In The Matter Of:

In Re:
Town of Sullivans Island Meeting

Sullivan's Island Design Review Board October 15, 2014

A. William Roberts, Jr. and Associates
We're About Service...Fast, Accurate and Friendly
(800) 743-DEPO
www.scheduledepo.com



A. William Roberts, Jr. & Associates
court reporting | videography | trial presentation | nationwide scheduling
scheduledepo.com | 800-743-DEPO

Original File Design_Review_Board_Sullivan's_Island_-_141015.TXT

Min-U-Script®

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

HEARING BEFORE: PAT ILDERTON, CHAIRPERSON

11 DATE: October 15, 2014

SULLIVAN'S ISLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

TIME: 12

6:00 PM

13 LOCATION: Town of Sullivan's Island Town Hall

2050-B Middle Street Sullivan's Island, SC

15 REPORTED BY:

PRISCILLA NAY,

Certified Shorthand Reporter

16

14

17

18

A. WILLIAM ROBERTS, JR., & ASSOCIATES 19

Fast, Accurate & Friendly

20

21

22

Charleston, SC (843) 722-8414 Myrtle Beach, SC (843) 839-3376 (803) 731-5224

Columbia, SC

23

24

Greenville, SC (864) 234-7030

Hilton Head, SC (843) 785-3263

Charlotte, NC (704) 573-3919

25

	2
1	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
2	
3	PAT ILDERTON, CHAIRPERSON
4	STEVE HERLONG, VICE CHAIRPERSON
5	MARK HOWARD, BOARD MEMBER
6	BILLY CRAVER, BOARD MEMBER
7	DONNA WEBB, BOARD MEMBER
8	RHONDA SANDERS, BOARD MEMBER
9	RANDY ROBINSON, BUILDING OFFICIAL
10	JOE HENDERSON, ZONING ADMINISTRATOR
11	KAT KENYON, PERMIT TECH
12	ALSO PRESENT:
13	Rachel Burton
14	Julia Martin Virginia Rogers
15	Kevin C. Reed Stacey Koon
16	Bill Booth
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	MR. ILDERTON: It is close enough to 6
2	o'clock and this is the October 15th, 2014 meeting
3	of the Sullivan's Island Design Review Board.
4	Members in attendance are Pat Ilderton, Steve
5	Herlong, Mark Howard, Donna Webb and Billy Craver.
6	We do have a reporter. Is Duke
7	MS. KENYON: Duke is not coming.
8	MR. ILDERTON: All right. The approval
9	of the minutes: Do we like the minutes?
10	MR. CRAVER: Move we approve.
11	MR. HOWARD: I second.
12	MR. ILDERTON: Everybody in favor, say
13	aye.
14	(Unanimous.)
15	MR. ILDERTON: The first thing on the
16	agenda is 1726 Middle Street. Is that correct?
17	MR. HENDERSON: Yes, sir. Thank you.
18	Pat, is Addenda Item C-1, a Certificate of
19	Appropriateness request for a historic property,
20	1726 Middle Street. The applicant, Ms. Rachel
21	Burton, is requesting conceptual approval to
22	demolish an existing garage, remove several
23	additions that are nonoriginal to the house and to
	additions that are honoriginal to the house and to
24	construct two one-story additions to the side and

Again, this is a Sullivan's Island landmark by way of Survey Card 255. This is one of 11 junior officer's quarters structures along Middle Street.

Again, we all know these structures very well. They have a homogeneous design, architectural design, comprised of a two-story cross gable roof shapes, slate roofs. They have two-story covered porches. And just to go through very briefly the scope of work, again, there's a request to demolish the garage. It's a concrete masonry unit construction, nonoriginal to the property, and I have provided the historic photographs in your packet to show that.

Also, there's a removal of several additions on the rear of the property. On the left rear side, there's a small shed and then also two, I guess, one-story additions that were put in.

However, there is proposed right a side addition to the right side elevation's one-story addition that will be visible from Middle Street.

I would just direct your attention to the Secretary of Interior's Standards that are put out in front of you. And I would caution you or ask you to consider three of the standards on 21 --

Section 2197 B and J and this essentially discusses retaining and reserving the historic elements.

Again, I went out on site and took photographs of all of the 11 structures on Middle Street.

There aren't any visible additions of the elements on Middle Street. I would like to hand out these photos of the structures and pass those around. Again, we're looking at the right-hand side of these. Mr. Chairman, I'll turn that back over to you.

MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Is the presenter here? Yes, ma'am.

MS. BURTON: Good evening, everybody.

First of all, my client is here, Bill Booth. His wife, Beth, is not able to be here this evening.

We want to do an addition -- two additions for this property that will allow them to have a master bedroom suite and a larger kitchen on the first floor. But I want to first just go through some of the photos and make sure that everybody understands this building.

I have some larger photos as well, if you would like to refer to these. So the very first photo I just wanted to show you is just so you can all see the garage building is a concrete

block building with just a gable roof. We want to remove that and remove the driveway, such as it is, that drives to that carport, to that garage. And we have a side view of that building as well. You can see it's a concrete block building and has no historic value at all.

The next view I'd like to show you is the rear so that you can just see there are two additions that are at the rear that we want to remove. One is a shed and one is the kitchen.

The kitchen part we will be removing the roof, but the shed will be removed entirely. But we will be building within that same footprint. This is the front view of the street or the front view of the property. We can see it's a two-story building. The porches are two-story.

There's nothing that is happening on this front that we are doing within this scope of work, so everything here would remain as it is.

Then I have two photos that are showing the side.

So on the side of this building is another -- like a two-story wing -- and that is the part that we would like to add an addition to.

So I have two views showing that so you could just see what it looked like from the street.

On the other side, the left side view, it's remaining exactly as it is and there would be no change on that from the street. These are closer-up views of the sheds that we're wanting to remove on the side and on the back.

So there's a little shed at the kitchen and then the two sheds at the storage and the kitchen at the back that we want to move. And then I also took photos of the details just to show you that this water table trim is the trim that we would use.

The porch columns and picket design that's on the front we would use on our new porch and the window trim and shutters are what we're going to use for our new windows and shutters.

So the overview on this site is this existing two-story part with the wing on the side. And then the work that we want to do is a small addition on the side. It would be four feet wide and that's the part that would be visible from the street. However, we are setting that back in so that the corner board of that elevation continues all the way down.

But that is the side addition that we're talking about and then we're doing an

addition at the back which is the master bedroom. This is currently the kitchen with the shed and we are reconstructing those with a new roof to be one kitchen with a porch then that goes behind that.

I have shown on here, just for clarity, our owner would like in the future to build a garage, a carport, and have a driveway. And I won't go into any of the zoning phases, but we are not going to exceed any of those on Sullivan's Island zoning requirements for the principal zoning square footage, for the impervious coverage.

You know, all of those requirements were under, even with the carport and the garage, so we would not be asking for relief on any of those items. So this is a planned view of what we want to do on the first floor and you can see this is the scope of the addition that we want to put on the side. One of the things that was the challenge of this particular home was keeping that front facade as intact as we could.

The second part of the challenge is that we want to keep the work of this property under 50 percent so we're not exceeding that 50 percent of the existing value, which means we need to be really careful about how much area are we

adding. So we wanted an official plan, which was why we elected to come out the side instead of only going to the back.

So the arrangement of the building is keep the living room exactly as it is, keep the side room exactly as it is. The dining room is here (indicating) and we're just removing a wall to then have more access into this kitchen at the back with a wraparound porch and the master bedroom, which is all entirely new on the side.

I have shown -- and it's in your packet -- this is the existing building, just so you can reference what is where. I have three sheets of elevations, just so you can compare existing to our proposed. This is the existing building at the front. This block remains entirely existing and is untouched. This is the side wing that's set further back, which is here, and then here is our little addition on the side.

So, as I said, the corner board continues. The two windows that are there now and the shutters all remain and our new piece is set back so that we're not in that same plane, trying to extend the plane or change how that proportion and shape works. This is the side view. So the

new addition here is a one-story addition that is added on to the side of the existing building. We extend that further to be the master bedroom and then that roof wraps around. And we have a new roof that's over the existing kitchen and what used to be the shed and it extends over the porch.

This is the existing where you can see these. The shed is removed. The shed is entirely removed, and this roof is removed so we can construct our new roof.

And then this is the rear view of the property and we have deliberately kept it just to the one story so that the existing house is clearly visible and we're just doing this one-story addition to the back which has the -- you know, the master bedroom on this side and then the porch and steps coming down here. This is the existing.

MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you.

All right.

MS. KENYON: Please announce yourself so Priscilla can get your names.

MS. ILDERTON: Is there any public comment to this application? An objection before we close or before we add?

MR. HENDERSON: No, sir.

1	MR. ILDERTON: Billy?
2	MR. CRAVER: I like it. I don't have a
3	problem with it at all.
4	MR. ILDERTON: Rhonda.
5	MS. SANDERS: I think it looks very
6	nice and very unassuming. I understand there's a
7	concern with the front because it will be different
8	from the rest by adding onto the side.
9	Is that what I heard when I walked in
10	late? I'm very sorry.
11	MR. ILDERTON: Yes.
12	MR. HENDERSON: Pretty much.
13	MS. SANDERS: Otherwise, I think it
14	looks really nice.
15	MR. ILDERTON: Donna.
16	MS. WEBB: I think that you did a great
17	job with making the floor plan very efficient,
18	working with the space that you have.
19	Did you consider doing the master bath
20	off that back bedroom to the right?
21	MS. BURTON: We did, and we're really
22	bumping up against our budget and wanting to make
23	sure that we're not going over that 50 percent
24	value. So we're trying to keep as small a new
25	building and an addition as we can just to stay

-	\sim
•	•
	1

within that and yet still allow Bill and Beth to have, you know, the amenity of having their master bedroom and bath on that lower floor and having, you know, the other amenities that would make their life so much nicer with a nice kitchen.

And so, yeah, we did look at that and I couldn't find a way to have the square footage meet what we were looking for.

MS. WEBB: What material will you be using on the roof for the new portion?

MS. BURTON: Although Joe mentioned slate, it's not a slate roof. In fact, it is an asphalt shingle roof now.

MR. BOOTH: It's not. The original structure that's under the hip roof on ours and a new one of the others are still slate. Everything else is what they call the 5 metal --

MR. ILDERTON: 5V?

MR. BOOTH: Yeah.

MR. ILDERTON: So was it your understanding that is what would be on the addition?

MS. BURTON: We're assuming that our addition would be the 5 --

MR. ILDERTON: Traditionally, all

porches on the officers' quarters were done in metal as opposed to slate. It's a lower pitch.

MS. BURTON: Yes, so we wanted to use that and then although the original house had wood siding we want to use hardie plank. So we're looking to a similar profile, so just wanting more durability and less maintenance in doing a hardie plank siding.

MS. WEBB: I'm fine with the plan.

Like I said, I think it's a very efficient use of
the space and it's a great thing that you're
keeping as much as original as you can. You're
just going to put in the new windows on the new
part?

MS. BURTON: Yes.

MS. WEBB: But the others will remain the same?

MS. BURTON: Yes.

MR. HOWARD: I think it clears up the back very nicely and whether the other units would have really been a mess there. The homogeneous nature of the non-commissioned officers is paramount here. I mean, that is what these houses are about, the uniformity. So we take this very carefully. I think you've done a good job and I've

looked at it a lot. I sort of came away believing this: Getting rid of the front driveway which is the only one on that row would be worth the addition of the two feet to the side and I'm sort of standing on that because I don't know how that driveway got in the front yard when none of the other homes have that and if we're trying to preserve this uniform nature.

So, in, fact, you mentioned the driveway's coming out, so we're not parking in the front yard anymore. So to me that would merit a fair trade-off.

MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Steve.

MR. HERLONG: These are interesting structures in that the back of them is so dysfunctional. For a lot of people, one of these came before the board many years ago when the board was -- you know, early on formed after about two or three years and somebody wanted to do a very extensive addition, almost the size of the existing structure, and they put it in the back corner and it kind of mimicked that structure and a board member was very enthusiastic -- previous board member -- in their dislike for that particular addition. I don't know if you recall.

MR. CRAVER: You're being so kind with politics.

MR. HERLONG: And I just think a lot of people are wondering what do you do with these structures because they are very important and they're all alike. So what do you do? It is a real interesting dilemma as to what to do to preserve them but make them functional.

And, Rachel, I think you are doing the same kind of direction I would take these as well. But the only one question I think I have is that I think it's great that everything is down low, at the lower roof but that one added piece is going to make this different than the others. And I'm not saying it's wrong or we shouldn't do that, but it's one of those things where if we sometimes follow these standards from -- whose standards are these?

MR. HENDERSON: They're from the town's zoning ordinance, but they're derived from the Secretary of Standards.

MR. HERLONG: Secretary of Standards -that it should be removable, but the way you're
removing that wall from the addition, I just
wondered did you ever try -- like, if the master

bedroom was just moved back a few feet, could you just gain any functionality by just putting it back a bit further and using just the footprint of that original part? It could even come back out further, back in the back, and then maybe then we could preserve that wall, that original wall right here.

MR. BOOTH: As the owner, first it's important to bump-out. Many of them have bump-outs on the side. It's important to point out --well, two, my neighbors. And you won't see mine when the driveway is done and the landscaping is done, just like you would have a hard time seeing theirs unless you were looking for them.

They haven't particularly landscaped against being able to see them. It's just there aren't -- it's a hard thing to see actually from the street. I had to walk down the road, take a look, and say, is that coming off their kitchen or is it coming off of some other part of the house?

I wonder, that must be their laundry room or something. So they are there and they're just not all that visible because they're away from the front of the house.

MR. HERLONG: I think you're exactly

1 right in adding that bit of an offset. I think you 2 might need maybe an eight-inch offset. 3 MR. ILDERTON: Yes, just a little bit 4 deeper offset, which really wouldn't mess up your 5 master bath, just a few more inches there. It really wouldn't affect your master bath if you add 6 a little more, a couple more inches there, off the 7 8 corner. 9 MR. HENDERSON: So you're currently 10 showing another eight inches offset? So another four inches? 11 12 MR. HERLONG: I think it is four. 13 MS. BURTON: Eight inches. MR. ILDERTON: 14 Is it eight? 15 MS. BURTON: I have eight. I think 16 have eight inches showing. When I --17 MR. ILDERTON: Because the walls don't --18 19 MS. BURTON: Oh, does it? 20 MR. HENDERSON: These say eight. 21 MR. ILDERTON: Eight inches would 22 really probably be the difference. 23 MS. BURTON: At least eight is what 24 you're saying? 25 MR. ILDERTON: Yes. I think that would

be good and, like you're saying, the master bath is still going to work. Just a couple of inches.

MR. HERLONG: I really think a lot of people are looking and wondering what to do in the back of these homes. That's such a nonfunctioning area of all of them and I think this is the kind of direction to take. But I would just challenge you to try, if you could, to work with that. This is a conceptual --

MS. BURTON: I have one question further. I really want to keep our master bath here because that's in the floor plan, gives us the space.

MR. HERLONG: Quite on the back -- back of the property --

MS. BURTON: What I have right now is the existing houses -- do you know what? When I reduced these drawings to print them on here, this has come out wrong. That's why we've got four inches and eight inches. You know, that whole -- you reduce it 50 percent and it's not right?

MR. HERLONG: Right.

MS. BURTON: So you're right. It was only four inches shown on there. But what I had on this side was this was an existing 19 foot and

three quarter-inch setback and this reduces it here, so it's an 18-foot setback and this is an existing two-foot -- two and a half. And what I want to have right here right now is we have 15 feet, one and a quarter inches.

order to get my bathroom working better, can we -if I can -- so move it back from the front face of
the front of this wall but move this out? But if
I'm pushing that and then you bumping against my
setback, I might need my trade-off to make my floor
plan.

MR. HERLONG: Personally, I think the board would want to help you adjust the setbacks where we're able to work with this --

MS. BURTON: Yes.

MR. HERLONG: -- structure. I mean, these were built long before these setbacks.

MR. ILDERTON: Yes.

MS. BURTON: Well, then I'd be happy to look at the plan and figure out how we can get a nice bathroom, giving us a slight bit more setback from the front, if I can move a little bit more that way, too.

MR. HERLONG: I think a lot of people

20 1 will be doing projects and you've got huge problems 2 with the 50 percent rule and the fact that it's 3 historic. 4 It's a big uphill battle to make them 5 work and so I just think this would be a great 6 It's the first one that really somebody's 7 come to us and wanted to make some significant 8 changes. So it's just a great opportunity to show a great way to do it and this is so, so close. 9 10 would just suggest trying it. 11 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Yes. Ι think it's a good effort and I think with just a 12 13 few small adjustments it should be fine. I don't 14 see any difference with it, too, so I'm essentially 15 for it with the comments that have been made, if 16 you feel like you can work with that. Do I hear a 17 motion? 18 MR. CRAVER: Is there any reason we 19 can't give final approval? 20 I mean, let's let them get done what 21 they want to do. 22 MR. ILDERTON: I mean, that's fine, as 23

MR. ILDERTON: I mean, that's fine, as long as Joe's aware of, I guess, the comments tonight and what we're hoping to gain by that.

24

25

MR. HENDERSON: Sure. If we were to

give final approval, just a little more clarity on 1 the recess from that facade, you mentioned it's 2 currently sitting at eight inches. Is that right? 3 MS. BURTON: No. It's currently 4 5 sitting at four. I'm sorry. I had a drawing/ 6 printing scale issue. So the current is four and 7 the board has asked it be at least eight. MR. HENDERSON: I would prefer to do is 8 9 get the rendering that shows eight inches, send it out to you digitally and make sure --10 11 MR. ILDERTON: Okay. 12 MR. CRAVER: I'm going to move we give 13 final approval, subject to everybody looking at 14 the --15 MR. HERLONG: Before we second that, I 16 do have one more question for the board, really. 17 You mentioned hardie plank siding. Are you thinking, like, the artisan siding, the thicker 18 19 material that would match the depth of the wood? 20 MR. ILDERTON: Yes. That occurred to 21 me, too. It should be the thicker hardie as 22 opposed to the thin hardie. 23 MR. BOOTH: Our desire is to match the house and if that means the original siding, we'll 24 25 figure that out.

room size.

	22
1	MR. ILDERTON: It's not a big cost
2	difference. It's a little bit more but not that
3	much, and same durability and acceptable.
4	MR. HENDERSON: Yes. Hardie plank is
5	an acceptable material for a contributing national
6	registered district property, so it is an
7	acceptable material to use.
8	MR. HERLONG: So I move we give final
9	approval as submitted, subject to the adjustment of
10	the four inches to eight inches on the side that is
11	set back.
12	MR. CRAVER: Offset.
13	MR. HERLONG: Offset. And having a
14	drawing e-mailed to the board for an eyeball.
15	MR. ILDERTON: Right. Do I hear a
16	second? We can discuss it after.
17	MR. HOWARD: Okay. I second that, I
18	guess.
19	MR. ILDERTON: Then we can have
20	discussion.
21	MR. HOWARD: I got the impression that
22	you actually were talking about a bit more than an
23	eight-inch setback, that you wanted to maybe, when
24	you set it back, readjust the side of the entire

MS. BURTON: I was just saying to move that back eight inches, if I have to move this wall out a little bit, and then encroaching into this side setback.

MR. HOWARD: So the way the motion reads, it says that we're only asking you to go back eight inches and if you change that we need to redo the entire thing. Do we not? Seems to me. I mean, because you're changing the entire wall, seems to me.

MS. SANDERS: Is it open for discussion?

MR. ILDERTON: Sure.

MS. SANDERS: My concern also is -- I think looks great, whatever, blah, blah. I really do. And from the street, probably you won't be able to see the difference. I guess my biggest concern would be especially for the board and for the town is precedence, for more of these going forward.

So if somebody says, oh, we just want two more feet or whatever, whatever, that would be my concern. And walking in late, hearing the first thing coming out of your mouth was, you know, from the front you see this new addition the rest of

them don't have. And two more may have been added on, how old they are -- you know, that's part of the reason for this board, was because a lot of those things were not approved in the historic --

MS. BURTON: I mean, I'm assuming that increasing my setback or that front face of the front addition, back it eight inches, I'm not talking about going further up to the side because I really am hampered by my square footage.

I need to be exceptionally careful.

But, you know, is it my understanding that if we send out electronic versions that you can say, no, bring it back?

MR. HENDERSON: That's right.

MR. HERLONG: I think Joe always has the option of reviewing it and sending it and getting approves or saying that's a little more than I'm comfortable with.

MR. HENDERSON: That's right.

MR. CRAVER: And my thought in my motion was that's essentially what happens to say I'm comfortable with what's here if y'all approve it or I think you guys need to look at it again.

MR. ILDERTON: And the fact this is just a one-story, really, addition with the shed

which also brings your eye down. It's going to be recessed. I mean, it could even be done a shade darker or something so it does help it disappear. I mean, there's all kind of ways to mitigate or put up a shrubbery in front of it or something. You're just not going to see it, I don't think.

Your main facade there, the two-story facade, is almost iconic, still going to be there. So I don't think it's really going to jump out at you as, you know, being a problem myself.

MR. HENDERSON: Just to clarify, staff can give approval and send out digital versions to get your review of a project but we can't issue relief to any standard of the zoning ordinance.

So if you requested 10 percent relief on that side setback that you were showing or something like that, like we talked about, we cannot give approval and you would have to resubmit it to the board.

MR. HOWARD: That being the case, I think it would be better to change the proposed approval as opposed to conceptual approval and continue back and -- to see how you want to do this which is what was --

MS. SANDERS: Was what was requested?

1 MR. HENDERSON: You weren't requesting 2 relief for the side setback, are you? 3 MS. BURTON: At the moment, I'm not 4 requesting anything. I honestly don't know when I 5 look at the plan if I'll need relief. I'm just 6 asking, should that happen, how are you feeling 7 about that so I kind of know where I can go? 8 MR. ILDERTON: I quess what we're 9 saying is if that happens you would have had to go 10 before the board. We probably would be okay with 11 it, as long as it's sort of in the rear. Didn't we 12 talk about that? 13 MR. HERLONG: I think so. 14 MR. ILDERTON: Probably wouldn't be a 15 problem, but you would have to appear before the board whereas if you didn't need that then we could 16 17 do this electronically. 18 MR. HOWARD: Okay. I agree with that. 19 MS. BURTON: Exactly. 20 MR. ILDERTON: Are we clear? 21 MS. BURTON: Yes. 22 MR. ROBINSON: Before y'all vote, can I 23 throw in one little historical fact since I'm an 24 historical guy sitting around here? Pat, you'll 25 probably remember this. Joe, you probably will,

Those two additions that were done in those 1 2 structures were done in the '60s. That was the two 3 MacManus' house and they had a causeway running 4 between the two houses because they had so many 5 children they couldn't fit them in one house. 6 MR. ILDERTON: Right. 7 MR. ROBINSON: At some point in time -and it may already be historical to those things. 8 9 I mean, it's going to be a neat fact somewhere down 10 the road that the McManuses had so many children that they needed two of those quarters to house all 11 12 the kids. Anyway, just thought I'd throw that 13 little point in there. 14 MR. ILDERTON: That's true. Okav. 15 we have a motion on the table. And do we have a Is it okay to call for a vote? Anybody in 16 second? 17 favor of the motion? Great. Everybody. 18 opposed. 19 MS. BURTON: Thank you very much. 20 MR. ILDERTON: We are removing 1026, right, Joe? 21 22 MR. HENDERSON: Yes, sir, that's 23 correct. 24 MR. ILDERTON: So we're going to 25 Middle Street.

MR. HENDERSON: 910 Middle Street is our next one. Ms. Julia Martin. The request is a conceptual design review and approval for a proposed new home construction. This is located at 910 Middle Street.

The applicants are requesting approval to essentially demolish the existing home on the lot which is construction of the early 1990s, I believe, and in its place build a 4,427 square foot home with a more modern, contemporary design.

Part of this request is requested relief for three provisions of the ordinance. The first is a side setback request. The applicants are requesting 24 percent or 6.5 feet. And, of course, the board is allowed to give 25 percent relief.

Also requested is a second story side setback, requesting 100 percent relief of that, and also relief of 18.6 percent for principal building square footage. And again, it's 25 percent that the board is allowed to give. I will defer to you, Mr. Chairman, for any questions.

MR. ILDERTON: Yes, ma'am.

MS. MARTIN: I'm Julia Martin. I've been working in Charleston for about 15 years and

working peripherally on some projects here on the island, but I've never been here in front of the board. So if I do or say anything inappropriate, feel free to call me out.

It's been a pleasure working with town staff as we have made this progress on this project. My clients are Stacey and Mark Koon.

Stacey is here with me tonight. And they have had this goal to live on Sullivan's Island for a long time. They looked for a long time to have the property they finally purchased at 910 Rutledge Street and they're really happy.

They know their neighbors and their neighbors' dogs and they've taken time to speak with all their immediate neighbors personally about this application. We have some letters of support for them. I'm not aware of any opposition at all.

I guess I'll just touch briefly on the existing house. It's a pretty well-built home. A lot of people really like it. It was built around 1990.

My clients always knew that they wanted this house to be something with a contemporary aesthetic, so we went through a pretty detailed analysis of the structure that was there to see if

there was a way to alter it and embrace it and just change it and make it what they wanted, but the result of that was that it didn't make any sense because the alterations needed were so significant that it just rendered it sort of pointless to try to save that.

So they're currently looking into some options for looking into another house or to relocating it to another lot, looking into things of that nature, so as to simply not throw it away.

Regarding the proposed house, we spent a lot of time studying the town's zoning code and took those standards and guidelines of design to heart. Although our design might not look like an expected product of the prescriptive code, we attempted to incorporate a real respect for what the code conveys and we hope you'll agree that our design is in keeping with the spirit of the framework provided. It does have that contemporary aesthetic, but we feel like it's in keeping with the aesthetic contemporary structures.

The Koons were very careful where they decided to plan this. There are some places on the island they wouldn't propose a house like this, just wouldn't be appropriate, but we feel like in

this particular location with these neighboring structures. It works.

It's proposed with a masonry structure, thinking insulated concrete forms, which is kind of unusual for coastal architecture for whatever reason, but I feel like it's very appropriate.

It's very, you know, durable, and can withstand a lot of natural opposition from the ocean and the other elements.

There's one point I want to make regarding Section 21-32 of the ordinance with respect to foundation enclosures. Our design does show some lengths of solid foundation that are greater than the four feet that are recommended or required, but we sort of feel like that is appropriate because of the nature of the material, the concrete.

It just, to me, feels a little odd to have a big -- you know, substantial masonry structure on piers, you know, so that's sort of why that happened. We're asking for you to consider modifying that requirement for us. Obviously, we will comply with FEMA requirements and there will be laws incorporating into that, but that is possible with the ICFs.

Also, it probably bears pointing out that the side elevation — each side elevation of this house is minimally visible, even to its occupants. I mean, there's like about a nine-foot setback, I think, on each side and a lot of vegetation. So from either of the public street fronts, it is nearly impossible to make out what's going on on the side elevation.

The relief that we're requesting, I think the ordinance by the calculations, you know, provided would require 27 feet and what we're proposing is going down to 20.6 feet. And then that site overlay study that we included on Sheet 0.3, you can sort of see the relationship, for what it's worth, at the existing house versus the proposed house.

And our existing house is never wider than what's there now. And in the front toward Middle Street, it's actually about five feet more narrow than the house that's there now. So we're increasing those setbacks at the front of the structure. And then the request for heated square footage, the ordinance allows a maximum of 3,764 and we are seeking, I believe, 18 percent relief to permit 4,413 square feet. And then the final note,

I think Joe might need to help me, but about the second story setback, when I read that I sort of believed that if you provide a porch that somehow mitigates that. That was what we attempted to do by having those recessed porches, but that is not --

MR. HENDERSON: If we could take a look at those side elevations, maybe we could direct the board members to look at that same page. We can take a look at that provisions of the ordinance. And I do have two other questions for you.

MS. MARTIN: Okay. So back on 2.2 and 2.3, just look at those side elevations. And see that we followed, I believe, what the code stipulated in not having more than X linear feet of solid wall and then having at least a 12-foot porch that was at least four feet deep.

So that was out of the hope that we would somehow be able to comply by doing that.

Again, here with the nature of the structure, to set the second floor in just doesn't quite seem to fit the aesthetic or the material. And we did that basically on both sides, but I was open to suggestions.

What were the other questions, Joe?

	34
1	MR. HENDERSON: Which page was that,
2	I'm sorry, that you were
3	MS. MARTIN: 2.2 and 2.3 are the side
4	elevations and yeah 2.4.
5	MR. HENDERSON: Okay. So the standard
6	is regarding the principal building side facade and
7	it states: The length of the principal building
8	side facade shall not exceed 30 feet without an
9	articulation or building inset and the side facade
10	of at least four feet. This standard may be met by
11	inclusion of a side porch, having a minimum depth
12	of four feet.
13	And so what you're showing is the
L 4	inclusion of these two-story porches, right?
۱5	MS. MARTIN: Yes.
۱6	MR. HENDERSON: They are a minimum of
L7	four feet. And then: The design review board may
18	give a 100 percent modification to release or
L9	exempt the structure if you know, that it meets
20	the standards for neighborhood compatibility.
21	MS. MARTIN: Should I sit down? I
22	think that's about all.
23	MR. HERLONG: Great. Thanks.
24	MR. HENDERSON: I did have a couple of
25	other questions. Julia, you mentioned one of the

side setbacks went down to nine feet on one 1 2 side or --3 MS. MARTIN: Let me look. 4 MR. HENDERSON: I'm showing on 5 application that it's 10 feet. 6 MS. MARTIN: Oh, yeah, ten. 7 MR. HENDERSON: So at no point can the side setback be reduced beyond 10 feet. 8 9 MS. MARTIN: You're correct. 10 MR. HENDERSON: And the foundation enclosure, let's see. So this is another point of 11 12 relief that you're requesting from the board? 13 MS. MARTIN: I think it's called a 14 modification. I think it's 21-32. 15 MR. HENDERSON: 32. So the standard established: The building's foundation exceeding 16 17 three feet in height shall be enclosed by lattice or slats having a minimum of one-half inch between 18 19 the lattice or slats. 20 Solid enclosure materials such as brick 21 or stucco may be used as building material 22 supporting the foundation and are limited to four 23 feet in width and no more than every eight feet on the exterior portion of the foundation. 24 25

So you're requesting that the louvered

	36
1	doors not have that space between it?
2	MS. MARTIN: We can have the space. I
3	just think it's that we have wider than the four
4	feet of masonry.
5	MR. ROBINSON: With the ICFs you
6	probably have to do that.
7	MR. HENDERSON: Did you see which
8	elevations we were pointing at?
9	MS. MARTIN: It's again, I think,
10	mostly the sides. The front and the rear are quite
11	open, but the sides do have more solid
12	MR. HENDERSON: It's 2.4, so these side
13	elevations on the foundation level don't meet that
14	standard that we typically see here.
15	MR. HOWARD: Okay.
16	MR. HERLONG: I thought Randy, as the
17	building official, had issues with anything solid
18	more than four feet in width in a V zone. Is this
19	a V zone?
20	MR. ROBINSON: It is a V zone.
21	MR. HENDERSON: It is a V zone.
22	MR. ROBINSON: Typically, yes. But if
23	an engineer designing it and says okay, then it's
24	possible to do it.
25	MR HERLONG: Okay.

1 MR. ROBINSON: But a typical design, 2 four feet, is this. 3 MS. SANDERS: Can you do that with your 4 concrete -- I mean, I've got the same kind of 5 construction myself. 6 MR. ROBINSON: Yes. I mean, the 7 engineer will have to specifically say that he has 8 designed the structure and those walls are 9 perpendicular to the wave action and that it will 10 have no adverse effect on the structure. 11 MR. ILDERTON: Neighboring structure. 12 MR. HENDERSON: Are you okay with that, kind of coordinating the engineer and the plan 13 14 submittal? 15 MS. MARTIN: Absolutely. 16 MR. ILDERTON: I assume there's no 17 public comment to this because there's no public here and so, Joe, you've already added all your 18 19 things. 20 MR. HENDERSON: Yes, sir. 21 MR. ILDERTON: I want the board to 22 start with this. Steve. 23 MR. HERLONG: I absolutely appreciate 24 the desire to do something more contemporary and 25 you've found some examples of more contemporary

homes like on this second page. I think those are some good examples of contemporary design.

The one at 3020 Marshall, I think we all know that one. I think my hesitation, I guess, is that when I look at the renderings, it almost has more of a monumental quality when I look at the rear elevation. When I look down at this one, it's not a very soft approach to contemporary design, and I can appreciate that.

I'm wondering what kind of questions
I'm going to get from neighbors as a review board
member when we look at this. And if it gets an
approval, I think people are going to question,
well, didn't we set up some guidelines and that
certainly wouldn't meet the guidelines. Well, in
fact, this can. I think we're showing that it can
meet the guidelines.

For instance, this house that's there, the eave height of that, with virtually the same setbacks, is about 20 feet maybe and the second floor is all within the roof line. Here, we're at maximum setback of 10 feet, and we're going up 37 feet, let's say. I think people are going to question, did y'all really approve that? That's a huge amount of relief for a -- that's a lot more

building put on a site than anybody's probably used to seeing.

On the other hand, let me show an example here of the -- there's a house at 2608

Bayonne that, I think, originally was going to be more contemporary than what you see here. It is an example of a house that's quite tall, going up the two side setbacks; however, not as tall as this one is going to be because on the right side of the one at 2608 Bayonne it maybe goes up to 30 something feet, not 37 feet. Into the low 30s.

When I look at these examples, even at 1655 Atlantic, that's been there a long time. There's something about that that -- there's a little bit of additional articulation and a curved facade in a couple of places that just provide a little bit of visual relief to that home even. The others have almost like a screening effect.

The addition that was done at 2401 is a nice addition in the backyard. That facade is set back, way back into the yard. It doesn't encroach into, say, a neighbor's view or it doesn't create shadow on a neighbor's property. I think going 37 feet up, 10 feet off of a side setback - well, in fact when that happened, that's what set off the

new push to create new guidelines and now the setbacks are more.

This happens to be an existing narrow lot. You're in a very narrow lot and so you get more relief on those setbacks. It almost makes it even more challenging to design something that most people are going to go, that's really a nice, sympathetic design to the neighborhood.

I'm not seeing this one as being particularly sympathetic to the neighborhood.

It's taking the full setback almost for the full depth of the house, front to back.

I would just think that some study of softening that effect to some degree, either whether you take the rear elevation and the vertical components on the back facade where the porches are, run a full height, maybe breaking that up so that visually there's a break in the various facades, could soften it some and make it more compatible in the neighborhood.

I think, absolutely, a contemporary home there can be very compatible in any neighborhood on Sullivan's Island. That's how I see it.

MR. ILDERTON: All right. Thank you.

I'll take the next comment. I think essentially it can work. But to your point, Steve, I think a few softening effects. I mean, if you did something and maybe you want flat roofs everywhere and maybe that's the look.

If you did just something on those porches on the marsh side, the Osceola side, and you had two shallow hips coming out there and basically get some sort of overhang or some sort of hips coming out of there to soften that side there, you could still have your big deck up top with the views on both sides and have that central deck — central access up there if that was taken and softened.

Even the columns coming up, maybe just a little bit more detail. I can see why you want the glass. The glass is going to be constant.

Maybe you can get that new glass that sheds dust and everything else, but it's going to be a constant thing, something to keep clean.

And just as a comment as a builder, I will say your windows on the side and without an overhang, just be damn sure how this is constructed because you're just asking for water infiltration through those penetrations there, just in years and

months down the road after finishing this house because that's so hard to keep the water out off the shear without any kind of cover on those windows where there's no overhang or anything.

It's just an observation because I've been through it. I think just a little softening on that side. I think, really, the Middle Street side because you've got all that glasswork on that side and the lower level on the right, I mean, it looks — and the large stairs and all, I mean that's fairly easy on the eye, I think. I think just a little bit of softening of the double porches on the Osceola side would make a huge difference and probably just be better for the house in maintenance and everything else in years to come.

So y'all did get a lot of support, I think. Didn't we get all those e-mails?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ HENDERSON: We had five notes of support.

MR. ILDERTON: I wanted to mention we got those e-mails and they do have those support from their neighbors. So we are hearing that as opposed to the opposite. So they do have a lot of support, at least from those people that responded.

So that is certainly something to be considered. Mark.

MR. HOWARD: I wanted to mention as well the letters because there is no public here, but apparently you've got good public support in the neighborhood. I guess to the effect — the drawings here which make the house actually look very nice, it sits out in the open which it doesn't on this lot.

So the roof line, the height, that would tend to be more of an issue. I'm not an architect enough to tell you how to help the house, but my only take-away from actually looking at it, going to the site, was that I guess softening is the word because I came away with -- you know, I don't know if it needs some eaves around the roof line or something, but that was my take-away on it was the house needs some kind of softening.

I'm not good enough to tell you what that might be, so I'd listen to these gentleman. But I thought there was some way that you could do that to -- to just quit some of the starkness of it. Other than that, it's certainly conceptually --

MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you.

Donna.

MS. WEBB: I don't know if I can say anything else that y'all haven't already voiced. I think it's important to have the neighbor's support, but I also think that whatever decision we make needs to be the same, no matter where it sits, because we might have this same request in another part of the island and they say, well, we did it here.

I'm a big fan of modern construction, but I think taking some of those thoughts into consideration will -- I don't know if it be exterior materials or, like Pat said, adding some eaves and just softening it a little bit. But I like how you make a more pervious surface and not taking up any more footprint than the original structure and that's all.

MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you. Rhonda.

MS. SANDERS: I really like it. I like contemporary and I will concur with Pat because I have three square walls with a flat deck and windows and it is a constant problem. You really want to put something over those. And I think if you could do something to soften, whatever you want

to call it, the roof line in some of those places it would help. Maybe it would help to also cover those windows.

When it rains, it comes straight down that wall and hits, the water. I don't care how you build it. It hits the sill of the window and it's a nightmare. And then the other side that gets direct sun with no rain is just as bad. I like it. I agree. Maybe some softening.

MR. ILDERTON: Billy.

MR. CRAVER: I am sort of ambivalent to real contemporary style, so it's not my style, but I also am big on as long as you comply with what's in the ordinance you should get to do what you want to do with your property. And so for that reason, I'm for it, as is.

MR. ILDERTON: Great. Thank you.

What are we going to do here? Is this a preliminary?

MS. SANDERS: I don't have an

application.

Does anybody else have an application?

I don't have an application so --

MR. HENDERSON: There was an

25 application.

Sullivan's Island Design Review Board - October 15, 2014

	46
1	MS. SANDERS: I don't have an
2	application, so I don't know what the request is
3	for.
4	MR. HENDERSON: This is a preliminary
5	request.
6	MR. CRAVER: Preliminary or consent?
7	MR. HENDERSON: Preliminary.
8	MS. SANDERS: Move to approve the
9	preliminary.
10	MR. ROBINSON: Second.
11	MR. HOWARD: Have we addressed your
12	concerns on the application?
13	MR. HENDERSON: Yes.
14	MR. HOWARD: We addressed the design
15	but the setbacks and
16	MR. HENDERSON: We're okay.
17	MR. ILDERTON: We've got a motion on
18	the floor. It has been seconded, open for
19	discussion. The applicant might want to take some
20	of the comments today in what they come back for
21	I guess final would be the next thing? Is that
22	right?
23	MR. HENDERSON: Yes.
24	MR. ILDERTON: And I think there have
25	been some constructive comments Again.

essentially, I think the floor plan and most of the work that the architect has done is not going to have to be redone by the comments and things like that. It's all meant to help the people that are going to live in the house and build the house and everything else so the architects can take the comments and possibly, you know, work with those comments. The next time you come in, hopefully there would be no issue at all.

MR. HERLONG: Well, currently the language is just for straight approval, but it doesn't say anything about studying it in any way. I think softening is what I think it needs or additional articulation or a study of some additional articulation.

MR. ILDERTON: Are we proposing to make that an adjustment to --

MR. HERLONG: I'm just talking right now.

MS. SANDERS: Some round elements?

MR. HOWARD: Or louvers or --

MR. HERLONG: Like I say, the rear elevation, it's in scale. It's monumental. I don't know if you realize how hard that's going to be on that back side.

At least, it is way in on the property. It's way back off of the street facade, but I just think I need some help to approve this. I mean, I know what kind of comments --

MR. CRAVER: You're concerned with the criticism we're going to get, that we let a big

MR. ILDERTON: Really, all you're talking about is that double decker porch which is essentially fine, as it is, except it could be softened any number of ways, a different roof line or articulation on the columns, or anything else, I think. I mean, however, but --

MS. SANDERS: A little flare or a rain diverter.

MR. ILDERTON: Well, whatever but without destroying the design, but it's going to be very contemporary no matter what. With that central section and central top deck that's going to flatten --

MR. ROBINSON: You know, Steve, if you look at these eight houses that they've put in here as examples, from 840 Middle down to 2708 Bayonne, which I get to look at every day, all of these are -- none of them have what I'll call just stark,

flat surfaces and -- I mean, I get what you're saying is part of what we attempted to do when we redid the zoning ordinance was to avoid having stark, flat surfaces or even surfaces that appeared to be -- now you've got those indentations but, I mean, I guess what the issue is you still have two boxes hooked together with these porches.

Again, my position is you get to do what want to do. But I agree with your issue. We're going to hear about this house once it's built.

MR. HERLONG: There's no question.

MS. SANDERS: We hear about houses that never came to the board.

MR. ROBINSON: Right. And so I'm not sure what you ought to do to it to help it out, but I can look at all eight of these houses and see there's variation on the surfaces that helped them avoid that mass.

I guess that's the issue, isn't it,

Steve? It's really a massing issue that you're -
MR. HERLONG: I'm not even sure that

that's it. It's more formal in its shapes than

most of these. There's irregularities on this

page. None of these are -- well the one, 3020

50 1 Marshall, is fairly symmetrical. The others, there's no symmetry going on. I see a lot of 2 symmetry in the rear elevation, which I see it's 3 monumental. It's a combination of those things. 4 It's the fact that there is a 37-foot 5 tall wall, I don't know however wide, 10 feet off 6 the property line, just straight up to basically 7 the max. It can go to 38 feet and no higher on the 8 Usually, that's in the center, near a 9 island. 10 ridge. Near a ridge. 11 MR. HOWARD: 12 MR. HERLONG: And it's going to slope down, most of the time, to a lower point. Here 13 it's right at the edge and it's just --14 Is that how high it is, 15 MS. SANDERS: 37 feet at the top of the wall? 16 I just want to point out 17 MS. MARTIN: again from each of the public streets, it's about 18 80 feet before you get to the house and there's --19 It said that in --20 MR. ILDERTON: MR. HOWARD: Quite a bit. 21 MR. HERLONG: That's quite a bit. 22 23 is long and it's got that going for it. From both streets, it's quite a ways back, but I just know 24 the board is going to -- I'm going to hear 25

comments. I know you guys probably all hear various comments when you see things happening. That's my concern.

MR. HOWARD: I'm just surprised the board felt the same way I did from my initial -- you know, I'm just looking at it, going well, it's contemporary. And that's fine, but I just don't know. There's a harshness and I think it would benefit you to fix it because I think it would avoid a lot of the issues better, that sort of thing, I think, if you soften that.

MR. ILDERTON: I don't think it would take too much of an adjustment to do something to soften it up, but I don't think it needs to be a reproduction either. I like contemporary architecture, too, and I think it's healthy for the island.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MR}}\xspace.$ HOWARD: I agree with that.

MR. ILDERTON: To make --

MS. SANDERS: Can I make a comment? I have a very similar style house in those respects and what I would do differently is I would have some eyebrows over that house so it didn't get rained on and maybe some inset balconies. If I could do it all over again, that's what I would do.

24

25

1	MS. KOON: Am I allowed to ask
2	questions? Do you mean the side of the home that
3	is on the front and the back we have that now
4	MS. SANDERS: Yes. Wherever the
5	you have the flat wall and the windows, you do get
6	water. I have a gutter, but, of course, it goes
7	right down the window and it also softens it up if
8	you would have an eyebrow, copper something. Help
9	me, Pat.
10	MR. ILDERTON: Also, how you get water
11	off of that, the porch roof, if the porch roof is
12	flat or if it's flat with a very slight where is
13	the water going to go? Rain comes down. Porch
14	roof, what does it do?
15	MS. MARTIN: The interior drains.
16	MR. ILDERTON: Yes, the interior
17	drains. So, it's essentially flat with an interior
18	drain. Okay. On the depth of the wall it's a
19	masonry wall and
20	MS. SANDERS: Mine, it's an eight-foot
21	wall. It's the same thing you're talking about,
22	eight inches.
23	MR. ILDERTON: They have it on office

buildings and they do it all the time.

```
1
      and, you know, I have the same -- there are some
 2
      things I would do differently.
 3
                  MR. ILDERTON: It is done.
 4
                  MR. HERLONG: It seems we have a motion
 5
     to approve it, preliminary? Is that what it was?
 6
                  MR. CRAVER: Preliminary.
 7
                  MR. HERLONG: We can either vote on
 8
     that, but I think it needs something to say please,
     please take the board's comments as advice as you
 9
     study it for final or something to that degree.
10
11
                  MR. ILDERTON: Would you adjust your
12
     motion to that?
13
                  MR. CRAVER: Who did the motion?
14
                 MS. SANDERS: What did I say? I'm
15
     sorry.
16
                 MR. ILDERTON: Move to approve.
17
                 MS. SANDERS: I don't even have an
18
     application, so I don't know what I'm approving.
19
                 MR. HENDERSON: For preliminary
20
     approval.
                Can be --
                 MS. SANDERS: Preliminary approval.
21
22
     Adjustments per comments? Sorry.
23
                 MR. CRAVER: And I'll accept that
24
     because I seconded it.
25
                 MS. SANDERS:
                                Thank you.
```

Sullivan's Island Design Review Board - October 15, 2014

	54
1	MR. ILDERTON: Got that. Everybody in
2	favor?
3	(Unanimous)
4	MR. ILDERTON: Thank you.
5	MS. MARTIN: There's a little murkiness
6	there because there was a little version that said,
7	please take our comments as we stated and the other
8	said, make our adjustments per our comments. So
9	there's a little murkiness.
10	MR. HENDERSON: I usually get together
11	with the applicant and share my notes and we kind
12	of try to address what the board is saying, and
13	we'll have a copy of the minutes for you, too.
14	MS. MARTIN: Cool. Thank you.
15	MR. ILDERTON: What number are we on
16	now?
17	MR. HENDERSON: We are on D-2. That's
18	1002 Middle Street. The file is in the item.
19	Mr. Kevin Reed is requesting consensual approval of
20	a rooftop deck addition and this is a nonhistoric
21	structure. However, it's located in Moultrieville
22	local historic district.
23	Just a little site information: This
24	property has two dwellings. It has one small
25	cottage on the corner fronting Middle Street and

this request pertains to the nonhistoric structure. So there is a third story master bedroom with a master bath and it opens out onto the roof.

MR. REED: Existing roof deck, yes, shown in the pictures.

MR. HENDERSON: So the owners are requesting a 200 square foot roof deck that's accessible from that master bath, master bedroom, and essentially the handrails for the deck will be set into the roof system.

So the rails will not be visible from the road frontage. Is that correct?

MR. REED: That is.

MR. HENDERSON: So this request pertains to sections of the ordinance 2139 which addresses roof decks and it states: They shall be designed to be an integral part of the roof structure.

We think the request complies with that provision. And 2128: Third-story additions may be no greater than 400 square foot feet and may only have 50 percent of its wall area projecting outside of the roof area. So in the event where you do have a third story structure, only 50 percent of that wall can stick up above the roof. Did I get

Sullivan's Island Design Review Board - October 15, 2014

56 1 that right? 2 MR. ROBINSON: Yes. 3 MR. ILDERTON: This doesn't conflict with either of those ordinances. 4 5 MR. HENDERSON: I'll defer to the board 6 for questions. 7 MR. ILDERTON: Yes, sir. 8 MR. REED: Thank you very much. 9 Kevin Reed. Some of you board members were here 10 about seven years ago. I'm actually the contractor 11 with New Tradition Homes that did the cottage on 12 the corner. 13 The homeowner wanted to jack it up and we had to explain to him that that was not going to 14 15 happen on an historic building. I don't know if 16 any of you got to see the finished building, but it 17 came out great. Randy was great. We turned it 18 back into a single family structure, no drywall, 19 used all the original wood, doors, kept it all 20 single pane windows, original roof structure. Не 21 currently rents that property out. 22 I don't know if any of you know 23 Dr. Rittenberg, the client, but he was widowed 24 about 16 years ago and actually just recently got 25 remarried about six months ago and we did about a

\$250,000 remodel of his existing home. We didn't change any footprints, new kitchen, new bathrooms, et cetera, new flooring.

In that permit, I had brought this up with Randy and Kat and they said, you know, we really don't like roof decks, really don't allow roof decks. So we actually waited until that project was complete and on the final walk-through I brought Randy up to the roof to show him what we were proposing.

When the structure got built across the street, it was raised up and had quite a large addition put next to it. As a result of that, Dr. Rittenberg virtually lost all of the view from walking out onto his existing roof deck from the master bath. So we were trying to look at an option for him that would comply with the rules, not adversely affect the streetscape or view of the building from the front or be adversarial to the neighbors or the actual view.

What we came up with, you can see from the pictures. There's one here, which is the existing house from the street, and that's all in your packet. These handrails and decks are going to be virtually undetectable from the street.

1.5

There is two that you'll see in your packet that have actually drawings and measurements on there.

The one in this picture here shows the jet-out of the existing master bath. This roof deck would actually go to the right of that. The second picture with the measurement on it shows the proposed handrails and the location of the roof.

And with the board's approval, what would happen would be the existing shingle roof would be taken off of the section right behind the handrail. We would actually take the shingle roof off, put ice and water shield on, and put a very similar color gray metal roof on there. And once the roof deck is built, if it's approved, it's going to be pretty inaccessible to get back to that roof for repairs, reshingle.

So the idea behind that was to put ice and water shield down and the metal roof. The existing white band that is showing in this picture at 59 and a half inches would actually be exactly where the band board for the proposed roof deck would be. That way the handrails and existing deck would not exceed the existing height requirement or the existing ridge of the structure. If you go to the floor plan that we drew -- and excuse the

hand-drawn diagram. I didn't want my client to incur any drafting or architectural or engineering expenses until we got through conceptual.

Basically, there would be a set of stairs that come up right next to -- you walk out of the master bath, turn to the left, and there would be landing and a set of stairs that brought you up right by the side of the wall and then the roof deck would actually sit level with the existing band.

And then, of course, there would be a handrail down around the top of the roof. It's about 220 square feet. Of course, when we submitted it with the full architectural drawings and exact products we'd be using, we're looking at a cable rail system. We were looking at a stainless steel column system and we were also looking at aluminum powder-coated pickets with a similar top rail structure that is on the existing deck.

The idea would be to maximize the view from the deck but also not draw your attention to it from the streetscape in that in the winter when the leaves are down and such we don't want this to draw any attention from the street.

Sullivan's Island Design Review Board - October 15, 2014

60 1 MR. ILDERTON: Thank you. Joe, 2 anything to add? 3 MR. HENDERSON: No, sir. 4 MR. ILDERTON: Billy. 5 MR. CRAVER: I'm good with it. 6 MR. ILDERTON: Rhonda. 7 MS. SANDERS: I'm trying to picture it. 8 My question is: Do you have cable rail on part of 9 the roof and then you have all this other rail all 10 over the house? 11 MR. REED: We'd be more than happy to 12 run the exact rail system that's here. The idea 13 was if there was any view once it's constructed 14 that you wouldn't want to look up and see 15 additional railing on top of the roof. 16 MS. SANDERS: Right. 17 MR. REED: So if that was the case, we 18 would still carry the same wooden cap railing stuff 19 that was there, but possibly would be the actual 20 picket system to be approved through staff. 21 We've looked at several options. 22 personal vote is powder-coated aluminum because 23 it's a gray. It's very low maintenance and you 24 would actually -- with a gray roof behind it, it 25 would absolutely disappear. I think if you add

these white pickets to what's up there, especially in winter, your eye could be drawn to see this additional picket line. But we'd be happy to run the white pickets.

MS. SANDERS: I'm not a fan of white pickets. I just think we need to have separate rail systems.

MR. REED: I think if we keep the top rail and bottom rail consistent they're going to disappear into the roof down below, but we would certainly be open to both options. I spoke with Dr. Rittenberg before the meeting.

MR. HENDERSON: We didn't see it would be visible from any street frontage, which is the issue here, but it would be visible from some of the other rooftop decks, right? So I thought by using the cable and the powder-coated, it would just kind of disappear and blend a little better.

MR. REED: The client also had -- we looked at some vertical cable and rail systems and with all the grandchildren, from a safety feature, he's concerned. So we want to make sure whatever picket or rail system we do is a vertical rail system and something that could be confined and that would be something in keeping with the rail

systems that are there. We're happy to do a two-by-two white picket, but we thought possibly the vertical powder-coated pickets and the same handrail would be even less drawing your eye to a neighbor or anybody that was looking at it. We'd be happy to put together a sample of the final submittal.

MR. ILDERTON: Donna.

MS. WEBB: I know the front won't be that visible, but when you drive down the side and the small cottages beside it, it seems like from that side street it is hard to tell with a visual -- I'm a visual person.

MR. REED: No. I get it. If you're standing on the lot, the cottage is on that left corner and the roof is on the opposite side of the master. You wouldn't see it at all from that side.

MS. WEBB: Which is good because there's a lot of vegetation between the houses but not on the street side.

MR. REED: Exactly. We looked there and another location in the back where it would have been visible from the other streets. With this right front location, it's such a sharp incline up to the roof. Really, I don't even think

we are going to be able to see the handrails from 1 the street or the neighboring house, but you 2 certainly won't be able to see them from the 3 4 cottage. That was my question. MS. WEBB: Okay. 5 Ι MR. HOWARD: I went out to the site. 6 had a hard time seeing the roof at all from the 7 front or back. I guess what I don't quite 8 understand, why is this here before the board? 9 MR. HENDERSON: Because it was an 10 alteration to a property that's deemed a 11 traditional island resource. 12 MR. HOWARD: I thought the new unit was 13 14 new. The property is MR. HENDERSON: 15 historic. 16 MR. REED: Even though the house isn't. 17 MR. HOWARD: Oh, because the little 18 cottage is there is the reason you're here? 19 MR. HENDERSON: And so we were almost 20 reluctant to put it on the agenda, but I kind of 21 decided to err on the side of caution. So it's not 22 visible from the right-of-way, but it has that 23 historic designation. 24 MR. HOWARD: Then I'll let -- okay. 25

MR. ILDERTON: All right.

MR. HERLONG: You might see a little bit of it right on this facade, so you might want something, some sort of lattice enclosure right here, but that will show up in your final drawing.

MR. REED: We could certainly incorporate that. I didn't want to draw any more attention. We can certainly look at that option. The handrail on this side will tie from the chimney and come out. I didn't know if by adding the lattice we'd be lessening that or drawing more attention to it, but I'd certainly be open to both options.

MR. HERLONG: I think it's going to look unfinished if you have a rail and a post up here but like a hole and a facade.

MR. HOWARD: Maybe a louvre?

MR. REED: I'd be happy to mention that to the architect, because when you're standing on that front deck, too, you're going to be staring right at the roof. So from that side you'd be covering the metal roof because the deck would be above that. But we can certainly look at some elements on that side for options for the board's approval or staff's approval.

Sullivan's Island Design Review Board - October 15, 2014

```
65
                  MR. ILDERTON: Do we hear a motion?
1
                  MR. CRAVER: I move we approve as
2
     submitted.
3
                  MR. HERLONG: I second.
4
                  MR. ILDERTON: Discussion? Everybody
5
6
     in favor?
                  (Unanimous)
7
                  MR. ILDERTON: Approved. Thank you.
8
     We're adjourned.
9
                  (The hearing was adjourned at 7:22 PM.)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Priscilla Nay, Court Reporter and Notary Public for the State of South Carolina, 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 25th day of October, 2014 at Charleston, Charleston County, South Carolina.

HOTARY

PUBLIC

Osiscila May

Priscilla Nay, Court Reporter My Commission expires December 2, 2021 THE DECISIONS OF THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD SHALL BE EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON THE APPROVAL OF THE CERTIFICTE OF APPROPRIATNESS. THESE MINUTES WILL BE USED AS AN OFFICIAL RECORD TO THE DECISIONS MADE UPON RATIFICATION.

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED THIS DAY OF NOVEMBER 19, 2014

PAT IL DERTON, CHAIRMAN

STEVE HERLONG, VICE CHAIRMAN