

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
SULLIVAN'S ISLAND, SOUTH CAROLINA
MEETING MINUTES FROM MAY 16, 2012

DATE: MAY 16, 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

SULLIVAN'S ISLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MAY 16, 2012

MR. ILDERTON: This is the May 16th, 2012 meeting of the Sullivan's Island Design Review Board. Members in attendance are Duke Wright, Pat Ilderton, Steve Herlong, Kelly Messier, Rhonda Sanders, and Billy Craver. The Freedom of Information requirements have been met for the meeting. First item on the agenda is the approval of the April minutes.

MR. CRAVER: So moved.

MR. HERLONG: Second.

MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor?

ALL: Aye.

MR. ILDERTON: 1820 I'on.

MR. ROBINSON: 1820 I'on. This property has been to you-all, I believe, a couple of times before. The owner, Andy Segal, is here to present it. It is in a National Registered District. It's also in the Sullivan's Island historic district. It's land mark structure number 206. Applicant would like to change the window sizes to accommodate a kitchen remodel. The windows on this particular side of

APPEARANCES

- MR. PAT ILDERTON, Chair
- MR. STEVE HERLONG, Vice Chair
- MR. DUKE WRIGHT, Secretary
- MS. RHONDA SANDERS, Member
- MS. KELLY MESSIER, Member
- MR. BILLY CRAVER, Member

ALSO PRESENT: KAT KENYON, Permit Tech/DRB Applications

PROPERTIES INDEX

- 1. 1820 I'on, window replacement in a historic structure
- 2. 1902 Central Avenue, door replacement in a historical structure
- 3. 1710 Atlantic, new construction
- 4. 402 Station 19, new construction
- 5. 2408 I'on, add/alt on a historic structure
- 6. 1850 Flag Street, add/alt
- 7. 2330 Middle, new construction
- 8. 2308 Jasper, new construction

the house -- there was a porch, and they -- at some point down the road, they infilled this so the windows are not original to the structure. That's all I have. I will let the applicant speak.

MR. ILDERTON: Yes, sir.

MR. SEGAL: Andy Segal. Thank you for the opportunity to present. Pretty much what Randy said, the reasoning behind it is that the windows come so low to the floor that if we are going to put counters tops in, we would have to run across the windows, and it would be awkward looking to do that. And the porch itself is very minuscule to begin with. And I think scaling those windows down might even look better. It's an option. We're not even sure that that's going to be the final way to go.

If we can keep the windows the way they are and get around it, so be it. But we have messed around with so many different designs, that there are only 22 inches off the floor. You really need counter height 36 plus a backsplash. Shorten the windows by about 14 or 16 inches, all wood windows. Keep them the same.

Like Randy said, where the porch ended, somebody bumped it out another three feet to make

1 some extra room in there and then just filled it in
2 with the windows. So they really aren't of value
3 to the house. And we would just like to get
4 permission to go ahead and change those if that's
5 possible.

6 MR. ILDERTON: Any public comment?
7 Okay. Public comment section closed. Anything to
8 add, Randy?

9 MR. ROBINSON: I don't have anything.

10 MR. ILDERTON: Duke?

11 MR. WRIGHT: I have looked at this
12 house several times. I think I meet the owner a
13 couple of times. Even though this is a very
14 historic house, structure, it's been modified so
15 many times, it has lost its original identity,
16 which is fine to me because I think it's a lot
17 better now than it was several years ago. So I
18 have no trouble.

19 MR. ILDERTON: I also have no trouble
20 with this house. It has been so well maintained
21 and kept up that the -- maybe it's not an -- it's
22 an octagon house or -- it has been -- it is in good
23 hands I think. So I have no problem with it also.
24 Steve?

25 MR. HERLONG: I think they're still in

1 of the reasons I would have given staff approval on
2 this -- but I felt that, you know, maybe you-all
3 ought to look at it. Since this is the first door
4 replacement, it might dictate what the other doors
5 around that structure are. And it probably should
6 come to you-all.

7 There's been a progression on this side
8 of the structure actually where it was a screen
9 porch -- I mean, it was an open porch at one time
10 and then it was infilled to make an office. And
11 somewhere between Hurricane Hugo and now, that was
12 removed and made a screen porch -- or an open porch
13 again. So any way, I will let the applicant
14 present to you and save any comments for later.

15 MR. ILDERTON: Is the applicant here?

16 MR. FRAMPTON: Wyman Frampton. I was
17 before you-all in another matter.

18 MR. ILDERTON: Yes, sir.

19 MR. FRAMPTON: Basically this was a
20 door that was -- at close inspection, it was a door
21 that was added at some other point. It was a
22 little french door. It had no security, and we
23 could see gaps the whole way around it. You can
24 push it in really -- it had a little thumb latch on
25 it. And I'm renovating the house, and this

1 proportion with the structure, and I think they --
2 as you say, may actually be a better proportion
3 than what's there now.

4 MS. MESSIER: It's fine with me. I
5 think all of the improvements you have done have
6 been great so far.

7 MR. ILDERTON: Rhonda?

8 MS. SANDERS: Looks good.

9 MR. CRAVER: I'm good.

10 MR. ILDERTON: All right. Let's hear
11 it.

12 MR. WRIGHT: I move the applicant's
13 application be approved as submitted.

14 MR. CRAVER: Second.

15 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor?

16 ALL: Aye.

17 MR. ILDERTON: 1902 Central, door
18 replacement.

19 MR. ROBINSON: 1902 Central, it's in
20 the Sullivan's Island historic district, but it's
21 not in a national registered district. It is a
22 landmark structure, number 233. The applicants are
23 asking for the approval of the design for a side
24 door on this structure. I'm not sure what kind of
25 doors were on this structure originally. And one

1 particular room trying to insulate, new beadboard,
2 and I wanted to replace the door.

3 You know, I think -- I liked Randy's
4 comment on so much has been changed on this house,
5 I'm a little frustrated in knowing what in the
6 world -- where I'm going with this house. This
7 door was originally cut off, and then it was fit in
8 the opening, and then the opening was closed in. I
9 mean, there was a 2-by-4 actually for a threshold
10 that you would have to step over to get out onto
11 the porch. And the original rough opening was
12 blocked in with some fairly recent 2-by-4s. So I
13 actually had a door that was out on the porch that
14 I got from Southern Lumber, which I thought was
15 going to fit in beautifully with the room, custom
16 made door. And then was informed that maybe that's
17 not the door for the spot. So I went to Withers
18 Industries and had them design a door -- this is
19 the original door I think you-all have that. And
20 this is where it is on the house on the side. And
21 they designed a door that would pretty much
22 duplicate it. It's not a French door. It is a
23 solid door, but it does have the V down the middle
24 to try to duplicate it. So I do need the rails
25 wide enough to put a lock set on, so the rails are

1 just a little bit wider than the original door.
2 But, you know, this is the problem I am having
3 because all of the doors on this house have been
4 replaced at some point and certainly unoriginal to
5 the house.

6 And I need a feeling on what I can do
7 to this house without coming to the architectural
8 review board each time I want to change something
9 out. Like I have PVC gutting, do I need to -- if
10 I'm going to replace it, do I need to --

11 MR. ILDERTON: I would like to think
12 not.

13 MR. FRAMPTON: That's all I have.
14 Certainly this door I have, if there's any way that
15 could be okayed for this opening, I would
16 appreciate it. I will order a custom made door if
17 you feel it's more suitable.

18 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, sir. Is
19 there any public comment to this application?
20 Public comment section is closed.

21 Randy?

22 MR. ROBINSON: Nothing.

23 MR. ILDERTON: Billy?

24 MR. CRAVER: I'm okay with it. I like
25 the -- I say I'm okay with it. I like the design

1 they're bigger is all I can say. The opening is
2 bigger, and they fit, and we're leaving them there.

3 MS. MESSIER: Are they French doors?

4 MR. FRAMPTON: They are French doors.

5 MS. MESSIER: Are they the same design?

6 MR. FRAMPTON: Same design.

7 MS. SANDERS: These are the same.

8 MS. MESSIER: I don't know. They don't
9 look the same to me.

10 MS. SANDERS: They don't look the same
11 to me either. They look like regular doors.

12 MS. MESSIER: I mean, you see like four
13 doors here.

14 MR. FRAMPTON: Off the living room
15 there are two French doors then there's the front
16 door.

17 MS. MESSIER: This one is the front?

18 MR. FRAMPTON: Yes. Then there's a
19 window, then the corner of the house. I'm sorry
20 for the picture, but that's all I had.

21 MS. SANDERS: The reason for my
22 question is if none of the windows and doors are
23 historic, I don't really see what the difference is
24 unless you want to try to, you know, make them
25 all --

1 of the door that's there. If that's what the
2 historic door was, I guess it ought to be
3 duplicated. I mean, this is a fairly historic
4 house. I can't believe I'm saying that, Randy.

5 MR. ILDERTON: I can't believe you're
6 saying it either.

7 MR. CRAVER: It is totally
8 uncharacteristic of me, but it is. So I get to
9 surprise everybody.

10 MR. ILDERTON: Rhonda?

11 MS. SANDERS: You said this is not the
12 historic door? None of the doors are historic?

13 MR. FRAMPTON: Well, I can tell you
14 there was modern 2-by-4s blocking in the rough
15 opening to set this door in that had been salvaged
16 from where -- somewhere else. There's no question
17 about it.

18 MS. SANDERS: The 2-by-4s or the
19 doors -- I mean, so all of the doors are replaced
20 so we don't know what the historic ones were?

21 MR. FRAMPTON: I have no idea.

22 MR. CRAVER: Are there other doors on
23 that porch that have the same bottom like that?

24 MR. FRAMPTON: There are two doors on
25 the front that are similar, but they fit. And

1 MR. FRAMPTON: Well, the front door is
2 certainly not historic. It's a stock door. The
3 kitchen door is an old stock door. There's a
4 bedroom door that's a salvaged two-panel door. I
5 mean, you can see they have been all cut down to
6 fit the openings. And that's how all of the doors
7 are in the interior of the house too.

8 MS. SANDERS: I guess my point is if
9 none of these are historic, I don't see any point
10 in dictating that this one should be replicated to
11 the one historic one that was refurbished.

12 MR. FRAMPTON: Exactly.

13 MS. SANDERS: That's all.

14 MR. ILDERTON: Kelly?

15 MS. MESSIER: Personally I would prefer
16 to see French doors going back in because I'm just
17 the kind of person that if you are trying to make
18 it look like a French door and you're going to have
19 it custom made, why don't you get custom made ones
20 that work. But I suppose if it looks like it -- I
21 don't know. Maybe it doesn't make any difference.

22 But, you know, I would think that
23 you're going with this because it is a historic
24 structure, we need to put something back in that's
25 in keeping with the -- and I think the door that

1 you chose -- I mean, it is appropriate, you know,
2 because you may be replacing these others as you --

3 MR. FRAMPTON: At some point I am going
4 to have to replace the doors because there's no
5 security. I mean, all they have is a little thumb
6 latch, literally. You can put your knee against
7 the door and push the doors in.

8 MR. ILDERTON: Steve?

9 MR. HERLONG: I tend to agree with
10 Kelly. The most appropriate solution is replacing
11 that door with French doors. However, this door, I
12 think, is a suitable alternative. I think it
13 matches the other doors. It has the right
14 portions. So I would be okay with it.

15 MR. ILDERTON: I also would be okay
16 with the Withers design door. I think it could be
17 problematic putting the other door in, although,
18 it's a very attractive door that Southern had. I
19 would be okay with Withers' door design.

20 MR. WRIGHT: I agree with what has been
21 said.

22 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a motion?

23 MR. HERLONG: I move that we approve
24 the submittal to use the door shown in the shop
25 drawing.

1 are asking for several increases on the side
2 setback, they are asking for the full 25 percent
3 relief side second floor setback, they're asking
4 for 100 percent relief on that. Principal building
5 coverage, they're asking for 2.3 percent relief.
6 And impervious coverage, I'm not sure exactly where
7 this goes, but they do say the grass pavers are,
8 you know, in the drive or park, which are really
9 pervious. You-all, know how it goes with that.

10 Anyway, the principal building square
11 footage, they're asking for almost 100 percent
12 relief. The most you-all can give them is 24.9.
13 And you-all are allowed to give 25 percent. Also,
14 they're asking for the foundation height -- an
15 extra foot on the foundation height. So it's a
16 very complicated application, and I just -- you-all
17 can look it over and ask questions, and I will be
18 here to answer any questions.

19 But in looking it over, I was a little
20 confused with some of the things and maybe the
21 architect can explain some of those things to you.

22 MR. ILDERTON: Yes, sir.

23 MR. TUCKER: Chuckie Tucker, architect
24 located in Charleston. I'm here representing the
25 owner, Mark Fulkman, who's in back. And as Randy

1 MR. WRIGHT: Second.

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

4 ALL: Aye.

5 MR. ILDERTON: 1710 Atlantic, new
6 construction.
7 Randy?

8 MR. ROBINSON: Okay. 1710 Atlantic. I
9 looked this application over. They're a new home,
10 they're outside of the historical district. It's
11 not a historical structure. There's an existing
12 home there that they're going to demolish and then
13 build this new home. I believe that a lot of the
14 design here is predicated upon the front of the
15 house being designated as I'on Avenue. You know,
16 we designate the front of the house as Atlantic
17 Avenue. So I think that's the first hurdle you-all
18 need to get over is where the front of this house
19 is. Because if the front of the house is on
20 Atlantic Avenue, then the pool, which it goes down
21 the length of the front of this house, is in the
22 front yard, and pools in the front yard are not
23 allowed.

24 There's also a roof deck on the top
25 that I want you-all to look at. Let's see. They

1 pointed out, there's a lot of sort of complex
2 issues. And he zoned in on sort of the biggest
3 one, the frontage of the building.

4 And I think you will probably see we
5 have developed the plans a little bit more since
6 the submittal about a month ago, and this is
7 located between I'on and Atlantic. But directly
8 across the street on I'on is the Officer's Row. So
9 we sort of feel that, although, we meet all of the
10 setbacks for the 45 degrees, all of those issues
11 for the Atlantic Avenue address, we feel that the
12 house is actually fronting I'on. It's fronting the
13 Officer's Row.

14 And I think one thing that we have
15 done, which I think is a vast improvement from the
16 drawing you have is we have introduced a front -- I
17 will call it the front, the I'on Avenue elevation
18 front porches. And I think why that's fairly
19 successful is it -- if we're thinking of that as
20 the front elevation, the porches are obviously
21 encouraged by the regulations. And I also feel
22 like this makes a -- you can see from these revised
23 elevations, it's a nod to the formality of
24 Officer's Row. It's fairly symmetric, almost
25 classic in the elevation.

1 And as Randy pointed out, the opposite
2 side, Atlantic Avenue, several adjacent properties
3 do not have any access to their houses aside from
4 the corner. The corner lot has a fairly prominent
5 stair. The buildings to the east sort of turn
6 their back to Atlantic Avenue. And we feel,
7 although, it's also a formal elevation, it's a
8 little more open. It's south facing. Probably
9 from the higher elevations there will be little
10 views of the beach across Atlantic Avenue.

11 As far as the -- I don't know if I
12 should address all of the requests we have or do
13 you want to do that by -- do you want to ask me
14 specifically about the increases? It's obviously a
15 fairly tight lot. It's 80 feet pinched at I'on,
16 opens up to a little over 100 at Atlantic. And
17 because we are under that -- since it is a small
18 lot, all of those calculations kick in for the lots
19 under 15,000 square feet.

20 MR. ILDERTON: Well, like you say, we
21 may have questions as this develops, and you may
22 want to respond, you know, to either us or anybody
23 in the audience. And maybe we will get some more
24 clarification about exactly what is going on.

25 Is there public comment to this

1 and I'm standing on I'on, I'm to the left of that
2 house.

3 MR. HERLONG: East of that house.

4 MR. TUCKER: And obviously I understand
5 your concerns for setback. We are -- and I felt
6 that it was -- the house just orients best on the
7 lot furthest to the west, which means we are asking
8 for the minimum 10 foot setback on this west
9 property line. And then we're getting more
10 distance -- I don't have that right in front of me,
11 but I think it's 13 or 14 feet off of your side.

12 Also the lot is somewhat pie shaped, so
13 the closer you get back to Atlantic Avenue -- just
14 by nature of the size of the lot, the house is
15 actually setback much further than closer to I'on.

16 MS. ANTMAN: What is the setback
17 supposed to be before you receive any allowance?
18 What is it supposed to be?

19 MR. ILDERTON: Well, you're asking for
20 almost, what, 25 percent relief -- or 24 percent?

21 MR. TUCKER: Yeah. The required
22 setback would be 35 feet. So we would be asking
23 for ten across the west. We would be required --
24 there is no variance to have 25 on the east. Since
25 we're asking for a 25 percent variance, that

1 application?

2 MS. ANTMAN: I'm concerned about the
3 setbacks because I live next door.

4 MR. ILDERTON: Could you identify
5 yourself?

6 MS. ANTMAN: I'm Carol Antman. I live
7 next door at 1714 Atlantic. I agree that it should
8 be oriented the way you said though because my
9 house is that way too.

10 MR. TUCKER: Are you located to the
11 east or the west?

12 MS. ANTMAN: I'm oriented in this
13 direction.

14 MR. TUCKER: Well, I guess the good
15 news is we have -- the setbacks are -- although we
16 are asking for a variance, we're -- we can go to
17 ten feet minimum. And that is the setback on the
18 west elevation. On your side -- on the east, so
19 east of this property. We're --

20 MR. FULKMAN: To be clear, the
21 orientation --

22 MS. ANTMAN: Isn't that facing I'on the
23 way it's facing me?

24 MR. FULKMAN: If you are facing --

25 MS. ANTMAN: If I'm facing the house

1 decreases the east setback to a little over
2 15 feet. It changes because of the shape of the
3 lot.

4 MR. FULKMAN: I mean, do you remember
5 the existing structure is actually much closer than
6 25 feet back. I think this would be back further.

7 MR. TUCKER: Yes. The existing
8 structure is -- and you will see on your set -- the
9 second page, the existing survey, the existing
10 structure, although, I know we know we're
11 requesting it to go away from the setbacks, don't
12 carry on, but the existing structure is 10 feet on
13 each side -- or actually a little less than 10 on
14 the west side. So the new structure will be
15 further away from the east property line.

16 MR. ILDERTON: Couple of feet further
17 away.

18 MS. ANTMAN: It's going to be further
19 away than the house that's there now. Is that what
20 I'm understanding?

21 MR. TUCKER: Yes. It will be 5 to
22 6 feet further away.

23 MR. ILDERTON: Before the new zoning
24 ordinance came in, you could go to 10 on either
25 side. 10 and 10. With the new zoning ordinance,

1 everything got a little bit tighter.

2 MS. ANTMAN: I see. Okay.

3 MR. ILDERTON: But I guess what you're
4 saying is it's going to be about two-and-a-half
5 feet less -- two-and-a-half feet further away than
6 it is now.

7 MR. TUCKER: Actually it's going to be
8 closer to 6 foot 3 inches. Because I'm asking for
9 16 foot for each side existing. Although, it's in
10 a different location, the house is further back
11 than the existing house. It's 10 foot 3 inches.

12 MS. ANTMAN: That's convincing. Thank
13 you.

14 MR. ILDERTON: Thanks. Randy, did I
15 give you the second opportunity? I'm not sure.

16 MR. ROBINSON: No. Huh-uh.

17 MR. ILDERTON: Do you want --

18 MR. ROBINSON: Yes. A couple of things
19 I didn't mention about the front being on Atlantic
20 Avenue. Atlantic Avenue is lower than I'on Avenue,
21 so we need to consider that, you know, as which one
22 is the front of this house again. That will impact
23 the height of this house. If it's on Atlantic
24 Avenue, it may be more than two feet above that
25 road. So now we can only go 40 feet from the road.

1 written into the code, we can't give them anymore
2 square footage on the third floor?

3 MR. ROBINSON: Well, you can give
4 15 percent.

5 MR. ILDERTON: We can increase it to a
6 percentage.

7 MR. ROBINSON: That's correct.

8 MR. ILDERTON: But only what is in our
9 particular purview.

10 MR. ROBINSON: That's correct. And
11 there may have to -- I mean, it looks like that's a
12 pretty flat roof up there. Less than 15 degrees.

13 MR. TUCKER: Yes. Obviously this is
14 conceptual approval that we're requesting. The
15 slope of those hip roofs at the top may be tweaked
16 a bit. I don't know if it's going to hit 15
17 degrees. It might. Especially if we can do it to
18 avoid zoning issues.

19 As far as the 50 percent extending
20 above the roof and maybe this is a little tricky,
21 but I guess my solution to that was this area,
22 which is the main living, kitchen, dining space --
23 actually there's a couple of things that make that
24 space, which is south facing, more light and airy.
25 And it also creates the level for the roofer

1 Also, the third story in this structure, if you
2 look at the third story on 2128, it says that the
3 enclosed portion of any third story should be no
4 greater than 400 square feet and shall only have 50
5 percent of its wall area projecting outside of the
6 roof area as measured from the outside of the wall
7 studs. That looks like it's pretty much all
8 outside.

9 And then you go back to roof shape, and
10 it says roofs sloping less than 15 degrees are
11 considered flat roofs and should be concealed
12 behind a raised parapet wall at least as high as
13 the peak of the roof. Anyway, I just wanted to
14 bring those two things up.

15 MR. ILDERTON: Some of those issues we
16 really aren't -- if I'm correct, we're not
17 concerned about here tonight because if they become
18 issues, they may become issues at the Board of
19 Adjustment, but not here. Right?

20 MR. ROBINSON: Well, they could ask for
21 variances from a specific ordinance that doesn't
22 allow them.

23 MR. ILDERTON: But not from you us,
24 right? I don't think they can ask -- like if the
25 third floor has a limited square footage already

1 terrace above.

2 So if you look at the side elevations
3 or if you look at the side of the model, I guess,
4 my argument to the being below the roofer, yes,
5 this portion might be argued as below this roof,
6 but this portion of that loft area is actually
7 under another portion of the house. You know,
8 there's two roofs coming together almost at the
9 same level.

10 So I think that is different than I
11 think the way the -- this is my interpretation of
12 the code would be you don't want a third story
13 that's sticking up like a lighthouse at the top
14 where this is -- as you can sort of see from the
15 elevations on the model, it's stepping down. And I
16 think that is sort of -- in a sneaky way, resolves
17 us not being outside of the roof level. But
18 obviously, that's not my interpretation.

19 MR. ILDERTON: Right. I agree with the
20 general perception. I think it has been stated
21 that most of these houses along here don't have a
22 formal entrance on Atlantic even though their
23 addresses are Atlantic. Who makes the call? Are
24 we supposed to make the call whether this -- I
25 mean, we're supposed to make the call certainly

1 architectural, aesthetically, you know, we can live
 2 with this. But as far as the pool and -- okay, you
 3 can have the pool in the front of the house and
 4 it's -- and that's already. Who makes that -- I
 5 mean, can -- is that -- does our board make that
 6 call or is that --

7 MR. ROBINSON: Yeah.

8 MR. ILDERTON: Is that specifically
 9 enough --

10 MR. ROBINSON: It says in the ordinance
 11 under 2130-C, in the Design Review Board, in
 12 determining orientation of principal building, the
 13 Design Review Board may modify the standard to
 14 achieve greater neighborhood compatibility as
 15 described in Article 12. So you have to look at
 16 Article 12 to see what it says, you know.

17 MR. ILDERTON: Okay. Good deal. Thank
 18 you. Duke, you want to start?

19 MR. WRIGHT: Wish you wouldn't start
 20 with me.

21 MR. ILDERTON: Steve, you want to
 22 start?

23 MR. WRIGHT: I knew he was going to do
 24 that to me.

25 MR. HERLONG: Well, as far as the site,

1 further than the house that's there, that house --
 2 the roofline starts maybe at 20 feet. There's a
 3 grade level and then one above it. So you have a
 4 20 foot wall and then there's a roof. Very, very
 5 different -- well, I think the massiveness of this
 6 home is going to be surprising to everybody I'm
 7 afraid. So I have got those concerns about it.

8 MR. ILDERTON: Kelly?

9 MS. MESSIER: I think the pool should
 10 be on the south side. That's where you want it for
 11 the sun orientation and the breeze. There is the
 12 issue that according to our zoning, that that is
 13 the front. So I'm not sure if we can change that
 14 around to say we make I'on the front instead or do
 15 they have to go to the BZA and get a variance to
 16 put the pool in the front yard?

17 MR. CRAVER: We make that decision.

18 MR. ROBINSON: That's what I was
 19 reading. You-all do make the decision whether
 20 it's front or --

21 MS. MESSIER: As far as the building
 22 setback -- and on the site plan, the front and the
 23 rear setback are both 25 feet. So it really
 24 complies to that. The real issue is is the
 25 swimming pool allowed on the Atlantic Avenue side.

1 I do think that the entrance should be on I'on. I
 2 think just about every house along there enters off
 3 of I'on. I don't know that any house has Atlantic
 4 Street entrance.

5 MR. CRAVER: They don't.

6 MS. MESSIER: They have the whole sea
 7 wall along there.

8 MR. HERLONG: So as far as that goes --
 9 I'm fine with that. I think that's probably the
 10 correct way to deal with that. And I can
 11 appreciate the -- especially the Atlantic Avenue
 12 facade. It's very open. One of the things I think
 13 everybody has to pay attention to with this model
 14 is none of the railings are shown. Everything you
 15 see just about from the Atlantic side has a railing
 16 on top of it. And I think that's not going to be
 17 what we are seeing here at all.

18 It's going to be a surprising change to
 19 the model if it had railings on it. I think the
 20 intent of -- the house steps back off of Atlantic.
 21 And it's buffered somewhat on the I'on side with
 22 that addition of the porch that's not in these
 23 drawings. And that's an improvement. However, the
 24 two sides go up almost, what, 38, 37 feet in the
 25 area without any setback. And while it's setback

1 And I would say I think it's okay for it to be
 2 there. I do have a concern, as Steve was saying,
 3 about the height of this structure and the mass of
 4 it. That we're sort of here as a board to make
 5 exceptions for structures when it helps with the
 6 neighborhood compatibility. And I think you guys
 7 have to show us how this makes -- this design makes
 8 it more compatible with the neighborhood because
 9 right now it doesn't -- particularly I think the
 10 I'on Avenue elevation -- I mean, this is -- when
 11 you look at the front elevation, it looks to be a
 12 four-story building. And, you know, the houses on
 13 either side look like they're one-and-a-half to two
 14 stories.

15 As far as these numbers and stuff they
 16 looked at too, Randy, when you look at the
 17 principal building square footage, don't they have
 18 to count the space on the third floor because it's
 19 not in this chart. And so it's -- I'm not sure if
 20 it's because they're calling it loft or storage
 21 that it doesn't get counted or -- you know.
 22 Because if you do that then the house is up to
 23 4,500 square feet. And, you know, according to the
 24 formula, you're only supposed to have 3,000.

25 MR. HERLONG: Did you count the loft?

1 MR. TUCKER: The loft space, the
2 ceiling height, at least is -- as I'm showing it
3 now as less than seven feet. So I wasn't counting
4 it as habitable space. It is less than 400 square
5 feet total as drawn.

6 MR. ROBINSON: But it does have an open
7 rail?

8 MR. TUCKER: That's correct.

9 MS. MESSIER: I mean, well, I don't
10 know. I calculated it. I probably went about like
11 12 times. I mean, if you -- 10 times 60 is going
12 to be 600. But it's --

13 MR. TUCKER: Minus the stair and then
14 the porch cuts in there at the front -- at the open
15 terrace.

16 MS. SANDERS: Those 20 square feet --
17 the stair and the open terrace are 200 square feet?

18 MR. TUCKER: Well, the width of the
19 loft is 12 feet because there's -- the covered
20 terrace runs the full length of I'on Avenue. So
21 ten feet interior by 55. So 550 and then minus
22 where the open terrace cuts in. So probably
23 another -- minus 50 feet. So 50 square feet minus
24 the stairs, maybe 50 square feet. So 400, 450.

25 MS. MESSIER: All right. And this is

1 it's within the principal building. If it was
2 closed off, if it didn't have a rail up there, you
3 know, then maybe you could call it attic space, but
4 as it is, it's an open loft, and it's square
5 footage. The way I'm looking at it.

6 MR. CRAVER: What does that have -- I'm
7 not sure I understand that. So what are you -- how
8 do you define attic space then? I mean, if you
9 have got an area that has seven-foot ceilings that
10 probably only can be good for storage.

11 MR. ROBINSON: If you had eight-foot
12 ceilings or nine-foot ceilings in an attic and it
13 was closed off as attic space and unfinished,
14 that's an attic space.

15 MR. CRAVER: That's the question. Is
16 this intended to be finished space?

17 MR. ROBINSON: Yes.

18 MS. SANDERS: Heating and air.

19 MR. ROBINSON: Yes. It's heated, it's
20 cooled, it has a railing going off the --

21 MR. FULKMAN: With all due respect,
22 gentlemen, ladies, if I could pipe in here. You
23 know, this is a conceptual plan. What we really
24 tried to do is present something -- that is
25 consistent with the mass of the buildings

1 to give 16-foot ceilings on the second floor space.
2 Is that --

3 MR. TUCKER: That's correct.

4 MS. MESSIER: I will pass on, but I
5 think I actually like the design of the building.
6 I mean, I like modern buildings, but I'm just real
7 concerned about this fitting in the neighborhood.
8 And I think you have got to make it more compatible
9 to work without us having to give you all of this
10 relief.

11 MR. ILDERTON: Randy --

12 MR. ROBINSON: Let me go ahead and read
13 the ordinance as far as principal building square
14 footage. The entire square footage encompassed
15 with the interior portion of a principal building
16 measured from the outside exterior wall studs, but
17 not including interior spaces not usable as living
18 space. And in parentheses they put attic or
19 parking areas beneath the principal building;
20 structures that are not used as living space,
21 exterior porches, and decks and exterior stairs.

22 I would say that this loft is living
23 space. I mean, if that's -- the building code says
24 one thing, but this is, you know, our ordinance.
25 And our ordinance dictates square footage. And

1 surrounding it in the neighborhood.

2 I think if you look at the homes both
3 on the adjacent sides as well as across the street,
4 they're all quite tall and they're exactly -- you
5 know, they're not one-and-a-half two stories
6 structures. They're all above 30 feet. We have
7 4,300 square feet on the corner. And I'm sure how
8 big the house is on the other side.

9 Across the street on I'on, Officer's
10 Quarters. Those are massive homes too. We tried
11 to really soften things up especially with the
12 facade on the I'on side, and we certainly would
13 love to hear any suggestions of what we can do more
14 to make that happen.

15 As it relates to the interior space,
16 you know, it's -- planning initially on using it as
17 storage. We are going to have things up on the
18 rooftop terrace was the idea. Chairs, lounge
19 chairs, chaise lounges, what have you, we would
20 like to have some convenient place to pull those
21 in, bring those in, you know, in case of a storm,
22 what have you. And that takes up room.

23 And, you know, we really quite honestly
24 are just feeling out your leniency on that too to
25 see if we can preserve one of those spaces as an

1 open loft space. If we can't, we will make it
2 attic space. But, again, we're looking for some
3 direction from you to help us in taking the concept
4 and giving some constructive feedback on what we
5 can do to tighten the design up and make it
6 something that both is consistent with the
7 neighborhood and meets with your approval.

8 MR. ILDERTON: Again, it is in our
9 discretion to call that loft or attic or usable
10 space or not, or it is your call, Randy, or is
11 it -- if it's within the Design Review Board to say
12 that's going to be a loft or that's going to be
13 storage or that's going to be -- seems to me we're
14 getting over on the edge of actual, you know,
15 things that may be not our call --

16 MR. CRAVER: What section is that,
17 Randy?

18 MR. ILDERTON: -- to determine that that
19 is going to be habitable space or not.

20 MR. ROBINSON: The Design Review Board
21 interprets the ordinance. So you-all can make
22 those determinations. My feel -- my reasons for
23 bringing this out is so you-all will make those
24 determinations, if you need to, you know. I mean,
25 if we didn't bring up all of these things at the

1 different. And I feel like not that we don't see a
2 lot of good designs coming through here, but Pat
3 likes to talk about the eclectic character of the
4 Sullivan's Island construction and that just fits
5 right in.

6 As far as neighborhood compatibility,
7 Brew and Libby have a third floor roof deck right
8 next to their bedroom. So this is -- I mean, this
9 isn't any different than other stuff right on that
10 block. As far as the attic loft space being attic
11 or not, I have always sort of had an issue if you
12 have attic space and it gets heat and air so that
13 you don't get mold and mildew on all of the stuff
14 you store in there. Does that make it living
15 space? I think it makes smart attic space. So I
16 am not so troubled with having some storage space
17 that has climate control so that you are protecting
18 your junk.

19 I'm a little troubled with the side
20 setback, because it seems sort of stark. And one
21 of the things that we -- I like that it's not a
22 flat side the whole way back, but going all the way
23 up it's -- it shifts, you know. I mean, there's a
24 change right there. But it does seem sort of stark
25 going up. And I think Steve is right, going up

1 meeting and talk about them and have you-all make a
2 determination, then when it comes to my office for
3 permitting, I'm going to flat turn it down, because
4 it just doesn't have the approvals it needs. But
5 anyway, you-all do have -- you-all can interpret
6 this ordinance.

7 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you.

8 MR. CRAVER: I got it. I know that
9 block fairly well. And I think the front is on
10 I'on. I mean, I don't think there's any question
11 the front is on I'on. So I think that's the right
12 call. Who is on the other side? The Spells.
13 Okay. So are you next to Brew and Libby.

14 MS. ANTMAN: We're next to the Beals,
15 who are next to Brew and Libby. It goes Spells,
16 then this house, then us, then the Beals, then Brew
17 and Libby.

18 MR. CRAVER: So this house is the one
19 that like 4 or 5 county policeman were living in or
20 something?

21 MR. ILDERTON: Yeah. It's been a
22 rental for a long time.

23 MS. MESSIER: It's worth tearing down.

24 MR. CRAVER: That's a good call. Knock
25 it down. I love this design because it's

1 38 feet there could be some value in doing
2 something to break those side walls.

3 The side setbacks, I mean, you know,
4 other than the side walls, I think the massing is
5 pretty well broken up in the design. Now, for
6 those of us who lived through Hugo, we saw people
7 that had roofs like that that functioned pretty
8 much like an airplane wing. So you have got to
9 figure that you can get to replace that roof if a
10 pretty good hurricane comes through because it's
11 going to just take off like a rocket. Unless you
12 nail it down pretty good. But other than that, I
13 mean, you know, that is a neat design. I think
14 that would be a real improvement.

15 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you.
16 Duke?

17 MR. WRIGHT: You finally got here. I
18 like the frontage on I'on very much, and it's very
19 compatible with the Quarters across the street on
20 the north side. And it's well done. I believe
21 that this is a conceptual submission, and I think
22 we need to -- the architect needs to -- and owner,
23 play with the third level with the issue over the
24 attic space as well as the roof angle and see if
25 you can't do -- the mass is an issue with me as

1 well, I think. But if you can tinker with that
2 third level, I think that would be worthwhile.
3 Other than that, I am fine with it.

4 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. I like the
5 house overall. I think I like something new and
6 different and that is a relatively different part
7 of -- the architecture is a little different all
8 over on that part of the Island. The verticality
9 on the side really doesn't bother me because it
10 does break up -- on the third floor it does get
11 quite a bit smaller in its size as it goes up. And
12 I don't think verticality in that interest is
13 necessarily a bad thing.

14 I do wonder on that upstairs deck and
15 lounge deck that's facing the Officer Quarter's and
16 facing the back, it's going to be a dark sunless
17 area many times. And most of the times I'm not
18 sure what you're going to see from up there. And
19 so I'm not saying -- I'm just thinking maybe just
20 for the owner and all, just maybe you may not be
21 using that area because there's not -- you are not
22 going to get sun. It's going to be maybe -- you're
23 not going to get much of a view, and you may decide
24 that you don't need that space or you're not going
25 to use that space like that so much because of its

1 that has a rail on the drawings, right?

2 MR. TUCKER: Not the entire section.

3 If you flip to the roof plan --

4 MR. WRIGHT: I can't tell from --

5 MR. SANDERS: Right down here is half
6 of it.

7 MR. ILDERTON: That's misleading, yes.

8 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. I see that now.

9 MR. HERLONG: The rail comes up over
10 the roofline of the front roof.

11 MR. TUCKER: That is 38 feet, so it
12 comes right up to the max. So the peak of the hip
13 roof and the railing are both right at 38.

14 MR. HERLONG: Right.

15 MR. TUCKER: And the area of the roof
16 terrace, we're still playing with. Obviously we
17 don't want the whole area to be roof terrace.
18 Maintenance.

19 MR. HERLONG: Looks great without the
20 railing.

21 MR. FULKMAN: Well, we have two young
22 children.

23 MR. ILDERTON: You could take the
24 railing and set it back so from an eyeball view you
25 could hardly ever see it and you would still have a

1 orientation really.

2 MR. WRIGHT: Excuse me. You're talking
3 about this side? This area? Is that going to
4 be --

5 MR. ILDERTON: Am I turned around?

6 MR. WRIGHT: You're fine. I think you
7 were talking about I'on --

8 MR. ILDERTON: This will be the south
9 side.

10 MR. WRIGHT: My question on --

11 MR. ILDERTON: I was talking about this
12 side.

13 MR. WRIGHT: That's the north side.

14 MR. ILDERTON: This area is going to be
15 dark and sunless, and you may still want it. But
16 that's just a practical observation. But if you
17 redo this since this is conceptual -- it would be a
18 conceptual approval, if it's approved. You may
19 want to think a long those lines and come up with
20 something that maybe suits almost everybody on the
21 board a little bit better.

22 MR. WRIGHT: Can I piggy back? Is this
23 going to be a railed and --

24 MR. TUCKER: A portion of it.

25 MR. HERLONG: The entire portion of

1 view. Meaning if the rail sat back here. And if
2 you looked up, you really wouldn't see the rail or
3 much of it, especially with a lightly done rail
4 with wire or glass or something like that to where
5 it wouldn't be dominant to what you would see, if
6 you just sat it back some.

7 MS. MESSIER: These rails look like
8 they're going to be cable.

9 MR. TUCKER: Something thin, not wood
10 pickets.

11 MR. FULKMAN: There won't be any direct
12 line of sight up to the house.

13 MR. WRIGHT: There's some nice oak
14 trees. Five oaks right on Atlantic.

15 MS. MESSIER: One of those is actually
16 cedar.

17 MR. ILDERTON: Can I get a carefully
18 worded motion?

19 MS. SANDERS: I didn't get a turn now.

20 MR. ILDERTON: I thought you said
21 something Rhonda. Excuse me, say something, girl.
22 I apologize.

23 MS. SANDERS: I think it's funny, it
24 reminds me of my house. It's very square and -- I
25 don't mean it as square. I think it's a little bit

1 large. I think asking for maximum set backs on
2 everything is a little bit much, and I will tell
3 you from experience, you do not want a flat roof
4 deck over living space. Ten years of experience.
5 Promise you. Redo it every year. You might want
6 to reconsider that. Maybe do it over a porch area
7 if you can. I don't know. Especially if you get
8 sun all of the time, it's a nightmare. I like the
9 roofline. I'm concerned that the railing is going
10 to be the same height as the roofline as the top of
11 the roof.

12 MR. TUCKER: That's correct.

13 MS. SANDERS: I'm not sure that maybe
14 you can't give a little more pitch to the roof. I
15 don't know. I just -- I think more pitch to the
16 roof would maybe soften it up a little bit and not
17 make it so square and so -- on the sides
18 particularly of your neighbors.

19 I don't know if you can lessen up on
20 some of the setbacks, but that would be my
21 suggestion. And I would really, really reconsider
22 having a flat top roof over living space.

23 MR. FULKMAN: We were looking at doing
24 some concrete. Are you using 2-by-4s for the roof?

25 MS. SANDERS: I have a concrete house.

1 elevation of the houses on either side. I'm just
2 throwing that out there. I know the Antmans were
3 concerned about the side yard setback. And their
4 house was built in a time when the height limit was
5 36 feet, not 38 feet like it is now. And, you
6 know, just -- I just want to throw that out there.

7 MR. WRIGHT: Which elevation are you
8 talking about?

9 MR. ROBINSON: Either one. Atlantic or
10 the I'on side. Just one elevation showing the
11 houses on either side.

12 MS. SANDERS: If you can deepen the
13 roof pitch, it won't look so square and three story
14 on the sides where your neighbors are. I mean,
15 right now it looks like a three-story wall because
16 you don't have more pitch.

17 MS. MESSIER: You want me take a stab
18 at a motion?

19 MR. ILDERTON: Yes, please.

20 MS. MESSIER: I make a motion to give
21 this plan conceptual approval that we will allow
22 I'on Avenue to be the front elevation of the house,
23 allowing the swimming pool along Atlantic Avenue.
24 That as they progress with design, that they look
25 closely at the comments we have heard tonight and

1 MR. FULKMAN: And you still have issues
2 with it? I would love to talk to you more.

3 MS. SANDERS: That's fine. I'm happy
4 to tell you. I have a block house, but it's
5 just -- it doesn't matter what you do I think. I
6 mean, yeah, it's just -- the elements between the
7 sun beating on down it -- I don't know what -- Pat,
8 I don't know is there anything that really works
9 really good? I just wouldn't suggest it.

10 MR. ILDERTON: There's some things out
11 there, but like you said, a flat roof is a flat
12 roof.

13 MS. SANDERS: It's a nightmare. And,
14 you know, to be honest with you, it's never used.
15 I'm not saying it wouldn't be used, but it's not
16 used as much as I would like to. It's a nice
17 concept.

18 MR. ILDERTON: Now, do I have a
19 carefully worded motion from anybody?

20 MR. ROBINSON: Can I say one more
21 thing?

22 MR. ILDERTON: Go for it.

23 MR. ROBINSON: Seeing as they're asking
24 for all of this stuff on neighborhood
25 compatibility, it would be good if we saw an

1 try to bring this further in compliance with
2 neighborhood compatibility to show us the houses on
3 either side. And, you know, for the next
4 submittal, try to decrease the amount of relief
5 that we would have to grant if they can work that
6 into the design. But that overall we're -- we
7 would give them conceptual approval.

8 MR. ILDERTON: That's a good motion.
9 Do I hear a second?

10 MR. WRIGHT: Second.

11 MR. ILDERTON: Any discussion?
12 Everybody in favor?

13 ALL: Aye.

14 MR. ILDERTON: 402 Station 19.

15 MR. ROBINSON: This application is
16 coming to you-all for final approval. They're
17 asking for minimal relief in the building
18 foundation height. And actually I think that's it,
19 isn't it?

20 MS. O'CONNOR: Also the additional
21 front set back, the 45 degree -- but I can describe
22 that, if you would like.

23 MR. ROBINSON: Go ahead.

24 MR. ILDERTON: You're on.

25 MS. O'CONNOR: I'm Julie O'Connor. I'm

1 the designer for the project. This house, as you
2 can see on the site plan, has streets on three
3 sides. Station 19, Back Street, and Station 18
4 1/2. This is the elevation that will be facing
5 Back Street. So we are asking for a nine-inch
6 relief for foundation height to, you know, sort of
7 improve the loge areas and the garage space
8 beneath. And also just give us nine extra inches
9 to improve our view. And then also we would like
10 to ask for relief for the additional front set
11 back -- front of the house is here on Station 19.
12 This house is across Station 19. This house is
13 across Station 18 1/2.

14 Our house is a story-and-a-half house
15 with one-story porches on the front and the side
16 and the back also. And so this line here is at the
17 25-foot front setback. And as the 45 degree comes
18 up, it just clips across this gable end. But we
19 feel with the adjacent houses that have two-story
20 porches -- and this house is a three-story house,
21 that we're still very much in keeping with the
22 neighborhood by asking for this additional front
23 setback relief.

24 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you. Is
25 there any public comment for this application?

1 how much is it?

2 MS. O'CONNOR: I'm sorry.

3 MR. ROBINSON: What is the relief we're
4 granting on the front porch setback?

5 MS. O'CONNOR: Well, I'm not sure.
6 That's what we were discussing. I couldn't figure
7 out what 15 percent actually meant. But right now
8 the -- you know, sort of the face of the porch is
9 at the 25-foot front setback and the 20-foot height
10 is basically the roof of the porch. And then when
11 we took our 45-degree, you know, it short of
12 clipped across that. And I don't know what the
13 feet are, but if you can grant the maximum, and
14 then maybe you and I can figure out the math, and
15 we will figure out if we have to move the house
16 back. I couldn't figure out what 15 percent meant.

17 MR. ROBINSON: We figured it out
18 15 percent of 25 feet is 3.75 feet because we
19 can't -- I couldn't figure it out years ago. So
20 that's what we came up with.

21 MS. O'CONNOR: Well, I'm not going over
22 the 25-foot front setback. I am meeting that
23 setback, but I don't meet the additional 45 degree
24 angle scenario, if you know what I'm saying.

25 MR. HERLONG: Yes. So is that 15 off

1 Public comment section is closed.

2 Randy, do you have anything to add.

3 MR. ROBINSON: No.

4 MR. WRIGHT: I think that's a very
5 reasonable request. I think the request will fit
6 right in with the neighborhood on either side. So
7 I am okay with it.

8 MR. ILDERTON: I'm also okay with it.
9 Steve?

10 MR. HERLONG: Just a question about
11 that front setback relief. We're allowed to
12 grant -- is it 15 percent -- I don't know how you
13 even apply this thing.

14 MR. ROBINSON: I know. It comes up to
15 3.75 feet. You know, whether you move the house
16 forward or you grant it in that.

17 MR. HERLONG: But by giving the maximum
18 relief, it works?

19 MS. O'CONNOR: That's a good question.

20 MR. ROBINSON: Yes, very much. They're
21 fine.

22 MS. O'CONNOR: I couldn't figure it out
23 either.

24 MR. ROBINSON: They're fine because you
25 can actually give up to three-and-a-half feet. Or

1 of the -- is it changing the angle? I have never
2 really --

3 MR. ROBINSON: It doesn't change the
4 angle. You can either go 3.75 feet in the height,
5 so you get 23.75 feet. And then go back to the 45.
6 Or you can move that line forward instead of
7 25-foot setback, it would be 21.25 setback off the
8 front. And then go 45 degree back.

9 MS. O'CONNOR: If that's the case, then
10 that would work either way.

11 MR. HERLONG: I think it is a very
12 suitable design especially in the neighborhood, and
13 so I'm fine with it. As long as that works.

14 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Kelly?

15 MS. MESSIER: When I went by the site
16 last week to look at these, they were in midst of
17 clearing the lot. Did they have permission to
18 remove all of those trees? I mean, there was --
19 like half this lot was open, and they had sort of
20 like clear-cut the other half, and there was a lot
21 of big trees. There was three live oaks removed, a
22 17 inch Pecan tree, six cedar trees, eight palm
23 trees.

24 Another comment, it looks like there's
25 a swimming pool that is extending into the side

1 setback. The pool and all of the pool patio area
2 has to be within the building setback area.

3 MS. O'CONNOR: Okay.

4 MS. MESSIER: And as you proceed with
5 it, you need to look at how you're going to meet
6 the pool enclosure regulations with the fence
7 because it looks like you have some loge spaces and
8 stuff that were going to work into the pool area.

9 And it looks like in your lot coverage calculations
10 you didn't count anything for the pool patio area,
11 and you did count the driveway, but you may end up
12 wanting the impervious -- or the impervious and the
13 pool and making the driveway pervious, so you can
14 study that as you go forward. But I think the
15 house looks nice.

16 MR. ILDERTON: Rhonda?

17 MS. SANDERS: I think it's an easy one.
18 Yes.

19 MR. ILDERTON: Billy?

20 MR. CRAVER: I'm good with it.

21 MR. ILDERTON: Do we hear a motion?

22 MR. CRAVER: Move we approve as
23 submitted. Is this final approval we're looking
24 for?

25 MS. O'CONNOR: Yes, please.

1 it's already been modified on the front end. I
2 have looked it over. I don't have any problem with
3 it.

4 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Yes, ma'am.

5 MS. COCHRAN: Sabrina Cochran with
6 Herlong and Associates here for Jeff and Wesley
7 Kennedy. As Randy said it was before -- it was
8 last year for front porch foundation modification
9 to try to lower it to the ground and make it look

10 more compatible. We now would like to do some rear
11 renovations adding a screen porch to the back and a
12 very small addition with a little porch and some
13 stairs down. Because it's a historic structure, we
14 had to come before you. And we're also requesting
15 side setback relief for a stair only on the side.

16 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Any public
17 comment to this application? Public comment
18 section is closed.

19 Randy, anything to add?

20 Billy?

21 MR. CRAVER: I am good with it.

22 MR. ILDERTON: Rhonda?

23 MS. SANDERS: I think it's very
24 reasonable.

25 MR. ILDERTON: I'm good with it.

1 MR. CRAVER: Final approval.

2 MS. MESSIER: We have to say that the
3 pool is not -- I mean, when we're giving final
4 approval, is it just for the house?

5 MS. O'CONNOR: We have not done any
6 work on the pool design.

7 MR. CRAVER: You always have to deal
8 with the pool issue.

9 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a second?

10 MR. WRIGHT: Second.

11 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion? Everybody
12 in favor?

13 ALL: Aye.

14 MR. ILDERTON: 2408 I'on.

15 MR. ROBINSON: This property has been
16 to you-all before. Also they did some
17 modifications to the front of the property, and now
18 they want to do an addition to the rear of the
19 property and also another modification to the
20 front. It is -- they're asking for final approval.
21 It's outside of the historic district, but it is
22 designated as a historic structure number 126.

23 Honestly, with this structure, it was a historic
24 structure that was low to the ground. It was
25 raised up prior to our ordinance being passed. So

1 MR. WRIGHT: Fine.

2 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a motion?

3 MR. CRAVER: Move for approval.

4 MR. WRIGHT: Second.

5 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor?

6 ALL: Aye.

7 MR. ILDERTON: 1850 Flag Street.

8 MR. ROBINSON: 1850 Flag Street was to
9 you-all a month before last. Anyway it's been to

10 you-all, and you-all gave it approval. They are
11 coming back for final approval to this plan. I
12 believe they have done some tweaking to it, so
13 you-all might want to look at it a little bit

14 closer. They are asking for some increases. The
15 one thing I want to make sure is the principal
16 building coverage, they didn't change it. You-all
17 are doing that bedroom up there, but it's over the
18 top of principal building coverage. It's all the
19 same. So that is over what we can allow, but it's
20 already existing, so they aren't going to increase
21 that. The other increases are allowable. And like
22 I said, you-all have looked at most of it.

23 MR. ILDERTON: Okay. Great. Yes, sir?

24 MR. CLOWNEY: Any increases were very
25 subtle and minor. There was also one decrease,

1 which was really kind of the only main design
 2 change, which was this porch. We actually made it
 3 just a little bit skinnier this way, and then we
 4 pulled it back. It used to come to the face of the
 5 building on the corner here, but in order for us to
 6 allow that bank of windows -- let me show you this.
 7 Here we decided to pull it back to have more
 8 contemporary windows in the corner core, so showing
 9 that. So we pulled that back, and we have also
 10 reoriented the stair. So the stair kind of flips
 11 around in a different direction. Just other couple
 12 of little minor things. Window locations really.
 13 Window locations and also this stair, I talked to
 14 you guys about how we were going to take this stair
 15 out last time, but now since we have changed the
 16 stair around facing out to the street, we -- this
 17 whole garden along Flag Street is going to become
 18 more of a kind of picket fence around that area and
 19 that's going to be the area where the kids play.
 20 It's not going to be a public area any longer. But
 21 we want the stairs to stay going from the pool down
 22 to the garden. So that and then a few little
 23 window modifications that are different from the
 24 last design.

25 MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you.

1 exactly, you know, how much they would take up.
 2 MR. ILDERTON: Great, thank you.
 3 MR. CRAVER: I'm trying to figure out
 4 what the answer is. So are they going to change
 5 the driveway or not? Because if you change it, you
 6 lose it.
 7 MR. CLOWNEY: As submitted right now,
 8 the driveway is staying as is.
 9 MS. MESSIER: But you're not counting
 10 it in any of these calculations.
 11 MR. HERLONG: It looks to me like you
 12 may be replacing the portion of the driveway within
 13 the property line that's pervious, which makes it
 14 count. And then it would change back to the --
 15 change back to concrete outside the property line.
 16 Is that really what --
 17 MR. ROBINSON: That's basically what
 18 can be done.
 19 MR. CRAVER: They can do that, can't
 20 they?
 21 MR. ROBINSON: They can do that. They
 22 can cut into the property line and put a pervious
 23 surface up to the house.
 24 MR. FERRICK: Currently what we are
 25 proposing is to not increase or decrease any of the

1 Public comment for this application? Public
 2 comment section is closed. Randy, anything to add?
 3 MR. ROBINSON: Unfortunately the
 4 driveway is basically the same as it was
 5 originally. I know the owners don't want to reduce
 6 the size of the driveway, but if they pull up this
 7 driveway on the right-of-way to put in pervious
 8 pavers, they will lose it. So they can put
 9 pervious pavers on there driveway, but once they
 10 pull that up -- if it's pulled it's a
 11 nonconformity. If it's pulled up by intent or
 12 neglect, it's gone.
 13 MR. ILDERTON: Because --
 14 MR. CRAVER: So they can't put it all
 15 down.
 16 MR. ROBINSON: Still encouraging to
 17 reduce the size of that driveway because it's such
 18 a large nonconformity.
 19 MR. CLOWNEY: What we were going to
 20 with this driveway, they are not interested in
 21 changing the curb cuts for many reasons from their
 22 observation and the previous owner, but they are
 23 interested in taking it in bits and pieces here and
 24 there because of the overall landscape design,
 25 whatever that goes through. So we don't know

1 existing impervious surface. We are just simply
 2 maintaining the current number. The number that is
 3 on there it says is a request, is actually --
 4 should say existing.
 5 MS. MESSIER: But the lot coverage that
 6 you have on here is not correct. I mean, we have
 7 got the survey here showing the existing conditions
 8 and right now they're 6,286 square feet, and you're
 9 not counting the decks -- the pool deck as the
 10 impervious coverage.
 11 MR. FERRICK: What was the
 12 determination on the pool deck at the last meeting,
 13 Randy? Because it's an open deck that drains to
 14 sand, so the ordinance reads that decks count
 15 against your impervious surface, but then in the
 16 next sentence it says that anything that allows
 17 water to flow through freely is considered
 18 pervious.
 19 MR. ROBINSON: We have always said that
 20 ground level decks were -- we could consider those
 21 pervious. But I mean, one of the reasons for the
 22 ordinance is to the decrease mass. And --
 23 MS. MESSIER: This is like 4 or 5 feet
 24 above grade; is that correct?
 25 MR. CLOWNEY: It's about four feet.

1 MR. FERRICK: So the question that we
2 would have is if we're not increasing the
3 impervious existing conditions of the house, are we
4 required to bring it within the new ordinance?

5 MR. ROBINSON: You are minute, but you
6 are covering a little more surface.

7 MS. MESSIER: I guess, what I'm sort of
8 talking about in terms of looking at -- you know,
9 when I look at these -- the break down of lot
10 coverages, the numbers on this form are not filled
11 in correctly. This should be counting the deck,
12 and it should be counting the driveway. And when
13 you plug those numbers in to the equation and what
14 you're asking, it's more. I realize that this is
15 an existing nonconforming use. And I do think
16 everything that you're doing to do the building is
17 a very big improvement. But I think when you're
18 undertaking a renovation like this that we're
19 charged as the Design Review Board to try to make
20 this structure come more into conformance with the
21 zoning code. And one of the ways to bring it into
22 conformance is to remove the concrete driveway and
23 put in a pervious driveway. And I think that
24 should be a condition of this approval, and I think
25 the concrete should be removed all the way to the

1 You can still get a golf cart and a boat and that
2 sort of thing through there. This one right here
3 because of the shape of the porch and the new
4 stairs, that one no longer can you pull through
5 that one.

6 MS. MESSIER: I mean, it seems to me
7 there was going be three places for cars.

8 MR. CLOWNEY: Right. Well, we have
9 three places for cars. And then the other bay
10 underneath here. This is also where they talk
11 about pulling up -- right up underneath here and
12 having a car partially shaded up underneath both of
13 those pieces there. I guess -- you know, in my
14 mind, I felt like all of this was resolved in the
15 last meeting. You know we laid everything out.
16 I'm not aware of any incorrect numbers at all. But
17 at the same time, you know, we are still wanting --
18 the owners are definitely not wanting to change the
19 curb cut. So if we did consider any pervious
20 changes it would be behind that line, Randy, that
21 you're talking about.

22 MR. CRAVER: Randy, you know, the way
23 I'm reading this, an elevated pool deck, as long as
24 water can go through it and as long as the boards
25 are separated, would still be a pervious -- we can

1 curb within the right-of-way, and it should, you
2 know, conform. It looks like when you look at the
3 ground floor plan, that you're not using all five
4 of those bays anymore for automobiles.

5 So it doesn't look like the driveway
6 would need to extend up into those areas anymore.
7 It seems like you could do a new driveway with one
8 curb cut that looked like this that would still be
9 easy to get in and out of and would come a long way
10 towards conforming. It would actually give them
11 some guest parking area too.

12 MR. CLOWNEY: The current ground floor
13 plan -- that middle piece was never really
14 necessarily a full automobile because we have the
15 chimney that comes down into there, but they are
16 planning to store boats and golf carts and
17 different things. They have the whole full
18 downstairs program, and they really want to keep
19 all of the openings as much as possible. That one
20 opening to the right here obviously would not be an
21 opening.

22 MS. MESSIER: Which is the chimney? Is
23 that what you're talking about?

24 MR. CLOWNEY: The chimney is the one in
25 the middle, but you can still get through there.

1 still determine that that's a pervious --

2 MS. MESSIER: Not when it looks like a
3 part of the structure. That's the way Randy has
4 always done it.

5 MR. CRAVER: I'm just reading the
6 ordinance.

7 MR. ROBINSON: It was Kent and mine's
8 interpretation years ago. We have just upheld to
9 that.

10 MR. CRAVER: What it is is any material
11 or structure through which water can to not be
12 absorbed or pass, including but not limited to roof
13 structures, compacted soil or stone, pavement
14 consisting of asphalt, concrete, oil and stone, tar
15 or asphalt. Impervious surfaces also include
16 building foundations, porches, decks, patios,
17 sidewalks, play courts, tennis, basketball, et
18 cetera, pools and other improvements that impede
19 the absorption of water.

20 Well, a deck that has dirt, sand, grass
21 whatever under it, doesn't impede the absorption of
22 water. Grass or mulched areas are not considered
23 impervious materials. So its depends on what's
24 under it.

25 MR. FERRICK: Sand.

1 MR. CLOWNEY: That was the way I
2 remember things going the last time we were here.

3 MR. ILDERTON: Well, if in fact it is
4 dirt and it is a deck, it's absorbing water. It's
5 absorbing rain.

6 MR. CRAVER: The whole idea is if --
7 and it says in section three, pervious surface.
8 Any material through which water can be easily
9 absorbed or pass at a minimum infiltration rate of
10 two inches per hour, such as but not limited to,
11 grass, uncompacted, gravel, shell, and crushed
12 stone.

13 MS. MESSIER: But what you just read,
14 the deck is an impervious surface.

15 MR. CRAVER: That is qualified with
16 that impede absorption of water. And so if a deck
17 is a solid deck, it would impede it. If it's not a
18 solid deck --

19 MR. CLOWNEY: Is not a
20 tongue-and-groove deck. It has gaps -- visible
21 gaps between them, and there are drip lines
22 underneath in the sand where the water falls.

23 MR. CRAVER: I mean, I think that's a
24 determination we can make based on, you know, the
25 actual facts in place.

1 MR. HERLONG: One second. One thing
2 about this is this particular deck is below the
3 main level of the house. So that massing is not
4 the big issue here. So for that reason, I say it
5 should be.

6 MR. CRAVER: Right. Well, this doesn't
7 deal with massing. And I think it would be -- I
8 think it would be a mistake for us to say that this
9 provision -- this provision specifically deals with
10 drainage. I mean, it's the drainage of the lot.
11 If it's -- if water can pass-through it, it's okay.
12 If water can't pass-through it, it isn't okay. If
13 we can't answer the question because we don't have
14 enough facts, we have to tell the owner to bring us
15 back some pictures and show us. But I mean, I have
16 seen this, and it's you know -- -- it's not
17 tongue-and-groove. It's open. So I mean, I'm
18 comfortable that that is pervious. That the
19 deck -- it wouldn't be fair to call that deck
20 impervious.

21 MS. MESSIER: I think we really have to
22 go with the way Randy has been requiring everybody
23 else. Doesn't it have anything to do with the
24 height of the deck above grade, Randy?

25 MR. ROBINSON: We have always just said

1 MR. HERLONG: What that will do is
2 change the way everybody begins to design, and the
3 way Randy has to now rule every time he sees it.
4 That's just the only issue there. I think it's
5 been used to limit some massing issues. Now,
6 maybe -- correctly or incorrectly, that's the way
7 it has been interpreted to date.

8 MR. CRAVER: Okay.

9 MR. HERLONG: But just so everybody
10 knows, and I don't disagree.

11 MR. ILDERTON: They're using one thing
12 to interpret something else. If they want to write
13 an ordinance to have a problem with massing, they
14 ought to write the ordinance. Not cloak it in some
15 of this nonsense here. You're reading it correctly
16 it seems to me.

17 MR. CRAVER: Right.

18 MR. ILDERTON: And if they want to
19 write or change the ordinance so that there cannot
20 be a massing so you're addressing the massing, and
21 they can be more -- you know, draconian as they
22 are, which the ordinance is boarding on ridiculous
23 now, then they ought to do that.

24 MR. FERRICK: Can I ask a question of
25 the board?

1 if it was at grade, then we could consider a deck a
2 pervious surface.

3 MS. MESSIER: But I thought if it was
4 within like three feet of grade.

5 MR. ROBINSON: Well, I have always said
6 if it was like 18 inches above grade. If it was
7 like down on the ground, we would consider that a
8 pervious surface just like any other. But if it
9 was above, you know, that, 18 -- 12, 18 inches
10 above the grade, then it was an impervious surface.
11 Just because of the mass.

12 MR. CRAVER: And I appreciate what
13 you're saying, but we all reserve the right to be
14 smarter today than we were yesterday. And I'm
15 suggesting that we all ought to be smarter about
16 applying this and fair. And I don't -- I mean, I
17 understand where you're coming from, but just
18 reading it.

19 MS. MESSIER: I think you're going to
20 sort of just run into problems like when somebody
21 has a porch or something that is like gravel or
22 something underneath that, you know, the wind can
23 blow the water in there.

24 MR. CRAVER: I think we look at the
25 facts and circumstances, you know. If it's

1 pervious -- if the stuff under the porch is
 2 pervious and the water can go through the porch --
 3 well, a porch is different. If a porch has a roof
 4 over it, it is impervious. If it's a deck and --

5 MR. ILDERTON: It's pervious. We are
 6 begging -- we are begging reality here. You're
 7 right. And in actuality it's pervious. It just
 8 is. It's pervious. I mean, we might want to call
 9 it something else, but it's pervious it seems to
 10 me. So it might have been interpreted that way,
 11 but I think if we have any discretion in the
 12 leeway, we can maybe call -- reinvent the days of
 13 Kent Prause and have a little bit more level headed
 14 interpretation and proper interpretation of the
 15 ordinance.

16 Yes, sir?

17 MR. FERRICK: My question to the board
 18 is -- well, it would start with a statement that
 19 because the existing numbers are existing and we're
 20 dealing with an existing deck, and technically we
 21 can't get the numbers -- if you include all of
 22 that, you might not be able to get the numbers
 23 within the allowable amount anyways, and we're not
 24 increasing the amount of impervious. And if the
 25 deck technically is a pervious material as defined

1 MR. ROBINSON: I'm going to have to do
 2 it. I just want to throw that out there. But in
 3 saying that also, I mean, on -- in the application,
 4 it says that this whole driveway will be removed
 5 and made pervious surface. I mean, it's on the
 6 plans, right?

7 MR. HERLONG: It's on the site plans,
 8 yes.

9 MR. FERRICK: The portion within the
 10 building, yes.

11 MR. ROBINSON: Within the building is
 12 going to be pervious surface. I mean, we don't
 13 really have an argument or a dog in the fight if
 14 that happens. I was just pointing out that we
 15 would like the homeowners to reduce the
 16 encroachment across the right of way.

17 MR. ILDERTON: Right. But you agree,
 18 you have the final call on it. We don't. You do.

19 MR. CRAVER: You know what, Pat, I
 20 disagree with that. We're the Design Review Board.
 21 And I mean, on the issue of the pervious surface
 22 thing, we are reading the ordinance. I think we
 23 have the final call on that.

24 MR. ILDERTON: I'm not so sure in the
 25 state of South Carolina that the building inspector

1 in the thing allowing water to go through it, then
 2 because it's an existing condition, would that not
 3 qualify, in this particular circumstance, because
 4 it is an existing condition?

5 MR. ILDERTON: Right.

6 MR. FERRICK: I certainly understand
 7 Randy's position on new stuff being built. But
 8 because it's already there, and it allows water --

9 MS. MESSIER: This is an existing
 10 nonconforming use.

11 MR. FERRICK: Right.

12 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a motion or
 13 Rhonda are you --

14 MS. SANDERS: Short of changing the
 15 ordinance, I'm confused. I mean, you know.

16 MR. ILDERTON: Now do I hear a motion?

17 MR. ROBINSON: Let me just say also on
 18 the impervious surface, wherever this may lead, we
 19 have been interpreting this ordinance for five
 20 years like this. There has been a lot of people
 21 who wanted this same situation that have not been
 22 allowed to do it. And before I allow them to do
 23 it, the Board of Zoning Appeals is going to rule on
 24 this one.

25 MR. ILDERTON: That's your call.

1 doesn't have the final call.

2 MR. ROBINSON: I think for just -- I'm
 3 going to have to -- I would have to fight this one
 4 because of all of the people, you know, that have
 5 been not approved for these elevated decks. But I
 6 don't think that's a dog that we're going to even
 7 have to fight with this application provided they
 8 put in a pervious surface in the driveway.

9 MR. ILDERTON: Great.

10 MS. SANDERS: Would all of those
 11 applicants on new or existing or both?

12 MR. ROBINSON: Both.

13 MS. SANDERS: So we're just trying to
 14 be consistent with positioning?

15 MR. ROBINSON: That's what I'm trying
 16 to do because if I change midstream then, of
 17 course, everybody will say, well, you let them do
 18 it. And I will err on being very cautious on
 19 taking something like this to the Board of Zoning
 20 Appeals for their interpretation on it, an appeal
 21 of our deposition.

22 MR. ILDERTON: I agree. And one point
 23 Billy does make very well is if we made a mistake
 24 for five years, well, we only say -- well, we made
 25 it for five years, we're going to keep on going

1 with it because we have made this decision. And
2 that is a point worth considering. I have made
3 plenty of mistakes in my life that I have had to
4 change because of -- so I mean, it is worth
5 discussing about should we interpret it a different
6 way. I will just say that. But, you know, I
7 agree, you are the final arbiter on this decision.

8 MR. CRAVER: And we will -- we will
9 just disagree, which we have done plenty of times.

10 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a motion?

11 MR. CRAVER: I move we approve it as
12 submitted.

13 MR. WRIGHT: Second.

14 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion?

15 Everybody in favor?

16 ALL: Aye.

17 MR. ILDERTON: 2530 Middle Street.

18 MR. ROBINSON: 2530 Middle Street, this
19 is a house that you-all approved demolition for.
20 They are coming in. The applicant has asked for a
21 preliminary approval, but I believe he would like a
22 final approval if he can get it. He is asking for
23 some side yard setback relief -- excuse me just one
24 second. 100 percent second floor setback relief,
25 and he is asking for the one foot increase in the

1 wanted to point out is directly across the street,
2 the home that is located right here -- as far as
3 its height, its existing height above grade is
4 about eight-and-a-half feet. And the one directly
5 across the street is very similar, and I have got
6 those exact numbers that I can pass off to you.
7 The other neighborhood compatibility issue, I
8 guess, I would point out is the mass of the church.
9 So all of those we felt like justified our request,
10 which would -- again, respectfully ask for relief
11 to allow the one foot that you can grant in height.
12 So the orientation is that the front is still on
13 Middle Street with a buffer of sorts along Station
14 26 creating more of the green space and courtyard,
15 trying to pick up very much so on the vernacular of
16 the Island. It's something very simple so that the
17 body of it is, again, oriented towards Middle, but
18 a two-level section. And then it's steps back to
19 the pods at the rear, which is connected. Has a
20 dining and living area, very simple open space,
21 breakfast, kitchen nook, master bedroom, and a
22 studio space to the rear that's connected by a
23 porch.

24 Upstairs are three additional bedrooms
25 and small office studio, but the massing kept on

1 building height. There was a little arrow on the
2 application. It's explanation was under building
3 orientation, but it's actually -- he's asking for
4 that one foot.

5 In reviewing the plan, I noticed that
6 it was actually two feet. And I think the
7 application -- the applicant would like to just ask
8 for the maximum he could possibly get, and we can
9 have some discussion on that as he goes through the
10 application.

11 MR. ILDERTON: Sir?

12 MR. FAVA: Eddie Fava with EE Fava
13 Architects representing my client, Vicki Clark, who
14 you may not be able to see, but who is moving to
15 the Island with her husband, Jeff. We are
16 proposing a very simple kind of clean modest home
17 at the corner of Middle and Station 25. There's a
18 concrete block, for lack of a better word, masonry
19 home on the corner there presently, which is this
20 home, which Randy has alluded to the fact that
21 you-all had already approved demolition on it. And
22 as far as neighborhood and general orientation,
23 it's on this location right here. This being
24 Middle and Jasper right behind it. So is two
25 busiest streets on the Island. The other thing I

1 the street side steps down towards the courtyard
2 side and the smaller homes -- it's an older
3 existing house right next door. So streetwise,
4 again, just something very similar with shed
5 dormers, appearance of a glassed in porch, breaking
6 down the front elevation massing. On the side --
7 I'm sorry, courtyard side, that's the interior
8 view, which is not as visible from public
9 right-of-way, the building's forwarded to one level
10 structure, two level along the opposite side
11 connected by the porch with the small out building,
12 which is not atypical to the Island. Then lastly
13 is the rear elevation, and a section through that,
14 again, breaking down the massing as it steps back
15 towards Middle Street. And the Station 26
16 elevation -- this element coming forward, this is
17 where we were asking for the relief from the second
18 level setback. With this element here, the
19 projection that covers the entry -- the side entry
20 that breaks up that side elevation, we felt like we
21 were addressing that pretty well. The other thing
22 that I did have a question about, and, Randy, I
23 looked at it again after you and I chatted as far
24 as our relief, the way that we had interpreted that
25 code or the ordinance by way of what was present

1 is, as I understood it, it says the bottom
2 elevation of the principal's building lowest
3 horizontal structural member could be no more than
4 the greater of either seven feet above grade or two
5 feet above FEMA.

6 Now, seven feet above grade puts it at
7 16 foot 6. And so that's where we were going -- we
8 thought that if we asked for the additional foot,
9 that allowed us to be at 17 foot 6 for the lowest
10 structural member. I will leave that to you-all's
11 interpretation. We are trying to get as much
12 height as possible feeling that it's compatible and
13 it fits within all of the overall heights that are
14 allowable and all of neighbors as I just pointed
15 out.

16 Now, Randy did point out, too, that
17 part of that design standard number two was the
18 finished floor should be no more than three feet
19 above FEMA, but I didn't see how that could be
20 accommodated in this either way -- or, again, no
21 disrespect to whoever interprets that ordinance or
22 how it is, but if we met it here with the relief,
23 we would be able to park underneath the structure
24 rather than have it slightly lower. And if that's
25 possible, that's what we would do.

1 it's outside the historic district, it is in the
2 historic district.

3 MR. ILDERTON: Okay. Great. Thank
4 you.

5 MR. ROBINSON: Not in the national
6 registry, but in the historic.

7 MR. ILDERTON: Duke?

8 MR. WRIGHT: I think the design is
9 fine. I have no questions with the design. Now,
10 that it is in a historic district, we are not
11 allowed HardiePlank and require wood siding in the
12 historic district. So that could be an issue, if
13 I'm correct on that. I think that's the position.

14 MR. HERLONG: I think you are correct.

15 MR. ILDERTON: All right.

16 MR. WRIGHT: And the windows I think
17 are okay. But other than that, I'm okay with it.

18 MR. ILDERTON: Right. I think it's
19 broken up nicely. It's attractive compared to
20 what's there. It's really going to improve that
21 corner. And I really don't have any problem with
22 Hardie because it has the bead and it's thicker
23 Hardie and it's essentially a good product. I
24 mean, it is a good product. And it's very low
25 maintenance and what they call sustainable these

1 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you, sir. Is
2 there any public comment to this application?
3 Public comment section is closed.

4 Randy, anything to add?

5 MR. FAVA: One more thing. I apologize
6 everybody. We had, needless to say, submitted
7 originals for preliminary. With the information we
8 had, Kat said we could ask for final. But it's
9 certainly up to you-all. But with that speaking to
10 some of the materials, we were looking at a Marvin
11 Integrity type window, which is an insulated
12 material. Mr. and Ms. Clark would like very much
13 to go with the HardiePlank as a low maintenance on
14 the exterior, the heavier grade with the bead. I
15 know that's something that -- typically you-all may
16 prefer it to be wood. We will defer it as you say.
17 But with this new structure and the heavier grade
18 of it with the bead at the bottom is something that
19 they would like materialwise, and we have the rest
20 of that listed as well. The Tabby stucco base,
21 painted wood trim, five V crimp metal wood, and
22 wood doors.

23 MR. ILDERTON: Anything, Randy?
24 Anything else you need to add.

25 MR. ROBINSON: Only the submittal says

1 days, which is a catch word, but it's true that it
2 is what it is. So I don't have a problem with that
3 aspect of it. I don't know, again, if we can
4 change, but -- Steve?

5 MR. HERLONG: Well, I love the facade
6 of the two of the Middle and then the Jasper facade
7 is fine and the courtyard facade. I think you
8 probably pulled it away from the church for noise
9 reasons, which I can appreciate.

10 It's just that it's almost as though
11 the Station 26 facade is like the back of the
12 house. It just -- this particular facade I'm
13 looking at, which is the public facade just sort of
14 looks to be the least successful facade. It's just
15 very tall, and I just wish there was a way to
16 moderate it in some way because we are giving some
17 setback relief to let you get closer to that
18 facade. It's just a large tall facade on the
19 street. It just seems like it's almost backwards,
20 but that is my comment.

21 MR. ILDERTON: Kelly?

22 MS. MESSIER: I saw something -- one of
23 the elevations it talked about the pool. Was there
24 going to be a swimming pool? There's the desire to
25 do that in the long term, but nothing planned

1 presently.

2 MS. MESSIER: Okay. But it would
3 obviously -- you can see where it would go. And, I
4 guess, you know, I just saw on this same facade
5 there's like, you know, three garage doors and then
6 another door and a set of steps. And, you know,
7 was just sort of wondering how you were going to
8 handle all of that and also how you were going to
9 handle it with the ordinance that allows just one
10 curb cut.

11 MR. FAVA: Again, I think the desire
12 would be that if there's any paved surface, that it
13 be pervious and it happens just here. The rest of
14 this would just be grass for parking for boats and
15 parking. There are no curbs or anything there
16 presently. So they were going -- to be perfectly
17 honest, if they could pull in the boat here or golf
18 cart over, that would be the idea. But the only
19 area -- and that could be a stipulation of this
20 approval, if you agree to do it.

21 MS. MESSIER: So where the boat was
22 going was going to go here.

23 MR. FAVA: Yes, ma'am.

24 MS. MESSIER: I mean, it looks like you
25 were going to make that look more like the siding

1 comment is a fair comment, but if you look at
2 the -- at the Middle street elevation, it seems
3 to -- it doesn't, from that elevation, it doesn't
4 look so stark going down that side. But I mean,
5 just looking at the Station 26 elevation, just the
6 flat side, it does look sort of stark, but it
7 doesn't look that way from the Middle Street
8 elevation.

9 MR. HERLONG: There's movement in the
10 facade. You don't necessarily see it, I guess, in
11 the flat elevation.

12 MR. FAVA: May I respond? I completely
13 understand your comment. And as you said there's
14 relief in it, but I think it's something we even
15 resolved that there would be further study on that.
16 And I'm happy to do that with staff to develop that
17 elevation a little more for a little more relief.

18 MR. WRIGHT: I think the house across
19 the street, Station 30?

20 MR. ILDERTON: 26 is across the street.

21 MR. WRIGHT: Is pretty much the same.
22 It's the back of the house, the garage. Normally
23 there's a large mobile home parked out there. So I
24 don't think that that is really disturbing me.

25 MR. CRAVER: I mean, I don't have a

1 or something.

2 MR. FAVA: Yes, ma'am.

3 MS. MESSIER: I mean, can that be done
4 with some of these other things so that it didn't
5 just look more like the back of the house with all
6 of these garage doors or try the make it --

7 MR. FAVA: Absolutely.

8 MS. CLARK: And we had talked about
9 that.

10 MR. ILDERTON: Rhonda?

11 MS. SANDERS: I like it. It's real
12 simple. HardiePlank. So the other houses -- this
13 house is in the historic district, but there are
14 other houses and structures around that are not
15 historic. So I don't understand why there would be
16 a problem with HardiePlank. I mean, so I agree
17 with that.

18 MR. ILDERTON: Billy?

19 MR. CRAVER: I like it. I think that
20 you have designed a house that looks like an old
21 Sullivan's Island -- I mean, the layout looks like
22 an old Sullivan's Island house. I want that little
23 office. I'm not sure how to move it down the
24 street. And I don't have a problem with
25 HardiePlank at all. So no -- I think Steve's

1 problem.

2 MR. WRIGHT: I thought of the same
3 thing Steve did when I looked at it, but I think
4 it's going be fine.

5 MR. CRAVER: I think it will be fine
6 too.

7 MR. WRIGHT: By the way, I'm okay with
8 HardiePlank. I just was stating that I thought it
9 was something we had done before, so I am glad that
10 we're moving to the real world.

11 MR. HERLONG: Maybe in this instance
12 it's okay.

13 MR. ILDERTON: I agree. I agree with
14 that. I agree.

15 MR. CRAVER: I agree with that.

16 MR. ILDERTON: We don't want to say
17 it's hard and fast.

18 MR. FAVA: Can I make one more comment.
19 You-all have seen me on instances -- I certainly
20 understand that. And we had that discussion as
21 well. But it felt like that as you-all look at
22 things site specifically, if there's ever a
23 location that it's deemed appropriate by virtue of
24 the busy streets and where it sits, that this one,
25 particularly with the type of HardiePlank we're

1 looking at.
 2 MR. HERLONG: Next door has
 3 HardiePlank.
 4 MR. CRAVER: It's hard to say no when
 5 it's right there.
 6 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a motion?
 7 MR. CRAVER: I move we give final
 8 approval as submitted.
 9 MR. ILDERTON: Second.
 10 MS. SANDERS: Second.
 11 MR. ILDERTON: Discussion? Everybody
 12 in favor?
 13 ALL: Aye.
 14 MR. ILDERTON: To our lat it's
 15 submittal. 2308 Jasper.
 16 Randy, has this been before us before?
 17 MR. ROBINSON: Yep. 2308 Jasper, yes,
 18 has been before you before. It's a historic
 19 structure under 1,200 square feet. They are
 20 wanting to put a second structure on the back of
 21 the lot. You give them conceptual approval. They
 22 have been to the Board of Zoning Appeals. The
 23 Board of Zoning Appeals has given them special
 24 exception status. And now they're coming back to
 25 you-all from final approval.

1 MR. CRAVER: Looks fine to me.
 2 MR. ILDERTON: Rhonda?
 3 MS. SANDERS: Looks good to me.
 4 MR. ILDERTON: Kelly?
 5 MS. MESSIER: The stairs on the Jasper
 6 elevation aren't the same on the site plan and on
 7 the building elevations.
 8 MR. MCCANTS: No. I think the ones on
 9 the Myrtle are the ones that are incorrect, and I
 10 have that corrected here.
 11 MS. MESSIER: Okay. The Myrtle one.
 12 MR. MCCANTS: I went back to the office
 13 and yelled at myself about that. You will see it
 14 here I have it corrected. So that elevation and on
 15 this elevation.
 16 MS. MESSIER: Okay. All right. So
 17 that was, I guess, the one thing. And, I guess, I
 18 noticed that it looks like on the end of the house
 19 here you are going to put some HVAC units.
 20 MR. MCCANTS: I'm not sure where you're
 21 pointing. That's correct.
 22 MS. MESSIER: And I assume this is sort
 23 of like a cable type railing.
 24 MR. MCCANTS: Right. There's a detail
 25 on I think maybe page A8.

1 Let's see. I was looking this up. You
 2 know, just the design has been approved by you-all.
 3 I think the thing to look at is the exterior
 4 materials. You-all feel like it's okay. It is
 5 inside a national registered district, and it is a
 6 historical structure.
 7 MR. ILDERTON: Yes, sir.
 8 MR. MCCANTS: Karl McCants for the
 9 record. Well, Randy summed up that. I guess
 10 materials would that be -- shall we start there.
 11 Look at the plans, there's a mixture of materials
 12 on there. We're using HardiePlank artisan, which
 13 is a little different than what is present here.
 14 It's a little thicker. It's actually the same
 15 nominal size as wood siding. It's a larger shadow
 16 line. Other materials will be wood. On there
 17 would be the shiplap siding, and then board and
 18 batten. The board and batten will be Hardie.
 19 We're looking at a five V crimp metal roof on the
 20 structure, and the underpinning will be vertical
 21 1-by-4 pressure-treated.
 22 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Public
 23 comment section? Randy, anything else?
 24 MR. ROBINSON: No.
 25 MR. ILDERTON: Billy?

1 MS. MESSIER: Well, my question is
 2 where the HVAC units are, do you think we want to
 3 make something more solid so we're not looking
 4 through at them.
 5 MR. MCCANTS: Well, we could, but we
 6 can also handle that with some landscaping.
 7 MS. MESSIER: I don't know. I just --
 8 I sort of like the idea of hiding the units with
 9 the porch, but I guess --
 10 MR. MCCANTS: And it would be simple
 11 enough to maybe do some louvers or something
 12 similar with the underpinning. I want to have -- I
 13 want to allow it to be able to breathe, you know.
 14 I don't want to put something solid there.
 15 MS. MESSIER: Well, the breathe thing
 16 makes sense. So that was just a question because
 17 usually the enclosures sort of visually conceal
 18 them.
 19 MR. MCCANTS: Sure.
 20 MS. MESSIER: My other question
 21 regarding this house is the swimming pool that is
 22 currently there. I mean, there's a curb cut, you
 23 know, off of Jasper and one off of Myrtle. And the
 24 sides of the yard are fenced in, but every time I
 25 have been by there, those gates are always wide

1 open. So it's really not meeting the swimming pool
2 enclosure regulation with those gates open. And, I
3 guess, I was also just wondering while this house
4 was under construction if there needs to be any
5 provisions to make that comply. And if the gates
6 don't actually even open in the proper direction,
7 nor meet the pool enclosure requirements, I don't
8 know as they build this pool and renovate it if we
9 need to ask them to bring this up to the --

10 MR. MCCANTS: Well, that was covered in
11 a BZA meeting. There was a provision put in there
12 that that curb cut that's coming off of Myrtle
13 would be abandoned and that that would only be a
14 gate -- people sized gate to be put in at that
15 point. And then also during that BZA meeting,
16 there was a question that if Randy can actually
17 fine them for leaving the gates open, and he said,
18 yes, he could.

19 Now, what we're going to have to look
20 at is the approach to the new structure use the
21 existing driveway. And I have spoken with my
22 client about it, and what he's looking at doing is
23 putting a new fence in that's going to come off of
24 the historic structure that will wraparound the
25 pool, so he won't have that issue with having a

1 (The meeting was adjourned at
2 7:51 p.m.).
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

1 gate that's facing onto Jasper closed all of time
2 to be able to pull in. It wouldn't be a good idea
3 to try to pull off this side of the road right
4 there, get out, and open that gate. So we're going
5 to reconfigure that.

6 MS. MESSIER: I'm not exactly following
7 what you're saying. You're saying you're going to
8 put a new fence to make the pool comply with the
9 pool enclosure regulations?

10 MR. MCCANTS: That's correct. And
11 we're going to abandon the other access off of
12 Myrtle.

13 MS. MESSIER: Okay. Sounds good.

14 MR. HERLONG: I think it's fine. Very
15 attractive submittal.

16 MR. ILDERTON: I think it's good also.

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

18 MR. ILDERTON: Do I hear a motion?

19 MR. CRAVER: Move we approve as
20 submitted.

21 MR. ILDERTON: Second.

22 MS. MESSIER: Second.

23 MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor?

24 ALL: Aye.

25 MR. ILDERTON: We are adjourned.

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE.
2

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

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

14 Witness my hand, I have hereunto affixed my
15 official seal this 9th day of June, 2012, at
16 Charleston, Charleston County, South Carolina.
17
18
19

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