

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
SULLIVAN'S ISLAND, SOUTH CAROLINA  
MEETING MINUTES FROM MARCH 21, 2012

DATE: MARCH 21, 2012

TIME: 6:00 PM

LOCATION: Sullivan's Island Town Hall  
2050-B Middle Street  
Sullivan's Island, South Carolina

REPORTED BY: Darah L. Nekola, RPR  
Registered Professional Reporter  
CLARK & ASSOCIATES, INC.  
P.O. Box 73129  
Charleston, SC 29415  
843-762-6294  
WWW.CLARK-ASSOCIATES.COM

1 but you will see some trees on the lot, and what  
2 they are trying to do is go up to the side setback  
3 ten feet to get away from the trees. The second  
4 floor facade setback to me doesn't seem to be a  
5 problem because of the roof section, but I will  
6 leave that up to you-all. And I will save any  
7 other comments for that.

8 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Sir, who is  
9 presenting?

10 MR. CLARK: Phillip Clark with Clark  
11 Design Group. I don't know if you-all have had a  
12 chance to look at this lot, and I have talked to  
13 Kelly about it, there's a number of really -- a  
14 nice clump of trees kind of on the front right  
15 side. So what we have attempted to do is do a  
16 house that's kind of a Sullivan's Island cottage  
17 character and keep it as far back and to the left  
18 as possible. We have kept the house about 34 feet  
19 wide, which it's not terribly wide, just in an  
20 attempt to stay far enough off the trees that we do  
21 not need to take out any of the trees from that  
22 main clump.

23 Just requesting that from 15 to 10.  
24 And the only part that's going to go from 15 to 10  
25 will be the porch. The heated space will stay at

SULLIVAN'S ISLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
MARCH 21, 2012

MR. ILDERTON: This is the March 21,  
2012 meeting of the Sullivan's Island Design Review  
Board. It is now 6:00 p.m. Members in attendance  
are Duke Wright, Pat Ilderton, Steve Herlong, and  
Kelly Messier, Rhonda Sanders, and Billy Craver.

The Freedom of Information requirements  
have been met for this meeting. Approval of the  
February minutes?

MR. WRIGHT: I will move that they be  
approved as written.

MR. HERLONG: Second.

MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor?

ALL: Aye.

MR. ILDERTON: 3109 Middle Street.

MR. ROBINSON: The application before  
you is -- I have not checked, but I do believe they  
are coming for a final approval for this. They are  
going to construct a new home. They are asking for  
two increases to both side yard setback -- one,  
increase to the second floor, and the side setback  
relief to minimum side yard setback is 15 feet.  
They have some -- the plans are in front of you,

15, but just an extra five feet from the porch.

MS. KENYON: Is this for final?

MR. CLARKE: Yes.

MR. ILDERTON: Is there any public  
comment to this application?

MR. SELLERS: Wayne Sellers, 3104 Ion.  
I'm here in full support of it. I have two  
properties on the island. One is adjacent to the  
property on the side, the other is diagonal across  
from the property, and I commend the Duncans and  
Mr. Clark for their work in preserving the trees.  
I happen to be the one that had the privilege of  
trimming most of the trees before the lot was on  
the market, but I think they have done a great job,  
and I am in full support of what they want to do.

MR. ILDERTON: Any other public  
comment? Public comment section is closed then.  
Randy, anything to add or --

MR. ROBINSON: No.

MR. ILDERTON: All right. Duke?

MR. WRIGHT: I'm familiar with that  
neighborhood, and I have no problem with this  
house. I think it's going to enhance the  
neighborhood. There's no question in my mind  
regarding the neighborhood compatibility. There

1 are two small brick houses on either end of the  
2 bookends, so to speak. I think ultimately those  
3 houses will probably go in the long run, but to me  
4 there's no issue now with compatibility. I support  
5 the design. It's good. And so that's all I have.

6 MR. ILDERTON: I support it also. I  
7 don't see any problem with it. Steve?

8 MR. HERLONG: Yeah. I think it's a  
9 good job of breaking up the massing, making it  
10 basically a one-and-a-half story house that would  
11 fit very nicely -- it would enhance that  
12 neighborhood in fact. So I think this would be a  
13 nice addition.

14 MR. ILDERTON: Kelly?

15 MS. MESSIER: I really like the design  
16 of the house. I did go out there yesterday and  
17 actually looked at this driveway and the trees a  
18 lot more closely. And these -- it's a really big  
19 oak cluster, and a lot of the branches are really  
20 low. So I got real concerned about the driveway  
21 coming in on the right side because even if you put  
22 the driveway right on the property line, you're  
23 going to have to cut some substantial branches off  
24 of that to make it work. And, you know, I'm not  
25 sort of advocating redesigning at this point, but

1 you want to think about as you go forward.

2 MS. SANDERS: I'm good.

3 MR. LANCTO: I'm passing on this.

4 MR. CRAVER: I think it's fabulous. Go  
5 for it.

6 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a motion?

7 MR. CRAVER: Move we approve as  
8 submitted, final approval.

9 MR. ILDERTON: Second?

10 MR. WRIGHT: Second.

11 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor?

12 ALL: Aye.

13 MR. ILDERTON: 2308 Jasper.

14 MR. ROBINSON: 2308 Jasper, this a  
15 request for a second house on the lot, which is  
16 permitted under 2120-C special exception in our  
17 zoning ordinance. You have the plans in front of  
18 you. They're asking for a conceptual. This  
19 property -- I mean, it does need to go to the Board  
20 of Zoning Appeals if you-all approve it. There are  
21 certain guidelines that you-all need to really use  
22 to approve this. And going down it meets almost  
23 all of them, but the one probably to pay special  
24 attention to is 2120-C2, in the event that a  
25 historical structural structure does not meet

1 it almost seems like you might want to look at, you  
2 know, if you can sort of come in on the other side,  
3 but that would sort of change your whole sort of  
4 parking focus. You know, it did seem like there  
5 was no way to -- I mean, if you you're going to  
6 have to drive on the right, it really needs to  
7 shift all the way over to the property line.

8 My other concern was just the pool area  
9 back in here, just the whole patio area and  
10 everything has to conform to the setbacks, and  
11 right now you're just showing a pool. And there  
12 didn't seem to be much space there. Just sort of  
13 thinking through the whole thing as a landscape  
14 architect and talking to Phil and knowing that you  
15 really wanted these oak trees to be the focus of  
16 the house, it almost, in my mind, was sort of  
17 saying, well, why aren't we putting the pool right  
18 there so if you are using the pool area, you  
19 actually see all of these beautiful oak trees, you  
20 know.

21 It seems like some of this porch space  
22 and stuff is sort of oriented toward the backyard  
23 where there's another house right there. So these  
24 are just some sort of thoughts that I had, not  
25 necessarily solutions. It's just maybe something

1 current FEMA elevation requirements, the Design  
2 Review Board finds that bringing it in compliance  
3 would significantly impair the historic and  
4 architectural character of the structure. And I  
5 just ask that you look at that section and make  
6 sure that if you do make a motion to approve, that  
7 you articulate that, that this structure -- trying  
8 to add onto this structure would be very difficult  
9 without hurting the historical character of it. I  
10 will let the applicant go ahead and present.

11 MR. ILDERTON: All right. Yes, sir?

12 MR. MCCANTS: Karl McCants here. Let's  
13 see here. Randy summed up pretty much what we're  
14 trying to do. Really this is for conceptual  
15 review. We need to go to the BZA if we in fact get  
16 approval from you-all. That's why we're asking for  
17 conceptual. We feel that we are in compliance with  
18 the neighborhood because the house adjacent to  
19 it -- if you are on Jasper, the house to the left  
20 of it has two structures on there as well that are  
21 both separate dwellings. Really I guess that's all  
22 I need to do. I mean, if you-all have any  
23 questions for me with the plans --

24 MR. ILDERTON: All right. Is there any  
25 public comment to this application? Public comment

1 section is closed.

2 Randy, anything you need to add?

3 MR. ROBINSON: I don't. I will be here  
4 to answer any questions you-all have.

5 MR. ILDERTON: Billy, you want to  
6 start?

7 MR. CRAVER: I'm all for preserving  
8 historical structures as they are and have always  
9 liked the idea of being able to put a second house  
10 on the lot and leave the historic -- or the old  
11 structure intact, and I don't have a problem with  
12 these plans. So unless I'm missing something --  
13 Randy, am I missing anything?

14 MR. ROBINSON: I don't think so.

15 MR. CRAVER: I think it's good. I'm  
16 sure there's some people who would have some  
17 qualitative and aesthetic things to say, but that  
18 just goes beyond my capabilities.

19 MR. ILDERTON: John?

20 MR. LANCTO: I'm good with the concept  
21 of it. I just haven't given a lot of thought to  
22 the building elevation aspect of it yet.

23 Randy, can you give any clarification  
24 as to what your concern is on that?

25 MR. ROBINSON: On what?

1 questions. Are you going to park under the new  
2 house?

3 MR. MCCANTS: That's the intent, yes.

4 MS. MESSIER: So there will be a  
5 driveway then coming off of Jasper?

6 MR. MCCANTS: If you look at the lot,  
7 there's an existing driveway that runs around the  
8 left-hand side of the pool. And our intention is  
9 to try to pull in through there. We still haven't  
10 figured out exactly how to do that yet. But  
11 there's no room on this lot for us to get a  
12 detached garage because we are eating up all of our  
13 lot coverage by having this structure here. So  
14 that's one reason why we wanted to have it, and we  
15 have kept it as low as we possibly could. I think  
16 we're at 7 foot 8 inches, and once you have a slab  
17 on that, it will take another four inches off that.  
18 We can't get much lower than that and be able to  
19 park under it.

20 MS. MESSIER: I think all of that is  
21 fine. I just was asking because if you weren't, I  
22 was going to ask how you were going to address  
23 that. The other question I have -- I mean, are you  
24 having to go to the BZA because there's two lots or  
25 because you're trying to do --

1 MR. LANCTO: On the elevations? Did  
2 you say there was an elevation problem?

3 MR. CRAVER: I think we just have to  
4 make a finding that it would destroy the historical  
5 character of the existing house to jack it up and  
6 add on, right? So if they had to bring it into  
7 compliance with the FEMA requirements and then  
8 we -- they added onto it, it would destroy the  
9 historic character, and I think it would. I don't  
10 have a problem with that finding.

11 MR. ROBINSON: Part of it is the  
12 50 percent rule. A lot of times in order to add  
13 onto the structure, you have to elevate the  
14 structure. You would have to elevate the old  
15 structure to add onto it -- feasibly add onto it,  
16 and a lot of times that is -- you don't want to  
17 elevate it. So the option is to build a second  
18 structure. Then you don't have --

19 MR. CRAVER: Then you don't have an  
20 elevation issue.

21 MR. LANCTO: Okay. Then I'm good with  
22 that.

23 MR. ILDERTON: Good.

24 MS. SANDERS: I'm fine. I'm good.

25 MS. MESSIER: I just had a couple of

1 MR. MCCANTS: Two structures.

2 MR. ROBINSON: If you read further down  
3 in what I was saying you need to look at, it says  
4 permission to build a second structure, use the  
5 historic structure as an accessory dwelling as  
6 approved with special exception by the Board of  
7 Zoning Appeals. So it has to go to the Board of  
8 Zoning. All of these have to go to the Board of  
9 Zoning Appeals. And generally they have approved  
10 it. The last one that went to them, they did not  
11 approve it.

12 MS. MESSIER: That's why I was sort of  
13 asking. How is the old home going to be used? I  
14 assume -- I mean, are those going to be  
15 condominiumized or used as a guesthouse?

16 MR. MCCANTS: No. What it's going to  
17 be is, the owner is going to live in the existing  
18 house, and his sister is going to live in the new  
19 house. So it's not going in the rental market.

20 MR. ILDERTON: When they didn't approve  
21 the last one, a lot of it was because there were  
22 objections from the neighbors and all that.

23 MR. ROBINSON: That's correct.

24 MS. MESSIER: But even -- I don't know.

25 I know there was another house down on 18th Street,

1 because one of the things I thought is they can  
2 allow two structures, but some of it just had to do  
3 with like the electric meter or something else,  
4 that it all had to be metered.

5 MR. ROBINSON: You only get one  
6 electric meter on the house. You don't get two  
7 electric meters. So all of the power for this  
8 other house would have to come off one of the  
9 houses. Either the historic one or the --

10 MS. MESSIER: So that's all conditions  
11 that the BZA just has to give the blessing through  
12 the whole thing.

13 MR. ROBINSON: That's correct. And  
14 they have guidelines that they need to look at to  
15 make sure that it meets all of those guidelines  
16 also, and its neighborhood compatibility. Probably  
17 their largest charge in this is that looking at the  
18 rest of the neighborhood and making sure that it  
19 isn't hurting the traffic flow in the neighborhood  
20 or the scheme in the neighborhood.

21 One difference between this property  
22 and the property that was turned down by BZA is the  
23 property that was turned down by BZA was in a  
24 location where there was not another house on the  
25 rear of the lot in that whole block. This

1 entry porch, so I didn't even know if they were  
2 going to make it. But anyway, overall I think it  
3 looks nice. And I have no problem.

4 MR. ILDERTON: Steve?

5 MR. HERLONG: Now, the size of the  
6 existing house is 1,200?

7 MR. ROBINSON: 1,200 square feet. It's  
8 right at 1,200.

9 MS. MESSIER: It says 1,051 here.

10 MR. HERLONG: I really think this is  
11 exactly the reason the ordinance was redesigned for  
12 these types of properties. You have got an  
13 existing house that has a lot of nice historic  
14 character, low to the ground, and there's no way to  
15 do any additions to that without destroying its  
16 character. So adding a second structure just seems  
17 like the only way to effectively use the property.  
18 You then have two smaller structures on the lot.

19 And, you know, the house as it's  
20 designed, it's a very attractive house. I think  
21 it's always debatable. I keep wondering should a  
22 second home relate architecturally to the other  
23 home or not? I just think -- I think either one  
24 can work. Either way can work, and I think this  
25 works. It's an attractive home, and I would vote

1 particular block, there's a house -- the property  
2 next door to this particular property has two  
3 houses already on the lot.

4 MS. MESSIER: But not on the other  
5 side?

6 MR. ROBINSON: Not on the other side.

7 MS. MESSIER: And I guess -- I don't  
8 know -- I mean, it looks like this house is  
9 oriented so that the front is facing the pool  
10 rather than Myrtle Avenue. Because that was sort  
11 of the problem when we looked at another one. But,  
12 I guess, just one of the things I was wondering was  
13 if you are standing on Jasper -- since this is sort  
14 of a small house, what is the other house going to  
15 look like behind it and how much of -- you know, of  
16 the one would you see behind it?

17 MR. MCCANTS: What this doesn't  
18 reflect, the site plan I have, is the trees that  
19 are existing in the back side of the pool. There's  
20 a bunch of -- I think there's a Leyland Cyprus back  
21 there as well as cedars that are elevated pretty  
22 high. You won't see much of this house. If you  
23 see any of it, it will really be from Jasper.

24 MS. MESSIER: It looks like those  
25 cedars are pretty close to the steps here on this

1 for approval.

2 MR. ILDERTON: Yeah. I think it all  
3 works. And it does face the opposite way of -- I  
4 mean, it does face away from Jasper -- I mean,  
5 Myrtle. It faces the same direction as the  
6 original home.

7 And it's interesting that the findings  
8 previously, didn't get it. Sounds like to me the  
9 BZA made their design based on design, because that  
10 was the objection. But if they are basing their  
11 decision on the design, they're stepping into our  
12 territory. I just made the observation because  
13 that was the objection from the -- from the folks  
14 living around there. We happened to pass it, they  
15 didn't. But they put that on public record. So  
16 when Jimmy Hiers -- he's a good friend of mine. He  
17 is the head of BZA, and his -- I will make sure  
18 he's aware of it.

19 Seems to me they might have made that  
20 decision based on design, which is interesting, but  
21 I think this works.

22 Duke?

23 MR. WRIGHT: I think it works fine.

24 And I don't think there's an issue in my mind. I  
25 know there's not an issue in my mind with

1 neighborhood compatibility on this property. There  
2 are several very attractive cottages on Jasper on  
3 either side of this property. And the rear is well  
4 protected by trees, so I think it's fine. And this  
5 is a preliminary?

6 MR. MCCANTS: Conceptual.

7 MR. WRIGHT: I would have some  
8 questions on materials and that later, but it's  
9 fine now.

10 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a motion?

11 MR. CRAVER: Move we give conceptual  
12 approve as submitted.

13 MS. MESSIER: Second.

14 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor?

15 ALL: Aye.

16 MR. ILDERTON: We are adjourned.

17 (The deposition was concluded at  
18 6:22 p.m.)  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1  
2 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE  
3

4 I, DARAH L. NEKOLA, Registered Professional  
5 Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of  
6 South Carolina at Large, do hereby certify that I  
7 correctly reported the within-entitled matter and  
8 that the foregoing is a full, true and correct  
9 transcription of my shorthand notes of the  
10 testimony and/or other oral proceedings had in the  
11 said matter.

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

15 Witness my hand, I have hereunto affixed my  
16 official seal this 1st day of April, 2012, at  
17 Charleston, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
18  
19  
20

21 DARAH L. NEKOLA  
22 Registered Professional  
23 Reporter  
24 My commission expires  
25 JANUARY 7, 2018