

**TOWN OF SULLIVAN'S ISLAND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

**REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
Wednesday, March 17, 2021**

A regular meeting of the Town of Sullivan's Island Design Review Board was held on the above date at 3:00 p.m. online via Zoom. All requirements of the Freedom of Information Act were verified to have been satisfied. Present were Board members Beverly Bohan, Luke Lewis, Ron Coish, Kevin Pennington, Steve Herlong, and Bunky Wichmann.

Town Council Members present: Chauncey Clark

Staff Members present: Joe Henderson, Planning and Zoning Director, Max Wurthmann, Building Inspector, and Randy Robinson, Building Official.

Members of the public: Stocky Cabe, contractor for Omni Services, Alexander and David Fox, owners of 2220 l'On Avenue, Cindy Campbell, owner of 2857 Brownell Avenue, Adrienne and Wells Whaley, owners of 818 Conquest Avenue, agenda item applicants

Media present: No members of the media were present.

**CALL TO ORDER:** Mr. Herlong called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and stated that the press and public were duly notified pursuant to State Law and a quorum of Board Members were present.

- I. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Mr. Wichmann made a motion to approve the February 17, 2021 Design Review Board Meeting Minutes. Mr. Pennington seconded this motion. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously.
- II. **PUBLIC INPUT:** No public input was made.
- III. **EXECUTIVE SESSION:**

**Mr. Wichmann made a motion to move into executive session at 3:04pm. Mr. Pennington seconded that motion. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously.**

Legal advice was discussed related to Design Review Board procedure when considering Certificate of Appropriateness violations.

**Mr. Herlong stated that at 3:40pm the Board came out of executive session to resume the items on this agenda.**

- IV. **HISTORIC CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REVIEWS:**

**2220 I'On Avenue: Review of posted "stop-work" order for a previously granted Certificate of Appropriateness (TMS# 529-09-00-027)**

Mr. Henderson stated that this property is located at the corner of Station 22.5 and Ion Avenue. This property is outside of this historic district but is designated as a Traditional Island Resource by survey card #181. Mr. Henderson stated that the applicant, Eddie Fava, requested to modify a Certificate of Appropriateness that the Design Review Board granted on February 19, 2020. Mr. Henderson stated that the applicant received approval to historically rehabilitate the existing structure. Mr. Henderson stated that on March 2, 2021 Town Staff observed that the historic structure had been removed, disassembled and thrown either into a dumpster or into piles elsewhere around the property.

**Mr. Henderson presented two images to the Board showing the existing structure and what is currently there after construction (Exhibit 1).**

Mr. Henderson stated that Town Staff posted a "stop-work" order on the property, as seen in image two, until the applicant had a chance to re-apply to the DRB for a revision to their Certificate of Appropriateness (COA). Mr. Henderson restated that this effective COA is linked to the current Building Permit, which states that the original historic structure would remain and the additions were to be attached to this historic structure.

Mr. Henderson stated that during the February 19, 2020 Design Review Board meeting, the Board granted approval for several increases to allow the additions to be built. The Board approved the following:

- 100% second story side setback exemption allowing 20' length max
- Historic Exemption for Principal building coverage in the amount of 468 square feet
- 25' combined side setback relief
- 85% and 90% principal building side façade allowing 54- and 10-inches length wall on western side elevations

Mr. Henderson stated that the Board had two options when granting consideration to Mr. Fava's application. The Board can hear the applicant's presentation and approve their request to alter the effective COA from February 19, 2020 with a new scope of work, which will lift the stop-work order. Alternatively, the Board could deny the applicants request which would invalidate their original COA and revoke all previously approved Design Review Board modifications. Mr. Henderson stated that this will also revoke their current Building Permit requiring the applicants to possibly redesign the structure and receive another COA from the Design Review Board.

Mr. Stocky Cabe, serving as contractor for the renovation project at 2220 I'On Avenue, stated that he formally wanted to apologize for the unintentional heartache that he caused for all involved. Mr. Cabe apologized for not properly communicating the construction plan with Mr.

Henderson and Mr. Robinson. Mr. Cable stated that after the relocation and salvage of the existing structure, Mr. Henderson should have been contacted so Town Staff could have seen the substandard components that were located on the south and the east walls. Mr. Cabe stated he wished he would have given Mr. Henderson the chance to approve any subsequent work instead of ending up where they currently are now. Mr. Cabe stated that the materials were collected with the intention of reusing them but realized they shouldn't have dismantled the two wall sections without proper approval. Mr. Cabe thanked the Board for their time.

Mr. Eddie Fava, applicant, thanked the Board for taking their time to review his application being presented. Mr. Fava apologized to Mr. Henderson and Mr. Robinson for not being contacted in advanced to the dismantling of the walls. Had he properly contacted Town staff before dismantling of these walls, Mr. Fava believed that they probably would not have been on this agenda and for that apologized to the Board for taking up their time. Mr. Fava stated that as requested by Mr. Henderson they put together a packet of what has been approved and completed as of today. Mr. Fava stressed that this was not a defense on the actions not given to contact the Town before the dismantling of the walls this was just for reference only.

Mr. Fava stated that this property is located behind Dunleavy's Pub on the corner of Station 22.5 and I 'On Avenue. Mr. Fava stated that this property is in poor shape and has been viewed by many over the course of several years. The Fox's purchased this property with the idea of turning this property into a second home. Mr. Fava stated that he is not defending the removal of the walls but do know that they have been significantly altered. Mr. Fava stated that they were charged with following the rules and got approval and now it is to the point where the walls have been removed and it was a mistake in judgement.

Mr. Fava stated for the record that the list that was compiled in 2003 with regard to the historic homes on the Island show what has been altered on this property as of 2003 which marked this structure as a Traditional Island Resource. Mr. Fava read that a historic property which is considered altered means that the resources no longer retain their overall historic character. Being altered also means that the preservation priority is low and the homes located in the historic districts would be considered noncontributing. Mr. Fava referenced the February 19, 2020 Design Review Board Meeting Minutes which stated that this structure is listed as a Traditional Island Resource by survey card #188 and has been considered heavily altered with multiple additions and FEMA noncompliant space below Base Flood Elevation.

Mr. Fava noted for the records a summary as to what was approved during the previous Design Review Board meeting minutes and how they got to this point prior to this meeting (Exhibit 1).

Mr. Fava stated that at the February 19, 2020 Design Review Board meeting his presentation went before the Board for conceptual review and what exactly was to be done with the building. Mr. Fava believed they were as specific as possible at a conceptual level based on what was planned for this property. Mr. Fava stated that during that meeting most of the Board was in favor except for Mr. Bunky Wichmann. Mr. Fava stated that he believed the Board

understood the plan. Mr. Fava specified that he will state this several times during this meeting and that this is no excuse for this action but simply a reference point for the structure itself.

Mr. Fava referenced Zoning Ordinance Section 21-94, historic property designation criteria stating that item seven could be the only item that would qualify in regards to this property. Mr. Fava reviewed the application submitted to the Board at the February 19, 2020 meeting that stated that 2220 I' On Avenue is sensitively incorporates an existing compromised previously modified structure. Mr. Fava stated that this property is clad in vinyl siding, with salvaged/ non-original and/or substandard non-historic windows/doors. It has been significantly modified, altered and added to in manner that has obliterated what would have been a typical Sullivan's Island Cottage form. The current and ill proportioned porch and irregular additions are atypical and the original footprint is currently undiscernible. Mr Fava stated that his original application highlighted the original cottage footprint and returning the structure to its typical Sullivan's Island Historical proportions and highlights the existing mass/structure, references historic precedents and insures neighborhood compatibility.

Mr. Fava reviewed his originally approved plans with the Board. He stated that his conceptual plan shows the original building and what he and his team determined it had been in three sections. Even at that time they noticed it was compromised but would not know for sure until he got further down the road with the removal of the elements one by one. Mr. Fava showed images of what the home looked like prior to work beginning. Mr. Fava showed images of what they believe are the three different pieces that were added at different times with windows and doors that were there presently not necessarily original but plugged in depending on when the addition was added. The extraneous additions covered the front and the rear of the home.

Mr. Fava stated that the original proposed plans had a small level and a half addition on the far left of the home, relocate the footprint of the structure to the right and work within the setbacks and not requesting any relief. Mr. Fava stated the diagram presented in the conceptual original submission showed the original footprint dotted in red. Dotted in red also showed where the original openings were and where the new openings would be. Mr. Fava stated that the original plan also showed the fireplace location and the walls that would no longer remain because they would be covered by additions. Mr. Fava highlighted on the plans what would still remain of the existing structure.

Mr. Fava reviewed the original conceptual plan submitted to the Board and stated that they tried to show the existing structure and what was proposed. The conceptual plans show the proposed roofline, dormers, addition front and rear, and openings. Mr. Fava stated for the record the motion given at the February 19, 2020 Design Review Board meeting which stated that the application submitted was approved with Mr. Wichmann opposing. Mr. Fava stated that he should note in all fairness to Mr. Henderson, that he was caught off guard with the DRB's vote for final approval when he requested conceptual approval during the February 19, 2020 meeting. Mr. Fava stated that they were please to get final approval and they thought they did a good job but in fairness to Mr. Henderson staff asked them to document thoroughly prior submitting for Building Permits what the intention was so there would be no question.

Mr. Fava stated that Mr. Cable, general contractor, submitted a “contractor narrative” per the Town’s request itemizing the step-by-step scope of work which described how he would proceed per the permitted plans. Mr. Fava stated that there were notes on the plan that no more than 50% of the structure’s exterior facing walls were to be removed. Mr. Fava stated that the Certificate of Appropriateness was issued after the February 2020 Design Review Board meeting and the initial permit drawing which was requested by Mr. Henderson went into great detail as to what was anticipated for each of the project elements. Mr. Fava stated that for the record the Design remained exactly the same as approved by the Board for final approval at the conceptual approval meeting. Mr. Fava stated that the roof, dormers, and elements all stayed the same as per the original plan approval. Mr. Fava stated that when the permit set was submitted there was no request or modification to the plans at that time. The plans show the building section as to what was going to take place to the new dormers and roof form around the existing structure and the new addition. Interior elevations were also included. A three-dimensional drawing was submitted as well to show the end result of the structure as well as the drawings from the engineer.

Mr. Fava stated that respectfully to Mr. Henderson he said the plans were good but more information was requested so they provided a set of notes that were typical. Mr. Fava referenced the Secretary of Interior Standards for Historical Rehabilitation and said that they made notes in regards to each point for this property. Mr. Fava highlighted the points he felt they did for this project and added that there may have been a few they missed that apply specifically with the structure. Mr. Fava stated that per Mr. Henderson’s request for additional information Mr. Fava submitted the plans with highlighted sections showing what was non-historic, historic and what was to be constructed. Mr. Fava stated that on the plans the yellow is showing the portion of the structure that was to be salvaged. The red shows new openings, new roof, and new dormers. Mr. Fava stated that the notes that called out those elements that were highlighted for clarity was where the current roof is and what would be modified or structurally modified.

Mr. Fava stated that the roof would be reframed to code compliance, with appropriate pitch and clad with code complaint stand seam metal roof- solid wood/mahogany windows install at the new dormers. The vinyl siding and framing would be removed to allow for approved new windows and masonry chimney. Mr. Fava stated that any original wood siding in good condition should be reused to clad exterior portions of the “original” structure. Mr. Fava stated that the wood siding would be historically appropriate milled to match the original.

Mr. Fava stated that for clarity of this meeting he presented a three-dimensional model which shows the proposed final structure. Highlighted in yellow showed the existing structure and red showed the new elements to be added at that point. Mr. Fava showed the existing plan and the proposed plan that was approved for construction. Mr. Fava stated that what you see with the new structure is what would be done at a vertical swap in hopes what is savaged can be saved. Mr. Fava presented a view of what would be seen from the interior looking out onto l’ On

Avenue. This shows the walls constructed of appropriate salvaged framing and materials and the existing floor structure will remain.

Mr. Fava discussed projected construction since it was purchased by the Foxes with images of the existing structure. Mr. Fava stated that demolition began in the rear and the pictures clearly show that the materials are not original. Mr. Fava stated that another interesting point was there was vinyl siding. Under the siding there was sheathing. Under the sheathing was asbestos siding and then under that were elements of siding. Mr. Fava pointed out that what remained under all of that was in pretty poor shape as what you could imagine. Mr. Fava continued to show images of the structure during demolition. Mr. Fava showed where they believe where the current additions had been added on at some point.

Mr. Fava stated that in 2003, before there was a Design Review Board on Sullivan's Island, he salvaged three portions of homes off Goldbug Avenue and had them moved to his home where he currently lives that were saved and worked around carefully. Mr. Fava believes they do that with every project him and his team work on. Mr. Fava stated again this is not an excuse for procedural error but just as with that property and other properties we have looked at with clients, the Zoning Administrator and so many others that are on the island. Mr. Fava showed images of substantial original materials that hasn't been altered, hacked and wacked in any form. Mr. Fava showed an image of a floor joist and stated that it is the type of material that is under the existing house that you have in this situation that they maintain. Mr. Fava stated that he is aware he is constantly restating but just want everyone to know this isn't an excuse it is just a reference point.

Mr. Fava stated that the owners went to a great expense and time to do everything right and this was dismantled piece by piece. Mr. Fava stated that all of the non-original material came off. The owners paid to have it moved and shifted forward. Mr. Fava showed an image of what is left after demolition and described the approved plans compared to what is left of the historic material. Mr. Fava stated that in theory with the plans we knew what we would be left with and it would be moved along accordingly. When the remaining structure moved forward after weeks of dewatering piles were inserted as much as 80 feet deep. The house was moved out of the way then moved back once the piles were in place and put up on new piers that were installed. The underside of the floor system remained intact. Mr. Fava stated at this point, they should have stopped and called Mr. Henderson and Mr. Robinson.

Mr. Fava said that Mr. Cabe, contractor, called him and stated that there is no way for them to cut in the proposed openings in the structure. Mr. Fava stated his response was that the wall system will need to be put back but the ball was dropped when there wasn't a phone call to Town Staff. Mr. Fava stated he was confident that there would be no way to insert the approved openings going forward without them being reframed. Per the structural drawings done by the engineer, all of those things were very detailed prior to the work being done but the wall was removed. Mr. Fava showed an image of the framing currently with the three-dimensional plan lapped together. Mr. Fava stated that as seen with the new openings it would just be a simple two by four in between each opening. Mr. Fava stated this is not an excuse for

not following procedure but it was not substantial material and he is sure that the contractor's intention was to put it back in the wall system which is what we said would require. Mr. Fava stated that the entire floor system has been maintained, the structure lifted and pulled apart piece meal, which didn't happen overnight this has been a several month process. Mr. Fava showed an image of the condition of the framing in the original wall systems.

**Mr. Fava stated that a letter was submitted from the engineer as to what his assessment was of 2220 I' On Avenue (Exhibit 2).**

Mr. Fava stated that the contractor salvaged the siding from the rear of the structure and the framing from those walls with the intent that all of this would be put back on the structure. Mr. Fava stated that this is not an excuse to call and tell anyone but respectfully Mr. Fava believes the result would have still been the same but would let the Zoning Administrator make that call not himself or the contractor. Mr. Fava presented a three-dimensional image of where the original framing would be put back and within the elements specified by the structural engineer. Mr. Fava showed an image of what the home would look like after completion of construction. Mr. Fava stated that the look of the structure still remains the same and there is and will not be any design change in which this happened was an error and a mistake and Mr. Fava apologized for that.

Mr. Fava stated that he received notification of the issue after hours on Monday March 1<sup>st</sup>. Mr. Fava stated he doesn't mean to say this a job in regards to afterhours but wanted this noted. Mr. Fava stated Mr. Henderson stated received several calls this week that the structure was removed completely and to stop work until we can resolve this issue. Mr. Fava stated that Mr. Cabe responded to this notification from Mr. Henderson the next morning at 4am stating that he had a couple of doctor's appointments but to please meet and review what needed to be done prior to noon. Mr. Fava stated that Mr. Henderson responded later that morning stating that there was a complete stop work order placed on the property and to see attachments related to fines and what not.

Mr. Fava stated that he acknowledges that this is a procedural error but this wasn't something that was done maliciously. Mr. Fava stated this is the second most promenade corner on the island and right across the street from a Board member who had the opportunity to talk with the owners on several occasions and they built a nice relationship. Mr. Fava apologized again to Mr. Henderson, Mr. Robinson, and the Board for having to take their time to handle this and appreciate their consideration.

**No public comment was made.**

Mr. Pennington stated that he resented the fact that this is characterized as a mistake and believes mistakes like this don't just happen. Mr. Pennington stated that this was an intentionally bastardized build and the materials were substandard and resents the fact that the Board gave Mr. Fava final approval and the leniency to change the openings and somehow then contributed to the inability to save part of the structure notwithstanding the interior

features that were just as important. Mr. Pennington stated that the fact that Mr. Fava asked for conceptual approval but was given final approval was due to their trust that Mr. Henderson was competent to ensure the plan was constructed according to what was presented. Mr. Pennington stated that speaking for himself he would have approved the amendments if the correct procedure had been followed. Mr. Pennington then questioned Mr. Fava; asking that as someone who is responsible for a great number of historic renovations, how would he suggest preventing this from happening in the future? Mr. Pennington stated he is looking for Mr. Fava's recommendation as to what the consequence should be for someone who doesn't follow the process on a historic property. Mr. Fava's first mistake was that the owners should have requested the property's removal from the historic designation list, if the owners found its historic character questionable. Mr. Pennington asked what the consequence should be to the builder and architects for this travesty that may create a dangerous precedent on Sullivan's Island.

Mr. Fava responded to Mr. Pennington's comments by stating that when he said mistake it wasn't a way to try to excuse what it was but very respectfully the honest to god interpretation was that what was approved with the addition encompassed those elements which are shown in plans slated for removal that at least those elements were ok to be removed. Mr. Fava stated that if there is confusion on that on his part... Mr. Pennington interrupted Mr. Fava by stating that he is not speaking at all in regards to the additions as those were already approved but we the Board gave every available leniency; now, how do we preclude this should we not approve any exceptions? Mr. Pennington asked what is the consequence in Mr. Fava's mind for the Board because we have 275 of these historic properties that are much like this one, questionable at best, and as long as they are on the historic list the Board has the duty to honor the ordinances to control historic preservation. Mr. Pennington asked Mr. Fava what he thinks the Board should do. Mr. Pennington stated that now this issue has become the Board's problem, that needs to be addressed. Mr. Pennington stated who is to stop the next builder from knocking the walls down because they think historic material is unusable.

Mr. Fava responded by stating that in one of the discussions he had with Mr. Henderson was that one of the things that was done in Town and maybe helpful here or in future to avoid this from happening is that the elements that are acknowledged for demolition come off and the only portion of the demo that is issued addressed only the removal of the non-historic elements. So, an exploratory demolition then an informed decision can be made about the historic elements that are left behind that to see if it can be salvaged. Mr. Pennington responded by stating that while they didn't mandate and forensic work to be done to approve the process we knew if you and the builder were working with Mr. Henderson that would happen as a course of business and in this case it didn't happen.

Mr. Pennington stated that even though he is being stopped to do this he would suggest that instead of delaying this he would stop Mr. Fava from coming to do work on this island for a year, including the builder, because they violated our trust and they are bad examples to this island. Mr. Pennington stated that evidently the Board is unable to legally take this type of action, however, this shows how annoyed Mr. Pennington stated he was. For someone who has



been on the Design Review Board and has been lenient and reasonable on every project, now Mr. Fava has caused Mr. Pennington to question that being reasonable is a good thing which bothers Mr. Pennington because it violates a lot of his values and principals about property rights and how they do the preservation on Sullivan's Island. Mr. Pennington stated that he does not have the words to describe his dissatisfaction. Mr. Pennington stated he does not know which alterative he will support or not support but does feel a little better for telling Mr. Fava how he really feels.

Mr. Coish stated that he agreed with Mr. Pennington and he was very upset about this demolition as well. Mr. Coish said that Mr. Fava's presentation was a good walk-through memory lane and he did a good job of explaining everything but it would be difficult for the Board to continue the COA given the precented it would set for future historic structures. Mr. Coish thought everyone should hear from the entire group before the Board makes a motion. Mr. Coish stated that the Board needed to be strong here to avoid this from ever happening again. Out of the two-options, Mr. Coish suggested going with option two to revoke the COA, but would love to hear from the rest of the Board on which way they would like to handle this after reiterating that he was very upset this has happened.

Mr. Lewis stated that he felt the way Mr. Pennington felt especially given his original comments about this property's historic character. Mr. Lewis stated that maybe the Board shouldn't have granted final approval and things could have turned out differently. Somehow the Board is supposed to quantify the amount of damage Mr. Fava did with trust by square foot or something. Mr. Lewis stated that how much square feet of whatever is not justified in his mind. Mr. Lewis stated that the Board trusts the applicant and the people involved with getting this stuff right. Other people have gone through bigger nightmares are more stuff than Mr. Fava with old structures and there is more to come and going forward Mr. Lewis feels that he is not going to feel great about the seat he is in if there aren't some consequences. Mr. Lewis stated he is inclined to go with option number two as well.

Ms. Bohan asked Mr. Fava and Mr. Cabe, that when one knows things aren't going as planned per the drawings, plans, etc., and you have opened-up the walls and there are things that are different than what was expected, the first thing Ms. Bohan would do is talk to the owners and the permitting authorities... talk to everyone involved because of the consequences. So, Ms. Bohan's question to Mr. Fava and Mr. Cabe was how long had they known about the perceived problems before everyone saw it torn down. Ms. Bohan stated that it looks like this was torn down piece by piece at one time and that she is not going to assume, but being in this business for a long time, she feels as though they knew the pieces just weren't going to work long before the walls got torn down. Ms. Bohan stated that she feels that Mr. Fava or Mr. Cabe could have come forward and spoke with Mr. Henderson, Mr. Robinson and DRB before they saw it in the trash pile.

Mr. Fava responded by stating that process has been going on for several months and he is not trying to defend these actions and that they saw it was substandard material. Mr. Fava's honest impression with the approval that they were granted was that two sections of the structure

were not going to remain. Mr. Fava stated it was illustrated that way in the drawings. Mr. Fava stated that it was clearly noted in the plans approved.

Ms. Bohan responded by stating she understood what Mr. Fava was saying but the historic structure has been completely annihilated and at some point, you knew the structure was not going to work. Ms. Bohan feels that the mark was missed by not coming forward and saying the original plans that were approved would not work. Ms. Bohan stated she is disappointed and the structure is now gone. She believed that this is a precedent that has been set and the Board has to figure out what to do. Ms. Bohan stated she saw the structure preserved and established on the new foundation one day and then the next it wasn't there. Originally, she thought it was moved off site and then she saw all the materials in the trash, which is really disheartening and she is really disappointed. Ms. Bohan stated that Mr. Fava is a better communicator than this.

Mr. Fava stated that he understands and he is not trying to make excuses but with the plan that was approved the roof was not being maintained. The areas highlighted in yellow are the only items that were to be maintained.

Mr. Cabe stated that in early March on a Friday all of this came to light he had a conversation with the framer trying to come up with a process on how to rebuild the front wall facing I'On and Station 22.5. Mr. Cabe stated that where they landed and what he believed got them into trouble is that they thought they could dismantle the studs and take some of the roof rafters and repurpose those in the construction of the new walls. Mr. Cabe stated they dismantled that Friday and that following Monday they came back and cleaned up which he stated was unintentional on his part. Mr. Cabe stated it was an oversight and he takes responsibility. Mr. Cabe stated he should have made a phone call and received approval prior and deeply regrets his decision. Mr. Cabe stated that it didn't actually dawn on him as a major consequence at the time. That Monday they returned to work and started to clean the site and save what could be saved and the plan was to repurpose these materials. Late Monday Mr. Henderson sent an email stating that they needed to discuss the stop work order. Mr. Cabe directed his staff not to show up on Tuesday for work and hoped to meet Mr. Henderson on site but couldn't make it quick enough, so the stop work order was written and now here we are. Mr. Cabe stated that one other point that is not an excuse but from his perspective but anything that didn't have rot was still on site to be salvaged. Mr. Cabe stated that the stuff that was in the dumpster was the interior trim and bead board that was on the walls but there was no framing material or older material in that dumpster. Mr. Cabe stated that his failure was not speaking with Mr. Henderson on the plan to reuse the exiting material. He was not trying to be spiteful or run around the Town in anyway and he deeply regrets that they were here and was truly sorry.

Mr. Wichmann stated that Mr. Cabe did a good job of answering the main questions he was going to ask but asked if Mr. Cabe has done any other renovations on the Island or anywhere in the area. Mr. Cabe responded by stating that they usually do most of their work in the downtown area. Mr. Wichmann asked if Mr. Cabe felt there was anything in the dumpster that could come out to be repurposed. Mr. Cabe responded by stating that the items that are in the dumpster are items they believe that are not in the historic category as it was just bead board,

interior wall siding and interior trim but no framing material was thrown away from the two walls that they were trying to preserve.

Mr. Wichmann stated that his fellow Board members did a great job discussing their feelings on the situation and he is disappointed. Mr. Wichmann stated that he doesn't get outraged much but is disappointed that this has happened. Mr. Wichmann stated that he likes the owners and believed that they were trying to do the right thing but someone is definitely going to feel some pain after this. Mr. Wichmann thanked Mr. Fava because this made them realize that the Board may have approved this application too soon and may need to slow down and take their time and look at historic properties more carefully in future. Mr. Wichmann stated that Mr. Fava referred to the Secretary of Interior Standards however, repurposed pieces are not being preserved very well. He explained the treatment of this material on site would be damaged even more which does not meet the intent and purpose of the Secretary of Interior Standards. Mr. Wichmann asked Mr. Henderson's opinion on the wood found in the dumpster on site.

Mr. Henderson stated that when he and Mr. Robinson inspected the site, several photos were taken that showed the dumpster filled about three quarters of the way with different types of materials, however, it was hard to determine if there was original siding or framing in the dumpster. Mr. Henderson stated that the two elevations that were shown and shaded in the permitted drawings were to be maintained on l'On and Station 22. These walls were always planned to be maintained and preserved. Mr. Henderson stated that he asked Mr. Fava and Mr. Cabe to submit the contractor narrative as documentation to clarify the preservation work to be done to these exterior facing walls. This is a standard operating procedure for all historic projects in requiring the contractor narrative and the highlighted elevations that show what materials are being preserved, which is then made part of the building permit. So, when Town Staff identified complete removal of the walls, they knew that there was a failure to comply with the COA and permitted drawings.

Mr. Herlong stated that he believes that Mr. Fava put together a very descriptive presentation as to show what was going to be done on site. Mr. Herlong stated that it is hard to believe that we are all sitting here and that the Board has been backed into a corner to set a precedent. Mr. Herlong stated that they would hope there are more properties on the island that could qualify for historic designation. By having the DRB granted historic exemptions, the property owners received a great benefit and now they can't see any of the historic materials, which puts the Board in a tough situation.

Mr. David Fox, property owner of 2220 l' On Avenue, stated that he and his wife are mortified that they are in the middle of this situation. Mr. Fox stated that he gave Mr. Fava and Mr. Cabe very strict instructions to abide by the book on this project. Mr. Fox stated they saw Mr. Wichmann on the property about a week before this happened and he complimented them on all the materials they were able to save. Mr. Fox stated he was equally disappointed but clearly, they didn't know they were doing something wrong because they did not attempt to hide this. Mr. Fox stated he can see how this could be damaging to the Design Review Board and a precedent needed to be set but from their perspective maybe there is a better solution like

maybe reinstalling the two walls with the materials left on site and then building the new additions around this historic material. To stop the project completely and go back to square one when they are this far into it- Mr. Fox believed this is very unreasonable in the sense that the design hasn't changed, the footprint hasn't changed and they went to considerable expenses to move this thing around so there was never an intent to obliterate this structure. Mr. Fox stated he can't speak to the poor judgement on how the architect and the builder should have coordinated with the Town and knows this has put the Town in a terrible position but the people that are going to suffer the most would be he and his wife. Mr. Fox stated that this project has been nothing but a nightmare for them and the unseen issues that have been found have caused this building to be much more expensive than anticipated.

Mr. Fox stated that the builder and the architect should be punished but for the Board to tell them to go all the way back to square one just to set an example is too much because they are going to ultimately be the ones that suffer. Mr. Fox stated they chose Mr. Fava to work on this project because of his integrity and he firmly believes there was no bad intention here on Mr. Fava or Mr. Cabes part. Mr. Fox stated that a mistake was made and everyone was put in a tough situation but he did go through the minutes and the video from the original submission and some of the comments made that if they could save any portion of this it would be a miracle.

Mr. Fox said they tried as hard as they could and the idea should be to reuse everything they possibly can onsite. From Mr. Fox's perspective he believed the method and end result of what you are going to get, is exactly what the Board approved. Mr. Fox stated that from the owner's perspective it would be extremely unreasonable to punish them for that. He understands the precedent the Board has here, but at the end of the day, there may be a better way to do it by telling the contractor and the architect to put back up the two walls that were there with all salvaged materials. Mr. Fox stated that he knows for a fact that when he stood in front of the property with only those two walls standing there was not an issue. If they need to do that, they would be happy to but Mr. Fox stated they spent thousands of dollars moving this building around and there was no intent to be in the middle of something like this- it was their intent to do the exact opposite, which is why they chose the best architect. Mr. Fox asked what they could do to remedy the situation and put the structure back to the way it was. He would be willing to do whatever is necessary.

Mr. Fox stated that he doesn't know what they mean when they say going back to square one because the foundation is in the structure is going up exactly how it was approved it is just the method in which it was done that is the issue. Mr. Fox feels shocked to be in the middle of this and they feel horrible because this is the last way you want to enter a community and there are consequences but them as the owners are going to be the ones that feel it the most and there was never any bad intent here. We had many people ask them why they were moving the house around and we were very careful about the situation but now here we are Mr. Fox said.

Mr. Fox asked the Board before making a decision to use a little bit of common sense and say how can we make this work for all parties and reach a middle ground because option number

two is extremely severe. Mr. Fox stated it is extreme to them personally and it would be really hard to stomach. Mr. Fox stated that they are not real estate developers they have lived here for years and they got married here and the last thing wanted was to put anyone into this position. Mr. Fox stated that he understands what the Board is up against but if you look at some of the comments from the original Design Review Board meeting in February 2020, there was a lot of commentary around why this property was even called historic. Mr. Fox stated that it would be one thing if they tore down something really really historic but they didn't and hopefully before the Board votes they will understand there's more impact here than just the architect but us and individuals who are already up to our necks in this and it is just going to make it worse for us. Mr. Fox stated this is not his style, it is not who they are and he believes that this is not who Mr. Fava is. Mr. Fox believes that Mr. Fava is just as mortified as all of us and thinks this is just a giant misunderstanding and there is complicity on all sides for not understanding to the extent as it should. Mr. Fox stated that he isn't an architect but has done other projects and if you look at Mr. Fava's drawings, he believes it is extremely clear as to what they were trying to do and when a structure is left and will not stand on its own Mr. Cabe should have said this will not stand with the new openings. But at the end of the day Mr. Fox believes they haven't asked for any changes on this project and if there is a way to put back up what was left over, he would be happy to do discuss that but option two is too dramatic particularly from his perspective since he had no intent in going that direction. Mr. Fox stated that hopefully that has some weight and some merit and Mr. Wichmann and myself stood in front of the property with two walls standing and we both didn't have the intent to see those walls come down. Mr. Fox asked the Board for their reasonable sympathy here on something like this because it is incredibly stressful for him and his wife. Mr. Fox stated the Board can make an example by putting new rules together, reprimand Mr. Fava and Mr. Cabe but at the end of the day they would like to just be able to do the building we promised to do exactly to the specs as promised to do and he doesn't see why they couldn't do that if they put the original structure back up even though it is only two walls.

Mr. Lewis stated that his sympathy is with Mr. Fox as he has been through this himself which is one of the reasons why he wanted to be on the Design Review Board so that we don't torture property owners like has been done in the past. Mr. Lewis asked what do we do here because we can't just allow people to blow down these historic homes. Mr. Lewis stated he was very enthusiastic about this from the original meeting and he doesn't think they went too fast. Mr. Lewis stated if the Board would have made the applicant come back four more times we would still be where we are. The walls potentially still could have been torn down. This is purely about procedures and the fact that Staff and the Board need these procedures to be followed or we may as well just go home and this is all a charade. This is the box that the Board is in and Mr. Lewis feels torn about this. Mr. Lewis stated that he gets enraged when he hears Mr. Fava quantifying it as only this much or that we gave final approval or the Board screwed this up by being too agreeable. Mr. Lewis stated he doesn't buy that and it is bull crap and hopes he never hears that again. Mr. Lewis believes that the Board could have sat and tortured everyone about this project and it still could have happened so it is not about getting final approval at a conceptual submittal that is all crap. Mr. Lewis stated that he mouthed off about this project during that February meeting and he probably shouldn't have but said that anything that could

be done to this structure would be a benefit and he still feels that way. Mr. Lewis loves what Mr. Fava is doing with this home but feels Mr. Fava didn't have to take a dump on the Board. Mr. Lewis stated he doesn't know how to vote and he would like to abstain.

Mr. Fox responded by stating he appreciates those comments and he understands why the Board is upset. Mr. Fox stated that he actually sent Mr. Fava and Mr. Cabe an email stating that they met with Mr. Wichmann on site and mentioned that they met with him and he was asking questions and looking at the structure. As the owner, Mr. Fox asked that at his perspective that it is his responsibility for hiring the architect and the contractor. Mr. Fox stated that he was not consulted when this was taken down and looked at this and thought what was that and assumed Mr. Cabe and Mr. Fava received approval to remove those walls which clearly didn't happen but he personally would not have done it this way. Mr. Fox asked the Board to consider some sort of monetary penalty and new procedural issues to roll out on top of that if you want to make an example but to just go back to the drawing board Mr. Fox believes that he doesn't think he band width or the compunction to do this all over again and it is taking too much of our time. Mr. Fox stated that we are so excited and have the best of interest in this place but he wanted to make sure that he isn't the one getting trampled for this mistake. Mr. Fox thinks that the Board should set an example but to allow them to finish what they started.

Mr. Herlong stated he wished he could find an option 1.5 that would seem to work and would love to hear everyone's opinions on how to create option 1.5. Mr. Pennington asked Mr. Henderson to clarify the new scope of work defined in option 1.

Mr. Henderson stated that the new scope of work would describe a change in elevations from what the plans currently say, which shows shading indicating that they were going to preserve the walls of the original footprint, original framing, and siding of those two walls facing l'On Avenue and Station 22.5, and instead it would be reframed with new wall studs keeping the original floor, new framed roof. They would be using all the materials that have been salvaged around the yard for the new scope of work. Mr. Pennington stated that the new scope of work would be reusing the materials on site and/or getting materials of that vintage to rebuild those two walls. Mr. Henderson responded by saying yes that is correct. Mr. Pennington asked if it would be appropriate for them to use wood from that era weather on the site or from another site. Mr. Henderson responded by saying that if it is the will of the Board, they could allow other historic materials from the same era to be used in the reconstruction of the original footprint and façade walls.

Mr. Pennington stated that notwithstanding his original comments he understands the circumstances, Mr. Fox the Board did consider fines, however, on Sullivan's Island, money is no object and people will gladly pay the fines to get what they want so with that the Board doesn't think minor fines is the right punishment. Mr. Pennington stated that he believes Mr. Fox when he said there was never this intent and he appreciates that. Mr. Pennington stated that in his mind if we cause the materials on site to be reused for the framing and cladding but if it can't be completed with materials on site, then the architect and contractor would need to procure these historic materials somewhere else with the same vintage as approved by Mr. Henderson.

This would appear as an additional option 1.5 for the Board according to Mr. Pennington. With that Mr. Pennington stated that there are exceptions on this because it was a historic building maybe we should think about trimming back on what was provided in the original design but I will wait to hear from other members.

Mr. Herlong asked what the proper way would be to recreate those walls and use the material that is there on site. Mr. Herlong asked if Mr. Fava knew a historical consultant that they could maybe work with to assure the Board and the Town that this is being refitted in a proper way. Mr. Fava responded by stating that if the material needed to be procured he is confident that they could do that with the original elements and also get a consultant to confirm with the Board and Town Staff that the construction was complete with the material requested by the Board. Mr. Herlong feels as though this is an appropriate route the Board can take.

Mr. Wichmann asked if for whatever reason if you end up 14 feet short for example and can't find matching pieces is there some type of material Mr. Henderson and Mr. Robinson and maybe the preservation society can review and approve as acceptable material to be used once painted and matched. Mr. Wichmann believes that Mr. Pennington made a very good 1.5 option and he was wondering if they are unable to find vintage wood that matches if they have a second option to mill only a portion only if they are out of options. Mr. Herlong responded that Mr. Fava and a historical consultant could analyze what is actual on the site and what would be the course of action is and to report that back to Mr. Henderson would could get that over to the Board to keep the process moving and doing it correctly so nothing like this happens again. Mr. Wichmann stated that the Design Review Board cannot assess fines and do not have the authority. Mr. Wichmann stated that even though the Board doesn't enforce fines the Town still has the power to implement any fines they feel is necessary.

Mr. Coish stated that you hate to inflict chaos to a customer. We have option one which is a slap on the wrist and option two which is pretty harsh. Mr. Coish stated that the 1.5 option Mr. Pennington suggested has peaked his interest and maybe there is a way for the situation to be salvaged without inflicting tremendous problems on the owner but somehow in the future the Board has to make sure that if this goes to the 1.5 option that there is a plan, it gets to Town Staff and the Board for review and to make sure that in future we keep a thumb on the pulse on all these historic renovations. Mr. Coish stated that all the applicants need to be made aware that if there is a change somewhere down the road that the applicants come and talk to the Board and the Town. Mr. Coish said he wanted to make a firm statement that the Board will not put up with this. We will never know if the owner really knew what was going on or if it was intentional or a mistake but it is a bad situation. Mr. Coish would like to make sure this gets worked out and taking the foundation and the house down now would be a huge disaster to the owner. The 1.5 option does make sense to Mr. Coish.

Ms. Bohan asked Mr. Fava what concessions other than the ones already presented would he be willing to offer. Ms. Bohan asked if Mr. Fava needs the 450 square feet that was given. Do they need the exemptions, setbacks and relief that was offered to Mr. Fava to continue the job? Ms. Bohan stated that she believes that they can find all the materials needed to rebuild but

she is looking for what Mr. Fava can offer to set a precedent to show this will never happen again.

Mr. Fava stated that the footprint of the original structure could be reframed entirely with the material on site or historic material found elsewhere. Mr. Fava stated that as far as moving forward in future he is sure there will be questions and all he can do is answer honestly. Mr. Fava stated that this was not done with ill intent and it should have been asked about before the tear down. Mr. Fava stated that his initial concern was that there may have been an impression that the whole building was to be retained but that was addressed. Mr. Fava stated that these walls were to remain in place and all he can offer is assurance that this will never happen again. Ms. Bohan asked if they need the 450 square feet and the exceptions, they were given due to the size of the home which was very tight and narrow. Ms. Bohan stated that she is just trying to figure out what else can be included into the 1.5 option.

**Mr. Wichmann made a motion to grant option 1.5 which is to rebuild the structure with the existing historic materials that are on site or historic/vintage materials to be procured by the owners to match the existing structure and the owner or contractor must hire the historical consultant recommended by Town Staff to oversee the that the reconstruction is done correctly.**

Mr. Pennington stated that it may be prudent if the historic consultant actual works for Joe in the process and paid for by the owner, architect, or builder just so the historic consultant is aware that they are working on behalf of the Town not on behalf of the owner of the property. Mr. Henderson responded by stating that the Town typically uses Craig Bennett Jr, Historic Preservation Structural Engineer, to do assessments of all of our historic buildings and batteries. Mr. Henderson stated that they could certainly require the owner to go with his team to assess this project moving forward. Mr. Pennington agreed with Mr. Wichmann's motion with the stipulation that we use the consultant suggest by Mr. Henderson.

**Mr. Wichmann modified his motion by stating that the Board grants approval for option 1.5 which is to rebuild the structure with existing historic materials that are on site or historic/vintage materials to be procured by the owners to match the existing historic building materials and the owner or contractor must hire the historical consultant recommended by Town Staff to oversee the that the reconstruction uses the correct material and is done correctly.**

**Mr. Lewis seconded this motion. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Coish made a statement that the Board isn't taking this situation lightly and the Board will have to take this situation into consideration when moving forward in the approval of historic structures.



## **NON-HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEWS:**

**3314 Jasper Boulevard:** Justin Ferrick, of Beau Clowney Architects, requested final approval to enclose first and second story porch spaces with requested modifications to the zoning standards for principal building square footage (TMS# 529-08-00-53).

Mr. Henderson stated that this property is located outside of the historic district. Mr. Henderson stated that the applicant requested relief for principal building square footage in the amount of 16% to enclose the first and second story porch spaces. Mr. Henderson suggested that the Board grant final approval provided the project complies with Zoning Ordinance Standards for Neighborhood Compatibility.

Mr. Justin Ferrick, applicant, presented his application to the Board.

**No public comment was made.**

Mr. Wichmann asked what is the existing square footage and what will be the final square footage after the enclosure. Mr. Ferrick stated that the current square footage is 4,425 sq. ft and the final square footage after adding the enclosures will be 4,762 square feet.

The Board was in favor of the application presented.

**Mr. Wichmann made a motion to approve this application for final approval. Mr. Pennington seconded this motion. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously.**

**2707 Bayonne Street:** Kate Campbell, of Beau Clowney Architects, requested conceptual approval to construct a new single-family home with in-ground swimming pool with requested modifications to the zoning standards for principal building square footage and side setbacks (TMS# 529-11-00-063)

Mr. Henderson stated that this property is located outside of the historic district. Mr. Henderson stated that the applicant requested modifications to the principal building square footage in the amount of 22% and side setback relief in the amount of 25% to build a new single-family home. Mr. Henderson suggested that the Board grant final approval provided that the project complies with Zoning Ordinance Standards for Neighborhood Compatibility.

Ms. Kate Campbell, applicant, presented her application to the Board. Ms. Campbell stated that the overall impervious coverage based on the lot size on the lot is 6618 not 5661. This was an incorrect number on the application. Ms. Campbell stated that the new flood maps make this in the flood zone AE 10. Ms. Campbell stated that it is 9.4 feet from finished grade to finished floor elevation. Mr. Henderson asked Ms. Campbell if she would be meeting the 8-foot requirement to the lowest structural member because this is new regulation for your floor system. Ms. Campbell stated that 8 feet from finished grade would give them a floor system of 1.4 feet so they may have to drop it a little bit but will take a look.

**No public comment was made.**

The Board was in favor of the application presented.

Mr. Wichmann made a motion to approve this application for conceptual approval.

Mr. Henderson suggested granting final approval because the Board is not asking for any design changes or modifications to the application presented.

Mr. Wichmann amended his motion.

**Mr. Wichmann made a motion to approve this application for final approval. Mr. Pennington seconded this motion. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously.**

**Mr. Herlong recused himself from this application (Exhibit 4).**

**2857 Brownell Avenue:** Brooke Gerbracht, of Herlong and Associates, requested conceptual approval to construct a new single-family home and elevated swimming pool with modifications to the zoning standards for principal building square footage, principal building coverage and second story side façade setbacks (TMS# 529-11-00-091)

Mr. Henderson stated that this property is located outside of the historic district. Mr. Henderson stated that the applicant requested modifications for principal building square footage in the amount of 24%, principal building coverage in the amount of 17% and 2<sup>nd</sup> story side façade setback relief in the amounts of 100%, 80% and 33%. Mr. Henderson recommended that the Board grant final approval provided the project complies with Zoning Ordinance Standards for Neighborhood Compatibility.

Ms. Brooke, Gerbracht, applicant, presented her application to the Board.

Mr. Henderson stated that there are design guidelines that are listed in the ordinance. First, the guidelines pertain to the applicant's request for a roof top deck. Mr. Henderson stated that from the street frontage and other adjacent properties the roof top deck should be hidden by a parapet wall or the deck should be worked into the structure of the roof. Second, the applicant is proposing an attached addition by the swimming pool. Mr. Henderson stated that the ordinance says that the detached addition must be architecturally compatible with the rest of the home. Mr. Henderson recommended taking note on these two items. Lastly, Mr. Henderson pointed out that on the third story it appears there is heated and cooled space. Mr. Henderson stated that he believes it is not actually heated and cooled space but just a clear story window. Ms. Gerbracht responded by stating the area on the third story is not an actual third floor but a 1 and a half story floor with an elevated deck that may look as though it is an actual third floor. Mr. Henderson thanked Ms. Gerbracht for the clarification.

**No public comment was made.**

Mr. Coish asked if they would have to do a solid parafait wall around the rooftop deck. Mr. Henderson stated that not necessarily but Town Staff has approved different designs to hide a rooftop deck. Mr. Coish stated that he believes that the design would look better with the handrail instead of a parafait wall. Mr. Coish was in favor of the application presented.

Mr. Wichmann stated he is concerned about the neighbors and the rooftop desk. Ms. Gerbracht stated that they have not spoken to the neighbors.

Ms. Cindy Campbell, property owner of 2857 Brownell Avenue, stated that they have not been in contact with any of the neighbors. Ms. Campbell stated that the neighbors located on the east side is currently a rental home and the owners will be building a new home there. Ms. Campbell stated that the home on the corner of Station 28.5 and Brownell they haven't met the owners but the home is probably the same height if not taller than theirs.

Mr. Wichmann stated that he is just concerned with the rooftop deck being shown from the street or the neighboring properties. Mr. Henderson referred to Zoning Ordinance Section 21-39 B. which states that roof decks and roof gazebos should be designed to be an integral part of the roof structure in order to diminish their impact and Town Staff has always taken that to mean that you create some kind of roof structure around the deck. Mr. Henderson stated that this is a design guideline and not a standard so it used to negotiate a better design but is not a required standard.

The Board was in favor of the application presented.

**Mr. Wichmann made a motion to approve this application conceptual approval and asked the applicant to modify the roof deck to create more protected privacy. Mr. Coish seconded that motion. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously.**

**818 Conquest Avenue:** Bill Huey and Associates, applicants, requested conceptual approval to construct a new single-family home and elevated swimming pool with modifications to the zoning standards for principal building square footage, second story side façade setbacks and nominal building foundation height increase (TMS# 523-06-00-027).

Mr. Henderson stated that this property is located outside of the historic district. Mr. Henderson stated that the applicant requested modifications for principal building square footage in the amount of 24.3%, principal building coverage in the amount of 17% and 2<sup>nd</sup> story side façade setback relief in the amount of 100%. Mr. Henderson recommended that the Board grant final approval provided that the project complies with Zoning Ordinance Standards for Neighborhood Compatibility.

Mr. Henderson stated that there was one modification made to the application. Mr. Henderson stated that after the owner and the neighboring properties met, the neighbors asked that the home be relocated 1' to the east per neighbor agreement.

Mr. Bill Huey, applicant, presented his application to the Board.

**No public comment was made.**

The Board was in favor of the application presented.

**Mr. Wichmann made a motion to approve this application for final approval. Mr. Pennington seconded this motion. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Coish stated that this was a very stressful meeting and the first item was a very stressful. Mr. Coish stated that we don't need to let this go and the Board really needs to be conscious about these historic properties. Mr. Coish wanted to thank everyone involved.

Mr. Herlong stated that when the Board approves the new homes for conceptual is completely different then approving historic homes with modifications or additions. Mr. Herlong thinks that the Board needs to be mindful when making decisions on historic homes.

Mr. Lewis stated that he doesn't think the Board should be beating themselves up about this situation. Mr. Lewis stated that the people doing the work screwed up and this shouldn't fall on the Board. Mr. Lewis stated that they messed up and there is nothing that the Board could have done to change what they did.

Mr. Herlong agreed with Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Henderson suggested holding a workshop twice a year or quarterly just to talk about our procedure and about how we are to review projects. Mr. Henderson stated that we could bring in John Linton, the Town Attorney, to discuss legal issues if needed.

Mr. Pennington stated that he is in favor of Joe's idea. Mr. Pennington asked Mr. Henderson if there should be any change in process based on the situation at hand and if so, what should we do to change our procedures. Mr. Pennington stated that he agreed with Mr. Lewis's comments.

Mr. Bohan stated that one thing Mr. Fava commented about really stuck out. Before submitting an application to Downtown there has to be an onsite inspection completed before the submittal and receive conceptual approval in advance. Ms. Bohan suggested doing an initial onsite inspection before the applicant submits and application that way that we know what is really going on and can implement any penalties needed.

Ms. Pennington stated that he is no expert and can't walk through a home to determine what is historic and what isn't. Ms. Bohan responded by stating that we the Board don't necessarily needs to be the people doing the walk through but someone who is a professional can come in to take a look.

Mr Herlong suggested requiring that part of the approval the applicant hires a professional consultant to provide updates to the Board and Town Staff to show that everything is being done correctly.

Mr. Henderson stated that he will work on getting dates and times together to get everyone together to discuss a new procedure.

V. **ADJOURN: Mr. Pennington made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Wichmann seconded this motion. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously.**

Steve Herlong                      4/26/21  
Steve Herlong, Chairman                      Date

Beverly Bohan                      4/26/2021  
Beverly Bohan, Vice-Chairman                      Date

---



Exhibit 2

## Project Description Per SIDRB Application 02.19.2020

Our design proposal for 2220 P'on, sensitively incorporates an existing, **compromised and previously modified structure** into a modest, new single family residence. The current structure is set at a significantly lower grade level (up to 2') than adjacent properties and street. It is **clad in vinyl siding, with salvaged/non original and/or substandard non-historic windows/doors**. It **has been significantly modified, altered and added to in manner that has obliterated what would have been a typical Sullivans Island Cottage form. The current & ill proportioned porch and irregular additions are atypical and the original cottage footprint is currently not discernible.** The goal of David & Alexandra Fox was to renovate this long since neglected property and have it become an integral part of the residential neighborhood. We have done this by **highlighting the original cottage footprint & returning typical Sullivans Island Historical proportions** and features to it. The addition to the original footprint is respectful, modest in scale with the overall design clearly defining and differentiating the two elements. We are confident that the project as proposed addresses the standards noted above and will be a respectful and welcome addition to the neighborhood and the island.

Request SIDRB review & approval for the proposed restoration, renovation and proposed addition to 2220 P'on avenue per the plans submitted . Property is in very low lying location @ busy and corner of and backing up to the SI commercial district. Our design proposal as submitted respects the existing neighborhood & insures an appropriately scaled solution that **highlights the existing mass/structure, references historic precedents and insures neighborhood compatibility.** Please see submitted drawing package and the attached description of work.



Exhibit 3

July 22, 2020

RE: Building Permit  
2220 Ion Ave.  
Sullivan's Island, SC 29482

Randy and Joe,

#### Site Preparation / Renovation

- Obtain building permit to cover the following scope of work
- Remove dead, and relocate or remove existing trees in accordance with approvals
- Remove center Chimney and associated foundation from the guest house and install a temp roof covering to keep house weather tight
- Remove electrical service from structure and set up a temporary pole
- Demolition to include front screen porch and associated stairs, as well as rear additions to the historic structure as noted on page 002A of the submitted architectural plans. Most like we will also need to remove the roofing material and rafters
- Install necessary bracing to allow for the relocation of the historic section of the house
- House will be supported on steel beams, moved to new location 5'5" to right and set on wooden cribbing supporting the steel beams to grade.
- Assuming the roofing was removed during demo, we plan to build a minimal temporary roof structure and cover with a heavy duty tarp to protect the structure from rain. Should there be a named storm that is predicted to make landfall in this area, we will cover openings in the structure with plywood panels and will attempt to strap the houses to the best of our ability.
- Install new foundation per specifications secure house to new foundation
- Framing of additions per plan.
- Build new masonry fireplace
- Exterior trim/siding repairs, new window and door installs
- Mechanical Installations
  - Plumbing
  - HVAC
  - Electrical
  - Gas
- New roof per approvals
- Exterior painting
- Start site work and landscaping
- Insulation as applicable
- Drywall / wood walls and ceiling per final design



- Flooring installations and finishing
- Interior painting
- Cabinets and Closet
- Punch list and final interior/exterior house details
- Wrap up exterior landscape and clean up of all construction related items

Sincerely,

*Stockton Cabe*

Stockton Cabe  
SC Homebuilders # 012597

# RECUSAL STATEMENT

Member Name: Steve Herlong  
 Meeting Date: March 17, 2021  
 Agenda Item: Section F Number: 3  
 Topic: 2857 Brownell Avenue

*The Ethics Act, SC Code §8-13-700, provides that no public official may knowingly use his office to obtain an economic interest for himself, a family member of his immediate family, an individual with whom he is associated, or a business with which he is associated. No public official may make, participate in making, or influence a governmental decision in which he or any such person or business has an economic interest. Failure to recuse oneself from an issue in which there is or may be conflict of interest is the sole responsibility of the council member (1991 Op. Atty. Gen. No. 91-37.) A written statement describing the matter requiring action and the nature of the potential conflict of interest is required.*

**Justification to Recuse:**

- Professionally employed by or under contract with principal
- Owns or has vested interest in principal or property
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Member: [Signature]  
 Approved by Parliamentarian: [Signature]