the historic list.

19 MR. ILDERTON: And that is good for a
20 year.

21 MR. REINHARD: I second that motion.

22 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion? Everybody in
23 favor?

24 (All hands raised.)

25 MR. ILDERTON: We are adjourned.

0145

1 (The hearing was concluded at 9:10
2 p.m.)

3 - - -

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

0146

1 STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
2)
3 COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)
4

I, Nancy Ennis Tierney, Certified Shorthand
5 Reporter and Notary Public for the State of South
6 Carolina at Large, do hereby certify that the
7 hearing was taken at the time and location therein
8 stated; that the hearing was recorded
stenographically by me and were thereafter
transcribed by computer-aided transcription; and
that the foregoing is a full, complete and true
record of the hearing.

9

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

11

Witness my hand, I have hereunto affixed my
12 official seal this 28th day of March, 2007, at
Charleston, Charleston County, South Carolina.

13

14

15

16

17

Nancy Ennis Tierney
CSR (IL)

18

My Commission expires
April 6, 2014

19

20

21

22

23

24

25