

0001

1

2

3

4

5

6

MEETING OF THE SULLIVAN'S ISLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

DATE: October 17, 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

REPORTED BY: NANCY ENNIS TIERNEY, CSR (IL)

23

CLARK & ASSOCIATES

P.O. Box 73129

24

North Charleston, SC 29415

(843) 762-6294

25

0002

1

A P P E A R A N C E S

2

3

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS:

4

PAT ILBERTON - Chair

5

STEPHEN HERLONG - Vice Chair

DUKE WRIGHT - Secretary

6

BETTY HARMON - Member

FRED REINHARD - Member

7

CYNDY EWING - Member

KAT KENYON - Administrative

8

9

10

11

ALSO PRESENT:

12

Kent Prause - Zoning Administrator

Clayton B. McCullough - Board Attorney

13

Randy Robinson - Building Official

14

15

16

17

18

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
0003

I N D E X

1		
2		
3		Page
4		
5		
	Certificate of Reporter	108
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

0004

1 MR. ILDERTON: It's 6:00 and the Design
2 Review Board of Sullivan's Island will meet.
3 Okay. We are meeting now. It is 6:00. You can
4 tell I haven't done this in awhile.
5 The members in attendance are Duke
6 Wright, Pat Ilderton, Steve Herlong, Betty Harmon,
7 Fred Reinhard and Cyndy Ewing.
8 The Freedom of Information requirements
9 have been met for this meeting.
10 The first item on the agenda is approval
11 of the minutes, the August of 2007 minutes.
12 MR. WRIGHT: I move they be approved if
13 they have been corrected.
14 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a second?
15 MR. HERLONG: Second.
16 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion? All in
17 favor?
18 (All hands were raised.)
19 MS. HARMON: I am abstaining because I
20 haven't read them. Oh, August. Sorry.
21 MR. ILDERTON: And the approval of the
22 September of 2007 minutes?

23 MS. HARMON: I will approve August.
24 MR. ILBERTON: Okay. Everyone approved
25 for August.

0005

1 Now, approval of the September minutes?

2 MR. WRIGHT: I move that the September
3 minutes be approved.

4 MR. REINHARD: Second.

5 MR. ILBERTON: Discussion? Everyone in
6 favor?

7 (All hands raised except Ms. Harmon.)

8 MS. HARMON: I am abstaining. I haven't
9 read them.

10 MR. ILBERTON: 1722 Middle Street,
11 fence. Kent?

12 MR. PRAUSE: This property is within the
13 historic district, and I assume the box shows a
14 check for -- or the line for designated as a
15 historic resource because it has a historic survey
16 number of 256.

17 They are requesting to install a fence
18 in the backyard, relocate existing 12-foot gates,
19 enlarge the existing cistern door and relocate two
20 existing HVAC units to the front corner of the
21 house.

22 And they have submitted a site plan and
23 a fence, a drawing of the proposed fence, and also
24 some pictures of the lot showing an illustrated
25 picture of the type of fence they want, the gates

0006

1 to be relocated, the cistern door, and also where
2 they propose to relocate the HVAC units.

3 That is all I have.

4 MR. ILBERTON: The applicant is here?

5 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes, sir, Michael and
6 Kim Richardson.

7 MR. ILBERTON: Do you want to say
8 anything other than just --

9 MR. RICHARDSON: Well, we need to
10 relocate the gate. If you look at the pictures,
11 there are two very large utility poles right
12 behind the existing gate, and it's kind of hard
13 for me to get my boat -- in fact, it's impossible
14 for me to get my boat back in through the gate, so
15 we would like to move the gate over to the corner.

16 MR. ILBERTON: Okay.

17 MR. RICHARDSON: I need a fence in the
18 backyard to keep my critter out of harm's way of
19 Sullivan's Island PD, my dog.

20 I am seriously considering putting the
21 geothermal unit in. And, if so, I will put the
22 unit inside in the existing mechanical room. If
23 we relocate the units, it's not going to be a
24 package unit. It's just going to be the condenser
25 portion, and you shouldn't be able to see it from

0007

1 Middle Street.

2 MR. ILDERTON: Geothermal, sure.
3 MR. RICHARDSON: And I need to use the
4 cistern for something constructive. If you have
5 been by my house, you will see all of my stuff in
6 the backyard because I have no place to put it. I
7 can't get my ice machine through the existing
8 cistern door, so I would like to enlarge it.
9 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, sir.
10 MR. PRAUSE: Anything to add, Randy?
11 MR. PRAUSE: No.
12 MR. ILDERTON: Is there any public
13 comment on this proposal? Public comment section
14 is closed.
15 The board, what do we think? Everybody
16 like it?
17 MR. WRIGHT: I have a couple of
18 questions. There is major maintenance work going
19 on on that house, if I have the right house. Is
20 that the one that has some of the siding off?
21 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes. We are replacing
22 some rotten wood.
23 MR. WRIGHT: I am just curious. Does
24 that have to come before this board when you are
25 doing that kind of work on a rather important
0008 historic house on Sullivan's Island? I am just
1 asking a question.
2 MR. RICHARDSON: They have gone through
3 painstaking effort to put it back the way --
4 MR. WRIGHT: I understand that, and I
5 don't have any trouble with it. I want to be sure
6 you don't get in a jam by doing something that is
7 not supposed to be done.
8 MR. ROBINSON: Normal maintenance does
9 not need to come before the board as long as they
10 are using like materials.
11 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. I just make that a
12 matter of record. That's good.
13 MR. HERLONG: Well, I wouldn't even
14 think repair, as long as they are using like
15 materials, wouldn't come before the board.
16 MR. ILDERTON: Just like we hope one day
17 fences won't come to the board.
18 MR. WRIGHT: That is all I have.
19 MR. ILDERTON: Betty?
20 MS. HARMON: I'm fine with it. Welcome
21 to the neighborhood.
22 THE RICHARDSONS: Thank you.
23 MR. ILDERTON: Stephen?
24 MR. HERLONG: I am fine with it. I
0009 think it's very appropriate.
1 MR. REINHARD: Don't we consider that
2 cistern as historic, and modifying that structure
3 to put a bigger door in would be getting into the
4 historic masonry and stucco? It looks like a
5 pretty neat old cistern. Does anyone have any
6

7 feelings about that?
8 MR. WRIGHT: I looked at that myself,
9 Fred. The way that is located -- have you looked
10 at it?

11 MR. REINHARD: No.

12 MR. WRIGHT: It's virtually out of
13 sight, really, this door. And I understand what
14 you are talking about, a modification of sorts by
15 enlarging the door. But, personally, I don't
16 think that that has an effect on the historic
17 significance of that cistern. That is my view.

18 MR. ILBERTON: And I'm thinking -- I
19 mean, there are so many. Almost all of them have
20 either been destroyed or modified it almost -- I
21 mean, it's almost historical not to modify it just
22 because everybody uses these things, these
23 structures, in various great ways that I --

24 MS. HARMON: I guess the question would
25 be is how wide is it going to be?

0010

1 MR. REINHARD: Three more inches.

2 MR. RICHARDSON: Three more inches and
3 maybe about eight inches taller.

4 MS. HARMON: Well, you have the height
5 and the width.

6 MR. RICHARDSON: I am just trying to
7 keep the critters out of that. There are a lot of
8 them around.

9 MS. EWING: I mean, I think it's up for
10 discussion what the board feels if cisterns come
11 under historic or not, and it might be a good
12 evening to discuss that and to decide whether we
13 feel that we need to ever discuss the historic
14 value of cisterns again.

15 MR. REINHARD: Well, let me be the
16 devil's advocate here. What if somebody came
17 before us and said they wanted to remove the
18 cistern because they needed a garage in its
19 place? Would we consider it a historic
20 structure?

21 MR. ILBERTON: Yeah. I mean, I think
22 that is a totally different --

23 MR. REINHARD: It's different, but it
24 just is an indication of whether or not we
25 consider it an important --

0011

1 MR. ILBERTON: I definitely do. We want
2 to always consider. I definitely think we always
3 want to, definitely, because it is historic.

4 But I think if somebody is going to use
5 this, especially in such a moderate manner, that
6 means they are going to maintain the cistern as
7 opposed to just letting it fall in, you know, just
8 let it fall into complete disrepair; whereas, that
9 could happen to these cisterns if we say you can't
10 use them or you can't -- and this is a relatively
11 moderate thing.

12 Again, I agree. If somebody came along
13 and wanted to bulldoze it or whatever else, that
14 would be a different level of discussion.

15 MS. EWING: So they are -- we are
16 going -- we think they are historic? You think
17 they are historic?

18 MS. HARMON: I think they are historic.

19 MR. ILBERTON: Yeah. I mean, I think
20 they are worthy of consideration. If they are in
21 the historic district, why wouldn't we consider
22 it?

23 MR. HERLONG: And, actually, there are
24 two situations. These are cisterns that are on
25 the exterior of a home. There are a lot of the

0012

1 older homes that have cisterns under the home.

2 Because they are not on the exterior or
3 something along the exterior of a property or
4 facade, they are not something that we can
5 protect.

6 But this one being an exterior feature,
7 I think it is historical. But I think, as Pat
8 said, they are minimally useful unless we -- and I
9 think, in this case, they found a need and a use
10 to use it as storage. The house is sitting on a
11 crawl space. They have no area under the home to
12 store, I don't know, lawn mowers or whatever you
13 might put in that structure.

14 But giving someone an opportunity to
15 make a modification that gives it a use is going
16 to preserve it for a longer length of time.
17 Otherwise, people might just let it go by
18 neglect. So I think it's a debatable issue.

19 MS. HARMON: I think it's treated like
20 an accessory building. The houses -- of course I
21 live in one, so I know about them. But you don't
22 have anywhere -- you destroy the appearance of the
23 backyard when you add things to it. So this is
24 the only thing you would really have to store
25 anything in it. You can't add an attachment to

0013

1 the house.

2 So it's a very useful thing for people
3 that live there, because then they have places to
4 store their property. I mean, it has to be of
5 some use. It can't just sit there, I think.

6 MR. REINHARD: I would be okay with it,
7 but I would like to see it go back the way it
8 looks in this picture.

9 In other words, you have to go in there
10 with a concrete saw and neatly cut the opening and
11 then use -- I know that these are not historic
12 materials, but it has a nice historic look to it,
13 a nice primitive look.

14 MR. ILBERTON: Plank door.

15 MR. REINHARD: Plank door and pressure
16 treated 2x6, 2x8. I don't know how many wide of

17 bricks there are in that. But put it back the way
18 it looks and let's not "shotsky" it up with a
19 bunch of moldings that cover up rough cut
20 openings.

21 Do a neat job and try to make it look
22 the way it looks in this picture and I will
23 support it.

24 MS. HARMON: Well, you know this door is
25 not the original door.

0014

1 MR. REINHARD: I know. I know.

2 MR. RICHARDSON: I don't have an
3 objection to that.

4 MR. ILBERTON: Does that need to be part
5 of the motion?

6 MR. REINHARD: I move for approval with
7 that as part of the motion.

8 MR. ILBERTON: Do I hear a second?

9 MS. KENYON: Let him finish the motion.

10 MR. REINHARD: That it be put back with
11 similar materials and the exact same look, jamb
12 and plank door and hardware features that it has
13 on it now.

14 MR. ILBERTON: Great. Do I hear a
15 second?

16 MS. HARMON: Second.

17 MR. ILBERTON: Everybody in favor -- or
18 discussion? I'm sorry.

19 MS. EWING: My only question is on the
20 HVAC. Nobody has a problem with that being moved
21 to the front of the house?

22 MS. HARMON: Well, the neighbor has both
23 of hers on the front of the house that is covered
24 by bushes.

25 MS. EWING: I know. I am just bringing

0015

1 it up.

2 MR. HERLONG: Is this one unit or is it
3 two units? An upstairs -- two units going in
4 there?

5 MR. RICHARDSON: It's currently one
6 package unit and one split system. And we are
7 definitely going to put a geothermal on the bottom
8 floor, so it's going in the back in the mechanical
9 room. So there would be just one condenser.

10 MR. HERLONG: So it's a relatively
11 small, maybe 30-inch square, type of a unit?

12 MR. RICHARDSON: Yes.

13 MS. EWING: And it doesn't need to be
14 raised off of the ground? It can sit on the
15 ground?

16 MR. RICHARDSON: I am sure it would have
17 to be above flood. The existing --

18 MR. HERLONG: But the house is not above
19 flood, is it?

20 MR. ROBINSON: Right. It would have to
21 be at the existing floor level.

22 MR. REINHARD: That is a good thing.
23 Because if it were raised up, it's going to be
24 above the vegetation and then it will show.

25 MR. RICHARDSON: Right.

0016

1 MS. EWING: So it's going to be at the
2 first floor level?

3 MR. ROBINSON: Correct.

4 MS. EWING: Okay.

5 MR. ILDETON: Any more discussion?

6 Call for a vote? Everybody in favor?

7 (All hands raised.)

8 MR. ILDETON: Any opposed?

9 (No hands were raised.)

10 MR. ILDETON: Great. Thank you, sir.

11 414 Patriot, alteration to new

12 construction.

13 Kent, what do you think?

14 MR. PRAUSE: It should have one of those

15 three boxes checked. It's either a submittal that

16 is outside the district and not classified as

17 historic and they are requesting DRB relief or --

18 MS. KENYON: That's what it was.

19 MR. PRAUSE: Okay. Well, that box

20 should be checked.

21 MR. WRIGHT: I agree with you that this

22 application is incomplete. We are going to talk

23 about this later in the meeting. But as we move

24 into this new application process, I think we are

25 going to have to have some reservations along the

0017

1 way.

2 MR. PRAUSE: Now I understand. They are

3 outside the historic district. They are not

4 classified as historic and they are seeking DRB

5 relief.

6 And, in that regard, I think from the

7 pictures that they have shown, or the drawings,

8 rather, it involves a side setback relief on the

9 second floor, a side facade, and also additional

10 front yard setback relief for, it looks like, some

11 kind of vertical -- what would you call it? I

12 don't even know what you call it. It's like a

13 baluster or something.

14 MS. HARMON: A column.

15 MR. PRAUSE: A column for that. That is

16 why they are here.

17 MR. ILDETON: Yes, sir?

18 MR. McCANTS: Carl McCants here. This

19 house was designed without having to bring it in

20 front of the board initially. The homeowner is --

21 it's under construction. You can see the photos

22 there. The house just has the sheathing on it

23 right now.

24 He's asking for a few things that Kent

25 just talked about. Number one is additional front

0018

1 yard setback. The newel post is encroaching into
2 that 45-degree angle. That is number one.

3 Number two, the side setback on the
4 second floor is in the back of the house. You
5 will see it illustrated on the drawings. We are
6 looking for an area that is approximately six
7 feet.

8 And, number three, the principal
9 building coverage, we are asking for a seven
10 percent relief on that to enclose or infill the
11 rear porch to improve the master bathroom.

12 MR. ILDERTON: Is there any public
13 comment on this application? The section is
14 closed.

15 Kent, anything more to add?

16 MR. PRAUSE: No.

17 MR. ILDERTON: Randy?

18 MR. ROBINSON: No.

19 MR. ILDERTON: Cyndy?

20 MS. EWING: Just refresh for me why, if
21 they didn't have to come to us before and now they
22 are coming to us because they want extra -- they
23 didn't want relief before but now they do? Is
24 that what it is? I am confused based on this.

25 MR. PRAUSE: Correct, correct.

0019

1 MS. EWING: And it's the relief because
2 the plans changed since they were first approved
3 by you-all?

4 MR. McCANTS: No, they haven't. We are
5 asking for these changes.

6 MR. ROBINSON: Yes.

7 MR. ILDERTON: Right. The plans have
8 changed.

9 MR. ROBINSON: Let me talk to that for
10 just a second. They brought in a set of plans
11 that had some problems. One was the front yard
12 setback, and the other was this thing on the back
13 that they told them they couldn't issue a permit
14 because those things had to go to DRB.

15 They would like to revise the plan.
16 They brought us back a revised plan that did meet
17 all the ordinance requirements, and now they chose
18 to come before you-all to see if they could get
19 the relief that we told them they needed to get on
20 the first submittal to us.

21 MS. EWING: But it's already framed out
22 and everything?

23 MR. ROBINSON: It is framed for a porch
24 back there, which is allowed. It is not framed
25 for heated space, so there is no forgiveness

0020

1 there. They have a permit in hand for what they
2 are doing out there.

3 MS. EWING: And the little bow strap, or
4 whatever it is up top here, that wasn't on the
5 original, that 45-degree --

6 MR. ROBINSON: It was on the original
7 when we told them they couldn't have it, so they
8 would have to adjust that baluster straight back
9 some.

10 MS. EWING: Okay. Well, one of the
11 questions that I have is besides on this side
12 relief on what is called the left elevation here
13 in the back, something that concerns me is this
14 wide expanse of second floor space that doesn't
15 have any -- it's not broken up by a window. It
16 doesn't -- it's not set back at all.

17 And, I mean, that is another thing that
18 I think we need to look at, because I don't think
19 that that fits in with -- I think you need to
20 request relief on that type of thing, too.

21 I am just concerned. I think it looks
22 like a big chunk of -- a big urban wall, and I
23 would like to see a different type of a solution
24 to it, actually. I have seen issues, and I don't
25 feel like I would --

0021

1 MR. McCANTS: If you could look at the
2 photos, you can see that this element will never
3 be seen from any road because the house is so
4 close to the other one.

5 MS. EWING: Well, for me, personally, I
6 am one of the people that think we need to plan
7 that it all looks good, it looks good for the
8 neighbors on both sides and it looks good on the
9 back.

10 And I know other folks may not feel that
11 way, but I definitely feel that that is an
12 important thing to look at. But go on, Fred.

13 MR. REINHARD: I agree. It's very
14 awkward. And it is a side of the house that is
15 presented -- this left side is the side that faces
16 the yellow house next door?

17 MR. McCANTS: That's correct.

18 MR. REINHARD: But I am confused.
19 Because this application is somewhat incomplete, I
20 am confused about the square footage.

21 Did you say principal building square
22 footage relief or lot square footage relief?

23 MR. McCANTS: Principal building.

24 MR. REINHARD: Principal building? And
25 how much are we over?

0022

1 MR. McCANTS: 97 square feet, 7 percent.

2 MR. REINHARD: See, that doesn't show in
3 any of this information. How are we supposed to
4 know that?

5 MR. McCANTS: Well, it does. Do you
6 have this form here?

7 MR. REINHARD: No.

8 MR. HERLONG: We don't have that form.

9 MR. REINHARD: No. Do you have that
10 form?

11 MS. EWING: No.
12 MR. REINHARD: Okay, we do not.
13 MS. KENYON: Let me make copies.
14 MR. REINHARD: That is all I have.
15 MR. ILDERTON: Betty?
16 MS. HARMON: Since this is not in a
17 historic district, and we would not have had any
18 say-so on this building at all except for they
19 want this 7 percent increase, I think I have to
20 give it to them.
21 MR. ILDERTON: Steve?
22 MR. HERLONG: Well, this is, to me, more
23 of an aesthetic issue. I think a lot of the homes
24 that are examples on this street are also examples
25 of one of the reasons Sullivan's Island determined
0023
1 that they needed to create a review board.
2 I think some of the solutions and the
3 boxy -- the boxy sections of homes that create a
4 viewing deck are the kinds of things that I think
5 a lot of people on the island have concerns about,
6 and this is actually another example of that.
7 And, Carl, I understand this is not
8 necessarily so publicly visible, but it is
9 exactly, if I look at that left elevation, it's
10 hard to imagine that a design review board would
11 look at that and say this is an acceptable
12 solution.
13 I enjoy seeing towers and viewing decks,
14 but I think, to have one, it needs to be
15 articulated or expressed in a sense that is just
16 pulled together better than this particular left
17 facade.
18 So while I don't really have a concern
19 in allowing the square footage relief on that, I
20 think it's the -- whether it's the first floor
21 porch, that would be infilling the first floor
22 porch to make the master suite more comfortable, I
23 have a concern with the exterior treatment of the
24 facade and the lack of any setback.
25 I think even with a setback, that facade
0024
1 is just not what most neighbors would want to be
2 looking at if they are in the neighborhood. That
3 is my thought.
4 MR. ILDERTON: Well, I agree that it's
5 not particularly attractive. I also agree that
6 you are not going to see it, too, because of the
7 way the house is placed.
8 I think there could be some relatively
9 simple solutions to dressing that side up with
10 windows or something, I don't know, or even fake
11 windows if they had shutters or something.
12 The 97 square feet is so small that -- I
13 mean, a relatively low percentage compared to
14 some, so I don't have a problem with that. So it
15 seems to me something could be done a little

16 differently and still achieve the same effect.
17 It's a tough one.

18 Duke?

19 MR. WRIGHT: In this instance, I don't
20 have a problem with it because of its location.
21 And I walked the site and it's not very visible.
22 You have to go hunting for this particular
23 feature. And I certainly don't have any trouble
24 with the 97 square feet.

25 MR. ILDERTON: Great. All right.

0025

1 Do I hear any kind of motion at all from
2 anybody?

3 MR. WRIGHT: I move that we approve the
4 application as submitted.

5 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a second?

6 MS. HARMON: I will second that.

7 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion?

8 MR. HERLONG: Again, I have no trouble
9 with the smaller square footage increase at all.
10 I do have -- I feel like, with further study, a
11 better solution to that side facade condition
12 could be -- that could be improved on, and
13 therefore I couldn't vote for it.

14 MR. REINHARD: I agree with Mr. Herlong.

15 MS. EWING: I agree.

16 MR. ILDERTON: Trying to consider the
17 client, would there be a suggestion from the
18 board? And I'm not sure. Maybe Steve might be
19 the one to suggest something that they could agree
20 to tonight to move on like we did the last
21 applicant and incorporate into a different
22 motion. Or do you see it too, too drastic?

23 MR. HERLONG: I don't know if anyone
24 else has any issue with the 97 square feet. I am
25 getting a sense no one does have a problem with

0026

1 that.

2 We could approve the porch addition and
3 ask for a re-study of the side facade condition so
4 that they could at least understand that, you
5 know, we can certainly work with part of this.

6 And I'm sure Carl is extremely creative.
7 He can come up with a solution for that side
8 facade issue.

9 MR. McCANTS: Yes.

10 MR. REINHARD: I will go along with
11 that.

12 MR. ILDERTON: So can we amend the
13 motion?

14 MR. HERLONG: Or withdraw it?

15 MR. WRIGHT: I will withdraw the motion
16 and restate a second motion. Is that legal?

17 MR. McCULLOUGH: Yes.

18 MR. WRIGHT: I move that we approve the
19 application for the added 97 square feet of space
20 and ask the applicant to re-study the side setback

21 relief portion of the application and return to
22 the board with a second recommendation.

23 MR. ILDERTON: Correct. Do I hear a
24 second?

25 MR. HERLONG: I second that.

0027

1 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion on that?
2 Everybody in favor?

3 (All hands raised.)

4 MS. KENYON: There were three items.

5 MR. WRIGHT: What was the third item?

6 MR. HERLONG: The front facade.

7 MR. WRIGHT: It doesn't describe what he
8 wants to do here. You have to go on a fishing
9 expedition. What was the third item?

10 MR. McCANTS: The front yard additional
11 setback, the bow strap encroaching into the
12 45-degree angle, which is illustrated on the plan.

13 MR. WRIGHT: That is here. Does anybody
14 have any trouble with that?

15 MR. ILDERTON: Can we incorporate that
16 into the motion?

17 MR. HERLONG: Why can't we just have
18 another motion on the other item?

19 MR. WRIGHT: I will withdraw the second
20 motion and we will make a third motion.

21 MR. HERLONG: But we have already
22 created -- that is already a motion. Can we --

23 MR. McCULLOUGH: You can vote on it or
24 you can withdraw it and start over. That is up to
25 you.

0028

1 MR. WRIGHT: Let's start over and have a
2 clean motion.

3 MR. ILDERTON: All right. Start over.

4 MR. WRIGHT: I move that the board
5 approve two of the three items in the application,
6 and ask that the applicant return to the board
7 with a proposed solution or solutions to the side
8 setback relief, which is one of the three items in
9 the application.

10 Is that clear to everybody?

11 MR. ILDERTON: Yes. Second?

12 MS. HARMON: I will second it.

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

15 (All hands were raised.)

16 MR. WRIGHT: Is that clear?

17 MR. McCANTS: Yes, sir.

18 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

19 MR. ILDERTON: 1002 Middle, A and B
20 Middle Street, raise structure.

21 Kent, what do you think?

22 MR. PRAUSE: This is an item that has
23 been before you once before. It was not quite as
24 modest a request. It was to elevate the building
25 and add a deck and do some other things to it,

0029

1 which was turned down, but they are back now.

2 This house is contributive to the
3 district. It's Historic Survey Number 344. You
4 have the preservation consultant's survey
5 information on it.

6 What they are proposing to do with this
7 application is to raise the house and chimney so
8 the first floor is three to five feet above ground
9 level.

10 And they note the elevations indicate
11 raising the house to four feet above ground level,
12 move the house back from Middle Street by three
13 feet along Station 10 so front stairs may be
14 extended to grade, extend wood stairs at the rear
15 because of the elevation of the house, remove
16 existing windows on both sides of the house and
17 restore the original condition back to existing
18 central window and install wood skirting around
19 the perimeter between the piers to elevate the
20 house. That is all I have.

21 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you.

22 Yes, sir?

23 MR. RITTENBERG: I am Charles
24 Rittenberg. I am the property owner. As Ken
25 said, I came before you-all in June and was turned

0030

1 down for raising the house to ten feet, which
2 would comply with the FEMA flood regulations, and
3 I think I have worked around the 50 percent rule,
4 or can work around it in the current application.

5 I bought the property almost four years
6 ago. I really was buying the house next door, and
7 this was an accessory structure that is or was a
8 duplex when I bought it.

9 When I bought the house I had the home
10 inspection done, and the home inspector said the
11 house is in good shape, but I can't really tell
12 you what is going on underneath because I can't
13 get underneath the property.

14 In the spring of this year I had a
15 tenant move out, and there was a hole in the floor
16 and I started about getting that repaired. And as
17 I got on my way, basically the whole flooring of
18 the house was rotten and needed to be replaced.

19 It's an old cottage. It's probably 80,
20 90 years old, and there was no subflooring to
21 support the floor which, among other things, had
22 been flooded in Hugo. So when I came in June I
23 asked to raise it, and I also asked to put a deck
24 on the back.

25 What I want to do now is just raise the

0031

1 house three to five feet so you can have a proper
2 crawl space so that the property can be adequately
3 maintained so that if something like the floors
4 were before can be detected before they get to

5 this shape.

6 I actually have some pictures here if
7 you-all want to take a look at them. I took those
8 this afternoon. There are like nine copies there.

9 The top picture -- I will finish talking
10 while you pass those around. The thing is that
11 the property is currently now -- I think on the
12 plans it says it's about 16 inches above grade.

13 In order to raise it up the four feet,
14 as it says in there, would require moving the
15 house back three feet just so the stairs remain
16 within the property line.

17 And the other thing I want to do is
18 restore the rear windows. There is a single
19 window there that you can tell by looking at it
20 where the original window was cut out.

21 Where that window is, there had
22 previously -- when the property was a duplex,
23 there was a kitchen sink underneath there. So
24 they had raised up and made the window smaller so
25 that it would fit in front of the kitchen.

0032

1 And on the photos -- the top photo, you
2 can see that is the crawl space door, which I
3 didn't measure, but you can see it's about as wide
4 as two slats of the siding, so it's probably ten
5 inches high.

6 The bottom photo is just showing you
7 another place where the crawl space is as high as
8 a single cinder block.

9 The other three pictures are pictures of
10 the window, both from the interior and the
11 exterior, and you can see on both of those
12 pictures, I hope, where there is a line where I
13 presume the original window was cut out and the
14 wall -- the wall enlarged and the window shrunk.

15 And then there is just one picture
16 showing that I want to make it match the double
17 window that is existing.

18 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Public
19 comment on this application? Yes, sir?

20 MR. HEIRS: Mr. Chair, my name is Tom
21 Heirs. I live at 1914 Central Avenue. This
22 really isn't about this case, but this is an
23 example.

24 What I found is it's really hard for me
25 to understand the complexity of the issues until

0033

1 after they have been discussed by you. So the
2 first couple of times when I heard things, I
3 didn't really have much of a clue about what they
4 were about until I heard you discuss those
5 complexities.

6 And I wonder if Robert's Rules of Order
7 would allow you to let the audience have input
8 after your discussion as opposed to before.

9 For instance, I didn't understand the

10 rationale -- none was offered for why you thought
11 adding 97 additional square feet was an acceptable
12 thing. No rationale whatever was offered, except
13 you thought it was okay.

14 And I think it would be helpful if the
15 rationale were offered, and if we could hear the
16 details before we are offered the opportunity to
17 give input. I don't know if that is permissible.

18 MR. ILDERTON: I am being told it's
19 not. At least I think I'm being told that.

20 MR. McCULLOUGH: I think you-all have
21 created a system. Down the road, if you want to
22 change it, but I think the idea is to hear from
23 the public.

24 MR. ILDERTON: We would have to formally
25 modify our system, and we could do that. We could

0034

1 discuss it at some point, but I don't think we can
2 do it tonight. But that is a good point, Tom.

3 Any other public comment? Okay. The
4 public comment section is closed.

5 Kent, any other comments?

6 MR. PRAUSE: No.

7 MR. ILDERTON: All right. We'll go a
8 different way. Steve, what do you think?

9 MR. HERLONG: Well, I wasn't here for
10 the first submittal. And so I do believe you were
11 asking at that time to have it raised above flood,
12 space under it, parking under it, I'm not sure --

13 MR. RITTENBERG: Right.

14 MR. HERLONG: -- but this is certainly a
15 reasonable request to get the house off of the
16 ground and provide some ventilation so that the
17 house can be maintained and have a longer life
18 cycle on the island. So, from that point of view,
19 it makes perfect sense to try to make these
20 modifications or slightly raise the structure.

21 I mean, but we have -- it's a debatable
22 question as to once you change completely the
23 foundation, or move a house, this board seems
24 very -- has concerns among the board as to whether
25 that is a proper solution or not.

0035

1 So when I look at these photographs --
2 these are relatively recent photographs here?

3 MR. RITTENBERG: Yes.

4 MR. HERLONG: And so the house -- the
5 siding does come basically down to the ground, and
6 you have a small amount of masonry around the
7 house, and this would give you a pier and lattice
8 solution, the solution you are thinking about,
9 which gets more air flow under the house.

10 And, of course, to do it you have to
11 push the house back so the stairs don't encroach
12 over the property line, is that right?

13 MR. RITTENBERG: That is the only reason
14 I'm asking to move it back, just far enough to

15 keep the stairs within my property.

16 MR. HERLONG: And so the step -- what is
17 the historical status of this house exactly? Does
18 this -- okay. So this historic card does speak
19 about this structure, not some earlier, a main
20 house that was on the property.

21 MR. RITTENBERG: My understanding is,
22 and Randy can correct me, is that this is
23 designated a traditional island resource, and
24 that, as I understand it, this was in what the
25 island wanted to be the historic district, but

0036

1 this part of my block is not currently in what the
2 state recognizes, but I will defer to you-all on
3 what that means.

4 MR. HERLONG: Well, I think that it is a
5 reasonable request to make these modifications,
6 which are a way to preserve the house. I'm
7 curious to hear what the other board members have
8 to say.

9 MR. ILDETON: We will go this way. We
10 will change it a little bit, so I will speak.

11 I think there was something similar done
12 down at Station 18. As far as moving and raising
13 that little structure, it really turns out well.
14 I think it really looks good, and it hasn't lost
15 its presence and all.

16 And this is really one way of
17 maintaining our traditional island resources
18 because this house, I'm sure, is getting eaten out
19 from the ground up. I mean, I work on these
20 houses and, in my younger days, under these houses
21 and seen the termite and moisture damage being so
22 close to the ground and all, and it does need some
23 relief.

24 In our air-conditioned houses we have
25 now, they are different and they need some air

0037

1 circulation to be off the ground a little bit, and
2 I think this is a reasonable request, because it
3 will maintain that house and keep it healthy. So
4 I'm in favor.

5 Duke?

6 MR. WRIGHT: You mentioned three to five
7 feet. I think a minimum would be nice, whatever
8 the minimum is, and I don't know what that is,
9 because it's a wonderful example of a Sullivan's
10 Island cottage. But I think five feet is a lot
11 different than three feet in terms of elevation.

12 MR. ILDETON: That is true.

13 MR. WRIGHT: And if you can keep it to a
14 minimum, and I don't know whether we can say
15 three, but that would be something I think would
16 be a factor in my decision.

17 MR. REINHARD: The drawing shows four
18 feet.

19 MR. ILDETON: We can always modify

20 that.

21 MR. WRIGHT: And I went in it myself,
22 and it's in pretty bad shape. But, out of
23 curiosity, you are going to bring it back to a
24 single family --

25 MR. RITTENBERG: I am going to turn it
0038

1 into single family.

2 MR. WRIGHT: -- house, as a guest house
3 or something?

4 MR. RITTENBERG: Right.

5 MR. WRIGHT: I think it's a wonderful
6 little example of a Sullivan's Island cottage.
7 That is my only comment.

8 MR. ILBERTON: Betty?

9 MS. HARMON: My concern is that house
10 has been there since 1915 and it survived, and if
11 you keep it up all along they survive longer. You
12 can't let them get in disrepair and then just
13 salvage them by moving them around.

14 And I understand where you are coming
15 from, but the placement of that house and the
16 historic significance, I just could not approve
17 that.

18 MR. ILBERTON: Fred?

19 MR. REINHARD: I think that the four
20 foot dimension as shown on the drawings looks
21 appropriate to me. I do have some concern about a
22 change on the front porch, but I will let Cyndy
23 talk about that.

24 MR. ILBERTON: Cyndy?

25 MS. EWING: Well, I have a number of
0039

1 concerns. I just think that this house, where it
2 sits exact close to the street at this low level
3 represents a quintessential part of Sullivan's
4 Island. And by raising it certainly four feet and
5 setting it back, it will dramatically change.

6 When I look at the diagrams here, it
7 looks like you are changing the front porch as
8 well?

9 MR. RITTENBERG: I don't have any place
10 to change the front porch. I don't know what --

11 MS. EWING: The diagrams are different.
12 The stair -- this is --

13 MR. RITTENBERG: I think that they
14 dropped a generic drawing in there -- I mean a
15 generic door in there that is different than the
16 door that was there. I don't have plans to change
17 it.

18 MS. EWING: It's not the door. It's the
19 width of the steps. It's the -- I mean, this
20 is --

21 MR. RITTENBERG: I have no problem with
22 maintaining that as it is.

23 MS. EWING: Well, here is my problem.
24 This is really a gem of a house, and there are

25 very, very few that are set low to the ground, and
0040

1 it's not your main residence. It is an accessory
2 structure.

3 So I would say to the board let's
4 consider very, very carefully what the use of this
5 is going to be.

6 I would also say I have a dependency
7 where mine is raised six or seven feet off of the
8 ground, and has been, and the floors are rotting
9 on that. So I don't think that raising
10 necessarily is going to solve rotting floors in a
11 climate like this.

12 Eventually, if we don't keep them up,
13 those floors -- you know, that is what is going to
14 happen to them.

15 I guess what I would say is I would
16 certainly not vote tonight to debate these
17 changes. And my recommendation would be before we
18 make -- before the board approves any of these
19 changes, that we get real precise drawings and
20 that we go to visit the site.

21 Because the other thing is that this
22 thing of, you know, putting it back to the
23 original, we don't have any photographs of what
24 the original is. We don't know what windows were
25 in there. I think we need to really very, very

0041
1 carefully review this and dot all "I"s and cross
2 all "T"s before we make a decision on this.

3 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you.

4 Do I hear a motion?

5 MR. WRIGHT: Let's talk about this a
6 little bit more, if we may.

7 MR. ILDERTON: Okay.

8 MR. WRIGHT: Cyndy, I think -- and I
9 understand what you are saying. But I believe
10 that looking at the longer term here, that by
11 getting this off the ground, and being able to get
12 underneath it and maintain it, which you could do
13 if you wanted to with your dependency without a
14 major problem, I'm sure, to get it high enough --
15 maybe this is about 30 inches, I guess -- to
16 enable someone to get under and do some work and
17 get air circulation underneath it.

18 I think it's important to the long-term
19 future of the house. I think if he left it where
20 it is that it would just continue to deteriorate
21 and we would lose the house completely.

22 MS. EWING: I think that's not the
23 issue. I think the floors have to probably be the
24 original floors from 1915. And there just comes a
25 time where you have to replace the floors, and you

0042
1 pull them up, and you clean underneath and you --

2 MR. WRIGHT: Well, I think it's more
3 than the floors.

4 MS. EWING: And I think they will go
5 another 90 years.
6 MS. HARMON: I agree with that.
7 MR. WRIGHT: That is short term.
8 MS. EWING: And that is certainly longer
9 than I think any of us will be around to see it.
10 MR. WRIGHT: I hope this board, in 90
11 years, will still look at this house as a valuable
12 island resource. So that is my thought.
13 MR. ILBERTON: It's more than floors.
14 It's the sills. It's the end of the studs. It's
15 the siding. It's the joists and --
16 MS. EWING: How do we know that?
17 MR. ILBERTON: -- as well as the
18 structure itself being anchored. It went through
19 Hugo. We don't know what the force on the island
20 was. But right now it may not be, and it maybe
21 continues to be, not anchored very well, how it's
22 secured to the ground and to Sullivan's Island.
23 With a new foundation, a moderate
24 foundation, if it's done properly, which it should
25 be, you know, it is going to be much more secure

0043

1 and stronger on a new foundation that workmen can
2 actually work under, instead of something you
3 can't even get under, and secure this structure so
4 it will be here in 100 years or 90 years to be
5 around.

6 I just see it as a reasonable way to
7 maintain these important structures because of the
8 strength that is going to be added to it, and in a
9 relatively moderate way. That is a very important
10 consideration. We live on a fragile island, and
11 these houses are fragile, and this house
12 particularly is fragile.

13 MR. WRIGHT: Is four feet an arbitrary
14 number?

15 MR. RITTENBERG: Yes. Actually, I asked
16 Kat's advice. I said -- I didn't know what the
17 right amount was, and I didn't know what you would
18 approve. So I said could I ask for one number and
19 do another. So she said why don't you ask for
20 three to five, and so I told the architect that,
21 so they drew it at four.

22 MR. WRIGHT: I think this is a very
23 important point in terms of aesthetics.

24 MR. RITTENBERG: And I have no problem
25 with three feet.

0044

1 MR. WRIGHT: I don't know what this
2 minimum is in terms of being able to get
3 underneath it, if there is any duct work or any
4 work space required. You architects --

5 MR. ILBERTON: Well, it just depends on
6 where the duct work is running, in the ceiling
7 or --

8 MR. WRIGHT: I think if it's kept as low

9 as possible it's not going to really detract
10 from --

11 MR. RITTENBERG: And if I only raise it
12 three feet, my guess is it probably only needs to
13 be moved back two feet instead of three feet
14 farther from the street.

15 MR. WRIGHT: There are also a couple of
16 trees that need to be trimmed if you raise it very
17 high.

18 MR. HERLONG: I think it appears that
19 the house is 20 -- possibly 24 inches to the top
20 of the floor. It's just hard to say from this
21 front elevation. It's probably just shy of two
22 feet.

23 And we are talking about if we could go
24 to three feet, raising it one foot, which would
25 substantially improve your ability to get some air

0045

1 and a place to get in and maintain the ground
2 level.

3 Right now, I don't think you could get
4 under there to actually maintain it it's so low.
5 That is the dilemma I see with it. And I don't
6 see a foot of grade change being a significant
7 detrimental change to the historic character of
8 the house.

9 MR. ILDERTON: Do any other board
10 members want to comment on this? Do I hear a
11 motion?

12 MR. HERLONG: I do agree that the stairs
13 should stay the same width as they currently are.
14 I think that probably was an oversight to draw the
15 narrow stairs.

16 MR. RITTENBERG: I have no problem with
17 that.

18 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a motion?

19 MR. HERLONG: I make a motion that we
20 approve the request to raise the house, but allow
21 it to be raised to a maximum of three feet above
22 grade. And I would like to see the porch steps
23 and the window change at least brought back to
24 staff, if not to the -- to have those brought back
25 to the board for approval, not to staff, but to

0046

1 the board.

2 MR. REINHARD: Second?

3 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion?

4 MS. EWING: Well, I just think we
5 should -- I think we should defer this, and I
6 think we should -- this is a building that is
7 important enough where we should all go out and
8 take a look at the property and look inside and
9 then come to -- I would feel much more comfortable
10 making these decisions because, you know, we have
11 done this before saying, you know, put them back
12 to the original. And I just saw a picture where
13 the original porch line had open-end rafter tails

14 exposed.
15 So we need to be -- we need to have more
16 details. And I think we also need to make sure
17 and see what the situation is inside the house.
18 Because, again, this is -- to me, it's an
19 important historic home. It may not be in the
20 historic district, but this represents a style of
21 a home that we do not have. I mean, the way it's
22 set on the street, all the things that I have said
23 before.

24 So we need to really -- I think it's
25 worth taking another month and going out and

0047

1 looking at it as a board.

2 MS. HARMON: I agree with that. I think
3 it's much too important. I think we need to go
4 back and look at it again, as a group go look at
5 it and talk once we get in there and see what is
6 going on. I think it's much too important.

7 MR. HERLONG: One thing that is unclear
8 is whether or not this was requested as conceptual
9 or final. And we have a motion on the table that
10 doesn't say whether it's a conceptual approval or
11 final approval. And if it's a conceptual
12 approval, we could ask to see all of the details
13 more clearly defined. So --

14 MR. WRIGHT: Are we still in discussion
15 mode?

16 MR. ILDETON: Yes.

17 MR. WRIGHT: This might be worthy of a
18 site visit. I don't know how many of you have
19 looked at it in the last two weeks. I stand by my
20 position, but I would -- hearing Cyndy, I think it
21 might be worthy of a site visit.

22 Now, the reality is that a site visit --
23 and the next board meeting is probably going to be
24 in December, and I don't know what your time --

25 MR. RITTENBERG: I am anxious to start

0048

1 repairing the structure. I mean, that is my
2 concern.

3 MR. WRIGHT: Off the record.

4 (Off-the-record discussion regarding
5 the November schedule.)

6 MR. WRIGHT: But I think the site visit
7 might be worth it.

8 MR. ILDETON: Well, I just hate to
9 see -- the applicant has already been to see us
10 once and we are asking him to come back. It seems
11 to me we could give him some sort of approval so
12 he can start doing something.

13 I mean, I have been by the house. I
14 have looked at it. I mean, we had this whole
15 month -- or we had a good while for all the board
16 members to visit it. You visited it and I visited
17 it.

18 I mean, we can't continue to

19 inconvenience these applicants when they try to do
20 it and do it the right way. They come back and
21 ask --

22 MR. WRIGHT: I agree. I am concerned
23 about we are talking two months in reality, and
24 that is a long time.

25 MR. ILDERTON: Yeah, as opposed to a
0049 month.

1 MR. WRIGHT: So I'm vacillating here.

2 MR. ILDERTON: All right. We have a
3 motion on the floor. We have had discussion. I
4 call for a vote.

5 Everybody in favor of the motion say aye
6 or raise their hand.

7 (All hands raised except Ms. Harmon and
8 Ms. Ewing.)

9 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, sir.

10 MR. RITTENBERG: Thank you very much.

11 MR. ILDERTON: 1908 I'On Avenue, gate
12 alteration.

13 MR. HERLONG: I will recuse myself from
14 this one.

15 MR. PRAUSE: This particular house is
16 within the historic district. It's designated as
17 a historic resource, Historic Survey Number 190,
18 and you have a copy of the preservation
19 consultant's survey card on it.

20 As they explained in their request, they
21 previously had an approval from the board to
22 replace existing chain-link fence with a picket
23 fence, and now they want to modify it to a certain
24 extent, to bring it down from four feet to three
25

0050 feet and change the entry feature leading to a
1 pedestrian gate on the Middle Street side, and
2 that is what they would like approval for.

3 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you. Is
4 the applicant here?

5 MR. HARRELL: Yes.

6 MR. ILDERTON: Yes, sir?

7 MR. HARRELL: I don't really have
8 anything to add to that.

9 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, sir. Public
10 comment on the application? Public comment
11 section is closed.

12 Kent? Randy?

13 MR. PRAUSE: None for me.

14 MR. ILDERTON: Cyndy, what do you
15 think?

16 MS. EWING: I don't know. We already
17 approved this, right, except for --

18 MR. ILDERTON: Except for the gate
19 alteration.

20 MS. EWING: And we approved the new
21 driveway cut?

22 MS. HARMON: The fence height changed.
23

24 It went down.
25 MR. REINHARD: Move for approval.
0051
1 MS. HARMON: Second.
2 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion? Everybody in
3 favor?
4 MR. WRIGHT: That tree that is in there
5 is not going to have to go, is it?
6 MS. HARMON: No.
7 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor?
8 (All hands raised.)
9 MR. ILDERTON: 2672 Jasper.
10 MR. PRAUSE: This property is outside of
11 the historic district. I assume it's designated
12 as a historic resource, and the historic survey
13 number is 42. You also have the preservation
14 consultant's information on it.
15 The site plan shows the existing and
16 proposed changes from a plan view, and also some
17 drawings that show a floor plan and elevations of
18 what is proposed and pictures of the existing
19 house.
20 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you.
21 Applicant? Yes, sir?
22 MR. COISH: Ron Coish, 2808 I'On.
23 MR. ILDERTON: Are you going to do any
24 song and dance here, Ron?
25 MR. COISH: I do have some pictures of
0052
1 the fence.
2 MR. WRIGHT: Comment. I believe on the
3 drawings where you say north, that is actually the
4 west elevation, isn't it?
5 MR. ILDERTON: Is there any public
6 comment to be made to this application? Is there
7 any other comment made by Kent or Randy?
8 MR. PRAUSE: Just to mention that they
9 had requested, also, an addition to the building
10 shown on -- or the building addition shown on the
11 site plan and the elevation drawings to install a
12 fence on the Jasper Boulevard property line, which
13 is not shown on that site plan, but provided
14 pictures of it.
15 And just to draw your attention that
16 they are asking for 100 percent relief on the
17 principal building side facade requirement as part
18 of the application.
19 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you. Board
20 discussion? Duke, what do you think?
21 MR. WRIGHT: Is the fence only on
22 Jasper, just Jasper?
23 MR. STONE: It will run down the
24 driveway. I am the homeowner, Howard Stone, who
25 bought the house in 1989. We have been off the
0053
1 island for the last 13 years because of military
2 service. We have just come back to the island, so

3 we are moving family back into the house after
4 it's been on the long-term rental market.
5 So the addition is to give our family of
6 five a little bit more additional living space.
7 The fence is to provide some protection for pets
8 and small children to keep from running out into
9 Jasper. And it will run across the front of the
10 house, down the driveway, and then have a gate for
11 vehicles to pass through the existing
12 drive-through driveway.

13 MR. WRIGHT: I don't have any trouble
14 with the fence. And then a chain-link down the
15 long way on the lot?

16 MR. STONE: Well, it would marry to an
17 existing fence on the next lot over.

18 MR. ILBERTON: I don't have any problem
19 with the application. Steve?

20 MR. HERLONG: I think the hip roof
21 structure that is going to be added to the back
22 corner is a very nice solution, very much in scale
23 with the existing historic house.

24 And the only comment would be that you
25 have, interestingly, a shed extension that is

0054

1 basically historic, I assume, that you are
2 attaching to as it goes back.

3 And I think it would be more effective
4 if there was just the slightest offset for the
5 section that links, if it were set back say a foot
6 from the shed extension; otherwise, it is one long
7 straight facade with several roof changes in that
8 one facade.

9 And, also, you probably have a detail
10 that is not indicated because that addition --
11 that low pitch roof that comes out that links to
12 that hip must need to shed water away from the new
13 structure. The water is actually just coming down
14 to that structure. So you probably have
15 something, some alteration right there at the
16 junction.

17 MR. STONE: I am hopeful that Ron will
18 be able to figure that out for us.

19 MR. COISH: That would be some type of
20 cricket.

21 MR. HERLONG: That's all I have.

22 MS. HARMON: With what Steve had said, I
23 think it's a great addition. I think you have
24 done a good job making the alterations that Steve
25 has proposed, and I have no problem with that.

0055

1 MR. ILBERTON: Fred?

2 MR. REINHARD: Some type of cricket?

3 MR. COISH: Some type of cricket.

4 MR. REINHARD: I can't exactly tell, but
5 is that -- unless I missed it. Is the new
6 structure a square? Is it 15 by --

7 MR. COISH: 18.

8 MR. REINHARD: It's not a square. Okay.
9 That answered my question. That's it.
10 MR. ILDERTON: Cyndy?
11 MS. EWING: Looks good.
12 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a motion?
13 MR. WRIGHT: I move the application be
14 approved as submitted.
15 MR. ILDERTON: Second.
16 MR. REINHARD: Second.
17 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion?
18 MR. HERLONG: Again, I think it would be
19 a better solution if there was the slightest
20 offset from the link back to that new structure.
21 MS. HARMON: I agree with that.
22 MR. ILDERTON: Do we want to amend the
23 motion?
24 MR. WRIGHT: To what?
25 MR. REINHARD: Which way would it go, in
0056
1 or out?
2 MR. ILDERTON: In.
3 MR. REINHARD: So we get more square
4 footage?
5 MS. HARMON: Less.
6 MR. REINHARD: Oh, in.
7 MR. ILDERTON: Just a bump in, just
8 enough --
9 MR. COISH: Six inches.
10 MR. HERLONG: Just something to make a
11 break in there.
12 MR. COISH: There actually is a little
13 six-inch deal right there now, and we could easily
14 put that in.
15 MR. HERLONG: So can we amend the motion
16 to include a six-inch offset at the length of the
17 shed roof portion?
18 MR. WRIGHT: Yes.
19 MR. REINHARD: I second that.
20 MR. ILDERTON: Do we have a motion
21 amended here?
22 MR. McCULLOUGH: Why don't you make that
23 motion to make it clear. You said it so pretty.
24 MR. WRIGHT: I withdraw my motion and
25 defer to Mr. Herlong.
0057
1 MR. HERLONG: That was an addendum to
2 your motion.
3 MR. ILDERTON: Do we have to have
4 discussion on this? All right. Everybody in
5 favor?
6 MR. HERLONG: Has the motion that we are
7 working on been written?
8 MS. KENYON: It's written down.
9 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor?
10 (All hands raised.)
11 MR. ILDERTON: 1102 Middle Street.
12 MR. PRAUSE: This one is within the

13 historic district, designated as a historic
14 resource, Historic Number 304.

15 They have actually been here previously
16 for either conceptual or preliminary approval and
17 are now seeking final approval as described in
18 their application.

19 They are requesting a final certificate
20 of appropriateness for the additions and
21 renovations as shown in the submitted drawings.

22 MR. ILBERTON: Correct. Thank you. Is
23 the applicant here? Yes, sir?

24 MR. HINSHAW: Jim Hinshaw with Herlong &
25 Associates Architects.

0058

1 MR. HERLONG: I will recuse myself from
2 this one.

3 MR. HINSHAW: You might remember from
4 the conceptual submittal when we came before you
5 that the major part of the renovation is to repair
6 the ground floor. It has remained there for a
7 long time.

8 We have met -- our offices met with
9 Randy, as well as our structural engineer, to talk
10 about the drainage issues that exist on this home,
11 as well as the structural issues that,
12 unfortunately, have taken a toll on this house.
13 So that is the major focus of this renovation.

14 But at the conceptual submittal we
15 received approval for the design, basically the
16 same design that is in front of you now. We are
17 not asking for any additional square footage or
18 anything like that.

19 But for the submittal we have clarified
20 the materials of the renovation, and also have
21 added some information regarding the site.

22 If you look at the site plan, we have
23 added a driveway layout, which I think is the
24 second sheet in your submittal. We have added a
25 driveway layout on Osceola. And the material for

0059

1 this driveway is yet to be determined, but it will
2 likely be something pervious because of the
3 drainage issues that exist on site. But when that
4 material is decided upon, we will come back before
5 the board and work on the driveway.

6 We have also indicated parking bays on
7 the Osceola side underneath the new addition,
8 which will allow the owners to shelter their cars
9 and put them away from view rather than put them
10 on Station 11, which they do now.

11 We are proposing to remove the driveway
12 on the side of the house, on the Station 11 side,
13 because it's not very functional and it doesn't go
14 into a bay where cars can be kept.

15 And, finally, on the front side of the
16 house we are proposing to remove that sidewalk
17 that is there now and replace it with a new

18 sidewalk of I or brick. Again, the material has
19 not been decided, but when we decide we will come
20 back before the board.

21 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, sir. Is there
22 any public comment on the application? Are you
23 finished?

24 MR. HINSHAW: Yes.

25 MR. ILDERTON: Public comment section is
0060

1 closed. Kent, any other --

2 MR. PRAUSE: Nothing.

3 MR. ILDERTON: Randy?

4 MR. ROBINSON: These overhead doors, are
5 they solid behind them, or are they open, just
6 lattice?

7 MR. HINSHAW: They are lattice.

8 MR. ROBINSON: I just haven't seen

9 anybody do this with --

10 MR. HINSHAW: They are lattice.

11 MR. ILDERTON: Board discussion? Betty,
12 what do you think?

13 MS. HARMON: I don't have a problem with
14 it.

15 MR. REINHARD: I like it.

16 MR. ILDERTON: Cyndy?

17 MS. EWING: Uh-huh.

18 MR. ILDERTON: Me, also. I like it.

19 MR. WRIGHT: I agree.

20 MR. ILDERTON: All right. Do I hear a
21 motion?

22 MS. HARMON: I make a motion to accept
23 the application as submitted.

24 MR. ILDERTON: Second?

25 MS. EWING: Second.

0061

1 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor?

2 (All hands raised.)

3 MR. HERLONG: I will recuse myself on
4 this one.

5 MR. ILDERTON: 1902 Middle Street,
6 Number 10.

7 MR. PRAUSE: Well, what they are asking
8 for here is to have a smaller cottage on this
9 particular property designated as -- or added to
10 the list of historic properties under the
11 provisions of Section 2194 A through D, 1 through
12 8. And I believe that's it, right?

13 MS. NELSON: Additions to that cottage
14 if it's placed on the list.

15 MR. PRAUSE: Oh, and additions to this
16 cottage if it's placed on the list.

17 MS. NELSON: Right.

18 MR. PRAUSE: How is that going to allow
19 it to be added onto?

20 MS. NELSON: We had this conversation as
21 part of this presentation. We discussed this in
22 May.

23 When we talked with you and with Larry
24 Dodds, two things. If the cottage was designated
25 historic we were allowed, I think it's

0062

1 nonconforming structures, 21-151, we are allowed
2 to add on to it or alter it. That was the
3 decision that was made back then.

4 So we came in May with this entire
5 project to have the cottage studied, to get
6 conceptual approval for additions to it, and to
7 get final approval for a myriad of things on the
8 main house and the rest of the property.

9 At that meeting there was a concern with
10 an old Board of Zoning Appeals ruling for the
11 previous owners, and in light of that the board
12 opted to approve all of the work on the main house
13 and the property, conditioned on us clearing up
14 the Board of Zoning Appeals issue, and voted to
15 defer the discussion of the cottage.

16 The other question that we discussed at
17 that time was that if you had a historic property
18 on your property and were requesting to build a
19 second house, then you were under different rules
20 than a property that had two structures on it
21 existing.

22 And a property that had two structures
23 on it that were both existing structures, in that
24 case the zoning administrator would determine
25 which one was the primary structure, that being

0063

1 considered the conforming structure, and which
2 would be the secondary structure or the
3 nonconforming structure.

4 And the nonconforming structure would
5 then be ruled by Sections A through E under
6 nonconforming structures. That is that 21-151.
7 And in that it says that additions are to be
8 allowed and et cetera, et cetera, or enlargements,
9 I think.

10 MR. PRAUSE: Well, I mean, it's really a
11 nonconforming use rather than a nonconforming
12 structure. I mean, it may have some structural
13 nonconforming aspects, too, but --

14 MS. NELSON: That is kind of what we
15 talked about with Larry back when we discussed it,
16 and it says -- the wording of it is that the
17 occupancy of it is the nonconforming use, but that
18 the two buildings would be considered structures,
19 one being a conforming structure and another a
20 nonconforming structure.

21 But there is some confusion, because it
22 says that and will be held in accordance with A
23 through E, but it doesn't say A through E
24 structures specifically.

25 MR. PRAUSE: Not as far as the use. And

0064

1 I guess what troubles me is that under B, under

2 use, is a nonconforming use shall not be expanded
3 except to eliminate or reduce the nonconforming
4 aspects.

5 MS. NELSON: And that is what we
6 discussed with Larry, is it a use or a structure.
7 Because under the structure, I don't know if it's
8 B or what.

9 MR. PRAUSE: It could be both, but it's
10 definitely a nonconforming use because it's two
11 houses on one lot.

12 MS. NELSON: Then what happens with
13 this, structural alterations including
14 enlargements are permitted if it does not increase
15 the extent of the nonconformity? And then it goes
16 on to talk about the nonconformities being setback
17 nonconformities.

18 MR. PRAUSE: Right. So it could be
19 nonconforming with respect to a structural aspect,
20 but it's a nonconforming use that can't be made
21 bigger. The use, as a dwelling, can't be
22 enlarged.

23 MS. NELSON: But the structure can be
24 enlarged?

25 MR. PRAUSE: Well, I don't see how you
0065

1 enlarge the structural aspects without increasing
2 the use.

3 MS. NELSON: And that was our concern
4 initially. And when we talked with Larry Dodds,
5 you and Larry were seemingly in agreement, this is
6 before we submitted it back in May, that if it was
7 regarded historic it could be added onto.

8 And so we requested then in May that the
9 board consider it for inclusion on the list,
10 showed the board at that time what we intended to
11 do with it so that you were aware before you put
12 it on the list.

13 MR. PRAUSE: Maybe I need to talk to him
14 again, though. Something is being lost on me. Do
15 you see anything on that? I mean --

16 MR. McCULLOUGH: (Inaudible.)

17 MR. PRAUSE: Well, I mean, that is from
18 a nonconforming structure. That means it doesn't
19 meet some structural aspect. It would be density,
20 lot coverage, floor area, height and dimensional
21 standards.

22 But if it's two houses on a lot, then
23 it's a nonconforming use. Two buildings on one
24 lot is a nonconforming use. And it says that they
25 can only be dealt with -- or the nonconforming use
0066

1 in Subsections A through E, which I think B is
2 pretty clear a nonconforming use, shall not be
3 expanded except to eliminate or reduce the
4 nonconforming aspects. Well, I will talk to Larry
5 about that.

6 MS. NELSON: Should we go ahead with

7 this submittal? I mean, I had thought that we had
8 cleared it with Larry prior to that May submittal,
9 which is why we moved forward now. But if there
10 is some uncertainty, I think the board is going to
11 have a difficult time giving us any kind of a
12 ruling.

13 MR. PRAUSE: There wasn't any kind of
14 discussion in regard to this about being --
15 allowing -- a special exception to allow two
16 houses on one lot if one is historic? Is that not
17 part of it?

18 MS. NELSON: I'm not recalling.

19 MR. PRAUSE: Because, I'm sorry, I just
20 don't see how it can be made any bigger.

21 MS. NELSON: I'm not sure what to do
22 here.

23 MR. ILDERTON: Withdraw it or --

24 MS. NELSON: We have already been
25 deferred.

0067

1 MS. HARMON: Do we need to make a motion
2 that you need to withdraw or defer?

3 MR. PRAUSE: I just don't remember.
4 There has been lots of conversations. This thing
5 has been up, way up, way down, back, forward,
6 sideways and every which ways.

7 But, I mean, I don't remember anything
8 specific about how it could be made bigger, unless
9 perhaps it was not a nonconforming use and it was
10 an accessory use because they had two houses on
11 one lot that would then be under the special
12 exception provisions for an accessory use on a
13 small house and a large house, but not as, you
14 know -- that is the other -- if you have a little
15 house and you might -- don't mess with that, make
16 a bigger house, and this is a situation where you
17 have two houses already on the lot and --

18 MR. REINHARD: And you want to make the
19 little house bigger.

20 MR. PRAUSE: Yeah. And it's pretty
21 clear when you have two houses that are already
22 there it's a nonconforming use and you can't make
23 a little one any bigger.

24 MR. ROBINSON: Why were you asking for
25 the historic designation?

0068

1 MS. NELSON: I'm trying to remember. I
2 am racking my brain. It's been long enough that
3 we had a conversation with you, Kent, and I know
4 that I think I spoke to Larry and e-mailed him all
5 this information, and then you and Larry had a
6 telephone conversation regarding it.

7 And then I talked with you again, and
8 you said that you and Larry were in agreement that
9 if it was designated as historic then you would be
10 allowed to add on to it, and so we proceeded with
11 plans based on that.

12 MR. ROBINSON: The only thing I could
13 see in the ordinance would be that if the smaller
14 house was designated historic and it got special
15 exception status.

16 MS. NELSON: That is what Kent is
17 saying.

18 MR. ROBINSON: Then it could be added
19 onto, provided it stayed under 1200 square feet.

20 MS. NELSON: I know that your comment
21 was that provided it be designated historic we
22 could add on to it, which is the only reason
23 originally we even studied it for inclusion and
24 thought that we had a chance at having it included
25 on the list.

0069

1 MR. ILBERTON: There is obviously a lot
2 of work to be done on the main house. It's going
3 to go on for months on the main house for that
4 much work.

5 Maybe this wouldn't be a big imposition
6 to the owner if we had to decide this in two
7 months instead of one month or something. I don't
8 know. Or at least it could be decided through the
9 laws of legality and zoning, and then we could
10 know what kind of direction to take in two months.

11 MR. WRIGHT: I am just thinking out
12 loud. I guess it has to be for the record.

13 Is there some way that we could hear the
14 presentation, discuss the proposed work, and
15 approve it or disapprove it contingent on
16 resolving the issues that Kent is discussing?

17 MR. REINHARD: No.

18 MS. HARMON: No.

19 MS. EWING: We are already so confused
20 that we don't know what is -- I mean, this has
21 been -- all I remember from when we had this was
22 approving tearing down part of the larger
23 structure. This is all --

24 MS. HARMON: This is all new.

25 MS. EWING: I think it would be really

0070

1 muddying the water if we do this.

2 MR. WRIGHT: This is separate from what
3 all the problems we have had with the larger
4 structure. I would have to go back and review the
5 minutes. I remember discussing this, but it
6 hasn't been included in any of the discussions and
7 reviews that we have had regarding the larger
8 structure, as I recall.

9 MS. NELSON: That is correct. It was
10 not discussed after we got into the Board of
11 Zoning Appeals issues. I did do a full
12 presentation on the cottage, what we had hoped to
13 do with it. At the time it was a conceptual
14 approval for the plan and a request for the board
15 to study. So we did discuss all of that as far as
16 the cottage is concerned.

17 But I think things got very confused and
18 muddy when the Board of Zoning Appeals issue was
19 brought up. And so the board opted to defer the
20 cottage discussion. I think it was because it was
21 just too much to deal with in one night.

22 MS. HARMON: We never really did discuss
23 it that night, because we were talking about
24 taking off the offending addition, so we never
25 went past that.

0071

1 MS. EWING: Right.

2 MS. NELSON: Right. We just went
3 through my presentation where I showed you
4 everything we wanted to do, but there was no board
5 discussion other than --

6 MS. HARMON: No discussion from you,
7 because you didn't get that far.

8 MS. NELSON: No. It's in the minutes.
9 It was the full presentation. It's in the
10 minutes. I have a copy if you would like to have
11 one.

12 MS. HARMON: I think it's too muddy.

13 MR. ILDERTON: Well, I guess -- yes?

14 MR. ROBINSON: Can I make a suggestion?
15 There was -- Layne did ask for a site visit in
16 your application. Maybe you-all could schedule a
17 site visit to go out and look at it to see if
18 there is any possibility that it might be put on
19 the list and we could put that issue to bed.

20 If you-all decide that it can't go on
21 the historic list, or shouldn't go on the historic
22 list, then there isn't any way they can add on to
23 it anyway.

24 MS. NELSON: It would be a moot point
25 anyway, which there was going to be --

0072

1 MR. ROBINSON: So you could possibly
2 schedule a meeting tonight and at least get that
3 schedule so you-all do a site visit before the
4 next meeting.

5 MS. EWING: Let me throw this out.
6 Because I, me, I just feel that to say something
7 is historic so that they can put this addition on,
8 I don't think that that means -- then I think it
9 takes away its historic value by putting this
10 particular addition on. So to --

11 MS. NELSON: Actually -- sorry to
12 interrupt. If you hear the presentation and look
13 at the Schneider report and see the information I
14 have, you will see what is original and what is
15 not, some information about the house.

16 And I think the biggest issue here, and
17 the reason that even though I found out a site
18 visit wasn't scheduled, I didn't worry too much
19 about it, was if this property were brought before
20 the board and the request was made to demolish it,
21 I am sure we would receive, you know, some

22 negative feedback there. I think there would be a
23 sense of loss if it were demolished.

24 In light of that, I think it's worthy of
25 looking at it and seeing if it's something you

0073

1 feel would be worthy of being put on the list.
2 It's hard to have it be only one way and not the
3 other. It was built in 1900.

4 The Schneider field survey, the original
5 one, is fairly ambiguous about it. It says that
6 it's a good example of the moderate-sized homes
7 that were built during that time. It says that
8 it -- I think under the recommendations or
9 possibilities or potential it says it has the
10 potential for the National Historic Register
11 district inclusion, certainly not being
12 individually listed. But there is enough
13 ambiguity there that the board found ambiguity in
14 other homes and opted to place them on the list.

15 I understand your comment that just so
16 they can do this, but the house is a house and is
17 worthy of looking at it for its own merit, and
18 then you the opt to approve or not.

19 MR. ILDERTON: I think we could schedule
20 a visit, and I think we will need to defer it.

21 MS. HARMON: I will make a motion.

22 MR. WRIGHT: Betty, before you do that,
23 then we are really talking about two things. One
24 is the historic consideration portion. That is
25 one action. We need to visit the site and make a

0074

1 determination that it should or should not be
2 added to the list.

3 And then the next one is by the time
4 that the legal issues are worked out, if they want
5 to come back and make a presentation request for
6 the addition, after we have determined that it is
7 or is not historic, that is a second action.

8 MR. ILDERTON: Right.

9 MS. NELSON: Can those not be combined
10 into one meeting?

11 MR. ILDERTON: Yes. Sure.

12 MS. NELSON: That is how we originally
13 presented it and intended to present it tonight;
14 one, to discuss the historic merit of it and, two,
15 to let you look at what we hoped to do with it.

16 Is it worth looking at it conceptually
17 tonight and taking a straw poll as to whether it
18 would even be considered? I hate to drag the
19 owners through three months of not knowing or four
20 months of not knowing what is happening if the
21 board is of a mind that they are not even going to
22 consider it.

23 MS. HARMON: I think we have to go out
24 and look at it before we even listen to the
25 presentation. That's how I feel.

0075

1 MS. EWING: I agree.
2 MS. NELSON: Is there a process by which
3 we can request that site visit prior to a meeting
4 and a presentation, just for the owners' sake and
5 the length of time that it takes to go through the
6 submittal process and all of these meetings?

7 That was one of the reasons that I
8 included in my request tonight that a site visit
9 be scheduled prior to this before we had already
10 been deferred once. Just as an aside, it would
11 help and would speed things along.

12 MR. ILDEBERTON: Yeah. I think we could
13 do it as a separate. Yeah, we could get it done
14 before the next meeting.

15 MS. EWING: I know what you are talking
16 about. And I think that that is something that,
17 once we wrap this up, what we can do is I will
18 bring it up so we can discuss it at the end of the
19 meeting. Because, you are right, we need to set a
20 process.

21 MS. NELSON: So is it that I withdraw
22 this presentation or does the board vote to defer
23 this? How do --

24 MR. ILDEBERTON: Do I hear a motion?

25 MS. HARMON: Kent, should we defer this
0076

1 or withdraw?

2 MR. PRAUSE: Well, Clay and I have been
3 talking about it, and it's unfortunate that this
4 transpired so long ago, and that we don't have
5 these e-mails or any written verification on it.

6 But there is the section under
7 nonconformings under Article 16, under 21-149(h)
8 of historic buildings, and maybe this played into
9 it. I don't know. It's the only thing we could
10 come to that perhaps you could hang your hat on.

11 It says the building is designated as
12 historic through the process set forth in the
13 historical preservation overlay district, Article
14 11, shall be considered conforming to this
15 ordinance for all purposes.

16 Any height setback, yard area, or other
17 dimension found by the Design Review Board process
18 shall supersede any conflicting standards set
19 forth in the zoning district in which the building
20 is located and shall be applied to the building
21 site in making future determinations of conformity
22 as to the existing building or any changes
23 consistent with approved certificate of
24 appropriateness.

25 Perhaps that was it. I don't know. But
0077

1 it doesn't seem to be with any of the other
2 provisions of 150 or 151. Those would seem to not
3 allow an expansion.

4 MS. NELSON: Is that, in essence, saying
5 that if you have a historic structure it is

6 technically then no longer nonconforming? It is
7 neither a nonconforming use or a nonconforming
8 structure? And if that is the case, then it would
9 not be governed by the rules of nonconforming
10 uses.

11 MR. PRAUSE: That's true.

12 MS. NELSON: It would be allowed.

13 MR. PRAUSE: But, there again, that
14 seems to be the only other aspect of it, that in
15 the nonconformity section it would allow that to
16 happen.

17 MR. McCULLOUGH: I would strongly
18 suggest that you hook back up with Larry and get a
19 written. Because this is the section I see that
20 might apply, and I'm not sure. It's very vague as
21 to exactly -- I think these folks are going to
22 have a hard time allowing an addition based on
23 this.

24 MR. ILDERTON: Should they withdraw or
25 do we ask them to defer? Can they defer people

0078

1 twice? Have we already -- well, we haven't --

2 MS. HARMON: We deferred them once.

3 MR. ILDERTON: On this?

4 MS. HARMON: On the cottage, yes.

5 MR. ILDERTON: Is that a problem with
6 deferring twice?

7 MR. PRAUSE: I wouldn't think so.

8 MR. McCULLOUGH: It says that you can do
9 it. It doesn't say only once.

10 MR. ILDERTON: We can defer. Do I hear
11 a motion?

12 MS. NELSON: If it's deferred, does that
13 mean it's automatically included on the next
14 meeting's agenda and there is no ruling that bars
15 us from being able to present this again, or do I
16 need to withdraw so that I can bring this back up
17 again?

18 MR. PRAUSE: No. If you withdraw it,
19 that is more detrimental than just being --

20 MR. McCULLOUGH: It just gets bumped up
21 to next meeting.

22 MS. NELSON: I would request that the
23 board defer it.

24 MR. WRIGHT: I move that the board defer
25 the application.

0079

1 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a second?

2 MR. REINHARD: Second.

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

5 (All hands raised.)

6 MR. ILDERTON: Do you want to bring up
7 the meeting?

8 MS. EWING: I do. If we could amend the
9 agenda for a minute, I would like to just
10 discuss -- this was brought to my attention

11 specifically with this issue.

12 We are missing a process here when
13 people want the board to -- when they submit an
14 application and then they would like the board to
15 do a site visit before that meeting.

16 So is there -- I just want to bring it
17 up for discussion how we could set a process in
18 order so that when Kat gets a request for this she
19 knows how to handle this and that it can be
20 expedited.

21 MR. ILDERTON: I think before we had
22 some e-mails on some sites that we didn't already
23 set up and said, yeah, I can be there, I can be
24 there at this time. Haven't we done that before?

25 MS. HARMON: I think we have e-mailed.

0080

1 MR. ILDERTON: We have all got
2 together. It's a formal meeting. And so it's a
3 matter of rounding everybody up, e-mail or
4 whatever. We have done that before.

5 MR. WRIGHT: You don't have to go
6 through a notification process?

7 MR. ROBINSON: That is a good question.
8 If you-all want to do site visits in that fashion,
9 that's fine. I just didn't want people coming up
10 and saying I want a site visit, and all of a
11 sudden we have three or four site visits before a
12 meeting, or somebody saying I want a site visit
13 two weeks before a meeting and we have already
14 advertised.

15 That is why I asked Kat to bring it up
16 at a meeting if they wanted a site visit. Then
17 you-all could vote on making that site visit at
18 the meeting. And then we would have some official
19 saying we are all willing to go out and look at
20 this house. We don't want to be dragging you-all
21 all over this island unless you-all want to.

22 MS. EWING: Well, I mean, that makes
23 sense. If three people would request two weeks
24 before, then what do we do?

25 MR. HERLONG: But currently it seems

0081

1 like a person has to make an application, come in
2 here and then request a site visit. It's an
3 automatic extra month to get a site visit. I
4 think it's becoming apparent, when there is a
5 historic issue involved, it's quite obvious at
6 times that a site visit is going to happen and
7 people can go ahead and ask that it be put on the
8 agenda.

9 MS. KENYON: What I have a problem with
10 is I have to try and schedule it, okay?

11 MR. HERLONG: You are trying to schedule
12 it after we have met and --

13 MS. KENYON: Well, the thing of it is
14 that sometimes, like 2650, you guys said, no, we
15 don't want to see it. But then there was an

16 occasion, yes, you do.
17 So when somebody hands me an
18 application, it's not my responsibility to say,
19 okay, I will schedule it. That falls on Pat. I
20 mean, really. I don't have the say, and I don't
21 want it. It's not my responsibility.
22 MR. ILDERTON: If they request it, you
23 just need to let me know they want to do it, or
24 somebody needs to let me know. But, yeah, that's
25 fine with me.

0082

1 MR. WRIGHT: But when we do a site
2 visit, does that constitute a formal board
3 meeting?
4 MR. PRAUSE: If you have a quorum, it
5 is.
6 MR. WRIGHT: See, there is the problem.
7 Then you have to do the notification.
8 MR. McCULLOUGH: You have to do a public
9 notice of a regularly scheduled meeting.
10 MS. KENYON: Right. If they come in
11 with their application and they request it at that
12 time, that would be fine, you know.
13 MR. ILDERTON: A regular scheduled
14 meeting. So we don't need to do public notice?
15 MR. McCULLOUGH: Of a regularly
16 scheduled meeting. If you--all are down at Poe's
17 at the same time, you don't have a quorum.
18 MR. WRIGHT: But a site visit is not a
19 regularly scheduled meeting?
20 MR. McCULLOUGH: Right, right, right.
21 MS. KENYON: And maybe I dropped the
22 ball on this one because Layne did ask. And I was
23 really unsure because, like I said, sometimes you
24 say yes and sometimes you say no, so I really
25 don't have a guideline to go by.

0083

1 So I kind of did a roundabout. And by
2 the time it got back to me it was too late to
3 advertise or anything. So if somebody asks me,
4 then I'm going to pass it to you.
5 MR. WRIGHT: You don't have to
6 advertise, as I just heard.
7 MR. PRAUSE: I don't think you need to.
8 MR. WRIGHT: If it's not a regularly
9 scheduled meeting.
10 MS. EWING: We have always advertised
11 the --
12 MR. WRIGHT: He just said we don't have
13 to do that.
14 MR. McCULLOUGH: Your bylaws say public
15 notice of a regularly scheduled meeting of the
16 board shall be published in the public notice
17 section of the local newspaper.
18 MR. WRIGHT: This is a regularly
19 scheduled meeting, but a site visit is not. Am I
20 wrong?

21 MR. McCULLOUGH: That is the position I
22 take.

23 MR. ILDERTON: So we can do it.

24 MS. NELSON: Does the entire board have
25 to go at the same time? I know that many of the
0084

1 board members go to the house.

2 If it's requested like in the
3 application, could each individual board member at
4 their leisure go by and view the property? It's
5 supposed to be viewed from the exterior, not the
6 interior, so it would just be a drive-by, not a
7 walk-through.

8 MR. ILDERTON: Just like we do now.
9 Most of us go and just look at the property.

10 MS. NELSON: Right. And if that is the
11 case, it's discussed here at a regular meeting,
12 you-all have the ability to discuss it with each
13 other. But it doesn't require setting up a whole
14 meeting, finding a time that everyone can be
15 there. You can each go and view and take your own
16 notes and then come back and discuss it at the
17 meeting having seen the property.

18 MS. KENYON: If you are going to do site
19 visits, you probably should do it right before the
20 meeting because it's too hard to try and get
21 everybody at one time on one day.

22 MR. HERLONG: We had a discussion a
23 couple of months ago and had a concern that if an
24 individual goes and a client is there -- or the
25 homeowner is there and you have some discussion,
0085

1 that you could compromise the situation. That is
2 when we decided it should be a group.

3 MS. EWING: I think it should be a
4 group.

5 MS. HARMON: Yes.

6 MS. EWING: And I personally think,
7 especially with historic, that we should go before
8 the meeting. Because you discover things as you
9 go through the home and it may cause you -- I
10 think we need more time to think these things
11 through and see if certain things that you look
12 at, see if there are records that can prove
13 certain things. I just think it's not good.

14 And, also, if we have more than one
15 during the month, if that's the case, I think it's
16 better to schedule them beforehand. But, you
17 know --

18 MR. ILDERTON: Yeah. I agree that they
19 need to be scheduled beforehand.

20 MR. REINHARD: I only remember the three
21 times that I went, all three times they were
22 before the meeting, and all three times we went
23 inside the house and it seemed to work.

24 MR. ILDERTON: Yes. I don't see that as
25 being a difficulty.

0086

1 MR. WRIGHT: You don't get that many
2 requests for site visits, do you?

3 MS. KENYON: No.

4 MR. WRIGHT: I don't think that is a
5 problem.

6 MS. KENYON: Well, it was in this
7 instance. But I need some guidelines so that I
8 know what to do so that you don't yell at me at
9 the meeting.

10 MS. EWING: Well, and I think everybody
11 needs to know so that there is a process where the
12 applicants know what their deadlines are and what
13 to expect so they can tell their clients.

14 MS. KENYON: And, like I said, I dropped
15 the ball with Layne on that one.

16 MR. ILDERTON: So in the future we will
17 have notification.

18 MS. KENYON: It will be Pat's decision.

19 MR. ROBINSON: Do we schedule these
20 meetings at 6:00 at the site visit, at 6:00 at the
21 house, or 5:30?

22 MR. ILDERTON: 5:30. And if there is
23 more than one place we have to visit, we schedule
24 it earlier than that.

25 MS. KENYON: So figure half an hour per

0087

1 site visit?

2 MR. ILDERTON: Yeah, I guess.

3 MR. ROBINSON: Is that how the whole
4 board wants to do it?

5 MS. EWING: I mean, I said how I think
6 it should be done.

7 MS. HARMON: I agree with Cyndy.

8 MR. ILDERTON: So we are all on the same
9 page, aren't we?

10 MS. EWING: No.

11 MR. ILDERTON: We are seeing the house
12 before we talk about it, before we visit it.

13 MS. EWING: Well, I believe we should go
14 see the house, but I think we should --

15 MR. ILDERTON: You want to go weeks
16 ahead or days ahead?

17 MS. EWING: Yes.

18 MR. ILDERTON: I mean, I don't have a
19 problem with that either. I can do that.

20 MS. HARMON: I think we should go at
21 least a week ahead.

22 MS. EWING: Yeah, not before the
23 meeting.

24 MS. HARMON: I agree with that.

25 MR. ILDERTON: What does everybody else

0088

1 think?

2 MR. WRIGHT: I don't have a problem.

3 MR. HERLONG: I am comfortable doing it
4 before the meeting, but I can do it a week before

5 as well.

6 MR. PRAUSE: The only problem there is
7 that it would have to be advertised.

8 MS. KENYON: Right. So I have to --

9 MR. WRIGHT: Now, wait a minute. That
10 is confusing again. It's not a regularly
11 scheduled meeting.

12 MR. PRAUSE: It doesn't matter. The
13 ordinance, which supersedes the bylaws, says
14 hearing shall, blah, blah, blah -- public notice
15 of all hearings and meetings of the Design Review
16 Board shall be published in a newspaper of general
17 circulation in the town at least 15 days prior to
18 the meeting. If you have a quorum, it's a
19 meeting.

20 MR. McCULLOUGH: Well, the ordinance is
21 broader than the bylaws. And my question was --
22 we were discussing whether or not a site visit
23 would be the same as a technical meeting. Because
24 the ordinance also cites through board meetings,
25 Design Review Board meetings, public meetings and

0089

1 hearings.

2 MR. PRAUSE: The definition of public
3 meeting in the Freedom of Information Act is if
4 you get together and you even talk about it -- you
5 don't even have to take action. If you just
6 merely discuss a matter over which you have some
7 type of purview or authority, that is a public
8 meeting.

9 MS. EWING: But we can still make that
10 deadline, correct?

11 MS. KENYON: In other words, I have to
12 know 18 days in advance of the meeting to be able
13 to get it in the paper on time.

14 MS. EWING: Okay.

15 MR. ILBERTON: What we did originally is
16 meet and just didn't talk. Remember that? No one
17 can talk.

18 MR. HINSHAW: So are we saying the goal
19 here is, as we talk about this, is if we submit
20 something on Friday, this Friday, a new house that
21 hasn't been before the board and we want to
22 request that you go visit it, that we can do that
23 in our submittal, and at the following board
24 meeting in November, assuming it happens, you will
25 go to that house, review that house, and we can

0090

1 present to get a conceptual approval at that
2 meeting?

3 MS. EWING: Yes. That is what we are
4 trying to do. That was the whole -- so that to
5 speed this along. So if people turn it in Friday,
6 you will have time and we will be able to meet
7 before the --

8 MS. KENYON: You said you didn't want to
9 meet before the meeting. I need to know if --

10 MR. ILDERTON: First of all, Kent is
11 correct. We have to meet at the meeting. We are
12 going to do it at 5:30 or whatever. We don't have
13 a choice, I am being told. We don't have a
14 choice. Because we can't be scheduling all of
15 these meetings all over week to week and paper
16 advertising and all of this nonsense.

17 MS. KENYON: I hate to tell you guys
18 this, but this isn't my only job.

19 MR. ILDERTON: Exactly, exactly,
20 exactly. So it needs to be simplified. It needs
21 to be simplified. So we may just have to meet on
22 the day of. And that is just because the grand
23 laws of the State of South Carolina says this is
24 the way we have to meet. I mean, if we want to --

25 MS. KENYON: Well, then that is the
0091

1 right way. You need to notify the public.

2 MR. ILDERTON: Or we just say to heck
3 with those laws and do what we want to do. But it
4 just depends on how we --

5 MR. WRIGHT: He's been doing that for 30
6 years.

7 MR. ILDERTON: It's just a matter of do
8 we --

9 MS. KENYON: If you come in with a
10 submittal and you tell me you want a site visit,
11 I'm going to call Pat and say, you make a
12 decision, Pat, and you tell me what you want me to
13 do. And then I will call you back and say Pat
14 said no. No, I'm just kidding.

15 MR. WRIGHT: But the site visits will be
16 the day of, as I understand it.

17 MR. ILDERTON: Well, that is what Kent
18 says it needs to be because it needs to be
19 advertised.

20 MS. KENYON: That's not what he said.

21 MR. McCULLOUGH: It's not clear. If you
22 want to get everything dead set and be careful, do
23 it at the same time; the definition of a meeting
24 in the bylaws, special or regular meetings.

25 But if somebody -- if you-all have a
0092

1 lawsuit to determine the Freedom of Information
2 Act, we will go back through and go through all
3 that process, we can do it. But if you want to --

4 MS. KENYON: It needs to be on the
5 agenda as a site visit.

6 MR. ILDERTON: I'm bending the rules
7 like Cyndy wants to do. I like that, Cyndy. You
8 are thinking right.

9 MR. ILDERTON: I will go either way,
10 like everybody else. Any suggestions?

11 Let's just go the day of the meeting for
12 now until we can find out some more definition.
13 Maybe we can find out some more information.

14 Tonight we will say, you know, maybe

15 next month we will change it. How is that?
16 Tonight it's going to be the day of the meeting.
17 Cyndy, we may change that to be more flexible so
18 we have days ahead so we can research it.

19 MS. KENYON: Now, if I can ask one more
20 question. Who will not be here next month?

21 MR. WRIGHT: Before we get on that, I
22 had one thing related to this. This has to do
23 with the application process.

24 I believe, and we talked about this
25 before, that when you receive your cutoff date on
0093

1 applications, I think it would be useful for one
2 or two board members to come in and sit down in
3 your office and review these applications and make
4 a judgment as to whether they are complete or
5 incomplete.

6 MS. KENYON: You don't have to wait
7 until --

8 MR. WRIGHT: Let me finish. If they are
9 incomplete, then you send them back to the
10 applicant and say here are the items that are --

11 MS. HARMON: Amiss.

12 MR. ILDERTON: It's staff's
13 responsibility to do that.

14 MR. WRIGHT: Well, they are not going
15 to, and they don't have time.

16 MR. ILDERTON: If they don't have time
17 to do it, then that's fine. I agree they don't
18 have time to do it. This whole damn zoning
19 ordinance is so complicated. You know, I mean
20 that is the problem with this whole process, this
21 little island of ours.

22 MR. WRIGHT: I agree. I think we can
23 save the board a lot of time by having better --

24 MR. ILDERTON: I agree, but I am not
25 going to expend any more time on this, personally.

0094

1 MS. KENYON: Can I explain?

2 MS. EWING: That's because you are going
3 to be making the appointments.

4 MR. ILDERTON: That is going to take me
5 hours.

6 MR. WRIGHT: Well, is that, then, not a
7 good idea?

8 MR. HERLONG: I think it's a good idea
9 to review, to get two board members to come in and
10 just look through it and be sure it is a complete
11 and clear application. If something is missing,
12 we will then let the applicant know, please add
13 this item.

14 MR. ILDERTON: Every board member gets
15 these two weeks before the meeting. We get the
16 whole package.

17 MR. HERLONG: We still see it, and we
18 are all looking at incomplete information, and we
19 have no recourse other than -- everyone sitting

20 here and then we are reluctant -- please let me
21 finish.

22 We are reluctant to ask someone to come
23 back with a complete application. We are trying
24 to help people through the process, and it would
25 help them if we just review it.

0095

1 MS. KENYON: Give me your name and
2 number and I'll call you when I'm ready.

3 MR. ILBERTON: I think the board is
4 taking on decision-making capabilities that is
5 beyond an individual board member to do. If an
6 individual board member is going to decide whether
7 an individual application is complete or not, I
8 don't think that is correct for an individual
9 board member just to make these, or two individual
10 board members together, to make these decisions on
11 an applicant situation here when the applicant
12 sits down with somebody on the staff to make sure
13 it's done correctly.

14 And if it can't be done correctly, then
15 it goes to the problem of the whole process. You
16 are taking the whole thing out, and we are asking
17 individual board members to sit and make decisions
18 that may or may not affect the outcome of what
19 these clients want to do.

20 I think that is beyond what an
21 individual board member should be doing. We need
22 to sit together and discuss, like we have, and
23 discuss and make decisions on these things as
24 opposed to one or two people making decisions or
25 suggestions or whatever.

0096

1 That is what a board does. I think you
2 are asking an individual board member to do more
3 than he should be doing, more than basically the
4 power of a board member is given.

5 MR. WRIGHT: In a perfect world, I agree
6 with you. But Kat and Randy don't have time, in
7 my judgment, to go through these and look at them
8 and determine whether they are complete or
9 incomplete.

10 MR. ILBERTON: I agree.

11 MS. KENYON: Can I explain my process?

12 MR. WRIGHT: They are just passing
13 through.

14 MR. ILBERTON: I agree. If the decision
15 is broken enough -- if the decision is so broken
16 that they can't do their job, which I agree they
17 can't, then it needs to be done and decided from
18 the -- the zoning ordinance needs to be changed
19 and done and redone so we and the staff can do
20 their job properly, or the Town of Sullivan's
21 Island needs to hire about two or three people so
22 it can be done.

23 This has been brought upon the whole of
24 Sullivan's Island, this whole zoning ordinance,

25 this whole process here without thought of how can
0097

1 this be done. And it's up to the powers that be
2 that need to say, okay, we have created this
3 thing, what are we going to do.

4 Are we going back up and maybe you want
5 to simplify things? Or are we just going to hire
6 more people, raise the taxes and have all
7 intricacies addressed by the staff, by a proper
8 staff. It's one or the other. It's not up to --

9 MR. WRIGHT: If the system is --

10 MR. ILDERTON: If the system is broken
11 and not correct, then it needs to be shown to the
12 people who made the system.

13 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. Having said that
14 then, you are saying just flow them in here to us
15 as individuals and we will look at them before the
16 board meeting?

17 MR. ILDERTON: And if they are
18 incomplete, and we have to reject them, we have to
19 reject them. I mean, I don't see how we can make
20 individual decisions by two members or one member
21 on whether they are complete or not.

22 MS. KENYON: And once you reject a few
23 of them, guess what? They are going to make sure
24 that they are done right.

25 MS. EWING: There were a couple tonight
0098

1 that should have been --

2 MR. WRIGHT: Should have been rejected,
3 out of hand.

4 MS. EWING: There was not, you know --

5 MR. WRIGHT: Well, we are too nice. We
6 don't like to do that.

7 MS. KENYON: Well, get mean.

8 MS. EWING: But where are we going to do
9 it and --

10 MR. PRAUSE: Well, you-all have the
11 authority to do it. It's in your bylaws. In
12 fact, it says application filed on the forms
13 approved by the board via applicants via
14 secretary. The board may require additional
15 information as deemed necessary. The failure to
16 submit adequate information may be grounds for
17 dismissal.

18 And I agree with Pat. That would be a
19 decision that you-all make, not a staff member or
20 not one or two board members. You make it as a
21 board. If there is not enough information here to
22 pass on it, we dismiss it.

23 MR. ILDERTON: But, I mean, I think we
24 need to be flexible, too. We are not here to
25 harass Sullivan's Island residents here or to

0099
1 harass the designers, you know. We are not here
2 to make their life miserable.

3 So we need to be flexible, too, in those

4 decisions, when maybe a housewife wants to add on
5 a little addition, and she comes in here and for
6 some reason she doesn't know how to do this song
7 and dance completely right for us to say, okay,
8 out of here, lady. No, I don't think so. I think
9 we are here to help the residents of Sullivan's
10 Island do what they want to do.

11 Yes?

12 MS. NELSON: I just have a quick
13 question. We basically had the same conversation.
14 I talked with Randy not too long ago about the
15 fact that Kat and Randy don't have time to be
16 doing what needs to be done, and I think everybody
17 has recognized that.

18 But I came back to the office and asked
19 who makes the decision. If we are not going to be
20 charging a fee, can that fee be used to hire
21 someone to help with this process? Do we come to
22 the board with that? Does the board have to go to
23 Town? Does Town go to the Planning Commission?
24 Who makes the decision and who initiates that?

25 Because the talk has happened. If it's
0100

1 a private citizen that has to go to the Planning
2 Commission or Town Council and say, please address
3 this, something needs to happen, or does it have
4 to come officially from the Design Review Board,
5 hey, guys look at this, there is a gap and a hole
6 and it's wreaking havoc on our lives, how do we
7 fix this? How does that move get initiated?

8 MR. ILDEBERTON: Our board could write a
9 letter, meet and discuss it, or any individual
10 can, you know. Whether we go to planning --
11 proper procedure would go through Planning and
12 then Planning to the Board.

13 MS. NELSON: Planning and then to the
14 Board.

15 MR. ILDEBERTON: Or the Council.

16 MS. EWING: Council.

17 MR. ILDEBERTON: What have we decided?

18 MR. WRIGHT: Well, I think we pretty
19 much decided that we don't want one or two people
20 to --

21 MS. HARMON: I mean, that is pretty
22 apparent.

23 MR. WRIGHT: -- expedite the process.
24 By the same token, when things come to the board
25 that are incomplete, we need to reject them rather

0101
1 than sitting here and massaging them for half an
2 hour.

3 MR. ILDEBERTON: I think if there are one
4 or two members of the board that really want to
5 look at this and help the folks along to complete
6 the application, I don't have a problem with that.
7 I mean, I really don't, you know, if that is what
8 we are talking about. Personally, I think that

9 would be a good thing, if people have the time to
10 do that.

11 MR. WRIGHT: Well, some of us have more
12 time than others.

13 MR. ILBERTON: As opposed to -- I think
14 that would be perfectly fine. That would be a
15 great service to this board. But I do think the
16 system needs to be fixed.

17 MS. EWING: On the other hand, there are
18 people -- I mean, Elizabeth Allen came in, and
19 when I asked her she said these new -- she said,
20 they are fabulous. They are easier. They are
21 this or that.

22 There are other people that don't seem
23 to be liking them as much. And, anyway, I think
24 they just need to read a little bit and ask
25 questions. If they have questions, call. And I

0102

1 think the only way some people will get the
2 message is if we just say sorry. I mean, that is
3 a tough thing. That is tough.

4 MR. ILBERTON: I think if it's
5 egregious, strong like -- I mean, you know, then I
6 agree. I mean, I think we need to be willing
7 to -- and, of course, they will raise hell with
8 Town Council to simplify the whole thing.

9 MS. EWING: And you are right,
10 especially people that are in the business.

11 MS. HARMON: When we get these, as soon
12 as Kat calls, we need to go that day or the next
13 day.

14 If we see an application that is
15 incomplete, that is the time that we need to do
16 something, because it saves time when we are on
17 the board and people are coming in and we have to
18 say, well, you didn't do this and this and this,
19 and we have to drag it out of them; whereas, if we
20 had a process that when we see an incomplete
21 application, we can designate somebody to call
22 that person and say this is wrong.

23 MS. KENYON: Why are you pointing at
24 me?

25 MS. EWING: We are not supposed to have

0103

1 contact with the individual.

2 MS. HARMON: I understand. I say we
3 call a designated person, Kat or whomever, and
4 say, okay, this is an incomplete application, you
5 need to call these people and say if you want to
6 be on the next board meeting, come fix your
7 application.

8 MS. KENYON: Okay. So then you all have
9 picked up your applications and I have to call
10 everybody or e-mail everybody and say come back in
11 and get more information? I mean --

12 MR. PRAUSE: And each board member may
13 have something different that they think is

14 incomplete.
15 MR. HERLONG: The intent was it would be
16 reviewed before it goes out to everybody to give
17 everybody an extra day to get that sheet in that
18 was missing or --

19 MS. HARMON: But that doesn't happen.
20 So we need a designated person that will say if I
21 call -- I need somebody I can call and say this
22 application is incomplete, can you please call
23 this person and tell them to complete this
24 application.

25 MS. KENYON: But Kent is right. You
0104

1 might think one thing is missing off an
2 application and Steve might say, oh, no, that is
3 fine, this is done though. So how am I supposed
4 to know --

5 MR. ROBINSON: So now we have to call
6 back that person again and say, oh, yeah, by the
7 way, there is another thing.

8 MR. PRAUSE: The way to handle it would
9 be does anybody have a question with it right off
10 the bat. Mr. Chairman, I make a motion we dismiss
11 this application as being incomplete for the
12 following reasons. You get a second, you get a
13 vote, it's gone. If you don't, then you baby-sit
14 them.

15 But you are all here. You are all
16 looking at the same information. You all are able
17 to say whether or not you feel it's complete
18 enough to go forward.

19 To try and make me or Randy or Kat make
20 that determination -- I mean, what if they just
21 don't check one of the little boxes, one of the
22 first things we saw tonight. No box is checked,
23 don't know why it's here.

24 Would you reject that? Would you say it
25 shouldn't even be here just because they didn't

0105
1 check a box? They are going to get upset with
2 that.

3 MS. EWING: Well, we wouldn't do that.

4 MR. ILDERTON: Well, good. We know our
5 direction. Who is going to be here the next
6 meeting?

7 MS. KENYON: November 21st.

8 MS. EWING: That is rough. That is a
9 rough --

10 MR. HERLONG: I won't be here.

11 MR. ILDERTON: I'm not going to be here.

12 MS. HARMON: I'm not going to be here.

13 MR. WRIGHT: I'm not.

14 MR. ILDERTON: All right, no meeting.

15 Two months break.

16 MR. PRAUSE: I would suggest you set an
17 alternate meeting date, unless it's just going to
18 be the following month.

19 MR. ILDERTON: Let's do it the following
20 month.

21 MS. HARMON: When is the meeting in
22 December?

23 MS. EWING: Yeah, it's Christmas Eve, 45
24 applications.

25 (Laughter.)

0106

1 MR. ILDERTON: It could very well be.

2 MR. HERLONG: Can we move it up a day or
3 two?

4 MR. ILDERTON: I can be here -- I can be
5 here -- I will be here the day before. I mean, I
6 won't be here --

7 MR. PRAUSE: December is the 19th.

8 MR. HERLONG: But I'm saying in
9 November, a day or two in November.

10 MR. PRAUSE: Yeah. Then you have got
11 all of these people -- either people can be here,
12 or there are other town meetings you have to take
13 into consideration.

14 MS. KENYON: Planning. I mean, it's
15 hard. I mean, like even if we wanted to try and
16 move this to like next Wednesday, we can't do it
17 because we have the tree commission meeting. I
18 mean, I thought I had e-mailed you guys with all
19 the --

20 MR. ILDERTON: How about the next
21 Wednesday, a week later, the 28th?

22 MS. KENYON: No, because that is the
23 tree commission. Here is our meeting sheet.

24 MR. ILDERTON: I don't mind if somebody
25 wants to figure out when it is.

0107

1 MR. ROBINSON: How about the Tuesday
2 night before?

3 MR. HERLONG: The 20th?

4 MR. ROBINSON: That's what I'm thinking.
5 Is the Tuesday night available?

6 MR. PRAUSE: That is the third Tuesday.
7 That is a council meeting.

8 MR. ROBINSON: Or Monday?

9 MR. PRAUSE: Monday the 19th. I don't
10 think we have any Monday meetings, do we?

11 MS. KENYON: No, only the first Monday
12 of the month. Do you want to do it Monday?

13 MR. ILDERTON: Do we have time to notify
14 everybody, the applicants and all that kind of
15 stuff?

16 MS. KENYON: Yes.

17 MR. ILDERTON: All right. Monday the
18 19th. Done. Changed. This meeting is adjourned.

19 (The hearing was concluded at 8:10
20 p.m.)

21 - - -

22

23

24
25
0108

1 STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
2)
3 COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)
4

5 I, Nancy Ennis Tierney, Certified Shorthand
6 Reporter and Notary Public for the State of South
7 Carolina at Large, do hereby certify that said
8 hearing was taken at the time and location therein
9 stated; that the hearing was recorded
10 stenographically by me and were thereafter
11 transcribed by computer-aided transcription and
12 that the foregoing is a full, complete and true
13 record of the hearing.

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

17 Witness my hand, I have hereunto affixed my
18 official seal this 30th day of October, 2007, at
19 Charleston, Charleston County, South Carolina.

20
21
22
23
24
25

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Nancy Ennis Tierney
CSR (IL)
My Commission expires
April 6, 2014