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THE CHAIRPERSON: This is the July 15, 2015 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 Rhonda Sanders.

The Freedom of Information requirements have been met. The items on tonight's agenda are the approval of the minutes. Do I hear a motion?

MR. WRIGHT: So moved.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Second.

MR. HERLONG: Second.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Everybody in favor.

(Ayes were stated by all board members.)

(Mr. Herlong exited the room.)

1908 I'ON

THE CHAIRPERSON: 1908 I'on Street, special exception.

MR. HENDERSON: This is agenda item C-1. This is a historic special exception for property at 1908 I'on Avenue. The applicant, Sandlapper Design Group, are here on behalf of Mr. Michael Wooddy. They're requesting final design review and approval for this historic special exception.

This is for the preservation of the traditional island resource, noted under historic
The DRB previously issued conceptual approval on June 17th. The BZA award the special exception during their meeting last week; this is on July 9th.

And the charge of the board tonight is to give final approval, demonstrating that the proposed new construction is compatible in height scale mass and placement with the historic structure.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Great. Thank you.

The applicant here? Anybody to present it?

MR. SELVITELLI: I'm James Selvitelli. I'm with Sandlapper Design Group. Just run through our boards quick. This is, again, the project. This is the existing structure, which faces on to I'on Avenue. The new house will face more on to Middle Street. It's a good size through-lot.

We're incorporating it -- there's another house filled along side here. There's an existing pergola facing the street. The entry path and the stair kind of line up on the street; keep it as far back from the street, keeping it off this 20-inch pecan tree here, also still having some room for a backyard.
They will keep the existing driveway off I'on. Landscape architects continue to work on it. Get to the garage on the backside, on the I'on side.

These are some elevations that will be viewed from Middle Street. View from I'on, garage below, master suite and bath. And couple side views of the structure. We just tried to keep it fairly simple.

THE CHAIRPERSON: We've seen this before.
MR. SELVITELLI: Yes.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Is there any public comment on this application? Public comment section is closed. Duke?

MR. WRIGHT: Why are we here?
THE CHAIRPERSON: For final, I think.
MR. WRIGHT: This is final. No changes since the --

MR. HENDERSON: Not to our knowledge. Any changes been made to it?

MR. SELVITELLI: No.
MR. WRIGHT: -- initial approval. I'm fine with it.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I'm good with it. Looks good.

MS. WEBB: I am, too.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Rhonda.

MS. SANDERS: Last month I wasn't here.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Do I hear a motion?

MR. WRIGHT: Move we approve as submitted.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Second?

MS. WEBB: Second.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Everybody in favor?

(Ayes were stated by Mr. Wright, Mr. Ilderton, Ms. Webb, and Ms. Sanders.)

(Steve Herlong entered the room.)

1726 MIDDLE STREET

THE CHAIRPERSON: 1726 Middle Street, detached garage.

MR. HENDERSON: This applicant has withdrawn their application.

THE CHAIRPERSON: That's withdrawn?

MR. HENDERSON: Yes, sir.

3019 I'ON AVENUE

THE CHAIRPERSON: 3019 I'on, new construction, addition.

MR. HENDERSON: This is listed under agenda item D-2. This is a certificate of appropriateness for a historic designated property.

Mr. Michael Curd, the applicant and also the property owner, is requesting conceptual approval for new
construction to be placed on the lot. This would be in addition to an existing historic landmark on the property. This is designated by survey card 27.

This is -- the designation is for the Fort Marshall Gun Battery structure. This is a structure that was built in 1943. It was altered in 1955 and also 1960.

There are three sections to this structure. They are all privately owned currently. On the ends of the structures, there were gun emplacements, and we're talking about tonight the center portion of the structure.

The property owner is essentially requesting to render the interior of the battery as nonliveable space. In the past, it was used as a principal building; family lived in the structure and occupied it for many years, but all 9,000 square feet has been rendered as nonliveable.

I was able to walk through the structure and take pictures to confirm that. And so the proposed structure tonight, the new construction would be the principal building on the lot. I do have a national register designation narrative that we can look through. And I can also show you some photographs of the property.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Great. Thank you.
Applicant. Yes, sir.
MR. CURD: Michael Curd.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, sir. Come on up.
I knew your Dad.
MR. CURD: I did, too.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah, figured you did.
MR. CURD: Thank you, Joe, for introducing the project. I have to stand behind my drawings to explain a bit. In your packet, if you could look at SP600, it shows the extent of the entire building, which has gun emplacements at both ends. The center section, as Joe indicated, has been in my family since 1965.
The interior, while it did serve as a residence for the family, I have to say there's no one that's surviving who lived there has any desire to go back and visit. And that is principally because of the internal climate of the building. If left alone without air conditioning, it gets immediately clammy and full of condensation dripping from the ceiling.
The property was placed in a trust by my father, and that trust made it imperative to my generation to convey the property to the next
generation, his grandchildren. That would be my nephews and nieces.

They all agree and my surviving brothers and sister are in agreement to or hoping the board will allow us to create or to build a modest scale vacation home in island style on the Brownell side of the structure.

I show the entire thing because I want to indicate that our desire is to render the interior of the fort back to what it was in 1965; clean, clear and showing as much as we can of the original concrete that was built by the federal government in the '40s, or '38 to '43 are the dates.

We want that to be museum-like in a sense that it's just open, just enough light and historic plaques to tell the story of that occupation and that original use.

The same time we do that, we want to step away from the battery. Oftentimes in my narrative I might refer to it as the fort. That's what the family called it for so many years. And enough distance from the fort, not enough that it's -- just enough distance from the fort to give a separation, get some daylight into the fort.

We want to build a two-story structure,
keeping it open. As I said before, keeping it island style; metal roofs, spread porch. Let's see. I need to swap to another drawing.

MR. SWAILS: Mike, they have it on the screen for you as well.

MR. CURD: Thank you. I'm going to go over there.

MR. HENDERSON: Here's a pointer, if you would like, Michael.

MR. CURD: My island style, as I described, this is the face. That's the face towards Brownell Avenue. Now the siting, this is an illustration. This is an elevation, but it's also a partial cross section of the original fort structure.

This line right here is the -- represents the slope of the bunker or the bank that conceals the bunker. There's three feet of sand on top. We built this wall in '06 to hold that three feet at the face, what had been excavated back in '65, and allowed that this slope still exists.

If you follow that line on down to the exterior grade, I hope you get the sense that this is the portion of the building. This portion of the building is in the bunker. It's designed to be set into the existing tree cover; that is, the hillside
or the banks that conceal the bunker.

This is a space that separates us; allowing drainage and some air and some light coming back into the bunker.

I guess I wanted to get to the point of massing and balancing of the facade and the side. If you take this width and this depth, somewhat visible and partially obscured by existing trees, you get that desired five-to-three ratio of facade to depth.

I could say that I want to preserve or restore the bank. While I am creating this space to pull away from it and attach to the fort, I want to preserve the bank.

And I know after this drawing, I need to be actually building the retaining wall a little bit higher. I expect if I get past this and go to conceptual, you'll see these windows stepping down, following the natural flow of the sand as it comes around.

Not shown in my presentation is the reverse elevation, which would be the I'on Street side. That has the appearance of a tunnel entrance. It was solid steel doors facing I'on Avenue. Once you step inside that, it was -- it had a bit of a zigzag design to the main hall.
Then another set of solid steel doors designed for reducing the blast effect and getting into the building. We have already taken steps to return back to that pre-1965 appearance by removing two garages that were in front.

And just today, began a very aggressive -- I can say aggressive, and I can also say delicate cleansing of the hillside, removing small trees, root trees, saving the few live oaks and save the large pine trees that have grown up over the 30 years or 50 years now. Already we can see air and see light and air on this portion of the building that we haven't seen for a couple decades.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Great. Thank you.

MR. CURD: Sorry to take up too much time.

THE CHAIRPERSON: That's all right. Any public comment to this application? Public comment section is closed.

Do you want to start, Duke?

MR. WRIGHT: I live right around the corner from this bunker and look at it a lot. And very familiar with it. And I have no problem conceptually. But I think it opens up a question about historic preservation of the bunkers, the forts, in terms of what do we want to be concerned
about the preservation of the structure and its visual front with a gun battery on either end, both ends, or do we want to worry only about the interior of the structure?

If you look at several of the bunkers on the island, there's a number; one with housing on top of it. There are two, I think, with houses on top of it; one down near the, I guess it's Station 18, and one about Station 28.

And I talked to Joe about it this morning. Is there any concern about the National Historic Register issue of doing any work such as this on the exterior of the bunker? I just raise that as an interesting question to me, whether or not we should be concerned about this.

And as we've done in the past, if something has been added to a historic structure, it can be removed. It's not necessarily attached.

Having made that speech, I'm okay with what you want to do. I just don't want to be in violation of any rules or ordinances regarding preservation of the gun emplacements, bunkers as they were done.

One question I have: Are you excavating anything in the front of the bunker where you're
going to put the house? Is that going to be on current grade?

MR. CURD: Current grade.

MR. WRIGHT: Is it? Okay. Having said that, I'm okay with the concept right now.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Great, thanks.

I've been in this bunker a couple of times with your father and your sister, too. It was right dank and cool even when he had the conditioning running and all. So I think it's a good move to put your living quarters outside of it.

And, you know, it's always been a livable piece of property. I mean, it's a home. And it's been that way for 50 years. I wouldn't have a problem with the structure being built outside of it.

I think we still have some -- we have a fair amount of bunkers that are still exposed and you can see them and all. They're not particularly attractive, I guess, but they are historical.

My only observation on the plan itself, I just think you might be better served -- your money might be better spent -- since this is preliminary, take it for what it's worth -- with a little more delineation of the windows. Maybe tightening the corners work-up a little bit. Make it just a little
bit tighter.

I mean, such as those big windows on the side, I don't even know if they make those except in plate windows as far as nonoperable windows. I don't know if that would be a good investment for y'all. I just think a finer delineation of the windows and maybe a little tightening of the corner would serve you better in your investment. Take that for what it's worth since this is, as I say, preliminary application. Those are my comments. Steve.

MR. HERLONG: This is an interesting question of how do you deal with that property. Because at one point it was one long emplacement. Then it got divided along the property into -- is it three properties that have some attachment to the gun emplacement?

MR. HENDERSON: If you take a look at the GIS overhead, you'll see the large property is the one in question.

MR. HERLONG: It's huge.

MR. HENDERSON: This property here was developed in 1991.

MR. HERLONG: That house is detached. Is that completely detached?

MR. HENDERSON: It's detached. There's
actually some pilings that come right up against the retaining wall behind it. This was a house allowed to be constructed in front of one of the gun emplacements. On the other side, it's the original structure.

And this is a home that excavated a portion of the earth and mound to put in a pool. There are three sections of this.

MR. HERLONG: The homes that are there, various styles. There's no style that connects the two or nothing that connects those styles to the gun emplacements either. There's nothing that's been done previously that would lead you toward a style.

I guess my only question, it appears in your sketches that you're attaching -- you have contiguous space in the new house to use or gain access to the inside of the emplacement or the gun emplacements.

MR. CURD: Correct.

MR. HERLONG: The house, actually, the portion that you're building is quite small.

MR. CURD: Yes.

MR. HERLONG: We're talking about, I think you had 2,400 square feet of addition and porch-roofed areas. Really small addition, or I
don't know what it is.

MR. HENDERSON: Duke and I had this conversation earlier. I think that once the interior liveable space is removed, this would be the principal building. This would be the principal building. It would be built adjacent to what would be an accessory structure.

Again, it's unique. It's hard to attach this to any section of the ordinance.

THE CHAIRPERSON: He came and went from the I'on side. That was his front door.

MR. CURD: Yes, absolutely. Right.

MR. HERLONG: In building an addition to the historic portion, you are considering linking it so that you're not -- so that you're reducing the overall impact against the historic structures. Is that -- in concept, it all seems to make sense, but I would agree as Pat said, I continue to study your personal aesthetics and what you're trying to achieve, which is fine.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I just think your money would be better spent, just little more better details on the windows and doors and fenestration.

MR. WRIGHT: This is only a concept.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Right, this is a
concept.

MR. HERLONG: You're not really doing anything that hasn't already been done already on the site, on the two end pieces. It's very similar.

MR. HENDERSON: Right.

MR. HERLONG: I don't see any reason to do anything any different.

MR. HENDERSON: I would note the previous development on battery sites, designated battery sites were done before the inception of the Design Review Board in the early '90s, and it was actually reported in the National Register of Historic Places application. It's noted here under the Fort Marshall Gun Battery section. Gives a little history here.

It also reflects that they were handed over in 1950 to private ownership. It has a statement here which describes it: The architectural integrity of each of these structures was compromised by in-filling their open walls, their front walls. In recent years, the settings of each of the resources has been further compromised by the construction of modern houses on the lots and the partial excavation of one, I think the earthen berm for the swimming pool on the end.

There's conflicting information from the
documents that we have on file. It goes back to the question that Duke asked: How do we allow this and is it appropriate and, if we allow it to take place, I think we're kind of setting the way we look at this in the future.

MR. HERLONG: It's really from an architectural point of view, even in the language there, the two homes that are there are relatively new so they were called modern. I was sitting here thinking before you read that, maybe because of these batteries, they're all concrete, would you not -- what style is more appropriate? Something more contemporary or is a cottage appropriate in front of those? Not really.

MR. WRIGHT: Do you remember, Steve -- excuse me. I don't know how many years ago, the occupants of the other end, not the other battery entrance, came to the board with a request to put a lattice, cabana-kind of structure on the front. The one -- point that out, Joe, right there.

And I don't know how many -- I guess the three of us were probably the only ones on the board at that time. And we okayed that. It never has been built. But we had kind of the same discussion. If you go back and review the minutes, I'm sure it would
show. And we didn't have a lot of trouble with that.
We had the same kind of discussion.

I find it interesting, more than many
times when I'm outside, somebody will come by and
stop and ask me about the structure behind my house.
What is that? Is it a fort? Is it a gun
emplacement? Is it a battery?

I made up a little book. I meant to bring
it tonight that I can show them. That goes back. If
you remember Lou Edens. He lives in that end of the
battery right now. To explain it to them. It
generates a lot of interest with people touring
around the island, see these things and wonder what
they are.

I don't think you're taking away the
effect of it. It is a fort. As I said a few minutes
ago, I think we still have a fort there. We can
still tell people about it even though there's a
house in front of it. And there's one, like you
said, that's been there since 1991.

MR. HERLONG: It's a fort that was sold.
It's privately held in its own residential.

MR. HENDERSON: To be used as residential.

Exactly right.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Donna, do you have
anything?

MS. WEBB: I agree with you. It's an opportunity -- you know, it's a one-of-a-kind property. It's an opportunity to really think about the style. I don't have any problem with what you're doing since it has been done, as long as the integrity doesn't have any obvious impact on the integrity of the structure. Sounds like some of the building that's gone on has impacted it a little bit.

As you're clearing, what's going to show? I know I read in there the clearing of the debris and vines and stuff. What will be exposed more?

MR. CURD: The original hill. When I sold the property in '65, there weren't any trees on the hillside. I think the family may have planted a Christmas tree on the hillside. I don't know if that would be responsible for the proliferation of these gigantic pines. We begun clearing that away.

What we cleared away very carefully was pulling down all the vines that were kind of restricting growth of the trees below them and picking up weed trees. What we are exposing is the bank. We hope to render that mullable and maintainable to see the form. And already you can
see the form of the entrance.

And I was surprised and happy to see you can also see the air shafts that are off to the side of the entrance from I'on Avenue. Those have been covered up completely for decades. Now they're visible.

MR. WRIGHT: I think you're also taking away a home for coyotes. We really believe that there was some coyotes living up in that area last couple of years. You would see signs of scat all around.

MR. CURD: I didn't recognize that.

MR. WRIGHT: I think they're gone. They're not there now. I don't want to scare you. There were some living there we think at one time. Clearing that off is good.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Rhonda, do you have anything?

MS. SANDERS: I do. Kind of going back to what Pat said, is there a reason to attach it?

MR. CURD: I'on Avenue is the address.

MS. SANDERS: I mean attach it to the bunker.

MR. CURD: Yes. I started by saying that is our way to the house. We didn't want to drive up
from Brownell Avenue to get --

MS. SANDERS: You're going to go through it.

MR. CURD: Through the fort. It's almost perpendicular, zigzag through the port. It takes you through what was dubbed the Atlantic room. That was the kind of center of family discourse; the only place with direct sunlight.

And we want to -- we're going to build a glass wall at the line of the original fort interior wall before it was opened up. That's partially to -- it's mostly to separate the climate from the fort to the new, once you walk through, again, what I say was a family gathering place.

And we're creating a larger and friendlier gathering place and then stepping up to flood level to get to two-story vacation home. Everything trying to stay in modest proportion.

I can't help but keep emphasizing I want to restore as much as possible the banks that were there.

MS. SANDERS: I guess what I'm thinking is to preserve -- so the houses that were built there in the last whatever, that were built before these new ordinances. You're trying to preserve it back to
what it was before. And I'm not sure -- I don't know how that works, going through it, being attached to it. I think you need some more porches on here.

MR. CURD: Okay.

MS. SANDERS: It doesn't look as traditional. I think this will have a hard time being approved if it weren't attached to something historic and having a lot of exceptions, personally.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Do I hear a motion?

MR. HERLONG: I make a motion that we give the application conceptual approval. And to take our comments --

MR. CURD: To heart.

MR. HERLONG: -- to heart as you move forward.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Do I hear a second?

MR. WRIGHT: I second that.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Discussion? Everybody in favor?

(Mr. Wright, Mr. Ilderton, Mr. Herlong, Ms. Webb all stated aye.)

THE CHAIRPERSON: Great. Thank you, sir.

2650 JASPER BOULEVARD

THE CHAIRPERSON: 2650 Jasper.

MR. HENDERSON: They have withdrawn their
application.

THE CHAIRPERSON: 2668 Jasper.

MR. HENDERSON: This is agenda item D-4, 2668 Jasper, being represented by Tal Askins, the owner and applicant. They're requesting approval to incorporate a pool on to this historic designated property. This is identified by survey card 41.

And, according to ordinance Section 21-137, the Design Review Board is required to give approval for accessory structures for designated properties. There are no increases requested here; obviously, principal building coverage, square footage.


MR. WRIGHT: Have we seen this before?

MR. ASKINS: For an addition.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Not the pool.

MR. ASKINS: We never did the addition.

THE CHAIRPERSON: The plans will speak for themselves, I reckon; right? Is there any public comment to this application? Public comment section is closed.

MR. HENDERSON: Just one question. Are
you proposing a fence to go around the pool? Is there one already there?

MR. ASKINS: There's one already there. The gates are compliable. We're going to switch it.
I was told by Blue Haven we don't have to have a fence because it's elevated. The railing would suffice as long as we have a fence, which we have a dog. We're definitely putting a fence at the bottom of the stairs to keep him out.

We're going to have double; elevated and the fence perimeter around.

MR. HENDERSON: No design change.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Great, thanks. Rhonda.
MS. SANDERS: I'm good.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Good. Donna.
MS. WEBB: I'm okay with it.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Steve.
MR. HERLONG: I'm fine. It's elevated pool, large lot. All of this is way far from any setback restrictions. I see no trouble with it.
THE CHAIRPERSON: I also see no problem with it.
MR. WRIGHT: I'm fine. I'm okay.
THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. Do I hear a
motion?

MS. SANDERS: Motion to approve.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Second?

MS. WEBB: Second.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Everybody in favor?

(Mr. Wright, Mr. Ilderton, Mr. Herlong, Ms. Webb stated aye.)

1611 MIDDLE STREET

THE CHAIRPERSON: 1611 Middle Street.

MR. HENDERSON: This is agenda item E-1, this is a certificate of appropriateness for a nonhistoric property. The applicants are requesting conceptual approval for elevation modifications of existing home on Middle Street. And they're requesting increase in principal building coverage of 20 percent. They're maxing out that request. And they're also in need of front setback modification of 6 percent or 18 inches. Staff recommend ensuring that this meets the standards for neighborhood compatibility when doing your review.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Great. Thank you. Applicant.

MR. ADRIAH: That's me.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, sir.

MR. ADRIAH: I don't really have a whole
lot to add. You have the plans in front of you. The house, y'all probably know it pretty well. It's right across the street from where you're building your county building, used to be. It's not very attractive right now.

Little shotgun, elevated house with two bad little bay windows on the front. The owner said he had a vision of wrap-around porches. The existing screen porch in the back, which we are going to enclose. Then we're adding a little one little room up on the second floor.

Great room. Interior. We have false ceilings. Three sets of French doors going out to the new porch. Dining. Front little sitting porch and front little dining room porch.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Great. Thank you.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would add that we received some correspondence.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I'll read that. Is there anything you need to add, Joe?

MR. HENDERSON: No, sir.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Is there public -- besides this letter, does anybody else have public comment to this application?

MR. RUDD: I did the letter. If you have
any questions.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I'll just read the letter from Howard and Vicki Rudd: Joe, as we noted to you, we are pleased with the significant improvements of the street side of the look of our immediate new neighbors' proposed modifications. That said, we are concerned regarding the proximity of the new second floor porch structure, which will be directly adjacent to our side of the porch/master bedroom area, which is considerably more potential noise and privacy problem since our master bedroom is on the first story and the proposed porch is on the second story, looking down on it without any potential noise or visual mitigation other than the bushes we planned to block the headlights and the noise coming from the traffic on the road and the driveway.

As Sullivan's Island residents since 1984, we had looked forward to some conversation with the new owners early on as to what their plans might be; however, that was not to be when we observed the DRB sign.

As you kindly shared the plot plan with us, we noticed right away the proximity of the new porch to our historic home which, of course, we could
not visualize right away since the plot plan does not include the adjacent neighborhood structure. And perhaps this part of the system could be improved along with direct solicitation from immediate neighbors as to smoothest process prior to the DRB decision making.

I know that transparency has not been in vogue in the past; hopefully, your arrival will change a great deal of that.

Hopefully. Is that true, Joe?

MR. HENDERSON: I certainly hope so.

THE CHAIRPERSON: That's wonderful.

That's quite a compliment.

MR. RUDD: It was meant to be.

THE CHAIRPERSON: We appreciate efforts of both Sullivan's Island Committees and Council to engage in that.

We would like the DRB and the out-of-town owners to consider the following mitigation for compatibility purposes: On the porch, while facing our house, provide a complete sound attenuating wall such as an outdoor shutter wall rather than a screen or open-sided porch as currently proposed; thus preventing considerable amount of potential noise from coming into our bedroom area, especially in good
weather when we would have our screen door open and windows open.

Consider adding an additional sound absorbing landscaping, if not already planned, and a visual break between the proposed second floor porch and our master bedroom area on the new owner's side of the fence.

We think that both of these suggestions would mitigate to some extent the potential for noise transmission to our historic home. Obviously, any noise parties would not be expected to close -- parties would not be expected so close to our master bedroom area.

Thanks for all your help, Joe, to understand the parameters of these kinds of decisions. The challenges facing these kinds of decisions, in fact, become personal when dealing with property rights of previous adjacent owners versus new owners. We look forward to a win-win decision and related process of the DRB.

Duke, what do you think?

MR. WRIGHT: What do I think? I think that architecturally -- where is the plan? It's kind of difficult to find. You can see the porches on the Middle Street side. And how far away? Where are you
from there? How many feet away from the porch?

MR. HERLONG: Joe, do you have the setback?

MR. ADRIAH: I want to say it's 15 feet, I believe.

MR. WRIGHT: Are you the owner?

MR. ADRIAH: I'm the gentleman designed it.

MR. WRIGHT: You're the architect.

MR. ADRIAH: The owner does not live here in South Carolina; out-of-town owner, which was referenced in the letter.

As I recall from the site plan -- I don't have it right in front of me -- that side, I think we were 15 feet.

MR. WRIGHT: Setback is about 15 feet?

MR. HERLONG: It's 24.8.

MR. HENDERSON: If you look at the GIS here, this is the corner of the house, Middle Street.

MR. WRIGHT: That's a driveway, that U-shape right there.

MR. HENDERSON: Right. This is the proposed porch come out ten feet. Front property line, 25 feet.

And then this linear distance is about 30
feet from the proposed porch to the house.

MR. ADRIAHI: I don't think that my client
would have any problem with landscaping, doing
privacy shutter on that side.

MR. WRIGHT: The shutters, that could be a
mitigating factor, I think, to me.

MR. RUDD: We thought a lot, trying to
figure out -- Joe was very helpful -- what would be a
win-win solution. We still felt that --

MR. WRIGHT: I certainly hear you and
understand how. I know exactly what you're talking
about. Landscaping and some architectural treatment
to the porch could possibly make that okay with me.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Anything is going to
improve that house.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, you're right there.

THE CHAIRPERSON: As porches do, porches
improve the look of houses. They break up the mass
of the front. That is definitely going to make the
house look better.

If there was some compromise or some
suggestion that maybe y'all can do some shuttering
and sound mitigation on that side of the porch, could
look pretty good, too, if it was done right. Not
only help in sound. Really wouldn't block -- you're
just essentially looking at Middle Street; right?

   MR. ADRIAH: That one side.

   THE CHAIRPERSON: There is the noise, not that part of Middle Street is that noisy. It's pretty quiet area, Middle Street really is. You do have some traffic there once in a while. It's not a noisy neighborhood at all or anything. I imagine there's not going to be wild, crazy parties on that front porch facing Middle Street where all the police are going to lock you down.

   MR. ADRIAH: Doctors can't get crazy.

   THE CHAIRPERSON: Still some sound mitigation could be done and maybe a nice compromise could be done. Other than that, anything is going to improve that house.

I don't have a problem with it. Is this preliminary, conceptual?

   MR. WRIGHT: This is final.

   MR. HENDERSON: It's all conceptual unless you decide otherwise. All projects are conceptual at our first review.

   THE CHAIRPERSON: That's right. You're right.

At least conceptually, I think maybe just coming back, it could maybe be approved at staff
level of some sort of design or some sort of sound mitigation on that porch. And if that could be done, so it doesn't have to come back just for that little small item. Steve.

MR. HERLONG: I tend to agree with you. Anything you do would almost improve that structure. And especially adding porches, it gives it more character. Just what it needs. It's 25 feet to the side setback. So that's pretty generous.

More often than not you might see 20 feet to a side setback or even less. They can go to ten feet.

MR. RUDD: We understand.

MR. HERLONG: I absolutely understand what you're saying. We have had that in years past. We have gone back and said, well, we would like to give it say a conceptual approval but please in the process go meet with your neighbors. That's occurred.

This may be a situation where -- it's a pretty straightforward submittal. It could be that we could give it approval and not have you go through the process of coming back again for those types of issues. If we could let that occur at staff level for you to --
MR. ADRIAH: I certainly don't have a problem.

MR. HERLONG: -- deal with the adjustments, with the homeowner. You guys can get together and see it and when everybody is good.

MR. ADRIAH: Good.

MR. RUDD: That would be wonderful.

MR. HENDERSON: Sounds good.

MR. HERLONG: That might be a way we can move forward.

THE CHAIRPERSON: It's all going to help the neighborhood. Whatever you're going to do is going to help the adjacent home look better anyway; the house will look better.

MR. ADRIAH: Did you see the colors picked out yet? It was Pepto-Bismol with green.

THE CHAIRPERSON: That's fine. You can paint it green with polka dots. We don't care. Thank God that's one thing we don't rule on.

MR. RUDD: More mitigation.

MS. WEBB: Howard is a neighbor of mine. I looked at it closely as well. I like that he made the suggestions. I think they're reasonable. I think it's something the homeowner would want to do as well, just to have an agreeing side versus being
on top of a neighbor with a house that's a little bit lower.

I did point out it is nice, the main entry is still on that side. And that the second story addition is rather small. It's not, you know, the full 38 feet all the way around, which could possibly be if this was new construction.

MR. ADRIAHI: As far as total square footage, I think there's still 150 or so square feet under maximum would allow for the property. Whole goal was just to have a room up there with a little bathroom.

MS. WEBB: I'm okay with enclosing that back porch. I think it's great to interact with the neighbors, have -- you know, everybody wants to have nice neighbors. I certainly do.


MS. SANDERS: Very nice improvement. Might actually break down some of the street noise.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Do I hear a motion?

MS. SANDERS: Motion to approve final.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Second?

MR. HERLONG: I think we should add that we want staff to handle the few adjustments we've
discussed and review that with the adjacent homeowners.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Can we add that to the motion then. Thank you.

MR. HERLONG: Then I will second that.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Everybody in favor?

(All board members stated aye.)

2816 MARSHALL BOULEVARD

THE CHAIRPERSON: Where are we here now, Joe?

MR. HENDERSON: We're on E-2. That application has been withdrawn. We're moving on to E --

1311 COVE AVENUE

THE CHAIRPERSON: Is Cove still here or not?

MR. HENDERSON: No.

THE CHAIRPERSON: 2816 Marshall and Cove is gone, too?

MR. HENDERSON: That's right. 2816 Marshall has withdrawn their application. 1311 Cove has withdrawn as well.

2908 MIDDLE STREET

THE CHAIRPERSON: 2908 Middle.

MR. HENDERSON: 2908 is next. I don't see
an applicant here. Is anyone here to represent this project, 2908?

There's no applicant so we will move on.

2870 BROWNELL AVENUE.

MR. HENDERSON: 2870 Brownell Avenue.

THE CHAIRPERSON: 2870 Brownell.

MR. HENDERSON: This is a certificate of appropriateness request for a new home construction, 2870 Brownell. Mr. Luke Jarret, the project architect, is requesting conceptual approval for this new construction. The only modification needed from the zoning ordinance is principal building square footage.

He's requesting 15 percent increase in the zoning standard. In addition to that -- Luke, I wasn't sure. Do you, when looking at the principal building, side facade, did you need --

MR. JARRET: We meet all the zoning requirements for this.

MR. HENDERSON: It is just principal building square footage needed here.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, sir.

MR. JARRET: Hi, I'm Luke Jarret with Byers Design Group, architects, for this house. Our clients, they currently don't live in Sullivan's
Island. This is going to be their permanent residence, they're looking forward to moving here. We've been working with them to design their dream house on Sullivan's Island.

The lot on Brownell is internal lot in the block. There's nothing on it right now. Nice cluster of oak trees in the front right-hand corner of this site that we're keeping. I took it out of the rendering so that it was a littler clearer to see the building itself. That separates us from our neighbors to the right. To the left is a large house, little over 5,000 square feet, also with two stories facing the street.

The goal of this house was to create a really appropriate house for Sullivan's Island where we have an entire second floor under the roof so that the scale of the house is cottage-like and small; change the building mass in a couple of areas to make sure it's never too long or too thick. Utilize some dormers to get some program in the second floor spaces without having any wall spaces.

This street, little knee wall. Front right-hand side is actually over the master bedroom, elevated one-and-a-half story space there.

Other features that make this site
interesting, it does sit in front of one of the bunkers. The design of this house, the back of this lot slopes up very steeply to the house that's on top of the bunker.

   The house really isn't viewable from any other facade than this main facade here.

   THE CHAIRPERSON: Great. Thank you.

   Joe, anything to add?

   MR. HENDERSON: Nothing further.

   THE CHAIRPERSON: Any public comment to this application? Public comment section is closed.

   Steve, what do you think?

   MR. HERLONG: So the enclosed square footage, you're asking -- I missed the relief part of this, what you were asking.

   MR. JARRET: 5,096 square feet is what we're asking for; 4,077 is what is allowed by zoning.

   MR. HERLONG: Large lot then.

   MR. JARRET: Yes, correct, very large lot in the center of this block. I think it's the largest.

   MR. HERLONG: It's a large home. This is an example of when it works well because you've got a one story elevated home and all of the second floor is set within a roof line so that it's a very
attractive home. Not imposing on the neighborhood in any way.

If you look at the floor plan, there are significant offsets that create -- that just break the scale down around the various facades. I would definitely say approve this.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Great. Donna.

MR. HENDERSON: I'm sorry. Let me just reiterate. I may have misspoke. I hit on a typo. You're requesting 24 percent, which brings you to 5,050 square feet total. I think I said 15.

MR. JARRET: I have 5,096 on the application. That's 24 percent.

MS. WEBB: It's correct on our sheet. But you said 15. It's correct here.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Donna.

MS. WEBB: I agree. I'm curious: What is the height, the maximum height on the roof?

MR. JARRET: We're under the height restriction. I think I have -- the ceiling height of second floor is 30 feet, two inches above adjacent grade. It's a little taller after that. Looks like it goes about four more feet up from that. 34 feet, maybe 35 feet.

MS. WEBB: It's a beautiful design. It's
a lot of square footage. Doesn't have -- the mass is
squared out nicely. The garage --

MR. JARRET: In the front is a large oak
tree; cluster of smaller trees.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Great. Rhonda.

MS. SANDERS: I mean, it's within our
purview to approve. I think it's a really nice
design. I don't know why somebody needs that many
square feet. Whatever. I don't have to clean it.


MR. WRIGHT: I'm generally not in favor of
big just because it's big. It's a 5,000 square foot
house on a decent lot, which I've heard mitigates the
size. I think we have to be careful looking at these
requests for relief on square footage just for the
sake of size.

Having said that, I'm okay with this
because of its location, and the bunker behind it
which certainly mitigates the size.

THE CHAIRPERSON: For me, the mitigating
thing is the design is a good design, good looking
house. That makes it easy for me.

MR. WRIGHT: Good design. I'm okay.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay with it also. Do I
hear a motion?
MS. SANDERS: Motion to approve.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Second?

MR. HENDERSON: Is that final?

MR. HERLONG: Do you want to let it be final approval?

MS. SANDERS: You decide it.

MR. HERLONG: I motion we approve it as a final submittal.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Do I hear a second?

MR. WRIGHT: I'll second.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Everybody in favor?

(All board members stated aye.)

2714 ATLANTIC AVENUE

THE CHAIRPERSON: What do we have left?

MR. HENDERSON: We're on E-6, which is 2714 Atlantic Avenue. Mr. Eddie Fava, the applicant, is requesting final approval. This is a new home construction; essentially a presentation of redesign for this property.

The applicants are requesting modification from the zoning standard for the side setback. They're maximizing this request at the full 25 percent allowed for that side setback.

Just to give you a little background on this, the DRB initially gave final approval on August
20, 2014. This is a presentation made to reorient the property towards I'on instead of what's required for new homes, which is that you orient the house towards the ocean.

The applicant received approval to have their pool on the Atlantic Avenue side instead of I'on Avenue to be more compatible with the neighborhood. This redesign incorporates the pool on the side yard, which is typical and encouraged by our ordinance to have it off the frontage.

Side setback request. And I'll let the applicant take over, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Eddie.

MR. FAVA: Good evening. Basically, again, I'm not fully aware of the history of what went on before. I know, I think previously that the applicants were concerned about the size of their house and what they were designing at the time and the general design direction. They had always had their eye on something maybe a little more contemporary and had come to us and said: Look, we want to cut down the square footage of what's been approved previously and look at something that's a little more contemporary, inspired by Sullivan's Island, but something that's a little more
contemporary.

Everything that we have done -- this is all in your packet. It's a vacant lot. Again, you may recall from last time it was here, I guess, located in this section right here, there are two rather large homes on each side. Both of those are maxed out to the 15-foot setback as best we could tell, and a significant amount of square footage. Not that there's anything wrong with that.

Just for context of what we're doing, it's well under what's allowable square footage-wise and lot coverage-wise, building coverage-wise, everything. The only thing that we are doing previously is, as I understand, they had permission from you-all to put the pool in the front yard, which when they came to us we thought wasn't a very good idea. We kind of upset their apple cart now, thought it was nicer on the side.

In doing so, we do meet the 15-foot setback everywhere. We would like to have your permission for the relief into the little ten-foot section of that setback.

I have some additional photos that might help. And I have handouts of these, if you would rather look at it.
MR. WRIGHT: I don't remember seeing this design before.

MR. FAVA: No, sir, it was completely different. Absolutely different. And they were very pleased with her. It was Heather Wilson. She's a wonderful and talented architect. She does great work. Things that we have done have gone her way sometimes, too. It just happens. I think the owners just said they wanted to reevaluate and downsize.

These are the homes that are to either side. This is the area where we are proposing being built. Again, I have a handout of this that I can give to you as well.

We have views looking from this way towards the beach side. And then two, three and four, which show you views that way just so you can get a sense of perspective. All of that is listed here as well.

The footprint front of our house would be essentially so. It's just the pool is where we're asking for some relief that encroaches into that additional ten-foot setback.

THE CHAIRPERSON: All you're asking really tonight is just for relief.

MR. FAVA: Yes, sir, that's all it is.
We're not in historic area. To be honest, I don't think it's anything associated necessarily with the design of the building. Just to give you some feedback.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Great. Joe, anything to add?

MR. HENDERSON: No.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Any public comment to this application?

Public comment section is closed. If it's just relief. Duke.

MR. WRIGHT: Well --

MR. FAVA: May I mention one other thing? I'm sorry. I know Mr. Hillman did speak with a neighbor to the right, Voorhees. I'm not sure if I'm pronouncing it. They are aware it was moving in that direction. She did not have a problem with it, according to him.

MR. WRIGHT: And there's been no neighborhood concern about the design per se?

MR. FAVA: No, sir.

MR. WRIGHT: In terms of --

THE CHAIRPERSON: The design is not before us.

MR. WRIGHT: The design is -- we can't do
anything about the design. I was just curious about it. It's different in the neighborhood.

        MR. FAVA: I can comment on that, if you like.

        MR. WRIGHT: Yeah.

        MR. FAVA: Would you?

        MR. WRIGHT: Yeah.

        MR. FAVA: I don't think it's really --

        MR. WRIGHT: It's not appropriate. I mean, you don't have to.

        MR. FAVA: No, no, I don't mind speaking to it. It's important to us.

        MR. WRIGHT: It's an interesting design.

        MR. FAVA: It is. To be honest, when we submitted the drawing that you see with the house, there's not an awful lot of detail associated with that. That's not what we were requesting or felt like we needed to address.

        To be honest, it really is based on forms that we think are very typical to the island. And you may look at this and say: Really? If you look at that kind of massing, there's a block that's very traditional.

        MR. WRIGHT: You felt ready to talk about this.
MR. FAVA: Yes, sir. If you have a question. All of those are some of my favorite houses on the island.

Our thought with our concept was the mass of our building does something very similar. It addresses the beach side. You've got a block. The back, you have a block. And then by doing so it creates a space internally.

From the front, it really will be a rather small mass, low height; again, well below the allowable height limit on all sides.

And I think as we develop material and details with it, you'll be pleasantly surprised.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, that's interesting.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Great. I think I'm fine with the setback. Steve.

MR. HERLONG: My only question is you've got 15 feet of setback, which is not a problem. That's the driveway. How do you get 16-foot long car in and out of that garage bay into a 15-foot wide?

MR. FAVA: We have our bays about nine feet wide.

MR. HERLONG: I mean, it's not really a DRB issue. It's a function issue. I'm just more
·1· curious than anything.

   MR. FAVA: Understand.

   MR. HERLONG: Looks very difficult.

   MR. FAVA: Brian has actually asked. He's worried about his wife turning in and hitting something.

   MR. HERLONG: I think that it's going to be really only 3,200 square foot home.

   MR. FAVA: Yes, sir.

   MR. HERLONG: It's going to be great. I would grant the relief.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Great. Donna.

MS. WEBB: I agree. I'm fine with it.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Rhonda.

MS. SANDERS: I agree. I really like it. I like to see the detail.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Do I hear a motion?

MS. SANDERS: Motion to approve as final.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Second?

MR. HERLONG: Second.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Everybody in favor?

(All board members stated aye.)

2624 RAVEN DRIVE

THE CHAIRPERSON: Joe, what do you have?

MR. HENDERSON: We have agenda item E-7,
2624 Raven Drive. The applicant, Julie O'Connor, requesting conceptual approval for new construction, requesting modification of principal building coverage, second story side facade setback relief, and also principal building -- I'm sorry -- building foundation height relief of ten inches.

Is there anyone here on behalf of 2624 Raven Drive?

MR. COLEMAN: I'm the builder. Apologize, the architect and homeowner are out of town. I'm just here to answer any questions or Randy has any concern.

THE COURT REPORTER: What's your name?

MR. COLEMAN: Allen Coleman.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Joe, anything to add?

MR. HENDERSON: Let me just recap very briefly. They're requesting 100 percent relief on the second story side setback.

Principal building coverage, 19.5 percent; they're maxing that out. Close to it.

And then building foundation height of ten inches. I would encourage them to request the whole foot, just in case. This is a challenging lot there. It's one of the town-owned properties that received the variances.
MR. WRIGHT: Which property is this on that stretch along there? Is it the one on 26-and-a-half, the last one?

MR. HENDERSON: It's the second to the last one. Let me show you here on the GIS.

On May 9, 2013 and then February 12th of this year they received variances for these lots to make them buildable.

The GIS doesn't reflect that the street has been put in. This is the parcel here, second to last one. These two received variances. They were the town-owned lots.

The critical line comes down into the lots like so. So the upland square footage is very small. The maximum principal building square footage is capped at 2,765. 2,765 heated square feet, principal building square footage.

However, in order for them to maximize that principal building square footage, they need the relief from the Design Review Board for principal building coverage to maximize that footprint.

So if you recall, the other property that received the variances was given this relief as well. Staff would recommend giving this since its part and parcel of that original variance.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Town was preparing itself for a new town hall, to sell these properties; right? Trying to give as many variances and consideration as possible.

MR. HENDERSON: This is a justified variance.

THE CHAIRPERSON: The town is very considerate when the town is interested. It's a lovely, lovely thing.

MR. ROBINSON: Can I defend that?

MR. HENDERSON: It was a definite hardship.

THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. Rhonda.

MS. SANDERS: I think it looks great.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Donna.

MS. WEBB: It's a creative plan with a small space to work with.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Steve.

MR. HERLONG: I think it's a really difficult lot. It's only a 2,700 square foot house. The only thing, my only concern, the facade looks fine until you get to the side, the east-side facade. It's a very tall, very vertical house with very few setbacks.

They've tried to make some slight setbacks
to agree with the roof line. I just wonder if they
couldn't -- if you could just put it on the record
that maybe they could've used some material changes
on that particular facade to make it more
interesting. But in the scheme of things, it's a
relatively minor issue. It's only a 2,700 square
foot house.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Those twin windows are
going to be problematic for shuttering or anything
like that as well as triples with twins, especially.
If they were divided up, the side would look a little
bit less.

MR. HENDERSON: This would be the
east-side elevation?

MR. WRIGHT: East elevation.

MR. HENDERSON: Do you see these?

THE CHAIRPERSON: They may be twins for
some specific reason.

MR. COLEMAN: That elevation won't be
visible because the right-hand side is so heavily
wooded, and we're not requesting to take out any
trees down the right-hand property line.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I think it looks okay.

Are you finished?

MR. HERLONG: I'm through.
MR. WRIGHT: I'm okay.
THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. Do I hear a motion?
MS. SANDERS: Motion to approve final.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Second?
MS. WEBB: Second.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Everybody in favor?
(All board members stated aye.)
2908 MIDDLE STREET
THE CHAIRPERSON: What else do we have, Joe?
MR. HENDERSON: I think our applicant for agenda item E-4, 2908 Middle Street, Ms. Heather is here.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Oh, really? She's not penalized?
MR. HENDERSON: I don't think so.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Let her off this time.
MR. HENDERSON: This is a request for conceptual approval, new home construction. The request is modification for principal building square footage and building foundation height.
Let me get back to that file here.
MR. WRIGHT: New construction.
MR. HENDERSON: The request here is 10 percent on the principal building square footage and full one foot in height increase in the foundation.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, ma'am.

MS. WILSON: Pretty straightforward house and request. The site plan, as we said, not asking for anything. The reason for the one foot is the slope of the grade, natural grade drops about 18 inches. We didn't want to amend that. They would like to park in the front, preserve as much of the backyard as they can for a pool.

Cars are going to be -- we're also keeping these trees. The cars are going to pull in under this front mass. It's just a little bit tight. With that extra foot, we can get the cars here and keep all of that green, the back of the yard, which is their preference. That's the one foot.

And I don't really have a good story for the square footage exception. Bath rooms, kids request. A good bit of vaulted space. A lot of one story space. It's actually over on the second floor, even though it's largely first floor plan. And both sides are dominated by first floor roofs. Some hips. Gables. Lots of porches. It was heated on second floor.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Anything to add?

MR. HENDERSON: Nothing further.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Any public comment to this application? Public comment section is closed. Duke.

MR. WRIGHT: I don't think I have any problems with this. I'm okay with it.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I don't think I have any problem with it also. Steve.

MR. HERLONG: I think it's nicely balanced with some one story and two story elements, and very nice design, nice home.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Donna.

MS. WEBB: I think it's worth what you're asking for to keep the space as green as possible. It's a great design.

MS. SANDERS: I agree.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Let's hear a motion.

MS. SANDERS: Hate to come in last.

MR. HERLONG: It came in as conceptual. We can approve it as final.

MR. HENDERSON: It's your choice to bump that up to final approval, if you choose to do it.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Less paperwork for
everybody.

MR. HERLONG: I make a motion to give it final approval.

MS. SANDERS: Second.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Everybody in favor?

(All board members stated aye.)

THE CHAIRPERSON: Anything else?

MR. HENDERSON: No, sir.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Are you sure?

MR. HENDERSON: Pretty sure.

THE CHAIRPERSON: We are adjourned.

(The hearing was concluded at 7:15 p.m.)
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