

1 TOWN OF SULLIVAN'S ISLAND

2 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

MEETING BEFORE: PAT ILBERTON, CHAIRMAN

12

DATE: July 20, 2016

13

TIME: 6:00 PM

14

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

15

16

17

REPORTED BY: LORA L. McDANIEL,
Registered Professional Reporter

18

A. WILLIAM ROBERTS, JR. & ASSOCIATES

19

Fast, Accurate & Friendly

20

21

Charleston, SC (843) 722-8414	Hilton Head, SC (843) 785-3263	Myrtle Beach, SC (843) 839-3376
----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------------

22

23

24

Columbia, SC (803) 731-5224	Greenville, SC (864) 234-7030	Charlotte, NC (704) 573-3919
--------------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------

25

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

APPEARANCES :

- PAT ILDERTON, CHAIRMAN
- DUKE WRIGHT, BOARD MEMBER
- STEVE HERLONG, BOARD MEMBER
- DONNA WEBB, BOARD MEMBER
- BEVERLY BOHAN, BOARD MEMBER
- JOE HENDERSON, ZONING ADMINISTRATOR
- RANDY ROBINSON, BUILDING OFFICIAL
- KAT KENYON, PERMIT TECHNICIAN

(INDEX AT REAR OF TRANSCRIPT)

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Let's call it 6:00. This
2 is the July 20, 2016 meeting of the Sullivan's Island
3 Design Review Board. It is now 6:00. Members in
4 attendance are Duke Wright, Pat Ilderton, Steve
5 Herlong, Donna Webb, and Beverly Bohan.

6 The Freedom of Information requirements
7 have been met for this meeting. Items on tonight's
8 agenda are approval of the June 2016 minutes. Do I
9 hear a motion?

10 MR. WRIGHT: Move this be approved.

11 MR. HERLONG: I second.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Discussion? Everybody in
13 favor?

14 (All present Board members stated aye.)

15 1914 MIDDLE STREET

16 THE CHAIRMAN: 1914 Middle Street,
17 modification of landmark structure.

18 MR. HENDERSON: This is agenda item C-1,
19 it's a certificate of appropriateness request of 1914
20 Middle Street. This is a Sullivan's Island landmark
21 property.

22 The applicants are requesting approval to
23 add a pool house structure, new pool and various
24 modifications to the newer home on the property.

25 Some background on this, this property was

1 granted a special exception for the historic home to
2 be used as an accessory dwelling unit back in August
3 of 2005. Any modification to the site needs to have
4 the review and oversight of the DRB.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Thank you. Yes,
6 ma'am.

7 MS. BURTON: I'm Rachel Burton of
8 Swallowtail Architecture. Our owners couldn't be
9 here tonight because they were detained.

10 In general, we're doing three things to
11 this property; one is we're replacing an existing
12 pool and adding a new pool house. We're doing some
13 exterior changes that are functional mostly so that
14 we can use some of the outside space, the porches.
15 And upgrade finishes and repair some of the finishes.
16 I'm going to go through that.

17 The last is we want to enlarge a third
18 floor porch, an existing third floor porch that faces
19 Middle Street.

20 I'm going to start with the site plan.
21 This is Central with Middle Street here. This is the
22 existing historic home. There is an existing pool
23 that is sited just behind or between the historic
24 cottage and the newer building. And we're just
25 replacing that, slightly changing the location,

1 adding some pool vacuum around it and adding a pool
2 house to that.

3 The amount of impervious coverage on the
4 site, we are below what is current. So we're not
5 asking for any changes on that.

6 I do have an elevation to show you what
7 the pool house will look like. It's just a really
8 simple, you know, one story building with a fireplace
9 at the back.

10 I'm sorry, I shouldn't have had this bound
11 the way that I did. But it just has lattice that
12 would be facing the sides or the side property
13 boundary, and then it's open on the other three
14 sides. Here's a bit of lattice and then there's a
15 fireplace at the back. This would be facing the side
16 property and boundary. It's a really simple change
17 design.

18 The change that we want to do to the
19 second floor is to add a porch. It's really
20 enlarging a porch. In the plan view currently, the
21 porch is about six feet wide. And we're just
22 extending it so it's the center bay -- thank you,
23 Joe -- the center bay that matches the width of the
24 property. And then what it looks like in elevation
25 is this.

1 So the existing elevation is shown here
2 with the existing porch, and you can see we're just
3 expanding it to match the width of the building,
4 adding a low slope roof with a trellis appearance on
5 the edge and new door and two new windows and then,
6 of course, railing.

7 I'm going to stay on this drawing just
8 'cause it also shows some of the exterior changes
9 that we're doing. Some of this work has already
10 started under permitting because it was about
11 maintenance.

12 In general, what we're doing is replacing
13 our handrails, adding new paint cap, replacing our
14 ceiling finishes so that it's a wood ceiling. We're
15 refinishing the floors of the porch. We're adding
16 new porch doors so all the doors that go out onto the
17 porch are new.

18 We're having solid panels on these two
19 bays. This is facing Middle Street. Just so we have
20 an area where they can have outside sitting area and
21 be able to have the breeze when they want to. Those
22 are the big issues that are on the Middle Street
23 side.

24 And then I want to go back two elevations.
25 And this is the elevation sheet that is facing

1 Central. This is the existing home and these are the
2 changes that we're making to it. So we're going to
3 add a new roof. We're adding shutters to all the
4 windows. We're deciding not to add impact windows,
5 but to add shutters that have impact protection.

6 Then just dressing up columns, changing
7 out railings, replacing ceiling finishes, adding
8 heaters on the porch so they can use their porch
9 through more of seasonal use, and slightly
10 rearranging the stairs that face Central.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Great.

12 MS. BURTON: Any questions, I'll be happy
13 to answer.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

15 MR. HERLONG: I do have a question. The
16 question is: Is any work happening to the historic
17 structure?

18 MR. HENDERSON: No.

19 MR. HERLONG: That's not even on the
20 agenda.

21 MS. BURTON: You have to see this because
22 it's a historic property.

23 MR. HENDERSON: It's a historic property.
24 There's a pool being put in, and there's an accessory
25 structure being put in. We went ahead and issued --

1 the building permit staff issued the permit to get
2 the owners started with their demolition, started on
3 some of this work; replacing the lattice on the
4 foundation.

5 MR. RHODES: I guess I need to bring this
6 up. I'm doing the work. There is a couple of rotten
7 boards on the historic property that might need to be
8 replaced. They plan to put it back just like it is.
9 It's just a few rotten boards. Nothing to change the
10 look.

11 MR. HERLONG: That would probably just be
12 under maintenance.

13 MR. HENDERSON: Right.

14 MR. RHODES: I just wanted to make sure
15 everybody knew that.

16 MR. HENDERSON: We don't have a problem
17 with issuing permits for that type of work and also
18 having them get started. Because of the second story
19 porch and the pool and the accessory structure, I
20 thought we would err on the side of caution.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Duke.

22 MR. WRIGHT: No, I don't have any trouble
23 with it at all. I think, if anything, it enhances
24 the facade of the house. And certainly it does not
25 distract from the relevance of the historic property.

1 I'm fine with it.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, I think it's fine.

3 Good work.

4 MR. HERLONG: I agree with Duke. I'm in
5 favor of it.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Donna.

7 MS. WEBB: Same. I think it's a beautiful
8 renovation.

9 MS. BOHAN: I agree.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Everybody good? Let's make
11 a motion.

12 MR. WRIGHT: I move it be approved as
13 submitted.

14 MR. HERLONG: Several steps.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: I think I jumped several
16 steps by not asking for anybody's comment, public
17 comment.

18 Anybody want to run this project down?

19 Public comment section is closed.

20 Joe, nothing more to add?

21 MR. HENDERSON: No, sir.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Do we have a motion?

23 MR. WRIGHT: You have a motion.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Second?

25 MR. HERLONG: I seconded it. I have a

1 question. Is it up for final approval?

2 MS. BURTON: Yes.

3 MR. HENDERSON: To the discretion of the
4 Board.

5 MR. HERLONG: What was it here for?

6 MS. BURTON: We want final approval.

7 MR. HERLONG: Approved as submitted.

8 MR. WRIGHT: The application is
9 conceptual.

10 MR. HENDERSON: The application, at first
11 blush, it's always conceptual. We've been directed
12 to require conceptual first. You guys always can
13 give final.

14 MR. HERLONG: Probably want to amend this
15 to call it final approval.

16 MR. HENDERSON: If you would, please.

17 MR. HERLONG: Second to that.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Everybody in favor?

19 (All Board members present stated aye.)

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ma'am.

21 MR. BURTON: Thank you very much.

22 2414 JASPER BOULEVARD

23 THE CHAIRMAN: 2414 Jasper.

24 MR. HENDERSON: This is agenda item D-1,
25 it's a nonhistoric property design review.

1 MR. WELLS: We have a new set of plans.
2 We had to scrap our plans. We have a crawl space
3 now.

4 MR. HENDERSON: There have been some
5 modifications to the original plans.

6 This is a new home construction. The
7 applicants are requesting modification of the zoning
8 standards for principal building square footage of
9 9.2 percent, and also second story side setback, 100
10 percent on that standard on two portions of the side
11 elevations. And I can run through those on the
12 projector here.

13 MR. WELLS: Do you have the crawl space
14 version on PDF that we e-mailed you?

15 MR. HENDERSON: I don't think I do. This
16 is -- the one with the original elevation on it?

17 MR. WELLS: Yes.

18 MR. WRIGHT: This is quite a change from
19 the submission.

20 MR. WELLS: It is.

21 MR. ADRIAN: It's four feet lower.

22 MR. HENDERSON: Is that the only change?
23 It was the height of the foundation; right? These
24 renderings are accurate. The only change --

25 MR. ADRIAN: No drive, no garage.

1 MR. HENDERSON: There's no parking
2 underneath the house.

3 MR. WRIGHT: There's a garage added;
4 correct?

5 MR. HENDERSON: The garage was taken off
6 of the plans.

7 MR. ADRIAN: The garage was taken off.
8 There was a detached garage that's been added.

9 MR. WRIGHT: Detached garage has been
10 added.

11 MR. HENDERSON: The detached garage,
12 that's correct. The reason being is that the
13 elevated house -- because the grade is so high and
14 the BFE is so low, to have the elevated home, it
15 would set it over the maximum allowed four feet above
16 the base flood elevation.

17 So their option was to lower it. And Mr.
18 Joel Adrian is the architect on the project who can
19 elaborate on the rationale for doing that.

20 MR. WELLS: We are mainly concerned about
21 draining issues and the street elevations at ten,
22 slight elevation. If we were really to try to
23 squeeze it, it would've been at 9.5, which would've
24 been six inches lower than the curb. Even at that
25 9.5, we still would've been struggling to try to get

1 the garage door to work.

2 Rather than try to really force something
3 that was really hard to work and probably result in a
4 bunch of transition, we just kind of scrapped it and
5 go with the detached garage instead.

6 MR. ADRIAN: Overall, I think it certainly
7 represents the scale of the project when you take
8 four feet off the height.

9 MR. WRIGHT: That's my question.
10 That's -- all the neighboring houses are low. So
11 it's going to be much higher than the neighborhood.
12 And if you lower it -- you've lowered it by four
13 feet?

14 MR. ADRIAN: Four feet.

15 MR. WRIGHT: That would help.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Lowered it quite a bit.

17 MR. WRIGHT: That would make a lot of
18 difference.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Definitely make a lot of
20 difference being that low.

21 MR. ADRIAN: I don't know if you need me
22 to walk you through the site plan. I think it's
23 important when you look at the site plan, first
24 sheet --

25 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, I think it would be

1 helpful.

2 MR. ADRIAN: The house is not a very wide
3 house, only about 40 feet in width. Obviously the
4 lots are deep. It's stretching back in the depth of
5 the lot. It allows for front setbacks -- or side
6 setbacks. Got 37, almost 38 feet on the right side,
7 and there's little over 27 feet on the left side to
8 our property line.

9 And, obviously, the adjacent properties
10 have their required setback. I think, even though it
11 will be taller than the existing properties on the
12 side, there's going to be a substantial amount of
13 room between the structures.

14 MR. WRIGHT: If you remember, that's where
15 the house was destroyed by fire last year.

16 MR. HENDERSON: That's right. This was a
17 Sullivan's Island landmark. Destroyed last year.

18 MR. ADRIAN: And the request I think we
19 need, we're asking for an additional 373 square feet
20 of principal building square area. We're allowed up
21 to additional, little over a thousand feet. Well
22 within the tolerance of what y'all can approve.

23 And then I guess the real question would
24 be that two-foot additional side setback. It occurs
25 really on the front, main body of the house. Full

1 two-story little structure with a gable roof. And
2 that gable roof starts -- has the long slope down and
3 has a couple dormers that pop into it, if you look.

4 This is the area that's in violation of
5 additional two-foot setback. I add this roof over
6 the window to try to help break up vertical mass on
7 it.

8 MR. HERLONG: I have a question about this
9 facade. As I look at it in two dimensions, it looks
10 like it's going to look great. Low plate height with
11 dormers. It looks fine. But it's really a shed
12 extension on the front that has the dormers in it.
13 Have you done that before?

14 I can't imagine how that looks in
15 three-dimension. That's the only question I have
16 really.

17 MR. ADRIAN: I guess I'd say kind of
18 almost like a saltbox construction. That back roof
19 just changes the pitch. I guess I'd say it's right
20 in here. If we can see it, we can certainly get a
21 3-D done, if I needed to, on it.

22 MR. HERLONG: I think it might look fine.
23 I'm just not sure I've ever seen a treatment like
24 that before, which is not saying it wouldn't look
25 right. I'm not sure. This is one of the places -- a

1 situation where 3-D image would explain it.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: What might help on the
3 front elevation is if you just tighten up the soffits
4 on each one. Each one is almost the size, little bit
5 larger. Obviously needs to be larger and wider than
6 the box itself, the box of the dormer.

7 MR. ADRIAN: Sure.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: If you tighten it up as
9 opposed to having the broad.

10 MR. ADRIAN: Almost eight inches.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Looks pretty wide off the
12 side.

13 THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, one at a
14 time, please.

15 MR. ADRIAN: Looking at reducing the width
16 of the dormer, closer to the window width and then
17 also reducing overhead on the dormer piece.

18 MR. HERLONG: My question is more about
19 the overall front extension that is inset of about
20 four feet that comes out.

21 MR. ADRIAN: Correct.

22 MR. HERLONG: With the extended roof that
23 has the dormers in it. I can't see what that would
24 look like. I can't imagine that, how it would really
25 look placed on the site. That's my only question

1 really. Not something you can answer without seeing
2 3-D image.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Following all this, Joe, do
4 you have anything to add on this?

5 MR. HENDERSON: Well, I would just ask for
6 a clarification. Joel, you mentioned that there's an
7 encroachment on a setback, Joel?

8 MR. ADRIAN: NO. NO.

9 MR. HENDERSON: No encroachment on the
10 additional front setback line; right?

11 MR. ADRIAN: No.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: It's not a large house.

13 MR. ADRIAN: No, it's a small width house.
14 It meets all the side, rear, front yard setbacks,
15 meets the additional front setback that y'all have.
16 It was just that side yard, the additional two feet
17 on that second story. That's what it was.

18 MR. HENDERSON: Does the Board see where
19 that's being requested on those two elevations?

20 MR. ADRIAN: Right here where that
21 fireplace is and the front part is.

22 MR. HENDERSON: Those two right here and
23 this piece.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any public comment
25 to the application? Public comment section is

1 closed.

2 We're going to run down. Beverly, you
3 want to start this one?

4 MS. BOHAN: I see what Steve is talking
5 about. Doesn't seem as obvious there (indicating),
6 as questionable as it here in the audioCAD drawing.
7 For some reason it looks stronger there. I wouldn't
8 mind seeing a 3-D.

9 I don't have a problem with the house. I
10 do see your point about the bands and the dormers and
11 looking very steep, I guess is the right word, on the
12 face of those dormers, what Steve was talking about
13 earlier.

14 MR. HERLONG: One thing that happens to
15 us, we see a drawing that is to scale. Those images
16 are compressed horizontally, so we're not seeing here
17 and the public isn't seeing what we're seeing either.
18 It's a little confusing.

19 MR. ADRIAN: Like the line weight is
20 better up there than it is on the paper here.

21 MS. BOHAN: Exactly.

22 MR. ADRIAN: It does help when you see
23 that line weight, foreground, background.

24 MR. HENDERSON: Full size set of plans
25 would be ideal for the Board -- for you guys to

1 review.

2 MR. HENDERSON: Is there a way to import
3 these so that they come into a scaled view?

4 MR. HENDERSON: Not with this technology.
5 We'll get an upgrade pretty soon with that building
6 over there. We'll try to encourage the two-scale
7 plans to full-size plans.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps if we want to give
9 preliminary approval, maybe work on those dormers or
10 at least look on the next submission look at those
11 dormers in 3-D or even if we wanted to -- even if the
12 architect wanted to do anything more with them. So
13 they could move on with, essentially move on with the
14 idea.

15 It's not a large house. It's built, like
16 you say, four feet off the ground. It's not bad at
17 all. Anyway, let's continue on.

18 MS. BOHAN: I think otherwise the scale,
19 the design is nice.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Donna.

21 MS. WEBB: I think it just feels heavy.
22 Like, the roof feels heavy. Almost like cottage,
23 mountain cottage style, how it's a little heavy.

24 I wanted to ask how much space is between
25 the three dormers. The space between the two,

1 between each one.

2 MR. ADRIAN: I don't think I probably
3 mentioned it on that plan. It would be right in
4 front of you.

5 MS. WEBB: It looks higher on the drawing
6 here.

7 MR. WELLS: Each one is five feet across,
8 13 inches between them.

9 MS. WEBB: That to me seems a little too
10 close.

11 MR. ADRIAN: You think a single large
12 dormer would be better instead of trying to break it?

13 MS. WEBB: I don't know.

14 MS. BOHAN: I think the separation is
15 nice. I don't know.

16 MR. ADRIAN: I can certainly work on
17 spacing.

18 MR. WELLS: Certainly would not mess up
19 the second floor rooms to have those spaced out. Be
20 better actually.

21 MR. ADRIAN: I can work on it. I want to
22 say right now that dormer is probably centered
23 between the windows on the front elevation and the
24 first floor. We can certainly stack them. Center
25 one stays where it is over the door. Left one goes

1 over the left side. Window right goes over the right
2 window. That may help.

3 MS. WEBB: Yeah, less weight. And then
4 the other question was like the windows on the back
5 left portion, if you're looking at it from the side,
6 I guess the side left portion, that one window looks
7 super close to the edge. I know sometimes with the
8 interior it has to be a certain way. The far left.

9 MR. ADRIAN: That piece there?

10 MS. WEBB: Above that left garage.

11 MR. WELLS: It's just because where that
12 bedroom -- where that bedroom wall is.

13 MR. ADRIAN: I think it certainly looks a
14 little more scrunched there than it does on your
15 plans, needs a little more separation.

16 MS. WEBB: It looks awfully close to that
17 edge. That's just esthetics.

18 MR. ADRIAN: All right. I'll make a note
19 to look at that.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Steve.

21 MR. HERLONG: Okay, I have a question. I
22 see some of the side setback relief you're
23 requesting. What about size, overall square footage
24 relief?

25 MR. HENDERSON: They're requesting 9.2

1 percent or 373 square feet. And the total square
2 footage would come out to 4,420.

3 MR. HERLONG: Half acre lot?

4 MR. HENDERSON: Yes.

5 MR. HERLONG: I think as Pat said, I could
6 see providing like a conceptual or the next level
7 approval, but I'd like to see a 3-D image of how the
8 front facade really is going to look with that
9 detail. It may look fine. I just can't see it.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Or you might want to change
11 the detail.

12 MR. HERLONG: Yeah.

13 MR. ADRIAN: Okay.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: I think if that's done, I
15 could probably go for the preliminary approval
16 myself. Duke.

17 MR. WRIGHT: I think it's a good solution
18 for the property. I agree with both of you that we
19 should look further at those dormer designs.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Great. All right. Do I
21 hear a motion?

22 MR. HERLONG: It's submitted for
23 conceptual?

24 MR. HENDERSON: It always begins at
25 conceptual.

1 MR. HERLONG: I would make a motion that
2 we approve it for conceptual and we would like to see
3 a 3-D image of that front facade, at least, for the
4 next submittal.

5 MR. ADRIAN: Sounds good.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Do I hear a second?

7 MS. BOHAN: I second.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Discussion? Everybody in
9 favor?

10 (All present Board members stated aye.)

11 2002 I'ON AVENUE

12 THE CHAIRMAN: 2002 I'on Avenue, new
13 construction.

14 MR. HENDERSON: Thank you. This is agenda
15 item D-2. It's a nonhistoric property design review,
16 located at 2002 I'on Avenue. Mr. Sammy Rhodes is
17 here to present this project. He was here during our
18 last meeting in June where the Board made several
19 recommendations to modify the massing of the
20 structure, re-orient the site.

21 Again, this is to, I think, specifically
22 to reduce the square footage of the building. The
23 applicant has presented a set of plans in front of
24 you that is reduced by 477 square feet. They have
25 also relocated the pool to the --

1 MR. RHODES: Station 20.

2 MR. HENDERSON: Station 20 frontage and
3 push the majority of the massing towards the interior
4 property line. Staff recommends that this project
5 comply with the standards for neighborhood
6 compatibility. And I can show you the digital plans
7 and also some site pictures.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir.

9 MR. RHODES: We took your recommendation
10 last month. We reduced the house by over 400 square
11 feet. We're not asking for any more relief on
12 coverage. We're asking for 333 square foot extra,
13 which is 8 percent, is what we're asking for today.

14 And we took your recommendations also on
15 the house, how it looked on 20th Avenue. It looked
16 long and tall. And we mirrored the house so that the
17 main body of the house actually sits off the street.
18 And the pool and the soft area will be towards the
19 20th Avenue.

20 I think it's going to look real good.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Thank you.

22 Anything more to add, Joe?

23 MR. HENDERSON: No, sir.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Public comment? Public
25 comment section is closed.

1 Steve, you want to start.

2 MR. HERLONG: I think, again, like I said
3 at the last meeting, this is a very good example of a
4 one-and-a-half story style home where the second
5 floor is set on lower wall plates. And I think
6 because of that it's automatically much more
7 successful.

8 And, again, I think it's great that you
9 are facing 20th Avenue -- 20th Station. I think that
10 makes it much -- it presents itself to the community
11 much better that way.

12 You've reduced the square footage. At
13 that size it fits the general neighborhood. Not the
14 specific neighborhood of homes immediately around it.
15 But that general neighborhood has homes that are
16 approaching that many square feet. I think because
17 of the reduced scale, it fits well.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Donna.

19 MS. WEBB: I agree. I like how you
20 situated it. And like we talked about with the
21 gingerbread cottage facing a smaller structure. I
22 think that will be very nice. Once again, I would
23 say landscaping that side along 20th, around the
24 pool, and that will probably be fine.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Beverly.

1 MS. BOHAN: I think the changes are
2 successful. I think it's a win-win. Love the
3 design. I approve it.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Great. I also like it.
5 I'm fine. Duke.

6 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, I think he's done
7 exactly what we suggested last month. I believe this
8 design is going to sort of set the standard for that
9 neighborhood because the other properties will
10 probably be taken out and new houses built. I think
11 it's good.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Do I hear a motion?

13 MR. HERLONG: I move that we approve it as
14 submitted for final.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Second?

16 MR. WRIGHT: Second.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Everybody in favor?

18 (All present Board members stated aye.)

19 TOSI WATER AND SEWER FACILITY

20 THE CHAIRMAN: TOSI Water and Sewer
21 Facility. What is this?

22 MR. HENDERSON: This is just an item for
23 information. Greg Gress, the water and sewer
24 director, wanted me to run this by the Design Review
25 Board.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Really? The town is going
2 to run some of their properties by the Design Review
3 Board? This is a first. All right. Go for it.

4 MR. HENDERSON: I think it's a good idea.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: I have an audience sitting
6 right here.

7 MR. HENDERSON: Captive audience.

8 So anyway the request was actually put
9 forth by the surrounding neighborhood to replace this
10 rusty old fence here with the barbed wire along the
11 top and clean up some of the site. And the tree
12 commission has approved removal of a pecan tree in
13 the back and removal of some of the sabal palmettos
14 to make way for an eight-foot high stockade wooden
15 fence. And it's actually going to be set back from
16 the right-of-way by about eight feet. And it's
17 actually going to be brought back from the side
18 station right-of-way to allow site visibility once
19 you stop at the stop sign. Right now, it's a little
20 close to the sidewalk.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: There's no ordinance
22 preventing that? As far as that tall fence on the
23 corner as long as it's pulled back.

24 MR. HENDERSON: That's right. As long as
25 there's no site obstruction. We went out and

1 measured the actual --

2 THE CHAIRMAN: It's like a structure. You
3 pull it back far enough.

4 MR. HENDERSON: The ordinance requires
5 15-foot triangle back from the edge of pavement.
6 Greg brought it back a little bit further. And even
7 on this backside, he angled the fence away from the
8 right-of-way so that you can get clear visibility of
9 oncoming traffic.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: What's the fence going to
11 be made of or how?

12 MR. HENDERSON: Wooden stockade fence for
13 privacy.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Why do we need privacy
15 there?

16 MR. HENDERSON: Just screening.

17 MR. HERLONG: There's a lot of, often,
18 just various items laying out and about.

19 MR. HENDERSON: It's going to be a storage
20 yard where pipes --

21 THE CHAIRMAN: This is going to be used
22 for something that it hasn't been used for.

23 MR. HENDERSON: Well, it's actually always
24 been used as a utility laydown area.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: They're going to store more

1 stuff than they historically have stored on there.

2 MR. HENDERSON: That's the idea, and they
3 wanted it to be a little more secure.

4 MR. ROBINSON: Actually the neighbors
5 asked for this.

6 MR. HERLONG: Long time ago they did when
7 I was there. Now that I move out of the
8 neighborhood, they improve it.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Is it going to be unpainted
10 fence?

11 MR. HENDERSON: Yes.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Treated on whatever
13 material. Eight feet up, eight feet tall.

14 MR. HENDERSON: My primary concern is with
15 this intersection here, this is Thompson. The fence
16 is going to be angled back from here, coming up.
17 There's actually not a stop sign here, strangely
18 enough. Everyone stops and looks this way.

19 MS. LANGLEY: Stop sign in other
20 direction.

21 MR. HENDERSON: The placement will be
22 sensitive.

23 MR. HERLONG: I have a question. I wonder
24 a little bit about that eight-foot tall fence looking
25 a little flat and severe. A little bit of planting

1 at the front of some very durable -- well, there's
2 some planting that's surviving. A little bit of
3 planting at the front of the fence of a proper hedge
4 like a recent submittal in the commercial district
5 would help it a lot, to soften the facade.

6 MR. HENDERSON: I'll mention that to Greg.
7 I think there is room between the edge of pavement
8 and some room between the property line.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: It grows up eventually. It
10 wouldn't have to be full size. It wouldn't have to
11 be expensive. It gains height as the years go by,
12 you know.

13 Because it will look a little bleak. It
14 will look a little intimidating because eight feet
15 tall, solid wood fence is like whoa. It's just, I
16 mean, very stockade. Like a stockade. Stockade is
17 like a jail when you think of it or, I don't know.

18 MS. WEBB: It's a big contrast between
19 that open field. It's like, boom, and then it's open
20 field.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: One could really build a
22 fence like that and do some like diamond shaped air
23 holes in it. I mean, just to free up your -- it
24 wouldn't cost anything. Just cut them in. You could
25 still hide all kind of trash in there. I think it

1 would just break it up. It wouldn't be a big deal.

2 MS. BOHAN: I was thinking if you go up
3 six feet and then something different on the top.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Still solid, if it had to
5 be solid. Like you say, just air holes that could be
6 high enough to where they sort of -- a circle,
7 diamond or whatever just to break it up. Massive,
8 you know. Something that wouldn't be expensive.

9 MR. HENDERSON: I'll relay your comments.
10 I know that the project has been funded to this point
11 for that specific design.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody putting the fence
13 up, the carpenter just putting the fence up could do
14 this, just lay it out. Make it look a little more
15 interesting. Whatever. You still can't see anything
16 behind it, you know. If I was a neighbor, I'd rather
17 look at that or driving down by it. Be nice to see
18 something without adding a big expense to the
19 project.

20 MS. BOHAN: Agree.

21 MR. HENDERSON: I'll relay those comments
22 to them.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Do we have to --

24 MR. HENDERSON: This is an item for
25 information.

1 STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR HISTORIC STRUCTURES

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Standards and Guidelines
3 for Historic Structures.

4 MR. HENDERSON: This is an agenda item
5 that we've actually been looking at through -- via a
6 study group of various Board members. We had Steve,
7 Billy and also Beverly sit in and form a study group
8 to look at some of these questions that were asked of
9 the DRB back, I believe in October, November of last
10 year.

11 And we've met three or four times to look
12 at basically these two questions here relating to
13 historic design guidelines. The question was whether
14 the town could benefit or whether the DRB and town
15 staff and citizens could benefit from the use of
16 historic design guidelines when we're talking to
17 folks in a conceptual manner before they buy
18 properties. Also when projects come in, come before
19 the Board.

20 Additionally, we identified at that time
21 that we were dealing with an issue involving the
22 elevating of a historic structure.

23 Also part of our study group was whether
24 we can do something to address elevating of historic
25 homes, most of the time to meet the base flood

1 elevation.

2 Just grappling with these questions
3 individually, after several meetings, what I've
4 gleaned from the study group was that design
5 guidelines are not recommended in general by our
6 study team.

7 And the reasons that were cited was that
8 the current process of using the Secretary of
9 Interior Standards for historical buildings,
10 reviewing historical buildings was sufficient in our
11 design review process.

12 On the table in front of you we have the
13 historic standards, the Secretary of Interior
14 standards. When we review our projects, we look at
15 each one of those standards and we make a decision.
16 We render a decision, as opposed to using historic
17 stand-alone set of guidelines to regulate the way we
18 make our decisions.

19 The other reason cited was that there are
20 very few historic structures in the commercial
21 district, and that our residential structures are
22 very unique and, thus, we need to review these design
23 reviews on a case-by-case basis using the Secretary
24 of Interior standards. Those were the reasons. You
25 guys can jump in and help me out here if you want.

1 Those are the main reasons of why we didn't think
2 that design guidelines were needed.

3 Another reason cited was that creating the
4 guidelines would be a very expensive process, a
5 lengthy process and possibly might be one of those
6 long-range goals for us.

7 We also, in dealing with the question of
8 elevating historic homes, we developed, to me, three
9 options for this. The first option to grapple with
10 this issue is to potentially increase the number of
11 incentives in our existing zoning ordinance.

12 Currently, as we well know, we have a
13 very, I guess, generous incentive to allow folks to
14 develop on lots that have very small historic
15 cottages. That's the accessory dwelling use special
16 exception.

17 And so the study team looked at the idea
18 of possibly raising the 1,200 square feet to 1,400 or
19 even eliminating the minimum or the maximum square
20 footage all together. If you have a historic
21 structure, then allow a second dwelling unit on the
22 lot no matter how big.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: You would subtract the
24 square footage from whatever. If you have 1,600
25 square foot house, you would be subtracting that

1 square footage from the --

2 MS. BOHAN: From the new structure.

3 MR. HENDERSON: That's right. That would
4 contribute to the underlying zoning standard maximum.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Right.

6 MR. HENDERSON: The other thing is to
7 change the ordinance to allow reconstruction of the
8 historic structure. Currently, it says if a historic
9 structure is burned or demolished by way of act of
10 God, you can't rebuild it whereas all other
11 nonconforming structures, if destroyed, can be
12 rebuilt. That's kind of a technical error. We need
13 to replace it. We need to fix anyway.

14 The third thing is to allow area increases
15 within the special exception. Currently there are no
16 discretionary increases allowed; principal building
17 coverage, square footage, or impervious surfaces.

18 First recommendation is to tweak, make
19 this more flexible, more of an incentive to property
20 owners.

21 The second one was to modify the historic
22 preservation of historic property section. To
23 encourage elevating, i.e., will allow you more square
24 footage if you leave the house where it is without
25 elevating it.

1 Option number two, to address the issue of
2 elevating homes is to create a standard or
3 guidelines, new standard or guideline within the RS
4 district section of the ordinance. This is a --
5 nobody can read this. I can barely read it.

6 So I took a crack initially at developing
7 a standard that would regulate how high you can
8 elevate a historic structure, limiting it to a
9 certain percentage.

10 The study group didn't like that because
11 there was a perceived legal issue. We had some
12 questions about whether we, as a town, could prohibit
13 someone from elevating a noncompliant structure to
14 meet FEMA standards.

15 And so it was changed essentially to be a
16 design guideline. The design guideline would allow
17 the Design Review Board to limit the height of the
18 elevation, review the composition and scale of the
19 structure.

20 So from the street frontage, if a building
21 is at a certain elevation and looks a certain way, if
22 it were to be elevated and taken back on the lot, if
23 it held the same scale that it had previously, then
24 it would be appropriate.

25 Perspective and orientation and scale and

1 minimization and architectural screening, this is
2 something that we do today. These are all elements
3 of what, I guess, a new design standard or guideline
4 could look like. That's the second recommendation.

5 And the third option for the town is to
6 hold off and wait until we get our new FEMA maps. We
7 hear that the flood zones are going to change. Going
8 from VE to AE. And possibly the base flood
9 elevations are going to decrease, which would lead to
10 fewer requests to elevate homes. That was another
11 recommendation from the study team.

12 MR. WRIGHT: We've been waiting for a long
13 time for this FEMA, new FEMA map. Randy, you've told
14 me that three years. I'm not blaming you.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: It's just FEMA. It's just
16 FEMA.

17 MR. WRIGHT: I know it is. Do we have any
18 idea?

19 MR. HENDERSON: Late August.

20 MR. ROBINSON: They are at FEMA right now,
21 scheduled to come out at the end of August.

22 MR. CLARK: 2015? '16, '17?

23 MR. ROBINSON: '16. And provided FEMA
24 doesn't have any problems with them and they
25 shouldn't because it's the same company that's been

1 developing other maps up and down the coast.
2 Charleston County is just the last one. So
3 it shouldn't be a problem.

4 MS. BOHAN: Number one city in the world.

5 MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, to
6 summarize, what we are requesting here today from
7 the Design Review Board is a formal recommendation
8 to forward to town council and also the land use
9 committee that will be meeting tomorrow morning at
10 8:30 related to historic design guidelines and some
11 of the treatments you would give to the ordinance
12 to address some of these issues. I would open it up
13 to you guys.

14 MR. HERLONG: I think it would be great to
15 have a good group discussion about some of the things
16 that this Board was recommending regarding the way to
17 incentivize people, who have a historic home, to
18 renovate that home and place. Everything is against
19 the person that has that historic home; FEMA, the 50
20 percent rule, insurance issues.

21 There are so many strikes against that
22 property that's historic that I think this town needs
23 to look at adding some incentives. And the reasoning
24 behind what we were saying was to -- right now, if a
25 home, existing historic home is 1,400 square feet,

1 automatically everybody starts looking for a way to
2 whittle it down to 1,200 square feet, which is a
3 very small structure.

4 And any existing home that's historic
5 that's 1,500 square feet, 1,800 square feet, doesn't
6 comply can't have the special exception. Our thought
7 process was, if we allow, if we create a higher
8 number, we incentivize people to renovate that
9 historic structure in place as it is and give them
10 the ability to build a smaller home on the site just
11 as the section allows now. But not reduce. Not only
12 allow it for the very small structures.

13 Otherwise, it's very difficult to sit in
14 front of people who own a property and tell them,
15 no, you can't do this. You can't have what -- the
16 amount of living area that your neighbors have. It's
17 a very difficult thing.

18 We're not -- we don't want you to
19 meet FEMA requirements. That's just an impossible
20 position I think for us to all be in.

21 We thought through some way of
22 incentivizing anyone who has a historic structure to
23 renovate it in place, we thought let's explore that
24 and take that as far as we can. And I think in the
25 meantime, wait on the FEMA maps and see really what

1 kind of situation we would have.

2 I think it was an even interesting
3 question that we were debating as a group: Well,
4 aren't you going to allow -- that's going to bring
5 more families on the island. The comment was, I
6 think, that's probably a good thing. There are very
7 few families that can afford to live in 2,000 square
8 foot home that can live on this island right now.

9 It will add some diversity to this
10 island to have two smaller homes on an island. I
11 don't really want to see an island where everybody
12 has a second home and they're all 5,000 square foot
13 homes. This place will turn into Kiawah if we don't
14 create some varied sized homes. Find some way to do
15 that. I thought that was a positive.

16 If you allow a larger historic home to
17 stay in place, give them a chance to build another
18 home on site. You've got a small family can live in
19 the new home. There's a nice home for another family
20 to live in or single people can live in. I think
21 that adds to diversity for the island which is
22 something we all struggle that the island is losing.
23 I think it's a win-win.

24 MR. HENDERSON: Would a conditional, say
25 hypothetically, 1,600 square foot historic structure,

1 would the condition be the house cannot be elevated,
2 we will grant you the ability to build the new house?
3 Is there a hard and fast condition applied to not
4 elevating the house?

5 THE CHAIRMAN: How would it react with the
6 FEMA and their flood premiums and everything? I
7 think we don't know.

8 MR. HENDERSON: We still might get
9 requests for folks to take advantage of the special
10 exception, if they still want to elevate that
11 historic structure.

12 MR. HERLONG: Again, that's where you
13 probably add language to take away any increases for
14 somebody who does that. It's hard to say you can't
15 do it. You've got to make it harder for them to do
16 that. They have more issues to deal with if they
17 want to go that route.

18 MR. HENDERSON: So is this option, is this
19 kind of what we agreed upon during our --

20 THE CHAIRMAN: It looks good to me. I
21 mean, it's still going to have to be discussed and
22 modified by town council.

23 MR. HERLONG: The issue here -- Billy
24 wrote a lot of that. He's not here. I think that's
25 basically what we were discussing.

1 MS. BOHAN: Yes.

2 MR. HENDERSON: Use this as a tool to
3 regulate, to keep the houses as they are.

4 I guess we could work in some -- the
5 intent of this revised section is to note
6 specifically that it's to keep houses where they are.
7 Not elevate the houses.

8 MR. WRIGHT: How is any of this going to
9 be impacted, good or bad, by whatever FEMA's changes
10 are? Does that enter into this decision process at
11 all? Seems to me like it would. Are we not going --
12 can we proceed without worrying about when the new
13 FEMA flood maps are published, changing FEMA
14 guidelines?

15 MS. BOHAN: There again it could change
16 after the election year. Anything could change.

17 MR. WRIGHT: I wasn't going to get
18 political.

19 MS. BOHAN: What I'm saying, it could
20 change next year or in four years, with all due
21 respect.

22 MR. HERLONG: On the other hand, I think
23 these types of changes would still be considered,
24 whatever the FEMA flood zone is.

25 MR. WRIGHT: That was my only question.

1 MR. HERLONG: It would still be a good
2 idea.

3 MS. BOHAN: I agree.

4 MR. WRIGHT: Can we move forward and not
5 be concerned about the FEMA issues?

6 MS. BOHAN: Exactly. I agree.

7 MR. HENDERSON: Absolutely. I think the
8 idea here is that you keep the house where it is. So
9 the 50 percent rule would still apply. FEMA would
10 still have oversight over that.

11 If you go over that 50 percent, they still
12 require you to bring the house up, unless you get a
13 variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals, which we
14 don't encourage because it affects our rating as an
15 entire town.

16 Yes, we can do this, and FEMA still has
17 their standards that we need to comply with.

18 MR. ROBINSON: Just to give you an idea,
19 if we had two in one year period --

20 MR. HERLONG: Variances.

21 MR. ROBINSON: Two variances in a one year
22 period, and we didn't have over 20 homes built that
23 year, then we would be kicked out of the CRS program
24 all together. That's the kicker.

25 City of Charleston, they can do it because

1 they're building thousands of homes a year. If they
2 have a few variances, it's not a big deal. If we had
3 ten structures that are noncompliant -- two
4 structures that are noncompliant, that's 10 percent
5 of 20, they kick us out of the program.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: We just can't let that
7 happen.

8 MR. ROBINSON: No, we can't let that
9 happen. It's way too much benefit to the town.

10 MR. HENDERSON: Option one addresses an
11 incentive to offer property owners.

12 Option two is a process by which we review
13 requests for elevating structures. We would use
14 these standards here to look at individual projects
15 and make sure the height wasn't out of character, the
16 composition and scale was correct, perspective and
17 orientation was right. And then you do things around
18 the site to minimize the impact of the elevating.

19 We did some of that with 1102 Osceola, if
20 you recall. What are your thoughts about this, what
21 we talked about here with the design standard? Is
22 that pretty accurate?

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, I think it's good.

24 MR. HERLONG: Since it's hard to read,
25 it's hard to comment. The concept was good.

1 MR. CLARK: It's the government. We don't
2 read it until after it's approved.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Billy wrote that; right?

4 MR. HENDERSON: Billy helped modify. I
5 drafted the initial version. It was more of a
6 standard initially; that shall not elevate the house
7 more than 75 percent of the height of the foundation,
8 et cetera, et cetera, DRB can grant X amount of
9 modification to that standard.

10 And Billy and the group didn't feel that
11 was good because we're running contrary to FEMA
12 regulations. And then we fall back into the variance
13 scenario.

14 MS. WEBB: When FEMA changes, this is
15 going to be significant. It may be a nonissue. I
16 mean, you go over Daniel Island where it's all A zone
17 and the houses are only a little bit off of the
18 ground. I don't know if there's a way to -- I hate
19 to wait if it's another year before we hear from
20 FEMA. If it's August, we're only talking six weeks
21 away, possibly. That is going to change it
22 significantly in terms of building.

23 MR. ROBINSON: Some of the stuff from what
24 I've seen so far, there are some properties on this
25 island that are V-17 and they're going to A-13.

1 That's huge.

2 And for years I've been using these maps
3 and telling people that Hugo was not the big 100-year
4 storm. And all these experts were saying, yes, Hugo
5 was the 100-year storm force. Based on our old flood
6 maps, it was not.

7 Now these new flood maps reflect pretty
8 much what Hugo did. That puts Hugo at one percent or
9 100-year storm. I'm just on the edge of my seat. I
10 can't wait to get these maps. If they are what I
11 think they're going to be, the majority of Sullivan's
12 Island is going to be in A zone.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: That's my understanding.
14 Some parts that are going to be in a B zone or
15 something. Or nonflood zone.

16 MR. ROBINSON: X zone. We may have some X
17 zones.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: That's pretty amazing.

19 MR. ROBINSON It will be huge. The reason
20 the maps were held up -- do y'all know why we waited
21 so long? They did these maps and they did them with
22 a lidar data. Lidar is where they shoot from a plane
23 and they shoot all the different elevation points.

24 The lidar data they originally used was
25 ten points, the size of this trailer. They shot ten

1 different points the size of this trailer.

2 The new lidar data that came out after
3 they had really done these maps, it was doing 100
4 points in the size of this trailer. The data was so
5 much better. So FEMA was like: Why are we approving
6 maps using old data when we have this really good new
7 data.

8 These maps are going to be -- they're
9 based off of that new data, which is awesome. So
10 it's a good thing that we got pushed back because
11 what we have is so much more accurate. Anyway,
12 that's the reason.

13 MR. HENDERSON: I blew this up a little
14 bit. I can go through what we dealt with, with the
15 study group, if you would like.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: I think it's fine. I think
17 it needs to be submitted and talked about. Let's
18 just do it.

19 MR. HENDERSON: Just the general idea is
20 to apply some type of standards by which to review
21 projects for elevating historic structures. Option
22 three is about the release of the maps.

23 Regarding the historic design guidelines,
24 again, we use those ten standards for all historic
25 projects. Can I get a little feedback from you guys

1 about whether you think historic design guidelines
2 would benefit the island in the future or really what
3 are your views for how we apply the ten Secretary of
4 Interior standards when we look at these projects?

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Again, we live on such an
6 eclectic island and the houses that are deemed
7 historic -- other than officers quarters, which are
8 one thing. All the various styles of it. It's hard
9 to categorize these houses. I think we all -- I
10 think we've got a good lock on what's historic and
11 what's not.

12 Also, the idea this is such an eclectic
13 island, we're not in an airtight box, and this is
14 Sullivan's Island. This is not some pure community
15 of historical structures, by any means. Quite
16 frankly, adds to the interest and liveability and
17 beauty of Sullivan's island. It's going to be hard
18 to draw up, follow guidelines that, you know, on
19 what? How are they going to be talked about or
20 applied?

21 MR. HERLONG: I think it's going to be a
22 painful process. You're going to have to hire a
23 consultant to come in and start interviewing and
24 start having town meetings just like we did. Town
25 meetings to identify what these guidelines should

1 say. And for such a small group of private
2 residents.

3 It's one thing if there were more public
4 buildings.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: The process is just not
6 broken.

7 MR. HERLONG: We don't have that much.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: The process is not broken.
9 The Design Review Board has done a damn good job over
10 the years. Certainly there's maybe been some
11 mistakes, things we might want to do differently and
12 all. That's going to be anything, hell. People are
13 going to run through here and not everything is going
14 to be liked. And certainly not everything is going
15 to be to everybody's liking. That's the way it is in
16 life.

17 We've done a necessary good job to hold
18 the line, I think, with what we've had in zoning and
19 everything else.

20 I do like Steve's recent observation that
21 we might want to have even more control over
22 everything that's --

23 MR. HERLONG: We'll talk about that next.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: We'll talk about that next.
25 I don't know that we need to remake or add to our --

1 the complexity we deal with anyway. I think this
2 Design Review Board reflects what Sullivan's Island
3 is and it's an eclectic and generally forgiving way
4 of living and all. We're trying to hold the line
5 against bad taste or certainly destruction of
6 historic properties.

7 I just don't know that we need anything
8 further in that process.

9 MR. HENDERSON: Again, I'll be forwarding
10 these ideas that we generated from the study group to
11 the land use committee tomorrow at 8:30. I welcome
12 any of you to come, if you can.

13 Also keep in mind, in talking about
14 historic design guidelines, we'll be rewriting the
15 comprehensive plan in 2018.

16 As part of that, there's a cultural
17 resources element which deals with historic
18 resources, what we have on the island. And historic
19 preservation is a big part of that element.

20 I think that we'll need to define one way
21 or the other whether we see the island needing to
22 build on guidelines or building on some kind of idea
23 of the building stock here, the historic buildings
24 that we have, and how we are going to deal with that
25 in the next 20 years or 30 years. We'll be

1 addressing it at some point through that process, I
2 believe. So give that some thought.

3 Are there any other comments about what
4 I'm going to forward to the land use committee?

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Thank you, Joe.

6 MR. HERLONG: One other. Go ahead.

7 MR. CLARK: I was just going to ask if
8 there's any clarification questions. Time for
9 clarification questions from the audience or do you
10 do that here?

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Sure, yeah. What do you
12 need, Chauncy?

13 MR. CLARK: You answered a question about
14 the 50 percent rule. In other words, they're going
15 to have to raise the house if they do over 50 percent
16 to the house. That comes back to Osceola, which is
17 17 feet in the air. Some of these houses are way up
18 there. On that property that's where it had to be
19 for FEMA; is that correct?

20 MR. HENDERSON: Right.

21 MR. HERLONG: Those properties at the end
22 of the island are on very low ground and in a very
23 high zone. They look very awkward. I've been
24 involved in some projects over there that are just
25 awkward.

1 MR. CLARK: There's no way a homeowner can
2 get around that if they put 50 percent into it. Can
3 they legally stay on the ground and pay extra fee or
4 they have to raise it up?

5 MR. HERLONG: If you're going to do work
6 on that historic structure --

7 THE CHAIRMAN: You have to raise it. You
8 don't have a choice.

9 MR. HERLONG: Again, that's my reasoning
10 for that other section where, give them a better
11 option to keep the house and where it is, renovate it
12 to 50 percent.

13 MR. CLARK: Up to 50 percent.

14 MR. HERLONG: Up to 50 percent to stay low
15 and give them the ability to build a separate house.

16 MR. CLARK: The key is keep it below 50
17 percent.

18 MR. HERLONG: That one stays where it is
19 and low and still build and develop your property.

20 MR. CLARK: Second clarification question.
21 Steve, you mentioned that you would have two homes on
22 a lot and two families on a lot. Are you talking fee
23 simple or are you talking rental? How does that
24 work? We don't allow division.

25 MR. HERLONG: One owner that has a house

1 and a rental.

2 MR. HENDERSON: That would be part of the
3 special exception. That's a condition of the special
4 exception that it's deed restricted.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: We don't want to open it
6 up.

7 MR. CLARK: Two families of separate DNA
8 is a rental deal you're talking about?

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

10 MR. HENDERSON: It has to be owner
11 occupied as well.

12 MR. CLARK: One of the houses has to be
13 owner occupied.

14 MR. HENDERSON: That's right.

15 MR. CLARK: The owner could live in the
16 small house and rent the big house or vice-versa.
17 But he has to be owner-occupied.

18 MR. HENDERSON: No, the owner has to live
19 in the principal building while renting out the
20 accessory dwelling unit, the historic structure.

21 MR. CLARK: Is that in the regs or is that
22 an assumption?

23 MR. ROBINSON: That's what it says.

24 MR. HENDERSON: That's a condition of the
25 ordinance.

1 MR. CLARK: For example, retired couple,
2 income property, business.

3 MR. HERLONG: We had a discussion.
4 There's a previous council person family came to me,
5 they have property on the island, 2,500 square foot
6 home. And 600 square foot rental on the opposite
7 street. They're approaching retirement. They would
8 like to make some small additions to their little
9 dwelling, 600 square foot dwelling and retire there
10 in place and then have the retirement income in the
11 home that they rent. They can't do that. None of
12 that is allowed right now.

13 I'm thinking that's where the ordinance
14 needs to be reviewed because here we have an older
15 couple who would love to retire in place on the
16 island but the island needs to tweak some of the
17 ordinances to allow that. That's not allowed right
18 now. You can't add anything to that little 600
19 square foot historic structure.

20 MR. CLARK: I brought it up not because
21 I'm old and retired. I'm thinking of others that
22 are.

23 MS. BOHAN: Joe, are you suggesting
24 there's not one, two or three options that we would
25 project? It would be a combination?

1 MR. HENDERSON: It could be.

2 MS. BOHAN: I agree.

3 MR. HENDERSON: These are multiple ways we
4 can address it.

5 MS. BOHAN: Parts and pieces as necessary.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Thank you. All
7 right, Steve.

8 MR. HERLONG: I wanted to bring up a point
9 and discuss it with the Board. It's even better
10 there's council members here, Design Review Board and
11 the public that's here.

12 When we get these applications for new
13 homes, we're finding that the reason they're here is
14 because they want some relief from us; generally,
15 relief to build a larger home. And often that might
16 be coming from a builder who wants to build a spec
17 home.

18 Over the last six months or so, I've been
19 struggling with some of the applications that have
20 come before the Board. What we're seeing are some
21 uninspired designs that come before the Board wanting
22 to get relief. And the Board gives them some good
23 options. Usually the Board is going to say: Maybe
24 let's lower that second floor roof. Let's get that
25 wall height down to reduce the appearance in height.

1 The problem we've seen is these projects
2 go away. They leave the Review Board and they go
3 straight to town and they build 4,000 and 4,100
4 square foot uninspired home. And it's not good for
5 the communities they're in, not good for the
6 island to have these out-of-character homes.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Poorly designed.

8 MR. HERLONG: Poorly designed boxes is
9 what we're beginning to see as the economy changes.
10 And so I think we should make some change that
11 doesn't involve any square footage discussion at all.

12 What I did, I went to the ordinance here
13 now and I looked under Section 21-36. Surprisingly
14 when all of this was done originally, this concern
15 was in here. Somebody wrote in a requirement to
16 limit the eave height.

17 And I'm proposing we take that section,
18 which is a guideline, and let's make it a standard.
19 So that when someone wants to come in to the island,
20 build a 3,800, 4,100 square foot home and doesn't
21 want to come to the Review Board, we need to have
22 something else in the ordinance that assures the
23 house will look better and have a character that
24 fits the island.

25 I've written some language here that

1 everybody can read that I've tried to make as
2 absolutely simple as possible that will force people
3 to either build a one-and-a-half, basically
4 one-and-a-half story home or a home that has a second
5 floor and dormers.

6 Everybody is not going to want that. Some
7 people would want a tall home. And a well-designed
8 tall home, we see those get approve when they're well
9 designed.

10 If somebody doesn't want that, they come
11 to the Review Board and request relief to build what
12 they want. If it's done well enough, they likely get
13 their approval.

14 MR. HENDERSON: 100 percent modification
15 of this standard would allow them to go above the
16 five feet to have the full size second story wall.

17 MR. HERLONG: Basically what the Design
18 Review Board, if anybody doesn't want to apply by
19 21-36, they come to the Review Board and we all deal
20 with it.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: It's either that or we just
22 eliminate anybody being able to build anything.
23 Everything has to come before us.

24 MS. BOHAN: Exactly.

25 MR. HERLONG: That is another option.

1 MS. BOHAN: I was thinking that.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: I mean, certainly a lot of
3 things that staff level would decide. All new homes,
4 let's say, just comes before the Design Review Board.

5 MR. HERLONG: Then a discussion
6 occasionally.

7 MS. BOHAN: Which I think is a great idea.

8 MR. HENDERSON: Steve, can you think of
9 any houses, second story, five-foot wall out there
10 that we can maybe pull up on a streetscape? Can you
11 think of any?

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Sammy's house just come
13 before us.

14 MR. HERLONG: The second floor of that
15 house is sitting inside the main roof line. So the
16 main roof of that house comes down to the first
17 floor, second floor plate basically.

18 We had this discussion about the new town
19 hall. You know, we chose the version where the main
20 roof comes lower and all of the second floor space is
21 up in the roof line in dormers or gables or whatever.

22 MR. HENDERSON: This may be better. Right
23 here. This is the --

24 MR. HERLONG: There's the second floor.
25 That wall goes up.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Fire wall.

2 MR. HERLONG: That dormer in the absolute
3 middle of drawing may be bigger than what I wrote
4 here. I created a percentage of the wall that needs
5 to come all the way down versus becomes dormer.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: It might be easier to just
7 eliminate. Then everybody has to come before us. As
8 far as trying to have --

9 MR. HENDERSON: This would be the
10 standard. If they wanted to go higher with their
11 wall, they would come request 100 percent relief?

12 MR. HERLONG: They would come request
13 whatever relief they need.

14 MR. HENDERSON: 75 percent or what have
15 you.

16 MR. HERLONG: I'm saying that's an option.
17 Try to make a change that everything comes before the
18 Review Board. I think there's going to be a lot of
19 discussion and a little bit of push-back here and
20 there by residents.

21 This couldn't be simpler in my thought
22 process to get adjusted fairly quickly. Might be
23 that we want to eventually have everything come
24 before the DRB. This could be -- the Board could
25 request that it be discussed by town council and see

1 if they want to implement it.

2 This is very simple to change. It doesn't
3 involve the first discussion about square footage of
4 house, size of house. It's just about the second
5 floor wall height, which would make a huge change in
6 the way certain homes would look. You're almost
7 guaranteeing they wouldn't be too ugly.

8 MR. WRIGHT: I think we should move
9 forward.

10 MR. ROBINSON: When we adopted this
11 ordinance, the comment was that we don't want to stop
12 people from building dome houses. Has that changed?

13 MR. HERLONG: That's where the Design
14 Review Board -- if somebody wants to come build a
15 dome house, they can bring it to the Design Review
16 Board. This stops people from building a dome house.

17 MR. ROBINSON: It does.

18 MS. BEVERLY: Randy, how many homes have
19 come before you in the last year without coming to
20 the Design Review Board and have been approved?

21 MR. HENDERSON: Not many.

22 MR. ROBINSON: Not many. Probably what?

23 MR. HENDERSON: Five or six.

24 MR. ROBINSON: I was about to say four or
25 five. I mean, not many.

1 MS. WEBB: The general perception, unless
2 someone has been through the process, I would bet
3 that most people, 75 percent think that everything
4 does come before the DRB. You know what I mean?
5 Unless you've been through the process. I don't
6 know. We may not get a lot of push-back.

7 MR. ROBINSON: If you look in the intent
8 of the ordinances, it says that all homes should
9 be -- should come to the Design Review Board. It's
10 in the intent. There's no meat.

11 MR. HENDERSON: Conceptual.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: In the Old Village, Mount
13 Pleasant, everything comes before them. These gated
14 communities, Kiawah, Wild Dunes, everything comes
15 before them no matter what size.

16 MS. WEBB: Our goal is to, these ones
17 where they're asking for relief is to have more
18 neighborhood compatibility. You're basically, it's
19 like a slap for someone who is doing something a
20 little bigger, more expensive or whatever versus you
21 can go basically roll in a trailer, you know.
22 There's no neighborhood compatibility to that. I'm
23 for it anyway.

24 MS. BOHAN: I am, too. Good idea.

25 MR. O'NEIL: It might be worth noting, as

1 some of you that weren't around at the creation as
2 some of you clearly were, when we came up with Design
3 Review, that was a pretty radical idea. It had a lot
4 of opposition. I'm not trying to justify what we
5 got. I think it's remarkable how far we've come in
6 that time.

7 There was a lot of push-back to having any
8 design review. There's a lot of push-back to having
9 any second structure. That's how we wound up with
10 1,200 square feet. That was about the only way we
11 could get a majority of council to allow any second
12 structures to help preserve historic structures.

13 This seems like a -- obviously council
14 needed to talk about planning commission. This
15 certainly seems like some natural evolution in our
16 approach to design on the island. Y'all remember
17 what the battles were like.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Yep. All right. Anything
19 more? Can we wrap it up here?

20 MR. WRIGHT: What are we wrapping up?

21 THE CHAIRMAN: The whole thing so I can go
22 home.

23 MR. WRIGHT: What are addressing now?

24 MR. HENDERSON: If I could just have a
25 general motion to move forward with the

1 recommendations to town council regarding the design
2 guidelines and the options.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. We've already sort
4 of.

5 MR. WRIGHT: I make a motion that we move
6 forward with the design guidelines proposed by Steve,
7 and with the presentation that you made, and that
8 this Board unanimously support going forward to the
9 town council.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Is that good for you?

11 MR. HENDERSON: That works.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Do I hear a second?

13 MR. HERLONG: I second.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Everybody in favor?

15 (All present Board members stated aye.)

16 THE CHAIRMAN: We're adjourned.

17 (The meeting was concluded at 7:21 p.m.)
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

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

I, Lora McDaniel, Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public for the State of South Carolina at Large, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true, accurate, and complete record.

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

Witness my hand, I have hereunto affixed my official seal this 26th day of July, 2016 at Charleston, Charleston County, South Carolina.



Lora L. McDaniel,
Registered Professional Reporter
My Commission expires:
September 18, 2016

I N D E X

	Page
1914 MIDDLE STREET	3
2414 JASPER BOULEVARD	10
2002 I'ON AVENUE	23
TOSI WATER AND SEWER FACILITY	26
STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR HISTORIC STRUCTURES	32

E X H I B I T S

(No Exhibits Proffered)

A
A

|

A
A

|

A
A

|

A
A

|

