

0001

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

MEETING OF THE SULLIVAN'S ISLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

10
11

DATE: February 20, 2008

TIME: 6:00 p.m.

12

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

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

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

25
0002

1
2

A P P E A R A N C E S

3
4

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS:

5
6
7
8
9

PAT ILBERTON - Chair
STEPHEN HERLONG - Vice Chair
DUKE WRIGHT - Secretary
BETTY HARMON - Member
BILLY CRAVER - Member

10
11
12

(Fred Reinhard and Cyndy Ewing were not in attendance.)

13
14
15
16
17

ALSO PRESENT: Kat Kenyon - Administrative
Kent Prause - Zoning Administrator
Randy Robinson - Building Official
Clay McCullough - Board Attorney

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
0003

1 MR. ILDERTON: It is 6:00, and members in
2 attendance are Duke Wright, Pat Ilderton, Steve Herlong,
3 Betty Harmon and Billy Craver.

4 We would like -- did everybody look at
5 the minutes? Everybody approve? Everybody likes the
6 minutes?

7 MR. WRIGHT: I move the minutes of the
8 January 2008 meeting be approved as written.

9 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a second?

10 MR. HERLONG: I wasn't here for that
11 meeting.

12 MS. HARMON: I second.

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

15 (Wright, Ilderton, Harmon and Craver raised
16 hands.)

17 MR. ILDERTON: Moving right along. The
18 election of new officers. Do I hear any nominations?

19 MR. WRIGHT: I recommend or move that we
20 retain the slate of officers that we have had. In my
21 judgment, it has been a very good, fair, and honest and
22 balanced slate, and I move that we retain the current
23 president and vice president and secretary.

24 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a second?

25 MR. CRAVER: I second.

0004

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

3 (All hands were raised.)

4 MR. ILDERTON: 2263 Atlantic Avenue, changes
5 to an approved plan.

6 MR. HERLONG: I will recuse myself from this
7 discussion.

8 (Mr. Herlong recused himself.)

9 MR. ILDERTON: I would like to state that
10 anyone speaking in favor or against any of the agenda
11 items, if they would speak their name clearly, name and
12 address clearly, and stand up when they address the
13 Board. Thank you.

14 MR. CRAVER: Duke, do we not have our easel?

15 MS. CAMPBELL: Oh, you do.

16 MR. ILDERTON: Kent?

17 MR. PRAUSE: They are here tonight because
18 this house -- it's a new house. It's outside of the
19 historic district, not classified as historic.

20 The reason why they are here is because they
21 had previously requested relief for modifications for
22 some of the zoning and design standards as shown on

23 their application, and they want to change some of that.
24 Basically what they are asking to do is to
25 add 20 square feet to the principal building square

0005

1 footage, that is the enclosed heated space of the
2 building, in order to reconfigure the location of a
3 dining room bay on the second floor on the west side
4 elevation, but it doesn't change the relief previously
5 granted, according to their application.

6 Request to provide certain windows on the
7 west side elevation as indicated on the attached
8 sketches, and they are requesting final approval for
9 these changes.

10 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you.

11 Yes, ma'am?

12 MS. CAMPBELL: Kent pretty much summed it
13 up, but basically this was --

14 MR. ILDERTON: Go ahead and state your name
15 and who you represent.

16 MS. CAMPBELL: I am Kate Campbell with Beau
17 Clowney Design.

18 Basically, the owner and the interior
19 decorator wanted to relocate the second floor bay to be
20 on center with the overall upstairs living room, which
21 basically increased each floor by 10 square feet
22 because, as you can see, by moving over the second floor
23 bay we have to move over the first floor as well.

24 It doesn't really change the design
25 character of the overall previously approved

0006

1 application. We just felt the need to come and get your
2 blessing on it.

3 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you. Any
4 questions?

5 MR. WRIGHT: I have no questions.

6 MR. ILDERTON: I have no questions. Betty,
7 anything?

8 MS. HARMON: No questions.

9 MR. CRAVER: None.

10 MR. WRIGHT: I move the application be
11 approved.

12 MR. CRAVER: Second.

13 MR. ILDERTON: Everyone in favor?

14 (All hands were raised.)

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

16 901 Middle Street, changes to an approved
17 plan.

18 I need to recuse myself, is that right?

19 (Mr. Ilderton recused himself.)

20 MR. HERLONG: So we are on 901 Middle
21 Street. Kent, can you fill us in?

22 MR. PRAUSE: Sure. This has been here
23 before. The submittal is within the historic district
24 and it is designated as a historic resource; however,
25 they didn't give us the resource number.

0007

1 But they, as they state in their

2 application, the change they are proposing is to move a
3 previously-approved street side entry stairs to align
4 with the front door, and I assume that is shown on the
5 drawings that they have submitted. Yes. It's showing
6 an approved stair location and a proposed stair
7 location.

8 MR. FERRICK: My name is Justin Ferrick, and
9 I'm also with Beau Clowney Design.

10 This is s pretty straightforward case of us
11 probably overthinking this in the beginning and getting
12 something approved that was probably not the best
13 design.

14 It's pretty clear, if you have been to the
15 site or to the house, that it makes complete sense that
16 the front stairs be located in that front bay that
17 aligns with the door. Previously we had it wedged up
18 against the house, and it's kind of a no-brainer when
19 you are sitting there looking at it in real life.

20 And that is the traditional original
21 location where the stairs were on the house,
22 additionally. So we are just asking to have the stair
23 location modified on the application and approved as is.

24 MR. HERLONG: Is there any public comment?
25 Public comment section is closed.

0008

1 Kent or Randy, anything?

2 MR. PRAUSE: I don't have any comments.

3 MR. HERLONG: Billy?

4 MR. CRAVER: I think it makes sense.

5 MR. HERLONG: Betty?

6 MS. HARMON: I agree.

7 MR. HERLONG: Duke?

8 MR. WRIGHT: No. It's fine.

9 MS. HARMON: I make a motion we approve.

10 MR. WRIGHT: Second.

11 MR. HERLONG: Any discussion? All in favor?
12 (All hands were raised.)

13 MR. HERLONG: Any opposed? No.

14 1801 I'on, new construction.

15 MR. PRAUSE: This application is before you
16 tonight because the subject property is within the
17 historic district. It contains a historic residence on
18 it. The survey number is 209. You may recall this one
19 has been before you before. It was formerly a different
20 house, or is it still there? The house is still there?

21 MR. FERRICK: Yes. It's still there.

22 MR. PRAUSE: And they just want to tear it
23 down and build another one and have two houses on one
24 lot because the historic one meets the requirements of
25 being considered a special exception accessory dwelling

0009

1 on the property.

2 And what they are asking for now tonight is
3 new construction of a wood frame two-story single-family
4 dwelling to replace the existing non-historic structure,
5 and the historic cottage will remain.

6 They are also asking for some relief in the

7 way of modifications that you are allowed to grant,
8 particularly the additional front yard setback at a
9 height of above 20 feet. You are allowed to give 15
10 percent relief there, and they are asking for the full
11 15 percent for three feet of relief.

12 And they are also asking for 100 percent of
13 the relief for the additional two-foot side setback on
14 the second floor, which you can grant 100 percent relief
15 on that as well. They will meet the other zoning and
16 design standards.

17 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you. Yes, sir?

18 MR. FERRICK: This is Justin Ferrick with
19 Beau Clowney Design.

20 This project we have had before you-all on
21 several different occasions, and this is sort of the
22 last leg of the process of developing this property.

23 And the last time we received conceptual
24 approval on the scheme. The plan is essentially the
25 same, and the elevations are very similar to what we had

0010

1 drawn freehand before.

2 We have developed them completely now. And
3 the project is very much the same as what was previously
4 approved, and what was also approved through the Board
5 of Zoning Appeals to develop this structure on this
6 property. And so we are here before you tonight to
7 receive the final approval for it.

8 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you. Anything
9 you need to add? Randy? Kent?

10 MR. PRAUSE: No.

11 MR. ILDERTON: Any public comment to this
12 application? Public comment section is closed.

13 Billy?

14 MR. CRAVER: Makes sense to me. I don't
15 have a problem with it.

16 MR. ILDERTON: Betty?

17 MS. HARMON: My question is you said
18 essentially the same. What is the difference from what
19 it was before?

20 MR. FERRICK: Just various subtle nuances
21 that can only be refined when you go from a freehand
22 drawing to a hard line drawing.

23 MS. HARMON: So what are they?

24 MR. FERRICK: I would have to say they are
25 very minor changes in probably floor-to-floor heights

0011

1 once you work out the mechanical, to get the mechanical
2 to work within the floor system, and probably minor
3 adjustments to a couple of the window locations and
4 sizes, but very little that is detectable to the naked
5 eye.

6 MS. HARMON: That is all I have.

7 MR. ILDERTON: Steve?

8 MR. HERLONG: I think it's a very successful
9 solution, a lot of one-story elements that address the
10 street on the I'on side, and then the one-story porch on
11 the opposite side, the south side probably. So, again,

12 it looks like a beautiful solution.

13 MR. ILDERTON: Who is the builder on this
14 project? Do we know who it is? Oh, okay. No, I think
15 it's great. It's a good-looking design.

16 MR. WRIGHT: I agree. I think it's a very
17 nice design, and I think it will certainly enhance that
18 evolving developing neighborhood on 18 Station, so I
19 certainly approve.

20 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a motion?

21 MR. WRIGHT: I move to approve it.

22 MR. CRAVER: Second.

23 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor?

24 (All hands were raised.)

25 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, sir.

0012

1 Moving right along. 2402 Raven, new
2 construction.

3 MR. PRAUSE: This one tonight is for
4 conceptual approval, new construction. None of the
5 boxes have been checked, so I can only assume, though,
6 that perhaps they are here because they are asking for
7 relief, because there is some shown on the zoning
8 standards compliance worksheet.

9 It looks like they are asking for relief
10 from the additional front yard setback. Same as the
11 previous application, as I explained.

12 You can give up to a 50 percent relief on
13 that, and they are asking for the full 15 percent, which
14 is three feet. The same with the second floor, two foot
15 inset side setback of 100 percent relief.

16 They are also asking for additional relief
17 of 10 percent on the principal building coverage. You
18 can give up to 20 percent. They are asking for 215
19 square feet there.

20 Also, principal building side facade, 10
21 feet 6 inches, for 40 feet 6 inches of requested relief.
22 And an additional one foot height on the building
23 foundation, which you are authorized to grant up to one
24 foot. That's it, Mr. Chairman.

25 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you.

0013

1 Yes, sir?

2 MR. CLOWNEY: I'm Beau Clowney. This is the
3 first time you have seen this house, and we have
4 designed it for Todd and Debbie Shuman**, who are the
5 current owners of the house. There is a house that is
6 currently there that was built in, I believe, the early
7 '80s.

8 But there are just two things that we are
9 really kind of driving the train on this. I mean, it's
10 very much straightforward in that it's reclinear to the
11 street and oriented towards the marsh view.

12 But they had a real interest in trying to
13 create sort of a nice central room almost that acted
14 like a center hall, so when you are in the space that
15 you are looking out to the garden on one side and to the
16 marsh to the other side, and that all the other volumes

17 have light and air coming around, which also brings us
18 to the idea that the roof forms would be very much
19 reminiscent of the way the homes have evolved on
20 Sullivan's Island where there are seemingly a collection
21 of different roof volumes.

22 So, basically, when you look at this you
23 enter -- you are going to walk up the front steps and
24 look straight out to the marsh. This volume here, they
25 also wanted to have an interesting ceiling, so it would

0014

1 be sort of almost a volume-and-a-half type storage
2 space.

3 And then this piece here will have its own
4 roof volume, as does the piece that runs along that
5 side. So there was a real effort, really, on our part
6 to just do something that was interesting in roof lines,
7 reminiscent of the island, but yet keeping it real
8 straightforward and simple, good ol' sort of beach
9 cottage, basically.

10 MS. CAMPBELL: And the house is not in the
11 historic district, although we didn't check that box.

12 MR. ILDERTON: Anything to add on this?

13 MR. PRAUSE: No.

14 MR. ROBINSON: I was just looking over the
15 increases asked for, and what was allowed, and it shows
16 they are asking for this extra one foot above BFE.
17 Knowing the other houses in the neighborhood, I can't
18 think of, you know, the other houses having 10 feet
19 underneath them. This is going to be 10 feet 10 inches
20 to the finished first floor.

21 You know, generally those houses run about
22 eight foot height under them, and I'm just questioning
23 why they need an extra foot.

24 MS. CAMPBELL: Part of that is because the
25 duct work, trying to fit the duct work underneath the

0015

1 house and in the structure. And the structure will
2 probably be about -- bring the clear head height
3 underneath the house to about 8-1/8 to fit the duct work
4 in the structure on the first floor.

5 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you.

6 Is there any public comment to this
7 application? Public comment section then is closed.

8 Duke?

9 MR. WRIGHT: No. The only question I would
10 have, and it follows Randy's, does this one-foot height,
11 one or two, does that elevate the house any substantial
12 height above the neighboring houses, make it stand out
13 in terms of neighborhood compatibility?

14 MR. CLOWNEY: Do you mind if I put the
15 next-door neighbor on the spot? Michael, how do you
16 feel about this? Because we have talked to you about
17 how we are doing this.

18 MR. McKAIGHAN: It's the old question of you
19 fight between being the roof height and then floor
20 height to try to get the heating and air underneath the
21 house. Of course, today, a lot of people try to

22 accommodate it all inside the house.
23 And, you know, in this particular design,
24 it's just a better design in order to get the duct work
25 under the house. That is where he needs the extra foot.

0016

1 So unless it was all put inside the house, there is no
2 other way of fitting it in but under the house.
3 MR. WRIGHT: I understand that. But the
4 result is that the house is going to be higher, but is
5 it going to be significantly higher where it's going to
6 stand out like a sore thumb?
7 MR. MCKAIGHAN: I would not say so.
8 MR. WRIGHT: Fine.
9 MR. ILBERTON: I think it looks great. I
10 don't have a problem with it. Steve?
11 MR. HERLONG: No. The height, the overall
12 height, apparently, at the highest is 36 foot 6. And I
13 know for a fact that the house down the street is at 40,
14 which is the maximum, or 38, rather.
15 But, again, I think you would be doing the
16 homeowners a big favor if you put that mechanical system
17 inside the envelope. It would just address the street
18 better and be, in the long-run, better for the
19 homeowner. But just a suggestion, because it seems to
20 work fine the way it is.
21 MR. CLOWNEY: Part of -- I think some of our
22 thinking might be the fact that double volume is sort of
23 in the middle, so how do we get from one side of the
24 house to the other, but we haven't completely explored
25 that.

0017

1 MS. CAMPBELL: Right.
2 MR. ILBERTON: And you could always drop the
3 apron down to -- I mean, the water table, so --
4 MR. CLOWNEY: Exactly, probably disguise it
5 completely from the public.
6 MR. WRIGHT: And this is a conceptual?
7 MR. CLOWNEY: Yes.
8 MR. WRIGHT: You are asking only for
9 conceptual approval, so it can be fine-tuned.
10 MR. HERLONG: And again, just regarding the
11 design, I think it's, again, another excellent solution
12 to -- the massing is broken up, various roof lines.
13 Again, typical of what you would expect to see in the
14 neighborhood, so I think it's a good solution.
15 MR. ILBERTON: Betty?
16 MS. HARMON: I think it's a nice design,
17 too. I hope when you come back you would study raising
18 it that extra foot, give that some consideration.
19 MS. CAMPBELL: We can certainly do that.
20 MR. CRAVER: I don't have a problem with
21 your foot. I think the design looks great.
22 MR. CLOWNEY: Thank you.
23 MR. ILBERTON: Great. Do I hear a motion?
24 MR. WRIGHT: I move we approve the concept
25 of the submission that was made.

0018

1 MR. HERLONG: I second.
2 MR. ILDETON: Discussion? Everybody in
3 favor?
4 (All hands raised.)
5 MR. ILDETON: 1454 Middle Street,
6 alterations.
7 MR. PRAUSE: They are asking for a
8 preliminary approval on this application. The submittal
9 is within the historic district and it's designated as a
10 historic resource, Number 259. And I think you-all were
11 given the 1987 survey card of the property.
12 Kat, it wasn't in the package I got. It was
13 in this folder. So do you have this? You will
14 recognize this. It's the old movie theater.
15 And what they are requesting to do here is
16 to have a preliminary approval of alterations to the
17 building to convert it from the original movie theater
18 space to a single-family residence as zoned by the Town.
19 And this conversion, as they set forth,
20 requires the installation of windows on the side rear
21 facade for ingress per code and light in the occupied
22 space. They indicate flood zone requirement will be met
23 with an internal raised floor, and they propose garage
24 space on the rear of the building.
25 They are not asking for any additional
0019 relief in the way of modifications that you-all can
1 grant, but I'm sure that the building itself right now
2 already is larger than what would be allowed, I assume,
3 in way of the footprint and maybe some of the other
4 things, but those are existing situations that are
5 nonconforming.
6 And, actually, the code under the
7 nonconforming aspects says if it's historic and you
8 think those are important aspects of it, then that is
9 okay. But I just wanted to point out that they are not
10 asking for any other relief in that regard.
11 MR. ILDETON: Thank you. Yes, sir?
12 MR. HUEY: I'm Bill Huey, the architect for
13 the project, and Doris Ferguson, the owner, is with me
14 tonight.
15 Basically it's as we summarized it in the
16 application form. We are proposing to convert this
17 building to single-family residential use as it is zoned
18 for by the Town of Sullivan's Island.
19 Ms. Ferguson is looking to occupy a part of
20 the building, and then her son and family are going to
21 be in the other part. So what we have is a common
22 kitchen area in between the two.
23 And the idea is that we really -- the main
24 change to the building we are proposing is the addition
0020 of windows along the sides of the building in order to
1 provide window egress into some of the bedrooms and also
2 some light into the internal space.
3 We are also proposing to accomplish the
4 flood zone requirement by elevating an internal floor
5

6 system within the building. What we are going to try to
7 do in doing that, right now there is already a flat
8 floor inside the building, a concrete floor. We are
9 proposing that would be the level to be maintained
10 underneath the house, and we would propose a bridge
11 structural system set in above that floor.

12 And our effort is to try to float the floor
13 within the space so that we do as little damage as we
14 can to the historic material of the building, which is
15 very limited, but we do have, albeit, some plainly
16 detailed plaster walls inside.

17 And really the main detail inside the
18 building has to do with the ceiling. We have a curved,
19 rolled edge curved and pointed ceiling inside. We are
20 going to maintain that within the living space.

21 And then the persimmon wall, there is a
22 return at the persimmon that we want to incorporate into
23 the rear living space as sort of the focus of the room.

24 So our effort is to preserve as much of the
25 interior material as possible and/or engage the material

0021

1 in a very limited way so that we can preserve material
2 even underneath.

3 The only other relief issue that we have, I
4 believe, goes to more of a building code issue. We are
5 asking for relief -- and I believe you can do this on
6 historic buildings, Randy will qualify it, but the
7 hydrostatic relief.

8 We are asking for a relief to use the
9 Smartvent system instead of using large, of course,
10 louvered openings, which we don't want to puncture large
11 holes into the side of the building.

12 Otherwise, as far as lot coverage goes, we
13 are actually reducing lot coverage. There is a small
14 appendage on the side of the building which, if you
15 notice on your plans, shows up on the existing
16 conditions plan.

17 MR. HERLONG: This?

18 MR. HUEY: Yes. Here it is. It's actually
19 on the survey. It's a smaller appendage over which
20 would be the facade of the left side of the building.
21 We have a picture that we included in our submittal of
22 like some of the troops from the fort rallying in front
23 of the building probably mustering in to go see a movie,
24 and you can see that appendage was not on the building
25 at the time, so that was added at a later date. We are

0022

1 proposing to remove that building. It's obviously not
2 original to the building.

3 That footprint being gone, and the reduction
4 of a lot of the hard paving and concrete in front of the
5 building is actually reducing the total proposed lot
6 coverage on the property. And I would be happy to
7 answer any questions you might have.

8 MR. ILDETON: Great. Thank you. Anything
9 to add or comment on? Randy or --

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

11 MR. ROBINSON: Nothing.
12 MR. ILDERTON: Is there public comment on
13 this application? Public comment section is closed.
14 Billy, what do you think?
15 MR. CRAVER: Well, I guess that is the end
16 of watching The Endless Summer in the movie theater,
17 which ran for a lot of summers. As a matter of fact, it
18 was the only movie that ever ran, that I remember.
19 I think it looks great. I think it's neat
20 that someone is willing to take the movie theater and
21 try to do something with it. I don't see anything that
22 offends me at all.
23 MR. ILDERTON: Betty?
24 MS. HARMON: I think it's great what you are
25 doing. I have been watching that and wondering if
0023
1 someone was going to fix it up, so I was excited about
2 that. It's wonderful to save that building.
3 I do have one question about the concrete,
4 the little slab on the other side where you go in the
5 door. There is a door there on the opposite side here.
6 Is there a place you walk up -- there is dirt there, and
7 there is a little concrete --
8 MR. HUEY: Yes. We are proposing to remove
9 that.
10 MS. HARMON: That is fine. I don't have any
11 problem.
12 MR. ILDERTON: Steve?
13 MR. HERLONG: I think that it's wonderful to
14 see the structure preserved but used in such a way.
15 It's great, a great solution.
16 MR. ILDERTON: I think it's a great idea.
17 It's being revitalized. Like you say, you can see life
18 there again, and that will be terrific. I was a child
19 and went to movies there when I was young. It was a
20 neat structure then and it's going to be good to have
21 people back in there.
22 MR. WRIGHT: All of the good words have been
23 said. I commend you for doing what you are doing. I
24 think it's a wonderful solution to a very interesting
25 and historic building on Sullivan's Island.
0024
1 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a motion then?
2 MS. HARMON: I make a motion that we approve
3 as submitted.
4 MR. ILDERTON: Second?
5 MR. CRAVER: Second.
6 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion? Everybody in
7 favor?
8 (All hands were raised.)
9 MR. ILDERTON: 2708 Goldbug,
10 addition/alteration.
11 MR. PRAUSE: They are here tonight for final
12 approval of a plan that has already been approved,
13 actually.
14 The submittal is outside of the district.
15 However, it is designated as Historic Resource Number

16 50. And as explained in their narrative of what they
17 propose to do, they received a variance from the Board
18 of Zoning Appeals on January 10, '08 regarding the floor
19 level over the garage, but the overall side setback
20 variance reducing the combined side from 40 to 36 feet
21 would not be granted.

22 In fact, they didn't get it in in time to
23 get it reviewed and they have withdrawn the request for
24 that.

25 So what they are here today is just to get
0025

1 approval for a revision on the drawing to meet the
2 setback requirement. It caused the design to change
3 somewhat.

4 MR. ILDEBERTON: Great. Thank you.

5 (Mr. Herlong recused himself.)

6 MR. ILDEBERTON: Yes, sir?

7 MR. HENSHAW: Jim Henshaw with Herlong
8 Architects. And Tim Cook really did want to be here for
9 the 7th and, hopefully, final submittal and approval on
10 Goldbug. But, as Kent said, we got approval from the
11 BZA on January 10th to have the floor level above the
12 garage raised up, and we needed to restudy the site plan
13 to bring this master suite within that 25-foot setback,
14 so that is what you have before you in your drawings.

15 Two other things we wanted to put before you
16 tonight that are just minor adjustments to the plan or
17 to the elevation.

18 First is that we were changing these
19 chimneys. You can see them here and here, and that is
20 the front elevation. We changed them to brick. They
21 were stucco originally, and they were stucco in your
22 packet, but we thought they would be more appropriate in
23 brick.

24 And the other change that we made was --
25 it's in your packet. We took this dormer off that we

0026
1 had shown on the front elevation. That is right next to
2 Goldbug. And the reason we did that was because the
3 zoning ordinance says that on the front elevation above
4 a height of 20 feet you need a setback at a 45-degree
5 angle. That is a setback regulation.

6 But the DRV is allowed to grant a certain
7 amount of relief, which is identified as 15 percent, but
8 it's hard to know what 15 percent is. We would take it
9 as 15 percent of the width of the front elevation which
10 would allow the dormer, but we didn't want to show it on
11 the application just because we weren't sure of the
12 interpretation.

13 So we would like for you to interpret it in
14 that way and keep the dormer there, because I think it
15 would be a nice feature on Goldbug. I think it would
16 bring a lot of nice south light into the room. It just
17 makes the house look better, especially in perspective.
18 You can see it in this view rather than if it was just
19 shown in two dimensions on this elevation.

20 MR. ILDEBERTON: Great. Thank you. Is there

21 any other comments?

22 MR. PRAUSE: Just on the last part. I mean,
23 it's the first I have heard of it, but it's not
24 interpretive as being across the full width. It's if
25 any element along the front facade protrudes into that

0027

1 45-degree space. So they need a variance beyond what
2 you can grant or they need to comply.

3 MR. ILDERTON: But that is not for us to
4 address, correct? Isn't that what you are saying?

5 MR. PRAUSE: Correct.

6 MR. ILDERTON: Is there any public comment
7 on this application? Public comment section then is
8 closed.

9 This thing has been before us many times. I
10 understand through the grapevine that the neighbors are
11 appeased, and so I don't have any problem with it
12 personally. Billy, do you?

13 MR. CRAVER: I'm fine with it.

14 MS. HARMON: I have a question. If you are
15 having a garage, why are you now showing it outside of
16 the garage? I haven't seen that before.

17 MR. HENSHAW: Just that is more like a
18 turnaround or guest parking space.

19 MS. HARMON: But you will still have a
20 garage?

21 MR. HENSHAW: Yes.

22 MS. HARMON: You hadn't done that before and
23 I was --

24 MR. HENSHAW: Right. We added the driveway
25 at final submission.

0028

1 MS. HARMON: I'm fine.

2 MR. ILDERTON: Duke?

3 MR. WRIGHT: I'm fine with it.

4 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a motion?

5 MR. CRAVER: I move we approve it.

6 MR. ILDERTON: Second?

7 MR. WRIGHT: Second.

8 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor?

9 (All hands were raised.)

10 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, sir.

11 1760 I'on Avenue, accessory building.

12 MR. PRAUSE: This one is within the historic
13 district. It's designated as a Historic Resource,
14 Number 276.

15 They are asking for final approval to
16 construct a 202 square foot pool cabana, and also an 87
17 square foot golf cart Pergala deck adjacent garage. I
18 guess adjacent to the garage.

19 So it's here for two reasons. Because they
20 are accessory structures that come before you, and also
21 because it is in the district and designated as a
22 Historic Resource.

23 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you.

24 Yes, sir?

25 MR. MARR: I'm Patrick Marr. I'm the

0029

1 homeowner, and Michael McKaighn is our designer, with
2 Michael Carlyle.

3 And the main thing we are trying to do is
4 add about a 200 square foot pool cabana in the backyard
5 by removing existing concrete and an existing shed that
6 is not deemed historic, and basically, by the end,
7 having a less impervious space on our property than we
8 currently have.

9 We are asking for relief to increase our
10 accessory structures by up to 20 percent of the 750 feet
11 allowed, to give us 900 square feet of accessory
12 structure. And to accommodate that we are, again, we
13 are removing a shed and putting up this pool cabana in
14 its place.

15 So we have before you the plans. And we
16 understand that the relief can be granted up to the 20
17 percent provided it goes with the historic nature. We
18 have elected to design the property using the same
19 columns throughout the property that we have, the same
20 roof structure.

21 And three-and-a-half sides would be open.
22 One half side will have siding. The siding will be the
23 same lapboard siding that is on the house, and all the
24 colors on the pool cabana will match the principal
25 residence on the site.

0030

1 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you. Is there
2 anything you-all need to add?

3 MR. PRAUSE: Just that it would need to also
4 meet the lot coverage requirements.

5 MR. ILDERTON: Right. That is a different
6 issue?

7 MR. PRAUSE: Right.

8 MR. ILDERTON: Is there any public comment
9 on this application? Public comment section then is
10 closed. Duke?

11 MR. WRIGHT: I am curious. I visited the
12 site today, and the golf cart cover, the shed, is
13 existing. Are you going to take that down and put a
14 trellis roof on it?

15 MR. MARR: Right. As I explained to Randy,
16 it was put up without a permit. We did not know when we
17 put it up about eight months ago, and we went to Randy,
18 and we are proposing to take down the constructed shed
19 roof of that.

20 MR. WRIGHT: Why?

21 MR. MARR: So that we can have other covered
22 area on the property so we are not over our lot
23 coverage.

24 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. It looks good to me as
25 it is.

0031

1 MR. MARR: Thank you. I hate to tear it
2 down.

3 MR. WRIGHT: Do you know what I'm talking
4 about?

5 MR. ILDERTON: Yes, the structure on the
6 back.
7 MR. WRIGHT: Yes. I mean, this shed, it
8 seems a shame to tear that down.
9 MR. ILDERTON: Well, it wasn't permanent to
10 begin with.
11 MR. WRIGHT: We have been down that road
12 before.
13 MR. ILDERTON: I don't have a problem with
14 it. Steve?
15 MR. HERLONG: No. I think it's very
16 appropriate on the back side of the house, sure.
17 MS. HARMON: I don't have a problem with it.
18 I think it's a nice addition.
19 MR. ILDERTON: Billy?
20 MR. CRAVER: Looks good.
21 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a motion?
22 MR. WRIGHT: I move to approve it as
23 submitted.
24 MR. CRAVER: Second.
25 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor?

0032

1 (All hands raised.)
2 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, sir.
3 2213 Atlantic.
4 MR. GAILLARD: Good evening. My name is
5 Foster Gaillard. I am here representing the applicants,
6 Miles Barkley and his sister, Nella Barkley Schools.
7 MR. ILDERTON: We are going to get Kent's
8 little prep and then we'll be right there.
9 MR. GAILLARD: Oh, I'm sorry.
10 MR. PRAUSE: This application is for 2213
11 Atlantic Avenue, and it's a property -- they are asking
12 for a final approval. The submittal is outside the
13 historic district; however, it is designated as a
14 Historic Resource, Historic Survey Number 152. And what
15 they are asking for is to have it taken off the list.
16 It was -- they have submitted some
17 background information, and also some photographs of the
18 property, and also a memorandum to David Schneider from
19 John Laurens dated 11-15-07 in which they delineate why
20 they think it should be taken off the list.
21 As the code points out, there are only two
22 reasons that you are allowed to use to take it off the
23 list. One is a procedural nonconformity in listing the
24 property, and the other is if you find that there has
25 been a misapplication of the criteria for designation as

0033

1 specified in the ordinance.
2 And those application criteria are spelled
3 out in 2194(d), 1 through 8. And so you would need to
4 make a finding that none of those apply in order for it
5 to come off the list.
6 I just want to point out that Mr. Laurens
7 was with Preservation Consultants when they did the
8 initial 1987 survey study for a proposed National
9 Register District that never came to fruition at that

10 time. We do have a National Register District now.

11 But he makes some arguments in his memo to
12 Mr. Schneider as to why he feels that, had it gone
13 forward, that it would have been recognized as not being
14 eligible for that National Register list, and that
15 probably that it's considered on the list because it was
16 in the context of other homes in the area that were
17 built by Mr. Blanchard. I think there were three of
18 them, two of which are no longer there.

19 So hopefully you have had an opportunity to
20 read the information in which they have made a case to
21 take it off the list, and they are here. I am sure they
22 will explain it you haven't read it. And that pretty
23 much concludes all I have to say.

24 MR. ILBERTON: Great. Thank you.
25 Yes, sir?

0034

1 MR. GAILLARD: Again, Foster Gaillard, and
2 with me is my law partner, James Wilson. And also, as
3 Kent mentioned, John Laurens, who is a local architect
4 and an expert in the field of historic preservation.

5 As Kent has mentioned, we have filed an
6 application to remove this property -- this is a
7 photograph of it, 2213 Atlantic -- to remove it from the
8 historic property designation list.

9 The list, as you know, was compiled in 2003,
10 and it was prepared by David Schneider, and this
11 property was listed at that time as Tier 2 Traditional
12 Island Resources, even though Mr. Schneider at that time
13 said this property, quoting from him, was without
14 individual distinction or integrity.

15 My partner is going to present some of the
16 arguments, and so is Mr. Laurens. But to summarize what
17 we hope to show you today, these are the three things
18 that we think are significant and why this property
19 should come off the list.

20 Number one, this property, as you will soon
21 hear, has been so altered and so compromised that it
22 bears virtually no resemblance whatsoever to the
23 original structure that was built in the 1930s and, for
24 that reason, really has no historic value whatsoever.

25 Secondly, as Kent mentioned, the only reason

0035

1 this property was ever considered in the first instance
2 way back in 1987 for inclusion was that it bore some
3 similarity to surrounding homes. Those homes were
4 either destroyed in Hurricane Hugo and no longer exist,
5 or, if they do exist, they have been altered in such a
6 huge manner that they, too, bear no resemblance to the
7 way they looked originally when they were built.

8 We will also show you that, and would
9 submit, that if you took a close look at this property
10 today, in its present condition, you would agree that
11 this property does not belong on the Tier 2 list, but
12 instead should belong more appropriately on the Tier 3
13 altered list.

14 So with that, I will turn it over to James

15 Wilson who can walk you through this. I will be happy
16 to answer any questions either now or later.

17 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you.

18 MR. WILSON: Good evening. My name is James
19 Wilson, attorney with Buist, Moore, Smythe & McGee, with
20 Foster here, representing the Barkleys.

21 This diagram right here -- what I want to do
22 tonight is I want to walk you through the current status
23 of the property and try to go through a little bit of
24 how we got to this point, and then apply the criteria to
25 the current house.

0036

1 This diagram right here shows you the house
2 and different parts of it. You see the central portion
3 right here was constructed around 1940, and that is the
4 original part of the house. That is less than 1200
5 square feet.

6 The front porch here, so this is the beach
7 side, of course, was built or rebuilt around the -- in
8 the mid 1950s. What you see here, there is a deck out
9 front and the stairs leading down. That was a 1980s
10 addition.

11 Over on the street side on Atlantic
12 Avenue -- of course this right here is the street view.
13 You see this addition that was added in the 1960s that
14 essentially doubled the size of the house. The entire
15 house is clad in vinyl siding. The chimney itself has
16 been rebuilt as well. That is the current situation of
17 where the house stands.

18 How we got to this point really, of course,
19 starts in 1987. The survey was done in 1987, and this
20 poster is probably helpful in this regard.

21 In 1987 Mr. Laurens and Mr. Schneider were
22 involved in the original survey that was done to come up
23 with potentially contributing resources, and this is the
24 map that was done at that time. The notes -- and Mr.
25 Laurens will elaborate more on this.

0037

1 But the notes to the original 1987 survey
2 conclude that the Barkleys' house is similar in
3 appearance to a row of houses that were large 1930s
4 beachfront residences. Now, of course, this house is,
5 the majority of it, is an addition. However, it had a
6 similar appearance to this row of houses and, as a
7 result, was included in the list of potentially
8 contributing resources because that row of houses, as
9 you look at it here on Atlantic, was included in this
10 originally conceived much larger historic district than
11 what ultimately was a conclusion. Of course, that's
12 largely a result of Hurricane Hugo and other losses that
13 occurred between '87 and 2004 when the ordinance was
14 actually adopted.

15 But, originally, the thinking was, and the
16 notes from the survey are, this is similar in appearance
17 to large 1930s beach front cottages, and there is a row
18 of them that might contribute to this historic district.

19 Following Hurricane Hugo, a 1990 survey was

20 done to assess the damage done. That was primarily to
21 figure out what houses that were originally included as
22 potentially contributing were still standing or in
23 significantly good enough shape to continue to be
24 considered for historic designation.

25 The Barkleys' house was largely destroyed on
0038
1 the ground level, but it was still standing. So
2 extensive replacements were done all across the ground
3 level.

4 Fast forward 13 years to 2003. That is when
5 Mr. Schneider & Associates did another survey. At that
6 point they did what Mr. Schneider describes as a
7 windshield survey. And, effectively, this was driving
8 the relevance to determine what houses that had survived
9 Hurricane Hugo were still in adequate enough shape to
10 warrant consideration for protection.

11 At that point Mr. Schneider concluded that
12 the Barkleys' home was altered, is the word he used.
13 Out of the 2003 survey Mr. Schneider did come the 2003
14 list. And, of course, that is the basis for the list of
15 properties that were ultimately adopted by the Town.

16 The list that Mr. Schneider described, as
17 Foster explained, had three categories. First, the
18 Sullivan's Island landmarks that clearly warranted
19 further protection or consideration for historical
20 designation.

21 The second designation, in which the
22 Barkleys fell, is Traditional Island Resources, which
23 were deemed to be without individual distinction or
24 merit.

25 The important thing about Mr. Schneider's
0039

1 list, that we will probably repeat a couple of times
2 tonight, but really want to emphasize, is that he
3 clearly stated in his listing of these properties that
4 this is a preliminary list. The way he describes it is
5 it's a preliminary list developed to serve as a starting
6 point. Additional intensive evaluation and
7 documentation will be required. It's a list of
8 resources warranting further evaluation.

9 The final category are properties that are
10 too altered that were deemed to be not worthy of further
11 consideration.

12 As you all know, in 2004, for very good
13 reason, the Town adopted the Historic Ordinance. It
14 took the first two categories of Mr. Schneider's list
15 and said we are having such a loss of truly historic
16 properties, let's protect everything in those two
17 categories. And that is the list, of course, that we
18 have had since. And, of course, that is how we got here
19 today.

20 That list was not -- that list that was
21 adopted by the Town wasn't the result of further study
22 by the Town of all of those properties on Mr.
23 Schneider's list. Mr. Schneider's list said preliminary
24 list, this needs further study. The Town again, for

25 good reason, adopted the entire list.

0040

1 In short, what we would say in terms of why
2 we are on the list, is that in 2003 Mr. Schneider looked
3 at what properties were still there from 1987, meaning
4 the Barkley home had not been washed away, and the
5 Barkleys had not substantially changed it enough from
6 1990, or over that period of 13 years, so that it
7 effectively was the same house from 1987. So the
8 question is why was it on the 1987 list.

9 It was on the 1987 list because it had a
10 similar appearance to an existing row of large beach
11 front residences. And as you know, of course, those
12 residences are largely nearly all gone at this point.

13 And, as a result of that, of course, the
14 historic district was redrawn as a result of Hurricane
15 Hugo and all the other changes and losses of property to
16 no longer include this area along Atlantic Avenue where
17 this row of houses once had been.

18 If we applied the criteria, as Kent properly
19 points out today -- and that is really our question. If
20 we apply this criteria to this house today, our opinion
21 and Mr. Laurens' professional opinion is that we don't
22 satisfy the requirements to be included on the list, and
23 that is why we are asking to be removed.

24 I want to run through the list fairly
25 quickly here. First, is there significant inherent

0041

1 character, interest or value to the property? Well, the
2 1987 survey and the subsequent surveys, and the experts,
3 Mr. Laurens and Mr. Schneider, effectively concluded
4 this is an altered property that does not have
5 individual value.

6 When you look at it on its merits, it does
7 not have any significant historic value on its own.

8 Was there a significant historical person or
9 event associated with the property? No.

10 Does the property exemplify cultural,
11 political, economic, social, ethnic or historic
12 heritage? If this property exemplifies anything, it
13 exemplifies an elevated vinyl-sided 1960s era box.

14 Is it individually or is it a collection of
15 resources? Does it embody distinguishing
16 characteristics of the style of the period? Well,
17 individually, no. And the row of large 1930s beach
18 front houses no longer exist.

19 Is it an established and familiar visual
20 feature of the island? Well, it's not a church or other
21 Sullivan's Island icon. Is it likely to yield
22 information important to pre-history or history, no.

23 We think that it should be removed from the
24 list, and really should not have originally been
25 included on the list for the reasons Foster stated.

0042

1 But, essentially, this is a tremendously altered
2 property that is largely a conglomeration of additions.

3 And the row of houses that perhaps had some

4 historic value does not exist, and it, in fact, was
5 never a large 1930s beach front residence. It had the
6 appearance of one because of its size.

7 What we are asking to do is to complete the
8 process that Mr. Schneider began. Mr. Schneider very
9 clearly stated this is our starting point, these are
10 homes that are worthy of further consideration, and we
11 are here tonight to try to complete that process and ask
12 you to look at this house on its individual merits, and
13 our conclusion is that it does not qualify.

14 With that, I will turn it over to Mr.
15 Laurens. But one thing I want to do, if I could, is
16 share with you letters of support from some neighbors.
17 Can I pass these out to you?

18 MR. ILBERTON: Sure. We do have a limited
19 time constraint. I would love to give you a lot more
20 time, but we are supposed to allow only ten minutes.

21 MR. LAURENS: I will go quickly.

22 MR. ILBERTON: Yes, do what you can.

23 MR. LAURENS: John Laurens. You know, I'm
24 the last person to stand in front of you in this whole
25 community that would come to you and ask for a

0043

1 significant resource to be eliminated from what you have
2 tried so hard to create here. Everyone in the
3 preservation community appreciates that and applaud you.

4 But, really, it comes back to me because I
5 am the fellow who walked the street in '87 and suggested
6 that this house be one that should be studied from a
7 windshield survey as a potentially contributing building
8 to a historic district.

9 I don't know how many of you were around
10 back then, but when I brought this survey to a close and
11 presented it to Town Council, I was practically tarred
12 and feathered and run out of Sullivan's Island. It was
13 the same night as the issue of separate individual
14 cottages or outbuildings on the building be no longer
15 allowed.

16 And the public was all in attendance, and
17 when they heard public national register it really
18 killed our 1987 preservation efforts, which I know
19 everyone is sorry that that came, that happened.

20 But to address how this property could have
21 been listed, it wasn't just that it was similar to other
22 1930 houses. We were told that it was built in '35,
23 which put it in the period of significance.

24 When you do a windshield survey you get a
25 rough estimate of what could be included. And being

0044

1 '35, this one and two of the other houses on the row
2 built by Blanchard, we just, you know, in a windshield
3 survey we said okay, then we need to survey it.

4 Had we known it would have been 1940, had we
5 known that -- and this is a closer example or photograph
6 of the rear -- that this entire -- over 50 percent of
7 the house had been added and changed, had we known it
8 was totally vinyl sided, you don't get into those

9 details. We didn't note it on the card.
10 But because of its context at the time it
11 had a -- from the front it had a simple hip roof and
12 chimney like two of the other cottages. But what you
13 don't get into is the specific evaluation of the altered
14 state within that windshield survey.
15 This is from the beach. You see the porch
16 has been added. But from this point back, the lack of
17 detail on the eave, everything about -- more than 50
18 percent additions to that building, in a survey of today
19 would not qualify it as a contributing resource, and
20 that is really what I'm here to say.
21 I talked to David Schneider about this and
22 he agreed. If you have any additional questions, I will
23 be glad to answer them. Thank you.
24 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Kent, do you have
25 anything to add?
0045
1 MR. PRAUSE: No.
2 MR. ILDERTON: Randy?
3 MR. ROBINSON: No.
4 MR. ILDERTON: Any public comment on this
5 application?
6 MR. WILSON: Would it be okay if Miles -- I
7 don't want to --
8 MR. ILDERTON: Well, that is part of the
9 application. That can be part of your public comment.
10 I will take public comments from Miles.
11 MR. BARKLEY: Very briefly, these
12 professionals have summed it up very correctly. Nella
13 Barkley Schools is my sister, and I, we, appreciate the
14 opportunity to present tonight.
15 We have been long-time residents on the
16 island. My parents bought the house in the early '60s,
17 and we are the current owners now.
18 You have heard how it has been altered over
19 the years and really how, after Hugo, the neighborhood
20 has changed dramatically. We have never felt that there
21 was an architectural significance or really anything
22 significant about the house. It was just on the beach.
23 So we would like to ask that the house be
24 removed, and we would like to make that request tonight
25 and hope you will grant it because Nella and I would
0046
1 like some resolution to this issue so we can then make
2 decisions as to what we can and should do with the
3 property going forward. So, thank you.
4 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Duke?
5 MR. WRIGHT: Are we asking to remove it to
6 the altered list, or are we asking to remove it totally
7 from any list?
8 MR. GAILLARD: We are asking that you move
9 it from Tier 2 to Tier 3, which is where we think it
10 belongs.
11 MR. WRIGHT: To the altered list.
12 MR. ILDERTON: Which, ostensibly, makes
13 it --

14 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you. Okay. I don't have
15 any trouble with the proposal.

16 MR. ILDETON: Well, I will say,
17 historically on this Board we have walked and gone
18 through and met in session, actually, at these houses
19 that we have looked at to every house that I think has
20 been a question, and it may be difficult to not do the
21 same to this house, and actually meet there and walk the
22 premises and discuss it in session.

23 Historically, we have done it a half hour
24 before this meeting. On a given Wednesday evening the
25 Board has done that. I am not sure that this Board

0047

1 would want to change, but I'm up for a suggestion.

2 Steve?

3 MR. HERLONG: Well, you know, just looking
4 at it, seeing it from the beach, from the street, it
5 clearly appears to be an altered structure. The street
6 side addition, you could almost say if anything like
7 that was built today it would be offensive. It's just
8 so lacking in detail.

9 I don't mean to talk bad about the property.
10 But even when you look at the front facade, there is
11 some indication of that low-pitched hip roof behind it.
12 But, clearly, even whatever was original was fairly
13 unremarkable, at best.

14 Yet, to put that addition on the street
15 side, anything that is historic in the original street
16 side facade would have to be completely gone, and there
17 would be no indication of any existing entry, window. I
18 just cannot imagine, when you look at the footprint
19 drawing that we would find this thing --

20 MR. ILDETON: This is not unlike the house
21 that is being reversed, lifted and reversed down the way
22 on Pettigrew as far as it was a single-story low without
23 really a front entrance, and I think Blanchard built
24 that one, too.

25 MR. HERLONG: Exactly. You are right. So

0048

1 I, you know --

2 MR. ILDETON: It's being worked on now.

3 MR. HERLONG: I mean, I really feel pretty
4 comfortable through the presentation that -- I feel very
5 comfortable in saying that that is miscategorized. It's
6 an altered structure, at best.

7 So whether or not this Board feels we should
8 have a site visit, I am really not sure, but that is
9 clearly an altered structure. It's hard to imagine it
10 it in any other category.

11 MR. ILDETON: Betty?

12 MS. HARMON: When was this done, this
13 survey?

14 MR. PRAUSE: 1987.

15 MS. HARMON: It says construction date,
16 1935, and you have it 1940, and it says framed with
17 synthetic siding.

18 So our precedence has been to go through

19 these properties, and I think, as a Board, we need to
20 continue that before we just say something can be
21 removed. I think we have to do a site visit, and that
22 would be my suggestion.

23 MR. ILBERTON: Billy?

24 MR. CRAVER: I think this house raises the
25 issue that -- this ought to have been one of my issues

0049

1 with old Sullivan's Island houses, and that is how do
2 you define old and how do you define historic?

3 And, to me, 1930s isn't old. My benchmark
4 for old is looking at the officers' quarters. And this
5 is a depression era house that was built at the time
6 when nobody had insurance, and they built houses, so if
7 they got knocked down it wouldn't cost a whole lot to go
8 build them back.

9 And I am very familiar with this house. I
10 have been inside it, under it, around it, and I don't
11 think it ever should have been put on the list, and I
12 sure would support them taking it off the list.

13 I don't need to go see it. It's not the
14 same thing as the house on Pettigrew. I think if the
15 Barkleys had done the -- had gone in and made it a
16 restoration project like they did on Pettigrew, we would
17 be sitting here looking at a replica again, and we would
18 have that same issue, which is what we -- it's based on
19 Pettigrew. We don't have that here.

20 I am comfortable. And I think it tests us.
21 Are we willing to really remove a house that doesn't
22 warrant being on the list. And I think this is one that
23 doesn't, and so I would -- I don't need to go see it. I
24 would vote to remove it.

25 MR. ILBERTON: Thank you.

0050

1 Kent, is there a demolition ordinance? Did
2 we ever pass one? I know one was voted down. There was
3 the first reading and then one was voted down.

4 Do we have any limitations on demolition now
5 as far as a year, age of houses? It never got passed,
6 right, 50 years, 60 years? It never got passed.

7 MR. PRAUSE: There is a pending ordinance
8 for the 14 houses that --

9 MR. ILBERTON: Well, this is one of the 14.

10 MR. PRAUSE: -- that Mr. Schneider was
11 talking about putting on the list, and a lot of those
12 come from that altered category, that third tier
13 category as it's been referred to.

14 But this one is -- I mean, it's already on
15 there. But if it were to be removed, then there would
16 be no protection from --

17 MR. ILBERTON: Because there was discussion
18 about having an ordinance like that, but they never
19 passed it, right?

20 MR. PRAUSE: On three different attempts, I
21 think.

22 MR. CRAVER: I would suggest this is the
23 equivalent of us having the hearing like we were going

24 to have, or could end having, on each of those 14.
25 MR. ILDERTON: Yeah, this is very similar.

0051

1 MR. CRAVER: Where the owners come in and
2 make a presentation.

3 MR. ILDERTON: This is very similar to what
4 is going to happen to those 14 houses. Not all of them,
5 but some of them, will come before us. I agree.

6 MR. WRIGHT: Betty and Pat, to the point of
7 site visits, I certainly support site visits in certain
8 situations, and I think we all do, and I think they have
9 been very beneficial to us.

10 To my recollection, the site visits that we
11 have made have been to properties that are very
12 questionable. And this one, in my opinion, is really
13 pretty much so altered that it would not warrant, in my
14 view, a site visit. It's not necessary.

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

16 MR. CRAVER: I move we grant the requested
17 relief and remove it from the list.

18 MR. ILDERTON: Second?

19 MR. WRIGHT: Second.

20 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion? Everybody in
21 favor?

22 (Hands raised by Wright, Ilderton, Herlong
23 and Craver.)

24 MR. ILDERTON: Anybody opposed?

25 (Hand raised by Harmon.)

0052

1 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, sir. 2061
2 Pettigrew.

3 MR. PRAUSE: This is a request for 2061
4 Pettigrew Street, final approval. Submittal is outside
5 of the historic district; however, it is designated as a
6 Historic Resource, Historic Survey Number 163.

7 What they propose is a replacement of
8 exterior windows to double-hung sash replacement
9 windows, clad wood vinyl exterior, wood interior. 6/6
10 design to remain with the house design. And it appears
11 that is the extent of the request.

12 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Yes, sir?

13 MR. TRAINUM: Good evening. My name is Matt
14 Trainum. All we simply want to do is upgrade an older
15 single-pane window, putty-glazed window with a newer,
16 more efficient, insulated, simulated divided light. We
17 want to keep the 6/6 looking the exact same.

18 We are going to put -- this is a sample.
19 This is just one I happened to have. The color will be
20 white. The simulated divided light, the GBGs here,
21 muttons or mullions, depending how you refer to them,
22 will be 7/8 inches wide. The original are three-quarter
23 right now, so it will be 1/8 of an inch wider than the
24 original. That is the closest I could get on it.

25 From the street it won't be detectable to

0053

1 the eye. We simply want to go back with the same
2 profile, same design, rails and stiles. On there is the

3 original, just to get better efficiency. And there is
4 some rot there now, replacing it, and it will be a
5 white, as it is now, clad for maintenance, and the
6 interior will be what the original was, staying with the
7 varnish or urethane finish on it to carry out the flow
8 with what it is now.

9 MR. ILBERTON: Good deal. Thank you. Any
10 more to add? Kent or Randy?

11 MR. PRAUSE: No. Public comment? Public
12 comment section is closed.

13 Billy, what do you think?

14 MR. CRAVER: I don't have a problem with it
15 at all.

16 MR. ILBERTON: Betty?

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

18 MR. ILBERTON: Steve?

19 MR. HERLONG: What I am seeing right here is
20 some 4/4 windows in one little area of the house, only
21 maybe one of the corners of the house.

22 MR. TRAINUM: Yes, sir.

23 MR. ILBERTON: But it's mostly 6/6, but a
24 few --

25 MR. TRAINUM: That is correct. Patty Powell
0054

1 here is representing the owners. She helped me put this
2 together to present to you guys.

3 Whatever the windows are, 4/4 in the
4 kitchen, some in the little bathrooms are 4/4, and the
5 bigger, in the common areas, are 6/6. We want to go
6 back with exactly what is there existing now.

7 MR. HERLONG: And you said they are going to
8 be vinyl clad or aluminum clad?

9 MR. TRAINUM: This one here is aluminum
10 clad. I think we want to go with the aluminum clad.
11 Once again, this is green, not white.

12 The product that Jeld-Wen is supplying to
13 us, with the sash kit replacement, they make with the
14 aluminum clad, which we were wanting to go with because
15 you don't actually have to remove any of the siding on
16 the home, to disturb any of that that is solid.

17 And also in there, I think it's 20
18 crank-down hurricane shutters that are no longer
19 working. And the way they were installed back in, I
20 guess, the '80s, they had to actually beef up the trim
21 to get all the track system on there. And we want to
22 remove those and the older storm windows that were
23 added, bringing the structure back to more of the
24 original appearance when we put the upgraded window
25 products in there.

0055

1 MR. HERLONG: I'm fine with that. It's
2 great.

3 MR. ILBERTON: I am fine with it. I just
4 will mention that some clad -- metal clad window
5 manufacturers have limitations on their warranty when
6 you are within 1,000 feet of the ocean, and that house
7 is fairly close to the water.

8 You just might want to look at that in the
9 fine print, because I have had windows like that start
10 falling -- like Pella windows really start oxidizing,
11 and I had problems with them down the road with the
12 salt, but I think it looks fine.

13 MR. WRIGHT: I will ask the expert
14 architects and engineers and designers here. What is
15 considered a better window, vinyl clad or aluminum clad?

16 MR. ILDERTON: I can give you my opinion
17 better than Stephen could.

18 MR. HERLONG: There is not an easy answer to
19 that.

20 MR. ILDERTON: It's not an easy answer.

21 MR. WRIGHT: The reason I ask, that is a
22 wonderful little house over there. It really is a
23 beautiful structure. And will this eliminate the need
24 for storm windows?

25 MR. TRAINUM: Absolutely, yes, sir.

0056

1 MR. WRIGHT: These are not hurricane proof,
2 but they are hurricane resistant, I guess?

3 MR. ILDERTON: Will they have to be DP-50
4 windows?

5 MR. TRAINUM: They will be DP-50 windows.
6 However, when we spoke with the building code service
7 down there, since this home is in the historical
8 society, I guess that kind of exempts them with the DP
9 rating because there was not a DP rating at the time of
10 the building of the home.

11 The sash kits do not actually carry a DP
12 rating on them because they are -- the jamb liners are
13 inserted with a clip system, and it's not a true window
14 package that can be tested.

15 MR. ILDERTON: That is not our purview
16 anyway.

17 MR. WRIGHT: I think the window system
18 will -- this will significantly enhance the appearance
19 of the house without the storm windows, certainly, even
20 that little room on the back side like the dining room,
21 I think. So I --

22 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Do I hear a motion?
23 Or, no, excuse me. Kent, Randy? Any public comment?
24 Okay, motion?

25 MR. CRAVER: I move we approve the request.

0057

1 MR. HERLONG: I second it.

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

4 (All hands were raised.)

5 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, sir. 2424 Myrtle,
6 fence.

7 MR. PRAUSE: This is an application for a
8 final approval. Submittal is within the historic
9 district. It has a historic survey number of 81. The
10 application is to install a new front yard and rear yard
11 property fence as indicated.

12 MR. ILDERTON: Yes, sir.

13 MR. KROSSE: Hi. I'm Dan Krosse
14 representing Ed Fava, the homeowner.
15 And the property has come along very nicely.
16 I know you guys have followed its progress, and it's
17 been terrific. This would be Myrtle Avenue here,
18 Goldbug Avenue here, in case you-all don't have this. I
19 think you do.
20 And, again, it would just be the fence on
21 the property line on both ends. And it's basically
22 going to be 3 feet 9-1/2 inches high, a horizontal look
23 which draws its design from really the railing of the
24 house and also the skirting down below.

25 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you. Anything
0058

1 to add to that, Randy or Kent? Any problem? Public
2 comment? No public left.
3 Billy?
4 MR. CRAVER: Yes.
5 MR. ILDERTON: Betty?
6 MS. HARMON: Yes.
7 MR. ILDERTON: Steve?
8 MR. HERLONG: Very nice.
9 MR. ILDERTON: I love it.
10 MR. WRIGHT: I'm fine with it. It's only
11 the front and rear that ties into the existing?
12 MR. KROSSE: The existing are already there,
13 yes, sir.
14 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor? Motion?
15 MR. CRAVER: I motion to approve.
16 MR. HERLONG: Second?
17 MS. HARMON: Second.
18 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion? Everybody in
19 favor?
20 (All hands were raised.)
21 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. We are done.
22 (The hearing was concluded at 7:20 p.m.)
23 - - -
24
25

0059

1 STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
2)
3)
4 COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)
5

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

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

17 Witness my hand, I have hereunto affixed my official

13 seal this 3rd day of March, 2008, at Charleston,
14 Charleston County, South Carolina.

14

15

16

17

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

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25