

**OLD VILLAGE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MEETING NOTICE
May 14, 2018 at 5:00pm
Town Hall Committee Meeting Room
3rd Floor, 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 and Louisa Montgomery and Ann Dovre

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 procedures with the public.

I. Approval of Agenda

Ms. Montgomery moved for approval; seconded by Ms. Wilson. All present voted in favor.

II. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Wilson moved for approval of the April 9, 2018 minutes; seconded by Ms. Rowe. All present voted in favor.

III. Public Comment & General Correspondence

Mr. Pohlman stated that there is no general correspondence.

IV. Consent Motions

Ms. Rowe moved to approve by consent Items #1, 221 Queen Street; #3, 311 Venning Street; #6, 204 Venning Street; #7, 242 Middle Street; #8, 817 Pitt

Street; #9, 141 Toomer Lane, #11, 116 Beach Street; and #12, 204 Live Oak Drive; seconded by Ms. Wilson. All present voted in favor.

V. Business

STAFF REPORT

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

[CONSENT MOTION]

2. [405 Royall Avenue](#) – (TMS 532-05-00-059) Conceptual Review for Tennis Court Renovations.

Mr. Pohlman reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

Warren Pruitt, Landscape Architect with ADC Engineering, representing the Town of Mount Pleasant Recreation Department. He stated that the Town has asked them to renovate the existing tennis courts at Royal Avenue at Edwards Park. He said the pavement at the courts are in failure and are becoming unsafe. He said that a Geotech engineer was hired to review them and they advised that the courts need to be rebuilt. He said in doing so, they were looking to replace all the fencing, the lighting and the parking areas, bringing them all into current compliance standards. He said the lighting will be a low-level LED lighting, which will be on a timer and use switch, so if they are not being used, they will not be on. He said if they are being used, they automatically shut off at 10:00 pm. He said the fencing will be black vinyl chain link fence. He said the current fencing is galvanized and has rusted over time. He said these courts are likely over 50 years old. He said the existing courts have three courts; however, due to the 40% permeability limit, they had to reduce the courts down to two. He said they have looked at different options, but there are no other options as three courts will exceed the 40% maximum. He said they are proposing two full size tennis courts. He said the three tennis courts were substandard for that size. He said the two full size tennis courts will be 60 x 120, and in the middle, they will put in a cabana to keep water cool and to sit down and take a break. He said the parking lot is not compliant as there are no handicap spaces or access and they are proposing to remove the parking, using the same curb cut that is there and making it compliant with current codes. He said the parking lot would be done with permeable pavers to stay

below the 40% maximum. He said the concrete plaza at the entranceway is the only impermeable surface other than the courts themselves. He provided illustrations of the tennis court colors as well as the permeable paver patterns for the parking area. He also provided illustrations for two styles of cabanas. He said the court lighting is an LED fixture. He said there is a path that runs through from Queen Street to Ferry Street and they are looking to do this path with plantation mix and installing path bollards along the way, with the bollards only turning on when they sense people are walking along the path. He said the existing bicycle rack will be reused, as well as the existing water fountain and trash receptacle. He said they are proposing to install a new wood bench at the entrance, similar to the bench at Memorial Waterfront Park, except black in color.

Mike Tinkey, 208 Venning Street, stated that he is here representing a number of people that attended the Recreation Committee meeting to discuss this item. He specifically asked the Town if this needed to go before the OVHDC, because he was advised that it needed to. He said they were told that it did not. He found out at the last minute that it did need to go before this commission and said had they known, there would have been a room full of residents. He said they all know the courts need to be redone and have been there since the 1960's. He said the real issue is three courts versus two. He said the overwhelming opinion is because the OVHDC does have purview of variances and has granted variances on the lots next to the courts for drainage purposes specifically, that the OVHDC grant a variance in order to have three courts, versus two. He said as a former tennis professional, the job that is being done by ADC is outstanding, as well as the design. It is true that the design is for two regulation courts. He said if you are a skilled player on the existing courts, you hit into the nets because they are not regulation, because the courts are too narrow. He said the issue is that these are courts that the village children enjoy playing on and learning on and have done so since the 1960's. He does not believe it is meant for tournament play and there are tennis instructions held there. He said that the residents would like to see three courts. He said there are significantly more families in the village than there were in the 1960's and there are limited recreation opportunities. He said there should be a variance granted for three courts.

Mr. Pohlman stated that for clarification, the Commission may grant a variance for setbacks; however, not for the impervious surface ratio.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that the Commission echoes the comments regarding the great design by ADC with the cabanas, benches and LED lighting. He understands that there is a space limitation and stated that there is a momentum of residents that would like to see three courts because it is a capacity issue. He said the Commission should explore a way, whether with a variance or otherwise to accommodate three courts. He said he is not sure there is enough space or if nets could be placed in between the courts. He said he would encourage the public to attend when final review is heard and would encourage Mr. Pruitt to explore the option of three courts. He said the Commission would strongly support a variance in writing or in person at a Zoning meeting and if possible to accommodate three courts, he would encourage it due to demand.

Mr. Pruitt stated that they have looked at different options and putting three courts on this area without breaking the 40% impervious is impossible.

Mr. Hirshorn reiterated that the Commission would support a variance.

Ms. Wilson asked what the number would be with three courts.

Mr. Pruitt stated that it is approximately 56% impervious.

Ms. Rowe asked if a variance was requested.

Mr. Pruitt said they have not, because the Town of Mount Pleasant has elected not to go that route.

Ms. Rowe stated that she has been stopped by residents in her neighborhood asking to have the three courts. She sees children playing on the courts every single day.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that it appears that Mr. Pruitt has expertise in designing courts with nets in between them.

Mr. Pruitt stated that he can design three courts but is simply the impervious ratio.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that the Commission will write a letter of support and if necessary, attend a zoning meeting.

Ms. Wilson stated that although technically not historic, it is the duty of the Commission to protect the fabric of the community as it is today, and three courts is a part of that fabric since 1960, which is a long time. She stated that she has been inundated with emails, telephone calls and residents stopping her on the street to say this is worth noting.

Mr. Pohlman stated that two emails were received in support; one from Charles Claus and the other from Colleen Griffith.

From: Charles Claus <Charles.Claus@RaymondJames.com>
Subject: Royall Avenue Tennis
Date: May 14, 2018 at 2:45:33 PM EDT
To: Heather Wilson <heather@heatherawilsonarchitect.com>

Vice Chair Wilson:

I am regrettably unable to attend this evening's meeting as I will be coaching the Mount Pleasant Academy Tennis team in a playoff match across town. In light of my absence, I wanted to submit my opposition to the Town's application to build two tennis courts on Royall Avenue.

I was an early proponent of renovating this facility. After approaching town council several years ago, I was asked to get in touch with the former Recreation Department Director, Ken Ayoub. In 2016, the town was awarded a Federal grant for almost \$200,000. In March of last year the town approved the remaining \$200,000 in their fiscal year 2017/2018 budget. It wasn't until earlier this year that I learned, by checking in with town officials, the proposed facility could not be replaced as presently situated given the town's flood ordinance.

I began a petition encouraging the town to find a solution. To date, it has nearly 350 signatures from other concerned town residents, mostly from those that live in the historic district. Despite the public outcry, the town Recreation Committee continues to insist that should they replace the facility with three courts, they will set legal precedence. I have consulted with two zoning/land use attorneys and both have doubts given the scope of the project and the intent of the ordinance.

A small subset of us have requested a meeting to brainstorm with the Recreation Committee, Mayor Haynie, Town Administrator Eric DeMoura, and town legal counsel, David Pagliarini, to present several alternative ideas. Two emails sent to Mayor Haynie (May 3 & May 10), have been ignored and we feel they're unwilling to provide an audience. (To be fair, Rec Committee Santos did meet with a group of pickleball players for a few minutes at the tennis courts and suggested the facility could be moved across Ferry Street to Edwards Park with the existing parcel being converted to green space or a dog park. This proposed idea would mean the loss of the \$200,000 Federal grant and I'm convinced there would be tremendous public outcry given Edwards Park is classified a historic property.)

I believe the Old Village Historic District Commission should be concerned that replacing three tennis courts with two will diminish quality of life within the district. While I could drive to the private l'on Club to play, most others could not. While I could drive fifteen minutes to the public facility on Whipple Road, the district's young children on foot, skateboard, and bicycle, could not.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
Charles Claus
701 Royall Avenue

From: Coleen Griffin <coleen.griffin@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 10:50 AM
To: Joe Keenan <joe.keenan@pcpsc.com>
Subject: OV tennis courts

Hi Joe,

This is Coleen Griffin from 840 Pitt. Sorry to bother you, but I thought you might be able to offer some insight on the tennis court situation.

I saw the article in the P & C this weekend stating that the town is planning to go forward with rebuilding only 2 courts in the OV as opposed to the existing 3 due to the new 40% impermeable surface rule.

It seems absurd to me that the town would not allow a variance for the courts, given that they have been there for a very long time as is, and they are very heavily used by the recreation department and the neighborhood (my son and his friends often have to wait for a court). It seems to me that a highly valued neighborhood amenity should not be penalized for the inappropriate private residential construction that is the cause for the new rule.

In any case, I sent an email to GM Whitley on Saturday who told me that the final decision has not yet been made. However, I also sent an email to Steve Gergick (Recreation Director who was quoted in the article) and he says that the town (via the recreation committee) would need to submit a variance request to the Board of Zoning Appeals and that they have decided not to do that. I then learned this morning that the two court proposal is going before the OVHC at this evening's meeting.

I noticed you are not on the board anymore? But wondering if you have a sense as to where the OVHC stands on this and if it's worth going to the meeting to continue to push to keep the 3 courts? I feel they are an important asset to our neighborhood and would like to do what I can to see they are rebuilt as 3 courts.

Thanks so much for your time and any insight you may have.

Best,
Coleen

Mr. Hirshorn asked Mr. Pruitt to keep him apprised as to any support he may be able to provide.

Mr. Pohlman asked if there were any comments on the cabana styles or the usage of vinyl chain link fencing.

Ms. Wilson stated that she would prefer the built cabana, as opposed to the fabric awning. She applauds the new lighting scheme as well.

Mr. Pruitt asked if the black vinyl chain link fence is acceptable.

Commission members responded in the affirmative.

3. [311 Venning Street](#) – Survey 6187 – (TMS 532-01-00-264) Conceptual Review for Accessory Dwelling Unit.

[CONSENT MOTION]

4. [315 Bennett Street](#) – Survey 6130– (TMS 532-01-00-024) Final Review for Alterations to Fencing and Installation of Parking pad.

Mr. Austin Rutherford reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

David Shuford, homeowner stated that he is not sure who was involved in the Phase 1 of the landscape project; however, they originally put the fence in the backyard and were not sure if grass would grow in the side yard. He said before they fenced it in, they were treating it as a side yard. He said the grass is doing well there, so they will have more room for the children and the dog. He said along the front they also did not know originally what parking would be required. He said they moved into the house in January and now realize they need more than anticipated. He said the back is too tight for their SUV's. He said it was suggested by the landscape architect to run the parking area along the road; however, they are open to any comments or recommendations by the Commission.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that his experience is that many homes in the Old Village have the street-side gravel parking spaces. He understands the need; however, the material that works best is the plantation mix. He said it is loose material, but when wet, it bonds and does not run into the street. He said the proposed river pebble is not recommended.

Ms. Montgomery agreed with Mr. Hirshorn's comments.

Ms. Rowe stated that the plantation mix is more subtle looking, as well. She said that Mr. Shuford has done a wonderful job with the property and she does not have any issue, as long as it is not the bigger pebbles.

Ms. Wilson stated that she would actually like to see the parking area reduced. She said it is a huge run of gravel and she is personally not in favor of plantation mix. She said she would like to see the material bordered and contained in some way. She stated that this is a massive run of gravel in a high visibility historic street. She stated that she is not agreeable with a large parking area, without it being broken out with some thought in the landscaping and how to buffer it. She said it is going to be so easy that there

will be vehicles in front of their house all the time. She is agreeable with the fence, but not the parking strip.

Mr. Hirshorn asked if Ms. Wilson would recommend a brick border or a reduction of the surface area or both.

Ms. Wilson said both. She said she would prefer that it not be located on Bennett. She said the homeowner has accomplished a significant amount of work on the front of the home to restore. She said she lives across the street from a neighbor who did the same thing and the whole block parks in front of their home, because it is not landscaped. She said you end up with a parking lot in front of your home. She said at the very least, she would like to see it bordered and defined as a single space with landscaping breaking it up.

Mr. Shuford stated that it was the recommendation from the architect; however, he is in favor of what the Commission recommends, as well as the type of mix used. He said as far as the border on the house side, it would be the steel border.

Ms. Dovre stated that she has seen the house and it is beautiful. She personally would like pavers as opposed to pebble.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that it appears that the consensus is to contain the material to one area with a plantation mix rather than the river stone with some type of confining border.

Ms. Rowe asked if Mr. Shuford has looked into the grass that you are able to park on.

Mr. Shuford stated that he has not. He said there was mention of an installation you are able to park on, where grass is able to grow.

Ms. Wilson made a motion to approve the fence and defer the parking for the project at 315 Bennett Street; seconded by Ms. Rowe. All present voted in favor.

Mr. Hirshorn asked Mr. Shuford to come back next month with another alternative for parking.

5. [908 Pitt Street](#) – Survey 5969– (TMS 532-13-00-058) Final Review for Exterior Siding Change.

Mr. Austin Rutherford reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

No one was available for the project.

Ms. Wilson moved to deny the application for 908 Pitt Street on the grounds the cementitious trim is not appropriate nor is the thinner siding material; seconded by Ms. Dovre. All present voted in favor.

6. [204 Venning Street](#) – Survey 6179– (TMS 532-01-00-078) Final Review for Fencing and After-the-Fact Alterations.

[CONSENT MOTION]

7. [242 Middle Street](#)—Survey 6010– (TMS 532-09-00-024) Conceptual Review for Exterior Alterations.

[CONSENT MOTION]

8. [817 Pitt Street](#) – Survey 5899– (TMS 532-09-00-050) Final Review for Exterior Alterations.

[CONSENT MOTION]

9. [141 Toomer Lane](#) – (TMS 517-15-00-064) Final Review for Exterior Stairs.

[CONSENT MOTION]

10. [118 Pitt Street](#) – **HISTORIC 5939** – (TMS 532-01-00-250) Final Review for Alterations to Stairs and Windows.

Mr. Pohlman reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

Phil Clarke, Clarke Design Group, stated that this house was originally an 1800's house, between 1850 and 1890. He said there may have been a fire at one time in the 1890's. He said the existing house was only the center portion with the porches on the side and the wing on the left side was actually one story. He said the second story wing on the left-hand side and the porch roof on the left side was added in 2005. He said there was a version of the side porch on the left side, which is not the main entry prior to 2005. In 2005, the second floor was added and the pieces on the rear were added. He said currently no one uses the front entry on the right-hand side. He said the left entry, which is more of a private entry becomes very public. He said they would like to take away the stack parking, pull the impervious coverage back towards the street, take away the set of stairs that comes down towards the street on the side entry. He said they will be able to take the fence that is there now and move it up closer to the street

so that you are able to come out the side door and go into the yard and not spill out onto the street. He said this would allow them to focus all of the public traffic onto the right-hand side. He said from a floor plan elevation issue, in 2005/2006 when the rear section was added (the two-story addition and the partial one-story addition). He said there is a window on the very rear of the house, not seen from the street, that they would like to remove. He said they are redoing the kitchen in the back portion of the house, so the single window will become a double window and the window to the left of it with the side stair, will become a door to exit the rear portion of the house into the yard. He said the window on the rear elevation will be removed and replaced with the same wood siding.

Ms. Wilson said that she has an issue with the rear. She said she is guessing the neighbor would be able to see the rear elevation and asked if the homeowner would be willing to shutter the rear window and close it from the inside and leave the casing. She said it is too large of a blank wall and believes it is visible from the rear neighbor and backside. She said other than this she is fine.

Ms. Dovre stated that she likes the plan because of the house and lot size.

Ms. Montgomery asked when the piazzas were put back on.

Mr. Clarke stated that he is unsure and has worked on this house for the past twenty years and of all the different pieces he has seen, he is not certain. He stated that Mr. Coleman may have some old photographs.

Ms. Montgomery stated that she remembers when they were not there. She said homeowners used to do that when porches became rotten, they would simply take them off.

Mr. Coleman stated that in 1989, there was a single front porch.

Ms. Wilson made a motion to approve the application for 119 Pitt Street, with the condition that the casing is retained on the removed window and infilled with a shutter; seconded by Ms. Rowe. All present voted in favor.

11. [116 Beach Street](#) – (TMS 5147-15-00-140) Final Review for After-the-Fact Alterations to Pool.

[CONSENT MOTION]

12. [204 Live Oak Drive](#) – HISTORIC 6234 – (TMS 517-15-00-029) Final Review for Accessory Dwelling Unit.

[CONSENT MOTION]

V. Staff Approvals

1. 9 Pierates Cruz – Survey 6068– (TMS 532-09-00-014) Reroofing
2. 817 Pitt Street – Survey 5899– (TMS 532-09-00-050) Reroofing, Siding, and Window alterations. Non-historic.

VI. Motion to Adjourn

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

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned at 5:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Ashe
May 14, 2018