Town of Sullivans Island In Re Design Review Board Sullivan's Island Design Review Board Mtg.

May 20, 2015

		May 20, 2015
1	INDEX	46
2		Page
3	2602 Atlantic Avenue	3
4	3308 Jasper Boulevard	33
5	2850 Brownell Avenue	42
6	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	45
7		;
8	REQUESTED INFORMATION INDEX	:
9		
10	(No Information Requested)	
11		
12		
13		
14	EXHIBITS	
15		
16	(No Exhibits Proffered)	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

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

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

Witness my hand, I have hereunto affixed my official seal this 29th day of May, 2015 at Charleston, Charleston County, South Carolina.



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

44 THE CHAIRPERSON: 1 Thank you. Duke. 2 MR. WRIGHT: I'm good. 3 THE CHAIRPERSON: I'm good, too. 4 MR. HERLONG: These things can happen. 5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mark. 6 MR. HOWARD: To all of us. 7 MS. WEBB: That's fine. MS. SANDERS: 8 I'm good. 9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Motion. MR. CRAVER: I move we grant the request. 10 11 MR. WRIGHT: Second. 12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Everybody in favor? 13 (Ayes were stated by all board members.) 14 THE CHAIRPERSON: We are adjourned. 15 (The meeting was concluded at 6:57 p.m.) 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

```
showed a slight overage on the zoning ordinance
1
2
     standard with regard to principal building coverage.
                 So the Design Review Board is allowed to
3
    give an increase of 20 percent in principal building
4
                I think Heather went over by point five; 3
5
     coverage.
 6
    percent?
                              Between 2 and 3 percent.
 7
                 MS. WILSON:
                 MR. HENDERSON:
                                 Heather is here requesting
8
 9
     small increase in principal building coverage.
10
     think sometimes margin of error and things happen in
     the construction process or in the surveying process.
11
12
                 THE CHAIRPERSON: Fairly insignificant
13
     request.
                                                 I'll let
                 MR. HENDERSON: That's right.
14
15
     Heather explain.
16
                 MS. WILSON:
                              70 square feet.
                                                It's my
17
     fault.
             Too careless with doing my calculations.
18
     Probably took out too many things like chimney and
19
     things like that when I was doing the square footage
20
     for the first floor heated. That's over by just
21
     under 70 square feet.
22
                 Going back over it with Chuck, who is the
23
     surveyor, I saw it's sort of half my mistake and half
24
     sort of tweaks in the field during inspection.
```

basically here to say I'm sorry.

1	with the change that Joe noted.
2	THE CHAIRPERSON: Second?
3	MS. SANDERS: Second.
4	THE CHAIRPERSON: Everybody in favor?
5	(Ayes were stated by all board members.)
6	MR. HENDERSON: I'm sorry, was that for
7	final approval?
8	MR. HOWARD: He said that.
9	MR. HENDERSON: I'm sorry. Thank you.
10	2850 BROWNELL AVENUE
11	THE CHAIRPERSON: We have our add-on.
12	2850 Brownell.
13	MR. HENDERSON: Yes, sir.
14	MR. HOWARD: We got what?
15	MR. HENDERSON: This is an add-on request
16	that I sent you digital correspondence on.
17	Ms. Heather Wilson is here. She is the architect on
18	this project. This is pertaining to a project that
19	we issued building permits for without a need for
20	request from the Design Review Board. So they met
21	all the zoning ordinance standards outright.
22	All they had to do was submit the plans to
23	town staff and issue the building permit. As part of
24	the certificate of occupancy requirements, they have
25	to get an as-built survey. That as-built survey

Move we approve as submitted

MR. CRAVER:

	May 20, 20
1	to have to ask for this one foot relief because, when
2	the design flood this guideline is based on FEMA's
3	flood elevations and the distance you can have off of
4	that.
5	Since the town went to the FEMA-plus-one,
6	which is considered the design elevation we have to
7	design to. When this was written, most foundations
8	or first floor framing was a foot; now most first
9	floor framing systems are anywhere from 14 to 16
10	inches. That's where that dimension comes into play
11	and why many times we have to come ask for relief.
12	It's something to do with grade but it's not all to
13	do with grade.
14	MR. HOWARD: The base has not yet been
15	decided.
16	MS. LURKIN: Randy has determined it will
17	be nine feet. And that was something that was
18	updated in your packet. When we originally
19	submitted, we did not have a determination at that
20	time.
21	So part of it also, if we were not granted

So part of it also, if we were not granted that, we would not have the ability to park underneath. There would not be enough space to park underneath the home. Every home along this parcel of land, every house has parking.

22

23

24

We do site the house exactly where the 1 house exists right now on the north property line. 2 3 You can see that the dotted line on your site plan is the existing home. We're coming towards the Warwick 4 5 property. We're asking to come towards the Warwick property by about three feet. It's not providing 6 them any extra hardship in terms of the distance that 7 8 they have set between the property line in their 9 home. 10 MR. HOWARD: I don't know, are they 11 natural sand dunes? There's kind of a grade

MS. LURKIN: There is. We have brought Randy in to look at that for us and help determine what that grade is, what that natural grade will be. And he is determining that and so we will be following whatever the town feels that natural grade should be.

In your request for the MR. HOWARD: eight-inch height variance, you're measuring it by the existing neighbors to the left and right?

MS. LURKIN: No, in your packet -- I can turn over this right here. In your packet, on this south elevation, you'll see in red how we're adhering to the guidelines. And it's not uncommon for people

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

variation on the lot.

May 20, 2015 38 1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thanks. 2 MR. HENDERSON: That will be in addition to principal building square footage, side setback, 3 and building foundation height. We're adding that to 4 5 the original application. 6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Is that all you have to 7 add, Joe? We're good? 8 MR. HENDERSON: Yes, sir. 9 THE CHAIRPERSON: No public here to 10 comment. Billy, you want to start off. 11 MR. CRAVER: I don't have a problem with 12 it at all. I like the design. 13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Rhonda. MS. SANDERS: Same here. 14 MS. WEBB: Love it. Glad you're not 15 asking for any more than what's already there. 16 17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mark. MR. HOWARD: So the side setback will be 18 the exact of what's already there? The existing 19 20 house? MS. LURKIN: No, not the existing home. 21 What I was saying is that the neighbors -- this new 22 home, the Warwick residence, they have 13-and-a-half 23 feet from their home to the property line. And we're 24 25 mirroring that on that property.

The building foundation height we're looking for is typical of the area. You can see the neighboring houses, and along the street all have parking underneath. So we're looking to just continue with what is happening in that neighborhood, and part of that is the result of the FEMA-plus-one additions.

And then we're also looking for five feet from the side facade to -- let me back up. We have tried to meet the guidelines to articulate that side facade on both the north and south property lines. So we were trying to articulate with these one story wings; therefore, we needed the additional five feet on that side facade.

MR. HENDERSON: Bronwyn, that's the 30-foot length where the articulation is required? You need five feet?

MS. LURKIN: We have 35 feet. We have articulated several times; on three times on this side and two times on that side and felt that we didn't want that side to get too busy, too many articulations.

By trying to keep a one-and-a-half story mass in the center, that additional five feet helped get the height needed on the second floor.

following. We started with trying to site the building very similar to where it is located now.

As Joe mentioned, we had resubmitted the site plan that we had originally sent in our submission because we had the house sited a little bit farther back. We didn't have all the current survey information. We brought that in line with this line right here, which is our limit.

We feel that where we have sited it is consistent with the homes that it neighbors, and the wings that come forward are also consistent on the Jasper side from a massing and neighborhood compatibility standpoint.

We are asking for several relief areas; one would be the side setbacks. And we are essentially mirroring what is existing on the side neighboring property lines on both the north and the south sides. We're not asking for any more or we're not asking for any less than what's already currently there.

We're also asking for about 800 square feet of additional conditioned space. Again, some of this is because we're trying to keep the main mass or I should say more on one story. It provided a little additional circulation that we needed.

to point those changes out.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thanks, Joe.

MS. LURKIN: I'm Bronwyn Lurkin with Herlong & Associates. This is 3308 Jasper Boulevard. I'm sure you're familiar with this area near Breach Inlet. It's essentially at the intersection of Jasper and Middle Street.

There is an existing home on the property that will be torn down. You can see that in this photograph right here. This is to the south. This is the neighbor to the south, the Warwick residence. And this is the Pollock residence to the north.

When we started working with our clients, part of our main goal -- you can see in this 3-D rendering -- was to have a main mass with a central portion and then have very low profile, one story wing that came out towards the street.

What we did notice, if you look in the aerial photograph, there's a great play of alternating sort of building configurations that go with these wings coming out towards Jasper Boulevard and then some alternating with homes that are essentially one main mass in the center.

There's sort of this interesting sort of rhythm along Jasper Boulevard that we're somewhat

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

34

1 footage, side setback relief, and principal building 2 foundation --3

(Mr. Herlong exits the room.)

THE CHAIRPERSON: Go for it.

MR. HENDERSON: Again, this is a new home construction. The applicants are requesting relief for principal square footage, and side setbacks, and principal building foundation height.

For the principle building square footage, applicants are requesting 20 percent to bring the square footage of the house up to 2,216 square feet.

Side setback relief of 25 percent, maxing Requesting eight feet on the side.

And for the foundation height, requesting eight inches when DRB's authority is to allow that one foot. All the requests are within your authority for relief.

I would point out that the site, the building footprint has been modified slightly from the packet that you received and were required to bring back the building footprint to not exceed the requirement of 2,123 feet, which is the build-to line. And it's that provision that prohibits any house going out further than any other house on the block, towards the marsh. I think Bronwyn is going

1	MR. CRAVER: I'm opposed.
2	THE CHAIRPERSON: One opposed.
3	MR. CRAVER: To be consistent with my vote
4	last time we got a house.
5	MS. SANDERS: That's what we want,
6	consistency.
7	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thanks, John. I'll be
8	glad to look at that house if you want me to.
9	DR. SELBY: I'm getting rid of the house.
10	I would like to tell them, whoever, whether it's my
11	children, they'll let me know this month if they
12	don't want it. They want me to sell it. That they
13	know you're very liberal.
14	THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, sir, exactly.
15	MR. HOWARD: I think we just want to
16	maintain the flavor.
17	3308 JASPER BOULEVARD
18	THE CHAIRPERSON: 3308 Jasper Boulevard.
19	MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, agenda item
20	D-1 is a certificate of appropriateness request for
21	historic property. This is 3308 Jasper Boulevard.
22	Herlong & Associates are requesting conceptual
23	approval for this new construction.
24	The applicants are requesting relief to
25	the zoning standards for principal building square

- 21 MR. HOWARD: I'll second.
- THE CHAIRPERSON: Discussion? Everybody 22
- in favor of her motion? 23
- (Ayes stated by Mr. Wright, Mr. Ilderton, 24
- Mr. Herlong, Mr. Howard, Ms. Webb, Ms. Sanders.) 25

extensive renovations and additions to historical 1 properties. We've really been quite liberal in what 2 people could do with their historic property. We're 3 not -- we haven't been a great obstacle to people 4 coming in and making -- having a large addition put 5 on or whatever. 6 MR. CRAVER: I would agree with that. 7 the last number of years, we've been a lot more 8

MR. CRAVER: I would agree with that. In the last number of years, we've been a lot more accommodating to people, trying to help them. In the earlier years, it was very difficult.

THE CHAIRPERSON: There were a couple of screwy board members on there.

Does anyone want to make a motion?

MS. SANDERS: I make a motion we keep the house on the historic list.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Do I hear a second?

DR. SELBY: One thing I would like to
emphasize again is safety. If you could be much more
liberal in things that you wanted to do to make sure
the house was safe. I think people could live with
that. I just don't want to leave the house that I
really don't think is safe, which I think should be
condemned like the house next door after Hugo. I
think would be better torn down.

If people are more liberal with your

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

30 1 either. 2 MR. WRIGHT: I was here when it first came 3 to the board. 4 THE CHAIRPERSON: I don't mind doing that. 5 If somebody wants to make a motion to do that, I'll 6 do that. And we can look at it. I feel strongly 7 probably it's not going to go -- it's probably not 8 going to pass to be taken off. 9 Looking at the house today as MR. WRIGHT: 10 I did -- all of you probably walked around it and 11 looked at it. In terms of compatibility of the 12 neighborhood, there are some historic structures right in the immediate neighborhood. There are some 13 relatively new houses. Trying to determine whether 14 15 that historic house, your house, could be relocated 16 on the lot with a newer house built behind it, that 17 could happen. That's not out of the question. 18 That's been done before. In terms of someone who might want to 19 20 preserve that house and build a new house, that's an option that a buyer could do. I don't think by 21 leaving it on the list, we're not diminishing the 22

THE CHAIRPERSON: This board historically has not been difficult for people that want to do

value of that property.

23

24

created.

THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. Do I hear a

3 motion?

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WRIGHT: Let me make -- I don't want to kick the can down the road because we need to make a tough decision. Steve's point -- this is not unprecedented. We have visited sites as a board to make sure that everyone is comfortable with the decision. That may be something that we might want to do in this case. We've done that several times over the years.

MS. SANDERS: Slippery, slippery slope.

MR. WRIGHT: I walked around the property today, under it and around it. It is deplorable right now. It needs a lot of work probably; hazards. I think that's something that we can't make judgement on. Unless an act of God could destroy the house, if lightening strikes.

MS. SANDERS: We are not God.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Are we going to come to a different decision by doing this? Like you said, are we just kicking the can down the road and prolonging it.

MR. WRIGHT: I don't think I would.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I don't think I would

MS.	SANDERS:	Passion	for	justice.
-----	----------	---------	-----	----------

MR. CRAVER: I wasn't here at the beginning of presentation. I would have to look at it very closely before I -- go look at it, go see it before I made a decision to either take it off or say we need to leave it.

MS. SANDERS: I understood a professional did do that. Snyder. Did he not do that when he came back, when it was requested to be put on the historic back in 2008?

MR. HENDERSON: He took a tour of the house, and he made a recommendation based upon his walk-through of the house. What could be done to the porch. You could remove the enclosure of the porch. You could remove the siding. He made the recommendation that it is indeed historic. He would remove it from its altered -- from what's stated in that document there, which is that it's altered.

MS. SANDERS: In these minutes, he backed it up with all four arguments you said in these minutes. It was put on the historic register at that time because he made his professional point. And the DRB voted on it. And it's a precedence and consistency. This is the whole purpose of this board. That's why this board and this ordinance was

	was	a	single	event,	one	home.
--	-----	---	--------	--------	-----	-------

THE CHAIRPERSON: Rhonda, do you want to weigh in.?

MS. SANDERS: Sure. Dr. Selby, I think you did not make a mistake at all. I think what you did was incredible. This was not originally put on the list. You went and made efforts to have it reviewed by Mr. Snyder and by the board to have it put on the list because of this person, because of the house, because it is historic.

And I know you might not feel an attachment to it right now, it doesn't feel safe to you, but I concur with Duke and with Steve and with Pat. This house -- somebody is not going to come in and live in it like it is. It's not safe probably. They're going to come in and redo it and remake it so that man's history remains on this island.

You can leave a legacy on this island because of what you did. I don't think it was a mistake at all. I think it was tremendous.

DR. SELBY: Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Good point.

Billy.

DR. SELBY: I don't feel that way myself now. I feel guilty.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: He put it on the list. 2 Snyder put it on this list. I don't know if he went 3 inside the houses or anything. He may have. 4 MR. CRAVER: When I say put it on the 5 list, when the planning commission said these are all the houses that are going to be designated as 6 7 historic houses and these are the areas that are going to be designated as historic. We used Snyder's 8 9 study. 10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah, we used Snyder's. 11 MR. CRAVER: We didn't do any analysis to 12 see if any of it was correct. 13 THE CHAIRPERSON: I agree. 14 MR. CRAVER: It just was done. 15 THE CHAIRPERSON: I agree. 16 MR. HERLONG: For the board's knowledge, 17 there was a time when there were -- I don't know if 18 it was a dozen homes came back before the review 19 board, and I forget how many were deemed historic. 20 Some we might've said were altered. I don't think 21 everything came before us. 22 MR. CRAVER: Most of them. 23 MR. HERLONG: Most of them, maybe a few 24 didn't and were considered altered. That was a large 25 group of homes. As opposed to when you had yours, it

Just like the one on front beach at the end of Pettigrew. We kept that and a huge addition. It really doesn't look too bad from the beach or from the road. It looks like okay. Big, I mean, the addition and all. We were able to preserve something in that. Anyway.

DR. SELBY: My understanding from my standpoint, this has nothing to do with the looks or the value. It has to do with safety as far as I'm concerned.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Donna.

MS. WEBB: Bringing it down to the issues, we can't, like you said, make a judgment on value or safety. The issue is deciding if the property is of historical significance enough to preserve it. And I like Steve's idea of actually seeing a little bit more about the property. I'm surprised that David missed this one on the initial mapping of historical properties. They answered the questions about how it was done fairly quickly. And without being able to see inside, you can't really tell, aside from what you have.

MR. CRAVER: We haven't seen inside any of the houses when we put them on the list. Again, it was done very quickly.

And I remember the Barkley house and just remember the very next meeting I shot my mouth off and said: We made a mistake last meeting. I just want to go on the record and say that. About taking the Barkley house off.

It was a lot of political pressure put on us. We caved back when the Barkley house because of that. I just want to go on record. I remember that. And I caved, too. I went on the next meeting. I made that statement just to make myself feel a little bit better anyway.

Value can't be a consideration of any time. I don't think we can consider the depreciation. I really do think this house -- I probably think it adds value, but it doesn't really decrease the value of this property as far as sitting on the property.

MR. CRAVER: You can't change it to the extent you can change a house that's not on the list.

THE CHAIRPERSON: There have been extensive changes. Look what we let the Colbert house do. We let them take that, turn it completely around. It was majorly changed, but it still has some historic presence the way it was done. And a great house.

MR. CRAVER: I can tell you when the planning commission put --

DR. SELBY: Why was that one taken off the list?

MR. CRAVER: -- created the historic district and put the houses on the list, it was done very quickly because there was a feeling that too many houses were being torn down. And the whole discussion was, you know, we can review this later. We're not really reviewing all these things now. And if somebody has a problem with it, they can come in. They can make their case and get off the list.

And there was a lot of concern at the time that, once you were on that list, you would never get off of it regardless of whether you were really historic or not historic.

I'm inclined to look really closely at it when somebody comes in. It really affects the value of their property.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I don't think that's the case in this case. Taking this out does not increase the value of that property. Taking this house off does not increase the value of that property, which certainly would have no bearing on our decision anyway, the value or not value.

May 20, 2015 22 1 added to the exterior. He saw the enclosure of the porch. I don't think he did a very in-depth 2 3 evaluation. 4 MR. HOWARD: It's obviously an old home. 5 There's been a lot of changes. Like Steve just said, 6 if you eliminate some of the added porches, you may 7 end up with a cottage and even a greater potential. 8 Speaking of the precedent here, the 9 on-and-off of the historic list is just a matter of Design Review Board. So we have precedent that 10 11 properties have been taken on and off? 12 MR. HENDERSON: Not since I have been 13 Randy, do you know of any properties that have 14 been taken off of the list? 15 MR. ROBINSON: Yes. 16 MR. CRAVER: Yes, absolutely. 17 MR. ROBINSON: Only one I can think of --18 MR. CRAVER: Barkley's house. 19 MR. ROBINSON: Barkley's house off 20 Atlantic Avenue. 21 MR. HOWARD: Not often? 22 MR. HENDERSON: Sounds like just one since 23 2005. 24 That's the only one I can MR. ROBINSON:

think of.

1	historic or not.
2	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Mark.
3	MR. HOWARD: Though I have only seen it
4	from the exterior, so the interior might change your
5	mind. In 2003, this surveyor said it was not
6	historic?
7	MR. HENDERSON: That's correct.
8	MR. HOWARD: The history we're talking
9	about is due to Judge Waring's ownership?
10	MS. SANDERS: That's not all.
11	MR. HOWARD: That's what I'm trying to
12	clear up.
13	MR. HENDERSON: There are three criteria
14	that it met. If you look on the worksheet behind
15	your agendas, I've highlighted those three criteria.
16	One of them pertain to a certain person, place or
17	time in history.
18	MR. HOWARD: Your original surveyor said
19	it's not historic.
20	MR. HENDERSON: He did a general
21	assessment. I think he did his windchill survey from
22	the road and saw
23	THE CHAIRPERSON: It wasn't scientific.
24	MS. SANDERS: He didn't have access.
25	MR. HENDERSON: He saw the vinyl siding

1.3

another precedent for somebody else wanting to come ask for the same thing.

And another option, when we would have these type of issues come before the board in years past, one consideration might be to post-pone any judgement and call next month's meeting at the house so that we can actually see it, walk through it to determine whether or not it's historic character is still there or not. Just to be completely fair.

(Billy Craver entered the room.)

DR. SELBY: The danger of things happening.

MR. HERLONG: Pardon?

DR. SELBY: Such as burning down after four major fires.

MR. HERLONG: I get that's a problem. I don't see that is telling me whether it's historic or not. That's a different issue.

DR. SELBY: Which is more important?

MR. HERLONG: Well, I think they're just two different issues. So I'm having trouble thinking that it should be taken off the list. I think, if anything, we should call next month's meeting and see the house, put our own eyes on it to really see the interior character, see whether any of us think it's

preserved something that was historic on the island, and that character is in that house, although on the exterior portions of it, it certainly have been altered.

I feel like the island would lose something valuable if the house -- if we took it off the list, I'm afraid a buyer would come in and, without considering things, would demolish and want to build a new house. And I think we would all lose something.

DR. SELBY: I think you are -- I think it is going to burn down.

MR. HERLONG: I think there might be ways. You might have to protect it in some way. Take the electricity off. I understand the dilemma. I really do. There may be options where this house, depending on the square footage, could become a cottage, and another modern house could be built on the property as well. So there are potential advantages to having an older house on a property.

I think the fact that there is a potential fire danger is a problem. I think that's hard for the board to use that fact as a reason to say this should be taken off the historic list. That's a tough call I think we have. I think it could set

	18
1	THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, I know. I worked
2	on it. I know it's a difficulty.
3	DR. SELBY: I know it's dangerous.
4	THE CHAIRPERSON: I would have a hard time
5	voting to see that house demolished, which is
6	essentially what this vote would open up to. Steve.
7	MR. HERLONG: Well, I tend to agree with
8	Pat. Personally I'm just finishing a renovation of a
9	cottage that probably was in very similar condition
LO	to your cottage. It's over on Station 19 where we
L1	live.
L2	And the bones of the structure were you
L3	could see what was originally there. Very similar to
14	your cottage, but it had gone through a lot of
15	alterations. And we took it back and tried to make
16	it look as original but making it more functional.
17	DR. SELBY: Make it more safe.
18	MR. HERLONG: It became more safe.
19	I think your house, this structure can
20	become a safe and valued structure because it's old.
2 1	It's part of the historic fabric of the island.
22	I think, when I see people that come
23	through the renovated house that we the renovated

25

portion of the house we have, you can just see

there's a -- there's a smile on their face because we

that property. They have much more life to them and vibrancy.

Knowing the house doesn't depreciate the property, and it does have, as you so well pointed out, does have more sole significance to it with Judge Waring's connection to it, it would be tough for me as much as I would do anything for this man almost, it would be tough for me to say I want to see this house disappear from the island.

I think my company has worked on it enough to know that it could be brought back to life or renovated or made safer or whatever. There's a way to do it. I'd have a hard time, John, voting to see that house disappear, both from my personal point of view, also from the historism of Sullivan's Island.

I don't know that -- I'm not so sure that house gone from that property, the house would be -- the property would be worth less. I think you might be in error in thinking this is a problem house, in my opinion. I think you might be looking at it from a point of view of --

DR. SELBY: Having lived there for forty years.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah.

DR. SELBY: Before there was a problem.

	_
16	
and	· ·

houses. Taking these wonderful old Sullivan's Island
houses and redoing them, adding significant additions
to them. And in many ways and in most ways, they're
better than if you had the product is better than
if you had a brand new house to turn out with.

As far as devaluing the property, this house, in my opinion, being the fact it's sitting on the property does not devalue it.

DR. SELBY: I'm not worried about the money.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Right. If there's nobody in it then, you know right now, anybody moving into it is going to do an extensive renovation structurally, roof-wise, whatever else and mechanically, everything. It would be made safer then and all and probably transformed.

There's countless houses, one on Pettigrew being built right now, almost finished, that was on the historic list that was done. There's the house we did for the Colbert family on front beach. It was historic. Both the houses -- one Steve did on Goldbug on the back, the Vogel. Great structures.

None of these houses would be, in my opinion, as interesting and well done had those original structures not had to be dealt with, with

T'11 I'll start it. THE CHAIRPERSON: 1 2 start it if you want. T will. I remember this back MR. WRIGHT: 3 in '08 when the application was made to put it on the 4 list. And we deliberated long and hard on the board. 5 That's why I thought maybe you DR. SELBY: 6 would be able to realize that, and that I had made a 7 8 mistake. I understand that, Doctor. MR. WRIGHT: 9

And I'm very sympathetic with your situation, quite frankly. I think we need to deal with one major issue, and that is a precedent of allowing an historic structure, house to be demolished unless there are really extenuating circumstances.

I'm not sure that I can reach those circumstances yet, although I haven't made a decision myself how to vote on this. I think we need to all hear each other's views.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Good. I know this house very well. I know this gentleman very well. revere this man very much. If there's anything I could do to ease his constitution and feelings, I would do it, if I could.

Both Steve and I have done houses and, quote, renovations but they're practically just new

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

14 1 dangerous. It's up to the person living there to I strongly feel that some people probably 2 decide. 3 wouldn't think it was dangerous. I do. I don't 4 know. 5 I would like to have the people to have 6 the house. Whether it's my son -- actually my son, 7 my handicapped daughter, and another son. That they 8 would have the choice, if they wanted to, to tear it 9 down. 10 And I know now, I didn't realize then when 11 I did all this, that they would not have a choice. Ι 12 feel very limited and very guilty about the whole 13 thing. 14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Great. Thank you, John. 15 Joe, is it correct to say, if this was 16 taken off the list, that the house could be basically demolished without any kind of limitation; just 17 making an application for demolition --18 19 MR. HENDERSON: That's correct. THE CHAIRPERSON: -- and it would be 20 demolished if it's taken off the list. 21 22 MR. HENDERSON: Yes, sir. THE CHAIRPERSON: Duke, you want to start 23 this? 24 25 MR. WRIGHT: No.

somebody. I didn't realize the handicap I was putting them under by saying this is your house but you have to -- if you want to tear it down and rebuild the house, you're not allowed to. I didn't realize that situation would ever come up.

Now it's come up, and now I know I've made a mistake. I feel very guilty about it, and I'm just hoping that you will allow me some kind of privilege to these future owners, if they can do what they want to with that house.

As far as I was concerned, when I asked for this to be made historic, it was the location.

And I thought it was very good for Sullivan's Island;
I thought it was very good for Judge Waring, who I think really, at least when I was looking at the situation, much deserving of some kind of more credit than he was getting.

He's been getting more and more credit recently, but he wasn't getting much credit then. I thought it was a good way of getting some credit. I still think he deserves the credit. I just don't like the idea of passing the house on to somebody else who I know is going to have some major problems.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Great. Thanks, John.

DR. SELBY: I think it could be called

fixing things. I made good contact with other helpers.

But I really do feel guilty now giving the house to my children which they want, I think.

5 | They're not sure yet. I haven't made that decision.

It's up to them. Either I'm going to give it to them or I'm going to sell it to somebody.

And I want them not to tear the house down but to have the privilege of tearing the house down if they feel like it has to be, if they can't control things. I really think that day is going to come. I feel very guilty about passing this house on to somebody else.

I have moved with my handicapped daughter to the Franke home 'cause I couldn't handle it anymore and even with all the help that I was getting. And it was good help, I just couldn't keep up with it.

And I have to get your approval, and I didn't realize that I would have to go through this much -- I wasn't thinking ahead that far. That even if I left it in my Will to the children, but I'm not going to now. For some reason I'm living too long. Since that's not happening, I'm going to have to give it to them or I'm going to have to sell it to

more to prevent the rats than any of the other things that I had done trying to get --

All these things were happening to the house, and I realized that it was pretty much, too much to cope with. I didn't realize it was so much until my wife died. We were married 60 years. This was the house we both wanted to die in. I never did think about the future. I do think when I presented to you this idea, all I was thinking about was Judge Waring.

The mistake I made was I didn't realize, even though I have left the house in my Will to the children, what it would mean to somebody who took over the house and all the problems that they would have. And whether my children take over the house and they're either going to do it or I'm going to sell it to somebody else this year. So it's definitely going to be in somebody else's hands.

I feel guilty not letting them have the privilege of tearing the house down if they feel it's dangerous. I do think the reason I can go for as long as I did was because I began to learn all the things that were likely to break and where they were going to break. And we got an awful lot of help from people like the Ildertons and everybody else for

the house. And we still love the house.

And then in the last few years, the house has even more problems with the roof leaking then.

It's a tin roof. It's been there since the house was built. And it's been treated regularly. But the little side issues where it comes in through the side of the holes around the roof into the windows so we had to plasticize all the upstairs windows. And it's gotten so you can't open any of the windows. Very few of the windows of the house can be open now.

Recently, everybody has rodents and a lot of rodent problems. A squirrel got into the attic and she was pregnant. It was terrible time getting her out of there. We had to close off more electrical circuits at that time. We got her out of there. And then some rats started coming in under the house, and they caused a fire in the stove. And we had to call the fire department for that to put it out.

We tried every way possible to ward off the area where the rats were getting in, but they seemed always to find another place. And one of them died in the stove. After we found -- the best thing to help us was to buy a couple of cats. And the cats loved to go after the rats. And I think that did

And then we started having other electric wiring problems in the living room. And upstairs we had to close off some more electric wiring. So I knew that the house had a little -- I would say we had at least four major fires that needed a fire truck.

And I think that -- I knew that. My wife knew that. And we have a handicapped daughter and dogs and cats and everything. We realized that there are safer houses to live in than this. We were pretty much -- more and more we lived there, we knew all the little tricks and trades about it.

I can't tell you how many times the roof leaked. It wasn't really the roof; it was all the connections, the metal connections in the roof where they -- where those pipes that come in through the roof make. And they would leak into the bathroom upstairs and then from the bathroom upstairs to the dining room, to a bedroom, the dining room downstairs.

And one time the pipes all froze. And we were taking a vacation, and all the pipes broke. So we had to put in all new pipes. An we put in all that new stuff that's better than what it used to be. More and more we began to know more and more about

8 .

We lived there for forty years. So somewhere, and I don't exactly remember when, I bought this book and saw in this book -- if you want to look at it -- that this had been a beach house -- first, the man, Judge Waring, was such a hero to me after reading that book. And then I found out this used to be his summer beach cottage. I knew he had a house -- I didn't know it until I read this book, and I saw all the things that he had done.

I thought: This is amazing. This is the property that he used to live on.

So I went down to the Charleston County, got all the details on it to make sure that this really was recorded. If you read that book, even be more impressed, I think. So I asked my wife about it. She says why not. We're going to live here forever. And it would be a nice way to honor him.

So I came to you and asked you to put it on the historic list. And I thought it was a smart idea at the time.

Why do I not think so now? Well, because I have looked back. We hadn't lived there very long before we had a major fire in the bedroom. We had to call the fire department to put it out. They had to change the electric wiring because it was so old.

Why we had bought the house was because of the location, location, location. It was the beautiful location. My wife said we have to have that house even though it was very shabby looking. It didn't look very liveable.

And she said we can fix it up. And we fixed it up with the vinyl siding and so forth.

Concrete flooring under the house, which was all dirt, under the garage, and put in a driveway which was all dirt, building a sidewalk to it, building a chain link fence around it.

So we got to where it was liveable. And the person that I bought it from said: Where is your real house going to be? This is a beach house.

And we didn't understand that. I had never lived in South Carolina before. I never lived near the ocean. So to me this was perfect because of the location.

And I said this is where we're going to have a permanent house, even though it didn't have any central air or heat and all that kind of stuff. We were very happy with the house. I never expected -- we kept working on it, fixing things that needed to be fixed.

We got to love the house more and more.

changed.

1	heritage of the town, state or nation.
2	So tonight the DRB must make findings of
3	fact to approve or deny the request to remove this
4	property from the historic designation list by
5	finding that it meets or does not meet these criteria
6	from the zoning ordinance.
7	I have several pictures here of the house
8	and can hand those out and can entertain any
9	questions.
10	MR. HOWARD: The age of the house?
11	MR. HENDERSON: The consultant felt that
12	it was from the 1920s or possibly earlier.
13	Originally in 2003
14	DR. SELBY: You have this copy here?
15	MR. HENDERSON: This is the deed?
16	DR. SELBY: That was when it was sold and
17	when it was built and everything else.
18	MR. HENDERSON: It has listed here 1923.
19	DR. SELBY: Recorded in Charleston County.
20	MR. HENDERSON: David Snyder originally
21	determined that it was so severely altered
22	DR. SELBY: 1920 it says built. The lot
23	was owned before that. It was surveyed in April
24	1899.
25	MR. HENDERSON: He mentioned several

this property as historic. He deemed it as altered in 2003 when he originally -- I guess during one of his historic surveys.

Mr. Selby and his wife petitioned the DRB on April 23, 2008 and requested that this property be placed on the historic designation list for various reasons. During that meeting, the DRB found that this property met three of the criteria from Section 21-94, which is required by the zoning ordinance to be deemed historic property. It has to meet one or more of the eight stated criteria in that section of the ordinance.

The board found that this property had significant or inherent character interest or value as part of the development for heritage of the town, state or nation.

Found number three, that the property is associated with a person or persons who contributed significantly to the culture and development of the town, state or nation. Finding that J. Waties Waring, who opened the Democratic primary in South Carolina for blacks, held this as his summer home.

And then they found that number four, criteria number four, exemplified cultural, political, economic, social, ethnic, and historic

preservation consultant, David Snyder, did not deem

Town of Sullivans Island In Re Design Review Board

Sullivan's Island Design Review Board Mtg.
May 20, 2015

	·	May 20, 2015
1	APPEARANCES:	2
2		
3	PAT ILDERTON, CHAIRPERSON	
4	DUKE WRIGHT, BOARD MEMBER STEVE HERLONG, BOARD MEMBER	
5	MARK HOWARD, BOARD MEMBER DONNA WEBB, BOARD MEMBER	
6	RHONDA SANDERS, BOARD MEMBER BILLY CRAVER, BOARD MEMBER	
7	JOE HENDERSON, ZONING ADMINISTRATOR RANDY ROBINSON, BUILDING OFFICIAL KAT KENYON, PERMIT TECHNICIAN	
8	RAI RENION, PERMIT TECHNICIAN	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16	/	
17	(INDEX AT REAR OF TRANSCRIPT)	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		!
23		
24		
25		

1		
2	TO	VN OF SULLIVAN'S ISLAND
3		DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11	HEARING BEFORE:	PAT ILDERTON, CHAIRPERSON
12	DATE:	May 20, 2015
13	TIME:	6:00 PM
14	LOCATION:	Sullivan's Island Town Hall 2050-B Middle Street
15		Sullivan's Island, SC
16	REPORTED BY:	LORA L. McDANIEL,
17		Registered Professional Reporter
18	A. WILLIAM ROBERTS, JR. & ASSOCIATES	
19	Fast, Accurate & Friendly	
20		•
21	Charleston, SC (843) 722-8414	Hilton Head, SC Myrtle Beach, SC (843) 785-3263 (843) 839-3376
22		
23	Columbia, SC	Greenville, SC Charlotte, NC
24	(803) 731-5224	(864) 234-7030 (704) 573-3919
25		



THE DECISIONS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD SHALL BE EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE APPROVAL OF THE CERTIFICTE OF APPROPRRIATNESS. THESE MINUTES WILL BE USED AS AN OFFICIAL RECORD TO THE DECISIONS MADE UPON RATIFICATION.

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED THIS DAY OF JUNE 17, 2015

PAT ILDERTON, CHAIRMAN

DUKE WRIGHT, SECRETARY