

In the Matter Of:

Town of Sullivans Island v
In Re: Design Review Board

Meeting
December 16, 2015

COPY

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 & Litigation Solutions
www.scheduledepo.com | 800-743-DEPO



1980 - 2015

COPY

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TOWN OF SULLIVAN'S ISLAND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

HEARING BEFORE: PAT ILBERTON, CHAIRPERSON
DATE: December 16, 2015
TIME: 6:00 PM
LOCATION: Town of Sullivan's Island
2050-B Middle Street
Sullivan's Island, SC 29482
REPORTED BY: LORA L. McDANIEL,
Registered Professional Reporter

A. WILLIAM ROBERTS, JR. & ASSOCIATES

Fast, Accurate & Friendly

Charleston, SC (843) 722-8414	Hilton Head, SC (843) 785-3263	Myrtle Beach, SC (843) 839-3376
Columbia, SC (803) 731-5224	Greenville, SC (864) 234-7030	Charlotte, NC (704) 573-3919



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

APPEARANCES :

PAT ILDERTON, CHAIRPERSON
STEVE HERLONG, BOARD MEMBER
BEVERLY BOHAN, BOARD MEMBER
DONNA WEBB, BOARD MEMBER
RHONDA SANDERS, BOARD MEMBER
BILLY CRAVER, BOARD MEMBER
KAT KENYON, PERMIT TECH
JOE HENDERSON, ZONING ADMINISTRATOR
RANDY ROBINSON, BUILDING OFFICIAL

(INDEX AT REAR OF TRANSCRIPT)

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: We're going to call to
2 order. Approval of minutes. Let's see. This is the
3 December 16, 2015 meeting of the Sullivan's Island
4 Design Review Board. It is now 6:00. Members in
5 attendance are Steve Herlong, Pat Ilderton, Beverly
6 Bohan, Donna Webb, and not Rhonda Sanders -- she's
7 not here -- and Billy Craver. He is here.

8 And the Freedom of Information
9 requirements have been met for this meeting. The
10 items on tonight's agenda are the approval of the
11 minutes, November minutes.

12 MR. CRAVER: Move for approval.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Second?

14 MR. HERLONG: I second.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Discussion? Everybody
16 in favor?

17 (All board members stated aye.)

18 2668 GOLDBUG AVENUE

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: 2668 Goldbug, historic
20 designation.

21 MR. HENDERSON: Thank you, members of the
22 Board. This is agenda item C-1. This is a historic
23 designation and historic special exception request
24 for a property located at 2668 Goldbug Avenue.
25 Mr. Matt Wilks is here on behalf of Allen Porter, the

1 property owner and also petitioner for this request. ⁴

2 This is basically a two-step request;
3 first, the DRB is considering whether or not to place
4 this cottage or structure on the historic designation
5 list.

6 The town historic preservation
7 consultants, when they did their historic survey
8 deemed this as an altered structure. And I can
9 distribute those historic survey cards if you want to
10 take a look at the survey cards.

11 In this survey and also a supplement to
12 that survey, Mr. Schneider deemed this as altered but
13 restorable alterations. And I quote from that
14 supplement: Alterations have comprised the
15 historic -- compromised the historic character of the
16 house but appear to be reversible in nature.

17 If you review the survey card and reflect
18 that it does have vinyl siding on the exterior,
19 modifications have been made to the front porch of
20 the structure. It's been enclosed and a deck put on
21 the front of it. So it was not included. That's the
22 first step.

23 The second request by the applicant is
24 that the DRB consider it for adoption and approval
25 for the special exception. Of course, this allows

1 the second principal building or dwelling unit to be
2 placed on the lot and the historic structure to be
3 used as an accessory dwelling unit.

4 What I would recommend is that we first go
5 through the historic designation criteria while
6 reviewing site photographs and also the presentation
7 of Mr. Wilks. I'll hand out that criteria and
8 conduct our historic review.

9 MR. HERLONG: I have a question about the
10 process. Tonight we're talking about the existing
11 structure on the property and whether it's historic.
12 Yet in the application there were some photographs
13 and some drawings shown in the site plan, but there
14 was a lot of information about a potential new house
15 given to the board. That's not on the agenda
16 tonight; is that correct?

17 MR. HENDERSON: That is actually -- we are
18 considering conceptual approval of the house being
19 placed or designated as historic, number one. If
20 it's designated as historic with the scope of work
21 that will be presented, then the request is to have
22 this structure deemed or approved for the special
23 exception.

24 (Ms. Sanders entered the room.)

25 MR. HENDERSON: The historic district

1 special exception allows a home or a structure that's
2 1,200 square feet or under to be used as an accessory
3 dwelling unit and then a new principal building
4 constructed on the lot. So if the Board deems this
5 as acceptable as a historic structure, then we can
6 move on to consideration of what they're proposing.

7 I think the first step is that we review.

8 MR. HERLONG: Also, further in that
9 process -- because I know this has happened in the
10 past, that a house has been considered historic,
11 second home put on there. Part of that process is
12 the DRB has to rule as to whether architecturally
13 these things are acceptable. But then it goes back
14 to the variance board.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: BZA.

16 MR. HERLONG: They, in the past, have and
17 sometimes have not at least in one case not agreed
18 with the DRB. There's a bit of risk to the applicant
19 if the Board considers that structure historic or if
20 it becomes unaltered, maybe it's historic. That's
21 one of the questions maybe we're discussing.

22 MR. HENDERSON: I don't want to speak for
23 the property owner. Matt, maybe you can elaborate on
24 this. I think the property owner simply wanted a
25 conceptual review for whether this property could be

1 deemed as historic if he moved forward with the
2 removal of the additions from the early '90s; the
3 removal of the siding, the vinyl siding.

4 So considering the scope of work that he's
5 going to present to you tonight, he would then
6 present to the Board of Zoning Appeals and explain
7 that the Design Review Board has given conceptual
8 approval. I don't think he wants approval, outright
9 approval to be added to the historic designation
10 list.

11 Matt, you can elaborate on this. I think
12 that if he doesn't get the approval of the historic
13 designation, he will demolish the structure and build
14 a single-family home on the lot. He wants to keep
15 the structure. He's invested a lot of money. He's
16 restored the interior.

17 We can go through some of the pictures of
18 the interior. Ultimately he likes the cottage.

19 MR. CRAVER: He wants conditional
20 approval.

21 MR. HENDERSON: That's right. He doesn't
22 want to demolish the structure.

23 MR. CRAVER: He wants conditional
24 approval, and he wants the zoning folks to say, if
25 you do it and you get it named historic, we will let

1 you build the second house.

2 MR. HENDERSON: That's right. But he
3 doesn't want to have the structure deemed historic
4 and not get the special exception.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: The second house is
6 restricted in square footage because of the first
7 house.

8 MR. HENDERSON: That's right. The allowed
9 square footage for the entire lot is inclusive of the
10 historic structure and what is built with the
11 principal. I think he wanted to be very clear
12 stating this is conceptual review only and wanted to
13 get the feelings of the Board.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Let's keep it going.

15 MR. HENDERSON: I would say that it is
16 codified and described in the zoning ordinance that,
17 if additions that are less than 50 years in age may
18 be removed to bring the house down to the 1,200
19 square feet. So it describes this as an acceptable
20 practice for property owners that have modified,
21 heavily modified historic structures.

22 I can go through these. This is the front
23 elevation facing Goldbug. This is, from the survey
24 card, the front porch was enclosed. And the deck
25 added to the front. Historically, I guess this was

1 an open or screened porch, am I right in saying that?

2 MR. WILKS: That's our best guess.

3 MR. HENDERSON: This is the east
4 elevation. This is the original chimney. You can
5 absolutely tell it was the original chimney.

6 This is the vinyl siding. Obviously, the
7 windows. Are the windows original or replaced?

8 MR. WILKS: There's a few that could be.
9 There's several that have been replaced.

10 MS. WEBB: Joe, will you give
11 clarification on the square footage. Is the cottage
12 currently 1330? And removal of the front porch
13 addition, do we know what that would bring it to?

14 MR. HENDERSON: Post-removal, after
15 removal of the additions, it would measure out to
16 1190?

17 MR. WILKS: It's my understanding that the
18 house actually -- I guess the survey card shows 1330.
19 And that is like somebody that did the post-survey
20 after Hugo. Went around the exterior perimeter and
21 gave an estimate.

22 Allen Porter, the homeowner, has gone
23 through and done a detailed calculation with the
24 interior walls. He calculates it to be 1191 with the
25 enclosed porch now.

10
1 MR. CRAVER: I don't think that's how they
2 measure square feet. You do measure it, for the
3 square footage of a house, from the outside walls.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah.

5 MR. HENDERSON: From the exterior walls.

6 MR. CRAVER: You don't measure the inside
7 of the box.

8 MR. HENDERSON: That was one of my
9 comments on the renderings, the site plan, was that
10 we need to have that perimeter more clearly defined.

11 MR. WILKS: That's an issue that I think
12 Allen, Mr. Porter, is definitely willing to work
13 with. Ultimately he wants to do whatever he can to
14 keep the structure and also build a new house as
15 well. If it involves converting the existing front
16 porch or rooms into a porch again, he would probably
17 consider that.

18 MR. HENDERSON: These are the exterior
19 renovations and you cannot see them.

20 These are the elevations. The rear
21 elevations come off, leading to a deck. And I think
22 the removal would come right up to this, Matt, I
23 believe.

24 MR. WILKS: Everything on the back is
25 open, screened-in porch area. It's poor

1 construction. He wants to get all that off there
2 anyway.

3 MR. HENDERSON: I don't think there's been
4 any exploratory work done to the siding. I think
5 you've estimated that the siding would need to be
6 replaced underneath the vinyl; right.

7 MR. WILKS: I would assume that's why they
8 put the vinyl up was to avoid maintenance.

9 MR. HENDERSON: The request would involve
10 replacing the historic wooden siding with hardiboard
11 or cement fiber siding, cement board.

12 Here's some interior photographs. I had a
13 chance to walk through. It obviously has the
14 characteristics of a '20s style cottage. Many of the
15 original doors and walls are obviously old. I think
16 the roof is also potentially original. Any
17 questions?

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Great. Thank you. One
19 question. We don't know this. Will the house stay
20 where it is? The structure not be elevated and,
21 essentially, if it was redone and all, stay pretty
22 much exactly where it is with the foundation? It's
23 not going to jockeyed around a lot to the corner or
24 whatever.

25 MR. WILKS: It's not going to be moved at

1 all.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: I think that might be
3 something to consider, too. Yes, sir, you're up.

4 Anything else to add?

5 MR. WILKS: No, I think Joe has done a
6 very good job. Unfortunately, Allen was supposed to
7 be here with me. He had work out of town he had to
8 attend to. I'll basically answer any questions you
9 guys might have.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Is there any public
11 comment to this application? Public comment section
12 is closed. Joe, anything to add?

13 MR. HENDERSON: No, sir. This is the site
14 plan that was provided in your packet. Illustrates
15 the removal here. So the house is proposed at 57 --
16 I'm sorry -- 69 linear feet from the back corner of
17 the cottage to the front porch.

18 The 30 foot setback is being met from the
19 critical line. What you see here is the build-to
20 line required for all houses. This is the furthest
21 house on the block towards the marsh.

22 I would add that the property adjacent to
23 the west has received a variance to have its building
24 footprint placed here. And then the house to the
25 east also received a variance to the build-to line.

1 Are you clear on that?

2 MR. HERLONG: I think you need to explain
3 that a little more.

4 MS. SANDERS: Totally confused.

5 MR. HENDERSON: I provided an aerial to do
6 that. Here we have the house. This is Goldbug
7 Avenue. This is Station 26-and-a-half. The house on
8 the corner here is the furthest towards the marsh.
9 This house establishes the build-to line. The
10 regulations states that a new construction cannot go
11 any closer to the marsh than the house closest in the
12 block. This imaginary line is created here.

13 In 2008, this vacant property directly
14 adjacent to the subject property received a variance
15 to place his house on this side, on the marsh side of
16 this stand of live oaks, and they are vested in that
17 variance. There will be a house constructed here.

18 The house just to the east also received a
19 variance to the build-to line to preserve the tree
20 that's right about here. Lots of large live oaks.
21 They encroach by about 35 feet, Randy.

22 MS. BROWDER: 28.

23 MR. ROBINSON: Thank you.

24 MS. BROWDER: You're welcome.

25 MR. HENDERSON: Here is the cottage that

1 we're discussing now. And 60 feet back from this
2 would be the front porch as proposed. And then the
3 majority of the house would come down.

4 In addition to receiving the special
5 exception approval, the Board of Zoning Appeals would
6 have to grant --

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Kind of variance.

8 MR. HENDERSON: Not a stand-alone
9 variance. They can give approval as a condition of
10 that special exception. Let's look at the site plan
11 again.

12 MR. HERLONG: The variance is given by the
13 BZA.

14 MR. HENDERSON: That's right.

15 There's the build-to line. There's the
16 front porch.

17 MS. WEBB: Joe, is the reason for the
18 positioning, is it all due to preserving the live oak
19 on the lot?

20 MR. HENDERSON: There is one pecan tree
21 here. I think it's about --

22 MR. WILKS: 17-inch pecan.

23 MR. HENDERSON: I think that drove the
24 decision to keep that there. Also, I'm guessing, to
25 preserve views. You have a variance that was issued

1 to this adjacent property.

2 MR. WILKS: We set the house roughly equal
3 to where the back of the house to the left will be.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: We're not really
5 considering at this point the new house or whether --
6 whether they get the variance or not is not in our
7 purview. Not our call; right?

8 MR. HENDERSON: Typically when a special
9 exception is being requested, we encourage them to
10 present the design to the DRB first for conceptual
11 review.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: That's what this is.

13 MR. HENDERSON: Along with consideration
14 of being put on the historic designation list, I
15 would review the site plan for -- the ordinance
16 requires the DRB during conceptual review to find the
17 height, scale, mass, placement of the new house is in
18 character with the existing historic structure and
19 also the surrounding neighborhood. So it has to be
20 compatible.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Is this application a
22 double application? They're actually asking for this
23 to be approved preliminarily as well as to ask us
24 preliminarily give approval or give positive input to
25 keeping the cottage?

1 MR. HENDERSON: As I see it, the process
2 allows you to do that.

3 MS. SANDERS: Can you go back to the
4 aerial with the red line. You had pointed out that
5 there were two properties that had variances. Can
6 you point out where those variances go back to. The
7 2008 variance was given here. So there are no
8 property lines on this. Property line runs rights
9 here.

10 MR. CRAVER: They can build their house
11 all the way out there.

12 MS. SANDERS: Is this request beyond that?
13 Is it closer to the marsh than those?

14 MR. WILKS: It's equal to that one. The
15 site plan in your package actually show the
16 footprint, the proposed footprint the variance was
17 granted for that one. You can kind of see where they
18 are on that

19 MS. SANDERS: Does it show the other one?

20 MR. WILKS: It shows it here, the one on
21 the screen now.

22 MR. HENDERSON: Rhonda, if you look at
23 this. Here's the property line. Here's the proposed
24 house. Here is the area allowed under the variance
25 in 2008.

1 MS. SANDERS: From the next one over. So
2 this adds a little bit more.

3 MR. HENDERSON: There is an element here.
4 Is this a master bedroom?

5 MR. WILKS: Master suite back there.

6 MS. SANDERS: How about on the other side?
7 I guess it doesn't matter whichever one is closer.

8 MR. HENDERSON: Is that it?

9 MR. WILKS: That's correct.

10 MR. HENDERSON: Master bedroom. I believe
11 there's a pool. We permitted a pool out here.

12 MS. SANDERS: The building on this one,
13 the variance that will eventually be requested is
14 much further out, closer to the marsh than the other
15 adjacent ones?

16 MR. HENDERSON: Certainly more than this
17 one.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Let's go back and try to
19 talk about the cottage. Let's define whether we're
20 going to consider that historical or not. We can
21 talk about other design as Steve suggested.

22 The difficulties of saying well we
23 probably would or would not agree this is a
24 historical. What are we getting into? Is that a
25 good thing or not? Billy, you want to weigh in on

1 that.

2 MR. HENDERSON: I think the criteria, you
3 would have to meet one or more of these criteria.

4 MR. CRAVER: Any old house can meet the
5 criteria. I think if he reduces, if he removes the
6 porch and restores the porch to the way it was,
7 removes the decks, you know, I think he can get -- I
8 would be willing to vote the historic designation
9 based on item number one.

10 I don't think Robert E. Lee signed the
11 declaration of independence there so it's probably
12 not an event of significance in history.

13 Probably meets four.

14 Probably meets the next to the last one.
15 I think it easily gets one of these designations. I
16 don't have a problem giving the conditional approval.
17 And looking at his plans, if we like those, saying
18 okay. I'm good with all of it.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Let's just run down.
20 Rhonda, what do you think?

21 MS. SANDERS: I apologize for being late
22 first. I will have to agree with Billy. I was
23 bringing up points regarding the property line
24 because, if you're basing this decision based on
25 where you're placing the house.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Donna.

2 MS. WEBB: I think it could be but the
3 question is, do we designate it as is or are there
4 conditions? Like it could be if you brought the
5 windows back into island character from the 25 or 30
6 when it was built and open up the porch and remove
7 that big decking, then it would look like -- I mean
8 it would have the character. If you designate it,
9 are there conditions, if we designate it and it stays
10 like that, I don't know. It's a little gray for me.
11 I need a little clarification.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Beverly.

13 MS. BOHAN: I'm the same. I think that it
14 does have the character of the island. I'm
15 struggling a little bit because of the facade around
16 it. I think the significant point is the fireplace.
17 I don't see a lot of other things that would, for me,
18 looking at some of the other historical properties to
19 say it's actual historical. I think 1925 is probably
20 accurate. Is that historical enough for the town
21 would be my question.

22 MR. CRAVER: I think 50 years was a number
23 of years that was used at one point, wasn't it,
24 Randy?

25 MR. ROBINSON: I don't think it was ever

1 approved. It was suggested. I don't think it was
2 ever a number we really used.

3 MS. SANDERS: Now that we're older.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: I think for my comments,
5 I think the point, first of all, if we do this, it's
6 probably going to be two houses on this piece of
7 property. And if and how this is redone would
8 influence me as long as it's done in a style that
9 brings it back to maybe what it was or at least
10 underlines what might've been there, you know, 40
11 years ago. It might make it positive for me as well
12 as keeping smaller structures like this, which were
13 original and sort of denote what Sullivan's Island
14 used to be, which is one of the reasons why we tried
15 to keep these ideas. And it further does reduce the
16 square footage of the new house.

17 The square footage of the house could be a
18 lot larger, which is generally considered not a good
19 thing. Bigger houses just dominate the space. And
20 if you can reduce the square footage somewhat, they
21 end up looking a little bit better, more like what
22 Sullivan's Island used to be. I would probably go
23 for it with those ideas in mind. Steve.

24 MR. HERLONG: I think as I look at the
25 house, the gabled portion which is behind what looks

1 like an altered porch is clearly a historic -- there
2 was a historic structure there. It meets the scale.

3 It would be unfortunate to lose that to a
4 demolition. But currently as I look at it, it is an
5 altered structure. The potential is there to retain
6 and enhance the historic character of that house. It
7 could be a great addition to that streetscape. And
8 quite a loss if we didn't have it there.

9 MR. CRAVER: Another thing, Steve, when it
10 comes to the placement of the other house, I wouldn't
11 be opposed to repositioning that house on the lot
12 restored, to have it restored if it would allow
13 better placement of the new house. We've done that
14 to make more sense.

15 MS. SANDERS: I agree.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: I think that might be a
17 problem myself. When you move it, you probably jack
18 it ten, 11 feet in the air. All of a sudden it's
19 going to look different than it does now.

20 I think it's important where it sits and
21 how it sits. That's something else. We can maybe
22 agree generally it's a good thing. Generally we
23 probably would agree as long as the new design they
24 bring back again, if it's approved, is what we like,
25 whatever that new design is.

1 If we want to go with this portion of the
2 application, we can say this is generally we view
3 this as a positive thing to keep this.

4 MR. HERLONG: It's clearly more historic
5 sitting in its location. According to the ordinance,
6 the moment you move it, you move it three feet, it
7 has to meet current code. It's got to go up.

8 MR. CRAVER: You're right.

9 MR. HERLONG: Because most of the work is
10 removing portions to get it -- get the later
11 additions off. It probably could be done under the
12 50 percent rule. We know the town is encouraging the
13 attempt to keep these houses lower and not elevate
14 it.

15 I think there are many opportunities to do
16 good things to that little structure. If those are
17 done, I could certainly see putting a second
18 structure in the back. Because like you say, the
19 second structure would be that much smaller. It's a
20 positive thing all the way around, I believe.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: You want to further
22 comment on the design?

23 MR. HERLONG: I guess that's -- the
24 general discussion, I guess there will be a motion to
25 vote. Sounds positive that it could be. The

1 potential is there to make that comment to have
2 historic designation.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: I guess we can do two
4 different motions or one motion for one application?

5 MR. HENDERSON: If I could just ask you a
6 couple questions about what was presented in this set
7 of renderings that were in your packet. I think that
8 what you presented is to replace all the vinyl siding
9 with hardiboard; correct?

10 MR. WILKS: Correct.

11 MR. HENDERSON: Not to remove the front
12 porch. And I think you made it clear you would have
13 to remove the front porch.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah.

15 MR. HENDERSON: Remove the deck out front.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Not to remove, to
17 restore to a porch.

18 MR. HENDERSON: To its original. Are you
19 showing the removal of the original chimney or is
20 that just a detail not included in that?

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: I don't think that's
22 what we're approving. We're not approving that
23 design. We're approving the idea.

24 MR. HERLONG: We're approving a concept of
25 restoring. You're looking for more specifics.

1 MR. HENDERSON: Before he resubmits an
2 application, I want to be able to make sure we tick
3 off on what the Board is looking for. I just want to
4 make sure these design elements are incorporated in
5 his resubmittal.

6 Windows. Are we looking for the windows
7 to be replaced, to be more historic character?

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: I think they have to be
9 more interesting than they are. They're not great
10 windows as they are. They're cheap windows. You can
11 see that driving by, or looking at the house, walking
12 around the house.

13 There's going to have to be some work done
14 on that house. Maybe not too bad. I think the
15 windows and the front porch are going to be important
16 to look more like a historical original where it was.
17 Those are not the original windows.

18 MS. SANDERS: If it's going to be granted
19 historic designation, it needs to be historic, which
20 is not Hardiplank unless it's termite damage.

21 MR. HENDERSON: Hardiplank is an
22 acceptable material for historic restorations. The
23 Poletti project down there on the national register
24 structure over there, that actually received historic
25 preservation grants from the state.

1 MS. SANDERS: With Hardiplank?

2 MR. HENDERSON: In certain circumstances,
3 you can.

4 MS. SANDERS: I don't want this to be a
5 another historic structure that, oops, it has termite
6 damage, we have to bulldoze it and then rebuild it
7 kind of thing.

8 MR. HENDERSON: Either wood or hardiboard.

9 MR. CRAVER: I'm okay with Hardiplank.
10 We've okayed it.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah, we've okayed it.
12 It's essentially a decent product.

13 MR. CRAVER: It's a good product.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Better than vinyl
15 siding.

16 MR. HENDERSON: Matt, are you okay with
17 the recommendations? Do you have any questions for
18 the Board?

19 MR. WILKS: I think Al will be fine with
20 all that.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Back to the design of
22 the home. We're considering that also, preliminary
23 design. Steve, do you have any ups and downs?

24 MR. HERLONG: Very quick review indicates
25 it appears to be it would be compatible within the

1 neighborhood if that's the proper way to say it. It
2 meets the scale of a home. It looks like a home with
3 a lot of porches.

4 The window proportion seems very balanced
5 in keeping with that particular design, and so for
6 that reason, I think I would support something like
7 that.

8 I guess it takes a little further study on
9 where it sits and how far back. The two other
10 adjacent homes receive variances specific to some
11 trees that were there. There's no tree -- there is a
12 tree.

13 MR. WILKS: Pecan.

14 MR. HENDERSON: Considered category one
15 tree.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: That's up to the BZA.

17 MR. HERLONG: True, not our issue.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: I'm fine with it. I
19 think it works. I think we'll want some more detail.
20 This is preliminary approval. He may come back to us
21 and we may say we like it but this, this, this needs
22 to be changed. I'm in favor of preliminary approval.

23 MR. CRAVER: Would it be preliminary or
24 conceptual? I think conceptual.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Conceptual.

1 MS. SANDERS: I'm sorry. I'm really,
2 really sorry being late. Despise being late. Maybe
3 I missed something. Do we have an application on
4 this?

5 MR. HENDERSON: Yes. It should've been
6 included in your --

7 MS. SANDERS: I have a packet. I don't
8 have an application.

9 MR. HERLONG: I didn't either.

10 MR. CRAVER: I don't have an application.

11 MR. HENDERSON: When looking at -- so the
12 special exception doesn't allow any increases in lot
13 coverages. There's principal building coverage,
14 principal building square footage. They aren't
15 proposing any increases. They meet the lot standard
16 requirements for heated square footage, principal
17 building coverage.

18 They are requesting on one elevation.
19 They're requesting second story; second story side
20 setback relief. And they are also requesting one
21 foot increase in foundation height that's permitted
22 by the DRB. So those are the only two areas of
23 relief they're requesting. That was noted in your
24 application.

25 MR. CRAVER: We don't have the

1 application. What was the second one?

2 MR. HENDERSON: It was the foundation
3 height of one foot. And second story side setback.
4 Wherever you have a second story element that goes
5 ten feet or more in length, you have to set it back
6 by two feet. I think this is the only elevation
7 where that would apply.

8 MR. WILKS: Both sides there's a 20-foot
9 long section.

10 MR. HERLONG: Joe, would there actually be
11 a requirement in our ordinance that a gable end like
12 that have a two-foot setback? Wouldn't that be
13 creating generally awkward architecture if that gable
14 end had a setback?

15 MR. CRAVER: It provides the basis for
16 granting the relief.

17 MR. HERLONG: It looks like there's a
18 lower plate height on that second floor. For that
19 reason it may not be a full height wall. It may not
20 meet.

21 MR. HENDERSON: At staff level we do, when
22 you do have that wall that's much lower, we tend to
23 consider that story-and-a-half. We don't require the
24 setback of two feet.

25 It's not very clearly defined in the

1 ordinance. I think that putting that on the
2 application, identifying that it's questionable, it's
3 just a safe way to approach it.

4 I'd prefer if the Board considered
5 granting the relief as opposed to staff giving the
6 approval.

7 MR. CRAVER: There's nothing about that
8 house that's a box. The mass is broken up
9 significantly. I think the roof line is, you know.
10 It doesn't have the issues that led us to put that
11 two foot setback in for the second story.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Beverly, you want to
13 comment on this?

14 MS. BOHAN: I don't have a comparison on
15 the application. Do we not have a copy of that?

16 MR. HENDERSON: There should've been one
17 included in your packet. I apologize if they're not.

18 MR. CRAVER: None of us got it.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Nobody got an
20 application.

21 MR. HENDERSON: Here is the application.
22 For impervious coverage, they're required to work in
23 the square footage of the historic cottage. I think
24 that has been done here.

25 This is the total allowed principal

1 building coverage, the footprint allowed. 51,117
2 impervious. Again, they all -- what's proposed falls
3 under this, what's allowed by ordinance.

4 And these numbers are reflected on the
5 site plan. If you want to double check those, I can
6 flip back.

7 So the only requested relief is for the
8 side setback, two feet.

9 MR. CRAVER: And the one foot.

10 MR. HENDERSON: And the one foot.

11 MR. CRAVER: They want it to be four feet
12 above.

13 MR. HENDERSON: Yes. Impervious, 10,000.
14 Principal building square footage, they're just
15 following with what they're proposing just under
16 what's allowed, 5,311.

17 MS. SANDERS: That's with the historic
18 exception?

19 MR. HENDERSON: That's with the historic
20 structure here of 1,191. They're just making it
21 here.

22 Principal building coverage 3,769, also
23 making that. They're in full compliance with regard
24 to the lot coverage. Just need minor adjustment for
25 the foundation.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thanks, Joe.

2 MS. BOHAN: I'm good. Conceptually.

3 MS. WEBB: Same. Conceptually, I think it
4 fits with the streetscape, cottage.

5 MS. SANDERS: Sounds good.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Do I hear a motion?

7 MR. CRAVER: I got one.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Give it to us, Billy.

9 MS. SANDERS: That's why you're here.

10 MR. HERLONG: Early on we said something
11 about conditional approval.

12 MR. CRAVER: This is a two-part motion.
13 Part one of the motion is that we would conditionally
14 designate the existing house as an historic
15 structure, that is, after the following conditions
16 are met. The house would be given the historic
17 designation but not before they have been met.

18 The conditions are that the house be
19 restored -- that the historic -- the owner would
20 restore the historic nature of the home including but
21 not limited to replacing the siding with Hardiplank
22 or wood, restoring the porch as a porch and replacing
23 windows with more traditional windows as necessary
24 and such other things as the homeowner deems
25 appropriate to restore the historic nature.

1 Part two of the motion would be to give
2 conceptual approval of the new home to go on the lot
3 including giving approval to the second story side
4 setback relief and the foundation, one foot
5 additional above the base flood level relief
6 requested.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Great. Thank you.
8 That's probably the longest motion we ever had.

9 MR. CRAVER: We needed it.

10 MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, did you ask
11 for public comment?

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: I thought we did.
13 Do I hear a second?

14 MR. SANDERS: Second.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Do I hear any
16 discussion. Do I hear a vote? Everybody in favor?
17 (All Board members stated aye.)

18 2714 ATLANTIC AVENUE

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: 2714 Atlantic.

20 MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, this is
21 certificate of appropriateness for a nonhistoric
22 structure. This is 2714 Atlantic. Mr. Eddie Fava is
23 requesting final approval or re-evaluation of this
24 project. He's asking for relief for principal
25 building foundation height increase of one feet.

1 Currently, the house was approved July 15,
2 2015 to be three feet above the base flood elevation.
3 He's asking for that one foot in relief.

4 No design elements are changing on this
5 project. And I can show you the rendering, if you
6 would like to review it.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Basically this has
8 already been approved.

9 MR. HENDERSON: Yes, sir.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: He's just asking for
11 another foot.

12 MR. HENDERSON: He's just asking for
13 another foot.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Shouldn't have to mess
15 with this one too much. Eddie? Is Eddie here?
16 Eddie, that's what we're doing; right?

17 MR. FAVA: Yes, sir.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Any public
19 comment to this application? Public comment section
20 is closed.

21 Joe, anything else to add?

22 MR. HENDERSON: No, sir.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Do I hear a motion?

24 MR. CRAVER: I move we grant the
25 additional foot. This house meets all of the

1 requirements.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Great. Do I hear a
3 second?

4 MS. SANDERS: Second.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Everybody in favor?
6 (All Board members stated aye.)

7 2251 ATLANTIC AVENUE

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: 2251 Atlantic.

9 MR. HENDERSON: The applicants are
10 requesting conceptual approval for addition to single
11 family home. This is located at 2251 Atlantic. This
12 is a house that was built in the early 1990 and
13 exceeded the town's regulations for principal square
14 footage setbacks.

15 What the property owners are doing,
16 they're constructing some additions off the back.
17 And getting approval for those additions, they're
18 requesting the relief to bring them into compliance
19 with the regulations.

20 They're requesting the full 24.9 or 25
21 percent relief for principal building square footage.
22 All of that is constructed already.

23 Side setback relief that's shown in the
24 application is already an encroachment into the side
25 setback. They're basically building along that

1 encroaching wall. So there is no additional
2 encroachment being requested. Again, they're just
3 bringing this house into compliance.

4 I do have site photographs and also the
5 elevations if you want to take a look.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir. Yes,
7 sir.

8 MR. QUARLES: I'm James Quarles. I'm with
9 Beau Clowney Architects. Just talk about some
10 additions and alterations we're doing to the house.

11 House was built post-Hugo, early '90s
12 house. Nothing very special or historic about it.
13 We're going in and bringing it more into the nature
14 and character of the island with some of the
15 detailing.

16 Some of the detailing we have on the
17 building is incorrect. We're improving that
18 detailing and correcting some of the dormers. And
19 we're adding on to create some more liveable space.

20 From the street, we're only adding, kind
21 of enlarging one upper dorm.

22 And then on the sides we're adding a
23 little bit to the sides.

24 And then the back, we're taking away the
25 very symmetrical nature of the house and bringing it

1 into little more interesting character. Once again,
2 more fitting to the island.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Great. Thank you. Any
4 public comment to the application? Public comment
5 section is closed. Steve.

6 MR. HERLONG: Those are nice improvements.
7 I would go for that for sure.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah, the house has been
9 built. Did Addison build it?

10 MR. CRAVER: Is this the Shealy house?

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah. Anyway, I'm in
12 favor of whatever they're going to do to it.

13 MS. BOHAN: Agreed.

14 MS. WEBB: Agree.

15 MS. SANDERS: Looks good.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Billy. Do I hear a
17 motion?

18 MR. CRAVER: Move as requested, final
19 approval.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Second?

21 MS. SANDERS: Second, final.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Discussion? Anybody in
23 favor?

24 (All board members stated aye.)

25 1711 ATLANTIC AVENUE

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: 1711 Atlantic. New
2 construction.

3 MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, this is --
4 the applicants are requesting final approval on this
5 agenda item. This is new home construction and
6 requesting modification of the zoning standard,
7 principal building square footage and second story
8 side setback.

9 This will be the third time that we
10 reviewed this project; the last time being in
11 September 16th. At that meeting, the DRB made some
12 recommendations for modification in design. The one
13 recommendation was that the front porch be given a
14 little more depth. I believe proposed was five feet
15 in depth.

16 They were proposing 100 percent relief in
17 the 30-foot articulation provision. And also the
18 second story side setback relief of 100 percent. And
19 with the Board explaining that this created kind of a
20 box shape. There wasn't enough architectural detail
21 given to those elevations.

22 Tonight they are proposing only relief of
23 19.5 percent in principal building square footage,
24 second story side setback and no relief requested for
25 the 30-foot articulation.

1 I do have the elevations up on the screen
2 and also we have an additional rendering or digital
3 media we can play for you.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Yes, sir.

5 MR. TALIERCIO: I'm Michael Taliercio, I'm
6 with Charleston Drafting Company, residential
7 designer. I know you're all very familiar with this
8 project. I was just recently brought on to it
9 because of comments made by the Board.

10 In October, before the October meeting
11 there was some comments given via e-mail. And after
12 those comments were made, then clients decided to
13 hire me to go ahead and address those comments.

14 Do you mind bringing up the site plan?
15 I'll go through some of the numbers, zoning first,
16 and then look into the building a little bit here.

17 On the site plan I have listed all the
18 calculations, building coverage area. We're okay
19 there.

20 Impervious coverage area. We're okay
21 there.

22 Scroll down. On the driveway, I did a
23 ribbon driveway to cut down some of the concrete so
24 we don't go over the impervious coverage there.

25 I do know there's a drainage problem on

1 the site. It was brought up in previous meetings.
2 All I can say, our civil engineer is well aware of
3 this fact. He is going to be addressing this as we
4 get along. Like I said, to cut back on some of the
5 concrete in that front corner where most of the water
6 is building up, I think that will help there, too.
7 We can get some drainage going.

8 The total principal square footage, like
9 you said, just under 20 percent out of the 25 percent
10 that you're authorized to permit on that. This is a
11 big family; four children. So that's why the square
12 footage is what it's at.

13 There's a lot of things I did change on
14 this project. Trying to get the square footage down
15 and get like five bedroom upstairs, all that to fit,
16 that wasn't one of the things I was trying to cut
17 down.

18 Can we go to the page down a couple,
19 please. Previous submittals, the house changed. At
20 first it was a box, rectangular box and that's not
21 something that was approved by the Board.

22 In other submittals they added bump-outs,
23 articulation so that it spread out. And that helped
24 a little bit. I went along with those concepts and
25 tweaked them a little bit more.

1 The front porch was a big deal before,
2 being five feet, and having the stairs come up from
3 underneath it. That didn't work out very well to the
4 welcoming from the street. We made it eight-foot
5 front porch. I did cut out square footage from the
6 center of the house in order to provide that room up
7 front.

8 I also pushed the stairs off the side and
9 then down so that they're not over the setback. The
10 front porch is right on the setback and the bottom of
11 the stairs do encroach. And also same thing on the
12 rear. The rear porch is on the setback and bottom of
13 the stairs encroach, not more than the six feet of
14 height that's allowed, so we're okay there.

15 I added open tail, rafter tails on the
16 front porch and on the bump-outs. And spin the model
17 around so you can see the other bump-outs, too.

18 I also changed the siding on the bump-outs
19 to straight cut shake. It's going to be the same
20 color as the board and batting, Charleston white.
21 The colors were taken from the Historic Charleston
22 Palette.

23 It's definitely not a historic Charleston
24 house. This is more contemporary. You can see that
25 by the single light casement windows and the clean

1 lines, the corner trim, frieze board and body all the
2 same white.

3 The louver panels on the foundation are
4 hitching post black. And again, very clean lines.

5 And although that's what they're going for
6 in the first submittal more of the box shape, I tried
7 to still keep it simple but add some interest to it.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Is there any
9 public comment to this application?

10 MS. ILBERTON: Can we see it all the way
11 around.

12 MR. TALIERCIO: Double porch in the back.
13 The bottom section is screened, and there's a couple
14 bump-outs on this side that help.

15 The second story relief, I want to be
16 clear, it's not 100 percent of each side. That
17 doesn't have the two-foot setback for the side
18 setback. The bump-outs do provide relief there, in
19 the front there.

20 And on the back it's really just the
21 section. And then if you really count the section
22 that's over ten feet, it's only really about 25
23 percent on each side that we're asking for there.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Joe,
25 anything to add?

1 MR. HENDERSON: No, sir.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Rhonda, do you want to
3 start this?

4 MS. SANDERS: I think it's an improvement.
5 I think it would help if the eaves were a little bit
6 deeper. I don't know. I think it would take away
7 from it being such a (demonstrating). Help me.

8 MR. CRAVER: Box.

9 MS. SANDERS: Yeah. I think maybe the
10 roof overhang would help. I don't know. I'm not
11 sure. It's two boxes now.

12 MR. TALIERCIO: It's still too boxy.

13 MS. SANDERS: It's two boxes instead of
14 one. I've think eave overhang would help a good bit.
15 Make it still contemporary, the look you're trying to
16 get, maybe make it look a little bit less -- little
17 bit better.

18 MR. TALIERCIO: Maybe two-and-a-half foot
19 eaves?

20 MS. SANDERS: I'm not sure. I'll let the
21 professionals.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Is this final approval?
23 What's the application?

24 MR. HENDERSON: Yes, sir, this is the
25 third review.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: This is up for final.
2 Thank you. Billy, you want to jump in.?

3 MR. CRAVER: You know, I really wrestle
4 with this. I look at it and I go -- it's sort of
5 like we put some window dressing on the sides to try
6 to take away from it being two boxes now but it is.

7 And, you know, I get back to the notion of
8 the whole -- one of the reasons for this ordinance
9 being put in place, and a lot of the thought that
10 went into drafting it the way it was drafted so that
11 you have, I'll call it a smaller size given the size
12 of the lot. But to get that additional square feet,
13 you've got to meet the requirements, and the
14 requirements aren't just mathematical. The whole
15 thing has got to fit. The massing has to look right.

16 And I think I said it the last time it was
17 in here and that is, if the owner wants a design
18 that's I'm going to say stark, that's not a good
19 architectural term, that squared off and boxy and
20 straight sides, then they have to be in a position
21 that they don't have to ask for any relief to get it.
22 That shrinks the size of the house into the envelope
23 where they're not asking for relief.

24 If they want relief, then they really have
25 to -- it's got to meet the letter of the ordinance.

1 And it's got to be compatible with the neighborhood
2 and fit in.

3 I know if that house is built the way it
4 is right there on the lot -- I've walked the lot
5 three times. I've walked around it and looked at it.
6 That is a small lot. If that house gets built on
7 that lot, there will be a lot of talking on the
8 island by the people who will be saying: Y'all
9 aren't enforcing this ordinance.

10 I don't think I could vote to give the
11 extra square footage to make that house bigger on
12 that small lot without having the design broken up a
13 lot more so that it didn't have the massing that it
14 has. I'm not using very articulate -- I'm not an
15 architect. I ain't got the lingo down too well. I
16 think that's it.

17 It's like the one we were looking at where
18 second house was going on the lot. Well, it was an
19 L-shaped. It was all broken up. There wasn't a
20 piece of it that was a big mass. This, the whole
21 thing is a mass. That's exactly the kind of
22 situation that caused the island to put this
23 ordinance in place; to redo the whole ordinance.

24 I probably couldn't vote to give that
25 relief given the starkness of the design. Sorry.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

2 Steve, you want to comment.

3 MR. HERLONG: I think it's an improvement
4 on the first two submittals. And I think Rhonda and
5 Billy have hit on what the issues are. I think the
6 footprint is quite possibly approveable. It's been
7 broken up. It meets that 30-foot requirement. It
8 reduces the mass.

9 When I look at it, I go, well, this house
10 clearly wouldn't get approved in a place like Daniel
11 Island or any other place with a review board.
12 Should we approve? I feel really bad that you guys
13 are here for another third meeting. It shouldn't be
14 this hard to do this. It should be a lot easier.

15 But I look at -- to give you a few
16 specifics. I think the eave condition, you
17 mentioned -- maybe this is a couple questions. You
18 put some open rafter tails at the lower porches, not
19 at the top. There's no detail at all at the top. Is
20 there a reason for that?

21 MR. TALIERCIO: Mainly impact on lower
22 levels compared to upper level, trying to compensate
23 for cost.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: The other things I
25 noticed is the windows just are -- they don't balance

1 with the house. There's something other than what
2 seems to want to go in this house. No rhyme or
3 reason other than they may relate to some interior
4 rooms. I think that's why they're where they are.

5 Is there a reason you go with big open
6 casements or fixed casements or operable casements?

7 MR. TALIERCIO: Again, like I said, the
8 clients are definitely looking for clean lines.
9 Inside is going to be very modern. And double hung
10 windows wouldn't work for them.

11 MR. HERLONG: In order to do this and get
12 it approved, it has to be much more highly
13 articulated and expressed more carefully than the way
14 it is. It's getting better, I'll grant you that.
15 The massing I could approve. I could almost approve
16 this at a conceptual or preliminary level with
17 further study on the exterior facades. The windows,
18 the exterior detailing in general needs to be more
19 highly refined.

20 And I think, Billy, what I've noticed too,
21 it's in a very exposed position on a small lot. It's
22 going to have a lot of impact in that small
23 neighborhood right there. And for that reason I'm
24 still struggling although it's getting better.

25 The house you mentioned earlier that got

1 conceptual approval, clearly we were looking. The
2 second floor wall heights were much lower, giving it
3 different pitches. They just articulated it at a
4 conceptual level to a point that it had very
5 acceptable massing.

6 This has two full height walls with square
7 box spaces so you have no roof pitch. On the other
8 hand, this Board has approved a highly contemporary
9 house further down the island but there was a lot of
10 study on those contemporary facades.

11 This is not really traditional. It's not
12 contemporary. It's somewhat awkward mix of styles at
13 this point. That's my concern.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: I think possibly bit
15 more articulation on the windows and the eaves, upper
16 eaves and things like that and maybe the lattice
17 work. Even the siding. I think the basic layout
18 could possibly be, you know -- vastly improved.

19 Vastly improved of what was submitted
20 before. It really is. It may not take a whole lot
21 of just tweaking just to make this acceptable. Just
22 a little more interest and articulation in the
23 details like that. That's my comments. Beverly.

24 MS. BOHAN: I have a question. Is the
25 roof really blue?

1 MR. TALIERCIO: Yes.

2 MS. BOHAN: It is blue?

3 MR. TALIERCIO: Yes.

4 MS. BOHAN: I've not really seen a blue
5 roof on the island. Kind of stood out to me when I
6 looked at it. I think maybe the roof kind of
7 overpowers the lack of eaves. And then the windows
8 kind of are not very, as Steve said, a little
9 unbalanced.

10 I'm kind of struggling with 38 feet on one
11 side and it not really having a lot of relief on that
12 side. I say there needs to be a little more
13 improvement. I think it's a big job; across the
14 street from where you were or where they were.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Donna.

16 MS. WEBB: I agree with Steve. The
17 balance is my issue. That's my background, just
18 visual esthetic design. It's a contradiction. I
19 feel like the overall design feels like a struggle
20 between traditional, trying to make it fit into a
21 cottage style house, more modern windows. And it's
22 just like somebody used the word awkward. I think
23 aside from the articulations and some of the things
24 that might add interest, I feel like there's a
25 struggle there.

1 I'm not sure the solution. It's the
2 traditional porch and traditional front with the
3 casement windows. I think it would be very -- it's a
4 big space. Big windows. I'm not sure that would do
5 justice.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Do I hear a motion?

7 MR. TALIERCIO: Might I get clarification
8 on one point. The roof eave, putting more detail on
9 that, changing the windows around, all that's, it's
10 easy to do; not a problem. Happy to work together.
11 Clients, make sure something that they're happy with,
12 too.

13 My main concern though is with the square
14 footage. If we did want to set the second story in
15 some, there's no way that anything would fit there.
16 I think what you're saying is that house of this
17 size, really, if I change the details or not, it's
18 still a house this size. You still don't think it
19 would work on a lot that size.

20 MR. HERLONG: No, I'm not saying that at
21 all. I think in order to grant this relief, I do not
22 think -- I think it could be this size, but to be
23 this size you've got to design it much better. It
24 can be done through the eave detailing, through the
25 window detailing and the basic facade detailing. Can

1 be done. I feel sure it could be done and get
2 approved.

3 MR. TALIERCIO: Keeping the massing the
4 way it is you're saying?

5 MR. HERLONG: As I said, I don't have a
6 problem with the footprint, the floor plan. I don't
7 understand the style. It's just not there yet.

8 MS. SANDERS: I think what you're saying,
9 in order to accomplish those goals, you have to cut
10 in and do some thing that will take away square
11 footage. Is that what you're asking?

12 MR. TALIERCIO: That's what I wanted
13 clarification on. It seems like if we do set the
14 second floor, have that second floor side setback
15 going into like that, I can't make the footprint of
16 the first floor any bigger than it is for the lot.

17 It's right on the front and rear setback
18 and side setback and driveway. It's maxed out down
19 there. Really, I would think the second floor would
20 have to come in some. In order to do that, I would
21 think that I would have to lose some square footage,
22 which I don't think would work for this family.

23 MR. HERLONG: I'm just wondering why you
24 think the second floor -- I didn't hear anybody say
25 the second floor has to come in.

1 MR. TALIERCIO: I think where he's coming
2 from. I thought when Billy was saying the house is
3 too big, square footage wouldn't be approved with the
4 massing.

5 MR. HERLONG: In order to be approved for
6 this much relief, the design in general, the facade,
7 the exterior detailing needs to be better than it
8 currently is. It needs to be handled more carefully.

9 MR. CRAVER: Steve, how can they -- I hear
10 what you're saying. I hear your question. I'm
11 sitting here going to myself, I think you're right.
12 And I hear you saying, no, I don't think necessarily.

13 In order to change the exterior facade to
14 make it -- to change the appearance, either the
15 bottom got to be bigger or the top has to be smaller
16 in some fashion to give it -- to break up the mass.
17 Maybe I'm not using the right word when I say mass.
18 To make it not look so boxy.

19 Again, I'm not an architect.

20 MS. SANDERS: You and I are on the same
21 page. That's what I was trying to say. You can go
22 in and out or do whatever. You're moving square
23 footage. You got to replace it with air.

24 MR. CRAVER: So you're maxed out on the
25 footprint.

1 MR. TALIERCIO: Right.

2 MR. CRAVER: I don't know how you do it.
3 To have that square number of square feet -- and what
4 happens, you've exceeded the building envelope that's
5 allowed in the ordinance without getting relief.

6 If you want a house that's a box like
7 that, you have to stay within the envelope. If you
8 go for the relief, you keep that same design, I don't
9 think -- to me, I don't think you qualify for the
10 relief.

11 MR. HERLONG: With the current design.

12 MS. SANDERS: Can I ask a question.

13 MR. CRAVER: I just want to be honest with
14 you.

15 MS. SANDERS: I'm sorry to interrupt.

16 There's no relief requested for side
17 setbacks. So maybe the relief needs to be in
18 different places so that you can make it a little bit
19 more interesting.

20 MR. HENDERSON: Here we're looking at
21 Atlantic Avenue. You're required 25-foot setback is
22 here. The porch goes right up to there.

23 This is your side setback of 15 feet.
24 There is your required 25-foot setback. This is your
25 25-foot.

1 MR. TALIERCIO: 20 on that side and then
2 15 on the left side.

3 MR. HENDERSON: Should be 25. At any
4 rate, the building envelope can go up to 25, within
5 this. You're working with that much.

6 MS. SANDERS: They have allowable -- in
7 other words, they're not requesting relief in certain
8 places where they might could if they changed the
9 configuration of the house not to be a -- I'm sorry
10 to say this word -- tract home box.

11 MR. TALIERCIO: I don't believe that if we
12 did expand it that way towards the driveway, the
13 driveway would fit to where there's enough turn rate.

14 MS. SANDERS: I'm suggesting if you want
15 to keep the square footage, you have to change the
16 two boxes. The one box to be something other than
17 that. You might want to request relief in a
18 different way. If you're set on the box, it either
19 has to be smaller or go somewhere else. That's my
20 minimal summary.

21 MR. CRAVER: Together we're getting it
22 out.

23 MR. HENDERSON: It is 20-foot side setback
24 because of the lot width.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: These are individual

1 opinions. Had the house come before us with maybe
2 more interesting articulation than the way it is now,
3 we might've felt better. I don't know. I agree it
4 is a box on top of a box. Box sort of just moved
5 around. It is so vastly improved from before.

6 I think we are at a bit of an impasse here
7 as far as giving it approval certainly; also, where
8 to go. I agree with Steve. I still think
9 architecturally there are ways to do this with the
10 same square footage to make it work. I think a good
11 design, good architect -- not that you're not. Good
12 ideas could work.

13 Like I said, that's what this Board is
14 about. That's why we were put here, to make -- to
15 guide the owners and the designers as much as we can.

16 MR. HERLONG: You're hearing the Board is
17 not unanimous on the footprint. I think it's
18 possible, as Pat just said. Others think you've got
19 to even further refine the footprint and setbacks.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: We couldn't say what the
21 future vote would be. Right now it's not looking too
22 good.

23 MR. HERLONG: I do have a question. Maybe
24 something helpful. Like I mentioned, one of the
25 previous submittals, some of the second floor

1 heights, the wall heights in some areas were lower,
2 giving them a chance to have dormers and create some
3 other visual interest other than wall. If all we see
4 is wall, vertical wall, that has to be a beautiful
5 wall to get passed. It's not a beautiful wall yet.

6 If we add other interest in the roof line,
7 our eyes goes to that and don't study the wall as
8 much.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: If you look at the
10 officers' quarters, they're boxes. They're box on
11 top on box. There's enough articulation and interest
12 about the officers' quarters to make them beautiful
13 structures, but they are essentially boxes.

14 MR. HERLONG: I don't know whether in some
15 of the upstairs bedrooms you could take the front
16 portion and change the wall height. I don't know
17 what your second floor wall height is. Is it nine
18 feet or ten feet?

19 MR. TALIERCIO: There was a picture that
20 was e-mailed couple months ago saying this is
21 basically what they're going to go for. It was a
22 house on Daniel Island you might've seen. That was
23 one story house.

24 MR. HERLONG: Those walls were lower.

25 MR. TALIERCIO: I started to use that as

1 the basis. It got shot down pretty quickly because
2 of cost and just because of clean lines inside. They
3 didn't want the vault ceilings.

4 MR. HERLONG: That's the kind of
5 situation, if you have to have the wall height, it's
6 got to be done more carefully detailed on the
7 exterior in order to get approved.

8 MS. WEBB: I want to throw out one thing.
9 Everything is too vertical from starting at the
10 bottom to the railing on the stairs to siding.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: It really shouldn't cost
12 a lot more to do that. It really shouldn't cost in
13 labor or material to do little bit more interest. As
14 a builder, I don't see why it would cost that much
15 more. Minimal. Minimal.

16 MR. HERLONG: Donna has a good point, two
17 stories of vertical siding, which is accentuating the
18 verticality of it.

19 MS. WEBB: Stairs maybe with crisscross,
20 stainless cables would give it more -- it just
21 feels very --

22 MS. MACHAIAH: Cables we cannot have
23 because we have kids. It's a hazard, it's a danger
24 is what we were told.

25 MR. TALIERCIO: They're worried about

1 ladder effect.

2 MS. MACHAIAH: That is one thing.

3 Then if it's just architectural, we can
4 change it to whatever. If you don't like it, we can
5 change it.

6 If it's something superficial, if you are
7 saying it's not valid, it's something that can be
8 changed.

9 The footprint of the house when we started
10 off, first thing we said, we have some religious
11 beliefs. We have to have clean lines.

12 Steve said he's okay with the footprint of
13 the house. If he's okay with the footprint of the
14 house, because we can't change it any other way. We
15 can't break the house into two. You know what I
16 mean? This house becomes one house. This house is
17 another house. Right?

18 We should be able to live in that house
19 with all -- I mean, if you make all those changes,
20 then we will have something in the back of our mind
21 that this doesn't fit, and we just leave.

22 We can't live in a house that is two
23 houses; basically two houses attached together.

24 We also looked at our neighbors. They are
25 all boxes. So we also went to that. I actually made

1 Joe all those pictures. On the corner, it's a
2 complete box.

3 MR. AYANDRA: They may be before this
4 board was here. See the neighbors.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: You say that was before
6 the design review.

7 MR. AYANDRA: Yeah, it does fit in the
8 neighborhood.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: We don't want ugly on
10 top of ugly.

11 MS. SANDERS: Would lengthening the eaves
12 help?

13 MR. HERLONG: I think so.

14 MS. SANDERS: I'm just trying to give a
15 suggestion.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: I think changing up,
17 like you say, the articulation of the exterior would
18 just vastly improve. Maybe some bahamian shutter
19 details or something or whatever just to make it like
20 interesting.

21 MS. MACHAIAH: All superficial, that
22 definitely can change. Footprint of the house very
23 important to us because we can't stretch the rooms
24 further. We have kids. They're growing, and they
25 need space to grow.

1 As he said, we'd be coming to change -- I
2 don't want to live in the house anymore, living in
3 two houses. L-shape that we first went with that
4 approach; okay, we'll change it to L. Everybody
5 coming to the board got an L. Not living in that
6 style, you know what I mean?

7 You should also consider where we come
8 from. And the city has to be acceptable to every
9 belief.

10 MR. AYANDRA: It's our religion. I've
11 gone back and forth so many times.

12 MS. MACHAIAH: If you want, I can e-mail
13 it to Joe or I should have done it. All the houses
14 on that lane, our side of the lane are similar
15 structures. I went out and took pictures of all of
16 them. I don't know why I didn't e-mail to Joe. Box
17 on a box. Every house is a box. It can be two boxes
18 here with L shape.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: It's all very
20 interesting. I don't think any criteria that we -- I
21 believe there's no criteria in our --

22 MS. MACHAIAH: It's not --

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Excuse me. Excuse me.
24 I don't believe we were given one of the criteria we
25 should consider religious beliefs even though maybe

1 we should. I don't believe it's in our -- how this
2 Board was created. I'm not saying we shouldn't do
3 that. I'm not so sure we have the ability, that is,
4 this Board has the ability to make decisions on any
5 design based -- there's other criteria; compatibility
6 and things like that. I don't know that we have any
7 basis or control of a project because of that.

8 I sympathize with your ideas. I just want
9 to point that out. I don't think we would be
10 considered anti-religion.

11 MS. SANDERS: I want to tell you I live in
12 a box. I built the box before this DRB. It would
13 never be accepted now.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: I do think just some
15 adjustments on this could make a huge difference
16 without it costing -- maybe cost you couple more
17 bucks to do some of the articulations and stuff.
18 Nothing that's going to make a huge difference.
19 Personally. That's my opinion.

20 I think I could live with it if it just
21 looked better. That's not everybody's opinion
22 possibly on this Board.

23 MS. MACHAIAH: We have taken all
24 consultation from the Board. And we have sent back
25 the house. It's not straight now.

1 MR. AYANDRA: We've taken all your
2 previous statements.

3 MR. HERLONG: I wonder, Billy, if we come
4 up with a motion to give it conceptual approval with
5 specific study on particular elements that can get us
6 there.

7 MR. CRAVER: Steve, I hear that. I
8 probably couldn't vote for that. I would probably be
9 willing to vote to defer it if they want to try to
10 redo something. I don't want -- for me, I don't want
11 to hold out hope that tinkering with it is going to
12 get me in a position where I would be willing to
13 approve 600 foot increase over what is allowed here
14 where -- it's not two stories of vertical. It's
15 three levels. It's all the way up vertical sides.
16 I'm as sorry as I can be that's an issue.

17 Unfortunately with this design, you're
18 trying to put too many square feet on a lot that
19 doesn't support that number of square feet. That's
20 my opinion. I'm sorry.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Going back to what Steve
22 said earlier, I think you could take the same design
23 and drop the roof lines lower and put some half
24 dormers.

25 MR. CRAVER: That may be.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Half dormers and maybe
2 in a particular bedroom you might have a five-foot
3 wall that rises up. It's not a perfectly rectangular
4 bedroom or something. That would visually bring it
5 down to the street more and you would have the same
6 choir footage.

7 MR. CRAVER: That's why I'm saying I would
8 be willing to defer if they want to try to go back
9 and do something. I don't want to lead y'all -- my
10 vote wouldn't be to lead y'all in a direction of
11 thinking that you're close because I don't think
12 you're close.

13 I wish I could sit here and say you were.
14 I'm the one who's generally for letting everybody do
15 what they want for their property.

16 MS. SANDERS: Absolutely.

17 MR. CRAVER: I'm also am very cognizant --
18 we hear a lot more input from town council, other
19 people on the island about our complying with this
20 ordinance. When we give relief, we have to be able
21 to justify it. I can't sit here and say it, yeah, it
22 warrants 600 square feet of relief.

23 MR. HERLONG: Billy, come to think of it,
24 the house that is built on the corner of Pettigrew,
25 Station 22 is the house that started this review

1 Board. And the facades of that house are almost
2 identical to this house.

3 MR. CRAVER: Right. We looked at.

4 MR. HERLONG: That's the concern this
5 Board has.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: That's what created this
7 Board.

8 MR. CRAVER: Y'all can't even imagine the
9 storm that went on over here and how much time Pat
10 was on the ad hoc committee. Steve was on it. I was
11 on it. We had an ad hoc committee that worked for a
12 year on the zoning ordinance. We did some changes to
13 it. Then the planning commission spent two years
14 redoing the whole ordinance. All as a result of a
15 house that looks an awful lot -- the features wise
16 looks an awful lot like that.

17 Again, I'm as sorry as I can be that the
18 lot isn't bigger and we can't figure out a way --

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Let's move on with a
20 motion.

21 MR. CRAVER: I move we defer this one to
22 allow the applicant to re-study it, see if they can
23 do some things with it to improve the design.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Do I hear a
25 second?

1 MS. SANDERS: Second.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Do we have discussion on
3 that?

4 Everybody in favor?

5 (All Board members stated aye.)

6 MR. TALIERCIO: Thank you.

7 2720-B GOLDBURG AVENUE

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: 2720 Goldbug.

9 MR. HENDERSON: Members of the Board, this
10 is agenda item D-4. Mr. Paul Boehm, property owner
11 of 2720-B Goldbug Avenue is requesting modifications
12 to this structure.

13 After review of Mr. Boehm's plan, he
14 submitted several renderings of this plan for the
15 previous meeting in November and also this one.

16 Staff is of the opinion that this, or
17 according to the interpretation, current
18 interpretation of the zoning ordinance, that his
19 request doesn't comply with certain conditions of the
20 nonconforming section of the zoning ordinance and,
21 therefore, staff doesn't have the authority to
22 approve Mr. Boehm's request.

23 I have the renderings of his plans here.
24 This is 2720-B Goldbug Avenue. And Mr. Boehm had
25 approved several years ago an accessory structure.

1 It was considered a slat house or accessory structure
2 area for storage on grade.

3 In 2014, staff identified that some work
4 was done to the roof of this slat house structure.
5 And we issued some violations on the property.
6 Ultimately, the structure was approved with a stair,
7 a deck or stair corridor going -- running along the
8 back of this structure here. Inside of the structure
9 is an apartment. This is a nonconforming use. And,
10 therefore, nonconforming structure.

11 And staff holds the interpretation that
12 modification of this slat house structure would be an
13 increase in the square footage for the nonconforming
14 use; therefore, we do not feel as though we have the
15 authority to approve what Mr. Boehm is presenting to
16 you.

17 In the zoning ordinance when an applicant
18 submits an application to the Board of Zoning
19 Appeals, and the proposal doesn't meet the
20 requirements of the zoning ordinance, the applicant
21 has the ability to request a denial of that building
22 permit application or the applicant can come to the
23 DRB and request suggestions from the Board. That's
24 what we are doing this evening.

25 Again, staff's interpretation is what he's

1 presenting doesn't meet the requirements of the
2 zoning ordinance. He has requested to be able to
3 present this to you tonight.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: This isn't a BZA thing?

5 MR. HENDERSON: The expanding of this
6 nonconforming structure and use has been before the
7 BZA three times; once in 2009 when Mr. Boehm
8 requested to expand the nonconforming use and
9 structure. That was denied.

10 Once in 2004, different design, same
11 request. That was denied.

12 MR. BOEHM: '14 or 2004?

13 MR. HENDERSON: March of 2014. That was
14 the first one.

15 MR. BOEHM: '14 was the second one. You
16 said '04.

17 MR. HENDERSON: I'm sorry. There are
18 three. October of 2009, March of 2014, and
19 December -- January of 2015, we restated the findings
20 of the BZA from March 2014.

21 And then again in November of 2015,
22 Mr. Boehm presented a different design to expand the
23 use and footprint. And that was reiterated by the
24 Board of Zoning Appeals. They said you can't present
25 approximately the same issue within a two-year

1 period.

2 Again, three times this has gone before
3 the Board of Zoning Appeals, and it's been denied.
4 And so when this was presented to staff, we issued a
5 denial of the request based upon all the previous
6 findings of the board. Board of Zoning Appeals.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: We're considering --

8 MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Boehm has asked to
9 present this to the Design Review Board; however,
10 according to the regulation, and I can pass this
11 over. It's stated in 21-109(f)(4), that an
12 applicant, even though the presentation doesn't meet
13 the requirements of the ordinance, they can still
14 come and present their noncompliant design to you.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thanks. Yes, sir.

16 MR. BOEHM: Joe and I disagree. That's
17 why we ended up in a lawsuit, which I have won but is
18 now being appealed by the town.

19 The last presentation I made to the BZA
20 was to encircle the slat house roof with a rail
21 system that was part of the house but did not -- was
22 not attached to the slat house. I'm trying to get --
23 what I'm trying to do is get a rail system around
24 this thing. It was built as a deck in 2001. No
25 question about it.

1 Joe, you haven't seen this yet. Give you
2 one of those. This is a statement by Ron Denton as
3 to the fact this thing was built and it accommodates
4 people. Whatever load you can get on it, it can
5 handle.

6 It was built as a deck in 2001 because
7 Kent Prause -- I gave you-all the facts of the
8 structure. Kent Prause said in 2001, well, I don't
9 think you can add on to this because it's a
10 nonconforming use, but you can build a slat house
11 right up against the existing house, and it will
12 serve the same purpose; it will be a deck.

13 It was designed with two-by-eight
14 structures, six-by-six posts, two-by-four and
15 two-by-two walkways on top. Accommodated people for
16 the next eight years before I asked to enclose it as
17 a screened porch.

18 Was told that, again, no, you cannot
19 attach this because it's enlarging the use, which I
20 disagree with. So did the courts so far.

21 So I've come to you because the ordinance
22 says, if this is an accessory structure, it falls
23 under your purview. If it falls under your purview,
24 I can ask to put this little roof up here, and I can
25 enclose it with screening.

1 I can also enclose this little section
2 here with screening but only as a part of the main
3 house. They can't be attached to each other. So I
4 can accomplish what I want, which is for this thing
5 to be safely used. That has been used as a deck
6 since 2001. Probably not very safely.

7 I attached furniture around it. I think
8 there's a picture. I hope you've seen the picture.
9 Little picture of the deck. It has been used by the
10 guys who lived there for ten years as a deck.

11 I put furniture around it to be safe so
12 nobody would fall off. No question it was built as a
13 deck. Joe is getting technical about, well, there's
14 nothing in the application that says you're going to
15 build this thing as a deck. That's what it was built
16 as.

17 Randy inspected it; it's been used as a
18 deck ever since. All I want to do is be able to
19 enclose it with a rail, make it safe and to put
20 screening around it to make it more useable. That
21 falls under your purview.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir. Is
23 there any public comment to this section?

24 Public comment section is closed. Joe,
25 anything to add?

1 MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Boehm is referring to
2 an outstanding pending violation on this property;
3 that is, this rail that goes across was approved by
4 town staff, building and permitted, inspected by town
5 staff. That was never intended to be removed. All
6 of this construction was done without building
7 permits.

8 The use of this platform was done without
9 the authorization of town government, without
10 building permits.

11 Town staff believes, according to our
12 current interpretation and town attorneys downtown,
13 that this is an increase in the nonconforming use
14 that's contained within that structure, on the
15 elevated first floor of that structure.

16 It's a nonconforming apartment use. It's
17 an expansion of the square footage. And the Board of
18 Zoning Appeals feels that way as well. They ruled on
19 it three times, adjudicated this same question.

20 MR. BOEHM: They have not ruled on this at
21 all.

22 MR. HENDERSON: That's all I have to say.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: I think there's a point
24 that we can discuss as a Board that we should even be
25 hearing this. Billy, you are the hot shot lawyer

1 here.

2 MR. CRAVER: Not hot shot. This order has
3 been appealed?

4 MR. BOEHM: Correct.

5 MR. CRAVER: This order has been appealed?

6 MR. BOEHM: Correct.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Seems to me that the BZA
8 has turned this thing down three times. This is like
9 a guy coming before us, asking to build a 10,000
10 square foot house, we are going to say it's fine.
11 Good. And we're okay. Whereas the people at the BZA
12 will say there ain't no way you can do that, you
13 can't build anything but 5,000 square feet, whatever
14 it is.

15 What we're talking about here is something
16 we can't -- if the Board -- they really have more
17 heft. More legal heft than we do. I mean,
18 historically the BZA does.

19 Seems to me this is something that we
20 wouldn't approve a 10,000 square foot house, 'cause
21 we know the town doesn't allow it. It would be us
22 like considering that design of the 10,000 square
23 foot house.

24 MR. BOEHM: Can I make a comment?

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: I don't know what we're

1 listening to here.

2 MR. CRAVER: I think part of the issue
3 here is, if the town is successful in its appeal,
4 then the three prior orders will stand; isn't that
5 right, Paul?

6 MR. HENDERSON: That's correct.

7 MR. CRAVER: The zoning board has issued
8 three orders, and you went to court and tried to
9 overturn those orders.

10 MR. BOEHM: First one is '09. That's long
11 expired.

12 The one that was done in 2014, that's
13 being appealed. The one in 2015 actually was simply
14 deferred because of the potential lawsuit. They
15 interpreted it as saying I was coming back from the
16 same sort of request. They deferred it until the
17 lawsuit is resolved.

18 MR. CRAVER: This says -- it sounds to me
19 like the one in 2015 was to make findings of fact.
20 And they made findings of fact. The judge didn't
21 seem to find that their findings were good enough.

22 MR. HENDERSON: That's correct.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: I wouldn't want this
24 board's findings to either add or subtract anybody's
25 legal ammunition that they're going at in the courts

1 and vote the town or the applicant could use what we
2 decide today as legal ammunition, seems to me.

3 That's not what we're about. This Board is not about
4 that.

5 MR. BOEHM: That's absolutely not correct.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: That's the way I feel
7 about ruling on this thing. I feel like I don't have
8 any comment on it because it's not -- it's already
9 been told by the town it's not legal. Quite frankly,
10 in a perfect world, it might be fine with me. The
11 town has already -- there's several levels of the
12 town ordinance I don't particularly like. I think
13 our hands are tied.

14 What are we supposed to be doing here?
15 We're wasting our time is what we're doing.

16 MR. HENDERSON: The procedure for the
17 applicant coming and talking to you today is
18 essentially -- and I can read this to you verbatim.
19 It states that: The Design Review Board finds that
20 the application is inconsistent with one or more of
21 the zoning ordinance standards, which it does not
22 have the power to modify or if the Design Review
23 Board determines that the requested application does
24 not meet the standards of neighborhood compatibility,
25 you can do two things; one, you can deny the

1 application accompanied by suggested changes and/or
2 variances that could be sought to make the
3 application appropriate and consistent with the
4 zoning ordinance or approve the application subject
5 to a variance being granted by the Board of Zoning
6 Appeals.

7 Both of those involve adjudication of by
8 the Board of Zoning Appeals. They have already done
9 that three times. To reiterate your point, I think
10 that the DRB can send Mr. Boehm back to the BZA.
11 We've already dealt with that three times.

12 MS. SANDERS: Can I say something?

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Sure.

14 MS. SANDERS: I have very little tolerance
15 for not filing a permit. I filed for a permit to get
16 a six-foot fence ordinance. I got denied by Kent
17 Prause. I had to wait -- three times I had to wait
18 two years. This is a fence. If you don't get a
19 permit, I don't have any sympathy.

20 So the original structure was not
21 permitted.

22 MR. BOEHM: It was permitted. Of course
23 it was.

24 MR. ROBINSON: Permitted as a slat house.
25 Not ever as a deck.

1 MR. HENDERSON: Place to store things
2 underneath here. That's what a slat house is, a
3 structure on grade.

4 MR. ROBINSON: To hang plants and that
5 kind of stuff.

6 MS. SANDERS: Not as is. It's
7 nonconforming. You want to extend the nonconformity.

8 MR. HENDERSON: This all began when we
9 identified people using this thing as a deck to hang
10 out on. Then we identified -- in 2009, the BZA heard
11 a request from Mr. Boehm to use it as a deck, and
12 they denied him. Contrary to final order issued by
13 the town's BZA.

14 MR. BOEHM: That's not true at all, Joe.
15 I'm sorry, that's just not turret.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Does anybody want to
17 make a motion to send him back to the BZA?

18 MS. SANDERS: I motion to send him back to
19 the BZA.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Do I hear a second?

21 MS. BOHAN: Second.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Discussion? Billy, do
23 you want to discuss that a little bit?

24 MR. CRAVER: This is more complex than I'm
25 willing to make a decision about just sitting here

1 without thinking it through, now that I've heard the
2 presentation. I'm not really comfortable making a
3 decision about it at all.

4 The fact that the BZA has done something
5 and they've been appealed and, you know -- I'm not
6 going to make any disparaging comments about the BZA
7 and how they make decision. And I know emotions can
8 get wrapped up in it. My inclination on this one
9 would be to defer it and study it.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: We have a motion.

11 MS. SANDERS: What are the options on
12 motions? One is to deny. I'm sorry.

13 MR. CRAVER: That's what he says the
14 options are. I'm not sure I agree with that.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Option was to send it
16 back to BZA. We have a motion on the floor to do
17 that. Let's vote it down or vote it up. Or discuss
18 it more. There is a motion on the floor. It's been
19 second.

20 MR. CRAVER: I would vote it down with the
21 idea of studying it.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Let's call for a vote.
23 Everybody in favor of that motion? Aye.

24 (Mr. Ilderton, Ms. Bohan, Ms. Webb, Ms.
25 Sanders stated aye.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

THE CHAIRPERSON: Everybody against it?

(Mr. Herlong and Mr. Craver raised their hand.)

THE CHAIRPERSON: The motion passed. We are adjourned.

(The meeting was concluded at 7:46 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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

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

Witness my hand, I have hereunto affixed my official seal this 22nd day of December, 2015 at Charleston, Charleston County, South Carolina.

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

I N D E X

	Page
2668 GOLDBUG AVENUE	3
2714 ATLANTIC AVENUE	32
2251 ATLANTIC AVENUE	34
1711 ATLANTIC AVENUE	36
2720-B GOLDBUG AVENUE	64
CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	78

E X H I B I T S

(No Exhibits Proffered)