

SULLIVAN'S ISLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

HEARING BEFORE: DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
DATE: JULY 17, 2013  
TIME: 6:00 PM  
LOCATION: Town of Sullivan's Island Town Hall  
2050-B Middle Street  
Sullivan's Island, SC  
REPORTED BY: MARIA D. DEMPSEY, Registered  
Professional Reporter

---

A. WILLIAM ROBERTS, JR., & ASSOCIATES  
Fast, Accurate & Friendly

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

1 APPEARANCES:

2 STEVE HERLONG, CHAIRPERSON

3 MARK HOWARD, BOARD MEMBER

4 RHONDA SANDERS, BOARD MEMBER

5 JON LANCTO, BOARD MEMBER

6 RANDY ROBINSON, CHIEF BUILDING OFFICIAL

7 JOE HENDERSON, ZONING ADMINISTRATOR

8 KAT KENYON, CLERK/PERMIT TECH

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. HERLONG: Okay. This is the  
2 July 17th, 2013 meeting of the Sullivan's Island  
3 Design Review Board. It is now 6 PM. Members in  
4 attendance are Jon Lancto, Mark Howard, Rhonda  
5 Sanders, and Steve Herlong.

6 The Freedom of Information requirements  
7 have been met for this meeting.

8 The items on tonight's agenda are:  
9 Number one, approval of the June 2013 minutes.

10 Do I hear a motion to approve?

11 MR. HOWARD: I'll make that.

12 MR. LANCTO: Second.

13 MR. HERLONG: All in favor?

14 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD: Aye.

15 MR. HERLONG: None opposed.

16 So now, the second item is going to be a  
17 discussion of the schedule to review properties  
18 being considered for historic designation.

19 MS. KENYON: No.

20 MR. HOWARD: No?

21 MR. HERLONG: That's incorrect?

22 MS. KENYON: That's incorrect.

23 MR. HERLONG: Okay.

24 MR. HENDERSON: Are you referencing  
25 your --

1 MR. HERLONG: I don't know.

2 MR. LANCTO: I move we strike that from  
3 the agenda.

4 MR. HERLONG: Yeah. So do I hear a  
5 second?

6 MS. SANDERS: Second.

7 MR. HERLONG: All in favor of striking  
8 that?

9 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD: Aye.

10 MR. HERLONG: None opposed.

11 MR. HOWARD: Well, can I ask you a  
12 question? Is this something we're going to do in  
13 the future or is this just a mistake?

14 MS. KENYON: No, it was something done  
15 in the past.

16 MR. HOWARD: Something done in the past.

17 MR. HERLONG: Oh. Interested -- I'm  
18 interested -- wow. We're all getting much older  
19 much quicker.

20 MS. KENYON: He's been busy.

21 MR. HERLONG: Okay. The third item is  
22 2824 Jasper Boulevard, demolition/accessory  
23 structure.

24 Randy and Joe?

25 MR. ROBINSON: I'll go ahead and present

1 this one since I know a little bit about it.

2 The 2824 Jasper Boulevard is a  
3 historical property. It's checked here that it's  
4 within the historical district. It's not within a  
5 designated district. It's in, you know, the whole  
6 of Sullivan's Island district. So it's not in one  
7 of our national registered districts or even one of  
8 our island districts.

9 The applicant is coming to y'all to  
10 remove an existing garage that's there and build a  
11 new 700 square foot garage. Based on the square  
12 footage of the structure, y'all are allowed, or they  
13 are allowed to have accessory structures that equal  
14 25 percent of the principal building square footage.  
15 And y'all are allowed to give a 20 percent increase  
16 in that if y'all feel that it meets neighborhood  
17 compatibility.

18 The principal building square footage on  
19 this property is 3438 square feet. If 25 percent of  
20 that equals 860 square foot, and then the 25 --  
21 20 percent increase is 172 square feet, which equals  
22 1032 square feet.

23 If you look on that here, they have an  
24 existing structure that they're going to have to  
25 reduce in size. The existing structure on the back

1 side of this lot is 412 square feet. They're going  
2 to reduce that in size to 332 square feet, and then  
3 build the new 700 square foot garage.

4 The one thing that I would keep in mind  
5 here is, this is a very large lot. The house that's  
6 on it is not near what it could be. As a matter of  
7 fact, if this lot were supporting the house that  
8 could be here, it could be probably, the max, 5600  
9 square feet. I didn't run those numbers yet, but it  
10 would be rather large. And then they would be able  
11 to put this much accessory structure on without  
12 asking you all even for any increases.

13 So anyway, what y'all are here to look  
14 at tonight is: Number one, it's a historical  
15 structure or historical property. We're not sure if  
16 the garage is historical or not. So what they're  
17 asking, to demo the garage, and then rebuild a new  
18 garage.

19 MR. HENDERSON: And we actually did a  
20 field inspection of the garage. Initially, we  
21 thought that the garage on the property was an  
22 original structure to the -- I guess the original  
23 construction was turn of the century; is that right?

24 MR. KENNEDY: I believe it was in the  
25 '30s.

1 MR. HENDERSON: In the '30s?  
2 What we -- the pictures reflect is that  
3 it was sort of used with, you know, piecemeal  
4 lumber, and rebuilt at some point maybe 20 or 30  
5 years ago. So it is not -- the structure being  
6 requested for demolition is not historic. It is  
7 sort of what we --

8 MR. KENNEDY: Yeah, post Hugo. Post  
9 Hugo.

10 MR. HERLONG: Okay.

11 MR. HENDERSON: And then as Randy said,  
12 it's based upon the size of the accessory structures  
13 that could potentially be built on the property, is  
14 what's being requested.

15 MR. HERLONG: All right.

16 MR. KENNEDY: My name is Hunter Kennedy.  
17 I'm with KDS, and I'm the designer of the project.  
18 And I'm going to run through some of the same points  
19 that Randy just brought up. But just going to try  
20 and concisely explain what we're requesting.

21 So this is the garage on the site here.  
22 The proposed garage and the surveys, or the site  
23 plans you've been provided, are in the dash lines.

24 So we're proposing replacing the  
25 existing 493 square foot garage. It's both

1 non-historic and non-conforming with the 700 square  
2 foot, one-story garage, which would accommodate two  
3 cars and a storage shed in the back of the  
4 structure.

5 We're requesting two easements for the  
6 new structure. One is a 12 percent easement for the  
7 additional 75 square feet of additional footprint,  
8 which is over the 625 square foot limit. And a full  
9 40 percent easement on the -- for a six foot side  
10 setback here, rather than the required 10 feet.

11 The existing garage, you might note is,  
12 I think, approximately three feet off that side  
13 setback.

14 We also have the issue of the accessory  
15 structure cap, which is based on the principal  
16 building square footage of the property. So the  
17 current square footage of the house is on 3438  
18 square feet, and the 25 percent accessory cap is 860  
19 square feet.

20 The existing structures, which are this  
21 garage here and this, is what is called the Oyster  
22 House in the back, totals 914 square feet, so it's  
23 already over that cap. We're requesting a  
24 20 percent easement on this cap to allow for 1032  
25 square feet of accessory structures. This would let

1 the owner keep the second existing outbuilding on  
2 the property.

3 To meet the proposed cap, an existing  
4 awning would be removed from the shed. And there's  
5 a photo in the set that you have that should  
6 illustrate that. I also have a photo here.

7 And this is that existing garage, and  
8 this small structure here has this extension. It's  
9 roughly about 10 feet. So we would just be removing  
10 this roof over. It's not enclosed, but we'd be  
11 removing that to make this building conform to the  
12 new accessory square footage cap.

13 When considering the application, we'd  
14 just like you to keep in mind that this is a 41,000  
15 square foot lot, which is just short of an acre.  
16 And for the future owner, the lot could accommodate  
17 up to 5600 square feet of principal building footage  
18 and 1400 square feet of accessory structures. When  
19 I did the formula -- if you follow the formula, it  
20 could accommodate 6100, but 56 is the island cap.

21 Both adjacent neighbors support these  
22 requests. We've spoken to both of them, and they're  
23 very comfortable with the proposed changes.

24 We'd suggest that the requested  
25 easements in this design would allow for a garage

1 that's proportionate to the setting, would improve  
2 on the existing design of the property, in that the  
3 modifications are compatible with the surrounding  
4 neighborhood. Thank you very much.

5 MR. HERLONG: Okay. Is there any public  
6 comment?

7 Public comment section is closed.

8 And so do you have -- do you guys any  
9 final comments?

10 MR. ROBINSON: Well, what I wanted to  
11 say is -- probably going to go ahead and bring it up  
12 anyway, because I want y'all to think about it, and  
13 it be on y'all's mind: Maybe to read this ordinance  
14 carefully as far as the accessory structures go.

15 And it talks about the principal  
16 building, that these structures could be so much of  
17 the principal building square footage. It doesn't  
18 say the existing principal building.

19 And what I wonder is, when this  
20 ordinance was created, I was here, Steve, you were  
21 here, we hashed this back and forth and everything,  
22 and I just don't remember what the intent was for  
23 saying that. Was it, the intent, that if you could  
24 build a 5600 square foot house on a lot because it's  
25 so large, can you have more accessory structures on

1 that property, even though you only have the  
2 existing house is only 3000. It kind of doesn't  
3 make sense to say, you know, you can't have the  
4 accessory structures that this lot will support  
5 because your house isn't big enough. That, to me,  
6 just doesn't make sense.

7 It's almost like the ordinance was  
8 written more to say, well, if the lot is big enough  
9 to support a 5600 square foot house, then it's big  
10 enough to support, you know, 1500 square foot of  
11 accessory structures. You see what I'm saying?  
12 Everybody understand what I'm saying?

13 MR. HERLONG: Exactly.

14 MR. ROBINSON: You know, and I'm sure  
15 that this owner doesn't really want to tear down  
16 that roof over that other area.

17 I don't know, but I don't think you do.  
18 I think we had a discussion a while back.

19 MR. LANCTO: That's the question then?

20 MR. ROBINSON: Yeah.

21 MR. LANCTO: Is the order a thing that  
22 he would have to tear down the roof in order to  
23 build the --

24 MR. ROBINSON: Yes.

25 MR. LANCTO: So in order to inspect

1 it -- in order, you'd have to see the roof torn off.

2 MR. ROBINSON: If you apply the  
3 ordinance saying that this is the 30 something -- I  
4 said the numbers.

5 If you apply the ordinance, literally as  
6 it's dealing with 25 percent of the principal  
7 building, this principal building is only 3438  
8 square feet, so that's why they're limited on 1032.

9 I mean, if it was a 5600 square foot  
10 house -- yeah, 1400 square feet, you know, he  
11 wouldn't have to rip off that other shed. He  
12 wouldn't.

13 MS. SANDERS: But does that roof really  
14 make a structure? I mean, the roof part is just a  
15 roof. It's not really -- it doesn't have walls.

16 MR. ROBINSON: Well, the way the  
17 ordinance, it deals with roof overhangs on an  
18 accessory structure. I would say yes, it is.

19 MS. SANDERS: Okay. That was my first  
20 question.

21 MR. ROBINSON: Because if you wanted a  
22 carport, we'll say that would be an accessory  
23 structure. You'd have to.

24 MR. HERLONG: I have a question. Is the  
25 existing house fully elevated?

1 MR. KENNEDY: It is elevated. I believe  
2 it meets -- the house is historic, but I think it  
3 meets flood -- or is it below flood?

4 MR. GREENE: It's three to five feet  
5 elevated.

6 MR. HERLONG: So this is one of those  
7 properties where you'd get the bonus square footage  
8 as well. Does that come into play?

9 MR. KENNEDY: I need to correct that.  
10 It's not fully elevated so that it's like eight foot  
11 ceilings underneath. It's elevated three to four  
12 feet off the ground.

13 MR. ROBINSON: You can't park  
14 underneath.

15 MR. GREENE: They're cinder blocks.

16 MR. ROBINSON: But they can't park  
17 underneath --

18 MR. HENDERSON: That's right.

19 MR. ROBINSON: -- they get exempt from  
20 lot coverage requirements.

21 MR. HENDERSON: That's the lot coverage  
22 requirements, right?

23 MR. HERLONG: Yeah.

24 MR. HENDERSON: That gives you the...

25 MR. ROBINSON: It's exempt from lot

1 coverage requirements because it's not high enough  
2 to park in.

3 MR. HERLONG: We just went over this on  
4 another project yesterday.

5 MR. HENDERSON: That's right.

6 MR. HERLONG: And we sort of stumbled  
7 into the same issue. So that is probably something  
8 that could be very helpful.

9 MR. ROBINSON: I think with that  
10 information --

11 MS. SANDERS: We can go home.

12 MR. ROBINSON: No, with that information  
13 which y'all are considering now is: It's in a  
14 historical property. Do you feel like its design is  
15 adequate or appropriate for a historical property,  
16 and is it okay to tear down the existing garage?

17 Those are the only two things you're  
18 looking at. Is it appropriate tearing down the  
19 existing garage? Is it appropriate to build this  
20 design that he has on that property?

21 MR. LANCTO: Without tearing the roof  
22 off the other structure, right?

23 MR. ROBINSON: That's correct, leave the  
24 other structure.

25 MR. LANCTO: Okay.

1 MR. HERLONG: Well, having said that...

2 MR. LANCTO: I feel like that the design  
3 is compatible with the neighborhood. I really like  
4 it. It looks good. If the neighbors don't have any  
5 objection, then I'd say, let's go with it.

6 MR. HOWARD: I agree 100 percent. And  
7 if the neighbors don't have a problem, I certainly  
8 don't.

9 MS. SANDERS: I agree.

10 MR. HERLONG: I agree as well. And so  
11 we also, in making a motion, might want to put in  
12 there that we defer to you guys for any future  
13 discussions, if you have to come in because of any  
14 other issues. This, we approve it, and it wouldn't  
15 necessarily have to come back to the board because  
16 of a technicality.

17 MR. LANCTO: Yeah. So I move that we  
18 approve with the exception that the roof does not  
19 need to be removed, and we defer any additional  
20 decisions to staff.

21 MR. ROBINSON: Correct. But you do give  
22 him the relief on the side yard setback.

23 MR. LANCTO: And we give the relief  
24 requested on the side setback.

25 MR. ROBINSON: Was there anything else?

1 MR. KENNEDY: The relief on the size of  
2 the garage too, if we need that, that it's just the  
3 700 square foot.

4 MR. HENDERSON: That was it, the setback  
5 and square footage.

6 MR. ROBINSON: Yeah.

7 MR. HENDERSON: Were the only two  
8 issues.

9 MR. ROBINSON: The size is a little over  
10 600, and so square footage --

11 MR. LANCTO: So I would add, I would  
12 modify that motion to include the additional square  
13 footage requested as well.

14 MR. HERLONG: Okay.

15 MS. SANDERS: I second the motion.

16 MR. HERLONG: Any discussion?

17 Okay. All in favor of the motion?

18 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD: Aye.

19 MR. HERLONG: Any opposed?

20 None.

21 And so any other discussion?

22 The meeting is closed.

23 (The Hearing was concluded at 6:17 PM.)

24

25

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

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

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

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

Witness my hand, I have hereunto affixed my official seal this 26th day of July, 2013, at Charleston, Charleston County, South Carolina.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Maria D. Dempsey, RPR  
My Commission expires:  
October 13, 2019