

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

## **REGULAR MEETING MINUTES Wednesday, September 18, 2024**

A regular meeting of the Town of Sullivan's Island Design Review Board was held at 4:00 p.m. at Town Hall. All requirements of the Freedom of Information Act were verified to have been satisfied. Present were Board members Tal Askins, Beverly Bohan, Bunky Wichmann, Phil Clarke, Heather Wilson and Ron Coish.

Town Council Members present: No members of Council were present.

Staff Members present: Charles Drayton, Planning and Zoning Director, Max Wurthmann, Building Official, and Jessi Gress, Business Licensing and Building Permit Technician.

Media present: No members of the media were present.

Members of the public: Mr. James Garton, property owner of 2672 Atlantic Avenue.

**CALL TO ORDER:** Ms. Bohan called the meeting to order at 4:00 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 THE August 21, 2024 Meeting Minutes:** Mr. Wichmann made a motion to grant approval of the August 21, 2024 Design Review Board Meeting Minutes. Mr. Coish seconded this motion. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously.
- II. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** Mr. Gardner, property owner at 2672 Atlantic, stated that after listening to the presentation at the Special DRB Meeting it was mentioned that additions be added to the rear of the historic structure, but stated that on his property, the rear of his lot is beautiful and would like if there could be some type of language to be added to allow for special exceptions depending on the lot. Ms. Bohan responded by stating that he should send an email to Mr. Drayton with any suggestions he may have for the Board to consider adding.
- III. **PROCESS FOR DESIGN REVIEW:** Ms. Bohan reviewed the meeting process for the Design Review Board which is as follows:
  - Statement of matters to be heard (Chair announcement)
  - Town staff presentation (5-minute limit)

- Presentation by applicant (10-minute limit)
- Town staff final statement (if needed)
- Board Q & A (may occur at any point during hearing)
- Public comment closed
- Board deliberation and vote

#### IV. HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEWS:

**2608 Myrtle Avenue:** Benton Grismer, architect for the owner, requested conceptual approval of the RS-District historic dwelling unit special exception. The plans include renovating the existing Traditional Island Resource cottage in situ and constructing a new single-family home spaced away from the cottage (529-06-00-051).

Mr. Drayton stated that this is the DRB's second review of this project; the applicant is seeking the Board's conceptual approval of renovations to the historic cottage so that the request can move to the BZA for consideration of the special exception. The existing cottage structure is 1952 square feet, and the ordinance requires historic cottages to have less than 1200 square feet to be eligible for the special exception, so the applicant will need to prove to the Board that the addition work they intend to remove is, in fact non-original to the cottage and that the additions are under 50 years old or if older than 50 years that the additions obscure the historic characteristics, features, or elements of the original cottage; and then they need to provide the Board with a preservation plan detailing the treatment of the historic cottage and its contributing elements during the restoration process.

Mr. Drayton stated that Butler's report provides evidence of the historic evolution of the home, pointing out historic lumber framing outlining the original massing, identifying the original front door with transom and sidelights, and evidence of a rear porch in the original design, all leading to a finding that the original cottage was substantially added onto over the years, however the applicant still needs to articulate what the size of the original cottage was, what portion of the original cottage is proposed to be recreated, what portions of later additions are proposed to remain, and what is proposed to be newly added construction. It must be noted that the goal and purpose of the Historic ADU Special Exception is to return the cottage to its original historic form.

Mr. Drayton stated that following the recommendations from Christina Butler, provided as part of her historic report, the applicant has:

- Reduced the cottage's mass through the removal of additions that are not crucial to the use and function of the cottage,
- Adjusted the architectural ornamentation,
- Revised the fenestrations to be more historically sympathetic,
- Modified the front porch to be more historically accurate, and
- Removed the screen from the front porch to bring greater visibility to the original front door.

At the DRB meeting in July, the Board provided the applicant with feedback for revising the application so that it can be approved. They suggested:

- The intent of the special exception is to bring the original cottage back;
- They want to see the historic and non-historic features clearly;
- Provide additional study of the windows and cedar siding;
- Remove the unconditioned space and focus on the massing of the original cottage; and
- Consider a smaller request for additional square footage because 25% will be too much and overwhelm the cottage and the lot.

While the original submittal proposed a new structure that would require the full 25% relief from the Board for additional square footage, they are now holding off on any requests and considering designs for the new structure that will maintain neighborhood compatibility.

Mr. Drayton stated that staff recommended conceptual approval for the restoration of the historic cottage if the Board finds that the applicants have adequately proven the additions do not contribute to the historic nature of the cottage and that their removal will meet the SIS Guidelines and render the cottage less than 1200 square feet.

Ms. Christina Butler, owner representative, presented her application to the Board.

**Ms. Bohan stated that Town staff received six letters in favor of the application presented (Exhibits 1-6).**

The Board was in favor of the application presented provided that the applicant makes the following adjustments:

- Dropping the roof ridge line on the right roof elevation of the structure to allow the addition to match more with the original historical structure.
- Remove the stairs inside the home that leads to the attic space or modify them in a format that won't allow for the potential of requesting additional square footage.
- Suggesting that the applicant does not ask the Board for the full 25% square footage relief.
- Use as many original windows as possible and if a replacement is needed, to use in like windows with historic structure.

**Ms. Wilson made a motion to grant conceptual approval for the application presented provided that the modification be made to the right roof elevation and to increase the window gable ends. Mr. Clarke seconded this motion. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously.**

**2624 Atlantic Avenue:** Carl Berry, of Carl Berry Architecture, requested final approval to revise a previous DRB-approval to replace non-original windows and siding on this Traditional Island Resource property (PIN# 529-10-00-029).

Mr. Drayton stated that following a deferral at the initial DRB meeting to discuss the expanded scope of the renovation plans in July, the Board members met in small groups with the applicant at the home to discuss and better visualize the proposed plans. The Board had expressed concerns in the DRB meeting about identification of historic versus non-historic features, wanting clarity primarily on the fenestrations and the siding. The applicant has responded with a plan that clearly identifies the historic and non-historic windows and noted where new features are proposed.

Mr. Drayton stated that staff recommended final approval if the Board finds that the proposed renovations will maintain the SIS Guidelines and the historic integrity of the home.

Mr. Berry presented his application to the Board.

**No public comment was made.**

The Board was in favor of the application presented.

**Mr. Coish made a motion to grant final approval for the application presented. Mr. Wichmann seconded this motion. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously.**

**1908 I' On Avenue:** Batton Kennon, of Herlong Architects, requested final approval to convert unfinished space in this RS-District historic dwelling unit special exception property into conditioned space, with a request for additional principal building square footage. The plans propose no changes to the existing Traditional Island Resource cottage on the property (529-09-00-008).

Mr. Drayton stated that this is the initial review of a renovation project that has been made possible through reworked historic ordinances that were codified in February of this year. This home was built in 2016 following DRB and BZA consideration and approval of the Historic ADU Special Exception. The Historic Survey Card for this property is number 190. At that time no relief could be granted for additional square footage for properties utilizing the special exception; now those properties are eligible for up to a 25% increase in square footage. There are no modifications proposed to the historic cottage, and only minimal exterior modifications are proposed to the new home on the lot. The applicant is seeking an additional 698 square feet or a 17% increase in principal building square footage to enclose a porch and finish an attic space. The north elevation of the newer home faces Middle Street, and no modifications are proposed to that principal façade. On the rear elevation of the newer home the applicant is proposing to add two dormers into the attic roof to bump it out to allow for a more functional conditioned space. On the east elevation windows and shiplap siding would replace a portion of the existing side porch. There are no other changes or modifications requested.

Mr. Drayton stated that staff recommended the Board grant final approval provided that the Board finds the applicant's design remains in line with the Standards for Neighborhood Compatibility.

Mr. Kennon presented his application to the Board.

**Ms. Bohan stated that Town staff received 2 letters in support of the application presented (Exhibits 7-8).**

The Board was in favor of the application presented.

**Mr. Coish made a motion to grant final approval for the application presented. Mr. Wichmann seconded this motion. All were in favor. None opposed.**

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

**Mr. Clarke recused himself regarding the application for 2314 Myrtle Avenue (Exhibit 9).**

**2314 Myrtle Avenue:** Bryce Richey, of Clarke Design Group, requested final approval to construct a new home on this lot (following demolition of the existing home), with requests for additional principal building square footage and principal building coverage area, as well as side setback relief and principal building side façade relief (PIN# 529-06-00-066).

Mr. Drayton stated that this is the second review of a proposal for a new construction on a lot with an existing home the owners wish to demolish. Staff notes that there are many Category 1 and 2 trees on the lot that will either need to be worked around or considered for mitigation in order to facilitate the project as proposed. The application has been revised to address the 4 points of relief required to allow for the proposed design: additional principal building square footage, additional principal building coverage area, side setback relief, and principal building side facade relief. The side setback relief request for a 6-foot encroachment into an 18-foot setback on the eastern side of the property remains unchanged; the proposed encroachment is a one-story element that is set about 45 feet behind the front façade. The requests for additional square footage and coverage remain on the higher side but neither request is for the maximum relief. The request for additional lot coverage increased slightly from 209 square feet to 223 square feet, however, the extra 462 square feet of conditioned square footage requested in the original design was reduced to 409 square feet. The application now includes the requests for principal building side façade relief: on the east elevation the request is to allow a 2-foot articulation within a 34-ft 3.5-in side façade; the western façade had a need for the relief along the rear wing of the house, but that was solved with a bump out in the bathroom meeting the 4-ft articulation requirement; however, the front wing on the west side now requires relief for the 35-ft 1-in wall with minor articulations and a chimney breaking up the mass. prior to final approval. Other aspects of the plan that need to be shown prior to final approval include dimensions and materials shown on all elevations, streetscapes, and 3d renderings.

Mr. Drayton stated that staff recommended final approval of the proposed plan provided the Board finds the design, with the requests for relief, upholds the Standards for Neighborhood Compatibility.

Mr. Richey presented his application to the Board.

**No public comment was made.**

The Board was in favor of the application presented.

**Mr. Coish made a motion to grant final approval for the application presented. Mr. Wichmann seconded this motion. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously.**

**1742 Poe Avenue:** Carl McCants, of MC3 Designs, requested preliminary approval of plans for a new home on this lot (following demolition of the existing home), with requests for additional principal building square footage and principal building coverage area (PIN# 523-08-00-035).

Mr. Drayton stated that this is an initial review for a new construction on a lot with an existing home the owners wish to demolish. The existing home on the lot is located toward the rear of the lot by Poe Avenue and oriented towards Middle Street with a large front yard. The applicant is seeking to re-orient the property to align with the Sullivan's Island traditional orientation, and the typical orientation per the zoning ordinance, Section 21-30, which typically designates the "front" of a property as the beach-facing façade. The ordinance states that double-frontage lots and corner lots (both applying to this lot) are to be oriented toward the beach, unless they are replacing a principal building that was oriented differently. Since this property has a home oriented towards Middle Street (away from the beach), the Board will need to find the re-orientation of the property is a change to the design standard that achieves greater Neighborhood Compatibility. The applicant did not identify this relief request, but it will be considered by the Board prior to final approvals.

Mr. Drayton stated that in addition to the need for a re-orientation request, the applicant has identified two relief requests to present to the Board in seeking approval for the new home's design: principal building square footage and principal building coverage area increases. The request for additional square footage is 403 sf, less than the maximum request of 500 sf allowed for this property and representing a 11.4% increase from the standard. The coverage area request is minor also, representing a 4% increase; the applicant is requesting 91 additional sf of coverage. All other aspects of the design are compliant with the zoning standards. The applicant will need to add notes to the elevations indicating the openings in the foundation enclosures, the dimensions for the foundation piers, and show the additional frontyard setback line. Also, the Board needs to see the ground floor plan, streetscapes, and 3D renderings of the project before considering final approval.

Mr. Drayton stated that staff recommends preliminary approval of the proposed plan provided the Board finds the design, with the requests for relief, upholds the Standards for Neighborhood Compatibility.

Ms. Daphene Wertz, applicant representative, presented her application to the Board.

**No public comment was made.**

The Board was in favor of the application presented.

Ms. Bohan stated that one concern Mr. Drayton mention was the location of the stairs. The Board suggested that the applicant move the structure to ensure that the stairs are located in the allowable setbacks, so no relief is needed.

**Mr. Wilson made a motion to grant final approval for the application presented provided that the applicant adjust the stair location to meet the Zoning Ordinance requirements. Mr. Wichmann seconded this motion. All were in favor. None opposed.**

**VI. ADJOURN: Mr. Wichmann made a motion to adjourn at 5:35 p.m. Mr. Coish seconded this motion. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously.**

  
Beverly Bohan, Chair

  
Date

# **September 18, 2024 DRB Public Comment Submittal**

## **2608 Myrtle Ave:**

- 1. Carl Hubbard, 2530 Myrtle Ave: In favor.**
- 2. Nancy Klemm, 2614 Myrtle Ave: In favor.**
- 3. Judy Linder and Teddy and Sissy Blanchard, 2692 Jasper: In favor.**
- 4. Austin Elliot, 2514 Goldbug Ave: In favor.**
- 5. Darrell Owenby, 2614 Goldbug Ave: In favor.**
- 6. 6: Ashley Haynes, 2620 Goldbug Ave: In favor.**

**6 in favor; 0 opposed.**

## **1908 I' On Ave:**

- 1. Brandon Brooks, 1907 I' On Ave: In favor.**
- 2. Mary Regner, 1914 I' On Ave: In favor.**

**2 In favor; 0 opposed.**



Charles:

Please include this with the Loyd's package pending before the DRB. The Gilberts resided there when we moved to the Island 27 years ago, and more recently the Hawkins before selling to the Loyds. We live one house over on the corner of 26 between Myrtle and Goldbug. I had no idea the home dated back to the early 1900s. The Loyd's proposal appears to take the existing cottage back to a more historic look opening the enclosed area facing Myrtle Avenue and removing some of the attachments to the house. These appear to all be in line with preserving historic structures on the Island. I note the DRB previously gave a certificate of appropriateness for alterations and new construction back in May of 2021. So long as the proposals put forth now are in line with our current ordinances, I have no objection to the request. I leave it to the DRB and you to qualify coverage, square footage, setbacks, etc. The renderings appear to be in keeping with mass and scale and design on the Island.

Let me know if there is anything further I can offer.

Carl

**CARL B. HUBBARD**  
**2530 Myrtle Avenue**  
**Sullivan's Island, SC 29482**

**843.814.3481**

Dear Mr. Drayton,

Just wanted to contact you regarding the proposed changes to 2608 Myrtle Avenue. The Loyd family was considerate enough to provide me with the details regarding the proposed changes to their home and lot and I would like to voice my support in those changes.

The plans are very much in line with our neighborhood and Sullivan's Island and we would be very happy live next-door to such a beautiful hime. The proposed changes have been tastefully designed and also embrace the historic charm of our island.

Sincerely,  
Nancy Barker Klemm  
2614 Myrtle Avenue

Mr. Drayton,

We have reviewed the plans for the renovation of the cottage at 2608 Myrtle and the proposed new home on the property that will face Goldbug. The renovations to the cottage reflect the historic nature of the property and will be a welcome upgrade. The new construction of the new house appears to be in line with the other new homes constructed in the area and will blend in with the older Island houses.

Our family home is 2602 Jasper Boulevard which is in front of the Loyd cottage. We look forward to the completion of the renovation and construction of the new house.

Owners of 2692 Jasper Boulevard:

Judy Linder

Teddy Blanchard

Laura (Sissy) Blanchard

Sent from my iPad

Hi Charles,

My name is Austin Elliot and my wife Jenna and I live at 2514 Goldbug Ave. and have been island residents for a little over 2 years now. The reason for my email is b/c we recently have gotten to know Adam and Sydney Loyd who live down the street at 2608 Myrtle Ave. and know they're going through the design review process with you all.

First off, as admirers of Sullivan's Island for the 11 years we've lived in the Charleston area, I want to say how impressed I am at how the city leaders have preserved this town and really put its residents first. It was always a dream for my wife and I to live out here and raise our boys (Sutton - 9, Reeves - 6, both of whom go to SIES), so now that we've been fortunate enough to turn that into a reality, we've seen with our own eyes how special it truly is and how lucky we are to have a town council that takes no decisions lightly. We truly can't imagine ever moving away from Sullivan's Island and want to do whatever we can to support its preservation and thoughtful growth / development in the years to come.

To that point, we've really gravitated to finding other residents that share that same appreciation and passion for this town - while I can't say we know them well, I believe the Loyd's share a similar passion and appreciation for the island. To that point and after seeing the depth into how much they researched the island, the history of 2608 Myrtle Ave. and how they hope to make thoughtful updates, I wanted to pass along my family's support.

Thank you for your time and for your part in making Sullivan's Island a truly special place to live!

Kind regards,

--

Austin Elliot  
2514 Goldbug Ave.  
Sullivan's Island, SC 29482  
C: 503-997-1157

Exhibit 5

To All,

The Lloyd's shared their proposed changes to the existing cottage on their property with us and as neighbors we are very pleased with what they have designed. We are excited about them building their home on the property and look forward to seeing their family enjoy living on Sullivans Island as much as our family has.

Thank you!  
Darrell Owenby  
2614 Goldbug Ave.  
Sent from my iPhone

Ashley Haynes  
2720 Goldbug Ave.  
Sullivan's Island, SC

Sept. 18<sup>th</sup>, 2024

Sullivan's Island Design Review Board  
Re: 2608 Myrtle Ave. DRB Application

To the Sullivan's Island DRB:

My name is Ashley Haynes, and my family and I live at 2720 Goldbug Ave. located approximately 2 blocks from 2608 Myrtle Ave. I have reviewed the proposed plan for this property, and I am in full support of its approval. The design is very tastefully done, and its mass and scale are aligned with the other properties in the neighborhood. I also very much appreciate the retention of the historic cottage that will be restored to its original size and character, and the positioning of the cottage on the lot is also significant because it will remain one of the most featured aspects of the property from the Myrtle Ave. side. Overall, I think this is a huge improvement over what has always been on this property, and it will be a great addition to the neighborhood.

Sincerely,



Ashley Haynes  
2720 Goldbug Ave.  
Sullivan's Island

Hi Charles,

Hope all is well! I've reviewed Steve's plans for 1908 Ion, and I'm in full support. I hope that all goes smooth and everything is approved.

Brandon  
1907 Ion Ave

DearbornCharles,

Mike and I are neighbors of 1908, at 1914 Ion Avenue. Stephanie and Chandler England have recently purchased this house for their young and growing family. This is the third family to own the property since 2017.

Their desire to make improvements to their home only enhances their enjoyment of the property and makes the probability of them becoming long term residents more likely.

We approve of their project and appreciate

the town's favorable consideration.

Sincerely,

Mary Regner  
(703) 655-5147





# RECUSAL STATEMENT

Member Name: Phil Clarke

Meeting Date: September 18, 2024

Agenda Item: 4 Section: F Number: 1

Topic: 2314 Myrtle 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: \_\_\_\_\_

Member Signature

9/18/24  
Date

Signature of Official

9/18/24  
Date

