

0001

1

2

3

4 MEETING OF THE SULLIVAN'S ISLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

5

6

7

8

9

DATE: July 15, 2009

10

TIME: 6:00 p.m.

11

LOCATION: SULLIVAN'S ISLAND TOWN HALL

12

1610 Middle Street

Sullivan's Island, SC 29482

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 REPORTED BY: NANCY ENNIS TIERNEY, CSR (IL)

CLARK & ASSOCIATES

24

P.O. Box 73129

North Charleston, SC 29415

25

(843) 762-6294

0002

1

2

A P P E A R A N C E S

3

4 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS:

5 STEPHEN HERLONG - Chair

DUKE WRIGHT - Secretary

6 FRED REINHARD - Member

BETTY HARMON - Member

7 JON LANCTO - Member

BILLY CRAVER - Member

8

9

10

11

12 ALSO PRESENT: Kat Kenyon - Administrative  
Randy Robinson - Building Official

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

0003

1 MR. HERLONG: The Design Review Board of  
2 Sullivan's Island is meeting now, July 15th, 2009 at  
3 6:00. The members in attendance are Duke Wright, Steve  
4 Herlong, Betty Harmon, Fred Reinhard, Jon Lancto and  
5 Billy Craver. The Freedom of Information requirements  
6 have been met for this meeting.

7 And, Duke, you wanted to maybe adjust  
8 the agenda?

9 MR. WRIGHT: Yes. I move that we revise the  
10 agenda, just to move the ones that are going to take  
11 longer to the end. The new order would be 1, 2, 5, 3,  
12 4, 6 and 7, 7 being the last one, addition to the  
13 agenda.

14 MR. HERLONG: We need a motion.

15 MR. CRAVER: 1, 2 --

16 MR. WRIGHT: 1, 2, 5, 3, 4, 6. And 7 is the  
17 one at the bottom that doesn't have a number on it,  
18 discussion of future Staff approvals.

19 MR. REINHARD: Second.

20 MR. HERLONG: Any discussion? All in favor?

21 MR. WRIGHT: Aye.

22 MR. HERLONG: Aye.

23 MS. HARMON: Aye.

24 MR. REINHARD: Aye.

25 MR. LANCTO: Aye.

0004

1 MR. CRAVER: Aye.

2 MR. HERLONG: Any opposed?

3 So the first item on the agenda is the

4 approval of the June 2009 minutes. Has everybody read  
5 the minutes?

6 MR. CRAVER: There is one change. Randy,  
7 you can tell them where it is.

8 MR. ROBINSON: There is one change. In the  
9 motion that they made on 2708 Goldbug last month that  
10 says, "My motion is we approve the application to allow  
11 the structure to be moved seven degrees subject to the  
12 condition that it is properly shored up to assure that  
13 the structure is not delayed but is preserved."

14 I believe that word delayed should have  
15 been destroyed.

16 MR. CRAVER: And it should have, because it  
17 was my motion.

18 MR. WRIGHT: It's in two places in the  
19 minutes, so that should be corrected.

20 MR. HERLONG: Any other comments on the  
21 minutes? Is there a motion to approve them with the  
22 adjustments?

23 MR. CRAVER: So moved.

24 MR. WRIGHT: Second.

25 MR. HERLONG: All in favor?

0005

1 MR. WRIGHT: Aye.

2 MR. HERLONG: Aye.

3 MS. HARMON: Aye.

4 MR. REINHARD: Aye.

5 MR. LANCTO: Aye.

6 MR. CRAVER: Aye.

7 MR. HERLONG: Any opposed?

8 Okay. The second item on the agenda is  
9 something I need to recuse myself for, so you can take  
10 over.

11 (Mr. Herlong recused himself from 2101  
12 Pettigrew Street application.)

13 MR. WRIGHT: The second item is for gates at  
14 the residence 2101 Pettigrew.

15 Randy?

16 MR. ROBINSON: The gates at 2101 Pettigrew  
17 are in front of you. I'm not exactly sure which gates  
18 we are looking at. There are two drawings of gates  
19 here. But --

20 MR. LEWIS: I think we put two in there just  
21 to see which one you favored.

22 MR. ROBINSON: But there are two drawings of  
23 two different fences. The fences are aluminum. Our

24 ordinance allows wood and wood-wire material.

25 It's kind of my opinion that you

0006

1 couldn't build gates like this out of wood. And the  
2 aluminum is a square-like post that appears to be wood.  
3 It's just a lighter material so it works. If you tried  
4 to build gates like this out of wood, it just wouldn't  
5 work.

6 So I think that these gates need to meet  
7 the intent of our ordinance, but it's up to you-all.

8 And there is a living fence around the  
9 rest of it that was approved with the house plan. And  
10 that is all I have.

11 MR. LANCTO: Doesn't the ordinance allow for  
12 different materials within an entrance feature?

13 MR. ROBINSON: It allows for solid materials  
14 on an entrance feature. So I just don't see the  
15 difference with trying to put a couple of gates like  
16 this.

17 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Randy.

18 Does the applicant have anything to add  
19 to that?

20 MR. LEWIS: I have a five-year-old and a dog  
21 I'm trying to keep in and I have a bunch of beach  
22 traffic I'm trying to keep out. That is pretty much it.

23 MR. WRIGHT: No further comment regarding  
24 the design? There are two designs here.

25 MR. LEWIS: Yes. I honestly put two in just

0007

1 to see if you-all had a preference. I don't  
2 particularly. I know you guys like to have a say in it,  
3 and I don't want to offend anybody, so I thought I would  
4 throw a couple options at you.

5 MR. WRIGHT: Do you have a preferred?

6 MR. LEWIS: I think we were talking about  
7 the one with the little curve on top. But, again, if  
8 anybody had an objection to that, I am fine with the  
9 other one. It's function over form, in my mind.

10 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you. Any public comment?  
11 Public comment period is closed.

12 Randy, do you have anything to add?

13 MR. ROBINSON: No.

14 MR. WRIGHT: Board, discussion?

15 MR. CRAVER: I don't have a problem with it.  
16 He can choose.

17 MR. LANCTO: Either one is good with me.

18 MR. WRIGHT: Fred?  
19 MR. REINHARD: I feel the same way. I do  
20 have a question about -- it says will have two posts.  
21 What is the material of the posts that the gates are  
22 mounted to?  
23 MR. LEWIS: I think they are aluminum, also.  
24 But, to be honest with you, I'm not positive.  
25 MR. REINHARD: They are not going to be  
0008  
1 masonry?  
2 MR. LEWIS: I don't believe they are.  
3 MR. REINHARD: Because it would change the  
4 look of it if it were masonry columns.  
5 MR. LEWIS: I'm not aiming to have any big  
6 columns. I am pretty sure they are 4-by-4.  
7 MR. REINHARD: So it will be a similar  
8 material, either steel or aluminum posts painted to  
9 match the gates?  
10 MR. LEWIS: Yes.  
11 MR. REINHARD: Sounds good to me.  
12 MS. HARMON: I'm okay with it.  
13 MR. WRIGHT: I'm okay with it.  
14 Do I hear a motion?  
15 MR. CRAVER: I move we approve.  
16 MR. REINHARD: Second.  
17 MR. WRIGHT: All in favor?  
18 MR. LANCTO: But I just wanted to modify  
19 that. I move we approve either design.  
20 MR. CRAVER: I will accept that  
21 modification.  
22 MR. WRIGHT: Second.  
23 MR. REINHARD: Second.  
24 MR. WRIGHT: Discussion? All in favor?  
25 MR. WRIGHT: Aye.  
0009  
1 MR. HERLONG: Aye.  
2 MS. HARMON: Aye.  
3 MR. REINHARD: Aye.  
4 MR. LANCTO: Aye.  
5 MR. CRAVER: Aye.  
6 MR. LEWIS: Thank you very much.  
7 (Mr. Herlong re-entered the room.)  
8 MR. HERLONG: The next item on the agenda is  
9 Item Number 5, 2014 I'On Avenue, accessory structure.  
10 Randy, if you can give us an idea on  
11 this.

12 MR. ROBINSON: What you have here is an  
13 accessory structure that you-all previously approved,  
14 but when they got out there in the field they just felt  
15 like it would be better situated if it was a little  
16 closer to the property line.

17 So they are coming in to ask if this  
18 structure can be six feet from the property line versus  
19 ten feet to the property line.

20 MR. REINHARD: Question? Does that mean the  
21 design didn't change, just the siting only?

22 MR. ROBINSON: That is correct, same design,  
23 I believe. Carl, I haven't seen anything different.

24 MR. McCANTS: No, we didn't change anything.  
25 We are just asking to push it back four feet.

0010

1 MR. HERLONG: Anything else, Randy?

2 MR. ROBINSON: That is all I have.

3 MR. HERLONG: Applicant?

4 MR. McCANTS: As you will see what is  
5 illustrated here, the pool is existing here, and we were  
6 abiding by the ten-foot side setback for accessory  
7 structures.

8 Once it was staked out, the owners  
9 realized how close it actually was to the pool.  
10 Visually, they couldn't pick it up on paper. And so  
11 that is the reason we are coming back to you-all now, is  
12 because I understand that you-all can give a relief of  
13 six feet, to where we can push this back to 6'2" off the  
14 property line to just give a little more space here.

15 As it would stand with the ten foot, it  
16 would be five feet to the steps, and so that will push  
17 us back nine feet to the front steps. The pool is  
18 elevated up approximately three feet.

19 MR. WRIGHT: How far is the property line  
20 away from the building that is next to the property; do  
21 you know? Is the property line right in line with the  
22 building?

23 MR. McCANTS: The building at some point  
24 encroaches over the property line.

25 MR. WRIGHT: Oh, it does?

0011

1 MR. McCANTS: Yes, sir. And this shows how  
2 the building comes over the property line here, so you  
3 can see that.

4 MR. WRIGHT: Oh, all right. So it will be  
5 five -- how many feet off of that?

6 MR. McCANTS: Off of the building?  
7 MR. WRIGHT: Yes.  
8 MR. McCANTS: I didn't measure that. But it  
9 would be approximately five feet from the existing  
10 building, because I think it's a foot at the max it  
11 encroaches.  
12 MR. WRIGHT: Good. Thank you.  
13 MR. HERLONG: I'm sorry. I missed that  
14 there is a structure, existing structure on the adjacent  
15 property that encroaches slightly?  
16 MR. McCANTS: That's correct.  
17 MR. HERLONG: And it's a -- just a storage  
18 building?  
19 MR. McCANTS: It's the back side of the dry  
20 cleaner, so I'm not sure what is back there.  
21 MR. HERLONG: Okay. Is there any public  
22 comment? The public comment section is closed.  
23 Randy, do you have any final comments?  
24 MR. ROBINSON: No other comments.  
25 MR. HERLONG: Do you want to start? Duke,  
0012  
1 what do you think? Do you have any questions?  
2 MR. WRIGHT: No, I have no questions. That  
3 is fine.  
4 MR. HERLONG: Betty?  
5 MS. HARMON: I'm fine with it.  
6 MR. REINHARD: That is the dry cleaners?  
7 MR. McCANTS: Yes, sir.  
8 MR. REINHARD: Five feet. I'm the dry  
9 cleaners and I catch on fire. What happens to you?  
10 MR. McCANTS: Well, it's a concrete building  
11 on that side of the dry cleaners.  
12 MR. REINHARD: It doesn't matter.  
13 MR. McCANTS: Well, you know, honestly, five  
14 feet or ten feet, it doesn't make that much difference.  
15 MR. REINHARD: I'm just asking. Do you  
16 really want to be that close to a dry cleaner?  
17 MR. ROBINSON: Fred, there is no dry  
18 cleaning equipment inside that building.  
19 MR. REINHARD: Okay. I didn't know that.  
20 MR. ROBINSON: They only pick up and deliver  
21 from that location at this time.  
22 MR. HERLONG: Any other questions? Fred?  
23 MR. REINHARD: No.  
24 MR. HERLONG: Jon?  
25 MR. LANCTO: I think it's the perfect place

0013

1 to grant a variance on this. I mean, that is a  
2 commercial building. They don't care how close that is.  
3 If it works better for these people with their accessory  
4 structure, I think we should grant that.

5 MR. HERLONG: Billy?

6 MR. CRAVER: I agree.

7 MR. HERLONG: And, again, it's almost a way  
8 to -- there is nothing else that could really happen  
9 right there with that building encroaching. That is  
10 just sort of a dead zone on the adjacent property, kind  
11 of a burden. So this actually helps solve a bit of that  
12 problem, so I'm fine with it.

13 MR. CRAVER: I move we approve.

14 MR. HERLONG: Second?

15 MR. LANCTO: Second.

16 MR. HERLONG: Any discussion? All in favor?

17 MR. WRIGHT: Aye.

18 MR. HERLONG: Aye.

19 MS. HARMON: Aye.

20 MR. REINHARD: Aye.

21 MR. LANCTO: Aye.

22 MR. CRAVER: Aye.

23 MR. HERLONG: Any opposed? Okay.

24 Item 3 is 2205 -- no, we are on Item 5.

25 No, we just did Item 5. We are on Item 3, 2205 Middle

0014

1 Street, accessory structure in a commercial district.

2 Okay, Randy, it's all yours.

3 MR. ROBINSON: What they are asking for  
4 is -- basically what they are asking for is some  
5 dialogue with the board on a sidewalk that may be put  
6 down in front of 2201 to 2205 Middle Street.

7 That is the Breakers building, or in  
8 front of Station -- Station 22 came out with a porch.  
9 This would go between the Station 22 slab and the Home  
10 Team BBQ slab.

11 What they are asking for is some  
12 discussion on it, about how the board feels about it.  
13 They aren't asking for approval.

14 I would like to see the board look at  
15 this and actually send it to Staff to make an approval  
16 on this type of thing, things like sidewalks, curb  
17 stops, those kind of things. They don't really have a  
18 lot to do with aesthetics.

19 But the Staff right now, particularly,

20 is dealing with the consultants that are working on the  
21 commercial district plan. The island is working on the  
22 commercial district plan. And I don't really see it is  
23 a need, from my perspective, that DRB really needs to  
24 get involved in where a sidewalk is, or other safety  
25 issues in the commercial district. And that is

0015

1 basically all I have to say.

2 MR. REINHARD: Is this on private property  
3 or is this on a roadway?

4 MR. ROBINSON: It's on private property.  
5 But you-all see what is in front of you. I think Doug  
6 wants to talk some on it.

7 MR. SMITH: Yeah. I mean, we are just  
8 trying to create a continuous walkway down that side of  
9 the street through the commercial district because there  
10 isn't one right now.

11 And I'm sure all of you have observed  
12 people walking behind the cars that are parked out there  
13 as you drive down the street when it's crowded, and that  
14 is what we are trying to do.

15 We have talked with Home Team, and they  
16 are willing to continue our raised sidewalk in front of  
17 their building. And Bill Jones, the dentist's office  
18 there, is we take that wall down and let us continue the  
19 walkway in front of him. And, although, there it would  
20 be on grade, and we would paint the concrete or  
21 delineate some form of walkway there onto the parking  
22 area that is between High Thyme and Seel's.

23 Eventually we might take it on across.  
24 I'm just not sure what is going to happen in front of  
25 Seel's yet.

0016

1 MS. HARMON: So you want to start at the BBQ  
2 place?

3 MR. SMITH: Well, right now the sidewalk  
4 goes from Station 22 to the north corner of Station 22  
5 restaurant, as it's there right now. And what we want  
6 to do is create the sidewalk from there to Home Team,  
7 and eventually continue it to the parking area between  
8 High Thyme and Seel's.

9 MR. HERLONG: What you really have are  
10 several property owners trying to come together, and so  
11 you can only talk about your properties you are  
12 representing, and then Home Team has its own property  
13 that might be a different application. Isn't there

14 something --

15 MR. SMITH: Yes. Home Team would have to  
16 come in and apply and do that work. We might help them  
17 do the work, but they would have to -- it's not our  
18 property to do with.

19 MS. HARMON: I think we ought to leave this  
20 up to Staff, because nothing has been decided whether  
21 they are going to put sidewalks in or what they are  
22 going to do, and I think we have to have a public  
23 hearing on that. I think I'm right. So I would say I  
24 don't think we can do that. I mean, I don't think the  
25 board could approve it.

0017

1 MR. SMITH: Yes. I'm not asking for  
2 approval right now. I know there is a lot of interest  
3 in the commercial district, about what is going on  
4 there, and as far as what -- the studies being done,  
5 about what to do with the commercial district from one  
6 end to the other.

7 But, you know, I think that we would  
8 like to get the walkway done from Home Team -- to  
9 continue it down to Home Team, to at least have it in  
10 front of our property a safe walkway. And we wanted to  
11 get your input and possibly submit for final approval  
12 for the next DRB meeting.

13 MR. HERLONG: Well, here is the question.  
14 What does the DRB -- does -- currently, the ordinance  
15 the DRB needs to be consulted and give a certificate of  
16 appropriateness? Is that --

17 MR. ROBINSON: Correct, for any change in  
18 the commercial district. But to put in my little input  
19 now.

20 Later on in the meeting we are going to  
21 be discussing Staff approvals. One of my discussions  
22 with you-all is going to be allowing me to make this  
23 type of Staff approval on sidewalk changes, curb stops,  
24 fences in the commercial district, those kind of things  
25 that won't affect the actual front of the building, the

0018

1 look of the building.

2 So I feel like, you know, maybe they  
3 won't need to come back to you provided we have a  
4 discussion and you-all agree that that is a good idea,  
5 for me to give those type of approvals.

6 MR. LANCTO: This is a very technical  
7 problem that we are dealing with here. I have looked

8 through the drawings. The drawings aren't accurate. We  
9 are dealing with a lot of different people here.

10           It's a much more complex thing than the  
11 Design Review Board could handle, to figure out what to  
12 do with this and integrate it with whatever is going on  
13 with the commercial district plans.

14           So this is way beyond just looking at  
15 one little section of sidewalk. Because, like Doug  
16 said, the wall needs to come down or have a break put in  
17 it. The drawings need to be clarified.

18           MR. SMITH: I'm not necessarily asking for  
19 approval for that at this particular point in time. I  
20 want to take the sidewalk to the -- actually I'm not  
21 asking for any approval at this time, but to get  
22 conceptual approval of this sidewalk to that parking  
23 area. And then next month, or through Staff, getting  
24 the sidewalk approved up to Home Team BBQ.

25           MR. LANCTO: I went down and looked at it,  
0019

1 and the major problem area is in front of Home Team BBQ.  
2 That seems to be where there is the least amount of  
3 space. That, in combination with the wall coming out  
4 from the dentist office, makes people walk around that  
5 wall, which puts them out behind the cars to start with.  
6 Then to get in front of the cars, there is no space  
7 between the cars and the screen wall of Home Team BBQ.

8           MR. SMITH: The parking in front of our  
9 building at the 7 -- down at Station 22, if all of the  
10 cars along that block are as far streetward as those  
11 cars already are right now, there will be three feet in  
12 front of the screen at Home Team BBQ in order to place a  
13 sidewalk in front of that screen.

14           MR. LANCTO: Yeah, but the car -- as you go  
15 down the road, you need to start to think about which  
16 lane you are going to be in, to go either straight or  
17 make a turn at the intersection there.

18           So if the cars are pulled back, they  
19 would actually be out across the pavement. The tail end  
20 of some cars, depending upon the length, would be out  
21 across the pavement. So you are actually parking cars  
22 in the right-of-way at that point.

23           So I think that is what my point is, is  
24 this needs to be coordinated very carefully with  
25 whatever is going on with the whole parking situation in

0020

1 that commercial district.

2           So for us to even think about making a  
3 decision on this, it's pointless until we know what is  
4 going to go on with that whole plan as far as parking in  
5 that area.

6           MS. HARMON: I agree.

7           MR. ROBINSON: There is some other  
8 discussion about ways to narrow that road, do some other  
9 striping in that area, maybe so those cars could come  
10 out into that right-of-way a little bit more. That  
11 would allow them a little bit more room.

12           You know, the sidewalks should be at  
13 least five feet wide. I mean, there should be a way for  
14 two people in two handicap -- or two wheelchairs to pass  
15 each other.

16           So it really needs to even push out a  
17 little bit further than what they are talking about.  
18 The only way to accomplish that would be some striping  
19 of the road, maybe putting a stripe out further than the  
20 gutter out into the road maybe three or four feet.

21           And so it's all kinds of thing like that  
22 that may play into this and may end up giving them a  
23 little more room in that area.

24           But what we are doing now is we are  
25 picking at it a little bit here and there. And it may

0021

1 end up that this sidewalk might ought to be a little bit  
2 further out, you know. Maybe it ought to be a little  
3 bit bigger.

4           So working with Staff, with DOT, with  
5 Council, I think everybody agrees the sidewalk is a  
6 great idea, to have a sidewalk going from one end to the  
7 other so nobody does have to go out into traffic. And  
8 we will diligently work on that, because I think it's a  
9 real safety concern.

10           As you-all saw, later on in the meeting  
11 we were supposed to discuss another property where there  
12 was some parking lost at that property, and that was a  
13 safety issue. It was at the right-of-way and it just  
14 wasn't a good idea. So Council said let's get that  
15 parking removed.

16           So maybe this kind of situation ought to  
17 be a Staff and Council situation, is what I'm saying.

18           MR. CRAVER: But if the ordinance says that  
19 we are supposed to consider it, I think the issue is I  
20 don't know that we have the ability to just say we are  
21 not going to do that. So I think our issue is, when the

22 overall plan is in shape, for us to weigh in on it. We  
23 need to weigh in on it.

24 MR. HERLONG: Yes. I would think at some  
25 point we would want to, if it required it, and it sounds  
0022

1 like it does, give an approval subject to the conditions  
2 that other entities look at it, the engineer, that it be  
3 reviewed more specifically by others.

4 MS. HARMON: I just think to do this now is  
5 a little bit premature.

6 MR. CRAVER: I mean --

7 MR. REINHARD: But it's just a temporary  
8 thing. It's a sidewalk on private property that they  
9 can use safely until the study comes out and we decide  
10 our permanent solution to parking and sidewalks  
11 downtown.

12 So it's their money on their property,  
13 and so I don't see any downside to it, having it as a  
14 temporary sidewalk until we have a permanent solution.

15 MR. HERLONG: And, you know, I said a  
16 similar thing to the previous application where the  
17 90-degree parking was taken out for the drop-off zone,  
18 and I felt the same way. It's an improvement.

19 And this is an unsafe condition, and you  
20 are right, it's on their property. They are willing to  
21 do something.

22 MR. REINHARD: My feeling is we go ahead and  
23 give Randy the authority to make the appropriate  
24 decision, if we are being asked to do that.

25 MR. ROBINSON: I feel like that can happen.  
0023

1 And I don't think that there is anybody on Town Council  
2 that doesn't want a safer business district, and I think  
3 this is working towards a safer business district.

4 MR. HERLONG: Since it's just a discussion,  
5 we have got someone --

6 MR. O'NEIL: Just whenever you get to the  
7 public.

8 MR. HERLONG: You are right. Very good  
9 point.

10 MR. CRAVER: So I want to make sure I  
11 understand the question that we are being asked tonight  
12 to approve. It's just --

13 MR. SMITH: Well, we were going up for final  
14 approval, and we were asked to back off a little bit.

15 MR. CRAVER: Final approval of what?

16 MR. SMITH: Extension of the sidewalk from  
17 the corner of Station 22 to Home Team BBQ, on our  
18 property.

19 MR. CRAVER: Your property. Okay. I agree  
20 with you.

21 MR. SMITH: And the reason I put the rest of  
22 it on the plan was just showing what the future might  
23 hold for the extension of this pedestrian walkway.

24 MR. REINHARD: Which is, in essence, a  
25 straight line, not this in-and-out thing?

0024

1 MR. SMITH: Yes.

2 MR. REINHARD: Which means all the noses of  
3 the cars will be in the same spot.

4 MR. SMITH: That is correct.

5 MR. REINHARD: Now, it may be that the  
6 sidewalk varies depending on the building projections,  
7 but at least it's a line that tells people I can walk  
8 here and not get bumped by a car because there will be  
9 curb stones set beyond that line that control how far  
10 the car can park into the sidewalk.

11 MR. SMITH: That is correct.

12 MS. HARMON: But the back end of the cars  
13 will be sticking out further in the street.

14 MR. SMITH: No further than the cars are in  
15 front of Station 22 restaurant, or in front of our  
16 office down at the Station 22 end of the street.

17 MR. REINHARD: You will see that these cars  
18 are much further off of the street because they are way  
19 up here.

20 MS. HARMON: Okay.

21 MR. REINHARD: If they were backed off -- we  
22 are looking at this picture here. If they were backed  
23 off, the backs of the cars, depending on how long the  
24 car is, of course -- a squad car is going to be  
25 different from a Pontiac Safari.

0025

1 MR. CRAVER: You mean a collector's item.

2 MR. REINHARD: That is what I think.

3 MR. HERLONG: We have had about ten minutes  
4 of sort of the applicant's presentation, so why don't we  
5 hear from public comment. Pat?

6 MR. O'NEIL: Pat O'Neil, member of Town  
7 Council, and speaking as a chair of the real estate  
8 committee.

9 As a member of Council, I have spoken

10 with the Mayor earlier today. I mean, there is a safety  
11 problem, big time, nobody would deny that, with people  
12 walking all over the streets, especially when it's busy.

13           However, as Mr. Lancto basically made my  
14 case for me, we are in the midst of a lengthy, fairly  
15 expensive, Mike tells me, \$85,000 or so consultation  
16 process with people with a planning group to help us  
17 come up with a workable commercial district design on  
18 many counts, which would include some possible changes  
19 to the streetscape, which could include changes in the  
20 parking configuration; and, therefore, the exact  
21 location where the thoroughfare would be and where  
22 sidewalks might best be.

23           We are not at the end of that process  
24 yet. We actually met this morning with DOT continuing  
25 to try to work out a way -- trying to convince them to  
0026

1 let us to do the type of reverse-angle parking that the  
2 consultants have actually recommended.

3           But that is an example of something that  
4 might determine where the thoroughfare is going to wind  
5 up, which would determine where you would want your  
6 passageway to be for pedestrians.

7           So I really would ask you to not do  
8 anything to encourage this project along further in the  
9 sense of putting down any additional sort of hard  
10 structure of any kind until we know we have a more  
11 complete and comprehensive look at what that streetscape  
12 should look like.

13           I think it's very commendable that the  
14 property owners or owner is willing to do this, but I  
15 would hate to see them get into that expense and the  
16 streetscape calls for, well, the sidewalk should have  
17 been over this way three feet more and it's a problem  
18 the way you put it there.

19           So I think maybe waiting a little while  
20 would be very prudent. And I am just speaking as an  
21 individual now.

22           Randy, I'll bet there are some things  
23 that can be done just with paint and the wheel stops  
24 that could allow at least an informal pedestrian  
25 passageway. But, again, that is out of my realm.

0027

1           MR. CRAVER: Pat, what was the timing on  
2 the -- and not to hold you to anything, but what is  
3 you-all's sort of guess?

4 MR. O'NEIL: I am hoping within a couple of  
5 months. The latest thing this morning was we have to go  
6 to another level in DOT to try to plead our case about  
7 reverse-angle parking.

8 But I would hope that within a couple of  
9 months we would have a generally good idea about how the  
10 parking is going to be laid out, and that allows us to  
11 go to streetscape design.

12 I mean, we are not going to have  
13 construction-ready drawings from these consultants, but  
14 the streetscape will be something that would give us a  
15 really good idea of what we would want.

16 MR. REINHARD: May I ask a question, Council  
17 member?

18 MR. O'NEIL: Sure.

19 MR. REINHARD: Would you anticipate that  
20 this plan might involve declaring eminent domain on that  
21 edge of that property in order to put in public  
22 sidewalks which should normally be in the public  
23 right-of-way?

24 MR. O'NEIL: That would be a pretty strong  
25 step, and I don't envision that. But I don't know --  
0028

1 MR. REINHARD: Well, if you are going to  
2 build sidewalks on someone else's property, how do you  
3 do that? Do you have to get individual permission?

4 MR. O'NEIL: Well, I guess if we were going  
5 to do that, or encourage that, we would be asking the  
6 people to do what these guys are willing to do now,  
7 which is to kind of pitch in and coordinate their  
8 efforts, which kind of is one of the reasons I kind of  
9 hate throwing a little cold water on the idea right now.

10 But I think if we know exactly what we  
11 would like to ask them to do, if it comes to that, that  
12 would be in a better place. Mike?

13 MR. PERKIS: No, I agree. I think they have  
14 shown the inclination that they want to put sidewalks  
15 in. What we are asking for is wait a couple of months  
16 until we -- because I think what is really critical is  
17 the reverse-angle parking. That could change the whole  
18 profile of where that sidewalk would go.

19 MR. REINHARD: I would suggest as a project  
20 manager, it ain't going to be a couple of months.

21 MR. O'NEIL: We are not talking  
22 construction. We are just talking getting their final  
23 report.

24 MR. REINHARD: I know. But then after that  
25 there is the design process, which means there is a  
0029

1 selection committee to find engineers to do it, and then  
2 there is the design and then there is the bidding. You  
3 are talking about at least a year before anything would  
4 change.

5 In that year's time -- I am just trying  
6 to shed light on the whole situation here. Concrete  
7 sidewalk, six bucks a square foot. His expense. A  
8 whole year's worth of safety and convenience.

9 And, guess what? They are so easy to  
10 take up. You take a forklift. You put the forks under  
11 it and pick it up and load it into a dump truck,  
12 especially one this accessible to the street.

13 If he's willing to look at it as a  
14 sunken cost that may be reversed in a year, I think it  
15 should be his decision since it's on his property, but  
16 that is my opinion.

17 MR. O'NEIL: Thanks.

18 MR. HERLONG: Any more public comment?

19 MR. COOK: Tim Cook, 2820 Jasper. A lot of  
20 municipalities have written in their ordinance that any  
21 improvements to a property, whether it's improvements to  
22 an existing building, need to comply with current zoning  
23 ordinances, which is the same thing Sullivan's Island  
24 has.

25 A lot of them address sidewalks, that  
0030

1 you need to add sidewalks in front of your facility,  
2 whether it can be done in the right-of-way or on your  
3 property.

4 It's great that as a property owner they  
5 are willing to do it. So it sounds like part of the  
6 battle already won. But just make sure that if you do  
7 it on your own it meets the ADA requirements.

8 MR. SMITH: Certainly.

9 MR. HERLONG: Any other public comment?  
10 Public comment section is closed.

11 Randy, do you have any additional  
12 comments?

13 MR. ROBINSON: I don't have any other  
14 comments.

15 MR. HERLONG: Well --

16 MS. HARMON: I would like to make a motion  
17 that we leave it up to Staff and Town Council.

18 MR. HERLONG: Do I hear a second?  
19 MR. REINHARD: Second.  
20 MR. CRAVER: So the motion is what?  
21 MR. REINHARD: Leave it up to Staff and Town  
22 Council.  
23 MR. CRAVER: And I haven't looked at our  
24 ordinance to see where it says exactly what our  
25 obligation is to make decisions. To the extent that  
0031  
1 that is changing what our duties are under the  
2 ordinance, I don't --I'm not sure we can do that.  
3 MR. PERKIS: I think Tuesday we are going to  
4 ratify the change in the ordinance, right?  
5 MR. O'NEIL: Yes.  
6 MR. PERKIS: We are going to ratify the  
7 ordinance that allows you guys to give Staff permission.  
8 MR. O'NEIL: Would that cover -- if I may?  
9 Does that cover this situation, Randy?  
10 MR. ROBINSON: Yes. Sure it does.  
11 MR. HERLONG: I don't remember a commercial  
12 district discussion pertaining to the commercial  
13 district. But if it does --  
14 MR. ROBINSON: Yes.  
15 MR. REINHARD: It should.  
16 MR. O'NEIL: I can look it up in my meeting  
17 book, if you want? Can I have my meeting book?  
18 MR. CRAVER: What is it that we are leaving  
19 up to Staff?  
20 MR. REINHARD: Whether or not this gentleman  
21 can put that sidewalk in on his property.  
22 MR. CRAVER: So if we can do that, or if we  
23 were to approve it subject to, I guess, Council weighing  
24 in on it.  
25 MS. HARMON: We said Staff and Town Council.  
0032  
1 I thought that was my motion, leave it up to Staff and  
2 Town Council.  
3 MR. LANCTO: It basically approves it.  
4 MR. CRAVER: I don't know. It depends on  
5 what Staff and Council --  
6 MR. REINHARD: I have an underlying motive to  
7 this.  
8 MR. CRAVER: Okay.  
9 MR. REINHARD: That is, I don't think we  
10 should be -- we should be talking about houses and  
11 buildings and not sidewalks and fences, to be honest

12 with you.

13           So if we can get this started, the  
14 process started where Randy -- and it's a coordination  
15 issue with DOT. It's more of a municipal situation than  
16 it is an architectural review situation.

17           MS. HARMON: It is.

18           MR. REINHARD: It's infrastructure.

19           MS. HARMON: Right.

20           MR. HERLONG: I guess the only question is  
21 have we fulfilled the duty, or does it create more of a  
22 burden that they bypassed a decision, or is the decision  
23 to defer it to Town Council?

24           MR. CRAVER: I guess, to me, if the issue is  
25 does Station 22 get to build their sidewalk, I think

0033

1 Fred was right about the year and concrete is cheap.  
2 And my inclination would be to say we will be there to  
3 approve it, just taking that one issue.

4           When it comes to the overall redoing the  
5 whole parking plan and layout of Middle Street and all  
6 of that kind of stuff, I see that as a Council issue to  
7 the extent that it comes to us to get our approval.

8           I mean, there is a design element to it.  
9 It is the commercial district. I mean, when it comes to  
10 doing little things, I don't have a problem with Staff  
11 doing it. I don't want to give up our input into the  
12 overall plan to the extent that we are supposed to have  
13 input into the plan.

14           MS. HARMON: I think the circumstances are  
15 different here because they have not completed the  
16 finalized plans. And so with the reverse parking we  
17 just -- I think -- that is why I think it's premature,  
18 until we get a drawing on the site of what they want to  
19 do.

20           MR. CRAVER: Right, but that is on the  
21 overall plan. I guess, to me, I agree with Fred on  
22 letting Station 22 --

23           MR. REINHARD: I might suggest that we not  
24 be cut out of the overall plan at all.

25           MR. CRAVER: So, again, I'm not really sure

0034

1 what it is we are saying we want to give to Staff and to  
2 Town Council.

3           I mean, we have two things. One is  
4 Station 22 saying they want to put in some sidewalk,  
5 which I'm inclined to say if you want to, go for it, but

6 it could be ripped up in six months, a year or three  
7 years.

8 And the other is the overall plan for  
9 the commercial district on the parking and everything  
10 else. And to the extent that we have input into that, I  
11 would just as soon reserve that input.

12 MR. REINHARD: Absolutely.

13 MR. CRAVER: So, again, I'm not quite sure  
14 what it is we are giving away.

15 MR. REINHARD: Randy, I can help. Randy  
16 started the whole conversation, discussion, by saying he  
17 would really like to have the ability to approve this  
18 particular application at Staff. I'm going all the way  
19 back to that saying I agree.

20 MR. CRAVER: And I guess I'm saying it's  
21 easy enough for us to approve it as opposed to giving  
22 Staff the ability to approve it. I mean, he has  
23 presented a plan. I would just as soon approve it.

24 MR. ROBINSON: And I'm not saying I am going  
25 to approve it. I am just saying, you know, the ability  
0035

1 to approve it. And if the applicant has a problem with  
2 me not approving it, it comes back to you-all.

3 MR. REINHARD: Then he can appeal.

4 MR. ROBINSON: That's right. He can appeal  
5 back to you-all. Or I may put conditions on it because  
6 of where the lines are drawn in the road. You know, and  
7 he may not like that and he wants to come back to the  
8 board.

9 MS. HARMON: That is why I think they are  
10 better able to do that than we are. I mean, you can put  
11 conditions on it and all of that. We just don't know  
12 that much.

13 MR. REINHARD: We have a motion on the floor  
14 and a second.

15 MR. HERLONG: Anyone else?

16 MR. WRIGHT: I walked this with the  
17 applicant last week and have a pretty good understanding  
18 what they want to do. I would like to hear the motion  
19 restated.

20 MS. HARMON: I made a motion that we give  
21 this to staff and Town Council.

22 MR. WRIGHT: This particular application?

23 MS. HARMON: Right, because of the  
24 conditions that we are under.

25 MR. WRIGHT: This does not exclude us from

0036

1 any other application or any other requirement in the  
2 commercial district?

3 MS. HARMON: Oh, no, no.

4 MR. WRIGHT: We are only talking about this  
5 one specific situation?

6 MS. HARMON: Right.

7 MR. WRIGHT: And, as I see it, there is  
8 about maybe 50 feet at the most of sidewalk to be  
9 constructed. The rest of it is to be delineated by  
10 parking bumpers from Home Team east to High Thyme.

11 So we are not talking about any  
12 construction there. We are strictly talking about  
13 delineating a walkway with parking bumpers.

14 So I am in favor of allowing Staff to work  
15 on this with the applicant.

16 MR. CRAVER: Again, I'm not sure what we are  
17 talking about here because now it's been expanded.

18 My understanding is we were just talking  
19 about all he can apply for is in front of Station 22.  
20 Are we talking about giving Staff -- when you say "give  
21 this", Betty, I'm still not sure what "this" is.

22 Is this the approval of the Station 22  
23 sidewalk or approval of doing something in front of  
24 Station 22, Home Team and the dentist office? I mean,  
25 again, I'm looking for clarification.

0037

1 MR. WRIGHT: The applicant told me -- Pat  
2 Ilderton, the applicant, told me that everyone has  
3 already -- the owners have agreed to this, the owners of  
4 Home Team BBQ, the doctor, Station 22 and the Ilderton  
5 building. Beyond that, there is no construction.

6 MR. REINHARD: Which building is 2205 Middle  
7 Street?

8 MR. SMITH: It's the office buildings  
9 between Station 22, and it includes Beauty and The Beach  
10 and Island Eye News is up there. It's between Station  
11 22 restaurant and the old Bert's building, or Home Team  
12 property.

13 MR. REINHARD: So it involves a few  
14 properties, a few businesses with one address.

15 MR. WRIGHT: But I think there is only one  
16 owner.

17 MR. SMITH: Yes. The large building which  
18 encompasses our office, Station 22 restaurant and  
19 2205 -- yeah. You have -- 2201, 2203 and 2205 is all

20 one building. 2205 is the only portion of the building  
21 that doesn't have that raised sidewalk in front of it.

22 MR. CRAVER: So is this -- when you say want  
23 to give "this" to staff and to Town Council, is this  
24 just the part in front of their building, or are you  
25 also including in front of Home Team and in front of the  
0038

1 dentist office?

2 MS. HARMON: We can't really do that because  
3 they haven't made an application.

4 MR. REINHARD: It's 2205 Middle Street.

5 MS. HARMON: Right.

6 MR. REINHARD: This is what "this" is.

7 MR. CRAVER: I'm asking for clarification.

8 So it's simply what is in front of that building?

9 MS. HARMON: Right.

10 MR. CRAVER: Okay. I would --

11 MR. REINHARD: That's all you get authority  
12 to approve -- don't look at me like that -- 2205 Middle  
13 Street. It's right there, black and white.

14 MR. CRAVER: My inclination -- and I am  
15 going to vote against this, because I would vote to  
16 approve the project and let him deal with the details.

17 MR. REINHARD: No means yes?

18 MR. CRAVER: No is going to mean get the  
19 project done. I don't know that this needs to be  
20 approved by Council.

21 MS. HARMON: Let's vote.

22 MR. HERLONG: Restate the motion one more  
23 time.

24 MS. HARMON: That we defer this to Staff and  
25 Town Council, and that is for 2205 Middle Street.

0039

1 MR. HERLONG: All in favor?

2 MR. WRIGHT: Aye.

3 MR. HERLONG: Aye.

4 MR. REINHARD: Aye.

5 MS. HARMON: Aye.

6 MR. LANCTO: Aye.

7 MR. HERLONG: Any opposed?

8 MR. CRAVER: Opposed.

9 MR. SMITH: Thanks, I guess.

10 MR. HERLONG: Item 4 is 2708 Goldbug Avenue.

11 MR. WRIGHT: Off the record for a minute.

12 (Off-the-record discussion.)

13 (Mr. Herlong excused himself from the

14 2708 Goldbug application.)

15 MR. WRIGHT: The next item is 2708 Goldbug.

16 This is right.

17 Randy, do you have any comments?

18 MR. ROBINSON: My comment, I wasn't here  
19 last month when you-all gave approval, but I did read  
20 over the minutes and the motions. I don't think I have  
21 anything to add. You-all back it for clarity on things.

22 I just would -- I just want to say when  
23 you make a motion, let's make it very clear exactly what  
24 you-all want done with this property, and I mean what  
25 type of materials you-all want, the siding, all of that  
0040

1 kind of stuff. Just be very clear when it comes time  
2 for that motion.

3 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. As chairman, let me  
4 usurp a prerogative here, or take a prerogative.

5 I would like to summarize for the board,  
6 and Randy who was not here, what I think happened at the  
7 last two meetings, and I would appreciate your helping  
8 me with this, Counselor.

9 MR. HELLMAN: Mr. Chair, I think I took from  
10 the minutes -- and I'm glad that there was some  
11 clarification from Mr. Craver over there, because I  
12 didn't know -- I was hoping we weren't going to delay  
13 anything else tonight.

14 MR. WRIGHT: We are not, hopefully. Let me  
15 do this. Let me summarize what I thought happened, and  
16 you correct me if you think I'm wrong, or anybody else  
17 correct me.

18 At the May 2009 meeting the DRB allowed  
19 the applicant to split his presentation into two parts.  
20 The first portion was essentially a presentation by  
21 David Schneider regarding his opinion that the  
22 classification of the historic house be changed from  
23 traditional island resource to altered. No motion or  
24 vote was taken on this presentation.

25 A previous request in June of 2008 to

0041

1 change designation was denied by the board. The house,  
2 therefore, remains classified as a traditional island  
3 resource.

4 At the June 2009 meeting the second  
5 portion, or continuation of the split presentation,  
6 focused on what had been done to protect the historic  
7 house from further deterioration and on proposed changes

8 to the Herlong design that was approved in January of  
9 2008.

10 After considerable debate a motion was  
11 made, amended and unanimously approved. To refresh our  
12 memories and get us all on the same page as we proceed,  
13 I have attempted to summarize the motion.

14 MS. HARMON: Good luck.

15 MR. WRIGHT: The motion was to grant  
16 preliminary approval of the revised January 2008 design  
17 to include shifting the historic house seven degrees.

18 It was to require the applicant to  
19 provide details of work to be done on the historic  
20 house, such as materials, rooflines, windows, doors and  
21 railings, porches, eaves, et cetera.

22 It was to require the applicant to  
23 provide means to ensure that the historic house is not  
24 damaged or destroyed during relocation. If it is  
25 damaged or destroyed during relocation, it will be

0042

1 replicated in its entirety.

2 That was my understanding of the motion  
3 after all of the discussion and carrying on that we did.  
4 I just want to state that to get us all on the same  
5 page.

6 Does everybody agree with what I just  
7 said?

8 MR. CRAVER: That is pretty close, close  
9 enough. I mean, the record is what it is. But for  
10 discussion purposes --

11 MR. WRIGHT: Well, to try to read the record  
12 of some of our discussions to get it boiled down to  
13 something that makes sense is not easy. And that is my  
14 interpretation of the motion after reading several pages  
15 of the record.

16 MR. CRAVER: My simpleton's view was that we  
17 said, okay, you can shift it seven degrees. If that  
18 house falls apart, you have to rebuild it the way it is,  
19 and bring us complete plans about what it is you plan to  
20 do there with materials and everything else.

21 MR. WRIGHT: That is what I just said.

22 MS. HARMON: Well, they were supposed to  
23 bring that today, weren't they?

24 MR. CRAVER: Or whenever, whenever they  
25 wanted approval.

0043

1 MR. WRIGHT: Well, today we will have to see

2 what the application is. I have read the application  
3 and reviewed the plans, and I assume everybody else has.

4           So having made that speech, Randy has  
5 made his speech, it's up to the applicant to make his  
6 presentation.

7           MR. HELLMAN: Mr. Chair, thank you. Brian  
8 Hellman, 2668 I'On Avenue. And thanks for the  
9 opportunity to present this tonight.

10           The last meeting we made tremendous  
11 progress, and hopefully we are there in terms of  
12 restoring this property.

13           I, too, attempted to summarize the  
14 motion. And I started with -- this is actually Page  
15 69 -- actually, 68, Line 25 that I started with out of  
16 the minutes. And you have to go to sort of two places.  
17 But I understood -- and I think we are saying the same  
18 thing here -- that the motion was:

19           "Preliminary approval of the new design  
20 and application to allow the structure to be moved  
21 subject to the condition that it be properly shored  
22 up" -- and this actually comes from -- the condition  
23 came from Page 57, Line 14 -- "subject to the condition  
24 that it be properly shored up to assure the structure is  
25 not destroyed" -- which I think it originally said

0044

1 delayed, but it's supposed to be destroyed, and we  
2 corrected the minutes -- "but preserved; and subject to  
3 bringing back more detailed plans about the historic  
4 structure in order for the board to be able to consider  
5 giving final approval."

6           So quickly, again, "Preliminary approval  
7 of the new design and application to allow the structure  
8 to be moved subject to the condition that it be properly  
9 shored up to assure the structure is not destroyed but  
10 preserved; and subject to bringing back more detailed  
11 plans about the historic structure in order for the  
12 board to be able to consider giving final approval."

13           We are here to do that tonight. Mr.  
14 Cook is going to do most of the presentation in that  
15 regard. And he has brought significant information  
16 about how that structure is going to be restored and, in  
17 addition, how the structure is going to be moved.

18           And we have been working with a moving  
19 company that is very knowledgeable in that regard and  
20 who has moved historic structures in the past. I know  
21 that that was one of Mr. Ilderton's concerns at the last

22 meeting.

23           And at this point I would like to turn  
24 the meeting over to Tim. Thank you.

25           MR. COOK: This is Tim Cook, owner of the  
0045

1 property. Thanks once again for allowing us to present  
2 our application. I hope this will be the last time.

3           One thing that concerns me about what  
4 Mr. Wright brought up, my understanding of the details  
5 was to address how to restore the house and protect it,  
6 not necessarily drawings that detailed what we were  
7 going to do. I apologize if I misunderstood that. But,  
8 generally, I think he -- what's there, so there is not a  
9 restoration in a lot of regards.

10           At the last meeting Mr. Reinhard had  
11 pointed out a variation between the approved plans and  
12 the plans that I had modified on the last submittal. So  
13 what I did -- and there was a difference in the  
14 roofline. The last application more accurately  
15 represented what is currently there.

16           So what I did is I went out and I did a  
17 detailed measurement and as-built of the existing  
18 structure, specifically the roofline.

19           Let me hand out some more information  
20 that is not too voluminous, but accurately addresses  
21 what your expectations are.

22           When we first bought the property --  
23 just to give you a starting point. When I purchased the  
24 property in 2005, the sellers, Oliver and Wistar  
25 Bjorksten, were required by South Carolina law to fill  
0046

1 out a disclosure form, and he informed me that the house  
2 is 80 years old, the floors sagged, the windows and  
3 doors are askew, no square corners, but livable.

4           And he's right. I lived in the house  
5 with my three kids and my wife for seven months. He  
6 renovated the kitchen and bathroom in 1990, and the back  
7 porch stairs were not up to code.

8           So he had done some work without a  
9 permit in 1990, because Randy didn't have the evidence  
10 that they had a permit for 1979 and 1980.

11           So, following the approval, we did some  
12 exterior modifications. We removed stairs. We removed  
13 that porch. We removed vegetation from around the  
14 house. We removed the crawl space surround, and some  
15 side stairs, and also some shutters were removed.

16           And I photographed a lot of this stuff.  
17 And there is a photo at Page 1 that shows some pictures  
18 about halfway through the packet. It shows the house  
19 the way it is now, which is B -- or C, and then the  
20 house when we purchased it, which was B.  
21           So, as you can see, the house is  
22 similar. It hasn't moved. None of the piers have been  
23 removed. So the exterior is the same with the exception  
24 of those items that I brought up.  
25           So my understanding from the last

0047

1 presentation was to show the board where the house  
2 exists in the new elevations, so that is what I focused  
3 primarily on.

4           So I did the as-built of the existing  
5 structure. I have got all four elevations, and I have  
6 superimposed it exactly where it would sit on the lot  
7 with respect to the new house.

8           I have highlighted the outline so you  
9 can see the roofline and where it exists within the  
10 complexion of the new elevation. So that is what the  
11 drawings represent that were submitted.

12           The east elevation and the west  
13 elevations are all shown on one page. And I apologize  
14 for the larger sheets, but I thought that was a better  
15 way to present what was changing and what was staying  
16 the same.

17           If you flip to the south elevation and  
18 the north elevation, the south elevation is the front  
19 elevation. I have done the same presentation of the  
20 existing structure, superimposed it in the new south  
21 elevation, which is the front elevation, and you can see  
22 the rooflines are identical. I haven't changed it at  
23 all.

24           The only concern with the front  
25 elevation is the head height at the roof -- or the porch

0048

1 is only 6'3". But I think Randy is allowed to allow  
2 that since it's a historical structure.

3           A major point of contention was the  
4 actual raising, rotating of the house. So I have  
5 contacted Johnson House Movers, and I have attached  
6 their credentials as Attachment B. And I can read the  
7 letter that he sent. But, due to time constraints, I  
8 will allow you to read it on your own accord.

9           But he's been in the business for

10 25 years. He also supplied his insurance and  
11 documentation.

12           One thing that I do want to point out on  
13 these elevations and this floor plan, specifically the  
14 front elevation, is that I have added two French doors  
15 to the master closet, which are in the same location as  
16 existing openings where French doors existed previously.  
17 So that is one modification to the design.

18           Addressing more specifically the  
19 roofline, the previous approval allowed for the roofline  
20 porch to be raised, but the drawings provided in this  
21 application is to keep the roofline exactly as it  
22 currently exists.

23           The head height at the front porch  
24 doesn't meet code. It only has 6'3" clearance.  
25 Normally you would have 6'3" for a door. But we are  
0049

1 proposing to keep it the same to meet the concerns of  
2 the board members that the appearance not change from  
3 the street. Where the building official deems it  
4 necessary, modifications will be made at his discretion.  
5 There is photos on Page 1, the Pictures A through D.

6           The roof rafters inside of the house,  
7 not the exposed portions, used varying sized rafters.  
8 Some are 2x4, some are 2x6, some are 2x8. Some are true  
9 dimensional boards and not nominal boards that you find  
10 today.

11           So the existing rafters will be sistered  
12 for stability to keep the roofline as it currently  
13 exists. Where the building official deems it necessary,  
14 rafters will be replaced.

15           Here is the most compelling part of my  
16 research on the house. I brought siding samples that  
17 were actually taken off the house, and they are varying  
18 types of siding. All of them are referred to as novelty  
19 siding.

20           The siding that Mr. Lancto has is  
21 located on the porch that was enclosed in the '80s and  
22 is a newer type siding.

23           The white siding is the predominant  
24 siding on the house that goes all the way around the  
25 main structure of the house.

0050

1           So what I propose to use, and I have  
2 given you examples of different novelty sidings on  
3 Attachment C, which the white siding closely represents

4 the E.W.P.-11, which is an eastern white pine, Number 11  
5 design.

6           And then the green siding is a 106 drop  
7 siding, either tongue-and-groove or lap siding. But  
8 that is a newer type siding, so I propose to use the  
9 older, truer historical siding similar to the E.W.P.-11,  
10 which is the white siding.

11           The front porch that was enclosed in the  
12 1980s, we are proposing to bring it back to a porch,  
13 which brings it more historically intact, brings the  
14 structure more historically intact since it existed that  
15 way prior to 1980.

16           Interior, there are some common walls  
17 that are still going to remain. This wall right here is  
18 the main dividing area between the entrance area and  
19 small living room area and the master bath closet area.  
20 So there will be -- an opening will shift, but that main  
21 wall is in the same place.

22           And it also projects out from the  
23 existing cottage, which is right here, the attachment  
24 for the master bedroom. So that is consistent with the  
25 wall placement. That is historical.

0051

1           The doors of the house are four exterior  
2 doors, three of which are true exterior doors, though of  
3 modern construction. They are nine-panel doors on the  
4 upper portion, and then one five-panel door that is an  
5 interior door, but it's used for exterior use only on  
6 the cottage.

7           So we are proposing to use that  
8 five-panel design on the interior portion of the house.  
9 And then on the exterior of the house we use a  
10 four-panel, three glass panels and one solid panel  
11 French door designed as indicated on the plan.

12           The windows in the existing cottage are  
13 6/6, with the exception of one 9/9 window. And Mr.  
14 Schneider pointed out that those are not the original  
15 windows to the house, evidenced by a shimming of the  
16 rough openings of the old window spaces.

17           The design that Mr. Herlong received  
18 approval on showed a 2/2 design throughout the old  
19 portion and the new portion of the house. I am not  
20 opposed to a 6/6 design. I will leave that up to the  
21 board to determine if the 6/6 is more appropriate on the  
22 existing portion of the structure as opposed to the 2/2.

23           I looked at some of the Sergeants

24 Quarters and the Officers Quarter, and there is both 2/2  
25 and 6/6, so on various houses on both of those streets.

0052

1           The foundation and skirting foundation  
2 definitely needs to be replaced. It's substandard. The  
3 skirting that existed when we purchased the property was  
4 a combination of solid plywood for a laundry area below  
5 the house, which had a roof head height of about five  
6 feet, and some standard garden lattice painted black.

7           So we are proposing to use 1x4 treated  
8 members for the crawl space covering the piers, with no  
9 stucco or tabby to be exposed.

10           The rafters of the old house, exposed  
11 rafters, are all dovetail, and that is what we are  
12 proposing to do on the new and the old design.

13           If you view some of the pictures,  
14 specifically Picture D on Photo Page 1, it shows the  
15 front facade of the house, and for some reason it was  
16 boxed in. I can't figure out why it was boxed in. But  
17 my plan is to just leave that remaining as it exists  
18 right now and try to not affect that look so it doesn't  
19 change.

20           So to summarize the materials that I'm  
21 proposing to use are identical siding that existed on  
22 the house currently and when it was originally built,  
23 replace the windows with 2/2, or 6/6 if the board  
24 decides that is more appropriate, utilize exposed rafter  
25 tails, or replace the roof, use the 5-E galvanized roof

0053

1 which exists right now.

2           The floor joists, some of the spacings  
3 are 24. Most of the spacings are at 24. Some are at  
4 30, which is certainly not to code. That will add  
5 joists between and sister in where we need to for  
6 stability and security when we are raising the house.

7           One of the details that I thought you  
8 might want to see were pickets for the front porch.  
9 Since there is no front porch right now, I can't  
10 replicate what was there.

11           So driving around the island, it seems  
12 like everybody has generally a 2x2 look. To make it  
13 more historic and match some of the true dimensional  
14 wood that is in the house, I propose to use treated  
15 2x2s, not 1-1/2 x 1-1/2, which is your normal size.

16           So I took pictures of two of the board  
17 members' houses. Both of them have 2x2s, and actually

18 have 2/2 windows, too. And then Officers Quarters also  
19 has 2x2.

20           So I truly hope that this addresses  
21 concerns. I apologize if it is not what the motion was  
22 requesting. It was confusing last month, but I really  
23 hope this addresses everybody's concerns.

24           And, additionally, on the Johnson House  
25 Movers, he has provided a plan for cross members, steel  
0054

1 cross members, and points out that normally you just  
2 have the two main beams running below the house, but he  
3 has added five additional cross members to ensure that  
4 the house doesn't shift or shimmy when he lifts it up.  
5 And then we will cross-brace the house on all the short  
6 sides to make sure it doesn't twist.

7           I appreciate the opportunity to present  
8 this once again. Thank you.

9           MR. WRIGHT: Thank you. Are there any  
10 public comments? Yes, sir?

11           MR. O'NEIL: Pat O'Neil, 1738 Thompson, as a  
12 resident.

13           It sounds like the applicant has gone  
14 through a tremendous amount of work to try to pay a lot  
15 of attention to historical details.

16           Just one question, I guess, that I have  
17 got for the board, and it has to do more with approvals  
18 passed last month and a year and a half ago, I guess.

19           But it's puzzling to me looking at this  
20 historic structure with the addition, which is almost  
21 enshrouding it, to where very little of the house is  
22 going to be apparent to the public, or anybody outside  
23 of it.

24           It looks like about one-third of the  
25 front of it is going to be obscured by the new house.  
0055

1 All of the west side is going to be covered with new  
2 addition, and about two-thirds of the back side, if I'm  
3 looking at the plans right.

4           I just wonder if there was some -- I  
5 mean any discussion about that at the time? It's a  
6 little troubling to think that we are preserving a  
7 historic structure, but its presence is mostly going to  
8 be felt only on the inside, and to whatever extent --  
9 you know, if it has spirits, they can still haunt the  
10 place. But there is not a lot of other historic fabric  
11 of the original house that is apparent.

12 I was just concerned about that and  
13 curious as to -- it was so long ago that I am sure none  
14 of you remember what the discussion was about, but --

15 MR. WRIGHT: I have tried to reconstruct  
16 the -- this is the 12th presentation, by the way, of  
17 this property, beginning in March of '05, and there has  
18 been considerable discussion.

19 I, frankly, would have to go back to the  
20 minutes to determine whether or not the specific issues  
21 that you are addressing were discussed. My feeling is,  
22 yes, they were. Now, to what degree, I don't know,  
23 because there was tons of discussion. It went on over  
24 the years with this application.

25 After many discussions, my recollection

0056

1 is that conceptual approval was granted for an initial  
2 design in November of '07 and February of '08 -- which  
3 is the last Herlong design that I have. I don't think  
4 there was any further Herlong design -- was approved  
5 with minor changes from the concept that it was  
6 submitted in in November of '07.

7 And at that time, after a lot of  
8 neighborhood input and discussions, and I assume  
9 meetings between the owner and neighbors, they came to  
10 pretty much an agreement that the plan that was  
11 submitted by Herlong and approved by the board was okay  
12 with the neighborhood. That is my recollection.

13 MR. CRAVER: Pat, I think you are raising  
14 what is another issue -- and I agree with your issue,  
15 okay? But I think it's a more global kind of issue, and  
16 that is this. And, Tim, I have seen this stuff so many  
17 times I'm trying to remember.

18 But my recollection is that originally  
19 he asked if he could pick the house up, move it over to  
20 the side of the lot, preserve it the way it is so that  
21 it's still the historic house that it is and build  
22 another house and we said no.

23 And so now he's stuck with a house in  
24 the middle of the building envelope and he's trying to  
25 make do with what he's got.

0057

1 Personally, I would have let him move  
2 it, said restore it, and build another house and have  
3 two smaller structures on the lot and not bastardize a  
4 neat little historic structure. So I agree with your  
5 point. But he's stuck with what he's stuck with.

6 MR. O'NEIL: And I don't mean to speak  
7 against this application.

8 MR. CRAVER: If you are suggesting that we  
9 ought to let him move it so he can maintain the  
10 integrity of the historic structure, I am all for that,  
11 and I would revisit that in a heartbeat, because I agree  
12 with the issue. Thank you.

13 MR. WRIGHT: My recollection, and again my  
14 notes, that the application to relocate the historic  
15 house in June of '05 --

16 MR. CRAVER: Right.

17 MR. WRIGHT: Three options were presented to  
18 relocate. One was to relocate to another lot on  
19 Sullivan's Island, attach a new house to it, or relocate  
20 it to another site on the lot.

21 My reading of the minutes were that the  
22 concepts were too vague and the application was denied.  
23 That is what you are saying?

24 MR. CRAVER: Yes.

25 MR. WRIGHT: Then in September of '06 the  
0058

1 application for partial demolition and relocation on the  
2 lot was submitted. Conceptual approval was granted to  
3 reposition the house on the lot and tie it into the  
4 design of a new house with the condition that more  
5 detailed design would be provided. This is what  
6 triggered the Herlong design that we debated a couple of  
7 times.

8 MR. COOK: Can I talk?

9 MR. WRIGHT: I don't know where -- Pat, that  
10 is all I can do.

11 MR. COOK: I resubmitted, following that  
12 preliminary approval to relocate the house forward, and  
13 got flatly denied twice. So I went at the direction of  
14 the DRB and got denied twice again on that  
15 recommendation to move the house forward.

16 So at that point I was like, what do I  
17 do?

18 MR. WRIGHT: I remember that.

19 MR. COOK: Now I'm trying to make a house  
20 plan work -- and I don't want to say stuck with, but  
21 this is what we came up with. This is what everybody  
22 came up with. And it's workable now. But I spent a lot  
23 of money, and a lot of time, and all of your time to try  
24 to come up with something that works.

25 MR. WRIGHT: I agree.

0059

1 MR. COOK: I never knew that I would get  
2 into this much issue when I first --

3 MR. WRIGHT: It's been approved by the  
4 board. The design has been approved by the board. Now  
5 they are asking for approval of tweaking or revisions to  
6 the design.

7 MR. CRAVER: Yes.

8 MR. LANCTO: I make a motion that we approve  
9 it based upon the clarifications.

10 MS. KENYON: Wait, wait.

11 MR. LANCTO: I'm sorry. I thought we were  
12 done.

13 MR. WRIGHT: We are not there yet. We are  
14 not there yet, Jon. We are still in the public comment  
15 period. Do we have a letter?

16 MS. KENYON: Yes.

17 MR. WRIGHT: This is from David Geer, 2702  
18 Goldbug, Sullivan's Island, 29482. Date is 7-15-09.  
19 Subject property, 2708 Goldbug Avenue.

20 "Please read at the Design Review Board  
21 meeting on June 15, 2009.

22 "As a resident at 2702 Goldbug Avenue, I  
23 wish to ask the Design Review Board to make a decision  
24 that the current structure on 2708 Goldbug Avenue be  
25 kept intact and be incorporated in any plans that are

0060

1 approved by the board. If in the process of shifting  
2 the structure is damaged, I ask that the structure be  
3 restored and incorporated in the future building plan."

4 Is that the only letter we have?

5 MS. KENYON: Yes. Ask for public comment.

6 MR. WRIGHT: Well, I asked for public  
7 comment. Yes, ma'am?

8 MR. GEER: I'm Aussie Geer. I live next  
9 door at 2702 Goldbug, and I appreciate the time that  
10 you-all have spent with the neighborhood and working to  
11 preserve the house.

12 And I don't know what you will decide  
13 about this plan or the other plan, but I would ask that  
14 you might consider, whichever plan, asking that the  
15 owners restore the original house, whichever way it  
16 goes, get a permit to do that full restoration before  
17 it's moved or shifted, before they are granted a full  
18 permit set.

19 They were granted a permit to do the

20 partial demolition, so they could get a permit to do the  
21 partial restoration, I would think.

22           We still have concerns, even though  
23 there are specific details of how to shore up the house.  
24 It's fragile. And we still do have some concerns that  
25 should it be demolished, under the ordinance we might  
0061

1 not -- because we are not in a historic overlay  
2 district -- it might technically become a vacant lot,  
3 and both the house and the neighborhood would lose the  
4 protection of the DRB. And that is still a concern we  
5 have. Thank you.

6           MR. WRIGHT: As I recall, there was  
7 discussion at the last meeting regarding what authority  
8 the Town had to ensure that if it was damaged that it  
9 would be reconstructed or replicated. Does everybody  
10 remember that discussion?

11           MR. CRAVER: If we approve the plan, then it  
12 needs to end up being what the plan is. And if it all  
13 turned to dust because it's all rot, then we end up with  
14 a reproduction, which is fine. I mean, I think -- isn't  
15 that --

16           MR. WRIGHT: Yeah. I think that is what --

17           MR. CRAVER: And the owner is okay with  
18 that.

19           MR. COOK: Yes.

20           MR. WRIGHT: Aussie, does that answer your  
21 question?

22           MS. GEER: Yes, if you are quite certain  
23 that you don't lose the control. I mean, that is -- we  
24 are just concerned, because we are not historic overlay,  
25 so that house alone is the only thing that puts us in  
0062

1 the umbrella.

2           MR. WRIGHT: I think you raised an  
3 interesting point. I think I heard you say that you  
4 would like to see the house redone in its entirety prior  
5 to beginning construction of the new house.

6           From a project management standpoint and  
7 organizational standpoint of scheduling and integrating  
8 construction, I am not sure that would be very feasible.  
9 That is my personal opinion.

10           MR. REINHARD: It's not.

11           MR. CRAVER: I'm not sure it's fair to the  
12 owner, either.

13           MR. REINHARD: Well, it's not practical,

14 because of all the shoring that is going to have to take  
15 place to that house so it doesn't wrack or twist when  
16 it's being moved. You can't do that after a  
17 restoration. That is done before -- it's like a cast on  
18 your arm or a leg brace. No, it's not practical.  
19 MR. LANCTO: The intent was so that if  
20 something does happen, you know, we have recourse, which  
21 we do already.

22 MR. WRIGHT: Which we now have.  
23 Any other public comments? Public  
24 comment section is closed.

25 Randy, do you have any further comments?  
0063

1 MR. ROBINSON: I do. There was a comment  
2 made about the front stairs being 6'3" at head  
3 height. So when --

4 MR. COOK: Front porch.

5 MR. ROBINSON: The front porch. The whole  
6 front porch?

7 MR. COOK: Inside. If you walk inside the  
8 house and measure the wall height, that is 6'3".

9 And that is where we removed the  
10 sheathing on the outside, and then you had to just have  
11 bare studs, so we inserted columns.

12 MR. ROBINSON: Can you show me on the plan  
13 where we are talking about? I just want to address  
14 that. I just see a little difference in the plan from  
15 what the original house floor is.

16 MR. COOK: The distance, if you go inside  
17 the house, from the wall height on the inside is 6'3".

18 MR. ROBINSON: Right at this point?

19 MR. COOK: Correct.

20 MR. ROBINSON: There to there?

21 MR. COOK: Yes.

22 MR. REINHARD: Is that the header?

23 MR. COOK: The header is at 6'3".

24 MR. REINHARD: The header is at 6'3". Is  
25 that original?

0064

1 MR. COOK: It looks to be. I think all they  
2 did was infill with studs and put sheathing and siding  
3 on the outside.

4 MR. REINHRAD: That is what it looks like.  
5 So that is the original header.

6 MR. COOK: So I was going to pull that out  
7 and put in columns and pickets and screen.

8 MR. ROBINSON: But that is not a problem.  
9 MR. COOK: I don't think so. It's not a  
10 problem for me. I just want to make sure --  
11 MR. ROBINSON: It's a problem where the  
12 stairs come down. And if you look at the original  
13 house, and then you look at the new house plan, this is  
14 flat right across here. In the original house plan  
15 those stairs start back a little bit.  
16 MR. REINHARD: That is how they cleared the  
17 header.  
18 MR. ROBINSON: So the new stairs need, if  
19 it's going to be replicated, they need to be back, need  
20 to be set back.  
21 MR. REINHARD: That is a good catch.  
22 MR. COOK: And that is correct.  
23 MR. REINHARD: Can you do that?  
24 MR. COOK: Sure.  
25 MR. ROBINSON: We have that. And then you

0065

1 said on the plan it shows the soffit is open tails  
2 across the porch?  
3 MR. COOK: Yes.  
4 MR. ROBINSON: But you say you are going to  
5 leave that?  
6 MR. REINHARD: Dovetail.  
7 MR. COOK: There are dovetails around the  
8 whole house except right there at the porch. And I  
9 don't know why they enclosed that rafter.  
10 MR. ROBINSON: And that would be you-all's  
11 decision, whether you-all want to go by the plan or go  
12 by what he's stating?  
13 MR. REINHARD: We have to go by this,  
14 because this is our guarantee. This tells us the  
15 efforts that are being made to achieve the historic look  
16 and restoration of that little cottage.  
17 And even though I had to speed read it,  
18 it's actually pretty comprehensive and well done, I  
19 think.  
20 MR. ROBINSON: So we are going to -- if  
21 there is a difference between the plan and this, we will  
22 refer to this.  
23 MR. REINHARD: Because the plan doesn't tell  
24 us nearly as much as this does.  
25 MR. ROBINSON: Okay. That is all I have.

0066

1 MR. COOK: How about the 2/2 and 6/6?

2 MR. REINHARD: Plan.

3 MR. WRIGHT: I state that this becomes a  
4 matter of the record, this written document.

5 MR. CRAVER: Does it get added to the  
6 application?

7 MR. WRIGHT: The "2708 Goldbug Presentation"  
8 will be added to the application.

9 MR. REINHARD: This is, in essence, Duke, a  
10 specification compared with the construction drawings.

11 MR. WRIGHT: Is that all you have, Randy?

12 MR. ROBINSON: That is all I have.

13 MR. WRIGHT: Board? Deliberation?

14 MR. CRAVER: I am good with it. I mean, I  
15 am pleased with the effort that has been made, and I see  
16 a beginning of an end.

17 MR. WRIGHT: Jon?

18 MR. LANCTO: The only thing that I would  
19 like to just bring up is the boxed-in front soffit. I  
20 think that the actual new construction might look better  
21 with that having exposed rafter tails.

22 MR. REINHARD: I agree. That is what is  
23 shown on the plans, is exposed rafter tails.

24 MR. LANCTO: So I would like to give the  
25 architect the opportunity to execute that detail in this  
0067  
1 situation versus what the house has historically.

2 MS. HARMON: My opinion is, on that, is that  
3 this is a little distinction of this little cottage. If  
4 we put the rafter tails on it, it's going to start  
5 change. And not having those 6/6 windows, it's not  
6 going to keep it historic.

7 I mean, we already are having problems  
8 knowing that that was a little house there. And I think  
9 if we change these, even though they are minor, if we  
10 don't leave the 6/6 windows and the rafters like they  
11 are, I mean dovetail, it's just not going to be -- I  
12 mean, why are we keeping the house? It's just not going  
13 to be any replica of the house.

14 MR. LANCTO: I don't think that that  
15 enclosed soffit was that way when the house was built.  
16 I think they did that because they probably had some  
17 rotting problems or bug problems, bugs building nests,  
18 whatever.

19 MS. HARMON: Well, we know it's been there  
20 since '87.

21 MR. LANCTO: The exposed rafter tails?

22 MS. HARMON: Yes.

23 MR. LANCTO: Yes. But that, still, is not  
24 that old, as far as I'm concerned.

25 MR. REINHARD: I think that is a  
0068

1 contemporary feature, being closed in like that. And a  
2 lot of times that is put on and then a gutter is  
3 attached to it.

4 MR. CRAVER: I would bet that is the  
5 contemporary.

6 MS. HARMON: Well, I am just saying that  
7 this is what was approved as historic.

8 MR. LANCTO: I think the window detail is  
9 something that is up for discussion. But you can see on  
10 the side of the house, you know, that exposed rafter  
11 tail.

12 MR. REINHARD: It looks nice.

13 MR. LANCTO: And that is what I would like  
14 to see along the front as well. I think that should  
15 turn the corner.

16 MR. REINHARD: I would be okay with the 6/6  
17 if that is a serious issue.

18 MS. HARMON: And I also would like to keep  
19 the 6/6 windows rather than the French doors. We are  
20 just going to have to do something to keep this  
21 historic. And if you put the French doors in there,  
22 there is another element of the historic house gone.

23 MR. COOK: Well, the reason I changed that  
24 on this application is because there were French doors  
25 throughout the house. They were about a quarter-inch  
0069

1 plywood French doors. They were kind of neat.

2 So what I'm doing is keeping the same  
3 opening and just making them glass, three-panel glass  
4 with solid at the bottom. It seems like that is  
5 bringing it back more to what the house was, but I will  
6 let you-all decide.

7 MR. REINHARD: Are you saying those doors  
8 were on that interior wall which was then enclosed with  
9 a --

10 MR. COOK: When we bought the house? I  
11 don't know if they were there before they enclosed the  
12 porch, but they were there when we bought the house.

13 MR. REINHARD: That was not my question,  
14 though.

15 MR. COOK: I don't know.

16 MR. REINHARD: When there was a porch, what  
17 kind of doors would you think had been there? Not the  
18 five panel?

19 MR. COOK: Two of the openings look old.  
20 One opening has new studs in it. So I thought when I  
21 was looking at it --

22 MR. REINHARD: It's hard to say.

23 MR. COOK: It's hard to say.

24 MR. REINHARD: And the 6/6 window that we  
25 are looking at is something that was added when the  
0070

1 porch was enclosed?

2 MR. COOK: According to Mr. Schneider, all  
3 of those windows are older. And the 2/2 --

4 MR. REINHARD: With the octagon windows.

5 MR. COOK: That was the 1980s. But the 2/2  
6 was more indicative of the era that the house was  
7 originally.

8 MR. REINHARD: Are there any 2/2s out there?

9 MR. COOK: Not on the existing structure.

10 MR. REINHARD: Then I retract what I said  
11 about the 2/2. I think you should go 6/6.

12 MR. COOK: So maybe 6/6 on the existing  
13 structure where windows are going to be placed?

14 MR. REINHARD: Everywhere.

15 MR. COOK: Even on the new section?

16 MR. REINHARD: Well, shouldn't it match?

17 MR. COOK: I don't know. I thought there  
18 might be a distinction between --

19 MS. HARMON: I think you ought to  
20 differentiate it.

21 MR. COOK: Then you can tell maybe the older  
22 part.

23 MR. HELLMAN: It wouldn't be atypical for  
24 French doors to have been there originally with the  
25 original structure, right? I mean --

0071

1 MS. HARMON: I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.

2 MR. HELLMAN: I said it wouldn't have been  
3 atypical originally, before these windows and doors were  
4 changed out, for the house to have French doors.

5 MR. REINHARD: Not on a house this simple.

6 MS. HARMON: This is not a fancy cottage.

7 MR. REINHARD: Let me tell you what I do  
8 like about it.

9 MR. WRIGHT: Excuse me. Jon, are you done?

10 MR. LANCTO: Yes, I'm done.  
11 MR. WRIGHT: Go ahead.  
12 MR. REINHARD: Sorry, Jon.  
13 MR. LANCTO: That's okay.  
14 MR. REINHARD: I like the fact that we  
15 retained the original roofline. I particularly like the  
16 fact that we restored the original porch which is, in  
17 and of itself, a function of the original roofline. And  
18 there is that little crease in the roof where, you know,  
19 your main house is and then there is a kicker out, that  
20 little crease?  
21 MR. COOK: It's pretty slight.  
22 MR. REINHARD: Now, all of a sudden, that  
23 make sense because you would expect, under that part of  
24 the roof, to be a porch.  
25 So when you restore it back to the  
0072  
1 porch, that looks good. And I like the use of the drop  
2 siding throughout.  
3 So I think that we -- we haven't  
4 achieved everything that we would like to have done, but  
5 I think there is enough here that I am willing to vote  
6 in favor of it.  
7 MR. WRIGHT: Betty?  
8 MS. HARMON: I guess my question is -- it's  
9 a little different from what we have been talking about.  
10 But when you got a permit, did you get it for demolition  
11 or for renovation to do what you did?  
12 MR. COOK: I think it was a partial  
13 construction.  
14 MS. HARMON: Partial construction?  
15 MR. ROBINSON: Repair.  
16 MR. COOK: Repair. I mean, there wasn't a  
17 demolition. The word demolition wasn't used.  
18 MS. HARMON: Pardon?  
19 MR. COOK: The word demolition wasn't used.  
20 MS. HARMON: But that is actually what you  
21 did, didn't you? It was actual demolition, because you  
22 did no renovation or repairs?  
23 MR. COOK: Didn't do any renovation. I  
24 removed what needed to be removed to implement the plan  
25 that was approved.

0073

1 MS. HARMON: But you didn't get a demolition  
2 permit?  
3 MR. COOK: Didn't get a demolition permit,

4 that is correct.

5 MS. HARMON: Can you tell me when the  
6 engineer's report was done and do you have a copy of  
7 that?

8 MR. COOK: The engineer's report?

9 MS. HARMON: Yes, of the foundation.

10 MR. COOK: The last engineer's report I had  
11 was a year and a half ago, probably June. You mean  
12 indicating that the foundation needs to be replaced?

13 MS. HARMON: Right, right.

14 MR. COOK: Oh, well, I'm a civil engineer.

15 MS. HARMON: Pardon?

16 MR. COOK: I am a civil engineer.

17 MS. HARMON: I can't hear you.

18 MR. COOK: I am a civil engineer, so there  
19 is no report. I dug down to determine what kind of  
20 foundation existed, and there is no continuous footers,  
21 which is required.

22 The foundation was just poured on slabs  
23 of concrete that were called cow patties, or concrete in  
24 the ground, let it harden, and the old foundation would  
25 appear on top of it.

0074

1 MS. HARMON: Architecturally, what does cow  
2 pattie mean? Because it means different things to  
3 different people.

4 MR. COOK: Just they dig a hole and pour  
5 concrete in there and smooth it out, and then they will  
6 build a pier on top of it. So the piers aren't -- they  
7 are not solidly filled. There is no rebar and there is  
8 no concrete.

9 MS. HARMON: Well, it wouldn't have been  
10 back then. I mean, my house doesn't have any rebar.

11 MR. COOK: I think the permit in 1980 was  
12 for foundation -- well, the CMU block that are there are  
13 not historical. If it was historical, it probably would  
14 have been brick.

15 So based on my recollection and  
16 discussions with Everett, who sold the house to the  
17 Bjorkstens in 1980 -- the guy that bought it renovated  
18 it, added stuff, sold it to the Bjorkstens. So they  
19 lived there for 25 years.

20 And the floors sloped, and that is where  
21 they taught their daughter how to roller skate. So  
22 there is a lot of neat stuff that went on in the house.  
23 There is no doubt about it.

24                   But a lot of the elements are somewhat  
25 modern, including the foundation. It was just built  
0075

1 substandardly.

2                   MR. HELLMAN: I think in the last meeting  
3 Pat Ilderton actually pointed out that he recalled it  
4 having creosote pilings at some point in its history,  
5 and at some point they were obviously changed.

6                   I think Randy pointed out at the meeting  
7 prior to that that there was a permit pulled in the late  
8 1970s to do foundation work and enclose that porch.

9                   And certainly the enclosing of the porch  
10 in late 1970s corresponds with Mr. Schneider's report  
11 that the construction materials used for that porch  
12 enclosure, the one that Mr. Cook is talking about  
13 restoring back to the historic front porch that would  
14 have been there, was there; that he had reported that  
15 those materials looked like they were from the '70s or  
16 '80s.

17                  MS. HARMON: So will you move the house? I  
18 mean, you are turning the house seven degrees and then  
19 start construction?

20                  MR. COOK: Right. Johnson House Movers will  
21 come in. They will put in the steel members. There is  
22 five across the front, slide them in from front to back,  
23 and then two from the side to support the five minor  
24 members, the two larger members.

25                  And then they will lift the house,  
0076

1 elevate it and then rotate it. And then the existing  
2 foundation would be demolished, a new foundation dug,  
3 piers constructed with rebar and filled with concrete,  
4 and then the house would be set back on top of that new  
5 foundation.

6                  MS. HARMON: At the same level?

7                  MR. COOK: At the same level, right.

8                  MS. HARMON: I wish you would consider  
9 changing those French doors out to windows.

10                  MR. COOK: That is fine. I thought it was  
11 something that the board would like. It wasn't what I  
12 had originally. Because they are going into a closet  
13 space.

14                  MS. HARMON: Well, it would make me happy if  
15 that were not a screen porch, make me very happy if that  
16 was not a screen porch.

17                  MR. COOK: You mean if it was an open porch?

18 MS. HARMON: Because it's going to look more  
19 like the historic house, because a long time ago they  
20 didn't have screen porches. When my house was built,  
21 there were no screens.

22 I mean, I understand why you want to do  
23 it, but I'm just trying to have some semblance of the  
24 old house.

25 Because we are giving you all of this

0077

1 over here and then all of that in the back. That, at  
2 least to me, it wouldn't make my stomach hurt when I  
3 looked at it as much.

4 I mean, when I think about the way it's  
5 going to look now, my stomach hurts. And I'm just  
6 saying if we could just get this done. And I don't  
7 believe that is too much to ask.

8 MR. COOK: Can I hear the opinions of -- it  
9 seems like a screen porch, at least one screen porch, is  
10 appealing, to me. Because the bugs --

11 MR. CRAVER: I don't have a problem with the  
12 screen porch.

13 MR. COOK: Because the bug issue is the  
14 problem in South Carolina.

15 MR. CRAVER: It makes it much more usable on  
16 Sullivan's Island.

17 MS. HARMON: But how much is he going to use  
18 that? Because he has the whole back.

19 MR. CRAVER: You know, I don't know, Betty,  
20 but I just don't have a problem with a screen porch. I  
21 mean --

22 MS. HARMON: Well, I do.

23 MR. CRAVER: That is why we get to vote.

24 MS. HARMON: Right. I just don't think you  
25 will use it that much, because you have all of the back

0078

1 with the pool and the deck back there. And with that  
2 breeze coming in from the back, you are not going to  
3 want to sit on that front porch, I will guarantee you  
4 that.

5 MR. COOK: Ironically, where I live right  
6 now, the front porch is much more enjoyable than the  
7 back porch. The back porch has a nice view. So I don't  
8 know how -- you really don't know how you are going to  
9 use the space until you live there.

10 MS. HARMON: I'm sorry. I can't hear you.

11 MR. COOK: You really don't know how you are

12 going to use the space until you live there.

13 MS. HARMON: Right. But, you know, I have  
14 found that people just don't use a front porch much. If  
15 I were there, I would be on the back porch looking out  
16 at that marsh.

17 MR. COOK: With as many kids as I have, I  
18 might want to be on the front porch.

19 MR. LANCTO: We should have brought up that  
20 kind of thing prior to now. I mean, we asked them to  
21 clarify what he was going to do to restore and to  
22 stabilize, and he has done a very thorough job of that.  
23 And we can make some minor modifications.

24 I am sure that if Mr. Cook would like to  
25 have a screen porch, I think he should be allowed to  
0079

1 have a screen porch, because we didn't bring up that  
2 objection until now.

3 I mean, we had plenty of opportunities  
4 along the way to say, okay, this would look much better  
5 without screening around there, but we didn't do that.

6 MS. HARMON: Well, we missed that.

7 MR. LANCTO: I understand that, and we will  
8 continue to miss things.

9 MS. HARMON: I was trying to remedy that.  
10 That is why I was asking.

11 MR. WRIGHT: Anything else, Betty?

12 MS. HARMON: No.

13 MR. WRIGHT: I would like to see the 6/6  
14 windows versus the French doors, personally, on the  
15 facade. Other than that, I have no problem with the  
16 submission.

17 Do I hear a motion?

18 MR. LANCTO: I make the motion that we  
19 approve it with the ability to change to exposed rafter  
20 tails on the front side, and keep 6/6 windows on the  
21 front elevation as well, and give him final approval for  
22 that.

23 MS. HARMON: And to change out the -- on the  
24 front you are saying?

25 MR. LANCTO: Yes.

0080

1 MR. REINHARD: Second.

2 MR. CRAVER: What else?

3 MR. ROBINSON: The stairs need to be set  
4 back as the original structure is.

5 MR. LANCTO: Yes, and the stairs need to be

6 recessed back to accommodate the head room necessary.

7 MS. HARMON: Matching the ones that were  
8 existing.

9 MR. REINHARD: Second.

10 MR. WRIGHT: Do I have a second?

11 MR. REINHARD: Second.

12 MR. WRIGHT: Any discussion? All in favor.

13 MR. WRIGHT: Aye.

14 MS. HARMON: Aye.

15 MR. REINHARD: Aye.

16 MR. LANCTO: Aye.

17 MR. CRAVER: Aye.

18 MR. COOK: Thank you.

19 MR. WRIGHT: We are going to miss you.

20 MR. COOK: I don't think you will.

21 MR. WRIGHT: Come back sometime.

22 MR. CRAVER: Tim, you did a good job.

23 MR. COOK: Thank you, everybody.

24 MR. HERLONG: We'll take a little break.

25 MR. CRAVER: Well, I have a request. Today

0081

1 is my 20th wedding anniversary, and I have been sitting

2 here for two hours now and --

3 MR. REINHARD: Come on. I will drive you  
4 home.

5 MR. CRAVER: I appreciate that. Rather than  
6 sitting here and just chat about something, if we can do  
7 it at another meeting, I would love to do it. If we  
8 have more business to do, let's do business.

9 MR. HERLONG: I think we are going to be  
10 okay.

11 MS. KENYON: We are going over Staff  
12 approval items.

13 MR. HERLONG: Item 6 is going to be  
14 deferred. So then let's wait to see if Randy -- if  
15 there is going to be a problem to defer the discussion  
16 of future Staff approvals.

17 MR. BOEHM: Is it possible to ask a question  
18 about -- I think Number 6 is the accessory structure  
19 issue.

20 MR. HERLONG: That is correct.

21 MR. WRIGHT: No.

22 MR. HERLONG: No. It's the review of a  
23 certificate of appropriateness.

24 MR. BOEHM: Well, somewhere on there is an  
25 accessory structure.

0082

1 MS. KENYON: 2014 I'On.

2 MR. BOEHM: Yes.

3 MR. CRAVER: And it was approved.

4 MS. KENYON: It was approved.

5 MR. WRIGHT: That is Kelly Maloney.

6 MR. BOEHM: Oh, that was that family.

7 Because you changed the order.

8 MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

9 MR. BOEHM: Is it possible to ask a question  
10 about accessory structure submittals?

11 MR. REINHARD: There is the guy.

12 MR. WRIGHT: Off the record.

13 (Off-the-record discussion.)

14 MR. HERLONG: Can we defer the discussion  
15 until we get a full board?

16 MR. WRIGHT: Your Item 7?

17 MR. HERLONG: Discussion of future Staff  
18 approvals.

19 MR. ROBINSON: Sure.

20 MR. HERLONG: Is there a time issue there,  
21 or can we wait?

22 MR. ROBINSON: No. I mean, I am going to be  
23 able to give approvals come --

24 MR. REINHARD: After the Council meeting.

25 MR. ROBINSON: After the Council meeting.

0083

1 And I think I have a pretty good handle on it. I just  
2 wanted to run down the list and --

3 MS. HARMON: Well, we will do it the next  
4 time when --

5 MR. REINHARD: Move for adjournment.

6 MS. HARMON: Right.

7 MR. CRAVER: Second.

8 MS. HARMON: He may not have a wife when he  
9 gets home. It's his 20th wedding anniversary.

10 MR. ROBINSON: Go.

11 MR. HERLONG: So it's in the record that it  
12 is a deferment on Item 6. And the Item 7, the last  
13 item, we are also deferring.

14 Meeting is adjourned.

15 (The hearing was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.)

16 - - -

17

18

19

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

0084

1 STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )

2

3 )

4 COUNTY OF CHARLESTON )

5

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

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

12 Witness my hand, I have hereunto affixed my official  
seal this 17th day of July, 2009, at Charleston,  
13 Charleston County, South Carolina.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nancy Ennis Tierney, CSR (IL)

24 My Commission expires

April 6, 2014

25