TOWN OF SULLIVAN’S ISLAND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

MEETING BEFORE:      PAT ILDERTON, CHAIRMAN

DATE:                July 20, 2016

TIME:                6:00 PM

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

REPORTED BY:         LORA L. McDaniel,
                     Registered Professional Reporter

A. WILLIAM ROBERTS, JR. & ASSOCIATES
Fast, Accurate & Friendly
Charleston, SC       Hilton Head, SC       Myrtle Beach, SC
(843) 722-8414       (843) 785-3263       (843) 839-3376
Columbia, SC         Greenville, SC       Charlotte, NC
(803) 731-5224       (864) 234-7030       (704) 573-3919
APPEARANCES:

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

(INDEX AT REAR OF TRANSCRIPT)
THE CHAIRMAN: Let's call it 6:00. This is the July 20, 2016 meeting of the Sullivan's Island Design Review Board. It is now 6:00. Members in attendance are Duke Wright, Pat Ilderton, Steve Herlong, Donna Webb, and Beverly Bohan.

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

MR. WRIGHT: Move this be approved.

MR. HERLONG: I second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Discussion? Everybody in favor?

(All present Board members stated aye.)

1914 MIDDLE STREET

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

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

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

Some background on this, this property was
granted a special exception for the historic home to be used as an accessory dwelling unit back in August of 2005. Any modification to the site needs to have the review and oversight of the DRB.

THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Thank you. Yes, ma’am.

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

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

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

I'm going to start with the site plan. This is Central with Middle Street here. This is the existing historic home. There is an existing pool that is sited just behind or between the historic cottage and the newer building. And we're just replacing that, slightly changing the location,
adding some pool vacuum around it and adding a pool house to that.

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

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

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

The change that we want to do to the second floor is to add a porch. It's really enlarging a porch. In the plan view currently, the porch is about six feet wide. And we're just extending it so it's the center bay -- thank you, Joe -- the center bay that matches the width of the property. And then what it looks like in elevation is this.
So the existing elevation is shown here with the existing porch, and you can see we're just expanding it to match the width of the building, adding a low slope roof with a trellis appearance on the edge and new door and two new windows and then, of course, railing.

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

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

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

And then I want to go back two elevations. And this is the elevation sheet that is facing
Central. This is the existing home and these are the changes that we're making to it. So we're going to add a new roof. We're adding shutters to all the windows. We're deciding not to add impact windows, but to add shutters that have impact protection.

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Great.

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

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

MR. HENDERSON: No.

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

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

MR. HENDERSON: It's a historic property.

There's a pool being put in, and there's an accessory structure being put in. We went ahead and issued --
the building permit staff issued the permit to get
the owners started with their demolition, started on
some of this work; replacing the lattice on the
foundation.

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

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

MR. HENDERSON: Right.

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

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


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

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

Good work.

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Donna.

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

MS. BOHAN: I agree.

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

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

MR. HERLONG: Several steps.

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

Anybody want to run this project down? Public comment section is closed.

Joe, nothing more to add?

MR. HENDERSON: No, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do we have a motion?

MR. WRIGHT: You have a motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Second?

MR. HERLONG: I seconded it. I have a
question. Is it up for final approval?

   MS. BURTON: Yes.

   MR. HENDERSON: To the discretion of the Board.

   MR. HERLONG: What was it here for?

   MS. BURTON: We want final approval.

   MR. HERLONG: Approved as submitted.

   MR. WRIGHT: The application is conceptual.

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

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

   MR. HENDERSON: If you would, please.

   MR. HERLONG: Second to that.

   THE CHAIRMAN: Everybody in favor?

   (All Board members present stated aye.)

   THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ma'am.

   MR. BURTON: Thank you very much.

   2414 JASPER BOULEVARD

   THE CHAIRMAN: 2414 Jasper.

   MR. HENDERSON: This is agenda item D-1, it's a nonhistoric property design review.
MR. WELLS: We have a new set of plans.
We had to scrap our plans. We have a crawl space now.

MR. HENDERSON: There have been some modifications to the original plans.
This is a new home construction. The applicants are requesting modification of the zoning standards for principal building square footage of 9.2 percent, and also second story side setback, 100 percent on that standard on two portions of the side elevations. And I can run through those on the projector here.

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

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

MR. WELLS: Yes.

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

MR. WELLS: It is.

MR. ADRIAN: It's four feet lower.

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

MR. ADRIAN: No drive, no garage.
MR. HENDERSON: There's no parking underneath the house.

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

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

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

MR. WRIGHT: Detached garage has been added.

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

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

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

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

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

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

    MR. ADRIAN: Four feet.

    MR. WRIGHT: That would help.

    THE CHAIRMAN: Lowered it quite a bit.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And then I guess the real question would be that two-foot additional side setback. It occurs really on the front, main body of the house. Full
two-story little structure with a gable roof. And that gable roof starts -- has the long slope down and has a couple dormers that pop into it, if you look.

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

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

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

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

MR. HERLONG: I think it might look fine. I'm just not sure I've ever seen a treatment like that before, which is not saying it wouldn't look right. I'm not sure. This is one of the places -- a
situation where 3-D image would explain it.

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

MR. ADRIAN: Sure.

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

MR. ADRIAN: Almost eight inches.

THE CHAIRMAN: Looks pretty wide off the side.

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

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

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

MR. ADRIAN: Correct.

MR. HERLONG: With the extended roof that has the dormers in it. I can't see what that would look like. I can't imagine that, how it would really look placed on the site. That's my only question
really. Not something you can answer without seeing 3-D image.

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

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

MR. ADRIAN: No. No.

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

MR. ADRIAN: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's not a large house.

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

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

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any public comment to the application? Public comment section is
closed.

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

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

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

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

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

MS. BOHAN: Exactly.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Donna.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MS. WEBB: I don't know.

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

MR. ADRIAN: I can certainly work on spacing.

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

MR. ADRIAN: I can work on it. I want to say right now that dormer is probably centered between the windows on the front elevation and the first floor. We can certainly stack them. Center one stays where it is over the door. Left one goes
over the left side. Window right goes over the right window. That may help.

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

    MR. ADRIAN: That piece there?
    MS. WEBB: Above that left garage.
    MR. WELLS: It's just because where that bedroom -- where that bedroom wall is.

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

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

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

    THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Steve.
    MR. HERLONG: Okay, I have a question. I see some of the side setback relief you're requesting. What about size, overall square footage relief?

    MR. HENDERSON: They're requesting 9.2
percent or 373 square feet. And the total square
footage would come out to 4,420.

MR. HERLONG: Half acre lot?

MR. HENDERSON: Yes.

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

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

MR. HERLONG: Yeah.

MR. ADRIAN: Okay.

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

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

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

MR. HERLONG: It's submitted for
conceptual?

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

MR. ADRIAN: Sounds good.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do I hear a second?

MS. BOHAN: I second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Discussion? Everybody in favor?

(All present Board members stated aye.)

2002 I’ON AVENUE

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

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

Again, this is to, I think, specifically to reduce the square footage of the building. The applicant has presented a set of plans in front of you that is reduced by 477 square feet. They have also relocated the pool to the --
MR. RHODES: Station 20.

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir.

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

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

I think it's going to look real good.

THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Thank you.

Anything more to add, Joe?

MR. HENDERSON: No, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Public comment? Public comment section is closed.
Steve, you want to start.

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

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Donna.

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Beverly.
MS. BOHAN: I think the changes are successful. I think it's a win-win. Love the design. I approve it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Great. I also like it.

I'm fine. Duke.

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Do I hear a motion?

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Second?

MR. WRIGHT: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Everybody in favor?

(All present Board members stated aye.)

TOSI WATER AND SEWER FACILITY

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

MR. HENDERSON: This is just an item for information. Greg Gress, the water and sewer director, wanted me to run this by the Design Review Board.
THE CHAIRMAN: Really? The town is going to run some of their properties by the Design Review Board? This is a first. All right. Go for it.

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

THE CHAIRMAN: I have an audience sitting right here.

MR. HENDERSON: Captive audience.

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

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

MR. HENDERSON: That's right. As long as there's no site obstruction. We went out and
measured the actual --

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

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

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

MR. HENDERSON: Wooden stockade fence for privacy.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why do we need privacy there?

MR. HENDERSON: Just screening.

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

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

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: They're going to store more
stuff than they historically have stored on there.

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

MR. ROBINSON: Actually the neighbors asked for this.

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it going to be unpainted fence?

MR. HENDERSON: Yes.

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

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

MS. LANGLEY: Stop sign in other direction.

MR. HENDERSON: The placement will be sensitive.

MR. HERLONG: I have a question. I wonder a little bit about that eight-foot tall fence looking a little flat and severe. A little bit of planting
at the front of some very durable -- well, there's some planting that's surviving. A little bit of planting at the front of the fence of a proper hedge like a recent submittal in the commercial district would help it a lot, to soften the facade.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MS. BOHAN: Agree.

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Do we have to --

MR. HENDERSON: This is an item for information.
STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR HISTORIC STRUCTURES

THE CHAIRMAN: Standards and Guidelines for Historic Structures.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The other reason cited was that there are very few historic structures in the commercial district, and that our residential structures are very unique and, thus, we need to review these design reviews on a case-by-case basis using the Secretary of Interior standards. Those were the reasons. You guys can jump in and help me out here if you want.
Those are the main reasons of why we didn't think that design guidelines were needed.

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

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

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

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

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

MS. BOHAN: From the new structure.

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Right.

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

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

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

The second one was to modify the historic preservation of historic property section. To encourage elevating, i.e., will allow you more square footage if you leave the house where it is without elevating it.
Option number two, to address the issue of elevating homes is to create a standard or guidelines, new standard or guideline within the RS district section of the ordinance. This is a -- nobody can read this. I can barely read it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. HENDERSON: Late August.

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

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

MR. ROBINSON: '16. And provided FEMA doesn't have any problems with them and they shouldn't because it's the same company that's been
developing other maps up and down the coast. Charleston County is just the last one. So it shouldn't be a problem.

MS. BOHAN: Number one city in the world.

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

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

There are so many strikes against that property that's historic that I think this town needs to look at adding some incentives. And the reasoning behind what we were saying was to -- right now, if a home, existing historic home is 1,400 square feet,
automatically everybody starts looking for a way to whittle it down to 1,200 square feet, which is a very small structure.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. HENDERSON: Would a conditional, say hypothetically, 1,600 square foot historic structure,
would the condition be the house cannot be elevated, we will grant you the ability to build the new house? Is there a hard and fast condition applied to not elevating the house?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. WRIGHT: That was my only question.
MR. HERLONG: It would still be a good idea.

MS. BOHAN: I agree.

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

MS. BOHAN: Exactly. I agree.

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

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

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

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

MR. HERLONG: Variances.

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

City of Charleston, they can do it because
they're building thousands of homes a year. If they have a few variances, it's not a big deal. If we had ten structures that are noncompliant -- two structures that are noncompliant, that's 10 percent of 20, they kick us out of the program.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. HERLONG: Since it's hard to read, it's hard to comment. The concept was good.
MR. CLARK: It's the government. We don't read it until after it's approved.

THE CHAIRMAN: Billy wrote that; right?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: That's pretty amazing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regarding the historic design guidelines, again, we use those ten standards for all historic projects. Can I get a little feedback from you guys
about whether you think historic design guidelines would benefit the island in the future or really what are your views for how we apply the ten Secretary of Interior standards when we look at these projects?

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

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

MR. HERLONG: I think it's going to be a painful process. You're going to have to hire a consultant to come in and start interviewing and start having town meetings just like we did. Town meetings to identify what these guidelines should
say. And for such a small group of private residents.

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

THE CHAIRMAN: The process is just not broken.

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

THE CHAIRMAN: The process is not broken.

The Design Review Board has done a damn good job over the years. Certainly there's maybe been some mistakes, things we might want to do differently and all. That's going to be anything, hell. People are going to run through here and not everything is going to be liked. And certainly not everything is going to be to everybody's liking. That's the way it is in life.

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

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: We'll talk about that next. I don't know that we need to remake or add to our --
the complexity we deal with anyway. I think this Design Review Board reflects what Sullivan's Island is and it's an eclectic and generally forgiving way of living and all. We're trying to hold the line against bad taste or certainly destruction of historic properties.

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

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

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

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

I think that we'll need to define one way or the other whether we see the island needing to build on guidelines or building on some kind of idea of the building stock here, the historic buildings that we have, and how we are going to deal with that in the next 20 years or 30 years. We'll be
addressing it at some point through that process, I believe. So give that some thought.

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Thank you, Joe.

MR. HERLONG: One other. Go ahead.

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

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

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

MR. HENDERSON: Right.

MR. HERLONG: Those properties at the end of the island are on very low ground and in a very high zone. They look very awkward. I've been involved in some projects over there that are just awkward.
MR. CLARK: There's no way a homeowner can get around that if they put 50 percent into it. Can they legally stay on the ground and pay extra fee or they have to raise it up?

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

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

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

MR. CLARK: Up to 50 percent.

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

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

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

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

MR. HERLONG: One owner that has a house
and a rental.

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

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

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

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

MR. HENDERSON: That's right.

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

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

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

MR. ROBINSON: That's what it says.

MR. HENDERSON: That's a condition of the ordinance.
MR. CLARK: For example, retired couple,
income property, business.

MR. HERLONG: We had a discussion.

There's a previous council person family came to me, they have property on the island, 2,500 square foot home. And 600 square foot rental on the opposite street. They're approaching retirement. They would like to make some small additions to their little dwelling, 600 square foot dwelling and retire there in place and then have the retirement income in the home that they rent. They can't do that. None of that is allowed right now.

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

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

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

MS. BOHAN: I agree.

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

MS. BOHAN: Parts and pieces as necessary.

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

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

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

Over the last six months or so, I've been struggling with some of the applications that have come before the Board. What we're seeing are some uninspired designs that come before the Board wanting to get relief. And the Board gives them some good options. Usually the Board is going to say: Maybe let's lower that second floor roof. Let's get that wall height down to reduce the appearance in height.
The problem we've seen is these projects go away. They leave the Review Board and they go straight to town and they build 4,000 and 4,100 square foot uninspired home. And it's not good for the communities they're in, not good for the island to have these out-of-character homes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Poorly designed.

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

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

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

I've written some language here that
everybody can read that I've tried to make as absolutely simple as possible that will force people to either build a one-and-a-half, basically one-and-a-half story home or a home that has a second floor and dormers.

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

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

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

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

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

   MS. BOHAN: Exactly.

   MR. HERLONG: That is another option.
MS. BOHAN: I was thinking that.

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

MR. HERLONG: Then a discussion occasionally.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. HERLONG: There's the second floor.

That wall goes up.
THE CHAIRMAN: Fire wall.

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

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

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

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

MR. HENDERSON: 75 percent or what have you.

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

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

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

    MR. WRIGHT: I think we should move forward.

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

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

    MR. ROBINSON: It does.

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

    MR. HENDERSON: Not many.

    MR. ROBINSON: Not many. Probably what?

    MR. HENDERSON: Five or six.

    MR. ROBINSON: I was about to say four or five. I mean, not many.
MS. WEBB: The general perception, unless someone has been through the process, I would bet that most people, 75 percent think that everything does come before the DRB. You know what I mean?

Unless you've been through the process. I don't know. We may not get a lot of push-back.

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

MR. HENDERSON: Conceptual.

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

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

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

MR. O'NEIL: It might be worth noting, as
some of you that weren't around at the creation as some of you clearly were, when we came up with Design Review, that was a pretty radical idea. It had a lot of opposition. I'm not trying to justify what we got. I think it's remarkable how far we've come in that time.

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

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

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

MR. WRIGHT: What are we wrapping up?

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

MR. WRIGHT: What are addressing now?

MR. HENDERSON: If I could just have a general motion to move forward with the
recommendations to town council regarding the design guidelines and the options.

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

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that good for you?

MR. HENDERSON: That works.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do I hear a second?

MR. HERLONG: I second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Everybody in favor?

(All present Board members stated aye.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We're adjourned.

(The meeting was concluded at 7:21 p.m.)
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