

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

MEETING OF
SULLIVAN'S ISLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

DATE: AUGUST 15, 2007
TIME: 6:00 P.M.
LOCATION: Sullivan's Island Town Hall
1610 Middle St.
Sullivan's Island, SC

REPORTED BY:
WANDA S. BUCKNER
NCRA Registered Professional Reporter
NCRA Certified Realtime Reporter
CLARK & ASSOCIATES
P.O. Box 73129
North Charleston, SC 29415
(843) 762-6294

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS:

3 DUKE WRIGHT

4 PAT ILDERTON

5 STEVE HERLONG

6 BETTY HARMON

7 CYNDY EWING

8 BILLY CRAVER

9

10

11

12

13

14 ALSO PRESENT:

15 KAT KENYON - Administrative

16 KENT PRAUSE - Zoning Administrator

17 RANDY ROBINSON - Building Official

18 CLAYTON B. MCCULLOUGH - Attorney

19 PATRICK O'NEIL

20 MIKE PERKIS

21

22

23

24

25

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: This is the August 15,
3 2007, meeting of the Sullivan's Island Design
4 Review Board. It is now a few minutes after 6
5 and members present are Duke Wright, I'm Pat
6 Ilderton, Steve Herlong, Betty Harmon,
7 Cindy Ewing and Billy Craver.

8 Freedom of information requirements
9 have been met for the meeting and the items on
10 tonight's agenda are now -- do you want to read
11 them and then make --

12 MR. WRIGHT: I move that we amend the
13 agenda to add two items or to add one item.
14 The item to be added is the discussion
15 regarding the new proposed application forms
16 that have come before the board. The second
17 item is to include the 2650 Jasper Boulevard at
18 the beginning of the meeting. That is the site
19 that --

20 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: The forms at the end
21 of the meeting?

22 MR. HERLONG: As well we would like to
23 amend it so the last item would be maybe a
24 discussion with council members about giving
25 the review board an update.

1 MR. WRIGHT: Is that clear?

2 MS. KENYON: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Moved?

4 MS. EWING: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Apparently voting, we
6 have to vote by name. Whenever we are voting
7 tonight we can't just raise our hands.

8 MR. WRIGHT: I approve, agree on the
9 motion.

10 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Approve.

11 MS. HARMON: Approve.

12 MS. EWING: Approve.

13 MR. CRAVER: Approve.

14 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: The first order of
15 business is 2650 Jasper Boulevard. Kent, what
16 do you think?

17 MR. HERLONG: Excuse me, probably the
18 minutes?

19 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Excuse me. What about
20 the minutes, everybody like them? I wasn't
21 here so I can't comment on them.

22 MS. HARMON: I make a motion we approve
23 the minutes for June and July.

24 MR. WRIGHT: Second.

25 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Discussion? All

1 right. Everybody in favor?

2 MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

3 MR. ILBERTON: Approve.

4 MS. HARMON: I approve.

5 MS. EWING: Approve.

6 MR. CRAVER: Approve.

7 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Now we can do 2650
8 Jasper hopefully.

9 MR. HOPKINS: Mr. Chairman, I am Bill
10 Hopkins. We own 2650 and our attorney is not
11 here at this point. He was told this would be
12 on the tail-end of the hearing.

13 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: That is fine. We can
14 wait. No problem. We just saw him, but --

15 MS. HARMON: I make a motion we amend the
16 2650 at the end -- next to the end of the
17 agenda.

18 MR. WRIGHT: Second.

19 MR. ILBERTON: Discussion? Everybody in
20 favor?

21 MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

22 MR. ILBERTON: I agree.

23 MS. HARMON: Yes.

24 MS. EWING: Yes.

25 MR. CRAVER: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Okay. Now, who is up?
2 Number three, 1402 Middle Street. Principal
3 building square footage increase.

4 MR. PRAUSE: This house is located at 1402
5 Middle Street. The reason why it is here
6 before you tonight is to ask for a modification
7 or proposed adjustment to the zoning standard
8 in the principal building square footage.

9 The current allowed amount of
10 principal building square footage, based on the
11 lot size, is 3,650.7 square feet. They
12 currently have 4,109 square feet. They are
13 already 12.3 percent over the zoning standard.

14 They are requesting an additional
15 427.5 square feet which is an additional
16 11.7 percent above the zoning standard.

17 So put together, if it is approved,
18 it will wind up being 24 percent over the
19 zoning standard. You are allowed to give
20 25 percent.

21 However, when you look at what has
22 been submitted, I want to mention one other
23 thing. They just received a variance for the
24 setback encroachment for the new porch which is
25 labeled as new porch at the last Board of

1 Zoning Appeals meeting last Thursday.

2 What you have been submitted in the
3 way of site plan drawings pretty accurately, as
4 near I can tell, pretty accurately reflects
5 what it is that they actually want to build.
6 It encompasses these modifications they
7 mentioned; however, both of the floor plans
8 show a future addition that cannot be built
9 because it exceeds even what you have the
10 authority to grant relief from, that they would
11 have to actually go get a variance to do that.

12 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Okay.

13 MR. PRAUSE: So that is not -- can't
14 happen, but it is shown on the plans. And on
15 the elevation drawings it also shows that
16 future addition which is not part of the
17 current application. And there is also an
18 existing and remaining structure that is only
19 partially shown on the elevation drawings, so I
20 think it is important for y'all to be made
21 aware of that fact.

22 And given what you have worked so
23 hard on the application form, it seems it would
24 be tough to be able to make a determination on
25 whether or not this meets neighborhood

1 compatibility based on what has been submitted,
2 but that is y'all's decision.

3 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: All right. The
4 applicant?

5 MR. CARL SMITH: Good evening, esteemed
6 Board. I apologize for having to be here this
7 evening. I was the last person available and I
8 normally do not like to appear before you for
9 obvious reasons.

10 I would like to, if it is approved,
11 negate any thought of that future addition.
12 That was done at the last stage and will not be
13 final in any way. If you do that, you can word
14 it in such a way and say this is -- this
15 approval does not in any way allow that future
16 addition or consideration of it.

17 I have a letter from the neighbor I
18 would like to read it, if I may? To whom -- it
19 is from Edmond Higgins, 1408 Middle Street, to
20 the Design Review Board. To whom it may
21 concern: I own property located at 1408 Middle
22 Street, Sullivan's Island, South Carolina. My
23 property is adjacent perpendicular to the
24 parcel located at 1402 Middle Street owned by
25 Jonathan and Sally Krell. The Krells are in

1 the process of applying for a building permit
2 for renovations to the existing structure on
3 the property.

4 I have learned that the Krells have
5 made a request to the Design Review Board for
6 additional square footage of 427.5 square feet
7 to be added to their property.

8 I reviewed the Krells' application
9 with the Design Review Board, the site plan,
10 architectural plan and the photographs and have
11 no objections to the Design Review Board
12 granting the Krells' request for additional
13 square footage.

14 The proposed renovations will enhance
15 the island character, preserve the property
16 value and protect the unique identity of
17 Sullivan's Island. If you have any questions
18 regarding my views on this matter, please
19 contact me.

20 And it has his phone number, with
21 kindest regards.

22 I will answer any questions that you
23 may have and I will leave.

24 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: All right. Thank you.

25 MR. WRIGHT: Do I have to state my name?

1 It is unclear to me what you really want to do
2 here. Is there a demolition of the existing
3 structure?

4 MR. CARL SMITH: There is a partial
5 demolition.

6 MR. WRIGHT: I can't determine from what
7 was submitted what is going on here, frankly.
8 Could you elaborate on that a little bit?

9 MR. CARL SMITH: All right. Let's go to
10 the first floor plan. We are limiting the
11 future addition where it says entry.

12 MS. HARMON: What page are you on?

13 MR. CRAVER: 82.

14 MR. CARL SMITH: It is a small screened
15 porch that will be demolished and replaced by
16 this entry. On the front elevation where it
17 says "porch", it would be on the lower left
18 side, this structure recesses there and we are
19 going to demolish that wall.

20 We will add the definition to the
21 roof and we will have the roof and the existing
22 portion that is under the living area and
23 dining area will be removed and raised. You
24 will see that on the elevation.

25 MR. WRIGHT: So essentially, all that is

1 left is that lower -- from the current
2 structure is that lower area that you can see
3 on -- I am just trying to get a fix
4 on -- whatever is done is going to be an
5 improvement, in my judgment.

6 MR. CARL SMITH: Yes, yes.

7 MR. WRIGHT: I am just trying to get a fix
8 on what is happening. Am I the only one who
9 doesn't see this?

10 MR. HERLONG: I think I am seeing that the
11 pitch forward structure that I see here and
12 here, that is existing?

13 MR. CARL SMITH: That is existing. It is
14 internal renovation, what is going on there,
15 not external.

16 MR. HERLONG: So this roof is a change,
17 this -- that is a change. The porch on Middle
18 Street is an addition.

19 MR. CARL SMITH: Right.

20 MR. HERLONG: And then the entry on the
21 service drive is an addition.

22 MR. CARL SMITH: Right.

23 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: It is going to be a
24 marked improvement on what is there. With the
25 porch present, it is going to be added to the

1 Middle Street side of the house as well as the
2 various levels, height of the roofline, is
3 going to make it much more interesting. I
4 don't have any problem with it.

5 If you don't have any more questions,
6 I will leave.

7 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Anybody want to speak
9 for or against? Public comment? Section is
10 closed. Kent, Randy, anything y'all need to
11 add to it?

12 MR. PRAUSE: Only other aspect that I
13 would bring to your attention is it doesn't
14 meet the current flood elevation requirements
15 and they will need to stay under the 50 percent
16 or elevate the building.

17 I think Randy informed me that based
18 upon the information they have submitted so far
19 they have about \$30,000 of a cushion in there
20 before they go beyond that 50 percent threshold
21 to bring the building in compliance with the
22 elevation.

23 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: All right. Board have
24 any other comments or observations?

25 MS. EWING: I just feel that this kind of

1 represents the incomplete application that we
2 have been discussing and trying to not make
3 decisions based on these kind of applications,
4 so I would have a hard time going forward with
5 this application as it stands and would
6 encourage the people to come back with an
7 application filled out with proper elevations.
8 I really -- I don't understand what I am
9 approving. That would be my feeling.

10 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: All right.

11 MR. CRAVER: I would love to have more
12 information, but I think that it is
13 easiest -- easy to follow, what is going on
14 here. It is an improvement. Once we approve
15 our application form and everybody has it, then
16 I think maybe I would agree with Cyndy.

17 But I can follow this. I think it is
18 a real improvement. The structure is
19 interesting enough and broken up enough that
20 the extra square footage isn't going to create
21 a matching issue. If they can keep it at their
22 50 percent, I would approve it.

23 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Betty?

24 MS. HARMON: I am a little bit confused
25 about it. I think I would approve it if we put

1 in there definitively what we are allowing them
2 to do.

3 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Well, this comes
4 before us as a final, you know, instead of a
5 preliminary or application or any of -- this
6 comes before us as a final application, is that
7 correct?

8 MR. HERLONG: That is what is circled.

9 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: All right.

10 MS. HARMON: Where?

11 MR. HERLONG: It is --

12 MS. EWING: It is actually final? Well --

13 MR. HERLONG: I think I could say that we
14 might want to give it a conceptual approval and
15 then see if that is --

16 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: I think that might be
17 the best thing, conceptually approve what is
18 here so they know they can go forward, and then
19 to bring it back for a bit more discussion with
20 a bit more detail. And maybe, I don't know if
21 we are going to be able to have it ratified by
22 next time, whether we will be able to use the
23 new form. I am not exactly sure how, if we do
24 pass the new forms, whether we can actually
25 start using them immediately, within two days,

1 yeah.

2 MR. WRIGHT: That is something we can talk
3 about.

4 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Yeah. So that was
5 probably a good idea.

6 MS. EWING: I have a question on
7 conceptual approval. Would this mean the board
8 would be conceptually approving the 25 percent
9 variance?

10 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Yes, I think
11 conceptually it would. I can't speak for
12 everybody on the board, of course.

13 MS. EWING: I again, I think that we grant
14 variances and this extra percentage when the
15 job has been really, really well done and it is
16 an exceptional design, and I am not seeing that
17 in this instance.

18 I still have a problem, even if it is
19 conceptual. I think that is something for us
20 to consider; not to say that when they come
21 back with better -- a better application and
22 plans we might not give them additional square
23 footage, but this is the maximum. And I think
24 we should be giving -- I feel it should be an
25 A-plus.

1 MR. HERLONG: As I understood Kent, I
2 think with what was listed as a future
3 addition, it would not be part of this. I
4 think at that point it was maybe 24 percent.

5 MR. PRAUSE: It is 24 percent without the
6 future addition.

7 MR. HERLONG: It is 24 percent, because
8 the existing condition is already over and then
9 the addition of the 427 takes it to 24 percent.

10 MR. PRAUSE: Right. The existing
11 condition is already 12.3 percent over the
12 zoning standard. What they are asking for is
13 an additional 11.7 percent over the zoning
14 standard.

15 So all combined, if it is approved,
16 it will be 24 percent over the zoning standard
17 if allowed. Now, but 12.3 percent of it is
18 already there.

19 MS. HARMON: I think we better get more
20 information. If we approve conceptually, can
21 we have --

22 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: I think we need to
23 consider this is an existing house, the people
24 are under some difficulty and hardship because
25 they have to deal with an existing house, they

1 are not designing a new house. We are not here
2 to be obstructionist to the homeowners and all.
3 We are here to help the process and everything
4 else.

5 If the difficulty is dealing with a
6 footprint of a house already of a certain
7 square footage, I don't think it is up to us to
8 penalize them, to want them to do more and
9 hopefully better architecture in that extra
10 400-plus square feet in the design plan. That
11 is what I would like to see happen is that they
12 would use that to create a more interesting
13 house that would look better as opposed to the
14 box that is sitting there, the difficult
15 structure that is sitting there.

16 MR. HERLONG: I tend to agree that, again,
17 I think we need to be in a position of
18 assisting people with existing conditions and
19 an existing house. It will be an improvement.
20 The current house is already 4,100-something
21 square feet.

22 So this new ordinance puts them in a
23 nonconforming situation and they are asking for
24 400-something square feet of relief. That may
25 or may not be appropriate, but I think under

1 those circumstances we have a house that is
2 three to four feet off of the grade, it is a
3 two-story house with a low sloped roof. Very
4 little additional impact to the neighborhood,
5 yet the opportunity is there to provide some
6 style and detailing that is much more
7 compatible and it maybe -- I think it could be
8 additionally studied to make it even
9 more -- add more character possibly to the
10 house.

11 I am not that concerned about them
12 asking for 400 square feet of additional space
13 because it is an existing home and they need
14 some help, they are under the 50 percent rule,
15 that is hard as well for them to deal with, so,
16 I would be in favor of some sort of conceptual
17 approval to move forward, possibly with some
18 conditional guidelines.

19 MR. WRIGHT: Can we develop just a draft
20 of a motion approving conceptual approval of
21 the plans submitted tonight without committing
22 the board to the increase in square footage
23 until we are able to see a preliminary
24 submission with considerably more detail?

25 MS. EWING: I think definitely that can be

1 done.

2 MS. HARMON: I second it.

3 MR. WRIGHT: That's a motion. I will
4 change that to a motion.

5 MS. HARMON: I second it.

6 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Discussion?

7 MR. CRAVER: I am not sure what the value
8 of passing that motion is if we are not nailing
9 down they get the additional square footage,
10 because where does he go from there? We either
11 tell him he gets the additional square footage
12 or not.

13 If we say you get it but it is
14 conceptual, then he has to develop the plan but
15 he knows he has the square footage to work
16 with. If we say that he can go change the
17 square footage, Steve, where do you go from
18 there? How do you design if you don't know
19 what your envelope is? If he is coming back --

20 MR. HERLONG: They are entertaining the
21 idea of more square footage; they now
22 understand -- I think when I first looked at
23 this I thought, my goodness, he will never get
24 this under the 50 percent rule. I couldn't
25 even tell that it was mainly existing space.

1 So I think we can't see the house as
2 it will appear because there is this future
3 addition on there that wouldn't be there. So
4 we need to see more in order to make decisions.
5 I would hate to overcommit, I think, that is a
6 concern. I think we have had that before.

7 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Conceptual approval is
8 just that, it is a concept that we are saying,
9 yes, you can go forward, but we are not really
10 approving the final thing.

11 MR. CRAVER: So what are we -- okay, if it
12 is conceptual approval but we are not approving
13 the additional square footage --

14 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: We are
15 conceptually -- I guess we are not -- you are
16 right. We are not approving it but we are not
17 voting against it either. We are not saying
18 you can't do it.

19 MR. WRIGHT: Frankly --

20 MR. CRAVER: We are basically deferring
21 it? Do we have an issue with the politics
22 here?

23 MR. WRIGHT: I am only concerned that I
24 can't --

25 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: I think the other

1 concern is we don't have anybody here to quiz.
2 They are not here. Where are they? I think
3 they need to be here. They need to be here.
4 Carl needs to be here or the Krells. We have
5 every right, maybe they will be here in a
6 month, but they need to be here just to say --
7 so we can ask questions about it and all, but
8 that is a difficulty. I think we are doing the
9 right thing by, you know, approving it,
10 essentially, but we need somebody's presence
11 here, you know, because there is nobody here to
12 represent them.

13 MR. CRAVER: I understand that if we
14 approve it conceptually, but we are not saying
15 we are approving the square footage, we really
16 defer --

17 MS. HARMON: We defer.

18 MR. PRAUSE: It might be in the best
19 interest to defer it with a recommendation to
20 come back with better plans.

21 MR. WRIGHT: I will amend the motion.

22 MR. HERLONG: Or we can vote.

23 MR. CRAVER: I just wanted to make sure we
24 were all clear on what we are doing
25 substantively, we are not fooling anybody.

1 MR. WRIGHT: I have no problem
2 conceptually with what is being done here. I
3 just can't tell from what has been submitted to
4 this board enough information to make a
5 decision.

6 I will amend the motion that we
7 approve it conceptually and defer -- strike
8 that.

9 MR. CRAVER: The other motion was okay. I
10 just want to make it clear what we were really
11 doing.

12 MR. WRIGHT: I move we defer this
13 application until we receive more information.

14 MS. HARMON: I second.

15 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Discussion? Everybody
16 in favor?

17 MR. HERLONG: Approve.

18 MS. HARMON: Approve.

19 MS. EWING: Approve.

20 MR. CRAVER: Approve.

21 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: All right.

22 1908 I'On.

23 MR. HERLONG: I am actually going to
24 recuse myself from this.

25 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Kent, what do you

1 think?

2 MR. PRAUSE: Appears to be an application
3 for a new picket fence, four feet tall with
4 gate and garden arch and a wooden bridge.

5 Also a new relocation of the driveway
6 and it is shown on the site plan. There is a
7 plat showing lot 220, 1908 I'On Avenue.

8 As mentioned in the application, it
9 is an historic building in the historic
10 district, located at 1908 I'On Avenue. It is
11 on your survey card as number 190. That would
12 have a significant factor to the existing
13 building to make it historic and it also shows
14 a picture that also includes some pictures of
15 the existing premises as well as the fence and
16 wooden bridge and garden arch treatments from
17 elsewhere that they would like to use.

18 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Thank you. Applicant?

19 MR. SCOTT HARRELL: I am Scott Harrell. I
20 live at 1908 I'On. I think it is pretty
21 straightforward. We want to replace the
22 existing chain link fence with a picket fence.

23 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: I agree. Is there
24 any -- anybody for or against? Kent, Randy,
25 anything else to add?

1 MR. ROBINSON: I would like to know what
2 the material will be on the paved driveway and
3 the new walkway. It doesn't specify what type
4 material.

5 MR. SCOTT HARRELL: Gravel.

6 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Thank you. All right.

7 MR. WRIGHT: I have no problem.

8 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: I have no problem with
9 it. Betty?

10 MS. HARMON: I think this is an excellent
11 example of what we are looking for. You have
12 given us nice pictures of fences so I have no
13 problem to approve.

14 MS. EWING: I think it looks great. I
15 have a question on what kind of trees are
16 you -- what tree is there?

17 MR. SCOTT HARRELL: I think it is a pecan
18 tree. We are planning on keeping the tree that
19 is beside the driveway, the proposed driveway.

20 MS. EWING: The big tree there?

21 MR. SCOTT HARRELL: Yes. That is not
22 really indicated.

23 MS. EWING: You are not taking down any?
24 Okay. Yeah, looks very good. Excellent.

25 MR. SCOTT HARRELL: Thank you.

1 MR. CRAVER: I am good.

2 MR. WRIGHT: I propose we approve the
3 application as submitted.

4 MS. HARMON: I will second it.

5 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Discussion? Everybody
6 in favor?

7 MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

8 MR. ILBERTON: Approve.

9 MS. HARMON: Approve.

10 MS. EWING: Approve.

11 MR. CRAVER: Yes.

12 (Off-the-record.)

13 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: 1102 Middle Street,
14 addition to historic structure.

15 MR. HERLONG: I am recusing myself.

16 MR. PRAUSE: Property is located at 102
17 Middle Street, known as the Hargrove house. It
18 is number 304 on the survey.

19 They are asking for no adjustments to
20 either zoning standards or design standards.
21 Basically, the request is to remove a late
22 addition stair, add to the rear of the house,
23 and enclose a portion of an existing side porch
24 as shown on the drawings.

25 They have included site plan

1 drawings, floor plan drawings, elevation
2 drawings and pictures of the existing
3 residence. That's it.

4 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Thank you. Yes, sir.

5 MR. HENSHAW: I am Jim Henshaw with
6 Herlong Architect. This is the Collin house.
7 We think it was constructed in the late 1800s,
8 probably around 1890.

9 Current owner is David Russell who is
10 here tonight and I believe he is going to have
11 some things to say at the end of my
12 presentation.

13 David and his wife, Jamie, have owned
14 the house for about 22 years. 1985, I believe,
15 is when they purchased the property. They came
16 to us to help renovate this house and
17 accomplish really three things, the first of
18 which was to address the moisture and
19 structural repairs that are very much part of
20 this house. If you walk underneath the house
21 or around the house, you can see some of the
22 damage and/or repair work that has been done
23 over years. We tried to address the issues,
24 and really, if it doesn't happen this house
25 isn't going to be here much longer because of

1 all of the damage.

2 The second thing they wanted to do
3 was increase the function of the house. One
4 example of the almost outdated function of this
5 house is on the first floor which is the main
6 living area, the living level of the home, and
7 has the kitchen and the living room and the
8 dining room and two bedrooms. There is one
9 small bathroom on that floor that serves as the
10 powder room and a shared bathroom between those
11 two bedrooms.

12 So we needed to find some place to
13 add a little bit of square footage to make it
14 more functional.

15 The third thing that we really want
16 to do with this renovation is to respect that
17 the house has been altered a good many times in
18 its over 100-year history, but we want to
19 respect those alterations, all of them, and
20 also respect the intent of the original home
21 which has some of the greatest features of any
22 home on the island with its detailing, so --
23 but we can see there have been a number of
24 renovations done to this property. You can see
25 the -- on the west side of the house at Station

1 11, that porch has been partially enclosed over
2 the years. I am not really sure when that
3 happened actually. You might have worked on
4 some of that, Pat, I don't know if that was
5 part of your work. But on this house, on this
6 side, it has been enclosed to a certain degree.

7 Also, if you walk around the house
8 you can see the siding patterns have changed
9 and a lot of it -- the house has been added on
10 to in certain spots and infilled in certain
11 spots that are certainly not original.

12 And probably the most significant
13 addition or renovation that has happened
14 happened in 1989 just before Hugo where David
15 and his wife, Jamie, had some renovation work
16 done to the second floor and basically
17 completely redid the second floor by removing
18 the roof of the house and enlarging the walls
19 of that second floor so the roof height here
20 got larger during that renovation in 1989 to
21 create more space on that second floor.

22 The roof was put back on at a steeper
23 pitch and dormers were added to each side of
24 that roof so -- which definitely changed the
25 pitch of the house and the dimensions of the

1 house, but the proportions of the house were
2 still good, at least from three sides. And the
3 reason for that is that on three sides of the
4 house, the front and the two sides, you have
5 this nice one-story porch that buffers that
6 second floor space. So you can get a nice
7 pedestrian scale from Middle Street and from
8 Station 11 so the second floor doesn't dominate
9 the site.

10 But if you go around to the other
11 side, to the Osceola side, that side of the
12 house is only an afterthought. Even back when
13 it was originally designed and the second floor
14 increased, when these plate heights were
15 increased, it added to the verticality. I
16 don't know if you see that picture in the
17 packet, but that is a wall that does not have
18 much detail on it. It doesn't have much street
19 presence and it doesn't address a nice scale
20 like the other three sides do. So we wanted to
21 look at those as we design the renovation.

22 So what we are trying to do as far as
23 increasing the function of the space, first, we
24 want to look at the east porch. If you look at
25 the site plan, you can see that area is patched

1 on the east side. We want to infill that
2 portion to match the west side and use the same
3 window patterns and details.

4 What that will do is not only get
5 some needed space in the house, but it will
6 also bring back some of that symmetry that was
7 characteristic of the original home.

8 Another thing on that first floor, if
9 you look at this elevation, you probably have
10 walked up on the porch of that home, it is a
11 great old home, but it has two bays on it here
12 and here. Originally, those were triple hung
13 windows. You know, triple hung windows you can
14 raise the bottom and walk from the inside onto
15 the porch. So in a renovation that was done at
16 some point, window seats were built in front of
17 those triple hung windows and so the
18 functionality of those triple hung windows were
19 lost so we are trying to bring that back. Take
20 the window seats out and allow those triple
21 hung windows to function again and bring in
22 more light into the house.

23 Finally on the Osceola side, which is
24 the side that we do feel was not addressed
25 properly way back when and through all of these

1 renovations, you do have a vertical elevation.
2 That is the rear elevation here, but you do
3 have currently the stair that is coming down
4 that was not an original stair. I don't know
5 if you know, but the stair that goes from the
6 first floor dining room down to the ground
7 floor space, but it really is somewhat
8 offensive the way it is put on the house. And
9 again, it was added at some point in the house
10 history.

11 We are proposing to take that off and
12 construct an addition that comes out
13 symmetrical on the house. We feel it could
14 have been built back in the 1890s as a porch.

15 What we are showing here is a space
16 that looks like it was a porch infilled with
17 some nice windows on the back; again, a
18 one-story space that will help address Osceola
19 at Station 11 better than it does now.

20 Right now there is a tree there. I
21 don't know if that picture is in the packet,
22 but that is the tree that is in front of that
23 stair which is kind of a shrub laurel tree
24 right now. I think there is a permit to take
25 that tree down. Once that tree comes off, you

1 can see how vertical that facade is and how
2 offensive that stair is.

3 But by doing this one-story addition,
4 all four sides of this wonderful house will be
5 addressed. The scale will be brought into a
6 more comfortable proportion and you would be
7 able to enjoy this house from all sides.

8 I do think you had something you
9 wanted to say?

10 MR. DAVID RUSSELL: I am David Russell
11 from Atlanta. I came down today after having
12 a -- after having owned property here for 22
13 years. This is the first either board or
14 council meeting that I have attended and I
15 appreciate the robust discussion that you have
16 here.

17 We love the feel of this island, my
18 wife, Jamie, and our two kids. And we love to
19 spend as much time down here as possible. The
20 history and character of this island is what
21 attracted us to it.

22 I grew up west of the Ashley and I
23 always envied this side of the harbor. But
24 this house we have has a lot of history and
25 character to it that we want to preserve, but

1 it also has been the victim of time and the
2 elements and it is badly deteriorating.

3 If you walk through it from the
4 previous owners and even some of my own fault,
5 we just sort of patched here and there and it
6 essentially has been cobbled together and held
7 up, you know, by toothpicks in some places. It
8 is sinking because the water seeps up from the
9 ground into these wooden foundations and it
10 just spreads the water and so it has to be
11 addressed.

12 What does not appear, I don't think,
13 from these views is that the inside, we did a
14 nice job, I think, on the upstairs where we
15 have some bedrooms, but the main floor is just
16 not that friendly or comfortable or livable and
17 it is just not a place, especially in the
18 winter where you want to spend any time. In
19 order to us to spend money to make it a more
20 comfortable house for our family and have
21 friends down, we have to add a little room on
22 to the back that would be the kitchen feeding
23 into the open area, and Steve and Jim have
24 designed what we think is a very sympathetic
25 addition to make it look like, frankly, it was

1 intended from the outset, because if you look
2 at this house from Station 11, it is really
3 front-end loaded. Everything is tilted toward
4 the front and this will help level it off from
5 the backside. It is not up there right now.

6 I think that Jim mentioned these
7 add-on stairs in the back, they are dangerously
8 steep. They were put on before us and that has
9 to be addressed and it is really an offensive
10 architectural object on the back.

11 What we want to do is rebalance the
12 symmetry of the house, keep it in character
13 with this island and in character with its
14 history and not look like it has been just
15 cobbled together, and with that we hope to be
16 here for a long, long time.

17 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Thank you. Is there
18 any public discussion or observations? The
19 public section is closed.

20 Kent? Board discussion? Billy?

21 MR. CRAVER: I like it. Again, I have to
22 applaud the Herlong folks for doing a good job
23 of addressing all of the issues. I assume they
24 are not asking for increases in square footages
25 or any of that kind of stuff? What you are

1 asking for is right here. I have no problem
2 with it. Makes a lot of sense.

3 MS. EWING: I agree. It is a wonderful
4 design, so basically, what we are approving is
5 just going to be that back addition and then
6 enclosing the porch and that's it? Okay. So
7 no demolition underneath or --

8 MR. HENSHAW: We are going to have to see
9 what needs to be addressed underneath the
10 house, but we are under the 50 percent rule
11 with this house so we have to be selective
12 about what we do.

13 MS. EWING: In terms of we are not going
14 to get any more raising of the house?

15 MR. HENSHAW: No.

16 MR. CRAVER: It looks like you have some
17 repairing to do.

18 MR. DAVID RUSSELL: It is below grade, so
19 when it rains or high tide, we get water in the
20 basement and it is deep and so we are going to
21 have to raise the concrete up above that with
22 sand and dirt in other places. The concrete is
23 under the house and not exposed to the outside.
24 In doing that it may require us to just shore
25 up some of the existing foundation but not

1 raising the elevation.

2 MS. EWING: I guess my one question is is
3 on this bottom level, the enclosed space, is
4 that going to change from what -- that is very
5 much a part of the house the way it is now, the
6 exterior, you are not going to replace it
7 with --

8 MR. HENSHAW: We are trying to keep the
9 character of the existing house as much as
10 possible.

11 MS. EWING: Other than that?

12 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Betty?

13 MS. HARMON: I think it is a great design.
14 I think it is an improvement on the back of the
15 house and I am all for it. I approve.

16 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: I think it is also a
17 good design. I am in favor.

18 MR. WRIGHT: I have no trouble whatever.
19 It is a very nice design. I think it is going
20 to improve the house significantly.

21 MR. CRAVER: I make a motion we approve
22 the request.

23 MS. HARMON: Second.

24 MR. WRIGHT: Agree.

25 MR. ILDERTON: Agree.

1 MS. HARMON: Agree.

2 MS. EWING: Agree.

3 MR. CRAVER: Agree.

4 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Thank you, sir.

5 26 -- no. 2650 Jasper.

6 MR. PRAUSE: As stated in the letter from
7 the property owner dated July 25, 2007, this
8 item was here July 18, last item. The board
9 deferred the decision until it could view the
10 site, and of course you made a site visit and
11 it is back before you now for consideration of
12 being added to the list, for lack of a better
13 term, historic property designation list.

14 And I just want to reiterate again
15 that if it is the Board's pleasure to do so, to
16 please put some findings on the record in the
17 way of a motion according to the requirements
18 of Section 2194D, 1 through 8, that is on page
19 40 of the ordinance.

20 Y'all need to make a determination
21 that it meets at least one of these
22 requirements in order to be placed upon this,
23 in order to be designated as an historic
24 property.

25 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Thank you.

1 MR. BRIAN HELLMAN: Well, because of the
2 unique nature -- Brian Hellman, 151 Meeting
3 Street, Nelson, Mullins. I represent the
4 Hopkins who are in the back there.

5 I guess because of the unique nature
6 is why we are here and this being brought by
7 this Board's motion, I feel as if I am almost
8 in a position of answering your questions as
9 opposed to making a presentation, if that is a
10 fair way of handling this. I could make one,
11 but --

12 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Save us a lot of time.

13 MR. BRIAN HELLMAN: Perfect.

14 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Thank you. Thank you
15 for that consideration.

16 Do I have any public comment? Yes,
17 sir?

18 MR. PAUL BOEHM: Paul Boehm, 3209 Middle
19 Street. I have the responsibility to market
20 this property. Since I don't know the
21 direction that you are leaning, I just want to
22 make a couple of observations.

23 It isn't going to be easy to sell the
24 property with either one designated historic,
25 but in particular, the little 650 square foot

1 structure designated historic, because I don't
2 know what you would do with it after you have
3 designated it such. Are you going to allow it
4 to be elevated to add to a new structure, does
5 it have to stay where it is, do you give it the
6 50 percent rule?

7 I don't know how in the world you
8 could fix that house to any extent without it
9 exceeding the 50 percent rule.

10 So I am as interested in guidance
11 from you as to what can be done with the
12 structure, that is the determination to be
13 made.

14 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Thank you. Anybody
15 else? Public section is closed.

16 Do we have anything else to add to
17 this?

18 MR. PRAUSE: No.

19 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Let's go right into
20 the discussion. Duke, do you have any --

21 MR. WRIGHT: Well, we are talking about
22 two structures here, two houses. One, the
23 original, as I understand it, the original
24 cottage which we looked at, in my judgment, I
25 don't see any redeeming historic value in that

1 property, in that house, the main cottage that
2 faces Jasper; however, I do think the little
3 small cottage on the bottom right is of
4 interest and we should consider what can be
5 done maybe to retain that house and allowing
6 the owner to move forward with some plan to
7 incorporate that into a scheme of a compound of
8 sorts.

9 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: I am sort of leaning
10 the same way, but I am not sure what -- can we
11 designate the little -- the really tiny
12 structure historic and not the front? Can we
13 divide it up?

14 MR. McCULLOUGH: It says property, so if
15 you want to be more specific as to what
16 particular piece of property you want
17 designated --

18 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: So we can do that?

19 MR. McCULLOUGH: I think you can, based on
20 this. It just says historic property,
21 property, it is not defined.

22 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Because if that were
23 the case, there have been several instances
24 where these little tiny structures, actually
25 structures larger than that, small structures,

1 that are so nicely done have stayed as well as
2 new homes being built on the property. It
3 wouldn't be a detriment to the property, it
4 would be almost something that would be an
5 attractive asset to the property and the
6 property owner or whoever would end up with the
7 property.

8 MR. McCULLOUGH: I just want to -- where
9 historic property is defined, it says any
10 place, building, structure, work of art,
11 fixture, or similar object that has been
12 individually designated by town council of
13 Sullivan's Island as designated as contributing
14 property in the historic district to the
15 definition of historic property.

16 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: So you can divide it
17 up?

18 MR. McCULLOUGH: Yeah.

19 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: I am not sure -- I
20 want to hear more discussion. Go ahead.

21 MR. HERLONG: I was kind of surprised,
22 actually, at first thinking that there might be
23 some core of historic structure in the main
24 house. And really, all I see is the fact that
25 their original gabled structure roofline, the

1 look of it is the most historic thing, the look
2 of it from across the street. Every material,
3 other than one window in that house, had been
4 altered, and altered to such an extent that I
5 don't see any historic value in that main front
6 structure.

7 Any attempt, any attempt to try to
8 take that back to the historic would actually
9 be a recreation of something that might have
10 been there. Every material would be brand-new,
11 so again, it wouldn't be historic. I don't
12 think there is a way to make it or take it back
13 to any -- anything that we could ever assume as
14 contributing to a historic structure.

15 So I think the front piece of
16 property is definitely not historic. But it is
17 interesting that the cottage in the back, other
18 than that porch addition, the green porch
19 addition which is clearly an afterthought, the
20 original two rooms and front streetside shed
21 addition looks surprisingly original. The
22 interior finishes have not changed that much
23 other than some painting, addition of window
24 air-conditioning units, but there is a core of
25 a very -- I think that is the intent when we

1 see a structure like that, there is a little
2 piece of history on the island that sits in a
3 nonconforming fashion on the side of the
4 property. Luckily that would allow a new home
5 to be built and not have to -- it wouldn't
6 interfere with any new home that would be
7 built.

8 I believe that is probably a
9 half-acre lot, am I correct? So that probably
10 is 6-, maybe 800 square feet at the most,
11 structure, the small cottage. You could
12 easily, from a marketing point of view, I would
13 say that you could build a 3,000, 3,500 square
14 foot house upwards of 3,500 square foot house
15 that would come to the Review Board for
16 approval and you still have a guest cottage
17 that sits close to the street, again, outside
18 of the building footprint of any new house.

19 So I don't see that putting that
20 cottage on a protected list of historic
21 structures would be a hardship from a marketing
22 point of view. I think it is completely
23 separate. It doesn't -- the 50 percent rule,
24 it would be to clean it up, fix it up, take off
25 the bad additions and it could be a nice little

1 cottage independent of any house that might go
2 there. That is the way I saw it.

3 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Betty?

4 MS. HARMON: I tend to agree with what
5 Steve is saying. I think that the front
6 structure has truly been altered so much that,
7 I know you said the pictures, there were
8 changes -- the structure inside has changed so
9 I don't consider it historic.

10 I agree with Steve on keeping the
11 cottage. I think that has -- portrays a value
12 for that property. I would say keep the small
13 cottage, the green cottage in the back.

14 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Cyndy?

15 MS. EWING: I feel the same way. And just
16 because I kind of like to go by the numbers if
17 at all possible, and this does appear on the
18 1924 map. And Paul, I will show you, here it
19 is here and here is the larger, and then I know
20 you gave us -- I think you gave us some
21 information, but just for the Board, I think it
22 might be interesting, in 1901 the United States
23 government gave -- this is the first time that
24 it went into the hands of a private citizen.
25 So I found that down in the courthouse.

1 And then somewhere, we know there was
2 a building there in 1924 and I am just trying
3 to date when the first building went in and I
4 think it is around 1914 that it showed a
5 Sullivan's Island to an A. M. Crisper, they
6 were given a deed to both this lot and then the
7 lot next door. And the way that Sullivan's
8 Island can convey that was that if you had
9 to -- you had to have built something on the
10 property in order to take -- to have that
11 property, that was the deal back then.

12 Anyway, clearly, these structures,
13 both of them, do meet the historical standards
14 of being old. And I just feel the same as the
15 others in that it is sad that the front home
16 has been so diminished, although it looks like
17 there might be some outside siding, but I would
18 be very much in favor of designating the back
19 cottage as an historic home and feel that it
20 would really add to the property.

21 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Billy?

22 MR. CRAVER: Cyndy, can I see that? So,
23 are we able to really tell which structure is
24 the one that is on the Sanborn map or whether
25 it is either one of these structures?

1 MS. EWING: The Sanborn map only gives you
2 part of the -- that is what the Sanborn map
3 gives you; whereas, it gives you the full lots
4 over here.

5 MR. CRAVER: The smaller structure would
6 be back here? I mean, so we can't say based on
7 this map -- we can't conclude that that is the
8 house that was there?

9 MS. EWING: No. But if you go back to the
10 deeds you can see.

11 MR. CRAVER: Can we conclude from the
12 deeds that this house was there?

13 MS. EWING: What are you trying to decide,
14 which house was built in what year?

15 MR. CRAVER: I am trying to determine
16 whether or not we have a map that shows that
17 there was something on that property in 1924.
18 The implication is that somehow this house has
19 been there since before 1924.

20 I haven't concluded, based on these
21 maps, that either one of these houses is the
22 house that was there. Houses were built all
23 over Sullivan's Island cheaply because
24 hurricanes came around and knocked them down,
25 so people built them back cheaply. So we have

1 a very lot of cheaply, very not necessarily
2 well-built houses on Sullivan's Island that we
3 are now looking at going, are they historic,
4 and before I will -- I understand that there
5 was a house here. I am not able to conclude
6 that either one of these houses is the house
7 that is on the Sanborn map. It may be, but I
8 am just not able to conclude that it is.

9 Good. All right. What kind of dates
10 do we have here?

11 MR. BRIAN HELLMAN: If I may just state
12 about the Sanborn map, these are the earliest
13 pictures we have of the house and it shows that
14 it has this section right here with the porch.
15 And the Sanborn map is showing actually a porch
16 that is entirely across the entire front and
17 then extends past the main structure. The
18 Sanborn maps typically will show the footprint
19 of the building and it will show porches
20 differently from that one, but I think that is
21 showing the porch that extends past the main
22 structure which is very different from what we
23 are looking at here. It might be placed in the
24 same location, but --

25 MS. EWING: It doesn't change -- I am

1 saying something did exist there then, we know
2 the dates on this, and through looking back
3 through who owned this and the deeds, there was
4 another structure in 1914, GIS says 1913.

5 MR. CRAVER: I understand that. I just
6 want to be careful that we don't somehow
7 conclude that either one of these structures
8 has been there since 1924 or earlier as a
9 result of the Sanborn map because they come and
10 they go. If these are 1940s era pictures, then
11 it raises -- it makes me wonder what was there
12 in -- was that little house there in 1940.

13 The reason I say that is, Steve, I
14 hear you, that if they have a 650 square foot
15 little house, it gives them the ability to
16 potentially have a small guest cottage and then
17 they could build a 3,500 square foot house.
18 But they can't build a 4,100 square foot house
19 or get -- or do interesting architecture and
20 qualify for even a larger house that would be a
21 4,500 square feet house if they do all of the
22 things necessary to meet all of the standards
23 that break up the mass and do all of the things
24 that would allow them to be considered for the
25 larger house, they can't build that house.

1 And before I would be willing to say,
2 let's take that very important property right
3 away, I would want to be convinced that that
4 little house, which may be an interesting
5 little house and it may have a lot of
6 interesting Sullivan's Island charm, but
7 interesting Sullivan's Island charm and a neat
8 little house that isn't necessarily historic,
9 that doesn't have more than just some
10 Sullivan's Island charm, isn't enough for me
11 unless somebody can -- I don't think the Gold
12 Bug is planted under there or Robert Lee didn't
13 sign the Declaration of Independence in that
14 house.

15 I am just trying to understand what
16 it is about that house that makes it historic
17 enough for us to say we are going to put it on
18 the list and limit this person's property
19 rights. I am willing to do it if I can be
20 convinced, but for me to vote for it I have to
21 be convinced that there is an historic element
22 to it, not that there may be.

23 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Thanks. Do I hear a
24 motion?

25 MR. BRIAN HELLMAN: If I may, I guess I

1 wanted to let you --

2 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: I'm sorry, go for it.

3 MR. BRIAN HELLMAN: I want to sort of
4 point out, I am glad you are coming to what I
5 think is a conclusion on the main house because
6 it may, if it is still like this, have some
7 charm and that is of value to the island, but
8 certainly as it looks today, these wonderful
9 windows and whatever has been done to it, it
10 obviously doesn't.

11 The back house, if the Board does
12 find to its discretion that it does meet the
13 requirements to be an historic structure, we
14 would certainly want some clarification.

15 We have got this picture we believe
16 from the late 1940s. It shows what was there
17 at the time. We have got this modern version
18 of what is there now with this add-on. And one
19 of the things that Paul and I noticed tonight
20 after the Board left, and, Cyndy, one of the
21 pictures you took of that chimney on the house
22 showed that there was a roofline not on this
23 front add-on structure but on the structure
24 that we walked into where the stairs were,
25 there was a roofline there. And I don't know

1 if you brought the camera with you, but you
2 took a picture of that chimney, and Paul has a
3 very small version on his camera, but when you
4 looked at it from this direction, it looked
5 like there may have been a main older structure
6 that was the part that we walk into, and then
7 this front structure where the kitchen and all
8 is, looks like it might have been some add-on
9 or modification.

10 And then there is a new roofline that
11 has been put on top of that here. Then we have
12 got this porch, so where I am getting to with
13 all that, if it is within the discretion of the
14 Board, and I agree with Kent's understanding of
15 the definition of historic property, that it is
16 very broad and this Board has the ability to
17 specifically define what part of that structure
18 is historic, because I certainly don't think it
19 is the wishes of this Board that this front
20 screened porch remain. So my then question
21 would be what exactly, if you deem that
22 porch -- I'm sorry -- that house to be
23 historic.

24 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: I don't think we can
25 state that here. I think you could rest

1 assured that the Board or the Board that is
2 existing when this comes up before the Board
3 again would work with whoever, because just to
4 try to create something, but I don't think we
5 can tell you what we will do or will not do.

6 I agree with you. I think this Board
7 definitely thinks that back porch is, you know,
8 inconsequential and not important. What else?
9 I don't know if we could tell you today exactly
10 what you can do in the future or what the
11 future owner of this can certainly do or will
12 want to do.

13 MR. BRIAN HELLMAN: The last piece I would
14 add about both of these properties, there has
15 been a lot of discussion from Mr. Krell's house
16 to the other house about the 50 percent rule.
17 Whatever happens with either of these houses,
18 if one or both is historic, the situation that
19 is -- a real situation here is both of these
20 will require substantial improvements by
21 somebody that is going to spend the kind of
22 money that Sullivan's Island costs to improve
23 it.

24 If by making property like this
25 historic, I think there is a bigger picture at

1 hand. The bigger picture if we have a
2 50 percent rule on something like that, Paul
3 was asking what an appraiser would appraise
4 something like this at. We are saying \$15,000
5 worth of improvements.

6 I don't know that you can replace the
7 windows, but certainly the siding and roof, and
8 the \$15,000 is spent. We haven't put in
9 air-conditioning, haven't done anything with
10 plumbing and electricity, there is an issue
11 here with the 50 percent rule.

12 Either we are going to have a
13 structure that is going to be lifted off the
14 ground or we are going to have a problem if
15 that you can't make the improvements that
16 somebody I think would want to make to a
17 structure like this.

18 The alternative, of course, being
19 that Randy gets put in the unenviable position
20 of saying there is a 50 percent rule, he is the
21 person FEMA designates to make sure there is
22 compliance, so that the rest of us that live on
23 the island don't have increased flood insurance
24 costs by a determination that we need to get a
25 50 percent variance so somebody can put in a

1 toilet in this house.

2 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Kent, on the
3 50 percent rule, if an appraiser were to
4 appraisal that property included the front
5 house in his appraisal, would that -- and then,
6 I mean, and then the front house was
7 demolished, would that appraisal then -- I
8 mean, I don't know.

9 MR. PRAUSE: The houses would be
10 separately. It couldn't be combined.

11 MR. BRIAN HELLMAN: So that, I think, is
12 the biggest risk here. I agree there are some
13 old elements of that house. There probably
14 were with the front house. But the real issue
15 at the house is not the windows are old, the
16 flooring is old, maybe underneath the siding
17 there is some old siding, but what happens when
18 somebody is stuck with this and wants to put in
19 a new sink, new toilet, and make a nice guest
20 house, and quite frankly they can't because
21 they can only spend \$15,000.

22 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Also they can seek a
23 variance because this Board would probably go
24 to bat for them before the EPA to support it
25 not being raised on an variance issue just

1 because that is how it sits and it is so low to
2 the ground and close to the street, it is
3 important to us, the feel of it. I don't know
4 but that is all a possibility because that
5 could be -- it could be considered.

6 Still, in my mind, if an owner may
7 consider that a real asset to have a separate
8 structure, a separate unit, as opposed to being
9 a negative. But --

10 MR. BRIAN HELLMAN: With that being the
11 issue with the future owner of the property,
12 maybe it is best that we leave that to the
13 discretion of the future owner to say, I like
14 the idea of potentially keeping this, doing
15 something with it, knowing that I may be only
16 able to put \$15,000 in it, or I may need to
17 seek a variance to the 50 percent which affects
18 every one of us that lives on the island
19 because it affects the island's rating for FEMA
20 and let the future owner deal with it.

21 The reason we are here today is the
22 board, by its own motion, it doesn't really
23 have to make a decision tonight and can -- and
24 can maybe turn to your counsel and can advise
25 you as to what can be done, but certainly can,

1 you know, withdraw this whole process.

2 MS. EWING: I would just like to add
3 something. Randy?

4 MR. ROBINSON: I just wanted to inform
5 y'all that this house would not be eligible for
6 a variance from the FEMA requirements.

7 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Can't do that?

8 MR. ROBINSON: Because it is not in the
9 district and it would have to be contributing
10 to the district or it would have to be
11 individually listed on the National Register or
12 eligible for the National Register.

13 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: The Board really can't
14 give variances to the FEMA requirements.

15 MR. ROBINSON: In certain areas, but this
16 one would not qualify unless it was National
17 Registry eligible, and I don't think a
18 structure like this would ever be able to get
19 National Register. It is possible, but --

20 MR. CRAVER: It is altered a lot.

21 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Worst case scenario,
22 somebody, if they did over 50 percent, would
23 have to jack it up above flood where it sits.

24 MR. ROBINSON: Correct. Which we don't
25 know the flood elevation of the property,

1 anyway, so we don't know, so it might be three
2 feet off the ground.

3 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: It could be
4 another --

5 MS. EWING: Another way to get the
6 50 percent would be you invest and then every
7 three years, is that what it is? So you make
8 an improvement up to 50 percent and then three
9 years later there is another improvement made
10 and you can continue improving it, and then if
11 the value changes, right? You get to add that
12 into it. So there are ways of saving it.

13 I just want to point out to the Board
14 what -- something that I think is important.
15 We are the Design Review Board and we are here
16 to preserve and protect historic structures and
17 we very much do care about, you know, we are
18 not trying to penalize anybody and make it
19 difficult to sell property, and I don't think
20 any one of us here that would vote for
21 putting -- making this an historic structure
22 would think that it was a negative at all to
23 have this on their property. I just think that
24 is something we need to remember.

25 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Do I hear a motion?

1 MR. HERLONG: The question would be, I
2 kind of gather that possibly a motion would be
3 that the larger structure is -- we would make a
4 motion not to put it on the list and that there
5 are portions of the rear structure that would
6 possibly be considered historic and we might
7 put it on the list. I kind of share the same
8 issues that Billy has to a degree.

9 I think the rear structure can be an
10 asset, but nothing is sure and there can be
11 roadblocks and obstacles to moving in that
12 direction. The last thing I think this Board
13 wants to do is put the property owners in a
14 position that it is a hardship, but I really
15 don't see -- I don't see that being a hardship,
16 I really don't. I am not really sure
17 what -- how we would designate it. I don't
18 know that we have done that.

19 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: It is just a matter of
20 putting it on the -- in the category, too, that
21 little structure. Then what happens to it in
22 the future is up to this Board or some other
23 configuration of this Board, and whether it is
24 the BPA or whatever else. We are choosing not
25 to put the front structure on it, basically

1 giving the people, the future owners, the right
2 to build a new house of so many square feet of
3 less this square footage.

4 As it is written now, as the way the
5 zoning ordinance is written now, that is the
6 way it is written now. Now, who knows what it
7 is going to read a year from now, you know. I
8 take it it is still a work in progress.

9 So I don't know that it is such a
10 terrible burden to the property to designate
11 600-plus square feet historic, at least for
12 now. Maybe we won't, maybe it will be reduced
13 to smaller square footage because of reasons of
14 it's the way it was added on to or whatever
15 else in the future. That is yet to be seen.
16 Anyway, that is my opinion. I can't make a
17 motion. If there is any motion to be made --

18 MR. CRAVER: I make a motion that the
19 front house with all of the windows and all
20 that, that the front house is not historic.

21 MR. McCULLOUGH: Can I interject? Y'all
22 have proposed an addition to be added on a list
23 of -- list of designated historic properties.
24 Y'all don't need to make any decisions about
25 anything that is not on it to be listed as an

1 historic property.

2 You can say one particular part of it
3 is historic or not.

4 MR. CRAVER: Right. So if we don't
5 address the front house and this Board makes
6 changes in six months or a year, then they can
7 be back reconsidering that house. And if this
8 Board has looked at it, considered it, and made
9 the decision if they don't think the front
10 house is, then I think we give this homeowner
11 some level of comfort in knowing that we have
12 made the decision on the record that it is not.

13 MR. McCULLOUGH: That is fine.

14 MR. CRAVER: That is the reason for any
15 motion to say that the front house, which has
16 been altered substantially, does not qualify as
17 an historic structure. That is my motion.

18 MS. EWING: We don't --

19 MR. HERLONG: That wouldn't be the end of
20 it.

21 MR. CRAVER: That is just that structure.
22 I want to deal with one structure.

23 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: That is a motion?

24 MR. CRAVER: That is a motion.

25 MR. HERLONG: I will second that.

1 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Second. Discussion?

2 The discussion is obvious, this doesn't
3 eliminate the possibility of us turning around
4 in the next five minutes and putting the little
5 structure on, is that correct?

6 MR. HERLONG: Correct. I think we will
7 deal with that. Now --

8 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: So that doesn't
9 preclude us turning around, is that correct?

10 MR. McCULLOUGH: What I would have thought
11 is what you would want to do is determine --
12 basically, it says the DRB shall determine
13 whether property shall be determined as
14 historic property or shall no longer be
15 considered an historical property.

16 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: We should be
17 addressing that.

18 MR. PRAUSE: If you don't want to
19 designate it, just don't do it.

20 MR. CRAVER: I hear what you're saying and
21 I have made the motion and the motion is
22 appropriate. And I don't want these people to
23 have to come back here, if we have made -- if
24 we have done the research, we have looked at
25 it, we have made the decision, we ought to give

1 them the certainty of it.

2 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: It doesn't preclude,
3 though, that another board --

4 MR. PRAUSE: Another board could come back
5 and say the same thing.

6 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: In a year it is going
7 to be on it, doesn't preclude that. It doesn't
8 mean anything either way.

9 MR. CRAVER: I am not sure it doesn't
10 preclude somebody from coming back a year from
11 now and saying that it doesn't.

12 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: I don't know. That is
13 what I am hearing, but --

14 MR. McCULLOUGH: I think somebody could
15 come back and say it should or shouldn't be
16 considered, but I understand what Billy is
17 saying. We have looked at it and you --

18 MR. CRAVER: We are going on record and
19 saying this board has made that decision.

20 MR. McCULLOUGH: The only other
21 alternative I would suggest is possibly saying
22 in the motion, we have reviewed this property
23 and after a thorough review, including on-site
24 inspection, have determined that this
25 particular piece, citing very specifically 1

1 through 8, whichever ones they might be, is the
2 only part that should be considered an historic
3 property.

4 If you want to do it separately, that
5 is fine.

6 MR. CRAVER: I have made a motion and
7 seconded it.

8 MR. WRIGHT: I have a question. If we do
9 this, what then precludes the owner from coming
10 out next week and tearing it down?

11 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: We can tear the front
12 structure.

13 MR. WRIGHT: We are dealing with one
14 structure. The point of the board worrying
15 about that a year from now is moot.

16 MR. CRAVER: Right. But you have an
17 adversary there.

18 MR. PRAUSE: Why take a chance?

19 MR. BRIAN HELLMAN: I object to that.

20 MR. CRAVER: They have it on the market
21 and it may be more marketable with the
22 structure than without it, I don't know. He
23 may decide he wants to sell it with the
24 structure.

25 I am trying to give them clarity,

1 okay? I think I am hearing that nobody thinks
2 the front structure meets the requirements. So
3 I have put that in a motion on the table and it
4 is seconded.

5 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: I can vote for that.
6 Any more discussion on that motion? Okay.
7 Let's call for a vote. Billy?

8 MR. CRAVER: I vote in favor of the
9 motion.

10 MS. EWING: No.

11 MS. HARMON: Yes.

12 MR. HERLONG: Yes.

13 MR. ILDERTON: Yes.

14 MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Okay. Now, we are
16 left with consideration of the little
17 structure. We have talked about it. Do I hear
18 a motion on that?

19 MS. HARMON: I make a motion that we put
20 this on the historic list under item two,
21 architectural style and period typical of the
22 area, and number seven, typical patterns of the
23 roofline.

24 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Do I hear a second?

25 MR. McCULLOUGH: Which numbers?

1 MS. HARMON: Number two and number seven.

2 MR. McCULLOUGH: I think you might be on
3 page 40.

4 MS. HARMON: Am I on the wrong page? I
5 will amend that motion. Just give me a moment.

6 Okay. Number one that has historic
7 inherent character; number two -- I think it is
8 number four, is culturally, politically,
9 economically and socially essence of the
10 heritage of the town. Number six, contains
11 elements of design, detail and material and
12 craftsmanship. Number seven, it represents an
13 established and familiar visual feature of the
14 neighborhood of the town.

15 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: That's correct. All
16 right. Do I hear a second?

17 MS. EWING: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Discussion?

19 MR. HERLONG: I think certainly the items
20 six and seven do characterize that structure
21 and so I think that is --

22 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: I think it is unique,
23 especially its presence close to the street. I
24 wouldn't build structures like that now. That
25 is part of the charm of Sullivan's Island being

1 able to build near the street. But at times it
2 would be neat to build -- reproduce something
3 like that. It has a lot of charm and so --

4 MR. BRIAN HELLMAN: Just for
5 clarification, are we going to exclude this
6 porch addition from what we are considering?

7 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: I guess we can be that
8 specific since we can do anything we want,
9 right?

10 MS. HARMON: Maybe the new owner wouldn't
11 want to do it. I think we better leave it
12 alone.

13 MS. EWING: Why don't we wait?

14 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: I think there is a
15 high probability of that, it is an obvious
16 thing in my opinion, but right now, it is part
17 of the building.

18 MR. HERLONG: I would like to -- another
19 answer to that question that they have,
20 typically, we would want to be very careful
21 about just saying, sure, you can tear that
22 porch addition off. Which one, we would like
23 to see if you come back with a plan, existing
24 plan and say, this porch specifically, come
25 before us, we say it is not historic and you

1 can demolish it, you are likely to get the
2 approval.

3 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: High probability of
4 that.

5 MR. HERLONG: But without a specific
6 document saying this part is -- we say it is
7 historic, this is demolishable, we have a
8 potential problem.

9 MR. BRIAN HELLMAN: I see.

10 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: It is on the record
11 that we could say high probability of it. So,
12 further discussion?

13 MR. CRAVER: Yeah. I would still -- I
14 still have the issue and I understand where all
15 of y'all are, but I just want to make sure it
16 is on the record as part of the discussion.

17 I still have the issue of concluding
18 that this structure, other than some portion of
19 what was here in 1940, that this structure
20 really has any real historic significance here.
21 I mean, it is an old -- it is a house that is
22 60 years old, maybe, and -- but I still
23 don't -- I still don't see the real historic
24 significance of it and I wouldn't -- I wouldn't
25 put the burden of that house on this property.

1 I would leave it and let the owner decide
2 whether they wanted to have that structure stay
3 on the property. That is just my --

4 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Thank you. All right.
5 Betty?

6 MS. HARMON: For it.

7 MS. EWING: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Billy?

9 MR. CRAVER: No.

10 MR. HERLONG: Yes.

11 MR. ILDERTON: Yes.

12 MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: All right. Thank you,
14 sir. Let's look at this form. Y'all have done
15 a lot of good work.

16 MR. WRIGHT: Can I make the first comment
17 since you and I have talked, the changes we
18 talked about were made.

19 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: You mean the new
20 section?

21 MR. WRIGHT: Terrific. With the exception
22 of the question that you had regarding the
23 timing of the survey.

24 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Yeah, okay.

25 MS. EWING: What are y'all doing?

1 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: We are considering
2 this form.

3 MR. WRIGHT: We are talking about the
4 form.

5 MR. HERLONG: We are on the next item of
6 discussion which is the new form, new forms and
7 applications.

8 MR. WRIGHT: Pat and I met; two of us can
9 meet legally, I hope.

10 MR. McCULLOUGH: (Nods.)

11 MR. WRIGHT: I reviewed with Pat the work
12 of the committee that developed the form since
13 he was not at the special meeting last month.
14 As we reviewed the letter, Pat had no problem
15 with the letter, proposed letter to the
16 property owners.

17 On the conceptual submittal
18 checklist, we discussed the requirement for the
19 certified survey as part of the submission.
20 Pat had a very good question, should that have
21 a date on it in terms of should that survey
22 have been done within the last year, not a
23 20-year-old survey. I think that is a valid
24 point that we might want to discuss and
25 consider maybe adding on the form, that a

1 certified survey by a South Carolina registered
2 land surveyor done within the past "X" number
3 of years or months.

4 MS. EWING: How about the --

5 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Also on the survey,
6 the other part is at what point -- I don't know
7 if we want to ask somebody to supply a \$400
8 survey if they want to replace their front rail
9 or something.

10 MR. HERLONG: It says that is required for
11 all new construction and for work which expands
12 or is outside an existing building footprint,
13 illustrating the following so we did cover
14 that.

15 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Okay.

16 MR. CRAVER: You would need a survey for a
17 fence? If you were going to put a fence up you
18 would need a survey?

19 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: I hope not.

20 MR. HERLONG: I think it says, the way it
21 is stated, one would need a survey to come
22 before this Board to build a fence.

23 MR. CRAVER: Because it is work outside an
24 existing building footprint, if you were going
25 to add a fence?

1 MR. HERLONG: That is true.

2 MR. ROBINSON: That is needed. You really
3 do need a survey in which to build a fence. I
4 can't tell you how many times I have seen
5 surveys with the fence outside of the property
6 line because somebody didn't get a survey.

7 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: What about the date or
8 the --

9 MR. HERLONG: Regarding putting a date on
10 this, I think some towns, municipalities put a
11 three-year time limit. I think OCRM, sometimes
12 that is a requirement within certain
13 communities. I know Kiawah has surveys with an
14 OCRM update within three years old. So three
15 years might be a good number. I don't know
16 that we are going to be able to find a perfect
17 date. I don't think a year, maybe, is
18 unreasonable, 10 years is too long, possibly
19 three years.

20 MS. HARMON: Why don't you say as long as
21 the owner has owned the house and had a survey
22 at that time?

23 MR. PRAUSE: What you want to do is
24 reflect accurate conditions. It may be they
25 had an addition put on in the last year that is

1 not reflected on the survey and you would want
2 a reflection of accurate conditions.

3 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Maybe we could have
4 language saying unless the house has been
5 substantially altered or the footprint of the
6 house and/or auxiliary structures has been
7 substantially added or altered, then we will
8 use survey of whatever, you know.

9 MR. PRAUSE: Maybe you could put a survey
10 reflecting the current accurate conditions of
11 the property.

12 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Yeah, that is good.
13 So if you have a 20-year-old survey but nothing
14 has changed, you can submit it.

15 That is good. I like that.

16 MR. WRIGHT: Excuse me. I want to make a
17 note here.

18 MR. CRAVER: Kent, would calling it an
19 as-built survey, wouldn't that do that? Isn't
20 that a term of art?

21 MR. PRAUSE: I would say so, yeah.

22 MR. CRAVER: So is that the term of art
23 for land surveyors, it is an as-built survey?

24 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: As a regular term, you
25 are right.

1 MR. CRAVER: Means you are showing all
2 improvements on the property.

3 MR. PRAUSE: Maybe you want to clarify
4 further saying showing as-built survey showing
5 all current improvements.

6 MR. CRAVER: Well, it could be a current
7 as-built survey which means showing -- that
8 actually says it.

9 MR. PRAUSE: Less is better.

10 MR. WRIGHT: What are we going to do here?
11 A current as-built survey?

12 MR. CRAVER: Yes. I think --

13 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: We could --

14 MS. KENYON: One at a time. One at a
15 time.

16 MR. WRIGHT: That is the only change, that
17 is on the -- that would be on the conceptual,
18 preliminary and final submittal checklist.

19 MS. EWING: I have just one change that I
20 think, this is very minimal, on these
21 conceptual, preliminary and final, they were
22 colored in and that is just not going to copy.
23 So we need to put an "X" in those so all -- in
24 other words, up here at the top --

25 MR. WRIGHT: They are already in here, for

1 some reason.

2 MS. EWING: But we just need to change
3 that.

4 MR. WRIGHT: All right.

5 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Can we vote on
6 accepting this and --

7 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah. The forms, and then we
8 have forms, A, B and C and C1 as far as
9 exemptions. I move that the letter be signed
10 by the chairman of the board. This letter
11 being given out by Kat or someone at the town
12 office when someone seeks an application, and
13 that we implement these forms immediately.

14 MR. CRAVER: When is the deadline for the
15 next meeting?

16 MS. KENYON: Friday.

17 MR. CRAVER: So is it fair to make people
18 who are meeting a deadline in two days?

19 MR. WRIGHT: Probably not. Probably not.

20 MR. CRAVER: I would say optional, the
21 next period, but mandatory after that.

22 MR. WRIGHT: We could make it clear by
23 just making it mandatory for submission toward
24 the October meeting.

25 MR. CRAVER: Sure.

1 MR. WRIGHT: Beginning October of this
2 year.

3 MS. HARMON: I have a question. I
4 submitted a site plan and did y'all decide not
5 to include it?

6 MR. WRIGHT: Yes. Do you remember looking
7 at the site plan?

8 MR. HERLONG: We had it and looked at it
9 and discussed it and just found that it
10 was -- it was a lot of additional information
11 that was as confusing as it was clarifying.

12 MR. WRIGHT: Betty, I think that the
13 language in here, everything that is in here is
14 very explicit in terms of what we need.

15 MS. HARMON: I didn't find it confusing at
16 all. I found it very clarifying and I would
17 really like to consider having it put in
18 because it gives you an idea of, you go look at
19 the structure, like I do, I go as soon as I can
20 and go look at them and then you write your
21 notes -- I write my notes. And then sometimes
22 you forget exactly where something is and
23 rather than getting back in your car and going
24 back and looking at it again, if you have a
25 site plan you can say, oh, that is there and

1 that is here. That was my purpose of having
2 it.

3 MR. HERLONG: There is a requirement for
4 the site plan and the list -- the requirements.

5 MS. HARMON: But you are not giving the
6 neighbors -- are you giving the property line?

7 MR. HERLONG: Yes.

8 MS. HARMON: Where?

9 MR. HERLONG: We did discuss whether or
10 not it would be good to put a requirement to
11 also survey your neighbor's property and felt
12 like that was becoming a burden to an
13 applicant. The Board may in some very specific
14 instances say, I need to see some information
15 about your neighbor's property, but we
16 discussed it and felt like it was too much of a
17 burden, too expensive to have to go do that
18 additional survey.

19 MS. HARMON: Well, I mean, if you have a
20 property line, you can use your one inch
21 equals -- one foot is an 1/8-inch. I don't see
22 how that would be very expensive. I just don't
23 understand how that is expensive.

24 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Surveyors charge a lot
25 of money.

1 MR. WRIGHT: There is a motion on the
2 table.

3 MR. CRAVER: Did you need a second or was
4 it seconded? I will second it.

5 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Discussion on
6 accepting this form and requiring it starting
7 October, for the October meeting? Everybody in
8 favor?

9 MR. CRAVER: Yes.

10 MR. HERLONG: Approve.

11 MR. ILBERTON: Yes.

12 MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

13 MS. HARMON: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: All right.

15 MR. CRAVER: I will express my thanks to
16 those who put all of the time into the
17 development of the form. Y'all did a lot of
18 work and it looks good.

19 MS. EWING: I do want to say something,
20 Betty, about your -- first of all, I don't
21 remember that conversation, having that
22 conversation, and -- but I am not saying that
23 it didn't happen. But I think, and it was my
24 thought all along, that when we -- when people
25 got that site plan that you gave us, it would

1 be part of the -- fill out how, if you are
2 having problems and you need to know how to
3 fill this out, this is what we are looking for.

4 And so I think we can still do this,
5 is what I am saying, as an example and have it
6 up on the board and you can even have it on the
7 Web site if need be, for an example, from what
8 I understand. That was my understanding.

9 MR. O'NEIL: An idea was floated by an
10 anonymous person that you guys also include an
11 environment that people have an electronic
12 version of what they turn in; was that idea
13 part of what you adopted?

14 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: No.

15 MR. HERLONG: We haven't gotten to that
16 yet. In fact, the other issue is we stated in
17 there that all applicable design and review fee
18 is paid, but I don't know that that is even
19 ready. That is -- that is a town form, that is
20 not our issue, so we just wanted to make sure
21 that it is in the checklist and people are
22 going to ask and be told we don't have any,
23 people are going to come.

24 MS. KENYON: We might have one.

25 MS. EWING: I think the intention of the

1 board is to have it available online, isn't it?
2 These forms are online?

3 MR. HERLONG: I guess there is a way. The
4 question was, was it not a thought it could be
5 not an interactive thing. You just get a scan
6 of it, fill it in and scan it back, and then
7 any committee can look at what is currently on
8 an application for the month.

9 MR. ILBERTON: Read-only PDF?

10 MS. EWING: That is what you want?

11 MR. O'NEIL: That is what I suggested when
12 we were going back.

13 MS. EWING: I thought you were just
14 requesting that the applications were online
15 and I didn't realize you wanted it available to
16 everybody.

17 MR. O'NEIL: I was just -- if it is
18 electronic, if it is going to be online, you
19 have to have an electronic submission, that
20 would be the first step. It would make it
21 easier to disseminate to everybody involved in
22 the process.

23 MR. HERLONG: The last item on the agenda,
24 we talked about that town council has taken
25 some actions and we thought it would be great

1 if Pat O'Neil could fill the board in on the
2 various actions that may affect the Design
3 Review Board in the future. So if you can kind
4 of --

5 MR. O'NEIL: Stephen asked me to show up,
6 I didn't just pop up on my own. Can you please
7 include Mike Perkis in the guilty party with
8 me?

9 MR. HERLONG: Certainly, certainly.

10 MR. O'NEIL: Steve suggested we might have
11 done something with the Snider survey, taken an
12 action that would have an impact on the DRB
13 without informing the DRB. And after I told
14 him that could never happen, it had never
15 happened in the history of the town, we talked
16 about what we did. And essentially what we
17 kept him out of the loop on, you are all aware
18 of the history of the attempts to modify the
19 ordinance to have demolition review
20 requirements of all structures over 60 years of
21 age or older that had not been part of the
22 David Snider surveys and found by David to be
23 either worthy of designation as historic or
24 altered beyond that or demolished beyond.

25 That effort was tried and failed, but

1 for a 50-year cutoff and then for a 60-year
2 cutoff, didn't work either time.

3 But the council did agree that it was
4 important that we get an idea of how many such
5 properties there might be and agreed to
6 contract with David Snider of Snider
7 Preservation, LLC.

8 I think most of you know of David
9 because he not only was a preservation
10 consultant as part of the Cooper consulting
11 team when we redid the entire zoning ordinance
12 but he also had done the original 1987 survey
13 of historic structures on the island. We have
14 contracted or we are in the process of -- we
15 have contracted with David to take a list of
16 properties which are thought to be 60 years of
17 age or older but not on any of these Snider
18 lists and to do a more involved survey than he
19 did, just a windshield, drive-by kind of thing,
20 to determine which of these properties might be
21 considered by the DRB for designation as
22 historic. And he is going to apply the same
23 criteria that we have in our ordinance for
24 that.

25 We do not intend for this to be

1 usurping any power whatsoever from the DRB, as
2 I look at it, and I am hoping to be corrected
3 by Mike or Randy or Kent, he doesn't have the
4 authority to do that.

5 We are not asking him to do something
6 rather than you guys do it, but rather to
7 narrow down that larger category of about 130
8 properties that are 60 years of age that are
9 kind of in limbo, narrow it down to those that
10 meet our criteria of being historic and then we
11 would wind up with that small list.

12 Steve asked me the troubling
13 question, what do you do with the data from
14 that and the results, and truth be told, I
15 don't think we have gone that far. I think
16 counsel for Sullivan's Island was interested in
17 trying to see which of these houses did or
18 might deserve protection, but we haven't
19 figured out what we would do with the results
20 of the list.

21 Obviously, one idea -- and this is
22 out of my own head, I am speaking for myself --
23 one option would be hand the list of properties
24 that he considers historic to you guys and ask
25 him to take a whack at it and evaluate each and

1 every one of them.

2 One idea would be to do nothing but
3 you would have that information.

4 One idea would be to try to do
5 another round of a demolition review ordinance
6 which would simply limit it to those identified
7 houses which would be a much smaller number.

8 We would be very open to hearing what
9 your ideas are about how we could use David's
10 information. But that is where what we are
11 doing with that.

12 We have been tweaking a notification
13 letter which will be sent to the owners of all
14 of these properties. The list, by the way,
15 came up -- Randy, Kent, y'all may need to help
16 me with this, or Jeff -- Bobby Thompson did a
17 first pass of going through the county records
18 and identifying properties where the county
19 claims they were built before more than 60
20 years ago or --

21 MS. KENYON: I have that list.

22 MR. O'NEIL: -- and then checking, he took
23 all of those and checked off the ones that were
24 on one of Snider's list because he made the
25 survey. The ones that are left are going to be

1 the starting points for David.

2 We are not presenting that to him as
3 we think these are historic. We are presenting
4 that to him as these are the properties that we
5 would like you to survey. He is going to
6 provide some other value to us; I can't
7 remember what it is. I think he is going to
8 give us a data card of some kind or other. He
9 is going to send the letters out next week or
10 so, he is going to start the survey
11 September 10.

12 MS. KENYON: He will be doing like a
13 survey card so we will have that.

14 MR. O'NEIL: Yes. I think he will be
15 coming out with similar or identical
16 information.

17 MR. PERKIS: He expects to be done
18 September 30. I expect we will have it in
19 October, then we have to decide once we look at
20 the magnitude and the numbers what do we do
21 next. It will be about October.

22 MR. O'NEIL: We are sending the notice out
23 to make sure -- for a couple of reasons. One
24 is for the individual property owners to
25 indicate whether they give permission to David

1 to go on their property with them on specified
2 hours, specified days, on the lot, not inside
3 the house. You can't go on the premises
4 without asking.

5 They can warn him about a dog, they
6 can tell him they don't want him there, they
7 can indicate what their priorities are, as well
8 as providing any other additional information
9 about the property. We are trying to send that
10 information out to the people so they are not
11 alarmed so they don't think David is going to
12 put them on the list to sell it, so --

13 MS. KENYON: Or shoot him.

14 MR. O'NEIL: -- or shoot him. So we are
15 indicating in that letter the fact that he
16 doesn't make the decision, that the DRB does,
17 and we are also including, and this was his
18 idea -- he drafted the letter, by the way. I
19 don't want to make it sound like it is
20 something we are doing on our own. He
21 suggested including the designation criteria
22 with that so people will know how their
23 properties are being judged.

24 MS. EWING: Can we get a copy of those?

25 MR. O'NEIL: Sure. Once we get the final

1 version. Kat, we are getting that list. We
2 will get David to look at what our deadline is
3 for council members to submit any comments.

4 MS. KENYON: That list he sent, there are
5 a lot you can take off right away because they
6 are brand-new houses. He will be able to
7 shorten that list quite a bit.

8 MR. HERLONG: I would much rather be in a
9 position as a neighbor on the island of having
10 a list presented to the review board and having
11 them to deal with a house that an independent
12 consultant designated as opposed to us having
13 to just designate them whenever an issue might
14 come up like we just had.

15 I think it is a better way for this
16 board to deal with issues, to let somebody at
17 one point in time identify a group of homes,
18 there is some information there, and then we
19 have to figure out how to deal with that
20 information, whether we agree with it or not.

21 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: The original list --

22 MR. HERLONG: We are just responding.

23 MR. CRAVER: So I think the idea of having
24 an expert opinion tell us whether he thinks it
25 is historic at least is a starting point. It

1 is better to me than the seven of us deciding,
2 this is a cute little island house, we think it
3 ought to be historic, when it may or may not
4 have any historic features to it which has been
5 my concern all along.

6 MR. O'NEIL: Again, we are not trying to
7 replace your discretion.

8 MR. CRAVER: I applaud you. I am glad
9 y'all -- I think that you will reduce the
10 number of issues that we have and will give us
11 some real valuable input from the expert, that
12 the town has decided is the expert, and give us
13 guidance on the whole list we have now. I
14 think it is a great idea.

15 MR. O'NEIL: But again --

16 MR. PERKIS: Ultimately, we can look at
17 something that he thinks is not historic and
18 the decision will be the Design Review Board,
19 not his.

20 MR. CRAVER: His opinion is just evidence,
21 but it is helpful to have an expert, that we
22 have all looked at a lot of his reports and
23 stuff, give us his input.

24 MR. HERLONG: One thing that I think is
25 still, as a board, confusing is the list of

1 homes. We have talked about that and there are
2 three categories, and specifically the altered
3 category of homes that are on the historic
4 resource designation study list, whatever it is
5 called, I think that is it, the altered
6 structures, and that I wish we could clarify
7 somehow, the town could clarify that either
8 through additional language. As I understand
9 it, an altered structure outside of the
10 district is considered altered by an expert
11 because it no longer is altered to the extent
12 it no longer retains any historic value. But I
13 don't really -- I don't think we have enough
14 definition as to what that altered means to
15 really use that category and make those
16 decisions.

17 MR. O'NEIL: And Steve, that category --
18 maybe Randy can help me with this, and our
19 attorney -- I don't think that category has any
20 legal standing under the ordinance, because
21 what we did is when we started out with the
22 first generation of this in its present form is
23 we said the historic properties of this town
24 consists of those that are in categories one,
25 two, on the list and those that are considered

1 in categories one and two on the map.

2 We knew that there were little less
3 than one hundred percent similarity between
4 those. It gives no standing to anything that
5 is on the altered list or on the demolished
6 list; I mean, somebody comes in and says, you
7 know, this is an altered structure, can I do
8 something with it before you guys, I don't
9 think you even have anything to say about that
10 unless it comes under some of the zoning design
11 guidelines, things like that. I don't
12 remember -- I didn't get -- I can't remember
13 who I spoke to. I didn't get to talk to you
14 again today, did I, Steve?

15 MR. HERLONG: No.

16 MR. O'NEIL: I moved my cell phone and it
17 is sitting on my dresser all day, I don't know
18 who called me. After you and I spoke, I found
19 an e-mail a day or two earlier from Larry which
20 I need to get some clarification on. But he
21 essentially is saying, you know, we could
22 combine all of the properties that fall under
23 that were passed by the original, plus the ones
24 y'all have taken off, plus the ones you have
25 added, and make for the town's use of the list

1 just so it is an itemization of everything that
2 could be included, but that the ordinance
3 doesn't refer to any specific list.

4 He did clarify, he did validate what
5 I said, verify it, that, you know, whether it
6 is category one or category two, doesn't
7 matter. It gets no different treatment under
8 the ordinance.

9 I think, if I am reading it right,
10 the ones that were on Snider's altered list,
11 they are off the table actually across the
12 board because they are not -- they are not
13 protected now and they are not included in the
14 new survey that we are doing. Right, Randy?

15 MR. ROBINSON: That's correct.

16 MR. HERLONG: That seems like that could
17 be confusing. We have a list of homes that had
18 enough potential value to be put on altered
19 lists and we are going to set that aside as
20 unprotected. Now we are going to the next
21 category that never made that list and
22 identifying them and those are going to come to
23 us to be dealt with whether they might have to
24 come before the DRB or not.

25 MR. O'NEIL: Well, I am not quite sure

1 whether that is the way to read that, although
2 I can see why you would. The altered list
3 wasn't -- that was just his convenient
4 category. He resurveyed everything which had
5 been originally part of his 1987 survey that
6 had not been characterized as gone after Hugo,
7 a quick recap, a resurvey of the island after
8 Hugo.

9 So when he resurveyed in 2002, he
10 then deemed those structures to have been
11 altered to the point where they retained no or
12 insufficient historic significance to be
13 protected by this; that is not to say, you
14 know, Randy Young -- if Randy is one of those
15 on the altered list, that he can't come before
16 you guys and ask to have it put on the list,
17 you are not bound.

18 The ones he is looking at now are the
19 ones that fell through the cracks. They were
20 either originally never identified as being
21 altered and/or the ones that have gotten to be
22 60 years old but weren't 50 years old in 1987,
23 I think that was the criteria they used back
24 then, if I am remembering what I was told.

25 So, you know, it is not a lower level

1 of importance, it is just the ones that -- the
2 ones we may have missed.

3 MR. HERLONG: The list that is considered
4 altered, wasn't that survey that he did sort of
5 like a windshield survey?

6 MR. O'NEIL: Yes.

7 MR. HERLONG: He did go in those homes,
8 but they are on an altered list. Now, he is
9 going to physically knock on the doors and
10 potentially go in homes that might have a
11 certain -- that are on this new list?

12 MR. O'NEIL: Yes.

13 MR. HERLONG: I feel like there is
14 still -- altered is still this question about
15 when we get more data, should he be looking at
16 these other homes and the altered? It is just
17 sort of always a question, what is the status
18 of these altered structures?

19 MS. EWING: In my estimate, because I have
20 spoken with David Snider before and it is my
21 understanding, I just find, as Steve does, this
22 altered is very -- it says historic, but
23 altered, on the list. If you go and look at
24 these homes, they are clearly historic homes.

25 MR. O'NEIL: Old or historic?

1 MS. EWING: This is it. My understanding
2 of the altered is when he was going through
3 with the intention of finding for the town for
4 the National Register, that is when he gave the
5 ones and twos which he was setting up this
6 hierarchy in order to say, okay, the altered
7 ones are never going to be National Register;
8 it doesn't mean that they are not historic,
9 therefore, they are going to be historic
10 altered, and I just -- I just find it very
11 confusing.

12 I have also talked to other
13 preservationists and asked them specifically is
14 this a standard designation that everybody
15 understands in historic preservation and it is
16 not.

17 MR. O'NEIL: It is not part of the
18 ordinance either. Remember that the survey
19 results he gave us, you know, it was a study,
20 and when we move two of his categories into a
21 class of protected properties, that is because
22 we had to start somewhere. That was, you know,
23 I don't think there was any better way to --
24 better starting point than the survey we had.
25 But we didn't say there is also altered

1 properties. The ordinance doesn't refer to
2 that.

3 MR. PERKIS: It should be -- should we not
4 have asked him to include those homes that were
5 altered? Since he is out there doing the
6 survey?

7 MR. HERLONG: Yes. I feel like this board
8 is dealing with some incomplete information
9 because that altered list was looked at through
10 the windshield. This new list is going to be
11 more closely studied than the altered list. We
12 will always have that feeling of doubt when we
13 are looking at something that has been
14 classified altered. We need to go look at it.

15 MR. O'NEIL: We might miss an opportunity.

16 MR. HERLONG: We have varying
17 classifications and it just leads to potential
18 confusion which could be very frustrating for
19 homeowners, what category, you know.

20 MR. CRAVER: A lot of the houses he is
21 going to be looking at would have been altered
22 to some extent. Most of the houses that we
23 have all had some sort of alteration.

24 I wonder, Pat, one of the issues we
25 have had with the Blanchard house which was one

1 y'all were working on, Steve, it had been
2 substantially altered because after Hugo it was
3 rebuilt. And so you look at it and it looks
4 like this great old house, but it really was a
5 reproduction, about two-thirds of it.

6 Well, it is not designated historic
7 because we designated it, but I mean, it is
8 altered, you know, significantly altered, but
9 it is altered to look really nice and historic.
10 I would call it this particular term, I would
11 say it is a neat, traditional island resource,
12 but if I were looking at it to allow the owners
13 to do something to it, I would look at it
14 differently than I would look at like one of
15 the Officers Quarters that I think you ought to
16 keep the exact same materials, you ought to
17 keep everything. But with the Blanchard house,
18 I would say I want to keep the character of it,
19 I want to keep the island features of it, but I
20 am not so concerned about whether you use
21 exactly the right materials and -- I mean,
22 there is almost a different standard there.

23 And I would feel a lot better about a
24 lot of the houses that we have come in here if
25 I thought that the standard on some of them

1 wasn't so strict as being, okay, this is
2 historic, so you have got to treat it the same
3 way you might treat an Officers Quarters, if I
4 was looking at it thinking, okay, this is a
5 traditional island resource and we want to
6 maintain the character, maintain the flavor, I
7 mean, somebody who could articulate some
8 standards there that wouldn't be quite as
9 stringent as the pure to start, but it does
10 maintain the Sullivan's Island character.

11 Now, whether or not you can legally
12 do that, I mean, there is an historic element
13 to it that would allow you to designate it --
14 have a designation. I would feel much better,
15 even about that little house tonight, the 650
16 square foot house, it has island character, it
17 has flavor, it has some age to it, but do I
18 think it has the same character as an Officers
19 Quarter? I am not convinced that it does. I
20 am not convinced that we have enough to do
21 that.

22 So if there were -- if there were
23 even another designation, but an historical
24 designation that gives more freedom of motion
25 than what we do with it, I would feel a lot

1 better about it. I think we would end up
2 preserving a lot more structures, too, doing
3 that.

4 MR. WRIGHT: Are you suggesting, Steve,
5 that the altered list be resurveyed in the
6 current survey that Snider is doing and
7 integrate it? That makes sense to me.

8 MR. HERLONG: I have never seen us
9 question the category one or two. It is the
10 category three, every time, well, it is almost
11 like half the board thinks one thing, half
12 thinks the other, and we are not sure what
13 direction we were given as to how to judge that
14 home. Now we are going to have an additional
15 group of homes that got judged by knocking on
16 the door, they went and may have been able to
17 go inside. These others were judged by a
18 drive-by.

19 MR. O'NEIL: Steve, have any of the --
20 because I have been thinking all along that you
21 guys had no dealings with the properties on the
22 Snider's altered category. Are they coming
23 before y'all?

24 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Yeah.

25 MR. CRAVER: When we had the 50-year

1 issue, we were getting a number of them.

2 MR. O'NEIL: But I mean are y'all making
3 any judgments about the properties that are in
4 Snider's altered category?

5 MR. PERKIS: Only one. And I think you
6 guys said there was no reason for them to come
7 before.

8 MR. ROBINSON: The only reason they came
9 is because they wanted an increase is what the
10 reason was they came.

11 MR. O'NEIL: That had nothing to do with
12 historic protection and the design review.

13 MR. HERLONG: Again, this shows confusion.
14 We thought it was there. Half of the board at
15 least thought it was there because of its
16 historic category. It might have been there
17 for increase, but it is on that list. So we
18 are looking at it.

19 MR. O'NEIL: We shouldn't even be letting
20 people indicate that they are on either of
21 those. I don't think we should ask people to
22 indicate which list they are on other than
23 historic resource or nonhistoric resource.

24 MR. HERLONG: That is what the new form
25 does.

1 MR. O'NEIL: The other thing is the town
2 has stuff on our Web site that should have been
3 taken down two years ago. I apologize for the
4 fact that we have that.

5 MR. PERKIS: We have a council meeting
6 Tuesday and I don't mind bringing up at the
7 council meeting, this is something that
8 bothered me before and I let it go, and there
9 is about 40 homes on the list. I don't mind
10 bringing it up on Tuesday since we are at the
11 very beginning of the process and ask council
12 to ask Mr. Snider to add these 40 homes because
13 the letters are just going out. If it is the
14 same letter, we don't need to change it, and
15 add the 40.

16 MR. O'NEIL: And the other thing, too, I
17 mean, I never even questioned any of that. I
18 questioned whether we should have been
19 comfortable just accepting, we didn't -- I
20 mean, we have got means to move, to take a
21 property whether it is on our historic resource
22 improvement or not and move it in and move them
23 out and all of that is at your discretion. But
24 I personally never questioned whether he might
25 have had some false negatives that wound up on

1 the altered list; namely, he didn't think they
2 had historic value but maybe they did.

3 MS. HARMON: A good example of that is
4 Fred Reinhard's house. It is an old house,
5 historic house, and it is not on the list.
6 That was one that slipped through the cracks.

7 MR. O'NEIL: Tell me what you mean by on
8 the list?

9 MS. HARMON: What was the date of his
10 house? It is an old, old house, but it didn't
11 make it on any list.

12 MR. O'NEIL: Snider did not survey it?
13 That is one of the ones we are picking up. The
14 other -- to the other point, we probably should
15 have been worried about the altered list.

16 MR. CRAVER: I think so.

17 MR. O'NEIL: I will say it will be useful
18 to ask David how did you arrive at the
19 conclusion that it belonged there, what was the
20 data you used for the decision. If it was just
21 drove by and it looked new, it had vinyl siding
22 on it, that is one thing. If it is, you know
23 -- if he gets more in-depth looking at it --

24 MS. EWING: Again I have to go back. This
25 is a map revised June 30, 2003, it is a list of

1 historic resources of Sullivan's Island.

2 MR. O'NEIL: Is that Snider's map?

3 MR. HERLONG: That is the current map we
4 use.

5 MS. EWING: It goes all the way down and
6 the ones that say, "modern, not eligible" for
7 preserving, are a blank circle; "gone" is
8 designated by black dot; and "altered" is blue.

9 Altered is clearly a part of a
10 historic resource and this is what I am trying
11 to get through. It may be altered, but in
12 historic preservation, many, many buildings are
13 altered and -- but that is by definition of the
14 Secretary of the Interior's historic
15 preservation guidelines, altered does not mean
16 it is not historic.

17 I think we have gotten very, very
18 confused down to the point where in our
19 ordinances it says we only protect number one
20 and number two and do not protect the altered
21 when clearly altered is historic.

22 MR. O'NEIL: I wish I knew, and I don't,
23 and I think it is important for all of us to
24 know exactly what he meant by that. I don't
25 recall if there was any information about his

1 survey methodology that he posted. All of that
2 data is posted, and, you know, I agree, just
3 because something has been added onto that
4 means it is not historic, I have used the
5 example of the U.S. Capitol.

6 MS. EWING: Exactly. Or Officers
7 Quarters.

8 MR. O'NEIL: Cyndy, I don't know what
9 criteria David used to put property in that
10 group. I think we may be making too much of
11 the fact that he just called it altered.

12 MR. HERLONG: It is written in there, what
13 he defined altered, did he not?

14 MR. PRAUSE: None of that really matters.
15 If y'all think that these ones need to be on
16 there then just put them on there. The Design
17 Review Board, town council, planning commission
18 or owners of one or more lots of land may make
19 additions or deletions to the list of
20 designated historic properties.

21 If there is anything on there you
22 think needs to be on there, put it on there.

23 MS. HARMON: You are on page 40?

24 MR. PRAUSE: Exactly. Give them 30 days'
25 notice, write up a list, send the notices out.

1 MR. O'NEIL: One of the many things I need
2 to find out is when he said they had been
3 altered, did he mean they were thought to be of
4 some historic value in '87 but changed since
5 '87 to where they had lost --

6 MS. EWING: No, because in 2003 he is
7 saying they are historic.

8 MR. O'NEIL: No, he is not.

9 MS. EWING: It says historic resource
10 list.

11 MR. O'NEIL: Pat, he is saying that is the
12 survey of historic resources, he is not saying
13 every dot on there is historic, Cyndy.

14 MR. PERKIS: It says clearly --

15 MS. EWING: If you look at the way he has
16 colored the ones that are not eligible are
17 white. The ones that are eligible are blue,
18 yellow, red and green. Those are the ones that
19 are eligible. Clearly --

20 MR. O'NEIL: Eligible for what?

21 MS. EWING: That are historic.

22 MR. PRAUSE: What is the title of that
23 map?

24 MS. EWING: Historic resources of
25 Sullivan's Island.

1 MR. PRAUSE: The ones that are --

2 MS. EWING: White are not eligible for
3 survey.

4 MR. PRAUSE: That is not the one that was
5 used. I don't know where that came from. The
6 one used for purposes of the ordinance is
7 called Historic Resources of Sullivan's Island,
8 South Carolina, Field Evaluation Map, provided
9 30 June 2003.

10 MS. EWING: That's this one.

11 MR. PRAUSE: Toss the other one and let's
12 talk about that.

13 MS. EWING: This is the one we are talking
14 about.

15 MR. PRAUSE: I thought you just read me
16 the title.

17 MS. EWING: June 30, 2003. This is the
18 one we are talking about.

19 MR. PRAUSE: All right. That's the one.

20 MR. HERLONG: Do you see what the problem
21 is? We don't know how to deal with the altered
22 group.

23 MR. O'NEIL: Right now you only deal with
24 them if somebody applies to have them put on
25 the historic resource list.

1 MR. PRAUSE: Or want a modification, but
2 if you think they need to be on the list, you
3 have the authority to put them on there.

4 MR. O'NEIL: I think we ought to go back
5 and see and take a look at them.

6 MR. HERLONG: Kent is right. We can take
7 any of those and say we want to identify that
8 house and put it on the list.

9 I would prefer that our consultant
10 bring that to this board as a full group then
11 we deal with it once that information has been
12 brought to us. I don't want to go out to the
13 community, find a neighbor's house and say, I
14 want to put you on the list. I just don't want
15 to do that.

16 MR. O'NEIL: The other thing I would say,
17 and I wish I could remember the specifics of it
18 but I am pretty sure that when we came up with
19 this way of having a starting point grouping of
20 historic properties, that we spoke with David
21 and out of that conversation came the decision
22 to go with two, but I just don't remember any
23 of that.

24 I think that would address some of
25 Cindy's concerns, but it would also address the

1 issue of how much we need to do to take a
2 second or third look at these properties and
3 make sure we get to them.

4 MR. PERKIS: I am looking at his survey,
5 structure built in 1925, but I can't find in
6 here why he said it was historic but altered.
7 And but, you know, he also has purchased, house
8 was there at the time in 1940, 50 years old,
9 1917, flat, you know, there is some history to
10 it but there is nothing he writes that says why
11 did it go to group three.

12 Your point is you have a window here
13 to have an expert take a look at these again.
14 I will bring it up on Tuesday. I don't see
15 what we have to lose.

16 MR. HERLONG: Right now, there is just
17 confusion and it makes people in the community
18 upset because it appears that there is some
19 kind of confusion as to the way we review them.

20 MR. PERKIS: I don't see the logical
21 exclusion test, why would -- I don't know why
22 he excluded it; I guess because he thought he
23 looked at it.

24 MR. O'NEIL: I am pretty sure we got the
25 information from him or it was his judgment, we

1 were going to start out protecting a group of
2 properties, that those were less defensible.
3 We did not want to get in a situation where we
4 froze all construction or all demolition until
5 each and every one was looked at, and we also
6 didn't want to get in a situation where it was
7 cart blanche for demo permits until, you know,
8 applications were made and reviewed and
9 properties put on the list.

10 I realize I am sounding a little
11 defensive about it, but I am also sounding more
12 confused about what he meant by altered.

13 MS. EWING: There are not that many homes
14 on the altered list, which is really the good
15 news, so I think it is positive.

16 MR. O'NEIL: I will ask for a resurvey and
17 altered to be added to the survey.

18 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Are we good?

19 MR. O'NEIL: Can I ask one more question?
20 May we say to town council that it is the clear
21 preference of the DRB that we get those
22 properties that are on Snider's altered list
23 included in the current survey?

24 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Yeah.

25 MR. CRAVER: I didn't --

1 MS. HARMON: Yes.

2 MS. EWING: I have one more thing to say.
3 I would like to keep this an ongoing type of
4 communication, if possible, and I realize this
5 can't happen at every meeting, but, you know,
6 the more information we have the better.

7 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: We are adjourned.

8 MR. O'NEIL: Mike has been far, far better
9 than I at coming to these meetings.

10 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: We are adjourned.

11 (The hearing concluded at 8:20 P.M.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
2 COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)

3

4 I, Wanda S. Buckner, Registered
5 Professional Reporter and Notary Public for the
6 State of South Carolina, at Large, do hereby certify
7 that the foregoing proceedings were recorded
8 stenographically by me and thereafter transcribed by
9 computer-aided transcription; that the foregoing is
10 a full, complete and true record of the proceedings.

11

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

15

16 Witness my hand, I have hereunto affixed
17 my official seal, this 22nd day of August, 2007, at
18 Charleston, Charleston County, South Carolina.

19

20

21 Wanda S. Buckner
22 NCRA Registered Professional Reporter
23 NCRA Certified Realtime Reporter
24 My Commission Expires:
25 August 20, 2013

24

25