

**OLD VILLAGE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MEETING NOTICE
March 12, 2018 at 5:00pm
Town Hall Committee Meeting Room
Floor 3, Room 3300
100 Ann Edwards Lane · Mount Pleasant, SC 29464**

NOTE: Items in [blue](#) are hyperlinks (some file sizes are large and may take a minute to load).

MINUTES

PRESENT: Scott Hirshorn, Chair; Heather Wilson, Vice Chair;
Leigh Rowe, Louisa Montgomery and Ann Dove

STAFF PRESENT: Eric Pohlman, Senior Planner; Joe Juan; Plan
Reviewer

Mr. Hirshorn called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and reviewed the meeting procedures with the public.

Ms. Wilson made a motion to amend the agenda to move Public Comments and General Correspondence to the end of the meeting; seconded by Ms. Montgomery. All present voted in favor.

I. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Pohlman stated that the February minutes were not complete at this time and would be addressed at the April meeting.

II. Public Comment & General Correspondence

[Amended and moved to the end of agenda]

III. BUSINESS

[STAFF REPORT](#)

Ms. Wilson made a motion for consent on items #2, 115 Friend Street; #3, 304 King Street; #4, 108 Carr Street; #5, 308 McCormick Street, #6, 959 Pitt Street, and #10, 112 Beach Street; seconded by Ms. Rowe.

Ms. Montgomery opposed. All others voted in favor. Motion carries 4-1.

1. [221 Queen Street](#) – Survey 6097 – (TMS 532-05-00-029) Final Review for Installation of Hot Tub.

Mr. Pohlman reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

Ms. Montgomery asked if there was a picture submitted for the proposed decorative gate.

Ms. Wilson said that it was not in the packet and the homeowners are not present. Hopefully, they will be present when their item appears again at the end.

Ms. Wilson made a motion to move the application for 221 Queen Street to the end of the items being heard; seconded by Ms. Dovre. All present voted in favor.

2. [115 Friend Street](#) – Survey – (TMS532-05-00-069) Final Review for Demolition and New Construction [**Consent Motion**]
3. [304 King Street](#) – **HISTORIC 6125** – (TMS 532-01-00-041) Final Review for ~~Installation of Railings and Reroofing~~ **Alteration to Dormer Siding. Rev. 03/06/2018** [**Consent Motion**]
4. [108 Carr Street](#) – Survey 6269 – (TMS 532-05-00-057) Final Review for Accessory Structure and Addition [**Consent Motion**]
5. [308 McCormick Street](#) – Survey 6078 – (TMS 532-09-00-246) Final Review for Exterior Alterations [**Consent Motion**]
6. [959 Pitt Street](#) – Survey 5890 – (TMS 532-13-00-032) Final Review for After-the-Fact Alterations [**Consent Motion**]
7. [116 Beach Street](#) – (TMS 517-15-00-104) Final Review for After-the-Fact Alterations

Ms. Wilson made a motion to defer 116 Beach Street, as upon review by the Town of Mount Pleasant, the application will be required to

appear before the Board of Zoning Appeals (BOZA) for encroachment on a rear setback; seconded by Ms. Rowe. All present voted in favor.

8. [127 Chicco Lane](#) – (TMS 532-05-00-036) Conceptual Comment for New Construction

Mr. Pohlman reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

Kate Campbell & Beau Clowney, Beau Clowney Architects, representing the homeowner. Ms. Campbell said most Commission members are familiar with this property along the harbor, which is the last vacant lot. She hopes that the Commission and neighbors will provide comments and that their design addresses some of the concerns read from the last submittal. She said it is a sloped site from grade 11 feet to approximately 3 feet. She said there is a critical line that impedes in the property; however, due to the plat date, this property is not subject to a 30-foot critical line setback. They have attempted to create more of a one-story volume that addresses Chicco Lane along with the front porch, utilizing the slope on the lot similar to most of the adjacent waterfront lots that have a park-under concept, where the house is more embedded into the hill, which will help mitigate the height from Chicco Lane and the harbor. She said they have a flood zone issue to address where they are required to build the house up off the lowest adjacent grade, which is where their overall height restriction is based from, which is at the rear of the lot. She said they are matching the 7-foot grade line that runs along the property. She said there would be a small amount of fill on the backside tapering down towards the critical line. She indicated the one and two-story portions of the home. They set the rear heated portion of the house approximately 30 feet off the critical. She said there is a one-story porch that wraps around and a one-story porch off the master bedroom and indicated where the porch is all open and not a solid heated space. She said there is a tight turnaround and they are exploring the possibility of a guest parking space, but also function as a turnaround space. She said that they will be required to do a stormwater management plan and a drainage management plan.

Ms. Dovre said that the parking is tight; therefore, for permanent residents living there, what will be an easy come-around.

Ms. Campbell described how the property owners would enter and exit their garage and driveways. She said they may design a larger turnout as they are navigating and turning around in terms of property owners within their own property. She continued with the design of the house and said the property will be at Chicco Lane grade and they may have to install a retaining wall in order to get some type of slope back slightly in order to prevent any water from going underneath the house.

Ms. Dovre asked if the house that is proposed will be similar to building on a hill.

Ms. Campbell said it is more similar to cutting into a hill. She said there will be some type of low retaining wall and/or swales along the side as they cannot shed water onto any other properties. She said the grades she is showing are the existing grades and have not worked out the proposed grades.

Ms. Rowe said that she is happy that the house is moved back off the critical line.

Mr. Hirshorn asked if there is an illustration that shows the proposed new structure relative to the critical line and the neighbors and asked if the porches extend beyond the neighbors.

Ms. Campbell responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that this was a hot discussion during the previous submittal.

Keith Jones, 121 Chicco Lane, said this is a 5,300 square foot house, but he does like it much better than the previous submittal, and it is set back. He said that both the pool and porches are way beyond his porch. He said the 127 Chicco Lane porches will extend way beyond theirs and into their view. He said the lot is open and the pool is very conspicuous and only 10 feet from their fence and 20 feet in front of

their porch. His main concern is the pool specifically in that location, which is not inconspicuous and almost out into the marsh, and the proposed porches being so far forward of his porch. He said the lot floods half way up during a storm and if they put the pool where it is being proposed, it will be flooded, even with a 6-foot retaining wall.

Janice Gaskins, 131 Chicco Lane, said she lives on the other side of the proposed house and her only complaint is the porch that is jetting out way past all the neighbors' structures. She thought the idea was to try and build it all in a row so that no one interferes with anyone else's view, which the porch will obviously do. She said it is not a deck, but an enclosed structure with a roof. She said this will block Shem Creek, Patriots Point and the Ravenel Bridge, because it will be obscured by the proposed roofed structure.

Mr. Hirshorn asked about the depth of the porch.

Ms. Campbell said it is 12 feet deep.

Ms. Gaskins said this would be 13 feet beyond all the other houses. She asked how far the porch juts out into the flood line, not the critical line.

Mr. Pohlman stated that for clarification regarding the flood line, this is from FEMA and is not exactly a straight line. He showed the flood area that would dictate the height that the building would have to meet, plus one foot, in order for the Town to comply with FEMA flood grants. He said it has nothing to do with the critical line or the marsh and is judged from aerial imagery on how high flood waters could rise during a catastrophic event, such as a hurricane.

Joanne Cooke, 631 Pitt Street, said her lot goes all the way back to 130 Chicco Lane. She said one of her concerns is flooding, which the homeowners seem to be addressing. She said her second concern is the porch. She has no doubt that it will be enclosed, which will block the view of all the other properties. She said that it should not jut out as it blocks the views of the neighbors. She said other than those concerns, she believes it is beautiful.

Ms. Dovre said that she is also concerned about the porch being too far forward and blocking the neighbors' views, who have resided there for many years.

Ms. Wilson said that the proposed plans are exponentially more sensitive than the previous application. She appreciates the stepping down in scale and the first story pieces do help both in addressing Chicco Lane and the harbor. She said that Ms. Campbell has done a great job of having two fronts which is needed on this lot. She said this will also be the same comment that you must take the three houses into consideration and not go past them with a porch or anything else. Her opinion is that it is the average of the four houses. She appreciates that Ms. Campbell is using the 30-foot setback; however, it is simply neighborhood capability. She said many of the residents have lived in their home on Chicco Lane for 20, 25, and 30 years and it is inconceivable to her that the Commission would allow anything with a foundation to go beyond the average of the four houses that this property is in between. She said the Commission would be more flexible on Chicco Lane because it is a unique street and has some ability to absorb some different relationships. She said other than those points, she believes that Ms. Campbell has done a great job.

Mr. Hirshorn asked if Ms. Wilson had any issue with the pool

Ms. Wilson said that the pool in the proposed location is not suitable, because it will flood. She said it would have to be raised and the Commission will need to see the site section and how it will be handled. She added that with the precedence that has been set, they cannot deny a pool on a harbor lot. While she respects what Mr. Jones said earlier about it being an open lot, it is also very narrow. She said that she does not know if it can be pulled back to be more parallel to the back. She believes an inground pool can go past the build-to line of the diagonal between the neighbors and if they wish to keep the location, the Commission would like to see a compelling buffer for the neighbors; however, the Commission is not able to comment on

landscaping. She suggested that when they come back before the Commission, to show how sensitive they can be.

Ms. Rowe agrees with Ms. Wilson that the porches and/or decks cannot block the neighbor's view but believes everything else looks so much better. She asked if Ms. Campbell could simply square off across the back.

Ms. Campbell stated that shifting it forward works, but with the turnaround, it may compress everything on the front and this is what they were balancing everything with, trying to ensure they were creating one story pieces on the front while also navigating to the second garage without having two driveways. She said this is part of the reason they were attempting to match everything with the heated footprint and having the porches be out, because the porches are inherently more transparent than a solid wall with windows. She said they will study this further.

Ms. Rowe stated that they have the space and as far as the pool is concerned, it is tricky.

Ms. Wilson believes Chicco Lane can absorb a little more two-story than what is being proposed. She said this is a unique lot, but believes Ms. Campbell is on the right track.

Ms. Montgomery said that the portion of the porch that juts out the farthest, she asked if it can be removed and the porch where stairs are coming out from, she asked if the stairs could be put on the exterior and the porch moved over closer to where the pool would be, so there would be a nice front porch, and instead of it going across, it would come down the side.

Ms. Campbell said that is a possibility, but believes it is a balance of spaces that have direct light and those that have indirect light.

Ms. Montgomery said this would help with the view. She said they have had homes cut across the site lines before and it is a difficult situation, but it will be a beautiful house.

Ms. Wilson said that she likes how the stairs are now because what she likes so much is the formality and the way it addresses the harbor.

Mr. Hirshorn said it appears that the main issues are the porch and the pool. He added that this is a difficult lot.

9. [720 Pitt Street](#) – **HISTORIC 5954** – (TMS 517-15-00-028) Final Review for Additions and Alterations

Mr. Pohlman reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

Elizabeth Drake, architect for the homeowners, stated that she apologizes that there are no details. She said that the clients would like a pool and wanted to push off of their existing kitchen and add a new laundry and mud room entrance. She said they proposed to remove the existing screened porch off the back and the side porch as well and will be rebuilding them. They propose to pull out from the kitchen area and pull off a gable with all the details to match existing. She said they need to relocate the HVAC and will use the picket style at the front of the house around the unit. She said in the back in the cabana area, they would like to make it transparent and less heavy and thought the cable railing would be more appropriate. With the new rule, they thought they were set with the gable, but when they learned they would have to do 20 feet, they explored lowering the pool deck and it did not work. She said they decided to try and work with the hip roof, and if you look at the front, there is a hip on the Pitt Street side, and she pulled that slope and moved it back to the cabana. She said the clients favor the Bahama shutter look, so they have come back with that proposal and will provide more detail and photographs of what the homeowners want. The fireplace was moved over to the property line, which was previously on the pond side, which will be brick. She said they are attempting to tie it into the ground using brick and coming up with louvers that would match the rest of the house. She said at the bench area, there is the one by four vertical tongue and groove, that the first step down on the terrace would be the bench where the children could gather, and the landscaping would be on the lower terrace. She wrapped it around to the side and is pulling

it around and doing two planters to soften it. She said there is a full drop and the railings would be along that side. She said the idea of the walls at the pool deck is for privacy and the materials were going to be similar to the cabana and have a wall over at the banquette which is close to the house. She said in the site plans, she did address the distance from the rear property line, which is 59.5 feet to the edge of the cabana from the rear property line. She said that the six-foot grade is in the middle and comes closer to the cabana. She got rid of the wrap around shed and changed the roof off the backside of the house.

Ms. Wilson stated that the front of the house is historic, but the back is not. She said in terms of materials on the cabana, she asked if the columns would be wood.

Ms. Drake said it is wood.

Ms. Montgomery asked if stucco was considered in order to lessen the brick look.

Ms. Drake said that there are brick piers there currently and the clients like brick.

Ms. Wilson said that this backyard floods which is why they need the lower level of masonry.

Mr. Hirshorn feels that Ms. Drake has addressed a number of the issues. He asked if there were any feelings on the new hip roof on the cabana.

Ms. Rowe said that she likes it.

Ms. Wilson said the change was based on the maximum ridge height they were allowed. She said that Ms. Drake has done a good job tying the height to the overhang.

Mr. Hirshorn said that he would like to see more of a finished design where the materials are showcased and what type of bricks are being used, because it does not appear complete. He said particularly the brick and he would be comfortable if Ms. Drake stipulates that it is Savannah or Old Charleston.

Ms. Rowe asked if that could be done at staff level if the brick was designated.

John Dukes, homeowner, said they would absolutely match what is existing, which is the Savannah Grey on the chimney.

Ms. Wilson stated that the cabana could be approved with the stipulation that all the details match the house. She said what she would personally like to see, is that the railings come back, but that it would not preclude them from permitting the cabana and working with the pool company and getting things moving.

Mr. Hirshorn asked if the Commission members were agreeable with the Bermuda shutters.

Mr. Pohlman said the guidelines only state that inharmonious shutter styles should not be installed.

Ms. Wilson stated she believes the Commission can approve the project but ask for a railing detail and an example of a shutter at a future date that would not slow the homeowners down from engineering and permitting.

Mr. Hirshorn said that he would be happy to hear a motion with stipulations on materials for the brick, shutters and the railing.

Ms. Wilson stated that if there is existing brick on the house, the brick should match the house, and this can be stipulated. She said they should only return on this item if the brick cannot be matched or they want to do something different.

Ms. Wilson made a motion to approve the cabana, pool and deck of the project at 720 Pitt Street, with the stipulation that the facia and roof details match the house, the brick matches the house, the columns are to be wood and the applicant will bring back railing details and a sample or picture of a shutter at a future date; seconded by Ms. Rowe. All present voted in favor.

10. [112 Beach Street](#) – (TMS 517-15-00-104) Final Review for After-the-Fact Alterations [**Consent Motion**]

11. [204 Live Oak Drive](#) – **HISTORIC** 6234 – (TMS 517-15-00-029)
Conceptual Comment for Accessory Structure and Additions.

Mr. Pohlman reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

Linda Balzac, architect for the homeowner, said that she worked on this home a few years ago and put an addition on the back. She said there is a new owner at this time and they are requesting a garage at the front of the house, but is behind the historic house, set back. She said there will be a half story above the garage that will be a living space. She has broken down the massing with a two-car garage made of two different pieces of masses so that it does not look as large from the street. She said there are a number of live oaks in the backyard on either side that would be compromised, which limited getting into the backyard with a garage. She said the homeowner also wishes for privacy on the porch that she designed a few years ago. She said they have precedent on the street with three other homes having garage doors facing forward.

Ms. Dovre asked if the garage was going to come around to the back to not be seen from the front.

Ms. Balzac said that it will be seen from the front. She said where the open porch is on the right of the home, it will be in front of that by approximately five feet, so there is still a walkway behind it to get to the yard. She said it is an exposed side porch from the street. She said there is a five-foot pervious deck, so they are not connected to the main house and it is open. She separated it in the back to get the light and kept the connector piece low to match the one-story piece in the back and pulled the garage over to the right to be away from the historic part of the structure.

Ms. Wilson said that she is sympathetic to the situation because it is exposed and parking currently where the garage is proposed. She said that it is too much garage for a historic house of this scale and size. She said two garage doors are difficult for her, and the scale of the main gable that is proportionately to the house. She believes it is too

much; however, feels there is a solution that will give the historic house more relief. She does not know if the homeowner is receptive to a detached garage.

Ms. Balzac stated that the homeowner prefers the garage to be attached and thought if they entered to the side, with the same garage location, except there would be window facing the street and the gable going in the other direction, that it would help break down the massing and the two dormers would be facing the street.

Ms. Wilson said it may be better with parallel gables in the same directions. She said this is a difficult project; however, she is not comfortable with that much garage door frontage and the close contact with the historic house without enough relief. She would not be in favor of a double garage door.

Ms. Rowe stated that it overpowers the cottage, which is a historic gem. She added that the garage is too massive. She said there is ample land on this property so there must be other options.

Ms. Montgomery suggested removing some of the trees in the back, since they are not large trees.

Mr. Pohlman reminded Commission members that landscaping is not the purview of the Commission.

Ms. Montgomery stated that the garage is too big for the cottage.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that it appears conceptual comment is that the garage is too massive for the historic cottage structure that is existing. He said the attachment to the house with the hyphen may also not be a historic element that is commonly seen, as well as the number of bays for the garage itself. He said the Commission has been attempting to minimize the building of accessory buildings, especially on historic structures. He suggested that the homeowner and architect review it further.

Allison Dailey, homeowner, said that the garage only has two bays, but it has interior stairs; therefore, she could cut back what looks like a double garage door.

Ms. Balzac stated that one bay is wider in order to get the vehicle over to the right side because of the stairs.

Ms. Dailey stated that they are not able to move the garage to the back, because it floods in the back. She said if you move it over, there is not enough turnaround room. She said it has been a challenge. She would like to have some independence, because she is the full-time guardian for her brother, who will be living in the ADU above the garage.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that Ms. Balzac has had a few of the ADU's on historic structures and the Commission gravitates towards a structure that takes its cues from the existing building and is simple in design, particularly on the old historic cottages. He said that the extension, which is the smaller bay, is not something that the Commission would typically see and have not approved anything similar to this, where there is a double entry to the garage. He said that he does not know the Commission's position on the hyphen that attaches it to the existing house; however, he does not feel that the Commission has seen many of these requests, as well, particularly with the old historic cottages.

Ms. Wilson said that she agrees with Mr. Hirshorn's comments. She said the garage is 21 feet wide, whether it is a two-car garage, the main gable is the width of a two-car garage in scale and proportion. She suggested thinking in terms of historic terms and the scale. She said she is also concerned about the hyphen, too, because she is not sure how the roof plan would work. She said that the homeowner will lose the shed that is currently on the back of the house, coming off of the primary gable.

Ms. Balzac stated that for the sake of discussion, if it were a detached structure, and pushed over more, would the Commission be more in favor of this.

Ms. Wilson said that she would like to see it as far from the house as possible. She said that it needs to give the cottage some breathing room. She said Ms. Balzac did such a great job restoring it the first time and it has a lot of small quirky small-scale pieces that were covered up with a much larger garage

Mr. Hirshorn stated that it appears Ms. Balzac has received ample feedback.

221 Queen Street

(Deferred from earlier on the agenda to the last item)

Larry D. Hudson, homeowner, said that he has provided his own drawings and they are not architecturally in scale; however, the portico that was built specifically for a living area is well screened from Queen Street, which sits 30 inches below the yard level. He said the only way you are able to view the hot tub is through the open gate, and he is proposing to put a gate on the existing fence. He said on the side facing their neighbor on Queen Street, he is proposing to place a Bermuda shutter to screen it from that direction. He said standing on the street, you are not able to view the lower half of the portico, other than through the open gate.

Ms. Dovre said that she likes the Bermuda shutter for screening.

Ms. Wilson said that you are able to view this area from Pitt Street from up the neighbor's drive. She said that she would need to see the louvers on both short sides of the portico.

Mr. Hudson said from Pitt Street, they have planted an olive tree and it blocks the view from Pitt Street.

Ms. Wilson stated that she is able to see it from Pitt Street, and landscaping is not within the purview of the Commission. She said that the only way she would consider approval is if the whole portico is

screened from any neighbor or public viewing. She stated that she walks regularly on Pitt Street and is able to see the portico. She said she would need to see a fixed louver on the neighbor's side and on the Pitt Street side.

Mr. Hudson stated that the way the portico is designed, it is not possible to screen from that side without putting a fence up. He said that the opening between the garage and the stairway to the back to the kitchen is less than three feet wide, so he has landscaped it to prevent egress to the back.

Ms. Wilson said from the back column over, so it is parallel to the one that is there.

Mr. Hudson stated that the way the roofline with guttering goes, he does not believe a Bermuda shutter would be architecturally possible.

Ms. Wilson stated that without pictures or drawings to scale, she is unable to respond. Her concern is that a raised hot tub would be seen.

Mr. Hudson said that any structure that is placed in that area, would block going down the stairs and into the garage, because the roofline is where you would walk from the stairway to the garage.

Mr. Hirshorn said that it is difficult to determine due to the nature of the drawing, He said what the Commission does not want to see is a hot tub view from the main right of way. He said if there is a way to block the view of the hot tub, then it should be done; however, the Commission needs to see drawings with more detail.

Mr. Hudson asked if there was an issue with the view from the Queen Street side.

Ms. Rowe stated that she has an issue with it. She said she has walked by several times and it is very open. She said that perhaps the gate will help and when the shrubbery grows it will help. She said that the hot tub needs to be almost completely enclosed.

Ms. Wilson stated that at the last meeting, she suggested a railing detail that concealed the hot tub.

Mr. Pohlman asked if the Commission would be agreeable to screening that would go up to the edge of the hot tub, or would the Commission prefer screening up to the roofline. He asked what a good screening height would be.

Ms. Rowe said that the Commission would have to see it.

Ms. Wilson said that she does not know what height the tub is, but said that a rail height, opaque handrail may be sufficient.

Mr. Hudson said this would work on the Queen Street side but does not know how to block the small port, other than some type of fencing, which would look worse.

Ms. Wilson said that all the Commission must go by in terms of how to resolve this are the drawings that Mr. Pohlman pulled up from a previous owner. She said that it appears that you can do a railing around the entire portico porch. She said it would obviously need to be broken between two of the columns. She said that the Bermuda shutter is still something that should be used on the neighbor's side.

Mr. Juan said that he is also concerned about the existing electrical components that are on that building, such as the fan. He said the swimming pool code does have clearance requirements.

Mr. Hudson said the ceiling is 12 feet and it has a 220 v access on the other side of the garage.

Mr. Juan said he is referring to clearance to the existing electrical that are on the building outlets.

Ms. Wilson moved to defer the application for the hot tub at 221 Queen Street to receive further information on railing or louvers; seconded by Ms. Rowe. All present voted in favor.

Ms. Balzac suggested putting lattice on the first half of the portion that is facing the parking area just four feet over, this will cover that area up and you will not see that side of the hot tub.

Public Comment & General Correspondence

[Amended and moved to the end of agenda]

- a. Review of Staff Recommendations for adding temporary handicap/ADA access to Staff Level Review List

Mr. Pohlman said that there were no staff approvals.

Mr. Pohlman stated that he and Plan Reviewer, Joe Juan reviewed the few historic codes they were able to find that mention temporary handicap accessibility, as well as reviewed the International Residential Code (IRC), to ensure that a guideline was not created that would violate the IRC or the ADA (American with Disabilities Act). He said the recommendation would be to allow staff level review for both historic and non-historic residential structures. He said the guidelines are almost verbatim to the Beaufort, North Carolina section, which states:

1. *Construct wheelchair ramps and/or chairlifts that are portable or temporary and do not permanently damage, obscure, or require the removal of character-defining architectural features. Such alternations should be reversible in nature to maintain the integrity of the structure.*
2. *Ramps should not enter any required side yard or setback. If encroachment is required, the application must be reviewed by the Commission. Ramp should have two guardrails that are 36 inches in height with slopes no greater than 1/8. Ramp should be built of wood or metal for temporary usage. If the ramp is to be constructed of a more permanent material such as cement or similar material, it must be reviewed by the Commission. Alterations to entry doors, porches or additional alterations to the façade outside of temporary removal of banisters will require review by the Commission. A copy of the cost estimate is required to be submitted to Town staff for review at staff level.*

Mr. Pohlman stated that the last statement is to ensure that staff is able to keep track of the projects for permitting purposes since there is no formal permitting for a ramp outside the cost of \$1,000.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that his only issue is when the Commission discusses “temporary”. He asked if there will be a time limit imposed.

Mr. Pohlman said that this would be up to the Commission.

Ms. Wilson suggested that if the ramp is going to stay longer than one year, they should come before the Commission.

Ms. Montgomery stressed the importance of being able to have immediate approval for a ramp for a disabled resident. She added that it should be as simple as a telephone call.

Mr. Pohlman said this can be accomplished for both historic and non-historic homes at a staff level with a telephone call, completing the application online and staff would review it immediately.

Ms. Montgomery said that the resident could be someone without access to a computer but is able to come to the Town in person.

Mr. Pohlman said that the process can be specified in more detail in the guidelines. He said that staff can assist with the electronic filing process. He asked Commission members if they would like staff to include in the guidelines: *If a ramp is going to stay longer than one year, the Commission must review and at that point has purview over design.*

Commission members agreed.

Mr. Pohlman stated that a resident may make two applications; one at staff level that is temporary, and one at the Commission level that will be for a period in excess of one year. He stated that he will display them for public review. He asked if he should phrase this as wheelchair ramps and/or chairlifts.

Ms. Wilson suggested indicating with an asterisk (*), any equipment required for ADA accessibility.

Mr. Pohlman stated that Ms. Montgomery also wished to discuss mailboxes in the Old Village.

Ms. Montgomery said that when she was previously on this Commission, there was a great deal of discussion regarding rural mailboxes. She said in Pierates Cruz, they were very disgruntled and were contacting the National Postmaster, who stated that the mailboxes had to be located on the house. She said that she was not in favor of having the mailbox on her house. She said in the guidelines, it indicates: *Should be located on the house, if not, curbside*. She stated that there are a number of rural style mailboxes in the Old Village on Queen Street, Mary Street, Friend Street and others, rural meaning curbside. She stated that their mail carriers were happier with the rural mailboxes, because it saves time and is much easier for them. She said her neighbor on Hibben Street was forced to remove his rural mailbox and place it on his porch by the Commission previously.

Mr. Pohlman said that it was found to be against the guidelines.

Mr. Hirshorn said that he would be open to allowing either type of mailbox.

Mr. Pohlman said that an option that the Commission has is while reviewing the handicap ramps, this item, which is #4 in the guidelines, may also be removed, which are *"mailboxes, newspaper boxes and similar items should be located on the house, not curbside"*.

Ms. Rowe said that it must be removed, because one of the postal officials advised her that on Pitt Street, the mailboxes have to be on the house, because they do not want the mail carriers running up over the sidewalks. She said on Friend Street, they were not allowed to put mailboxes on their house and was told it had to go on the road.

Ms. Wilson suggested removing it from the guidelines as this was from when everyone only had mailboxes on the house and there were no mailboxes.

Ms. Montgomery stated that Mary Street has had rural mailboxes since the 1950's.

Mr. Pohlman stated that if Commission members agree, he will make this part of the current guideline updates. He said eliminating #4 would eliminate conflicts when it does come time for CO's (Certificate of Occupancy).

IV. Staff Approvals

No staff approvals.

V. Motion to Adjourn

Ms. Wilson moved to adjourn; seconded by Ms. Rowe. All present voted in favor.

There being no further business, meeting adjourned at 6:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Ashe
March 12, 2018