

MEETING OF THE SULLIVAN'S ISLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

DATE: April 18, 2007

TIME: 6:00 p.m.

LOCATION: SULLIVAN'S ISLAND TOWN HALL
1610 Middle Street
Sullivan's Island, SC 29482

REPORTED BY: TERI L. HORIHAN
COURT REPORTER
CLARK & ASSOCIATES
P.O. Box 73129
North Charleston, SC 29415
(843) 762-6294

A P P E A R A N C E S

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS:

PAT ILBERTON - Chair

STEPHEN HERLONG - Vice Chair

DUKE WRIGHT - Secretary

BETTY HARMON - Member

FRED REINHARD - Member

BILLY CRAVER - Member

CYNDY EWING - Member

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

I N D E X

Page

Certificate of Reporter

116

E X H I B I T S

No exhibits were marked.

MR. ILDERTON: Okay. This is the April 18th, 2007 meeting of the Sullivan's Island Design Review Board. It is now 6:00. Members and attendants are Duke Wright, Pat Ilderton, Steve Herlong, Betty Harmon, Fred Reinhard, Cyndy Ewing, and Billy Craver.

The Freedom of Information requirements have been met for this meeting, and the items on tonight's agenda are approval of the February 2007 minutes, and the March -- actually both February and March. I guess we have to do them separate. So we're going to -- is everybody okay? We're deferring the February minutes approval.

MR. WRIGHT: I move that we defer the February 2007 minutes.

MS. HARMON: I'll second.

MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor?

(Craver, Ewing, Harmon, Herlong, Ilderton, Reinhard, and Wright raised their hands.)

MR. ILDERTON: And so we can approve the March? Everybody read the March?

MR. HERLONG: I'd like to state that my firm was involved in 4 of those submittals, and it stated that I was -- I excused myself. I recused myself.

MS. HARMON: And on page 44, where it's -- Ilderton said, thank you for your time. I will excuse myself from this one. And then that left Steve Herlong as the vice chair, and she put Mr. Reinhard -- 2215 I'on, Ilderton. And she just got the names mixed up. It was her first night. She did a really good job, but that was the only one she missed, I think.

MR. ILDERTON: So we'll get those amendments. Anything else?

MR. CRAVER: I think there's a real question as to -- and, Trenholm, you need to weigh in on this issue. Do we -- the Board verbatim transcript as the minutes versus having minutes, can we actually do that?

MR. WALKER: The Board can adopt a verbatim transcript as the minutes. The minutes are the official record of the Board. Also under our bylaws, the minutes constitute the basis for the Board's findings. So the Board could do that.

You and I happened to talk today about how convoluted that can get. It may be that the Board will want at some point to go to some condensation of the minutes or something else. But you do have the right to adopt a verbatim

transcript, subject to a motion to amend to make corrections, as the minutes.

There's no prohibition of having a verbatim transcript. The minutes can get unwieldy though.

MR. CRAVER: One of the issues that it creates for us is that we need to make sure that we absolutely meet the requirements of the ordinance because we'll have a verbatim transcript that will show whether or not we did and any action we take.

MR. ILDERTON: The idea of the verbatim transcript was not the Board's idea, was it?

MR. CRAVER: I don't know whose idea it was. I mean I think it was a bad idea.

MR. ILDERTON: Randy, Kent, where did that originate? Is there any other entity on Sullivan's Island that has a verbatim -- the Town Council or the Board of Adjustments? Do they have verbatim transcripts? And why would we have one, and they wouldn't, for instance? I mean I don't know. I'm just -- where did that come from? Does anybody know, the idea to have --

MR. REINHARD: Town Council.

MR. ILDERTON: Town Council has

requested a -- so they've essentially -- that's fine. They're essentially our boss so that's fine.

MR. BENKE: They're just looking for a way to simplify the process a little bit. It's hard to nail down the exact minutes. We're spending a lot of staff time trying to get minutes prepared. I mean I guess really what's important about minutes is the motion, but there seems to be a lot of other language that goes with it and --

MR. ILDERTON: So I guess it is easier to have it in print as opposed to on the tape because the tape you'd have to roll back through and say, we -- at least in print, you can go to at least the item that was discussed.

MR. CRAVER: Is there any reason why our minutes can't simply be action taken by the Board as opposed to a lot of attempts at paraphrasing discussions?

MR. WALKER: To go to what Pat said, tapes do not suffice because both the Freedom of Information Act and your bylaws require minutes. So we need actual minutes.

To go to Billy's question or suggestion, I think that, yes, you could have a list of action taken as your minutes. And you may want to combine

that with the actual verbatim transcript. It'd be much easier if you just had a list of the actions taken.

My concern is, if you limit it to a list of the actions taken, someone who appeals a decision could assert that the Board didn't have sufficient information. Unless there's some basis in the minutes to substantiate the decision, it might be -- I'm not saying it would -- but it might be subject to challenge.

Why don't -- what we could do is maybe have an executive session on this at some other time and talk about the way to do it.

MR. ILDERTON: Okay. Great. And especially if this is a request of the Town Council, I don't know that we want to just summarily say, we're not going to do that, so that's great. Thank you.

We want to -- first of all, do I have a motion to approve the minutes as amended?

MS. HARMON: I make a motion to approve the minutes as amended.

MR. ILDERTON: Second?

MS. EWING: Second.

MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor?

(Craver, Ewing, Harmon, Herlong, Ilderton, Reinhard, and Wright raised their hands.)

MR. WALKER: That's the March minutes.

MR. ILDERTON: Right. I was told that we need to remove one of the -- or we will be removing one of the applications, the 2708 Middle Street, Caldwell residence, from the agenda. And --

MR. WALKER: That's correct, Mr. Chairperson. I was informed that Town Council last night did not approve on final reading the ordinance that required houses of more than 50 years of age to come before -- or owners of houses that are more than 50 years old to come before the Board for approval to destroy the houses if those houses were not separately deemed historic structures or within the historic district.

And I understand that this house is neither a separately designated structure nor within the historic district. As such, it would not at this time need to come before the Board for demolition.

MR. ILDERTON: Great. So we are removing that from the agenda.

MR. HERLONG: I'll make a motion that

we alter that agenda to remove item 8 from discussion.

MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a second?

MR. CRAVER: Second.

MR. GRIMES: Can I make a comment?

MR. ILDERTON: Well, we're going to have discussion. Let's have discussion of this motion. I mean I guess this means that this house basically -- it needs to be removed from the agenda for the request, but this house is not on the historical list.

MS. HARMON: Right.

MR. ILDERTON: And I guess by removing, it means that -- does it mean the bulldozers can start tomorrow?

MR. WALKER: Well, we can even get more specific. There is no jurisdiction to require them to do it. The ordinance is no longer pending. It did not pass on third reading. The reason they were here was a pending ordinance that looked like it would be passed, and it's no longer pending. So there's no requirement that they be here. You have no basis for taking action on this.

MR. ILDERTON: So we really can't discuss this at all; is that correct?

MR. WALKER: You could discuss it.
But I think as a legal matter, you can't do anything
that the application is not properly before you
because they don't need the permission nor can you
insist that they get your permission.

MR. ILDERTON: Right, right. Okay.
Right. Well, then, yes, sir?

MR. GRIMES: I just want to make sure
that you are aware that Bobby Thompson wrote a
letter in this.

MR. ILDERTON: But it's not being
heard. There's lots of people that may want to
speak, but we're not hearing this item.

MR. GRIMES: I just want to make sure
you know that letter is there and consider it.

MR. ILDERTON: Right. But whatever,
pro or con, we cannot hear discussion. We're not
hearing it, right? Is that correct?

MR. WALKER: That's correct.

MR. ILDERTON: So it's removed.
Everybody in favor of removing it from the agenda?

(Craver, Ewing, Harmon, Herlong,
Ilderton, Reinhard, and Wright raised their hands.)

MR. ILDERTON: All right. Thank you.
So the agenda is amended, and we'll start with the

first item, 2623 Myrtle Avenue, the Norris residence.

MR. PRAUSE: This is an application for 2623 Myrtle Avenue, and it's basically to -- it says, cement slab, but it's to install a basketball court on the property. And really the -- it's labeled concrete slab on a drawing submitted page 2 of 2.

The only reason it's here is because it's a recreational accessory use. All accessory uses and buildings come to the Design Review Board for approval.

MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you. We'll hear from the applicant. Is the applicant here? Do you need to add anything?

MS. NORRIS: No. I don't know what I need to say.

MR. ILDERTON: Great. Well, I think it's pretty straightforward what you're asking for. Is there any public comment on the request? Yes, ma'am?

MS. MIDDLEAUGH: I have a question. Would this need any variances for lot coverage or setbacks?

MR. ILDERTON: Identify yourself.

MS. MIDDAUGH: Susan Middaugh, 2420 Raven Drive. So is this just an accessory structure, or are they also asking for relief from lot coverage or setbacks?

MR. ILDERTON: Kent, is that --

MR. PRAUSE: According to the application they've submitted, they check every block that says, meets standard. So I don't see any request for any relief of the modifications that you-all are allowed to grant. So I would assume no.

MR. ILDERTON: Great. Public comment section is closed if there's no other public comment. Kent, any -- Randy, anything else to add? Our board discussions.

MR. HERLONG: I'm not exactly sure I know exactly which -- is it the entire plan of -- the pool as an accessory structure, or did I hear basketball?

MR. PRAUSE: All that they've applied for tonight was a slab concrete.

MR. HERLONG: Slab of concrete.

MR. CRAVER: 25-by-44 slab?

MR. PRAUSE: I assume so. That appears to be what's on the drawing.

MS. HARMON: I was told it was for

basketball.

MR. PRAUSE: The intended use is for a basketball court. I assume if these improvements are not existing at this time and if they wish to install those improvements, they'll be back to see you again.

MR. HERLONG: In other words, this might -- we're probably looking at an overall plan. Right now they want approval for a basketball -- a slab of concrete.

MR. PRAUSE: I believe so. That appears to be what they've asked in their application.

MR. ILDERTON: Any other Board --

MS. HARMON: I just have to say one thing. I was looking at this, and I don't think that this signature is recognizable. And these are legal documents, and we have to have a signature that's legible.

MS. NORRIS: That is his signature.

MR. WRIGHT: That's not unusual.

May I make a comment, Mr. Chairman? And I'm not picking on you in particular. This is a general statement. We've got to be more particular in how these forms are filled out. I couldn't tell

whether this was to remove the slab or construct a slab or do what. So we have to get better information on these applications or simply reject them.

MR. HERLONG: It's completely blank.

MR. WRIGHT: Yeah. Having said that, I move that we approve this application and get on with it.

MR. CRAVER: I second that motion.

MR. ILDERTON: Do we have any more discussion? Everybody in favor?

(Craver, Ewing, Harmon, Herlong, Ilderton, Reinhard, and Wright raised their hands.)

MR. ILDERTON: Everybody opposed?

MR. WRIGHT: Randy and I are going to get together and try to work up some criteria.

MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, ma'am.

2914 I'on Avenue, Dobson and Moses pool.
Kent?

MR. PRAUSE: This is essentially a similar request. It's a recreational accessory use to the principal building, and as I stated, the ordinance requires that all of these accessory use structures -- uses and structures and buildings, including recreational accessory uses, which would

include this swimming pool, come to the Design Review Board for approval.

MR. ILDERTON: Right. Great. Thank you. Is the applicant -- yes, sir?

MR. MOSES: Frank Moses, sir.

MR. ILDERTON: And just pretty much straightforward?

MR. MOSES: Pretty much straightforward.

MR. ILDERTON: Need a pool. Great. Is there any public comment on this? Yes, sir?

MR. GRIMES: The next door neighbors have written a letter.

MR. ILDERTON: Identify yourself, sir.

MR. GRIMES: My name is Peter Grimes. I live across the street from that property. And the next door neighbors, Lisa and Andrew Crow, have written a letter opposing that pool. I have only one copy, and I've given it to you. Do you want to read it?

MR. ILDERTON: I'll read it. Great. Thank you. This is to the Sullivan's Island Design Review Committee. Well, let's see.

2914 I'On Avenue. Dear Committee

Members, thank you for taking into consideration the opinions of the adjacent property owners and residents of Sullivan's Island when concerning requests for concessions. It is our understanding that the developer of the spec house would like permission to construct an elevated pool and gazebo.

We would like to object first on the grounds that the request is not made by a resident with livability issues. It is a request made for investment purposes.

We think that this committee was set up to guard the residents and their desire to express themselves artistically in their homes and make their homes better suited for their families. The request before you is not made by a family living in the house who would like to have a pool and gazebo for exercise and entertainment uses.

There is no resident in the picture just as there are no residents in three other large homes recently constructed in this area. In other words, there is no compelling reason to grant the request.

Second, we would object to a pool being constructed in an uninhabited house for public safety reasons. This is a safety hazard that is easily avoided.

As the parents of two young children living next door, we have a real concern for children who may wander into the pool unnoticed and drown if the pool is full, or fall and possibly break their necks if the pool is empty.

Given the length of time that the house just a block away has been on the market, it could be a considerable amount of time that this spec house stands vacant. Again, the new residents can always add a new pool and/or gazebo in the future.

Third, if the request is granted, we would ask the design to be respectful of the residents of the neighborhood, especially regarding privacy and noise.

Based upon the above, we would request that the developers' request be denied. Thank you for serving on this important committee. Respectfully, Andrew and Lisa Crow.

Is there any other -- yes, sir?

MR. GRIMES: I have also forwarded an e-mail from Bobby Thompson to Andy this afternoon. And essentially, he says, please add my name to those in opposition to a large pool and gazebo at 2914 I'on, a spec house with no family inside. That's the message.

I've also expressed our sympathy to Lisa and Andrew's request. We would -- we don't want to -- my wife and I, we don't want to have the Board put any undue restrictions on the property owners, but we would like to ask the Board to be very conservative in granting any variances in cases of spec relation objects.

MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you, sir. Anybody -- is there any other public comment? Yes, ma'am?

MS. MIDDAGH: Susan Middaugh, 2420, just the same question. Is this going to involve extra variances for lot coverage or setbacks if you grant it? It's a vacant lot, so I'm assuming there's a whole house going in.

MR. ILDERTON: From what I understand the application -- Kent, is that correct -- that it's within the bounds of the percentages?

MR. PRAUSE: That's correct. At least according to the application they've made. There are no requested modifications which you are authorized to grant.

MR. ILDERTON: Right. Thank you. Is there any other comment? The public comment section is closed.

Is there anything you need to add?

Randy?

MR. ROBINSON: The one thing is, this application does say, provide rear pool and deck as an accessory structure. It doesn't say anything about this gazebo. I just want to make sure that if -- that that's included in there.

MR. ILDERTON: Great. Great. The Board, discussion. Anybody want to weigh in first?

MR. HERLONG: This is sort of a technical question, Randy or Kent. But what I'm looking at is an elevated, attached deck, pool, and covered gazebo area to the rear of the property. Does that -- is it still automatically accessory even though it's attached to the house?

MR. PRAUSE: Yes. In fact, that was an issue that came up originally whether or not this even needed to come to you, but the ordinance clearly defines a pool as a recreational accessory use.

And, in fact, the only way that you can have an elevated pool is if it is integrated into the design of the house. So if it were a -- even if it were a detached, in-ground pool, it would still come to you.

MR. HERLONG: Okay. Well, I would just continue that I understand the concerns of the neighbors that this is not a request of a homeowner to have this pool. But what I do see is that they are not asking for any relief of any kind. They are putting it away from what looks like an existing tree, I guess, is in the back yard. What kind of tree -- is that a --

MR. MOSES: Pecan.

MR. HERLONG: Okay. So it is to the rear of the property within the setbacks, and I just don't really see -- while I understand that there's a concern that it could be there and not occupied, that's -- a lot of those concerns that I heard in the letter were code-type issues that would be resolved through fencing and privacy fencing.

So I don't really see a problem with someone having a pool in the back yard of a home, especially elevated and attached to the rear as it is.

MR. ILBERTON: Well, it's within the boundaries, right? There's no -- we're not granting any variances on it? I mean it's allowable. It's an allowable structure.

MR. HERLONG: Aesthetically, one

could argue that maybe it should be sitting lower and not so high so you're overlooking a neighboring property. So perhaps it could be more steps down to a lower pool and deck, but that's one potential resolution.

MR. ILDERTON: But then again lower is going to be more accessible to children which is a concern to the neighbors. I mean I don't know. Would the fencing or the railing really be higher than the 4-foot required?

MR. HERLONG: Well, it appears to be within 18 inches of the floor level, which is 10 feet off the ground. So it must be 8 -- over 8-feet off the ground I assume, the deck.

MS. HARMON: Is that correct?

MR. MOSES: That's correct. Well, the deck has to be above the flood though, right?

MR. PRAUSE: No. Not if it was unattached from the house, it could be down below flood.

MR. MOSES: But it's attached to the house, integrated; therefore, being able to have an elevated pool.

MR. HERLONG: It could be structurally detached on some foundation, separated

by an inch or so, and it would probably meet the requirements of detached so that you could put it at 4 to 6 feet but elevated.

MR. CRAVER: But does it then meet the requirements to have an elevated pool if it's --

MR. ILDERTON: There's no requirements to have an elevated pool.

MR. CRAVER: No. But if you want to have an elevated pool, does it have to be attached?

MR. MOSES: Right. Anything over 6 inches, I believe.

MR. PRAUSE: Yeah. But we'll see what the wording is. The operative language is, pools elevated more than 6 inches above grade are not permitted unless developed as an integral part of a principal building.

MR. HERLONG: I'd say even if it was 4 to 6 feet off the ground, it's integral. It might not be attached, but it could be integral.

MR. PRAUSE: Right. The integral part is really -- I would think is probably more of a design consideration rather than a structural consideration.

MR. WRIGHT: I don't understand that. An integral part of something is a part of

something, isn't it? I mean it has to be attached, doesn't it? But that's --

MR. HERLONG: That's for you guys to tell us.

MR. ROBINSON: It could be attached by the stairs.

MR. WALKER: If it's not defined, it's up to you to apply a reasonable interpretation. There's no pat answer as to what integral part means.

MS. EWING: So as long as the stair deck went down to a lower level pool deck, it would be considered an integral part of the house?

MR. PRAUSE: I wouldn't go so far as to say that. I mean because you could have a pool -- an elevated pool that could be a considerable distance away from the house that would just be attached by some minimal means that I don't necessarily think that -- is certainly not the intent of this ordinance is to make that an integral part of the house.

The whole idea is if you have an elevated pool that it's going to be designed to at least appear as part and parcel of the house rather than a separate structure away from the house and merely

connected by some artificial means, if that makes sense to you.

MR. WALKER: It's supposed to look like an element of the house as opposed to being a separate element.

MS. HARMON: An accessory building.

MR. PRAUSE: Right, exactly.

MR. REINHARD: And if it is an integral part of the house and not appearing as though it's an accessory building, why are we hearing it? I thought the reason we were hearing it is because it's considered an accessory building.

MR. PRAUSE: Correct.

MR. HERLONG: It is not an accessory use as opposed to -- you mentioned accessory use earlier.

MR. PRAUSE: By definition in the ordinance, a pool, whether or not it's in an in-ground pool or an aboveground pool, is an accessory use or structure.

MR. ILBERTON: That's a structure, right.

MR. PRAUSE: By definition, it is that. And as such, it's -- under Section 21137C, it states, in relevant part the Design Review Board

shall also approve all accessory structures that require a building permit.

It doesn't make a distinction whether or not it's an in-ground pool or an aboveground pool. If it's a pool, it's an accessory use or structure. It has to come to you because it requires a building permit.

MS. EWING: Well, I guess one question is, is the neighborhood concern -- I understand the safety concern, whether it's elevated or not, but are they concerned that there's a pool at all? Is that what you're -- a pool in a -- the neighborhood does not want a pool?

MR. ILBERTON: There are three people in the neighborhood.

MR. GRIMES: The neighbors do not want a pool.

MS. HARMON: Do they not want the pool because it's aboveground?

MR. GRIMES: And one of these neighbors is adjacent to the property.

MS. HARMON: Do they not want a pool because it's aboveground?

MR. GRIMES: That I cannot tell you. I don't even know if she was aware that the pool is

aboveground or not.

MS. EWING: They want a pool, but they're concerned that the house will be -- because it's a spec house, that's their concern. That no one will be living in the house, and that there will be a pool, and it may be a danger to the children.

MR. GRIMES: This is how I understand it.

MS. EWING: And she says, we're not building afterwards.

MR. ILDERTON: I think we are enjoined to consider things on architectural and design merit, not because somebody wants to make a buck or not want to make a buck or whatever. We can't address those kinds of ideas in this forum.

So we just need to decide whether it is poor design, or does it need to be redesigned and submitted or -- I think that's how we want to consider it.

MR. HERLONG: Or as well, is it compatible within the neighborhood.

MR. ILDERTON: Yeah. Compatibility or whatever else. But that's all --

MS. EWING: Or is there a way that we could -- you're Mr. Dobson?

MR. MOSES: Moses.

MS. EWING: That you think you might be able to come to some kind of agreement with the neighborhood? Have you presented this to -- have they seen it and discussed it?

MR. MOSES: No, ma'am.

MS. EWING: Is that an option to --

MR. ILDERTON: I don't think that's up to -- for this Board to suggest or not. I think we've got to go ahead and probably vote and decide. Or if there's anybody -- do you have any --

MR. WRIGHT: No. I frankly and personally don't have a problem with the requirement or the --

MR. ILDERTON: I don't really see it as a problem. I mean overall, it's in the boundaries and all.

MR. WRIGHT: It meets all the criteria.

MR. ILDERTON: It's a hole in the ground.

MR. CRAVER: They're not asking for any variances. I mean I hear what Steve's saying, but I'm not sure that isn't a -- as much of a matter of personal preference of how they have the design.

I guess it's hard for me to sit there and look at it and say I have a problem with it. I might like it better if it was different.

MR. ILDERTON: If it was lower or something like that.

MR. CRAVER: Right. But I can't sit here and tell you I have a problem with it. I hear all the stuff that the neighbors are saying, but I'm not sure that's -- I'm not sure I'm hearing anything that would make me turn down the owner of the property, spec house or no spec house.

MS. HARMON: Well, why don't we give him an opportunity to say that he would be willing to change the design and come back before the Design Review Board. That would make it much easier on us, for me at least. Would you be willing to do that?

MR. MOSES: I need to get the house started for one. And I don't have a problem lowering the deck, but like I said --

MR. ILDERTON: That might be a consideration for the neighborhood if you lowered it.

MR. MOSES: I like it better -- it looks better lower.

MR. ILDERTON: Yeah. I think that's

one of the concerns is basically the whole structure idea and it being so prominent in the neighborhood. I think that'd be a great thing to do.

MR. MOSES: I mean I have 3 feet basically to play with.

MR. ILDERTON: If you could offer something like that, and that would make it easier on us.

MR. MOSES: I'd be glad to do that. Like I said, the house is going to be at 18, and the flood is at 15. I don't have to be plus one on a deck, right?

MR. ILDERTON: Right.

MR. MOSES: It can be all the way down to 15.

MR. ILDERTON: Right.

MR. MOSES: So there's 3 feet I can lower it from the house elevation.

MS. HARMON: I think that would be much better.

MR. MOSES: That's fine with me. I don't have a problem with that at all.

MR. ILDERTON: Well, do I hear a motion to amend the request within the purview?

MR. CRAVER: How about a motion to

approve it subject to him lowering it approximately 3 feet, lowering the pool and the deck?

MR. MOSES: It's already a step down, but I'll just make sure it's down to the 15-foot mark.

MR. CRAVER: Will they be in compliance with all the height requirements and everything if they do that?

MR. PRAUSE: You mean the flood elevation requirements?

MR. CRAVER: Yeah. The flood elevation.

MR. PRAUSE: As long as -- even if it's a structurally integral part of the building, then the -- actually it's an A zone, I assume.

MR. MOSES: Right, it is.

MR. PRAUSE: The flood elevation requirement is the finished floor. And as long as the finished floor of the building meets the base flood elevation requirement, they're okay.

MR. CRAVER: So I --

MS. EWING: So the deck could actually be even lower than 15 feet?

MR. PRAUSE: I believe so. Correct me if I'm wrong, Randy.

MR. ILDERTON: It can be lower than 3 feet because people do in-ground pools all the time.

MR. MOSES: We're talking about the deck though.

MR. ILDERTON: Well, the deck can be, too, right?

MR. PRAUSE: I believe the standard in the A zone is the finished floor as far as the --

MR. ILDERTON: Right. Of the house itself.

MR. GRIMES: May I ask you a question concerning compliance?

MR. ILDERTON: Apparently not. I'm told you can't. The public comment is closed.

Do I have a motion?

MR. CRAVER: I was trying. I make a motion that we approve the request subject to him lowering the elevation of the deck and the pool by approximately 3 feet.

MS. HARMON: Or more.

MR. MOSES: Well, Kent and I will get together and figure out exactly how low I can go with it, and I don't have a problem with that at all.

MR. CRAVER: I guess the motion would

be to approve it and to encourage him to lower it as much as he can, but lower it at least 3 feet.

MR. HERLONG: I second.

MR. ILDERTON: Discussion? Everybody in favor?

MR. REINHARD: Wait. I don't quite understand what that's going to accomplish. The real issue here if we're -- usually when we deal with neighborhood compatibility issues, it's in regard to a variance. But this gentleman's not asking for any variances because the building is in total compliance which we encourage people to submit buildings that are in compliance so that they don't have to ask for a variance.

So I really -- I think that we are jumping to conclusions to assume that lowering the pool 3 feet is going to satisfy the neighborhood compatibility issue when the neighborhood has said they don't want a pool. You see what I'm saying?

MR. CRAVER: Fred, I agree with you.

MR. REINHARD: I think we ought to either disapprove it, or we should -- we could ask for a deferral.

MR. CRAVER: Or we can approve it. We can either approve it, disapprove it, or defer

it. But withdraw my motion and make a motion that we approve it as submitted.

MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a second to that?

MS. EWING: I think we should defer and ask the neighbor. Ask Mr. Moses if he will get together with the neighbors. They can nail this down. They're, after all, people that will be living in the neighborhood and have to deal with the neighborhood compatibility for years.

And certainly that's not going to stop your construction right now. You can go on with the rest of it, and then next meeting we can go forward.

MR. MOSES: Can I comment on that?

MR. ILDERTON: Essentially, we're -- if we defer, that's fine. But I mean basically any in-ground pool -- which any pool comes before us, in-ground or aboveground, whether it's in-ground, any pool -- I mean, I don't know. Are we saying that any in-ground pool that if people don't like we're going to vote against it?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, may I weigh in? You do have a standard to apply. It's subjective. But if you look at the second paragraph of 21136, it says, an accessory use or structure is

permitted on a property in conjunction with the principal use.

The size of accessory structure should bear a relation to the size of the principal structure. Proper location of accessory structure is important to their impact on adjacent homes and businesses. Therefore, it allows you some discretion with respect to location and size.

MR. ILDERTON: Right. Location and size, right.

MR. WALKER: And those considerations are generally, as always, neighborhood compatibility or compatibility with the house, primarily.

MR. HERLONG: I feel like the height of the pool is a size issue. I think at 8 feet above grade, it's continuing that band of the house all the way back.

I think if it were lowered it would appear much less imposing. I think it could be buffered with the landscaping that would go around the pool, and that's the reason I seconded the motion to approve the pool at a lower height.

MS. HARMON: I'm in agreement with that.

MR. ILDERTON: I think that's a good

compromise. And it could be even lowered farther than that. And quite frankly, it would be less expensive to build.

MR. MOSES: Absolutely, yeah. I don't have a problem with that.

MR. ILDERTON: And that does make it less apparent. Whether it makes it more compatible with the neighborhood, you know, that's up to us to decide. But --

MR. WRIGHT: Excuse me? Did you withdraw your motion?

MR. CRAVER: I did, but it was seconded. I'm not sure I can withdraw a seconded motion. He seconded the first one so I assume it's still alive. Trenholm?

MR. WALKER: Why don't you kill it, and somebody else can make another motion.

MR. CRAVER: It was the motion about approving it subject to him lowering it at least 3 feet. If that got seconded, why don't we vote on it?

MR. WALKER: Then go ahead and vote. That's what I meant. Take it to conclusion if there's no further discussion.

MR. ILDERTON: All right. Everybody

in favor of the motion?

(Craver, Harmon, Herlong, Ilderton,
and Wright raised their hands.)

MR. ILDERTON: All right. Everybody
opposed?

(Reinhard and Ewing raised their
hands.)

MR. ILDERTON: 2 Citadel Street, Hall
residence, removal of a house from the island.
Kent, what do we got?

MR. PRAUSE: The application is for
Number 2 Citadel Street, and I believe the reason
why this one is here before you tonight is not with
respect to age, but rather that it's located in an
historic district --

MR. ILDERTON: In the historic
district. Right. I've got you.

MR. PRAUSE: -- which requires
you-all's approval to allow it to be removed from
the property.

MR. ILDERTON: Is the applicant here?

MR. HALL: Yes. John Hall, owner of
the property at 2 Citadel.

And we're requesting to have the house
removed from the lot. We're in negotiations with

Habitat for Humanity to donate the house to them and subsequently erect another house there.

MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you, sir. All right. Kent, is there anything you need to add?

MR. PRAUSE: I don't have anything further.

MR. ILDERTON: Public comment? Anybody pro or for or want to say anything? Public comment section is closed.

All right. The Board -- Duke, what do you think?

MR. WRIGHT: I have no problem with this application to remove this house.

MR. ILDERTON: All right. I don't have a problem with it either. Steve?

MR. HERLONG: I see no historic value to the structure, and so I have no trouble with approving that for removal.

MR. ILDERTON: Great. Betty?

MS. HARMON: I see no historic value, and I would approve the application to give the house to Habitat for Humanity.

MR. REINHARD: It's a good house to recycle.

MR. ILDERTON: Everybody speak up.

Apparently Kat can't hear.

MS. EWING: Yes.

MR. CRAVER: Yes.

MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a motion?

MR. WRIGHT: I move that the
application be approved as submitted.

MR. ILDERTON: Second?

MR. HERLONG: Second.

MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor?

(Craver, Ewing, Harmon, Herlong,
Ilderton, Reinhard, and Wright raised their hands.)

MR. ILDERTON: All right. 1723
Middle Street, Rhodes residence, new construction.
All right. One more time.

MR. PRAUSE: It appears that this
one's here asking for some modifications to the
design standards that you are authorized to grant
relief. And they are delineated on the Design
Review Board Request Form and submitted with the
application.

MR. ILDERTON: Okay. Great. Thank
you. Is the applicant -- yes, sir?

MR. McCANTS: Carl McCants.

MR. ILDERTON: Yes, sir. Carl, do

you want to tell us what you --

MR. McCANTS: Well, we know this is a sensitive area, being in between the Junior Officers' Quarters and the Officers' Quarters. We feel that any structure that goes there needs to complement those historic houses. The items that we're asking for are additional front yard setback.

And if you refer to plan sheet 9, it'll show you where it encroaches into that area. The area that it encroaches into is a projection of the front house that only is 22 feet wide, and it's not the full massing of the front of the house.

MR. ILDERTON: All right. So it's a setback issue?

MR. McCANTS: Yes. It's a front yard setback issue. Item D -- no -- item B. I'm sorry. Additional front yard setback.

MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you.

MR. McCANTS: Next on there we're asking for the right side wall, the dining room, is at 14 feet in length, and it's not articulated. It carries a full two stories.

Next, we're looking for principal building coverage. We're over by 1 percent. We're asking for 34 square feet. Next is the impervious

coverage. We're asking for 13.2 percent, which is a total of 136 square feet.

And finally we're asking for an increase for principal building square footage of 21 percent which is 736 square feet.

MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, sir.

MR. RHODES: I'd like to say one thing too.

MR. ILDERTON: Yes, sir.

MR. RHODES: This house is in a B zone. I'm sure a lot of people are not aware that --

MR. ILDERTON: Identify yourself.

MR. RHODES: I'm Sammy Rhodes.

And the reason it's up so high, it's in a B zone right on Middle Street. Hard to believe it is in a B zone.

MR. McCANTS: The house has to be elevated higher than, of course, the adjacent houses that are there because of its location in a B zone.

MR. ILDERTON: Okay. Thank you, sir. Kent, anything to add?

MR. PRAUSE: I just -- maybe a clarification. The impervious surface, they're requesting an additional 136 square feet or 13.2

percent, and I'll ask if there's -- under Section 2126C, one Design Review Board can increase no more than 25 percent the maximum permitted impervious coverage. But if that impervious coverage consists solely of materials such as grass pavers, that are employed to allow vegetative materials such as grass to permeate the surface, giving the appearance of grassed area.

So if this is for relief of impervious coverage for building area, you-all don't have any authority to grant any leave in that regard. I just wanted to clarify that.

MR. ILDERTON: Okay. Great. I'm sorry. I was out of order. I should have asked for public comment before I asked for Kent's comments. Is there anybody? Public comment section is closed then.

Randy, do you have anything to add?

MR. ROBINSON: I want to add that the -- this infinity pool ledge, something's going to have to be changed there because these things just aren't working.

MR. ILDERTON: As far as in the code?

MR. ROBINSON: It is a code issue that just isn't working. We're going to have to

regroup there so something needs to be done there.

Also, just keep in mind, the house right behind this is -- you just allowed it to be taken off the island. So whatever you approve here is probably going to set the standard for those 4 lots right in that area. That's it.

MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Billy, anything?

MR. CRAVER: Well, it sounds to me like we can't do the impervious coverage request.

MR. PRAUSE: If it's for building -- an impervious building treatment, no. I don't know what it is. It's not clear to me.

MR. CRAVER: I guess the question is, Carl, is at least 136 feet of your impervious coverage grass pavers?

MR. McCANTS: No, it's not.

MR. PRAUSE: Can't do that.

MR. CRAVER: So we don't have the power to do the request in G. And if you've got to redo that, how does that impact the rest of the requests?

MR. McCANTS: Let me clarify. You're asking about the pavers, and that's what I'm not clear on. Now, the driveway is considered in what I

came up with my square footage. Is that what you're asking? You're talking about pavers that grass grows through, and we're not asking for anything with that type of pavers.

MR. CRAVER: Right. But that's the only kind of thing that we can grant that extra allowance for.

MR. McCANTS: Is for pavers?

MR. CRAVER: Is for pavers that are effectively pervious, I guess.

MR. RHODES: He said the driveway's in his calculations so that could be pavers.

MR. McCANTS: Yeah, that's correct. The driveway is included in my calculation.

MR. RHODES: So the driveway could be pavers, and we wouldn't have to ask for the relief?

MR. CRAVER: You've got a concrete driveway now, so if you made it -- well, I say you do. It says, paver driveway. So is that part of -- is the driveway included in your pervious coverage?

MR. McCANTS: Yes, it was.

MR. PRAUSE: What you want to ask is, is it included in your impervious coverage?

MR. CRAVER: That's what I mean. In your impervious coverage.

MR. McCANTS: Yes, it is. Now, you-all do not grant pavers as being pervious, do you?

MS. EWING: No. They have to be grass pavers.

MR. McCANTS: They are impervious, correct? The pavers are.

MS. EWING: They need to be those grass pavers.

MR. CRAVER: If they're those grass pavers that are impervious, then do they -- I guess they count and can't count.

MR. PRAUSE: I'm just reading to you what's in the ordinance.

MR. CRAVER: I'm just trying to understand it.

MR. PRAUSE: I don't understand it. That's why I'm reading it to you.

MR. ILDERTON: One more thing in the ordinance.

MR. PRAUSE: Yeah.

MS. HARMON: What's your take on it?

MR. CRAVER: It's those crazy people that did that ordinance. I guess -- we're trying to figure this out.

MR. ILDERTON: Cyndy, do you have anything to --

MS. HARMON: We're waiting on Trenholm.

MR. ILDERTON: Oh, yeah. I'm sorry.

MR. CRAVER: I'm waiting to -- I don't want to rocket past.

MR. RHODES: If we take the driveway and make it pervious and take the square footage off, we wouldn't have an issue; is that correct?

MR. PRAUSE: If the driveway is impervious, then you could make it pervious and reduce the amount of impervious surface. But if the driveway currently proposed is impervious then --

MR. ILDERTON: It's already impervious.

MR. PRAUSE: It's already impervious. So you can't reduce it and do anything with it.

MR. CRAVER: But it's currently -- if it's currently impervious and they switch it to pervious, then if it's more than 136 square feet, they're okay.

MR. PRAUSE: Yeah. They're okay. But I guess the question is, are the pavers that are shown on the site plan, are they intended to be

pervious or impervious?

MR. CRAVER: Well, Carl said that they're included in your --

MR. McCANTS: In my calculation.

MR. CRAVER: In your calculation of impervious --

MR. McCANTS: That's correct.

MR. PRAUSE: So all they need to do is reduce it or ask for you-all's relief in this grass pavers thing.

MR. WALKER: Reading this less-than-perfectly-drafted provision, which is 21-26C1, that suggests that the allowance is permitted where the additional impervious cover is in the form of pervious materials that appear to be impervious if they allow vegetative grass to come through them.

I guess they're talking about some sort of domino paver that's partially pervious and partially impervious. One reading of it is that it restricts it to those types of hybrid pavers.

MR. REINHARD: Which are impervious.

MR. WALKER: In part. With the illusion of perviousness.

MR. REINHARD: Exactly.

MR. CRAVER: Okay. Well, then I'm going to -- I'll finish giving you-all my penny's worth of comments. I don't have a problem with the request in B, but that's a slight change in the angle. We've given a good bit of relief on that two-foot inset. Hear what everybody else has to say about it, I don't think that's a problem.

The 34 square feet principal building coverage, a 1 percent change, doesn't give me any heartburn.

MS. HARMON: But G does.

MR. CRAVER: Well, G does. I'm going to assume that that's going to go away because he's going to change that to a pervious driveway.

And the principal building square footage, I'd kind of like to hear some more about why it is this structure is meeting all of the guidelines that would have us say, okay. Give them more square feet.

I mean I hear the request for it, but I think that's part of the issue is that to get that square footage, you're supposed to justify it in some fashion, and I haven't heard anything on that. I think that's all my comments.

MR. ILDERTON: All right. Thank you.

Cyndy?

MR. CRAVER: The last sheet. I saw that last sheet.

MS. EWING: What Billy was just talking about, I'd like to have a discussion about that, how this house meets the criteria to be given extra relief.

And also, I think it's important that we have a discussion about how it fits in with the neighborhood. I can see -- it looks as if the design -- they've tried to mimic some of the design in maybe the Junior Officers' Quarters, but the -- when you elevate a two-story structure like that, you're going to come up with a really massive building. And we've already done that on Middle Street and gotten a lot of negative phone calls on that.

So I think we should -- I think we need to talk about kind of the massing of the structure. And one of the questions is the flat-roof treatment. I don't think we can have flat roofs, but anyway -- that's my feeling. A lot of it looks really good, but I do have concerns about the mass.

MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Fred?

MR. REINHARD: It's a nice house, but

it's 21 percent too big. That's all.

MR. ILDERTON: Betty?

MS. HARMON: I think it's a nice house. It's a nice design. I think if you're asking for more principal building square footage, if you've thought about lowering it some. I think the mass of it being so high and so -- it makes it just look so much bigger when it's up so high. If you could lower it, maybe there would be consideration to give you the extra square footage.

And I also would like to ask you -- I know this is preliminary, but I'm wondering about what kind of pickets these are? I can't delineate.

MR. McCANTS: They're one-by pickets just in an X.

MS. HARMON: An X?

MR. McCANTS: Yes, ma'am. And we cannot lower the house because of it being in a B zone. The house is as low as it can be to grade right now. It has to be up that high for the B zone.

And keep in mind that any structure that's built along that street is going to be in a B zone in that area, and they're all going to be elevated to that nature.

MS. HARMON: Okay. Well, I guess if you did a lot of landscaping in front, it would reduce the mass of it.

MR. McCANTS: Yes, ma'am. And that's what I'm saying.

MS. HARMON: But I would like to make a suggestion now, is that, I think if you had the straight pickets like on the Junior Officers' Quarters, it would be more compatible.

MR. McCANTS: Well, I appreciate that, and we're trying not to replicate historic structures, just compliment them.

MS. HARMON: Right. And I think that would be a nice compliment to it. Those are my thoughts.

MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Steve?

MR. HERLONG: Is this in a historic district? Well, I do think there is, in this case, a bit of a higher level of detail indicated, or perhaps it's in the massing or the layout of the floor plan that gives it that look.

But I tend to think and to agree with some of the earlier comments that what I'm looking at really is a two-story, T-shaped structure.

One of the things the Officers' Quarters

have, even though they start lower and go high, some of the third floor in those is -- has lower plate heights and maybe some dormers.

We have full two-story walls on every wall except where there are porches, and I think that creates some of the massiveness that I'm looking at here.

And I think too that this particular site on Middle Street, it's going to be shocking how large this is going to be compared to what was there. We're going to hear many comments about this particular home as it goes up. It's in a very important and public type of an area there.

So I mean for that reason, I'm reluctant to approve the increases, and I still think additional study on some of the massing issues could help resolve some of the issues and concerns that I have.

MR. ILDERTON: Okay. I see it as generally a -- I see how they tried to compliment the Officers' Quarters both across the street as well as behind them. The verticality is a concern, the massiveness, like you say.

The problem is that the house behind it is going to get moved off or demolished. And the

house probably to the right of it eventually is going to because it is a small brick structure.

And farther down from there maybe the other house too. There's two houses on there that probably will be gone eventually just because we've already approved that those certain houses similar to that can be removed from the island.

And farther down the corner is a very large structure -- it's not the BOQ. It's the apartments there.

MS. HARMON: It's the commissary.
Oh, yeah.

MR. ILDERTON: On the corner.

MS. HARMON: Right, right, right.

MR. ILDERTON: But anyway, it's a substantial structure. But I think some lattice work that might simulate siding might help, that is, to bring the idea of the siding farther down. But also, the story-and-a-half kind of idea, like you say, might bring the roofline down and make it feel less massive.

I mean I really think you could probably put the same square footage with using that idea but bringing the roofline down. It's not going to look like the Officers' Quarters though. It's not going

to look anything like the Officers' Quarters as far as that's concerned. If you do that, it's going to look more of like a cottage or something.

But these other houses that it is replacing, they didn't have any relationship to the Officers' Quarters either. So I mean that is to consider what's going back here. So those are my comments. Duke?

MR. WRIGHT: I think I essentially agree with all the comments that have been made. One, I am opposed to increasing the square footage. I think this house needs to be low profile. It's going to set a standard, as you say or as Randy says, for at least the first 4 lots. It's a very visible location, probably as visible as any location on Sullivan's Island.

So I think that we should ask the designer to come back with a redesign of a lower profile house that is smaller than what he's asking for.

MR. ILBERTON: All right. Do I hear a motion?

MR. REINHARD: I move for disapproval.

MS. EWING: I second.

MR. ILDERTON: Discussion?

MR. WRIGHT: Does that mean what I said, that we ask that he come back? I'm okay with that.

MR. ILDERTON: I mean essentially, if it is disapproved, they can come back with a different design.

MS. HARMON: Right, right.

MR. WRIGHT: Have we -- where's the architect? Have we -- may I ask him a question?

Does that give you enough sense of the Board's feelings of what we want to see there?

MR. McCANTS: Yes, sir.

MR. WRIGHT: We don't want to send you away confused.

MR. McCANTS: No, I'm not.

MR. ILDERTON: All right. Everybody in favor of the motion?

(Ewing, Harmon, Herlong, Ilderton, Reinhard, and Wright raised their hands.)

MR. ILDERTON: Everybody opposed?

(Craver raised his hand.)

MR. ILDERTON: Billy Craver was opposed. Everybody else was in favor.

2820 Middle Street, Conant residence, new

construction of a cabana. Kent?

MR. PRAUSE: This also is an accessory use building, a cabana for a pool and existing residence. It's located at 2820 Middle Street. The drawings that you have are fairly rudimentary.

And what I was trying to find out -- I thought when I looked at this earlier I saw a site plan. I see it now on the application. It shows that it's drawn -- hand-drawn in on a survey that was done June 4, 1996, but apparently it doesn't show the pool or some of the other improvements on the lot.

It's located 23 feet from Brooks Street and 21 feet from the adjacent lot, 191. And that's really all I have.

MR. ILDERTON: Okay. Does the applicant have anything to add?

MR. CONANT: Yeah. Actually, it's not 23 feet. It's 23 feet from the lot line. It's over 30 feet from Brooks Street.

MR. PRAUSE: Well, the Brooks Street right-of-way. I'll clarify that.

MR. CONANT: I just wanted to clarify that.

MR. ILDERTON: All right. Anything else you want to --

MR. CONANT: No, no.

MR. ILDERTON: Any public comment on the cabana request? Public comment section is closed.

Kent, Randy, there's nothing you need to add? Board discussion. Duke, what do you think?

MR. WRIGHT: I'm okay with it. My only comment again is I think we need to get better information to make a decision on. This is pretty basic as Kent says.

But I walked over this property today over there, and I think it's going to be okay in terms of compatibility with the neighborhood, and I haven't heard any objection so I'm okay with it.

MR. ILDERTON: I am also okay with the application. Steve?

MR. HERLONG: I'm okay with the concept of this application. I think based on the drawings -- I don't want -- I've seen this happen before. I think Randy has accepted certain drawings, and there's no way to know whether this is going to be a compatible, good-looking structure. It appears that it might be, but it's just hard to

tell by the drawings.

But I do feel like it's a small -- it's going to be a small cabana that has a level of detail that would be compatible in the neighborhood so I'm okay with it.

MR. ILDERTON: Betty?

MS. HARMON: I need -- it's a nice design, and I walked through the property. Are there going to be breakaway walls? Are there going to be -- what kind of walls is it going to be?

MR. CONANT: Yes, ma'am. It'll be the same walls that I have in the basement in the bottom of the house, the one-by-sixes with one-inch spacing. Just in the back of it, not in the front. The back would just be to buffer from Brooks Street.

MS. HARMON: So you're not going to enclose the whole area, just the back?

MR. CONANT: No. Just the back side, and then 3 feet in on each side.

MS. HARMON: I'm fine with it.

MR. ILDERTON: Fred?

MR. REINHARD: I think the rudimentary drawings was a compliment. It's going to be hard to build this right. That bird's mouth in those rafters is so deep. I don't know how the

rafter tails are going to -- but that's a means and methods problem. Otherwise it's okay. Good luck.

MR. ILDERTON: Cyndy?

MS. EWING: I'd approve.

MR. CRAVER: I'm good with it.

MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a motion?

MR. CRAVER: I move we approve it.

MR. ILDERTON: Second? Discussion?

Everybody in favor?

(Craver, Ewing, Harmon, Herlong, Ilderton, Reinhard, and Wright raised their hands.)

MR. ILDERTON: All right. That's everybody in favor. Thank you, sir.

Number 8 is deferred, so number 9, Lot 41A, Stratos residence, new construction.

MR. STRATOS: Milton Stratos here.

MR. ILDERTON: We'll hear you in a second, Mr. Stratos.

MR. PRAUSE: It's for new construction of a residence located at -- well Lot 41A, no address on it.

MR. WRIGHT: It apparently does not have a street address.

MR. PRAUSE: We'll get them one. But the reason why they're here, it's not in a district.

They are asking for some relief with regard to the building foundation height. And they want to elevate it a little higher than what the design standard allows, and that's why they're here.

MR. ILDERTON: And we can grant that relief?

MR. PRAUSE: Correct. Of course, it's dependent upon the findings of neighborhood compatibility.

MR. ILDERTON: Right, right. Great. All right. Yes, sir?

MR. STRATOS: You've read over my pamphlet, and if we want to cover the new terminology that I've heard here today, the livability issue, certainly that's what we need. And we just want to utilize it as a garage so we can drive our vehicles underneath.

Otherwise -- and we're trying to maintain sort of the integrity of the neighborhood by keeping as much of the natural trees as we possibly can. Otherwise, we're going to have to knock more trees down and build separate garages off the side of the house.

And in terms of the symmetry, if you look at the neighborhood, most of the houses surrounding

us all have their garages underneath the home. And so we believe it certainly fits in with the compatibility of the neighborhood, and we'd ask you-all to grant it for us.

MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, sir.

Public comment? Yes, ma'am.

MS. MIDDAUGH: Susan Middaugh, 2420 Raven Drive. This is in my neighborhood. I'd just like to support the application. It is a heavily wooded lot. It's a gorgeous lot.

And we've all been concerned that when somebody built there, a lot of the trees might go and there might be a huge house. This is a very reasonable sized house. Love to see them park under the house rather than put in a separate garage and take down more trees.

And it's right across the street from Elmore Brown's house on another largely wooded lot, and it's elevated just the same. And all the houses in the neighborhood are elevated and parked underneath, so the design would be very compatible.

MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Is there anybody else that needs to comment? The public comment section is closed. Kent or Randy? Randy, you've got anything?

MR. ROBINSON: I don't have anything.

MR. ILDERTON: All right. Board discussion.

MR. WRIGHT: I hope there's no poison ivy in that lot. I walked through there today. I'll find out. But I agree with what you said, and I talked to the neighbor next door, Judith -- I don't remember her last name, and she certainly was happy to see what was going in there. And I think we should approve it as submitted.

MR. ILDERTON: All right. I guess I'll comment. Well, I think essentially the layout is fine. I think the roof really probably could be broken up in its massiveness a little bit probably without disturbing the overall design of the house hardly at all.

I think just because of the way it's drawn probably the designer could go back and do something with it. It's just a little strong, but I guess it's really -- it is heavily treed. I know. I used to live in a house catty-corner to the lot, Ms. McGuire's old lot, and there's a bunch of trees.

And I know the neighbors are very concerned about keeping the trees, and it sounds like to me the owners want to keep the trees for

both beauty and privacy. I think probably the roof could be broken up. If the neighborhood's fine with it, I guess I would be too. Steve?

MR. HERLONG: Well, it's -- I agree. I think it's great that you're -- you have basically a small footprint, small square footprint, and it does keep the trees.

I actually find it refreshing to look at an elevation where the entire eve, except for that one addition on the rear elevation, is at about 20 -- maybe less than 20 feet. And then the entire roof goes up.

So all of the second floor is almost within the roofline. And I find that that's -- it's nice to see something a little bit different on the island.

It's got a porch on 4 sides is what I see. That's going to be very nice to look at as anyone drives around the property so I'm in support of it.

MR. ILDETON: Betty?

MS. HARMON: I think it's a very nice design. I am -- I'm not in favor of these houses being up so high, but if it meets neighborhood compatibility, I'm fine with it.

MR. ILDERTON: Great. Fred?

MR. REINHARD: I think that the roof is a little bit strong as well. I'd like to see that mitigated somehow. I know that it is a principal part of the dwelling. But it just seems, the front elevation, kind of overwhelming. That's all I have.

MR. ILDERTON: Cyndy?

MS. EWING: I agree with Fred.

MR. ILDERTON: Billy?

MR. CRAVER: Lovely. I think it's fine. I'd approve it.

MR. ILDERTON: Well, do I hear a motion?

MR. CRAVER: I move we approve the application.

MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a second?

MR. WRIGHT: Second.

MR. ILDERTON: Discussion? Everybody in favor of approving?

(Craver, Harmon, Herlong, Ilderton, and Wright raised their hands.)

MR. ILDERTON: Everybody opposed?

(Ewing and Reinhard raised their hands.)

MR. ILDERTON: Fred Reinhard and
Cyndy Ewing are opposed.

MR. STRATOS: Thank you.

MR. ILDERTON: Never been built on.
Virgin territory.

MR. CRAVER: Been looking at that lot
for 20 years.

MR. ILDERTON: 2101 Pettigrew, the
Lewis residence.

MR. HERLONG: I'm going to recuse
myself from this discussion.

MR. PRAUSE: This is an application
for a final approval for the additions and
renovations to the house located at 2101 Pettigrew
Street.

It's been before you previously for a
conceptual or preliminary approval at which time
you -- the Board approved that the house be turned
around and brought closer to Pettigrew Street to
allow for additions and -- renovations to that
portion and additions to the beachside portion of
the property.

They have submitted an application before
you that -- this might be the first one that you've
seen. As you may recall, also, this one came before

you previously to be added to the list and has been added to the list as a -- I believe it was a traditional island resource.

So there is a provision in the zoning code that allows certain exemptions of up to 50 percent for impervious surface and principal building coverage and also the principal building square footage for houses that are either individually listed or in the district.

They only apply to houses that are -- only one house on the lot. If you have a second dwelling on the lot, you can't avail yourself of this opportunity.

But they are asking for relief in that regard. And there again, it's discretionary for you to allow this to happen, and you should take into consideration the concepts of neighborhood compatibility. But the percentages are actually greater than what would be allowed under a normal modification.

And they submitted drawings, floorplans and elevation drawings, and also the requested modifications. And they have given a scope of work with materials for the proposed building. And that's all I have.

MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you.

Layne?

MS. NELSON: Layne Nelson with Herlong and Associates. I'm here for Luke and Laura Lewis who could not be here tonight. They're the owners of 2101 Pettigrew. And we are, as Kent said, here for our third and hopefully final time before you.

We were given conceptual approval in January for the plans that we submitted to you with one request, that we go back and restudy the mass and scale of the second floor of the addition at the oceanside to see if we could do something to maybe reduce that scale.

We went back and talked with the Lewises. And what you see here, these are the drawings that we submitted to you in January. These are the drawings that you have before you today.

When we met with the Lewises and discussed this, we came up with a couple of ways that we thought would work very well to reduce the scale of that second floor at the oceanside.

The first and probably most important thing that we did is we brought the master bedroom from the second floor down to the first floor and

took a smaller guest bedroom that was on the first floor and put it up on the second floor in its place.

That allowed us to reduce the overall square footage of that second floor and contain most of it underneath the roof and within the dormers. The square footage you can see was taken out of the width of the home here. It's brought in this way, which allows that roofline to lower as well.

You can also see, probably in these drawings, that we've lowered the plate height just a little bit too to about 5 feet to again reduce the mass of that main roofline that's up there.

Lastly, it's pretty apparent, we took the roof off of the covered porch that was up there, and left it as an open deck. We actually reduced the depth of that porch as well, took the roof off of it, and just added kind of a gable overhang element there to provide some protection for the door.

We think that with those reductions, keeping this a very low profile, one-and-a-half story house, that it fits very well and is very compatible with the other homes that are along that stretch of beach.

I've put a little model in this

photograph for you to see. It's probably difficult for you to see from where you are, but I'll be happy to pass it up at the end if anybody would like to have a closer look at it.

And as you know, as Kent has said, we are requesting certain exemptions for percentages of this existing home. This 21 -- Section 2143, it's an exemption of the existing house if it's an historic structure.

So even though as Kent was saying the percentage, 50 percent is higher -- it's 50 percent of the existing home, not 50 percent of what's allowable on the property. So basically we're asking for these exemptions for several reasons.

When we took the square footage out of the second floor and brought it down to the first floor, we increased the size of the first floor which increases the building's footprint, stretches out that principal building coverage.

When you scale a house down to a story-and-a-half house, typically that's what's going to happen, the square footage is going to go onto the first floor and kind of spread that footprint. In this particular case, three quarters of the square footage of this house is at the first

floor which pushes it just outside of the principal building coverage and the allowable impervious coverage.

With this much square footage on the first floor, I think we've had this discussion before, that you have to get from one end to the other. It takes a little more square footage for hallways and things to go all first floor space. When you combine that with having to work within the confines of an existing historic structure and take that square footage, it just is a less efficient way to lay out the plan.

You can see here -- again, this being what we presented you in January and this being what we showed you at this particular submittal, we did rework the plan of the existing house on the interior to make it as efficient as we possibly could.

But when you take a one-and-a-half story space and link it to an existing structure, try to be as minimally invasive to that historic structure as you can, you're just going to require a little additional square footage to get from place to place.

And so I think that the town, when they

were revising the zoning ordinance, kind of recognized that when you're dealing with an existing structure, you're creating a little bit more of a design challenge.

And they made provisions with this Section 2143 for you to be able to help us as design professionals create something that is both usable for a family, but is also compatible with the neighborhood, in this instance and in many instances here, that story-and-a-half structure that works so well in these neighborhoods.

I'm hoping that you've all had a chance to read Section 2143 and its purpose. I think that up until now we've been a little behind the learning curve. We've been coming to you with all of these projects and requesting the standard DRB relief. I think the Board has even expressed concern that so many projects are coming before you asking for DRB relief.

I think there are two main reasons for that, the first being that many of the homes that you see actually lie outside of an historic district and wouldn't be brought before you at all except that they're asking for that relief.

The second reason is that I think we, as

architects and design professionals, really didn't understand the purpose behind this new section which allows an exemption for the design challenge of working with an historic structure.

Consequently, what's been happening is that new homes that are seeking relief are being lumped together with historic homes in need of exemptions because of the design challenges that they create.

In this particular case, we feel like the exemptions are justified in that we are dealing with an historic structure. And the fact that we've made attempts to address concerns that the Board brought up at our conceptual review to try and reduce the mass of the second floor, we've pulled that square footage to the first floor.

That and the fact that we've made, you know, some pretty nice attempts to design a home around an existing historic structure, be minimally invasive to that structure, and still make it work for a family of three.

Of the 50 percent that you are allowed to grant, we are asking for you to exempt 17 percent of the existing home's principal building square footage, 13 percent of the existing home's principal

building coverage, and 3 percent of the existing home's impervious coverage.

And with this submittal, we are asking for final approval of the drawings as we've submitted them with those exemptions, which are outlined in the submittal as well.

MR. ILDEBERTON: Great. Thank you.
Public comment? Yes, sir?

MR. CARR: My name is Tom Carr, and I live on Pettigrew Street. This house has no affect on our visibility nor is there any reason for me to stand except to make a more philosophic statement which may be impudent, but it's not going to be frivolous.

I think you've got an impossible job because the charter we have given you -- I guess, we, the citizens, have given you -- I think I was the one that got up a few years ago and said that the Board of Architectural Review in Charleston had driven me nuts, and we'd had a problem with them for years. But I look back on it, it was a great experience.

Because here we have a 300-year-old city, which is the most beautiful city, most livable city in the United States, so there was some merit to an

individual group of citizens taking a look at the quality, the style of architecture.

And that's what we're asking you to do is not to go over the details of square footage, of design construction materials, but rather start with the way I started when I came here in 1946. There was something that was known as a Sullivan's Island house, and everybody knew what that was. It was beautiful. It was compatible. It was livable. It was a beach house, simply.

I challenge you to read the New York Times today and to tell me what a Sullivan's Island house now is. In fact, the last article I saw not long ago had called megamansions and things like that. And I think we have begun to fail in a way.

It was a great move on our part, I think, to convene this Board because you've got a charter that goes way beyond the square footage, way beyond the building materials. It goes to the taste of an eclectic community. And that, to me, is a far more important kind of a job.

The words massive, ugly, incompatible shouldn't even exist on Sullivan's Island, and yet they do. Somehow, some things have slipped between the cracks because people focus too much on

materials and square footage and not enough on how the house fits the rest of the community.

I love to hear General Wright and others say they have walked the territory. Wow. Is that important for a review board to get out of here and go out there and stand as you were a neighbor and take a look at what things are going to look like.

I can't say much else except that I hope you continue to do exactly what you're doing, which is to go beyond those things. I haven't -- I've never even seen the plan of this house. I'm sure it's fine. Wow.

I do have a vested interest because my house is this one -- well, nobody's seen this house. My house is two houses to the right, and it is the model for the house you're now considering. My house is considerably bigger, and we did add a very small third floor. But that is an exact duplicate except for the scale of my house.

MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, sir.

MR. CARR: End of statement. Sorry to talk so long.

MR. ILDERTON: Is there anybody else that would like to speak for or against the application? I've got a letter to read from the

adjacent neighbor.

As the immediate neighbor to the east of 2101 Pettigrew Street, I'm writing concerning the proposed changes and alterations to which you are now considering to that property. In the minutes of your February 17, 2007 meeting, 2101 Pettigrew was added to the list of historic properties designated as a traditional island resource.

To that end, common sense would dictate that the final structure after additions, alterations, and demolition should be recognizable as the original. Otherwise, why have historic designations in the first place?

I would also draw your attention to the ordinance that does not allow the demolition of structures over 50 years old unless they have no historic value. I would argue that allowing changes to an existing structure over 50 years old, such that it is no longer recognizable as the original property, is tantamount to demolition. In my opinion, this should not be allowed.

The five houses on the south side of Pettigrew between Stations 21 and 22, all built around the same by the same contractor, represent individually and collectively an excellent example

of architecture admired by early island dwellers that should be preserved.

The house across the street from my own, 2105 Pettigrew, owned by Les Robinson, is a good example of a new home that is compatible with older neighbors.

Your charge as the committee is to see that neighborhood compatibility does exist. For example, all the chimneys on the five Pettigrew beachfront houses are brick, but the proposed changes to 2101 specify stucco or tabby chimneys.

Obviously I don't expect the owners of 2101 to preserve the existing brick chimney or to relace plans for a stucco chimney or tabby chimney with a new brick one. However, the point is that it's important to note not just the changes in style, such as rooflines, but in materials.

To preserve the integrity of Sullivan's Island beach houses old and new, it is crucial to consider all aspects of a design. And while allowing for new ideas and progress to draw the line wherever new houses or alterations fail to respect the spirit of the island's traditional architecture.

My fear as a neighbor is that the plans to improve 2101 Pettigrew may not be compatible or

in keeping with the flavor of the street.

As you know, Sullivan's Island is regarded as a unique and beautiful place. National publicity that draws attention to the island focuses on old style houses.

Houses on other islands in South Carolina as well as up and down the eastern coast look virtually identical to each other. We should not strive -- should we not strive to preserve our uniqueness? Downtown Charleston itself should serve as an example in this regard.

Please carefully weigh your decisions as they set precedence that we will have to live with for a long time to come. Sincerely, Wayne Guckenberger, 2105 Pettigrew Street.

Public section is closed. Kent, do you have anything to add?

MR. PRAUSE: No.

MR. ILDERTON: Randy?

MR. ROBINSON: Yeah, I've got a couple things. I looked at the plan, and I just -- don't all the rest of the houses on this block have screened porches, and this one's wide open?

And there are just some things about the front of this house that I look at that I'm just not

convinced it's there. And my comment is, it's a Steve Herlong house, not a Blanchard house.

And I know we're trying to get where we don't use exactly what was there before, but I just don't feel like it's back to -- it's going to fit in on that block so well.

MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you.
All right. Board consideration. Billy?

MR. CRAVER: I think they've done what we asked them to do. I mean I think that from what's on the right to what's on the left -- I'm fine with it. I would approve it.

MR. ILDERTON: Cyndy?

MS. EWING: I agree with Randy. I feel that -- I was against the changes that we allowed to get to this point, and I really feel that -- and I've gotten -- I'd like to also add -- I don't know if anybody else -- I had numerous phone calls from other homeowners on Pettigrew just before the meeting. And they were -- it would not be too much to say that they were frantic about what is being done, and they're very, very concerned, and they could not be at this meeting.

So I think it's getting -- I think the design is getting there. I think we need to really

work much harder -- because again, you know, we started out -- this is what we started out with. This is a very, very important view on the island. This is what everybody that leaves the beach sees now and has seen for -- since 19 -- what is it, 1930, when these houses were built? 1926.

And I think we need to really make -- we need to be very, very careful because this -- the Pettigrew block -- we discussed this before -- is the only block of homes that still exists that you can stand on the beach and see Sullivan's Island the way it was.

And as the -- I mean the design is getting better, but I would not feel comfortable approving. I think we need to work on the design more to have it a lower profile.

One question is, how high is this elevated? How much higher is it elevated than the house as it stands now?

MS. NELSON: It's not.

MS. EWING: It's at the same elevation?

MS. NELSON: It's at the same elevation.

MS. EWING: Okay.

MR. ILDERTON: Fred?

MR. REINHARD: Well, you know, I was adamant about making sure that the existing house deferred to the Pettigrew elevation, and I think that they have accomplished that very well.

I like the -- well, it's clipped off of that particular picture on the lower left-hand corner. But where you could see someone walking down the street, and the sight line is such that you really don't see the roof of the new structure on the beachside. So you've done a good job of accomplishing that.

I like the way the second floor has been diminished and is laid out. And I guess my final statement is, you're 494 square feet away from an approval from me. I think you need to find that 500 square feet.

MR. ILDERTON: Betty?

MS. HARMON: I was not at the January meeting, and I must admit that I was just astonished that this building got to be turned 180 degrees. I would not have voted for that at all. It's a nice design, but it -- for me, it does not meet neighborhood compatibility on that street.

And secondly, because you are at an

addition to a historic house, you get to get 50 percent more, and yet you're back asking for addition to that, and I think that's too much. I think you've already had enough square footage, and then you're requesting more.

MS. NELSON: We don't get anything additional for being an addition. Only if you grant us the exemption do we get anything. We're held to --

MS. HARMON: Has that been granted?

MS. NELSON: No. That's one of the reasons we're here tonight. No. We're held to the same standards as anyone.

MS. HARMON: I would not vote to approve this.

MR. ILDERTON: I think the owner and the architect -- the problem is they've come before us once, and we've given them some sort of direction and some sort of tacit approval on some basis, but not approval. So they've come back. And I think the effort when they came back was pretty much under our direction, what we were hoping.

Now, the increase to the square footage perhaps was not addressed last time, and I think the overall idea though of bringing the house down and

making it less vertical and more in keeping with what's there was met.

I would like to see some discussion with the adjacent property owners to see if there's anything they would like, just as a good neighbor kind of address, a brick chimney or whatever. I think it always -- almost all these cases could bear that, discussing with the property owners and discussing various details to where it might make it somewhat more palatable to them.

But I think I would probably approve this because I feel like we've sort of given them tacit approval on the front-end. So that's where I am I guess.

MR. WRIGHT: I think we've -- we did address and approve the preliminary design of this with some contingencies and questions, and I think they've come back and answered those. I agree with Fred. I think if you could reduce the size of the house to some degree, it would make me more comfortable.

But I think the lower profile -- and if you drive it -- I rode up and down Pettigrew today two or three times to try to get a grasp of what this means.

And I don't think it changes the streetscape as you go by that much. And I think the profile from the beach, it looks fine the way it's been done. I could go with it if you would promise me you'd try to reduce some of the square footage.

MR. CRAVER: Can I ask a question? Am I reading this right? So the house is 3,900 square feet?

MS. NELSON: Uh-huh.

MR. CRAVER: So it's not a big house.

MS. NELSON: Huh-uh.

MR. CRAVER: How big is that house -- Pat, didn't you add onto the house at the end there? How many square feet is that house?

MR. ILDERTON: I really don't know. It's probably somewhere in the neighborhood of 4,000 or maybe larger. I really don't know how big that house is. Steve did the drawing, but I don't know.

MR. CRAVER: I just am -- I'm sitting here going, okay. This isn't a massive house by any stretch of the imagination. And so we said, make the top floor smaller so that it reduces the mass, and they've done that. And that's added to the -- for them to get what they reasonably want is added to the bottom.

This isn't a 5,000-square-foot house. It's a 4,000-square-foot house. And you've got the whole beach in front of -- I mean it's not like the -- it's not like this house is somehow overpowering everything.

MR. ILDERTON: And part of the difficulty is they are preserving the original structure, even though they are turning it around. Meaning preserving the idea of the original structure. Meaning they're not putting the square footage on top of that structure or in that roofline.

MR. CRAVER: Right.

MR. ILDERTON: That roofline is sort of -- the second floor square footage is above the new section, not on top of the old section, which I think is a consideration. Meaning on the streetscape, you still -- it still has that sort of single-story look which is something.

MR. CRAVER: Yeah. I just -- I'm having a hard time -- if we were going -- if they were asking to go from a 4,200-square-foot house to a 4,700-square-foot house, I might be sitting there going, no, I think 4,000 square feet in that area is enough. But it's not out of -- it's not out of

whack with the rest of the houses there.

MR. ILDERTON: Well, those X amount of square feet taken out from underneath the house, that has removed a living area, removed from in the flood zone, in a flood area from underneath the house. It is there now, but is to be taken out.

MR. CRAVER: Because they're the 50 percent rule?

MR. ILDERTON: Well, that and -- yeah, essentially.

MS. EWING: They didn't want it.

MR. ILDERTON: And the design.

MS. NELSON: It's noncompliant with the flood guidelines.

MS. EWING: See, I completely disagree. I think that the square footage on the house was -- well, I'll tell you exactly what it is. The square footage is about -- is it 1,900 that it started?

MS. NELSON: I'm not exactly sure what the original. I can tell you -- well, actually it is here. If you look at the calculations for the percentage here, the existing house -- well, that doesn't -- the existing house, principal building square footage is 2,940 square feet. But that does

not include that ground floor square footage.

And just as a note, this lot is about 4/10, less than 4/10 of an acre, so it's a little bit smaller than the standard lot is, which limits the allowable square footage somewhat on this lot as well.

MR. CRAVER: But you're not crowded by a house on the beachside, which would add to the massing issue.

MS. EWING: Wait. I'm -- back to this square footage. I've got -- okay. What is the -- because the square footage with the basement that was enclosed was --

MS. NELSON: I don't know that.

MS. EWING: Was 3,100 square feet.

MS. HARMON: That includes the bottom floor?

MS. NELSON: That includes the ground floor square footage?

MS. EWING: Uh-huh. Including proposed addition.

MS. HARMON: And you said that this did not include the square footage of the ground floor.

MS. NELSON: But that doesn't add up

right.

MS. EWING: This is from 2002, a calculation on Pettigrew from the original owners, a survey.

Anyway, my concern is that the homes that are in here on this street, again, they're -- this home -- we need to be very, very careful because -- I mean these homes are not 4,000 square feet that are in the neighborhood. They're just not.

And Billy pointed to the one house that's been renovated and is much, much larger. And if you look at it on the scale of the -- from the beach, it way overpowers the rest of the line.

And based on -- I'll tell you, the neighbors -- I have been getting phone calls, and the people could not be here tonight. But the neighbors are not happy about this. They're very, very concerned.

And I think this Board -- it would be to our advantage and to the island's advantage and for neighborhood compatibility if we deferred this and took another 30 days. And if you -- and let the neighbors work on this with the architects so that something comes up where they're more comfortable, and the whole island will be more comfortable.

Because again, this is a -- talk about high visibility. I mean it doesn't get more visible than standing on the beach and looking. And I'll tell you -- that's my feeling.

MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a motion?

MR. WRIGHT: Excuse me. I have a question. Cyndy, are you saying that what you're hearing is that the neighbors are not opposed to the project, they're opposed to the design as it is?

MS. EWING: What I'm hearing is, the neighbors have great concern. They have not seen the design. They can't believe that -- I mean what they're -- I'm just saying that they have great concern, and they do not want large, and they are not happy with what they're hearing.

And I think based on -- I was not happy with what this Board decided in the last meeting. And I just feel that I personally am not going to approve this tonight, and I would urge my fellow Board members to just have some patience and to take a step back. And to -- again, for neighborhood compatibility -- maybe you haven't gotten the phone calls that I've gotten on this.

MR. WRIGHT: Let me ask again, but it's not the addition to the house. It's not the

project. It's the design that you're hearing about?

MS. EWING: I think --

MR. WRIGHT: Is that what you're hearing?

MS. EWING: I think you need to hear from the people that could not be here tonight. I had someone call me from Seattle, Washington, and say, I'm sorry. My granddaughter just had a baby. I could not be at this meeting.

MR. ILDERTON: Well, let's make a motion here. Let's move on with this.

MR. WRIGHT: I'm serious. I mean my question is still not answered.

MR. CRAVER: I have a real concern about sitting here and having -- and saying that people have gotten calls from neighbors. The neighbor either needs to write a letter or needs to be here.

AUDIENCE: We're here.

MR. CRAVER: For my part -- well, and that's fine. And when we have the public session and you have an opportunity to speak, then speak. But Cyndy, I'm sorry. I can't give any credibility to hearsay from somebody who's not here or doesn't submit something in writing.

I mean that's just not fair to the applicant, to the process. That's why we put signs out and do that whole thing. I think if somebody's got input, they need to either be here or send something in writing or something, but I don't think we just keep deferring because somebody might come to the next meeting. I just don't think that's fair to the applicant.

MR. ILDERTON: Well, this was on the agenda -- and like you say, we did hear this once, and it was well-publicized on our tacit -- or on whatever we approved the last time. So that is a point to be taken.

MS. HARMON: Can I say one thing, excuse me, before that? My brother-in-law, Frank Harmon, is an architect and an environmentalist. He's an environmentalist first. And if you saw that Luxury magazine that came out -- Luxury Living -- about two weeks ago, he had a wonderful article in there.

And he says that his main worry now is that people like big houses for status symbols, and he wants to educate the people that you can have a fine house without having to have it so big, and that's what his design is in that magazine if you

get it. If you can find it, please read it because it's a wonderful article.

MS. NELSON: I'll look for it.

MS. HARMON: And that's what my feeling is about living on Sullivan's. It's the environment, and it doesn't -- you know, we've never had huge houses over here. And now because everybody wants a, I mean, status symbol, we've got these huge houses.

MR. ILDERTON: I will say the house across the street from Les Robinson's house is 4,000 square feet. That was held up as representative, so point made. But let's make a motion. Anybody want to make a point?

MR. CRAVER: I move we approve the project as submitted and requested.

MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a second?

MR. WRIGHT: I second.

MR. ILDERTON: All right.

Discussion?

MR. CRAVER: Yeah. I do have one point of discussion I -- and Fred, you said you're 494 square feet. So is it the principal building coverage, or is it the square footage of the house that's an issue?

MR. REINHARD: It is the square footage of the house, principal building square footage.

MR. CRAVER: Okay. So it would be 384 square feet.

MR. REINHARD: Well, that's not what's listed on this.

MS. NELSON: It's 494.

MS. HARMON: It's 494.

MS. NELSON: Principal building square footage.

MR. CRAVER: -- is right here, and that's 384. You're asking for 384.

MS. NELSON: You're right. I transposed the numbers on this one.

MR. CRAVER: So it's 384 square feet difference, not 500 square feet difference.

MR. REINHARD: That is correct.

MR. CRAVER: It's 11 percent difference in the square footage.

MS. NELSON: Thank you.

MR. CRAVER: I really think they've done a very good job of making this thing work, and I just think we ought to approve it. I know we're not going to get a unanimous vote on this thing.

MR. ILDERTON: Well, everybody in favor of the motion raise their hand.

(Craver, Ilderton, and Wright raised their hands.)

MR. ILDERTON: Everybody opposed?

(Ewing, Harmon, and Reinhard raised their hands.)

MR. ILDERTON: All right. It does not pass. Duke Wright, Pat Ilderton, and Billy Craver for; and Fred and Betty and Cyndy against. Okay. Great. So it does not pass.

MS. NELSON: Can I ask, as design input, there were comments made that the design was not there yet. I've heard about the square footage, but where in the design are you looking for us to go?

MS. HARMON: Turn it back around.

MR. REINHARD: I won't go for that.

MS. HARMON: That's just my suggestion.

MS. NELSON: These clients have been through --

MR. REINHARD: I'll give you some input. I've already said it. It's in the record, but it was the wrong number because I was reading

off the wrong sheet. If you knock off 384 square feet, I'll approve it.

MS. NELSON: I get the square footage, but the comments, the other comments were the design was not there yet.

MR. REINHARD: I didn't make that.

MS. NELSON: I know you didn't.

MR. CRAVER: I think that's your issue.

MS. NELSON: It's solely square footage, not design. So the design, as it stands, we're okay to stay with it if we can just reduce some of the square footage.

MR. REINHARD: Well, there are mixed opinions on that.

MR. CRAVER: You're not going to get unanimity on this one. So if you're looking for 4 votes --

MS. NELSON: If I can adjust the design and bring the square footage down, I'm getting closer to that. And I guess my question is, for those of the Board members who are concerned about the design, I'd like for you to feel as comfortable as you can with the design. And I'm looking for direction, guidance, in where this

design should go from here.

MS. EWING: The only thing I can say would be have some conversations with the neighbors, and that would be my strongest -- I mean these people feel very, very strongly. And I think it's a good way to -- it's a good process to go to the neighbors and let them say --

MR. REINHARD: If they're here, let's hear from them.

MR. ILDETON: Well, we've already had discussion. We've already had public comment. We've already read letters. We're already through that. We've already had a vote.

I think it would be great if you did talk to the neighbors and all and reduced whatever you could, square-footage wise. I think that's probably the path to take.

The next application is 412 Station 14, Cook residence, new construction. Steve Herlong recuses himself from this.

Kent, what do we got?

MR. PRAUSE: This is a request for final approval for new house construction at 412 Station 14 Street. They were here previously for a final approval; however, the Board felt a bit

reluctant at that time to give a final approval and asked them to go back and make a few changes which they have made and are back here tonight for final approval.

MR. ILDERTON: Yes, sir?

MR. HENSHAW: I'm Jim Henshaw with Herlong Architects and representing Tim Cook who's here tonight. As Kent -- well, Kent didn't mention, the house is not in the historic district. And at the last meeting, the March DRB meeting, when the home was in preliminary approval, we were asked by the Board to come back with two additional pieces of information when we came back this month for final approval.

The first was the dimensions on the plans, which I think you'll see in the packet. And second was to study the garage and to make sure that it was not an accessory structure, and it was indeed part of the house. We had to confirm some flood zone requirements.

And since that time, we went and talked to Randy and Kent and altered the design slightly. And you'll see on the east side and the south elevation in your packet, that we -- instead of a solid brick wall, we made brick piers with breakaway

lattice in between those. And Kent and Randy seemed to be okay with that design.

It also clarifies that the garage is actually a part of the house and not an accessory structure.

There was also a discussion at the last meeting about the view from Station 14, and that's why we did this perspective sketch of the view from Station 14. And if you'd like me to pass that around, I will. It might be hard to see from there.

MS. HARMON: I would like to see it up closer.

MR. HENSHAW: But that sketch really illustrates how the overall massing and the design are very compatible with the street and illustrates a very comfortable pedestrian scale.

And lastly -- and this wasn't really a part of our charge as we left the meeting last month. But we've continued over the past month to study the materials and the systems of the house including further research of the materials and the systems that will increase the sustainability of the house and also decrease the energy consumption.

Again, I know that wasn't a charge, but we felt that a larger home deserved to be studied a

little bit more and made sure that the energy consumption was reduced such as insulating the building envelope, studying the heating and cooling systems, the lighting, and the interior finishes, things of that nature.

And based on the approval that we received last month, the preliminary approval and the satisfaction of the Board's request that we just illustrated, we're requesting final approval for the design we've shown you.

MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you. Is there any public comment on this? Yes, sir?

MR. BOEHM: I'm Paul Boehm at 3209 Middle Street. I'm just jealous that I wasn't the one who got to build this house. It's absolutely fantastic. You guys did an extraordinary job.

MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, sir. Anybody else? Public comment section is closed. Kent, anything to add?

MR. PRAUSE: No.

MR. ILDERTON: Randy?

MR. ROBINSON: The only thing I have is that this garage that's up on the street is just not a part of this process. So you-all need to come back and ask for approval on that. Otherwise, it's

pretty much --

MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you.

Duke?

MR. WRIGHT: The questions I had last time have been answered.

MR. ILDERTON: I don't have a problem with the application. Betty?

MS. HARMON: I guess I'm trying to figure -- the second floor garage, does that open into the second floor main building.

MR. HENSHAW: There will be an access to get to that area above the garage for storage.

MS. HARMON: So it will be accessed from the main house?

MR. HENSHAW: I believe so. I believe so.

MR. ILDERTON: Fred?

MR. REINHARD: It's a beautiful house. There is a request in here for a variance allowing it to go up 21 percent principal building square footage, but it's not in a historic area, and it's on a lot that could sustain a little bit larger house. And I don't want you to think that I'm going to vote against everything that comes in and asks for a variance, so I'm okay with it.

MR. ILBERTON: Cyndy?

MS. EWING: The space above the garage and on the third floor here, will they -- are those areas that can be built out in the future? These are FROGs or what are they called? Bonus rooms? Is that what this is?

MR. HENSHAW: Again, I think it's illustrated on the plans. A lot of the systems of the house, because the house is so low to the ground, are going in the attic spaces, and it's also serving as storage.

MS. EWING: Right. I just want to know if potentially these could be built out. Are these FROGs or bonus rooms?

MR. HENSHAW: They're not classified as FROGs or bonus rooms. They're classified as storage and mechanical space and system space, I guess, is the term.

MR. PRAUSE: That's something we'll just have to keep an eye on because they've maxed out on the amount of heated space that they can have. But these types of uses lend themselves very easily to be finished without permits.

But as the Board mentioned at the last meeting, that's not really their function, to deal

with those issues. Those are more Randy and my function to deal with from a code enforcement perspective. But we both mentioned that as a consideration at the last meeting. It's just something we'll have to deal with if indeed it occurs.

MS. HARMON: That's why I asked if the storage over the garage entered into the house, the main part of the house.

MR. PRAUSE: It does, yes.

MS. EWING: I just -- I have a concern that what we're approving is something that will set a precedent. And we're again, going to start seeing the -- because it's a way to -- because if they add this, I think the house will be over 6,000 square feet if it's built out. And I have a concern on that because it's not staying in the guidelines.

MR. ILDERTON: Billy?

MR. CRAVER: I would approve it as it is. I'll make the same point I made before about that is, we have to assume that people that say something is going to be storage will keep it as storage, and that they aren't going to violate the law.

And if they do, then that's Kent and Randy's issue to determine that they've done something without a permit. I'm not going to assume they're going to do something wrong.

MS. EWING: I'm not either, but houses do get sold.

MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a motion?

MR. REINHARD: Move for approval.

MR. ILDERTON: Second?

MR. CRAVER: Second.

MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor?

(Craver, Harmon, Herlong, Ilderton, Reinhard, and Wright raised their hands.)

MR. ILDERTON: Opposed?

(Ewing raised her hand.)

MR. ILDERTON: All right. Thank you, sir.

1620 Atlantic Avenue, Downs residence, accessory structure. Kent, where are we at?

MR. PRAUSE: Another accessory use, which I'm not really sure what it is.

MR. ROBINSON: Maybe I can better -- this was a structure, an existing structure. There was an existing structure, a low flat roof kind of structure that housed some pool equipment.

And the contractor went and started -- well, he said he felt he got a permit to do this, but we didn't understand that the permit that was issued was to also do this repair of this structure.

So I noticed it being built, so I stopped work on it, told them they needed to come to you-all for approval.

MR. REINHARD: It was existing?

MR. ROBINSON: It was existing, but it was much shorter. It was probably about a few feet tall. It was just something to house the pool equipment.

MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you.

Applicant? Yes, sir?

MR. DOWNS: I'm Bruce Downs. I'm the applicant. And I think Randy pretty much described it. I came in to get a permit to do several different things on the house. And maybe I wasn't paying enough attention when I spoke with Kat because I said, I need to replace this.

And that's the only thing it houses. I mean it literally just barely covers the pool pump, and that's it. I mean literally, it's this wide. I gave you a picture of it.

And I said, replace; she said, repair.

And so anyway. I replaced it. Randy came by and said, hey, we didn't give you a permit for this. You've got to fill out all this. So anyway, here I am. There it is.

MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, sir.

That's what we've come to on this island. All right.

Any public comment? Public comment section is closed. Al right. What do we think?

MR. WRIGHT: I have a question. On this drawing it shows, proposed screen porch. Is that related to this?

MR. DOWNS: That's already there.

MR. ROBINSON: The site plan was received by me, and I gave it to him to use for the previous project.

MR. ILDERTON: Billy?

MR. CRAVER: I'd approve it.

MR. ILDERTON: Cyndy?

MS. EWING: I don't have a problem.

MR. ILDERTON: Fred?

MR. REINHARD: Good job, Randy.

We're counting on you, buddy.

MR. ILDERTON: Betty?

MS. HARMON: I'm fine.

MR. ILDERTON: Steve?

MR. HERLONG: I'm fine with it.

MR. ILDERTON: I'm fine with it.

Duke?

MR. WRIGHT: I'm fine with it.

MR. ILDERTON: All right. Everybody
in favor?

(Craver, Ewing, Harmon, Herlong,
Ilderton, Reinhard, and Wright raised their hands.)

MR. ILDERTON: 2850 I'on, Martin
residence, withdrawn.

Okay. 2402 Jasper Boulevard, McSweeney
residence.

MR. PRAUSE: This is for an addition
to the house located at 2402 Jasper Boulevard. It
is listed, individually listed, on our survey.
Built in approximately 1920. There is a new
600-square-foot garage proposed and also a
976-square-foot addition to the side of the existing
residence. We have floor plans, pictures, and
elevation drawings for what's proposed. No floor
plans. Site plan and elevation.

MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you.
Applicant?

MS. ALLEN: Elizabeth Allen with

Allen Design here on behalf of the homeowner who is also here, Gray McSweeney. Basically what we're asking to do is fairly simple.

We're first asking to raise the home above base flood elevation 2 feet from where it currently sits which will put it only 2 inches -- its porch only 2 inches higher than the porch of the house next door.

In addition to that, we are also adding -- asking to add 976 square feet of living area. Most of it is in a master bedroom addition. If you're looking at the front of the house, to the right. And a small portion of it is at the back left corner in a new bathroom off of an existing bedroom in the existing house.

In pulling those additions in, we are trying to tie in with the existing architecture of the house and absolutely preserve the integrity of what is there right now.

And replacing some of the fenestration along the front where there's a door that needs to become a window and some windows on the front where we're going to relocate the kitchen on the interior. So we're doing a little bit of modifications to the front there and adding shutters down the Station 24

side for a little bit of a buffer from that side of the house to that street.

And then we're also requesting to construct an accessory garage at the rear corner of the lot. And as you can see, the current house doesn't meet some of the zoning standards as far as setbacks goes. We are not increasing any of those nonconformities and looking at the footprint trying to maintain the integrity of the historic structure as much as possible.

MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Public comment? Yes, ma'am?

MS. ELLIOTT: My name is Amy Elliott. My family owns the house at 2320 Jasper Boulevard across Station 24 Street, and I've looked at the plans, and we have no objections.

MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, ma'am. Is there anybody that needs to comment? Public comment section is closed. Anything you need to add, Kent?

MR. PRAUSE: No.

MR. ROBINSON: Just again, with this garage, I don't see any plans with that garage. So they probably need to come back before you-all.

MR. ILDERTON: Right. Thanks. Duke?

MR. WRIGHT: I'm on the fence right

now because this is a highly visible cottage on Sullivan's Island on Jasper Boulevard. Even though the addition is low profile, I have -- it bothers me to see a change like this to this house.

But I'm not saying I'm bothered enough to flat reject it. I just have some concerns so I've got to think about it.

MR. ILDERTON: All right. Well, we're going to run down the line here. I really don't have a problem with it. I probably would like to see maybe some of the windows, as opposed to doubles -- I think I'm seeing right. In addition, the mold together windows might look better separated and all.

And maybe the roofline, in that long roofline of the addition, could be broken up with something somehow. But other than that, it's not -- you know, it's fine by me. Steve?

MR. HERLONG: Well, I see that you're raising it slightly just to get above flood. I'm assuming that's a flood zone issue, right?

MS. ALLEN: Correct, correct.

MR. HERLONG: And I don't think that's raising it too much, and I'm assuming that allows you to now be compliant.

MS. ALLEN: Correct. It allows us to be compliant with flood, but we are not raising it above the ordinance requirements nor are we trying to raise it to park underneath. We're just trying to get it out of flood plane.

MR. HERLONG: I think that's a big dilemma for anyone that has a house that's below flood, with insurance issues. That's always going to be a huge dilemma, and I think in this case, it will still retain its character with that additional 2 foot of height.

And I really -- I don't have a problem -- I don't see that from the street or from a public space I'm seeing any major change to the scale of the home. I think I could agree with Pat's comment about that east side, I believe, the long facade could possibly be broken up along that east side.

And as a detail the linked roof comes up above that wing by a few inches, and I would think you'd want to adjust the pitch so that you don't see that linked roof just missing the addition. And I agree with Pat's comments about the windows as well. That's all.

MR. ILDERTON: Betty?

MS. HARMON: I agree with what Pat

and Steve have said. I do have a problem with raising the house. It's a historic house, and I hate to see it raised. And I appreciate that it's only 2 feet, believe me. I appreciate that fact, but I have a problem with raising it.

MR. ILDERTON: Fred?

MR. REINHARD: I'm not crazy about the new master bath gabled addition, which would be on the Jasper Boulevard facade. That whole front facade of that nice house, you don't see any gables. You see just the pitch of the roof. I don't mind them on the back of the house, but it just seems a little incongruent on the front.

And to put side-by-side double hung windows on that mitigates the problem -- not mitigates it, but exasperates it because there are no side-by-side double hungs on that front facade. And that is a bathroom, so one would question why you need that much fenestration over the bathtub.

I'm just not comfortable with that elevation. I'm okay with the back elevation, the infill and the extension. But that gable on the front bothers me.

MR. ILDERTON: Cyndy?

MS. EWING: Actually, the gable -- I

think it's very nice, and it's always great to see design come in like this where you're keeping it pretty much the same. It seems as if any addition could be taken off, and you'd still have the old home preserved so that's really great.

Raising it, I don't have a problem with that. My concerns are with the window in the false window walls. Are those -- how are those going to be treated?

MS. ALLEN: That face the front and the side on the existing corner of the house?

MS. EWING: Uh-huh.

MS. ALLEN: Well, there are existing windows there right now.

MS. EWING: Actually, I'm looking at a different elevation, the eastern end of the island, the new addition on the master bedroom, those false windows.

MS. ALLEN: Yeah. Those will be like shiplap siding in an attempt to break up the mass of that wall.

MS. EWING: But filled in? As if there were windows there and then you filled them in.

MS. ALLEN: Yes.

MS. EWING: Okay. There's no way you can just put a fake -- put a regular window and seal it up? I've seen that done before.

MS. ALLEN: Well, they could be false shutters there instead of siding if that makes you a little bit more comfortable.

MS. EWING: Something just to work on it a little better. That would be my -- that's one of my concerns. And then your -- on the street side elevation, you're going to take those double -- those wonderful double windows and change them?

MS. ALLEN: Yes. And the ones that are -- there are double windows towards the front of the house, and we are going to change those to singles which are in keeping with the other single windows on that side of the house in order to facilitate creating an additional bathroom inside the house and not having to expand any further, trying to work within the footprint as much as we can of the existing structure.

MS. EWING: Okay. Again, that's something if you could work with that and maybe do something with just building over those windows because that is -- you see that every day when you drive by. It's a -- anyway, otherwise, there's a

lot that's great about this.

MR. ILDERTON: Billy?

MR. CRAVER: I like it. I didn't see anything about it that bothered me. I'm not quite as -- got quite as much of the architectural flair as you guys have, but it works for me.

MR. ILDERTON: And this is for preliminary approval, right? Is that what it's coming for?

MR. CRAVER: I would give it preliminary approval.

MR. ILDERTON: It's preliminary. So they can take the comments they've heard and come back. Do I hear a motion?

MS. HARMON: I'll make a motion to approve it as a preliminary design.

MS. ALLEN: Approved as submitted?

MS. HARMON: Preliminary design.

MR. ILDERTON: And I think you're going to want to take into consideration these comments. Because, I think, if it comes back just like this, it may have a problem.

MS. HARMON: It's a preliminary.

MS. EWING: I second.

MR. ILDERTON: Discussion?

MR. HERLONG: The one you'll probably want to do is deal with the garage as Randy said.

MS. ALLEN: Yeah. We'll show you elevations of that next go around. No problem.

MS. HARMON: And don't forget the building materials being it's a historic house.

MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor?

(Craver, Ewing, Harmon, Herlong, Ilderton, Reinhard, and Wright raised their hands.)

MR. ILDERTON: We're done? I want to stay here another hour or two. The meeting is adjourned.

(The meeting was concluded at 8:23 p.m.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, TERI L. HORIHAN, Court Reporter in South Carolina at Large, do hereby certify that I correctly reported the within-entitled matter and that the foregoing is a full, true and correct transcription of my shorthand notes of the testimony and/or other oral proceedings had in the said matter.

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

Witness my hand, I have hereunto affixed my official seal this 8th day of May, 2007, at Charleston, Charleston County, South Carolina.

TERI L. HORIHAN

Court Reporter

My Commission Expires 1/17/2017