

0001

1

2

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

3

4

THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD OF SULLIVAN'S ISLAND

5

6

DECEMBER 17, 2008

7

8

9

10

11

DATE: Wednesday, December 17, 2008

12

TIME: 6:05 p.m.

13

LOCATION: Sullivan's Island Town Hall
1610 Middle Street
Sullivan's Island, South Carolina 29482

15

REPORTED BY: Janice D. Hayward, RMR
NCRA Registered Merit Reporter
Clark & Associates, Inc.
Post Office Box 73129
North Charleston, South Carolina 29415
843.762.6294
www.clark-associates.com
jan@clark-associates.com

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

0002

1

PRESENT

2

Board Members: Duke Wright
Pat Ilderton
Steve Herlong
Betty Harmon
Fred Reinhard
Jon Lancto

3

4

5

6

Also Present
Billy Craver
Randy Robinson
Kat Kenyon

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
0003

INDEX TO AGENDA

1		
2		
3	November 2008 minutes approved	4
4	2502 Jasper Boulevard	5
5	3314 Jasper Boulevard	8
6	1607 Poe Avenue	10
7	1420 Thompson Avenue	21
8	2402 Raven Drive	33
9	2412 Quarter Street	39
10	Meeting adjourned	71

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
0004

CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: It is about five minutes after 6:00 and the Design Review Board, December 17th, 2008 -- says seven here but I won't say seven, eight.

And in attendance are Duke Wright, Pat Ilderton, Steve Herlong, John Lancto, Betty Harmon, Billy Craven and Fred Reinhard.

MR. CRAVER: My cousin is Craven, I'm Craver.

CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: I'm sorry, Craver.

And now we have approval of the November 2008 minutes. Have we all read them? Do we want to approve them?

MR. CRAVER: I move we approve them.

MR. WRIGHT: Second.

CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Everybody in favor?

MR. WRIGHT: Aye.

CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Aye.

MR. HERLONG: Aye.

MS. HARMON: Aye.

24 MR. REINHARD: Aye.
25 MR. LANCTO: Aye.
0005
1 MR. CRAVER: Aye.
2 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Minutes are
3 approved.
4 First item, 2502 Jasper
5 Boulevard, addition of a fence.
6 Randy, what do we have?
7 MR. ROBINSON: Hang on a second, I
8 got a little behind there.
9 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Okay.
10 MR. ROBINSON: What you have is
11 approval for a fence. This is in the
12 historic district. The home on there was
13 moved to that location from another
14 location.
15 But what you have in your packet
16 is a site plan showing where the fence is
17 going to be, a detail of the fence -- it's
18 going to be four feet wide,
19 three-and-a-half inch pickets, two-inch
20 spacing in between them -- and the
21 application.
22 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Great. Thank
23 you.
24 Is the applicant here? Yes,
25 ma'am?
0006
1 SUSAN HASKILL: I'm representing
2 them, I'm Susan Haskill.
3 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Great, thank you.
4 And it is pretty self-explanatory, I
5 assume, and you don't need to -- looks
6 like to me it is. You don't need to say
7 anything more if you don't choose to.
8 SUSAN HASKILL: I don't need to say
9 anything.
10 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Great. Thank
11 you, ma'am.
12 Is there is any public comment
13 on the fence application?
14 (No response.)
15 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Public comment
16 section's closed.
17 And Randy?
18 MR. ROBINSON: I have no other
19 comment.
20 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: What do we all
21 think?
22 MR. REINHARD: I have a question.
23 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Yes.
24 MR. REINHARD: Does the zoning
25 ordinance allow a 48-inch high fence?
0007
1 MR. ROBINSON: Um-hum, yeah,
2 four-foot fence.

3 MS. HARMON: I have one question, are
4 the gates going to match the rest of the
5 fence?
6 SUSAN HASKILL: Yes, they will.
7 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: All right.
8 Anybody else have any comments?
9 Questions?
10 MR. CRAVER: I move we approve it.
11 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Second?
12 MR. LANCTO: Second.
13 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Discussion?
14 (No response.)
15 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Everybody in
16 favor?
17 MR. WRIGHT: Aye.
18 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Aye.
19 MR. HERLONG: Aye.
20 MS. HARMON: Aye.
21 MR. REINHARD: Aye.
22 MR. LANCTO: Aye.
23 MR. CRAVER: Aye.
24 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Great. Thank
25 you, ma'am.

0008

1 SUSAN HASKILL: Thank you.
2 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: 3314 Jasper
3 Boulevard, changes to an approved
4 accessory structure.
5 MR. ROBINSON: Ready for me?
6 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Yes.
7 MR. ROBINSON: Okay. This one's been
8 before you before. They came before you
9 with the whole house plan. When they came
10 in for plans review on the house we
11 realized that the little area out back had
12 a roof on it but the floor was below base
13 flood elevation, they couldn't do that.
14 So now they've decided to change
15 that roof and put an arbor on it which
16 would be okay and they're coming back and
17 asking for approval.
18 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Great. Thank
19 you.
20 All right. Yes, sir? Justin?
21 JUSTIN FERRICK: Yes. Justin Ferrick
22 with Beau Clowney Design. Basically what
23 Randy said, there's still a need for a
24 shade structure out there, and it's an odd
25 situation where you're not allowed to have

0009

1 a roof on the structure and have a raised
2 floor like that, but you can't have an
3 accessory structure with a height over 15
4 feet anyway so it's not like we could lift
5 it up nor do we want it to be that high
6 regardless.
7 So the -- I think the

8 appropriate solution is to do an arbor and
9 then have a vegetative canopy over the top
10 of it for shade.
11 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Great. Thank
12 you.
13 Is there any public comment on
14 this application?
15 (No response.)
16 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Public comment is
17 closed.
18 Randy, anything else?
19 MR. ROBINSON: No.
20 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: All right. What
21 does everybody think?
22 MR. WRIGHT: I'm fine with it.
23 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: I am fine with it
24 also.
25 MR. HERLONG: I think it's a great
0010 solution, probably better than the roof.
1 MS. HARMON: I agree.
2 MR. REINHARD: I agree.
3 MR. LANCTO: Looks good.
4 MR. CRAVER: Rock and roll.
5 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: All right. Do I
6 hear a motion?
7 MR. REINHARD: Move for approval.
8 MR. CRAVER: Second.
9 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Everybody in
10 favor?
11 MR. WRIGHT: Aye.
12 MR. ILDERTON: Aye.
13 MR. HERLONG: Aye.
14 MS. HARMON: Aye.
15 MR. REINHARD: Aye.
16 MR. LANCTO: Aye.
17 MR. CRAVER: Aye.
18 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: All right.
19 Rolling right along, 1607 Poe, new
20 construction.
21 MR. ROBINSON: This one came before
22 you all before, last month. Last month
23 they were asking for increase of principle
24 building square footage. They have
25 reduced it to fit within the guidelines on
0011 the principle building square footage.
1 What they're asking for tonight
2 is the front dormer projects out into the
3 45-degree angle that -- 45-degree setback
4 so they're asking for an exemption from
5 that, and also second floor facade setback
6 or building -- second floor setback
7 relief. And you'll see both of those on
8 S102. I think that probably best depicts
9 what they're asking for.
10 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Great. Thank
11
12

13 you.

14 Eddy?

15 ERNEST FAVA: Good evening. Eddy
16 Fava with EE Fava Architects representing
17 Mr. and Mrs. Walsh who we spoke of last
18 week in reference to this property.

19 And as Randy had referenced,
20 what was discussed at that time is we were
21 asking for a ten percent increase to what
22 was allowed as far as the square footage
23 which I think amounted to about a hundred
24 square feet.

25 At that time I know there was a

0012

1 neighbor that came forward and said she
2 had not seen the sign. And you all had
3 asked would we meet with her or make the
4 attempt to, which we did, and in good
5 faith spoke about it after that meeting
6 with this neighbor and told her that we
7 had every intention of reducing it and
8 would come back to you with that.

9 So essentially all of the
10 guidelines have been met, every single one
11 of them, I will reiterate, with the
12 exception of what was discussed last time,
13 this minuscule projection within the
14 zoning envelope which we think makes for a
15 more attractive building and has no
16 detrimental effect to anybody whatsoever,
17 in our opinion, we just think it makes for
18 a more attractive building.

19 And the second level setbacks
20 were discussed last time as well but with
21 the variation that we have in the floor
22 plan and the way it L's back, that was
23 well received last time as well.

24 And I would reiterate that we
25 made attempts to speak with the neighbor,

0013

1 we left messages, had let her know that we
2 would be on site with the owner. And she
3 said she'd be interested in meeting with
4 him and told them the time we'd be there,
5 went there, knocked on the door, there was
6 no response and no return calls, so.

7 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Great. Thank
8 you, sir.

9 As part of the public comment
10 I'm going to read a letter that the board
11 has and I'll open it up to the floor for
12 public comment.

13 Dear Mr. Chairman and Members of
14 the Board: I am writing to request that
15 the proposed plans for 1607 Poe Avenue be
16 modified to comply with all limits
17 established by the consultants and enacted

18 by the governing body. Compliance with
19 the limits is more consistent with the
20 scale of the existing neighborhood.
21 Further, I am requesting that
22 permission to add any fill to the
23 elevation to 1607 Poe Avenue be denied due
24 to long-standing problems with the
25 flooding area.

0014

1 Thank you for your
2 consideration.

3 Respectfully, Cynthia Holmes.
4 And just a comment on the last
5 sentence, what fill is or is not going to
6 be considered for this property is not
7 part of our purview. It's in the
8 ordinance and that will be applied through
9 the ordinance, I would assume. But we
10 don't have any control or say-so over what
11 fill is added to the property. That's not
12 in this board's purview.

13 It's the architecture and the
14 other -- the limits that determine what we
15 would address, so. And it would be
16 governed by the ordinance.

17 Is that correct, Randy?

18 MR. ROBINSON: That's correct.

19 CHAIRMAN ILDEBERTON: And now I will
20 open the floor for any public comment.

21 Yes, ma'am.

22 CYNTHIA HOLMES: If I may
23 introduce --

24 MS. KENYON: Please state your name.

25 CYNTHIA HOLMES: Cynthia Holmes at

0015

1 1607 Poe Avenue. If I may enter this, I
2 have copies for everybody. And just to
3 say that I believe the minutes will
4 reflect that there was a request to add a
5 foot of fill or request for permission to
6 add a foot of fill at the last meeting.

7 I am here to just let the board
8 know that there is a long-standing problem
9 with flooding. Any elevation will
10 aggravate flooding to others and not
11 just -- there is threatened ground floor
12 living space so I did want to make that --
13 make the board aware of that.

14 The other issues are that we are
15 requesting compliance and respect for the
16 town's code. We believe that the
17 consultants, you know, put a lot of time
18 and effort into these recommendations.

19 The neighborhood is a smaller
20 scale neighborhood. We would request, you
21 know, a building consistent with a more
22 modest neighborhood.

23
24
25
0016

We are also requesting that the primary front facade appears to be out of proportion for the lot and the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

neighborhood and, you know, that is one area of concern.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Thank you, ma'am.

Is there any other public comment from the section?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Public comment section is closed then.

10
11

Randy, anything to add?

MR. ROBINSON: No.

12
13

CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: All right. Billy, comments or questions?

14
15

MR. CRAVER: It sounds like they've come into compliance with the size limitations and that the only thing we're addressing is that one dormer. Is that --

16
17

MS. KENYON: Second floor setback.

18
19

MR. CRAVER: And the second floor setback. I don't see how either one of those -- denying either one of those is going to really, you know, help the issue that you raised.

20
21

I mean, you could cut the size of the house in half, but they're within

22
23

24
25

0017
1

the ordinance. I probably would -- I don't say I would probably, I would approve the request. I think it's a reasonable request.

2
3

CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Thank you.

4
5

Jon?

6
7

MR. LANCTO: Yeah, I think that the only issue we're dealing with is the dormer projection. I think the alternative on that would be worse. So I would be inclined to grant them that relief on that issue and approve it as they've got it.

8
9

CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Thank you.

10
11

Fred?

12
13

MR. REINHARD: Yes, I liked the design of this house the first time it was brought before us and I like it even more now that it meets the principle building square footage requirements of the ordinance and I'm ready to pass it and get it final.

14
15

CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Betty?

16
17

MS. HARMON: I agree with Fred, but I would like to note that the one foot of

18
19

20
21

22
23

24
25

0018
1

fill was mentioned in the minutes and we

2 would say that that's not under our
3 purview, to make sure that it's not
4 granted because we said so. Otherwise,
5 I'm fine with it.

6 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Steve?

7 MR. HERLONG: I wasn't here for the
8 first or preliminary submittal or
9 preliminary approval but I did carefully
10 read through the minutes of that and from
11 what I understand, this is not in a
12 historic district, right, it's only here
13 because of those -- it wouldn't even be
14 here if it weren't for that dormer
15 projection and the side setback because
16 you're not asking for any increases now.

17 And I agree, it appears that
18 there have been attempts to break up the
19 massing of the rooflines and the facades.
20 That one-story porch across the front
21 seems to be as much as one can do to be
22 compatible in the neighborhood, that
23 one-story element of a porch out front.

24 And I'm assuming, this is sort
25 of a question of Eddy, the architect, but

0019

1 I think you probably have it about as low
2 to the ground as you can.

3 ERNEST FAVA: Yes, sir, absolutely.

4 MR. HERLONG: It's not like it's
5 extra high off the ground.

6 ERNEST FAVA: By virtue of --
7 obviously you are familiar with the FEMA
8 regulations, we couldn't go any lower.
9 We'd love to but it's not possible.

10 MR. HERLONG: And it's less than
11 3,000 square feet. It's nice to see
12 smaller homes coming through these days.
13 We often see them much larger than that.
14 So I think it's a nice solution.

15 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Well, although I
16 mourned the demolition of the structure
17 that was there because it's the first
18 house I built on Sullivan's Island, I
19 think this is a nice replacement to that
20 structure. So I think it's fine.

21 MR. WRIGHT: I agree with what's been
22 said. I don't have any problem with the
23 project at all.

24 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Do I hear a
25 motion?

0020

1 MR. CRAVER: I move we approve the
2 request.

3 MR. REINHARD: Second.

4 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Discussion?

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Everybody in

7 favor?
8 MR. WRIGHT: Aye.
9 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Aye.
10 MR. HERLONG: Aye.
11 MS. HARMON: Aye.
12 MR. REINHARD: Aye.
13 MR. LANCTO: Aye.
14 MR. CRAVER: Aye. It's final
15 approval, yes.
16 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: All right.
17 ERNEST FAVA: May I make a quick
18 statement if it's all right?
19 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Yes.
20 ERNEST FAVA: And just for the
21 record, 'cause I know there's some that
22 signed up and I don't know if anybody is
23 here for this house, but would like
24 everybody to know that if there's ever
25 anything you see with our name on it,
0021
1 you're more than welcome to call us with
2 questions.
3 Again, we tried to make that
4 effort but it wasn't received or nobody
5 responded to it and, unfortunately, by
6 virtue of that, there was a lot of
7 misinformation spread which I think scared
8 some of the neighbors, some of whom I know
9 and some of whom are friends.
10 We had done a survey of the
11 building and the three-block radius and
12 more than half have a greater square
13 footage than what's done here.
14 So, I mean, every effort was
15 made to do that and it would have been
16 easily resolved had somebody had the
17 courtesy to return the effort.
18 CYNTHIA HOLMES: Just for the record,
19 I would like to say that I did make the
20 effort to come.
21 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: All right. 1420
22 Thompson Avenue, new construction.
23 MR. ROBINSON: This is the first time
24 you have seen this one, but they are
25 asking for final approval on it. In front
0022
1 of it you see the application, lot
2 coverage calculations.
3 What they're asking for is a
4 hundred percent on the second floor
5 setback, a two percent impervious coverage
6 relief, but I've informed the applicant
7 that you all cannot grant that two percent
8 impervious coverage because you can't
9 allow impervious coverage relief. And
10 they'll work that out. There's a pool in
11 the back yard and they'll work that out.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
0023
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
0024
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

DARYL COBB: I've redrawn it and brought sheets for you all.

CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: We'll get to you all -- to your presentation.

MR. ROBINSON: And one thing I noticed this afternoon was they're asking for a one-foot -- the one-foot relief in height above base flood elevation with the first floor. If you look at the plans, it says that it's 19.3 which is actually 5.3 feet above base flood, you all can only give them four, right, three feet plus one would be four.

CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Right.

MR. ROBINSON: As drawn it's 5.3 or 5.2 'cause it's five feet three inches above base flood elevation.

I did look at -- when I saw that I pulled some of the elevations on some of the other houses in the block, and the first floor elevations at 1920 were 19.3, basically the same thing they're asking for; 1414 was 20.2, 1412 was 19.1, 1411 was 20.1, and 1408 is 19.5.

So all the houses in that area are right what they're asking for, it's just that you all can't grant that extra 1.3 feet.

MR. HERLONG: This is one of those situations where a flood zone happens to be closer to the grade.

MR. ROBINSON: That's correct. So the other houses in the neighborhood are already up there. Of course, the houses that are lower down below base flood elevation, the prefirm houses, we don't have any elevation certificates on those, of course, but generally in that neighborhood all the houses are right

where they're putting this one.

CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Great. Thanks.

MR. ROBINSON: That's all I've got.

CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Yes, sir?

DARYL COBB: Hi. I'm Daryl Cobb, I'm the architect. After I submitted the plans to the board I realized, or it was pointed out to me that I couldn't get the relief for the two percent so I redesigned, we cut off some pool deck is what we did and I was told to bring this, I'll give everybody one. So we're below the 30 percent impervious.

As in the application, we're asking for relief for that two-foot step-in on the second floor.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
0025
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
0026
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

MR. WRIGHT: And that's all?

DARYL COBB: No, sir. We're asking for some relief, I have a stair tower on the east elevation and I'm aware that I need relief to have this much stucco at the foundation. I can break it up if I have to, but this is a tower and I like the massing of it, I think it's appropriate, so.

CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: All right. That's good. Thank you.

Do you want to go ahead and run through the whole thing, are you finished, or?

DARYL COBB: Yeah, I'm finished.

CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Okay. Great.

Is there any public comment to this application?

JOHN CAGLE: I'm John Cagle, I'm the owner. I've owned it since 1985 and I'm just now getting around to building what I want.

CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Yes, sir. Thank you, sir.

Public comment section's closed. And Randy, anything to add?

MR. ROBINSON: The only thing I will add is they could, if you all felt comfortable with it, they could -- well, even if you all don't feel comfortable with it, they can go to the board of zoning appeals and ask for that extra 1.3 feet by a variance.

MR. HERLONG: That would be probably the only way you could get it, I'm thinking, because this board cannot grant that; isn't that correct?

MR. ROBINSON: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Right. Okay. Thank you.

Steve, why don't you start it off.

MR. HERLONG: Well, I know, I think, that those are difficult lots, very narrow properties, very few options on parking on those properties. And I think the south elevation that you see on the right there does a lot to break up the scale of the house as it faces the street.

And even the two side facades, a lot of work has gone on to make some adjustments so that there isn't a large wall on either side property. And then, of course, nice porches on the view side.

So I think it's a fine solution,

22 that it fits the neighborhood. And I
23 think this board could possibly approve it
24 with some sort of stipulation that the --
25 they need to get a variance on the flood

0027

1 relief that they need to get parking
2 because there's really, it almost seems
3 like a hardship condition. How else can
4 you handle parking really without -- on a
5 property this limited, so. That seems to
6 be the only dilemma.

7 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Great. Thank
8 you.

9 Betty?

10 MS. HARMON: I'm going to pass right
11 now.

12 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Fred?

13 MR. REINHARD: Again, this is one of
14 those nice houses that the principle
15 building square footage is right within
16 our zoning regulation.

17 I have a question though about
18 the building height. In the ordinance in
19 section 21-24 they talk about building
20 heights in 38B. How does this tie into
21 this? What am I missing here?

22 MR. ROBINSON: It's 37 feet 11 inches
23 to the ridge of this house. What they did
24 was they put a number up here, 47 feet 2
25 inches above sea level. I think that's

0028

1 what you're probably looking at. You're
2 looking at that 47 feet up top?

3 MS. HARMON: Yeah, I was too, it's
4 confusing.

5 MR. ROBINSON: But if you come around
6 the side you'll see that he's got it
7 labeled as thirty-seven eleven.

8 MR. REINHARD: I see, thank you.
9 Looks good.

10 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Jon?

11 MR. LANCTO: Yeah, I like the looks
12 of the house. I think it fits in with the
13 rest of the houses on that street, and if
14 they can get the zoning variance, then I
15 don't think we should hold them up. So I
16 would say let's go with it.

17 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Billy?

18 MR. CRAVER: I agree.

19 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Duke?

20 MR. WRIGHT: I have no problem, I
21 think it's fine.

22 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: I also have no
23 problem with the design.

24 Do I hear a motion?

25 MR. REINHARD: Move for approval.

0029

1 MR. LANCTO: Second.
2 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Discussion?
3 MR. CRAVER: That would be subject to
4 their getting a variance to allow them to
5 have that extra 1.3 feet?
6 MR. REINHARD: It's not in our
7 purview.
8 MR. ROBINSON: Or reduce the height,
9 the 18 feet.
10 MR. LANCTO: We don't have to cover
11 that in our discussion; right? This does
12 not pass zoning in its current state;
13 correct?
14 MR. ROBINSON: Correct, but you all
15 could approve it at a height of 18 feet
16 till the first floor elevation so in case
17 they decide they just want to go with
18 18 feet to build this house, they don't
19 have to go to the board of zoning appeals.
20 MR. REINHARD: Is that what you want?
21 DARYL COBB: Yes, sir. If the zoning
22 says no, then I guess I would want the
23 relief from you.
24 MR. CRAVER: You can have the
25 one-foot.
0030
1 DARYL COBB: I'm allowed one foot.
2 You're allowed to give me one, not two.
3 MR. LANCTO: We would amend the
4 motion.
5 MR. REINHARD: I move for approval
6 with one foot of relief.
7 MR. LANCTO: Or whatever the zoning
8 gives them.
9 MR. REINHARD: Well, we don't have to
10 approve that.
11 MS. HARMON: You mean the ordinance.
12 MR. CRAVER: Well, we ought to though
13 because if they give it and we haven't
14 given that too, he'd have to come back and
15 get it from us too.
16 MR. ROBINSON: That's right.
17 MR. CRAVER: So.
18 MR. HERLONG: Can we not just approve
19 it as submitted or at any -- with the
20 first floor at any lower height.
21 MR. REINHARD: Is that a better way
22 to do it?
23 MR. WRIGHT: Would someone restate a
24 motion that makes sense.
25 MR. REINHARD: I restate the motion
0031
1 as such. I move for approval that it be
2 as submitted with relief of one foot in
3 addition to that, if necessary. Is that
4 better?
5 MR. CRAVER: No, I don't think that

6 does it. I think it's as submitted
7 subject to them getting the relief from
8 the zoning board of appeals, and if they
9 don't get that relief, then with the one
10 foot.
11 MR. WRIGHT: Restate that motion then
12 so it's not fuzzy when we review the
13 record.
14 MR. CRAVER: Well, because they've
15 got 2.3 feet of extra space now. We can
16 give them one without getting a variance.
17 But we would also have to approve that
18 extra 1.3 feet with the variance. So we
19 got to approve it either way.
20 MS. HARMON: Why would we have to
21 approve it? You don't usually come back
22 for that.
23 MR. CRAVER: 'Cause then the design
24 isn't approved.
25 MR. ROBINSON: You all just need to

0032

1 approve it both ways, is what you need to
2 do. You need to approve it with the one
3 foot and also approve it with the 2.3
4 provided it goes to the board of zoning
5 appeals and they grant the extra 1.3 feet.
6 MR. CRAVER: That sounded like a
7 motion right there.
8 MR. LANCTO: I would make the motion
9 we approve it as submitted or at any
10 height below, as they wish.
11 MR. ROBINSON: Sounds fine to me.
12 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: That works. All
13 right. Do I hear a second?
14 MS. HARMON: Second.
15 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Discussion?
16 (No response.)
17 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Everybody in
18 favor?
19 MR. WRIGHT: Aye.
20 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Aye.
21 MR. HERLONG: Aye.
22 MS. HARMON: Aye.
23 MR. REINHARD: Aye.
24 MR. LANCTO: Aye.
25 MR. CRAVER: Aye.

0033

1 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Great.
2 2402 Raven Drive, new
3 construction.
4 MR. ROBINSON: Okay. This has come
5 before you for final approval, 2402 Raven.
6 I believe, Kat, you said that they have
7 seen this before, I'm sorry, but I don't
8 remember, in February of '07.
9 KATE CAMPBELL: '08. It was the
10 beginning of this year, pretty sure. It

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
0034
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
0035
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

was a long time ago but I think it was this year.

MR. ROBINSON: You all have seen this before.

MS. KENYON: '08, you're right.

MR. ROBINSON: They're asking for final approval. And they're asking for front yard setback relief, three feet; side yard second floor setback relief, over a hundred percent; principle building coverage, they're asking for some relief from that; and principle building side facade. I don't see any relief for square footage. So that's it. And the plans are in front of you.

CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Great.
Kate?

KATE CAMPBELL: Kate Campbell with Beau Clowney Design. There's really nothing that different about the plan of the house. The biggest difference is, from the last submittal, I don't know if you have the last submittal in front of you, but we were asking for a one-foot height variance on the building foundation height.

And we did determine we are going to put the mechanical still in the floor system but we were able to lower the house by a foot so we're not any more requesting that relief.

The principle building side facade, previously we were requesting a total of ten and a half feet on the principle building side facade and now we're only requesting eight and a half feet.

But the floor plan from the previous submittal is pretty much the same. The second floor we did end up --

initially the plan was, second floor was slightly skewed from the back volume and so for structural integrity and simplicity we aligned those volumes and that actually resulted in a reduction in the second floor square footage from the previous submittal. So the size of the house is a actually a little bit smaller than the last time we came before you.

Other changes, the pool area, previously the pool had been kind of closer to this property line and the deck was here and also more elevated.

We changed this to center the pool more on the house to give them more

16 pool deck area and also be able to lower
17 the open deck closer to grade which we
18 felt was all around better just for the
19 look of the house and just usability of
20 the deck with relationship to the pool.
21 The only other change to the
22 site plan was the driveway. Previously we
23 had a paved driveway coming straight into
24 the house. We have changed that to a
25 pervious driveway, and also a little bit

0036

1 more space to provide parking since there
2 is only one parking space under the house.
3 That's pretty much it.

4 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Great. Thank
5 you.

6 Public comment?
7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Public comment
9 section then is closed.

10 Anything to add?

11 MR. ROBINSON: Nothing.

12 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Randy?
13 Duke?

14 MR. WRIGHT: No, I think it's a good
15 design, fits the neighborhood as it
16 currently exists and may develop in the
17 future. So I have no trouble with it.

18 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: I also have no
19 problems with it.

20 Steve?

21 MR. HERLONG: And I recall when it
22 came through the first time that it's nice
23 to see solutions where you're not needing
24 to get to the 38 feet. This is one where
25 the height of the roof is significantly

0037

1 lower than the maximum height so that's
2 really a nice neighborly way to deal with
3 the design.

4 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Betty?

5 MS. HARMON: I have no problems with
6 it.

7 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Fred?

8 MR. REINHARD: I love the different
9 roof structures and the way they're
10 applied to this house. It's just fun to
11 look at.

12 I do wonder about the principle
13 building square footage. Am I right in
14 what I'm looking at here, they're asking
15 for a 25 percent variance and we're only
16 allowed to give 20, or?

17 MR. ROBINSON: There's a typo in that
18 form.

19 MR. REINHARD: It's 833 square feet
20 more than what we're allowed -- I mean,

21 than what the ordinance requires?
22 MR. WRIGHT: That typo --
23 MR. LANCTO: That's a typo.
24 MR. REINHARD: What is the square
25 footage of the house?
0038
1 KATE CAMPBELL: The square footage of
2 the house is, total is 3,181, page before
3 that, and you're actually allowed 3,335.
4 MR. REINHARD: Well, then you're
5 fine.
6 KATE CAMPBELL: Right. I think
7 you're looking at the maximum authority
8 for relief, but we're not asking for
9 anything -- that's what you can grant.
10 MR. REINHARD: Oh, that's the typo.
11 MR. ROBINSON: Yeah, the ordinance
12 actually says you can do 25 percent.
13 KATE CAMPBELL: We're not asking for
14 it.
15 MR. REINHARD: Good for you. I love
16 it.
17 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Jon?
18 MR. LANCTO: Yeah, I wasn't here for
19 the initial but it looks good. I think
20 you guys have already given this a pretty
21 thorough review so I'm fine with it.
22 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Billy?
23 MR. CRAVER: I'm good with it.
24 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Do I hear a
25 motion?
0039
1 MS. HARMON: I make a motion we
2 approve for final.
3 MR. HERLONG: I second.
4 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Discussion?
5 (No response.)
6 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Everybody in
7 favor.
8 MR. WRIGHT: Aye.
9 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Aye.
10 MR. HERLONG: Aye.
11 MS. HARMON: Aye.
12 MR. REINHARD: Aye.
13 MR. LANCTO: Aye.
14 MR. CRAVER: Aye.
15 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: All right.
16 KATE CAMPBELL: Thank you.
17 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: 2412 Quarter
18 Street, removal from the historic list.
19 DAVID MARK BROWN: My presentation
20 board came courtesy of the Sullivan's
21 Island Post Office, so.
22 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Randy, what do we
23 have?
24 MR. ROBINSON: Okay. What you have
25 here is Mr. Brown is asking you to let

0040

1 this house be removed from the historic
2 list. It's historic survey number 362. I
3 don't believe we have a copy of 362.
4 There's some of the historic surveys that
5 are missing.

6 Mr. Brown was talking to me, we
7 looked at it, it was built in 1955. There
8 was some question as to whether that house
9 should be on the list or not. I told him,
10 well, he's welcome to come to you all and
11 ask for it to be removed. And so that's
12 what he's doing here.

13 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Great. Thank
14 you.

15 Yes, sir?

16 DAVID MARK BROWN: Good evening. My
17 name is David Mark Brown and this
18 application is for my property at 2412
19 Quarter Street, which also includes the
20 house at 2413 Quarter Street which are
21 currently designated as a historical
22 resource.

23 I believe that's historical
24 survey number 169 in the Atlanticville
25 historic register. I'm requesting these

0041

1 houses to be removed from the list.
2 Tonight I'll show you these photographs
3 and give you some information which I
4 believe will support the request.

5 I want to point out also that I
6 have no plans for any radical renovations,
7 additions or demolitions or anything like
8 that, plus I maintain a great respect for
9 historical preservation.

10 I'm also aware that the code
11 points out that there are only two reasons
12 which would allow property to be removed
13 from the list and those are that there was
14 a procedural nonconformity in listing the
15 property or misapplication of criteria for
16 designation.

17 I actually recently discovered
18 the property was on the list only a few
19 years back as the property was not on the
20 original list dated September 24, 2003
21 prepared by David Schneider and forwarded
22 to me afterwards.

23 I'm going to summarize. The
24 property actually contains two houses: At
25 2412 Quarter Street which is this pink

0042

1 house here which is approximately
2 1200 square feet was built in 1955 on a
3 concrete block foundation and it's clad in
4 asbestos shingles and asbestos replacement

5 shingles.
6 This house bears no resemblance
7 whatsoever to any of the other historic
8 structures or homes in the Atlanticville
9 district or anywhere else on Sullivan's
10 Island. The house is situated across the
11 from the, I call it the pumping station
12 which was constructed in the '90s.

13 The other house, 2413 Quarter
14 Street, which is approximately 700 square
15 feet, was built prior to 1955 but we have
16 yet to locate an exact date.

17 For several years even prior to
18 Hurricane Hugo this small house was clad
19 in vinyl and a porch deck was replaced by
20 an aluminum screened porch. The house was
21 so altered by the previous occupants and
22 owners prior to 1983 when we purchased the
23 property that it bears no resemblance to
24 the original structure or to any of the
25 other historical houses in the

0043 Atlanticville district.

1 This house is also situated
2 across the street from the outdoor dumping
3 station and what I call the phosphate
4 storage enclosure.

5 To continue, the roofs of both
6 houses were badly damaged during Hurricane
7 Hugo and were replaced by contemporary
8 metal roofs. In addition, the older house
9 at 2413 Quarter Street is at most only 700
10 square feet and may, based on inspection
11 of the ceilings and the crawl space, have
12 been only two rooms and not four rooms
13 originally.

14 The houses do not seem to
15 qualify under the eight criteria in
16 section 21-94. And I'll go through these
17 very quickly because I have some
18 additional points to point out.

19 There is no significant inherent
20 character, interest or value as part of
21 the development or heritage of Sullivan's
22 Island, the State of South Carolina or our
23 nation.

24 I would also like to add that my
25

0044 1 historical research into the South
2 Carolina History Room includes ghost
3 sightings. There have been ghost
4 sightings in the Atlanticville district
5 but none in these two houses.

6 Neither house was the site of a
7 significant event in history. The
8 historic battles were at either end of
9 Sullivan's Island but the old trolley line

10 did run down Quarter Street which was
11 formerly called Railroad Avenue.

12 So from this 1926 map, you can
13 see it was called Railroad Avenue and it
14 goes right down in that area and that's
15 why they used to call it Railroad Avenue.

16 Neither house is associated with
17 a person or persons who contributed
18 significantly to the culture and
19 development of Sullivan's Island, the
20 state of South Carolina or our nation
21 although two fire and rescue icons did
22 reside in the two houses: Aubrey Olsen at
23 2413 Quarter Street, I guess everybody
24 remembers the sign he put out there, Next
25 Week Enjoy Folly Beach, and Alex Robinson

0045

1 resided at 2412 Quarter Street.

2 Neither house exemplifies the
3 cultural, political, economic, social,
4 ethnic or historic heritage of Sullivan's
5 Island, the State of South Carolina or our
6 nation, plus at least 2412 Quarter Street,
7 the pink house, is not pictured on page 88
8 in this Sullivan's Island book which
9 features Quarter Street by the Gadsen
10 Cultural Center on the historical and
11 architectural inventory of Sullivan's
12 Island.

13 Neither house embodies
14 distinguishing characteristics of a type,
15 style, period or specimen in architecture
16 or engineering.

17 Neither house contains elements
18 of design, detail, materials or
19 craftsmanship which represents a
20 significant innovation.

21 I did a complete survey of this
22 Sullivan's Island book by the Gadsen
23 Cultural Center and noted at least 50
24 historical architectural details that are
25 identified by historical Atlanticville.

0046

1 None of these details outside of
2 my contemporary metal roofs and some
3 possible beaded wood at 2413 Quarter
4 Street is in any of the houses, exterior
5 or interior.

6 Neither house represents an
7 established or familiar visual feature of
8 the Atlanticville Historic District of
9 Sullivan's Island.

10 Strangely, during this survey of
11 historical architectural details, I
12 discovered that my 14-year-old house, the
13 third house I own, at 2911 Jasper
14 Boulevard has actually far more exterior

15 and interior details that relate to
16 historic Atlanticville than these two
17 houses on Quarter Street.

18 Neither house has yielded or may
19 be likely to yield information important
20 in prehistory or history.

21 In addition to a complete survey
22 of the Sullivan's Island book by the
23 Gadsen Cultural Center, I spent a number
24 of days at the Calhoun main library and
25 the Sullivan's Island branch library, I've

0047

1 been through all the books by Suzannah
2 Smith Miles, plus books by Ledbetter and
3 Wannamaker, along with numerous newspaper
4 clippings, with no references to any
5 historical event.

6 I also spent a day tracing
7 ownership at the RMC office on Meeting
8 Street including computer, microfilm, the
9 old reference books they have down there.

10 This is an ownership that goes
11 from myself and my brother Steven to
12 Joseph and Wilhelmina James and seems to
13 stop with William and Margaret Ehrhardt
14 which were married in 1941 which appears
15 to place 2414 -- three Quarter Street,
16 which I can't find a date on, sometime
17 after that date.

18 Additionally, I did a search
19 under Margaret Ehrhardt's maiden name --
20 this is the woman that married this guy in
21 1941 -- which still came up with no
22 property ownership or property inheritance
23 under the name Margaret Dillon.

24 So the only thing -- conclusion
25 I can come up with is this is a 1955 house

0048

1 and this house was probably thrown up
2 sometime in the 1940s. Maybe somebody has
3 some additional information on that.

4 I also visited 2213 Atlantic
5 Avenue, which I believe was recently
6 removed from this list, and found that
7 structure in my opinion to be
8 significantly older and more interesting
9 than my two houses on Quarter Street.

10 In addition to all the previous
11 points, these two houses share absolutely
12 no historical or architectural DNA.
13 They're completely different from one
14 another.

15 This is in complete contrast to
16 the other historical multiple dwelling
17 properties on Sullivan's Island where a
18 main building and the accessory structures
19 are usually a matching historical set.

20
21
22
23
24
25
0049
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
0050
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

In conclusion, based on my findings today, I sincerely believe that neither 2412 Quarter Street nor 2413 Quarter Street warrants being on this list.

And after removing it from the list if this is possible, you know, the reverse could actually come true, meaning that either myself, my decedents, or any other future owners could have the opportunity to make these buildings on this property look more like it belongs in Atlanticville rather than less as it does today.

Hopefully the ARB will support my conclusions and I really appreciate your time.

CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Great. Thank you, sir.

MS. KENYON: Let me make -- that sheet I handed, one house is actually number 369 and the other house is actually 395.

CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Is there any public comment on this application?

Yes, sir?

ERNEST FAVA: Just briefly, Eddy Fava. I live a couple blocks away. And you've obviously done your homework. Just out of curiosity, if I could ask Mr. Brown a question.

I mean, why would you want to remove them from the list? Is there a detriment to have them on the list?

DAVID MARK BROWN: First of all, I think, deep down inside me, I think it's a sham that they're on the list. That's number one.

The other thing, when you've got a house over here that, you know, just speaking of the windows, some are vinyl, some are six-over-six, some are four-over-four, some are one-over-one, I don't want to replace like-for-like like that. You know, I've got an aluminum screened porch here.

Why would I want to -- you know, I would prefer, after reading this book, which inspired me a lot, I'd rather replace that porch with a porch, later on down the road, with a porch that possibly looks more like Atlanticville, because this porch does not look like Atlanticville.

You know, if this structure

25 right here is historical, that means we
0051
1 got tens of thousands of houses on James
2 and Johns Island that are also historical.
3 So, you know, the National Historical
4 Registry has got a lot of work cut out for
5 them.

6 But both of these houses, and
7 this house over here, this is all concrete
8 block here and this whole peak section is
9 concrete block.

10 When I look at these homes in
11 this book, I look at every single one of
12 these house here and the first adjective
13 that comes to my mind is historical and
14 quaint and things like that. Nobody has
15 ever gone by my house and -- these two
16 houses and said -- used the word quaint.

17 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Great. Thank
18 you, sir.

19 Is there any other public
20 comment?

21 ERNEST FAVA: The only other thing I
22 wanted to say on that, and again, I
23 certainly think you've done your homework,
24 as you said, so I wouldn't want to deter
25 you from doing that, but I think what I

0052
1 think is important about them is the
2 massing and we're losing those and kind of
3 hate to see that happen.

4 But if the intention is to go
5 the direction you're going where you keep
6 some of that, 'cause the ones that I
7 renovated were very similar to that,
8 concrete block, small, little two-room
9 shacks, but tried to kind of reference the
10 history of the island and the vernacular
11 and I guess what I was afraid of is they
12 were going to be wiped off the face of the
13 map and then something built out to the
14 max like the governor's place, that would
15 be a shame.

16 DAVID MARK BROWN: I don't think that
17 the setbacks on this property would allow
18 for anything -- and anything that I would
19 ever do would have to be approved by this
20 group of people here and everybody else
21 anyway.

22 ERNEST FAVA: I just wasn't sure if
23 it required a demolition permit if it
24 comes off the list or not.

25 DAVID MARK BROWN: Quite honestly, I

0053
1 have no interest in demolition, I have no
2 interest in anything. I just don't think
3 that these houses are historical.

4 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Great. Thank
5 you, sir.
6 Fred, do you want to start?
7 MR. REINHARD: Some compelling
8 arguments there and a very nice
9 presentation, but I don't see any reason
10 to take it off the list, either house.
11 MR. HERLONG: I've got a question.
12 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Yes, sir, Steve.
13 MR. HERLONG: It's in one of the
14 Island's historical districts. Is it on
15 one of the national register districts?
16 Is that property in one of those
17 districts?
18 MR. ROBINSON: I know it's in the
19 island district but I'm not sure it's in
20 the national registry district. Give me a
21 second, I'll go look on the map.
22 MR. HERLONG: What I noted is that
23 we, the town established the four
24 districts and then the national register
25 districts have been applied or overlaid
0054
1 and they are smaller than the Island's
2 districts.
3 So those homes that are outside
4 the national register district but in the
5 town's district are at a distinct
6 disadvantage when it comes to renovations.
7 The 50 percent rule issue becomes a big
8 problem for those homes.
9 MR. ROBINSON: It is in both the
10 national register and the Sullivan's
11 Island district.
12 MR. HERLONG: What that means is that
13 these properties can qualify for that
14 historic variance on 50 percent rule
15 issues and can be rehabbed and brought,
16 may be brought -- have more character
17 brought into them even though they might
18 be below flood.
19 So I'm not seeing that there's
20 any disadvantage to be on the historic
21 list, especially being in a national
22 register district. It almost gives them
23 some advantages.
24 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Jon?
25 MR. LANCTO: Well, I agree with your
0055
1 comments about the age and the look, but I
2 do agree that the massing is something
3 that I'm afraid we're losing a lot of and
4 would be inclined to keep that size
5 building intact on the island.
6 If this property were to change
7 hands, I think it would give somebody the
8 opportunity, if these weren't still on the

9 historic district, of just being wiped off
10 and replaced with probably one large
11 structure.

12 So I'd be inclined to leave it
13 as is, especially with Steve's point with
14 the advantages of being in the historic
15 district.

16 MARK DAVID BROWN: Can I ask a
17 question, because I haven't really heard
18 this term massing before. Does that mean
19 somebody would tear down a house and build
20 a larger structure there, is that what you
21 mean?

22 MS. HARMON: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Essentially.

24 MARK DAVID BROWN: Is there a way
25 that we could work out some type of

0056
1 compromise where we could put something in
2 writing that somebody couldn't build
3 larger structures there, we couldn't do
4 that?

5 Because one of my concerns is
6 that, you know, with these old houses and
7 things like that, you know, some of them
8 are kind of like mere space stations, it's
9 just a matter of time before they
10 disintegrate, you know. You know, could
11 be ten years from now or 20 years from
12 now.

13 And the idea particularly of
14 either one of these houses is that, for
15 me, you know, both here and here, I would
16 want to put something there possibly in
17 the future that would actually reflect
18 Atlanticville more than what they do now.

19 But, you know, by keeping a 1955
20 house and a house that was possibly just
21 thrown up sometime in the '40s quite
22 quickly and designate these buildings as
23 historical, this is the issue I have
24 problems with because they're not
25 historical.

0057
1 If you go into the national site
2 of historical registry and there's, I
3 think it said there's 85,000 properties or
4 something listed in the country or
5 something like that, and the spirit of
6 registering a house and a house being
7 historical in this country, these houses
8 do not fit any of that criteria also.

9 MS. HARMON: Well, I think from my
10 point of view, it does fit in the
11 Atlanticville area and it's part of the
12 socioeconomic times and that's what we're
13 trying to preserve here so I would not be

14 in favor of taking it off the list for
15 that reason.

16 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Billy?

17 MR. CRAVER: I actually agree with
18 Mr. Brown. This to me is a classic
19 example of what shouldn't be on the
20 historic list. And we have a
21 well-thought-out new zoning ordinance that
22 would govern what size structure could be
23 put on that property if these were torn
24 down.

25 And I just, I look at these two

0058

1 things and I go -- to me, I see absolutely
2 no historic redeeming qualities to them.

3 And, you know, the massing
4 issue, the zoning ordinance deals with
5 that. And we got all kinds of good stuff
6 in there to deal with that. The shape of
7 that lot is going to -- I don't know what
8 he could put on that lot with its shape.
9 But it ain't going to be a huge mass.

10 I just think that to call those
11 two houses historic to me is almost a joke
12 to our ordinance. I mean, that's just my
13 opinion.

14 So I would grant the request.
15 But I also don't believe that anything
16 that's on that list will ever get off that
17 list. So you'll have one vote at least.

18 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: I'll make a
19 comment. The problem with taking it off
20 the list is it does allow basically for
21 demolition, you could demolish it, and
22 then -- and I would hate to see those
23 demolished even though that's not your
24 intention to demolish them. But I would
25 hate to see those houses demolished.

0059

1 The massing is important as part
2 of the historical and cultural heritage of
3 Sullivan's Island which is what our
4 historic ordinance is about primarily,
5 it's not necessarily about a 150-year old
6 house.

7 But within the district it is,
8 this board has been relatively lenient and
9 helpful in letting people rehab and add
10 and even make larger the historical
11 structures, especially when there's
12 obvious -- something like this when it
13 could be a little of this, could be a
14 little of that, it's not obviously old.

15 And so there really is probably
16 more advantage, like Steve pointed out, in
17 leaving them on the list because of the
18 relief from the 50 percent rule and more

19 value in the property, I mean, because of
20 that. It's maybe not evidently seen by
21 you, but there's probably more value
22 there, you've got two structures there.
23 And I'd have a hard time -- I
24 would not be in favor of taking them off
25 the list, so, basically.

0060

1 Duke?
2 MR. WRIGHT: One of them is in the
3 altered category, 395, on the list.
4 MARK DAVID BROWN: Which one is that,
5 sir?
6 MR. WRIGHT: That's the smaller one,
7 2413. If you look at the list that was
8 prepared bring Mr. Schneider, that one is
9 in the altered category. That takes it
10 out of our domain anyway, doesn't it?
11 Didn't we determine or --
12 MS. HARMON: I don't think so.
13 MR. WRIGHT: -- wasn't it determined
14 that this board did not have any authority
15 over houses that were in the altered
16 category?
17 MR. ROBINSON: Yes, but the ordinance
18 also references the map and the list. And
19 on the map, this is, both of these
20 structures are traditional island
21 resources.
22 MR. WRIGHT: What governs?
23 MR. ROBINSON: Either/or. So if one
24 of them -- whichever one is more
25 stringent. If the map says that they're

0061

1 two traditional island resources, they're
2 two traditional island resources.
3 You know, the one thing I will
4 say about this property is it is in the
5 historic district and the national
6 registry district. Anything that happens
7 on this property, whether these houses are
8 removed from the list or not, come before
9 you all.
10 I mean, you can take them off
11 the list but it's still, everything that
12 happens with these homes is still going to
13 come before you.
14 CHAIRMAN ILDEBERTON: But the problem
15 is they're going to be eight or ten feet
16 off the ground, any new structure; isn't
17 that correct?
18 MR. ROBINSON: Not necessarily. Not
19 necessarily. A new home within a national
20 register district can get a variance to be
21 down below flood if that will -- if being
22 up above flood will harm the national
23 register district.

24
25
0062

MR. HERLONG: And also the fact that these are currently considered historic

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

doesn't mean they can't be altered or you can't sympathetically add an addition to either one of them. I may be wrong about either one of them. There's got to be one main one that could be added onto.

But additions, alterations and upgrades to historic structures are occurring on the island all the time. The window issue, as you mentioned, could easily come before this board to be resolved so that maybe there should be one window style in either one of those homes.

The fact that they're on the list doesn't mean they're preserved as they are in that just sort of random state they're in.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23

MR. REINHARD: That's a good point.

MARK DAVID BROWN: I don't know if it's appropriate for me to make this comment to you all, but this house that was on -- was this house on 2213 Atlantic Avenue removed from the list? From what I understand, it was removed from the list.

24
25
0063

MS. HARMON: It wasn't on the historic list, was it --

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

MR. ROBINSON: That structure was also a traditional island resource but it was not within a historic district, it was outside of the historic district. That's the difference between these two.

MARK DAVID BROWN: So if you had the one house on Atlantic Avenue which actually looks historic and is more historic than these houses that was not in the historic district which was removed from this, from the list, you got two more modern houses than that that happen to be in the Atlanticville district on Quarter Street.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

And they're also opposite two huge eyesores over there: One is this pumping station that went on for quite a long time over there, and then this other area which I call it a phosphate storage area where you have semi-hazardous waste which is supposed to be stored in cool, dry places. So you have barrels over there, loads of them with residue in them on the other side of the street.

25
0064

MR. REINHARD: Mr. Chairman, what

1
2

does this have to do with the historic district?

3 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Well, what's
4 across the street I guess really doesn't.
5 MARK DAVID BROWN: I think it has a
6 lot to do with it because if we're talking
7 about preservation on Sullivan's Island,
8 why is the island -- this same group here
9 not looking after what's strictly across
10 the street from these houses.

11 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: I think we are.
12 I think we're talking odds and ends. But
13 I think this board and what the original
14 island historical list, why it was made
15 was not only, as I say, to protect the
16 100- or 150-year old homes but was also to
17 protect the moderate nature of Sullivan's
18 Island or what was the moderate -- we
19 wanted to keep as much moderation in
20 Sullivan's Island. It's gotten a little
21 out of the barn.

22 And that's what we're talking
23 about. Essentially we're talking about,
24 like I said, the massing and the feel of
25 it, these houses. And these houses, like

0065

1 Steve pointed out, if they came before us
2 again for some modification, I think this
3 board would be very generous in that, in
4 the modification.

5 I would not like to see those
6 houses demolished, and essentially by
7 taking them off of this, they could be
8 demolished tomorrow. And I just don't
9 think this board would like to see that
10 happen nor do I think probably most of
11 Sullivan's Island would like to see this
12 happen.

13 MARK DAVID BROWN: We keep going, I
14 keep hearing the word demolish. Is there
15 any way that we can say that's not going
16 to happen, put that in writing, there's
17 absolutely no -- 'cause this is not the
18 intent of this.

19 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Well, the problem
20 is if you sold -- if you had that
21 admonition on the property, you'd have to
22 sell the property with that, so you'd have
23 to sell the property with that attached to
24 the deed. I don't even know if that's
25 even possible. But you'd have to have

0066

1 some attachment to the deed that said you
2 could never demolish these if you ever
3 wanted to sell it.

4 You'd probably be putting these
5 properties -- really devaluing your
6 property if you wanted to attach something
7 like that. I think that would be a

8 problem for you. And I don't know that we
9 could even do that.

10 I know some boards have done
11 some attachments to deeds before like with
12 attachments, properties, you know, make
13 sure there's not rental units going to be,
14 but I don't know that that would be for
15 this board anyway, maybe for another board
16 altogether, board of adjustment or
17 something like that.

18 MR. ROBINSON: As it stands now, even
19 if these two homes were taken off the
20 list, to demolish them, they would still
21 have to come before this board because
22 they're in a district.

23 CHAIRMAN ILDETON: Oh really? Yeah.
24 Yeah. So really it's six of one, half a
25 dozen of the other. Even if they're taken

0067

1 off the list, you know, which really is
2 going to be a disadvantage because this
3 being on the list is an advantage in a
4 way, if it's taken off, the board has
5 control anyway.

6 I'd hate to see them taken off
7 the list because I think whatever future
8 board in ten years would have an idea that
9 these still should have more concern even
10 though they have to come before the board
11 again.

12 But if they have to come before
13 the board no matter what, I guess that's a
14 consideration. But I'm not so sure taking
15 them off the list would be an advantage
16 for the property because I know this board
17 right now would hate to see these
18 demolished.

19 Now, there's no reason in ten
20 years that somebody, you or whoever owns
21 the property, couldn't make another
22 application to take them off the list
23 again, I guess, or five years or next
24 year, I guess, whatever, to a different
25 board and that board may feel differently.

0068

1 At least I'm not speaking for the whole
2 board though. But that's the way I feel,
3 I guess.

4 Duke, you haven't really jumped
5 in on this I don't think. Do you want --

6 MR. WRIGHT: Well, I've got mixed
7 emotions here. It's a tough one. But I
8 lean towards keeping them on the list for
9 the reasons stated. And I think as Steve
10 or someone mentioned, if you do want to do
11 work, alteration, modification, such as
12 the windows or any other feature on the

13 exterior of the buildings, this board
14 would be very much in favor of doing what
15 you want to do, I'm sure, to provide
16 consistency in the houses.

17 MARK DAVID BROWN: Actually what you
18 just said is possibly what I'm looking
19 for. And what I want to be able to do in
20 the future is make these houses not only
21 look more like the Atlanticville district,
22 but I'd also like to also make them more,
23 I would say, use the term, Hugo-proof, if
24 you understand what I'm saying,
25 particularly when it comes to glass in

0069

1 windows, style of windows, type of windows
2 and things like that.

3 And if I can come before this
4 board and say, you know, I need to do
5 these things, they're modern revisions but
6 they will look old and they will fit into
7 the neighborhood, I would want to have
8 that opportunity to do something like
9 that. Are you following me?

10 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: I think this
11 board would be sympathetic to that. I
12 don't think this board can say we will
13 grant you everything you want in the
14 future, but I think we would be
15 sympathetic to something like that.

16 MR. HERLONG: Or I could say this
17 board has in the past allowed very
18 historic structures to have, in some of
19 their additions, impact rated windows.
20 They can -- you can upgrade a structure
21 and keep the historic look. That's been
22 approved by this board in the past.

23 So this board has worked
24 probably in every way they can to let
25 homeowners deal with their insurance

0070

1 issues or often opposing what a historic
2 board might want. So we've got a lot of
3 those issues that go on on this island. I
4 think the board does try to help
5 homeowners do the things they need but
6 deal with the historic issues of the
7 neighborhoods.

8 CHAIRMAN ILDERTON: Thank you, sir.

9 Do I hear a motion?

10 MS. HARMON: I make a motion that we
11 deny the request to demolish.

12 MR. REINHARD: It's not deny --

13 MARK DAVID BROWN: It wasn't a
14 request to demolish.

15 MS. HARMON: -- to remove it from the
16 list.

17 MR. REINHARD: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Discussion?
19 (No response.)
20 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Everybody in
21 favor?
22 MR. WRIGHT: Aye.
23 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Aye.
24 MR. HERLONG: Aye.
25 MS. HARMON: Aye.
0071
1 MR. REINHARD: Aye.
2 MR. LANCTO: Aye.
3 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Everybody
4 opposed?
5 MR. CRAVER: Aye.
6 CHAIRMAN ILBERTON: Thank you, sir.
7 We're adjourned.
8 (The hearing was concluded 7:12 p.m.)
9 ---oOo---

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
0072

1 STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
 : CERTIFICATE
2 COUNTY OF DORCHESTER)
3 I, Janice D. Hayward, Registered Merit
4 Reporter and Notary Public, certify that I was
5 authorized to and did stenographically report the
6 foregoing deposition, and that the transcript is
7 a true record of the testimony given by the witness.
8 I further certify that the witness was
9 duly sworn and cautioned by me to tell the truth,
10 the whole truth and nothing but the truth. I
11 certify that the same was reduced to typewritten
12 form from my original stenograph notes by
13 computer-aided transcription.
14 I further certify that I am not of
15 counsel or kin to any of the parties to this cause
16 of action, nor am I interested in any manner in
17 its outcome.
18 IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set
19 my hand and seal this the 29th day of December 2008.
20
21

22

Janice D. Hayward, RMR
Notary Public, South Carolina
My Comm. Expires Oct. 9, 2012

23

24

25