

**TOWN OF SULLIVAN'S ISLAND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
Wednesday, July 16, 2025**

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 Beverly Bohan, Heather Wilson, Phil Clarke, Sacha Rosen and Tal Askins.

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

Staff Members present: Charles Drayton, Planning and Zoning Director, Max Wurthmann, Building Official, and Christina Oxford, Building and Planning Department Assistant

Media present: No members of the media were present.

Members of the public: Mr Jason Fabrizio of 2414 Ion Ave.

**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 June 18, 2025 Meeting Minutes:** Mr. Clarke made a motion to approve the June 18, 2025 Design Review Board Meeting Minutes. Mr. Askins seconded this motion. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously.
- II. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** Jason Fabrizio of 2414 I'on Avenue commented on the process for approval of staff level amendments to COA's.
- 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:**

Mr. Clarke recused himself from the application regarding 1656 Atlantic Ave (Exhibit 2)

**1656 Atlantic Avenue:** Bryce Richey, of Clarke Design Group, requests final approval for renovations to this existing home (A Traditional Island Resource Property), with requests for additional principal building square footage and principal building coverage area (PIN# 523-12-00-050).

Mr. Drayton stated this is the second review of the renovation plans for this Traditional Island Resource property; the applicant came before the Board initially in June 2025.

Mr Drayton continued, the Board will recall that the subject property came before the Board in March 2024 to request that the property be designated as a historic resource by the Town and to approve some renovations primarily to the rear porches of the property. The Board approved both requests and the property is now designated as a Traditional Island Resource. The current request is primarily to modify the porches on the building, removing the side deck and wrapping the front porch around, removing the heated in-fill on the rear porch and replacing with a covered porch that matches the front porch. To make these renovations possible, the applicant is requesting small increases in both principal building square footage (pbSF) and coverage area (pbCA), as well as relief for a long side façade without articulation. Mr Drayton stated the pbSF and pbCA requests have not changed from last month, but the locations of the increases have been modified with more square footage going into the master bedroom and some coming out of the guest bathroom, maintaining last month's requests; pbSF 39 sf or a 1% increase and pbCA 82 sf, also a 1% request. The proposed design will also require side façade relief to allow a façade that has a linear length greater than 38 feet without an articulation; the proposed distance between the front porch and the rear of the house on the western façade is 45 ft 9 in, which represents a 20% increase. The encroachment into the side setback on the western elevation is an existing condition and, since the property is historic, this is a conforming setback.

Mr. Drayton stated, last month the Board expressed general appreciation for the renovation designs; they had only a couple of requests of the applicant. The Board asked that the applicant study the long side façade without an articulation and make changes to be more conforming. The Board also asked that the applicant take time to document and provide information to the Board on all of the windows. The applicant has responded with a revised floor plan that flips the sides for the master and guest suites; this change did not affect the length of the side façade without articulation, but it did account for a change in the fenestration pattern on that side, adding a fourth window. The changes also increased the square footage and coverage area requests because a small portion of the proposed rear porch is now proposed to be part of the master bedroom. The new application does not address the Board's request for more information about the windows.

Mr. Drayton stated the staff recommends granting final approval for the renovation plans if the Board finds the applicant has satisfied the Board's requests and that the plans uphold the

policies of the Sullivan's Island Design Review Guidelines (SIDRG) and maintain the SIS Standards for renovating historic properties.

Mr. Richey presented his application to the Board.

**No public comment was made.**

The Board liked the design changes that were made. The Board suggested that an HVAC stand would help break up the mass.

**Ms. Wilson moved to approve the application as presented for final approval. Mr. Askins seconded the motion. All were in favor. None opposed. The motion passed unanimously.**

**2415 Middle Street:** Anita King, of Sea Island Builders, requests final approval for a change of design to the previously approved renovation plans for this Traditional Island Resource Property (529-10-00-012).

Mr Drayton stated this is an initial review of a modification to previously approved renovation plans for this Traditional Island Resource historic property (2007 survey card)(new historic survey card). The original plans and historic designation for the property were approved by the DRB at the meeting in July 2023; since that approval, they have come back to the Board in July 2024 to modify the approved plans by changing some of the fenestrations, relocating the building, removing the church spire homage, and reducing the rear 2-story element to a single story. Additionally, since that time staff has authorized 2 minor modifications to the approved plans: 1) the window change on the western elevation that was approved in 2024 was returned to the originally approved triple window from July 2023, and 2) the 2 smaller windows on the rear façade were enlarged to match the other 4 windows on that façade by dropping the sills by 12 inches.

Mr. Drayton stated, for those unfamiliar with this property, it is a unique property on the Island: the building was once a church which had been converted into a 2-unit home; it is on one of the smallest parcels on the island (± 3416 sf); and the building on the property sat across the parcel lines on one side. The approved renovation plans will turn the former church into a RS-District compliant single-family home.

Mr. Drayton continued, records indicate that the church was constructed in 1920 as the Union Congregational Church. The 2007 historic resources survey identified the property as "Altered" stating there had been a loss in the historic integrity of the building through its conversion into a dwelling and the loss of all original windows and doors. The applicant's goal remains to restore the building into a functional home and reconstruct the public-facing facades to pay homage to the previous use and form of the church. The new plans before the Board are requesting to add a triple skylight on either side of the roof to allow additional light into the building.

Mr. Drayton stated staff recommends granting final approval for the renovation if the Board finds that the plan modification maintains the Standards for Neighborhood Compatibility, and adheres to the SIS Guidelines.

Ms. King presented her application to the Board.

Ms. Bohan stated the Town staff received one letter of correspondence from the public regarding this application (Exhibit 5)

**Public Comment:**

Mr Jason Fabrizio of 2414 I'on Avenue questioned the difference between approving skylights and other windows that had been approved at the Staff level that are more impactful. He expressed concern that the Staff had overstepped its bounds by approving additional windows and additional sizes of windows. He asked that the changes be corrected back to what had been previously approved by the Board. He asked that no additional changes be made until it is figured out what is being built and that what has been approved by the Board is what is being built.

The Board questioned why a two-story rear addition was previously approved and now the plans are for a one-story rear addition. Mr. Drayton stated that in 2023, the Board approved a two-story rear addition with triple windows on the side of the building. The applicant came back in 2024 with plans for a one-story rear addition and a two-window pattern on the side of the building. At permitting, Staff allowed them to go back to the triple window pattern of a previously DRB approved design. Staff also approved the enlargement of two windows on the rear, dropping the sill by 12 inches to make them match the other four windows on the rear. Staff felt this was a small move that did not need DRB approval. The Board expressed that the skylights are lower profile but as a historical resource, they are not compatible and do not match the historical character of the Island. The Board expressed that the change should have been presented earlier in the process. The small size of the lot and small setbacks make the changes more impactful on the neighbors where there are other properties that are larger and aren't as visible where they could be more lenient.

**Ms Wilson made a motion to deny the request as submitted Mr. Clarke seconded the motion. All were opposed. None were in favor. The motion was denied.**

**1908 I'On Avenue:** Batton Kennon, of Herlong Architects, requests final approval to renovate the non-historic main dwelling on this Traditional Island Resource property with the Special Exception, historic dwelling unit, with requests for additional principal building coverage area and principal building square footage (PIN# 529-09-00-008).

Mr. Drayton stated this is the initial review of an addition to a renovation project the Board approved in September 2024. This property contains a Traditional Island Resource historic cottage (Historic Survey Card) (new card), and the property has been through the special exception process to build a new main house on the property. The new home was completed in 2016 and was the subject of the 2024 renovation plans that in-filled porches and attic space of the new home. The application is now seeking to in-fill another section of porch to create a “sleeping porch” on the right corner of the front porch facing Middle Street. The request would increase the 17% of additional principal building square footage that the Board granted in 2024 to a 19% increase; this represents an additional 81 sf of conditioned space on the lot. There is also a request to allow the principal building coverage area to increase by 6% or 189 sf above the standard. Staff believes the coverage area increase reflects the size of the proposed porch enclosure, and the smaller increase in square footage means that the scope of the attic infill, approved last November, has been reduced by the 108-sf difference. The applicant needs to supply dimensions on the drawings to corroborate the staff’s supposition. There are no modifications proposed to the historic cottage, and there are no other changes or modifications requested.

Mr. Drayton stated the staff recommends the Board grant final approval provided that the applicant satisfactorily explains the requests and the Board finds the applicant’s design remains in line with the Standards for Neighborhood Compatibility.

Mr. Kennon presented his application to the Board.

**No public comment was made.**

The Board appreciated the changes that had been made to the design. They asked that the bottom shutters on the sleeping porch be made to match the upper shutters if they are replaced.

**Mr. Clarke made a motion for approval for final as presented with one note that if the shutters are replaced, to align them vertically. Mr. Askins seconded the motion. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously with notes.**

**1914 Central Avenue:** Amber Aument, of Aument Design Studio, requests a conceptual review of the plans for the new construction on the Historic ADU Special Exception request for this Traditional Island Resource property, with requests for additional principal building coverage area and principal building square footage (PIN# 529-05-00-059).

Mr. Drayton stated this is the Board’s second look at this Historic ADU Special Exception project; the Board granted conceptual approval for the historic cottage renovations at the meeting in March 2025, and in June 2025, the BZA granted the special exception that allows for the renovated historic cottage to become an accessory dwelling unit on the property with a new main house allowed to be constructed on the lot. The applicant now returns to the Board

requesting a conceptual review of the plans for the new house on the Traditional Island Resource property (as designated by the Board in March 2025). The applicant's design requests relief from the Board for additional principal building square footage and additional principal building coverage area; the application also notes that the historic ADU is an accessory structure that's existing location is in the front setback and that per the plans, it will remain in that location, 23-ft, 8-in from the front property line. Staff also notes that this is a historically designated structure, so its location sets the setback for the property as conforming.

Mr. Drayton stated the proposed site plan adheres to the conditions of the special exception, and the new home's massing does not seem to overwhelm the historic cottage; the design is primarily for a raised one-story house with a small second story of 588 sf in the back left corner. A courtyard with a pool is proposed as separation between the two units, with the distance between the structures set at 43 feet. The tree removals that have been proposed to accommodate the design have been approved by Tree Commission but have not yet been requested for permitting.

Mr. Drayton continued, when reviewing the front façade of the proposed new main house, staff spoke to the applicant about the proposed seating portals, enclaved in the ground level of the façade. The design does not comply with the standards set forth in Section 21-32 of the Zoning Ordinance, Foundation Enclosure. The standards state that the solid foundations are only allowed for foundations of 3 feet or less and that solid walls are only permitted for up to 4-foot support runs and should be separated by 8 feet of open enclosure (slats, lattice, open, etc.). The Board does not usually receive requests for modifications to this section of the ordinance, but they have the authority to make changes so long as the NFIP regulations are maintained, and per our Floodplain manager, as long as the portal walls are constructed in a breakaway manner they can be approved by the DRB. Typically, staff does not support relief for modifications to the Foundation enclosure section, but the design here is unique and deserves consideration.

Mr. Drayton stated staff recommends preliminary approval of the new main house on this ADU Special Exception property, if the Board finds that the relief sought, including to the foundation enclosures, is justified by the design, upholding the Standards for Neighborhood Compatibility and following the guidance in the SIS Guidelines and the SIDRG.

Ms. Aument presented her application to the Board.

**No Public Comment was made.**

The Board appreciated the approach and overall concept of the design and the respect it shows to the Island's character. The Board advised that the detailing shown in the new construction building like the post caps may not be appropriate for the historic cottage. The Board liked the idea of trying to activate the ground floor which has precedent on the Island. There was concern about enclosing areas of the ground floor with alcoves and still adhering to the flood restrictions. Mr. Wurthmann stated that all space below flood level can only be enclosed by

open lattice, except for 200 square feet. The alcoves enclose 52 square feet on each side which would count towards the 200 square feet of enclosure but the rest of the space underneath the house is only enclosed with open lattice. There was a question about the shutters on one side of the casement windows on the side elevation. The Board suggested that the shutters be changed to a double hung or European tilt turn shutter or eliminate the shutters altogether. The Board commented that the foundation seemed thin with large openings and 16-inch piers. The Board thought doubling the piers might help keep the design from looking top heavy.

**Ms. Wilson made a motion to approve for preliminary approval as presented with suggestions to be taken into consideration. Mr. Clarke seconded the motion. All approved. None opposed. The motion passed unanimously with notes.**

**2256 I'On Avenue: Joseph Fitzpatrick, of Leave It to Nick, requests final approval for minor exterior changes to this Traditional Island Resource Property (PIN# 529-10-00-00-002).**

Mr. Drayton stated this is an initial review of a request to make some minor changes associated with a historic rehabilitation project for this Traditional Island Resource property (new card). The applicant has applied for a repair permit for the property and staff deemed portions of the repair scope to require DRB approval;

1. Siding replacement for 6 boards,
2. Windowsill replacement in 3 fenestrations,
3. Front doors to replace hinges and clear silicone coating over the glass, and
4. Replace lattice surrounding ground floor with louvred panels.

None of the proposed repairs or modifications are major, but their cumulative effect could impact the historic fabric of the home. The home was built in either 1895 or 1930, and the historic resource cards mention the front door, siding and windows as likely historic features of the structure. Staff is generally supportive of the proposed repair work and requests that the applicant provide clarity on the proposed material replacements.

Mr Drayton stated staff recommends final approval if the Board finds that the proposed rehabilitation treatments follow the SIS and SIDRG Guidelines.

Mr. Fitzpatrick presented his application to the Board.

**No public comment was made.**

The Board had questions about the type of louvres being installed and noted that the lattice is a consistent historical feature but because half of it had already been replaced with louvres, the application was supported.

**Ms. Wilson made a motion to approve the application for final approval taking the presented picture into account that the louvers are 1" by 4" vertical with appropriate space. Mr. Clarke seconded the motion. All approved. None opposed. The motion passed unanimously.**

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

Mr. Clarke recused himself from the application regarding 3104 I'on Ave (Exhibit 3)

**3104 I'On Avenue:** Keleri Chastain, of Clarke Design Group, requests preliminary approval for a new house construction, following the zoning guidelines in place when the project received preliminary approval in June 2023, with requests for additional principal building square footage and principal building coverage area, and relief for side setbacks, secondary side setbacks, and the principal building front facade (PIN# 529-12-00-033).

Mr. Drayton stated this is a request for preliminary approval to construct a new single-family home on a corner lot; this is the applicant's 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting with the Board for this project. The applicant was last before the Board in July 2023, when the project received a conceptual approval from the Board; the applicant is utilizing that conceptual approval along with the Governor's Joint Resolution on Development Rights (H3209) to request the continued review of this project under the regulations that were in place at the time the conceptual approval was granted. Staff confirms that the Board's conceptual approval meets the Resolution's definition of "Development approval" and that the July 2023 date of that approval is within the window of time (January 1, 2020 to December 31, 2023) for which the joint resolution applies.

Mr. Drayton stated some of the applicant's requests have been modified from the previous iteration and some have been maintained. The applicant is seeking relief for side setbacks and second story side façade setbacks, as well as additional principal building square footage and principal building coverage area, as before with some changes in the values requested and has an added request for principal building front façade relief. The Board may recall that the large cluster of oaks located front and center in the buildable area of the lot was a driving force in the design and relief requests. The request for additional principal building square footage has been reduced from 749 sf to 694 sf; this brings the request to 19.2%, which is still higher than today's allowance of 15% not to exceed 500sf. The principal building coverage area request remains unchanged at 8.6% or 223 additional sf of coverage. The application is showing a change in the side setback relief request, but it appears that the architect sharpened her pencil and found that the cantilevered balcony would be 21-ft 10.75-in from the Station 31 right of way, as opposed to 22ft proposed in July 2023; the other side setback dimension remained the same (10 ft 9.75 in). Therefore, the request is actually for a 32.7-ft combined side setback, which is an 18.2% reduction or 7.3 ft. The second story side façade setback request remained the same to allow a 19-ft10-in second story wall, where the ordinance does not allow wall lengths greater than 10 ft. Per ordinance definition the primary front façade of the proposed home is the largest front facing surface of the building, and the



- largest front facing surface is 34 feet long with a 10-foot-deep porch covering 29 feet of that surface; therefore, the design meets the ordinance standard, and no relief is required.

Mr. Drayton added at the July 2023 meeting when the Board granted conceptual approval, they had several conditional comments for the applicant. The Board requested a study of the trees, reducing the foundation concrete, studying the height, scale, and massing along Station 31, and for a full streetscape analysis. There were other comments related to moving the larger massing interior and pulling the cottage massing to the street frontage, lowering the ceiling heights along Station 31, and breaking up the foundations more to soften the structures.

Mr. Drayton stated the staff recommends preliminary approval should the Board find that the comments have been addressed and the updates made to the design will maintain the Standards for Neighborhood Compatibility.

Mr. Richey presented his application to the Board.

**No public comment was made.**

The Board was concerned with the height of the left side of the design as compared to the cottage on the right side. The Board would like to see the left side ridge height lowered and suggested the first floor height could be lowered from 11 feet to 10 feet. There was also concern that the pitch of the roof on the left-hand building was too low. It was discussed that the overall height could be reduced by reducing the height of the slip.

There was also concern that the tree canopy has grown and that an oak on the back left corner that would need permission from the Tree Commission to be removed or the design would have to be adjusted to accommodate the tree.

**Ms. Wilson moved for final approval with the condition that the overall height be reduced between 8 and 12 inches taken out between grade and eaves. Mr. Askins seconded the motion. All approved. None opposed. The motion was approved for final approval with conditions.**

Mr. Clarke recused himself from the application regarding 3019 Jasper Blvd (Exhibit 4)

**3019 Jasper Boulevard:** Rose Harrington, of Clarke Design Group, requests a conceptual review for a new home construction following the removal of the existing home on this lot, with requests for side setback relief, additional principal building square footage and principal building coverage area, (PIN# 529-08-00-011).

Mr. Drayton stated this is the initial review of a request to build a new home on this lot following the demolition of the existing home there. The applicant has applied for a conceptual review and has requests Principal building square footage and coverage area increase and a request for side setback relief. The applicants' requests were not articulated in the application, nor

were any reasons given for the requests, and a survey was not included in the plans. However, the site plan indicates the lot area is 13,023 sf which complies with the staff estimate based on GIS. Therefore, the pbSF request for a 3681-sf house is near the maximum allowable for this lot; the standard home size for this lot would be 3202 sf, and the applicant is requesting an additional 479 sf (15%); this is 1 sf less than the maximum ask of 480 sf or 15%. The pbCA request is to exceed the standard 1953 sf of coverage by 518 sf for 2471-sf of principal building coverage area. This represents an increase of 26.5%, which is beyond the Board's authority to grant relief; the maximum amount of relief the Board could offer is 20% or 391 sf. The setback relief is requested along the eastern façade of the property, where a 22-ft wall length is located 2 feet within the required 25-ft setback; since the other wall length of that façade is also 22 ft long, the average setback on that façade is 24 ft, so the request should be for a one-foot reduction in that side setback. A foot reduction represents a 2.5% decrease in the setback. This is a conceptual review, so the applicant can provide the fully dimensioned plans, notations for construction materials and engineering details, streetscapes, 3D renderings, and any other requests from the Board at a future review of this project. Staff notes that the ridge height as shown on sheet A201 is drawn from final grade, and the requirement is for the ridge height to be pulled from natural grade, so the applicant should reach out to the Building Official to get an official natural grade to base the building height upon.

Mr. Drayton stated staff recommends for the Board to provide feedback on the design and relief requests to help the applicant's request maintain the Standards for Neighborhood Compatibility.

Mr. Richey presented his application to the Board.

**No public comment was made.**

The Board appreciated the clean design of the home but thought that it didn't warrant the extra square footage. There was concern that there is a large knee wall with no fenestration. It was also noted that it is unusual to have the shoulders of the chimney above the ridgeline.

**VII. ADJOURN: Mr. Clarke made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:07 p.m. Mr Wichmann seconded the motion. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bunky Wichmann, Board Member                      Date