

**TOWN OF SULLIVAN'S ISLAND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
Wednesday, November 19, 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, Bunky Wichmann, Phil Clarke, Heather Wilson, Sacha Rosen, 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 Christina Oxford, Building and Planning Department Assistant

Media present: No members of the media were present.

Members of the public: Ms. Robie Scott of 1450 Middle St

**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 OCTOBER 15, 2025 MEETING MINUTES:** Mr. Wichmann made a motion to approve the October 15, 2025 Design Review Board Meeting Minutes. Mr. Coish seconded this motion. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously.
- II. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** No public comment was made.
- 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:**

**1808 Ion Ave:** Eddie Fava, of ee fava architects, etc. inc., requests final approval to designate this property as a Sullivan's Island Landmark Property (529-09-00-002). (Supporting Documents)

Mr. Drayton stated the home first appears on a US Census map dating from 1917; at that time there was only one wing on the structure, with the nearly symmetrical west wing appearing in photos from as early as 1957. Staff documents related to this property do not provide much evidence of its history, but the property card from the original historic survey in 1987 estimated the house to date from around 1870; despite the information in the survey, the property was left off the historic designation list when the Town created its historic overlay district in 2004. However, staff has found references from 2007 and 2014, wherein the Zoning Administrator issued guidance to applicants that the structure was a Sullivan's Island Landmark property. Staff firmly believes this is a historic property and is happy that the applicant is willing to go through the process to formally place the property under the protections of the Historic Preservation Overlay District.

Mr. Drayton continued, the applicant has provided several map documents that place the house on the property at a time that gives it historic significance; they have also detailed the historic aspects of the house to help highlight what features are most significant to preserve. In designating a property as historic and protected under the Historic Preservation Overlay District, the Board must find that the property meets at least one of the criteria, below, for designating an historic property

**21-94 Criteria for Designating an Historic Property.**

D. In determining whether a property should be designated an historic property, it should be considered whether the property:

- 1) Has significant inherent character, interest, or value as part of the development or heritage of the Town, state, or nation;
- 2) Is the site of an event significant in history;
- 3) Is associated with a person or persons who contributed significantly to the culture and development of the Town, state, or nation;
- 4) Exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, ethnic, or historic heritage of the Town, state, or nation;
- 5) Individually, or as a collection of resources, embodies distinguishing characteristics of a type, style, period, or specimen in architecture or engineering;
- 6) Contains elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship which represent a significant innovation;
- 7) Represents an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood or the Town; or
- 8) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in pre-history or history.

Mr. Drayton stated staff recommends consideration of final approval for the historical designation (Section 21-94) of 1808 I'On Avenue as a Sullivan's Island Landmark Property, Historic Resource, based on historic designation criteria #1, # 4, #5, & #7.

Mr. Eddie Fava and Mr. Joel Tratham presented the application to the Board.

**No public comment was made.**

The Board questioned if a property is deemed historic, how much of the fabric of the property is historic? All of it or parts of it? Is there a way to deem a part of it historic? Mr. Drayton stated the Board can determine what portions of a property are the most historic features. The Board agreed this should be a protected property.

**Mr. Wichmann made a motion to approve for historical designation based on #1, 5,6,7 and potentially 8. Mr. Coish seconded the motion. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously**

The Board questioned which designation should be granted, the Traditional Island Resource or a Landmark Property designation. Mr. Drayton stated a designation does not freeze a property, a homeowner can request changes to a historic element that are deteriorated. The iconic shape in totality rather than the age made this property more suited to be a Landmark Property. Mr. Drayton stated neither category has any differentiation as far as regulation is concerned.

**Ms. Wilson moved to further deem this a historic Landmark Property. Mr Wichmann seconded the motion. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously.**

**2. 1808 I'On Avenue:** Eddie Fava, of ee fava architects, etc. inc., requests a conceptual review for a renovation and addition to this proposed Sullivan's Island Landmark Property, with a request for principal building side façade relief (529-09-00-002).

Mr. Drayton stated this is the second review of a request to build a modest addition onto the rear of this home which has just been updated from an altered resource to a Sullivan's Island Landmark Property in the Town's historic registry. Recent permits have been issued to place the home on a new set of foundation piers and to repair and/or replace rotten siding and columns on this home that was estimated to have been built in 1870. As was discussed during the historic designation, there are several different sidings on the property, ranging from potentially original to recent additions, and the rotten front porch columns were old but not original. Both of these permits were reviewed by staff as though the property already had a historic designation, so there are photos of all of the damaged portions of the historic resource, and the applicant has provided details on the profiles of the siding, where it will be replaced, and has stated that there was a stockpile of siding found under the house that will be used for replacement first, before any new materials are feathered in on the less visible frontages.

Mr. Drayton stated for this review the owners have hired a new architecture firm to handle the proposed addition work, which explains why they are requesting another conceptual review. The new concept follows the basic idea that was proposed at the previous meeting in August 2025 and incorporates solutions to the concerns expressed by the Board during that meeting. The Board expressed the following concerns:

- 1) The need to reach out to the neighbors: the applicant has reached out to the neighboring property owners.
- 2) The addition needs to be broken apart and not feathered into the existing design so that it expresses as a separate addition and is reasonably constructable: the applicant has proposed a hyphen connection from the existing structure into the new addition.
- 3) The porch railing was discussed as being inappropriately located along the rear of the home and suggested a step down to a terrace in lieu of the deck: The new plans still propose a deck that is elevated to match the FFE, but it appears more integrated with the home than the previous iteration; it is located centrally across the rear mass, not tucked to the west side; the uniformity of the cross balustrade pattern across the center rear facade looks more balanced and to be a more appropriate finish along the rear.

Mr. Drayton continued, with the designation of the property as a historic resource, the existing building now creates the conforming setbacks for the lot; with that in place, the proposed addition can now extend along the existing setback for longer than the 50% of the linear distance of the encroaching element which was a limiting factor in the previous design that had been overlooked by the applicant. The newly minted historic property is located within and may be considered a contributing element in both the Sullivan's Island National Register and Local Historic Districts.

Mr. Drayton stated the staff recommends preliminary approval if the Board finds the new direction addresses the concerns expressed at the previous meeting and the design adheres to the SIDRG and SIS Standards as well as maintaining the Standards for Neighborhood Compatibility.

Mr. Fava presented the application to the Board.

**No public comment was made.**

Ms. Bohan stated the Town staff received three letters of correspondence from the public in favor of this application. (Exhibits 1,2,3)

The Board had questions about how the change in window design would affect the new historic designation of the home. Mr. Drayton stated no historic windows are proposed to be changed. The Board discussed that this is a historical landmark that has the original fabric plus several additions that are more than 50 years old that includes the overall shape, symmetrical form, the west addition and the hyphens. There are some changes to the fabric like the hyphens but the aspect of the hyphens and overall form are a part of the historic

character and that changes should be allowed to that because they improve the design and don't negatively impact the historic factors. The proposed design of the west wing is consistent with the historic character and is compatible. The hyphen and hip roof design separates it from the historic fabric. The back porch is consistent with the historic fabric. It was recommended that they reduce the width of the closet to have a compliant design. There was disagreement about the width of the back porch. One board member thought the stairs could be brought in to line up with the outer planks of the gable. Other Board members appreciated the current placement of the stairs that line up with the hyphen because it highlights the two gables. There was also appreciation for the nod to the previously screened hyphen with the larger glass.

**Mr. Clarke made a motion for final approval as submitted. Ms. Wilson seconded the motion. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously.**

**1454 Middle Street:** Anthony J. Cissell, of Cissell Design Studio, requests final approval of new plans, replacing a previous DRB-approval, to renovate and adapt the former Fort Moultrie Post Theatre building, a Sullivan's Island Landmark property, into a single-family home, with a request for accessory structure setback relief (523-07-00-043).

Mr. Drayton stated this is the third review of the new plans for an adaptive reuse renovation of this historic resource, modifying the old Fort Moultrie Post Movie Theater into a single-family residence; there are approved renovation plans for this structure, that the Board blessed in July 2022. Following that approval, the ownership has changed, and the new efforts began last year to revise the approved plans, meeting with the DRB on 3 occasions in 2024, but not receiving approval for the updated plans. In 2025 the ownership transitioned to a new design team and reconsidered the adaptive reuse project through a new lens. The Board conducted a conceptual review of the new plans in April and felt the design warranted preliminary approval. The plans received their second review in September 2025; in that meeting the Board upheld several concerns and reaffirmed preliminary approval, asking the applicant to return after rethinking a few design choices.

Mr. Drayton stated the Post Theater is one of the more outstanding historic buildings on the island; it is of few buildings on the Island today that were constructed out of brick by the military, and because of its unique purpose, it is one of the larger structures on the Island. It is protected by the Town as a designated Sullivans's Island Landmark property ([Historic Survey Card # 259](#), [New Survey Card](#)) and is a contributing feature within the Fort Moultrie Quartermaster and Support Facilities National Register Historic District.

Mr. Drayton stated at the September meeting the Board dug in on previous concerns about the windows and privacy; they did not like the switch from steel, industrial style windows to the aluminum-clad, Pella windows, with the distinction between the historic and new windows to be expressed primarily in the setting depths within the wall. They were also concerned about the stacking of operable windows within the large window openings. Concerns also remained

surrounding privacy concerns raised by the neighbor over the size of the windows. In response, the applicant has:

- 1) Eliminated the structural mullions on the windows and increased the density of the muntin grid per board comment. This made all of the windows across the board slightly smaller.
- 2) Eliminated stacking of operable window units and fixed window units at the Living Room windows per board comment. These are single fixed units now.
- 3) Eliminated the stacking of operable window units and fixed transom units at other windows.
- 4) Brought all the windowsills up to 24" sill height per board comment. This had the effect of reducing the Living Room windows approximately another 18" in height/area.

The other 2 areas of concern from the Board related to the rear screen porch and to the ancillary, historic front doors. The Board had expressed some concern over the delicate design of the screen porch addition, finding it to be too delicate or the utilitarian building and finding the multiple roof lines were making the façade look busy. To address these concerns the applicant has married the screen porch roof with the historic boiler room feature on the rear façade and abandoning the 4" metal columns in favor of 6" wood columns supporting hip style roof instead of the previous shed roof over the screen porch. The former exit doors on the front façade were proposed to be restored fixed in place with the elevated floor system visible in the historically accurate 12-paned glass doors; this visual concerned the Board. As a response the applicant is seeking to replace the doors with 8-over 8 windows with wood paneling below to hide the floor system within the building.

Mr. Drayton stated the site plan remains the same, thus the relief request to the Board remains. The applicant is seeking relief from the Board for the 2 accessory structures in the rear to be located within the accessory structure setback, at 6 feet off the side property line on each side at the rear of the property. On the right hand side (from the front, the pool house is proposed in the setback, and on the left, the garage meets the setback requirement, but the golf cart awning would require relief as it overhangs the setback area.

Mr. Drayton stated the staff recommends final approval should the Board find that the plans will maintain the Secretary of the Interior Standards and the TOSI Design Review Guidelines.

Mr. Cissell presented his application to the Board.

Ms. Robie Scott of 1450 Middle St spoke in opposition to the application.

The Board asked if there is a regulation that would require the applicant to get the approval from the neighbor with regards to the fence design. Mr. Drayton stated there is no clear regulation that would require neighbor approval. It must meet the Town's regulation. The Board also confirmed the runoff from the building is addressed in the engineered plan for drainage and downspouts. The design will include gutters and downspouts and meet all of the city and state stormwater regulations. It is currently sheet draining into the neighbor's yard.

There was a question about the type of windows that will be used and the mull condition in the larger windows and how much meet there will be. There was concern about what will cover the structural mull. There was concern that the second floor walkway will align with the second floor structure so that the mullion will be above the floor and you would look through the glass and see the side of the walkway structure. The Board asked if it would make sense to lower the major horizontal of the major windows to align with the walkway which would lead to better proportioning of the side windows and use the walk way structure to stabilize the window which would give the flexibility to create the horizontal and vertical mullions in a way that gives more control and ability to work with more standardized products. The Board expressed that the window design now feels scattered and that there was more intention and rhythm in the original design. There was concern about the window details including mulling details on the larger windows. There was a question about the roof, and it was suggested that the roof be hand crimped with the pitches in the back. There was concern with the arch of the windows and the garage doors. There is a soft arch on the garage doors but full radius arch on the porch and front. The Board wanted more information regarding the structure and detail of the front door. The Board asked if they could meet with the neighbor to come up with some plans for the fence.

**Ms. Wilson made a motion to defer for further study of windows to include details of the windows and the structural members and building sections. Mr. Wichmann seconded the motion.**

**Ms. Wilson amended the motion to defer for further study of sections and details through all fenestrations and doors including the front assembly as well as garage. Mr. Wichman seconded the motion. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously.**

**1735 Atlantic Avenue:** Anthony J. Cissell, of Cissell Design Studio, requests a conceptual review of plans to renovate and adapt the former Fort Moultrie Officer's Club and later, Sand Dunes Club, a Sullivan's Island Landmark property, into a single-family home (523-12-00-020).

Mr. Drayton stated this is the initial review and introduction to a conceptual plan for the adaptive reuse renovation of the former Fort Moultrie Officer's Club into a single-family home. This is probably the best known building on the Island, after Fort Moultrie, itself, and the Stella Maris Catholic Church; it was built as a beach club for the officers stationed at Fort Moultrie, and it was later purchased by SCE&G and the use continued as an employee club and event space, hosting weddings and the like. During the SCE&G era, it also became a community amenity, with the pool being opened up to residents of the Island during the summer months. At the onset of the Pandemic SCE&G shuttered the club and sold the property to a private entity, which unsuccessfully attempted to revitalize the club use of the property; in November 2023, the BZA voted to deny an appeal to extend the nonconforming use, and upheld the requirement that the property be utilized as intended by the RS, Single-Family Residential, Zoning District in which the property is located. Following that ruling the applicant has proceeded to develop the 4 outparcels surrounding the former club with single-family homes

and is now seeking to breathe life back into the historic club building and restore it to become the largest home on the Island.

Mr. Drayton continued that the building is protected by the Town as a Sullivan's Island Landmark property, New Survey Card, and it is an eligible resource for National Register of Historic Places recognition. It is located outside of the Town's historic districts, but it was vitally connected to Officer's Row, which is within the Sullivan's Island Local and National Register Historic Districts. When the building was first opened by the military in 1933, it was known as Jasper Hall, and the applicant intends to bring back that historic name to this iconic structure.

Mr. Drayton stated the proposed plans do not require any relief from the Board; however, the Board should be aware that the building does not conform to the residential standards in the code of ordinances. It is larger than the RS District would allow and does not meet the setback or façade requirements in the ordinance. However, these are historic nonconformities and may be maintained during the renovation process. The applicant does propose to reduce the existing nonconforming impervious coverage on the roughly 2-acre lot by almost 50%, bringing the coverage down from 56%, to a conforming 28%. The applicant also seeks to remove the nonconforming principal building square footage located below base flood elevation and build that square footage back into the rear roof line using dormers as a small second story overlooking the pool and the rear of the property. The front façade would be reenvisioned to mimic the original porte cochere with an embellished Palladian style entry portico. The biggest change proposed is along the rear, or beachfront façade, which was originally a 1.5-story high, tall-windowed façade with an open porch that stepped down to the beach. The applicant is seeking to reconstitute those features but add a second story to the porch and tuck a widows walk into the roof above. In addition to the renovations of the historic building, the applicant is proposing to add 3 accessory structures to the property, a garage, a pool pavilion, and a workshop pavilion.

Mr. Drayton stated staff recommends for the Board to provide feedback on the design and help guide the applicant, so the design follows the guidelines provided by the Town and the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Cissell presented the application to the Board.

**No public comment was made.**

Ms. Bohan stated the Town staff received three letters of correspondence from the public in favor of this application. (Exhibits 4,5,6)

The Board thanked Mr. Cissell for the research on the building. There was a question about the overall size of the structure and adding to the massive footprint with the additional structures. There was also a question about making the pool building structure that is concrete block that



is not historic. There was also a question about keeping the roofs on the porches while keeping the pool building or removing the roof to be more historic. The Board also had questions about the grading and whether the brick water table would keep the water out in a meaningful way when there is not much historic precedent for using the brick. The Board also thought that the design should be grand but there is a struggle because some of the original structure was plain because it was part of a military base and thought should be given to the level of detailing. It was suggested that examining the original structure and the precedence of the officer's quarters and how they exist today and have evolved. The Board suggested the back side of the house gives an opportunity to do some interesting things that are appropriate for a single family home on Sullivan's Island as long as it is not visible from the front. There were concerns about the materials being used for the roof. There was a question about the detail of the portico and the scale of the front façade and perhaps the portico could be expanded or less detail could be presented. The Board suggested leaving the front of the building alone and creating stairs on the side. The Board appreciated the presentation of the building.

## **VI. NON-HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEWS**

**2820 Jasper Boulevard:** Steven D'Amato, of Remark landscape architecture, requests final approval to relocate a pool on the property and do a renovation/addition to the rear porch area of this existing home, with requests for side setback relief, second story side setback relief. And additional principal building coverage area (PIN# 529-07-00-027).

Mr Drayton stated this is the initial review of a request to redesign the rear façade of this existing home and to replace the front yard pool with a new pool in the rear yard. The application is actually only seeking side setback relief, although the way it was filled out confused staff; there is no proposed change to the principal building coverage area, which is below the maximum allowable. The existing home extends into the side setbacks on both sides of the house, and the proposed addition work and the new pool would be located within those existing nonconforming setbacks of the house. The ordinance (Section 21-151 B. (2)) does allow for the 50% expansion of an existing structure along the existing encroachment line; however, the deck expansion along the eastern façade exceeds 50% of the distance of the encroaching side façade of the house, and similarly the pool exceeds 50% of the length of the western façade of the house; additionally the pool represents a different structure, so the language of the ordinance would not apply. Based on these facts the applicant is seeking to officially reduce the side setbacks on both sides of the house to allow for the permitting of the deck expansion and the new location of the pool. The request is broken into separate requests for setback relief on the western facade and the eastern façade, but the requests are beyond the 25% relief that the Board may grant for reducing setbacks. As written, the request on the eastern façade is for a 19% reduction in the 20-foot setback to create a 16-foot, 2-inch side setback, and the western façade request is for a 49% reduction in the 20-foot setback to create a 10-foot, 3-inch side setback. Essentially, the request is to reduce the combined 40-foot setback to 26 feet, 5 inches, which represents a 34% reduction, and 25% is the maximum allowable.

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

Mr. D'Amato presented the application to the Board.

**No public comment was made.**

The Board supports moving the pool from the front yard to the rear of the home and expressed support for the direction of the project but recommended that designs be drawn that fall within the parameters of what can be approved. It was recommended that they reduce the deck and stairs so the pool can be approved. It was also suggested that the deck could be drawn to be perpendicular rather than linear. The Board requested more information in terms of house plans, drawings, and elevations. The Board agreed there is not enough information for final review and gave feedback for a conceptual review.

**VII. ADJOURN: Mr. Wichmann made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:03 p.m. Ms. Wildon seconded the motion. All were in favor. None opposed. Motion passed unanimously.**

 12/17/2025

---

Beverly Bohan, Chair

Date