

**OLD VILLAGE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MEETING NOTICE
July 9, 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; Leigh Rowe, Louisa
Montgomery and Ann Dove

EXCUSED ABSENCE: Heather Wilson, Vice Chair

STAFF PRESENT: Austin Rutherford, 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. Rowe moved for approval; seconded by Ms. Montgomery. All present voted in favor.

II. Approval of Minutes

[June 11, 2018](#)

Ms. Montgomery moved to approve the minutes; seconded by Ms. Rowe. All present voted in favor.

III. Public Comment & General Correspondence

Corey Barber, 120 Rose Lane, stated that he was not readily aware of the meetings that took place in 2016 regarding the St. Andrews Church plans. He heard that some select neighbors received via mail a notice; however, he did not receive any notice. He believes the large scale commercial

project in a residential setting is different and everyone should have been notified and made aware, especially if the Town's Commissions and Boards cannot uphold all the rules and ordinances while residents are not able to make the meetings. He does not know who was on the Commission two years ago and if any of them are affiliated with St. Andrews Church. He does question the Commission's review of the design, as well as the Zoning Board, but does not know if they are involved. He had questions on the judgments of buffers and variances and would appreciate it if this Commission would respond to them. First, why do the neighbors adjacent on the east and northeast corner have to look at a less than historic design and finishes. He said the Venning Street side has a nice-looking facade, but no one lives there because it is a parking lot. He said the Rose Lane side, north and east sides, get a commercial looking efface box, potentially loud rooftop HVAC systems that have no screening. Should all aspects of the building meet historic design goals and requirements. He does not know what other buildings look like this in the historic district. He asked why no renderings from those sides of the building were included in the submission from last month. He said this is the only submission he has had the opportunity to see. Why would the views from the north and the east not matter to this Commission? Why was the buffer requirement waived on the east side where a variance appears to have been granted? He asked if a forty-five-foot-tall building, eight feet from the property line of a small one-story residence, without any buffer requirement is acceptable. He asked Commission members if they think this does not affect the value of their property. He asked if they felt it was safe in a potential future fire. He said they woke up at 4:00 AM and felt the heat from the fire recently and they are across the street and not directly adjacent. He said the church has a large parking lot and does not understand why this property was not used to satisfy whatever space requirements the church appears to need. He believes the church wants to respect their neighbors and moderate adjustments could be made and accomplished by the design firms that have been hired by the church. He said everyone will say this is "too late",

but he wanted to provide his comments and feels that it is never too late to do what is right.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that with reference to the notices, they were posted at the site which is the procedure for all applications. He said the design firm did make an effort to contact all surrounding residents.

Mr. Barber asked if there is a list of those neighbors that were contacted.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that the design was a process that went on for many months with individuals from the public present who voiced their comments at the time of the application. He said all aspects of the design were reviewed after months of iterations and they were approved. He stated that the last application, which was last month, was to address minor features that the church adjusted as a result of the recent fire. He said there were no large-scale design changes.

Mr. Barber stated that his concern was that he did not feel there was enough notice. He said posting a sign on a street that he may never drive down is not helpful. He said he has seen the yellow signs lying down, but not upright.

Ms. Rowe stated that the church parking lot cannot be utilized, because it cannot be made pervious.

Mr. Rutherford stated that the parking lot is also not located in the Old Village Historic District. He stated that the application went through a non-commercial site review which is approved at staff level.

Frank Ancrum, 107 Rose Lane, stated that he owns an adjacent property at the back of the church, and said that this will totally depreciate his property. He said what he does not like it.

Mr. Hirshorn interrupted and stated that the St. Andrews Church application is not on the agenda for this evening.

Mr. Ancrum stated that he understands, but he was advised that he has two minutes to speak.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that he understands; however, there is nothing this Commission is able to do regarding the St. Andrews Church project. He

stated that the Commission is not approving or disapproving an application for the church, because it has already been approved.

Mr. Ancrum stated that it does not take much for everyone to ruin Mount Pleasant. (Mr. Ancrum returned to his seat in the audience)

Veronica Barber, 120 Rose Lane, stated that she also wants to discuss the 440 Whilden Street project as well. She said that it is her understanding that this Commission approved a decrease in the size of the buffer from fifteen feet to ten feet.

Ms. Rowe stated that she believes that the Chairman just advised that this item is not on the agenda.

Ms. Barber stated that she thought she could have two minutes of public comment.

Mr. Rutherford stated that she can speak for two minutes.

Mr. Ancrum stated that he did not even get that (two minutes).

Ms. Barber continued and stated that she is wondering about the five-foot-wide concrete sidewalk in the buffer, so there is still a 10.33 foot buffer from what she understands. She stated that there are no renderings from the Rose Lane side, so she would appreciate this information and transparency from the developer of the church. She said the proposed use of the buildings is a church and a school; however, will it still be from infant through kindergarten or is there a future expansion and what type. She said this is a non-profit and asked if there have been studies by the Town about the impact on Simmons Street as Moultrie Middle School is also expanding. She said this will also affect the Coleman Boulevard/Simmons Street intersection. She said what they are requesting consideration and would like the Commission's assistance, as this has already been reviewed by the Commission. She said regarding the rooftop HVAC units, they would like to request that they be pushed more towards Whilden Street and consolidated, as well as screened, because they are noisy and unattractive. She said there is a second story balcony that looks over Rose Lane and they are requesting that this be taken out. She said they can still have that area, but it should not be

commonly used. She stated that approximately twenty mature trees were removed from the northwest side of the site and are irreplaceable in her and her children's lifetime. She said the church is paying over \$18,000 into the Tree Bank and she would like these funds to be used to plant more mature nursery stock on the Rose Lane property owners' side and make sure that the trees take root, so there is more of a buffer in that area. She said those property owners deserve a buffer. She said this is not right. She asked if the church will be installing security lighting where the sidewalk is located on that side of the building, and if so, asked that it only be installed on the first story level and should be downlighting. She said this would prevent light pollution which is an issue in their area, especially in a residential area with single family homes on small lots, essentially an institution. She said they had a playground and 35-inch grand trees, so they are asking for the church to be a good neighbor. She understands this is a project that is important to the church, but their houses are important to them.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that Ms. Barber has reached her two minutes and reiterated that this was a project that had public notice and was brought before the Commission for a number of months prior to being approved. He stated that the church recently came back for some minor modifications after the fire. He stated that these concerns should have been aired at the time the application was before the Commission.

Ms. Barber stated that typically adjacent property owners are notified; however, she is across the street, so she was never notified. She said Mr. Ancrum is an adjacent property owner and he was never notified and asked the reason why the property owners were not notified.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that required signage was posted.

Ms. Barber argued that the signs are too small and do not indicate anything about the magnitude of the project. She provided a copy of her concerns to Commission members.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that he does not feel this is the appropriate forum for these concerns.

Ms. Barber asked about the buffers.

Ms. Rowe stated that this does not fall under the purview of the Commission.

Ms. Barber stated that it was in the Board of Zoning Appeals meeting minutes from June of 2017 or 2016, and it stated that the buffer was the purview of the Old Village Historic District Commission.

Mr. Rutherford stated that the setbacks are within the purview of the Commission and the Commission can approve those requests. He said any buffer issues would be handled through the Town during the staff level review and not by this Commission.

Mr. Hirshorn suggested contacting St. Andrews Church to voice their concerns and to seek other avenues through the Zoning Board or Town Hall as this Commission does not have the ability at this time to help resolve any of the issues raised.

Ms. Barber stated that the church needs oversight and asked who at the Town would be able to help them.

Mr. Rutherford stated that any of the site design with reference to buffering and trees would be handled at the staff level. He stated that this would involve the Town's arborist and the Town's non-commercial site design reviewer. He stated that the church would be required to mitigate trees that are removed.

Ms. Barber stated that they could be planted in Park West.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that if Ms. Barber wishes to continue this discussion further, this is not the forum and suggested that she contact the Town.

Ms. Montgomery stated that Ms. Barber has a valid concern about the lighting and suggested that this is addressed with those in charge of this project.

Mr. Ancrum stated that he feels that the Commission was impolite to him, because he was entitled regardless to his two minutes of public comment, which was not too much to ask. It is not right. He said he was

not able to express his thoughts and if he is entitled to two minutes, he should have it, regardless.

IV. Consent Motions

Ms. Rowe moved to accept the applications for items #1, 242 Middle Street; #2, 407 Royall Avenue; #3, 141 Toomer Lane; and #5, 308 McCormick Street, as submitted; seconded by Ms. Montgomery. All present voted in favor.

V. Business

STAFF REPORT

1. [242 Middle Street](#) – Survey 6010 – (TMS 532-09-00-024) Applicant is seeking Final Review for Exterior Alterations.

[Consent Motion Approval]

2. [407 Royall Avenue](#) – (TMS 532-05-00-063) Applicant is seeking Final Review for a new inground pool and spa and to screen in the front porch.

[Consent Motion Approval]

3. [141 Toomer Lane](#) – Historic 4244 – (TMS 517-15-00-064) Applicant is seeking Final Review for replacing fencing.

[Consent Motion Approval]

4. [908 Pitt Street](#) – Survey 5969 – (TMS 532-13-00-058) Applicant is seeking Final Review for site hardscaping, fences and wall, and revisions to stairs.

Mr. Rutherford reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

David Tomblin, Architect representing the homeowner, stated that staff provided them with clear direction last time to provide more greenspace and reduce the hardscape. He stated that there were also three different fences that the Commission questioned. He said they did not clarify to the Commission why those three fences were there and what their uses were. He stated that he will

address the hardscape issue first. He stated that they went into the courtyard and instead of the bluestone being surrounded by granite fines, they are putting in turf around it which will grow and shrink the size of the bluestone visually. He stated at the parking for the ADU, they introduced the idea of the bluestone surrounded by the grass and wherever they are not parking, they will put a side strip. He said at the main parking area for the residence, they will put large grass strips. He said they removed all the pavers out of the back and went to the idea of bluestone surrounded with sod. He said as a percentage in the courtyard, they reduced their hardscape by 71% and on the parking areas, they reduced it by 21%.

Ms. Montgomery stated that there is a house on Pitt Street that has pavers and further in, there is a square rectangular area with bricks and oyster shells and plantation mix in between, so that you do not see a long concrete driveway.

Mr. Tomblin said that he would be happy to look at it and asked if it was a mix of materials. He said at the last meeting, the Commission reiterated that they wanted more greenspace.

Ms. Montgomery stated that the large space behind the ADU would be a perfect area to put a similar rectangular area.

Mr. Tomblin stated that this is also where the storm sceptor is located. He said that the civil engineer on the drainage study stated that they must have it there with a system that really drains through there. He said he loves oyster shell and will explore it.

Ms. Montgomery stated that she believes they have done a wonderful job.

Mr. Tomblin stated that Town staff really assisted with the process. The other item the Commission had concerns with was fencing. He said there are three different types of fencing. He said the picket fence is picked up from the neighbors. They remove the chain-link fencing which is overgrown with vines and brush and

extend it to the back end of the house, tying it into the architecture. Then they pick up the six-foot privacy fence at the back main residence. He said it will also serve as the pool containment, so the fence must be at least 48 inches. He said that they would also replace the six-foot wood privacy fence at the back that is falling down and in poor condition. He said they will come back around and tie it in to form the pool enclosure. He said they will continue it around and stop it where they would like to discuss with the Commission the idea of a small wall, where they would then continue with the picket fence all the way up to the front with a gate. He said the picket is very appropriate, the six-foot privacy is where it needs to be to hide and contain the pool for safety. He said the small stucco wall, in the original architecture, ties into the base of the house which is stucco. In their design plans, they have a small wing wall that turns the corner and begins to retain the grade in order to push the water towards the storm sceptor. He asked if it could be a 4 ½ foot garden wall, defining the entrance into the courtyard. He said with the base of the main house being stucco, there is already architectural direction.

Anton Roeger, homeowner, stated that out by Pitt Street, it is nine-feet and the grade goes back to six-feet, which is why the retaining wall was designed up front in order to provide for the grade. He said they have the retaining wall there, so they would have to fence on top of it simply extending the height of the retaining wall to try and make it appear to be a courtyard at the front entrance.

Mr. Hirshorn asked about the height of the retaining wall as proposed.

Mr. Tomblin stated that the retaining wall at the back would be approximately six feet, but the grade comes up and at the entrance where it is at the garden wall is 4 ½ feet and blends with the 4 ½ foot gate.

Mr. Roeger stated that the picket fence is up against Joe Keenan's property, so it encloses his picket fence as they are removing the chain link fencing that is bordering their properties. He stated that he has had discussions with all the neighbors, who were provided copies.

Ms. Montgomery stated that she is concerned about the six-foot fence; however, feels that landscaping would take care of the height.

Mr. Tomblin stated that they are doing a row of 15-gallon mahonia shrubs, so they will already be 3 ½ to 4 feet tall. He said from the street you will only see the 4 ½ foot classic wall and this is where their big safety issue lies.

Ms. Rowe stated that where the picket fence goes down the driveway, why not take the picket fence all the way back, so that you do not see picket and then privacy.

Mr. Tomblin stated that it is an architectural decision to change from the courtyard to the private residence.

Mr. Roeger stated that bordering Joe Keenan's property are his utilities and HVAC units, so Mr. Keenan would not be looking at anything, but he would be looking at Mr. Keenan's HVAC units. He said this would have the picket fence around the ADU and the main house would have the privacy fence.

Ms. Dovre stated that she likes it and believes that the homeowner and architect have studied this a great deal. She looks forward to the finished product.

Mr. Roeger stated that looking down the path from Pitt Street, you would not see the transition from picket fence to privacy fence.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that the only thing he would add on the record is that the Commission has shied away from the walled in fencing. He said there have been a number of applications over the years that have not been approved for privacy walls.

Ms. Rowe stated that she feels this is different, because it is a retaining wall.

Mr. Tomblin stated that it functions to retain and is simply a garden type fence.

Mr. Hirshorn also asked about the staircase.

Mr. Tomblin stated that when they presented last time, the original plans had a double staircase; however, they propose to eliminate the double staircase to make more greenspace.

Ms. Rowe moved to approve the application as submitted for 908 Pitt Street; seconded by Ms. Montgomery. All present voted in favor.

5. [308 McCormick Street](#) – Survey 6078 – (TMS 532-09-00-246) Applicant is seeking Final Review for proposed alterations to previously approved exterior changes to the main home.

[Consent Motion Approval]

6. [200 Queen Street](#) – Survey 6091 – (TMS 532-05-00-025) Applicant is seeking Final Review on a rear gable roof.

Mr. Rutherford reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

Hans Altenbach, architect representing homeowner, **Ken Spicer**, stated that they also requested a small 15-inch bump out on the east elevation, which is on the floor plan and the site plan. He said it is a minor adjustment to facilitate a better pantry and laundry room.

Ms. Montgomery stated that she prefers the option with the one larger dormer in the center.

Commission members agreed.

Dr. Spicer stated that the house was destroyed by Hurricane Hugo and the more elements on a roof, the more vulnerable you are to lose it. The single larger dormer was also his preference.

Ms. Montgomery moved to accept the first alternative view as indicated for 200 Queen Street; seconded by Ms. Dovre. All present voted in favor.

Mr. Altenbach asked if the Commission's motion would also include the 15-inch bump out request for the pantry.

Commission members responded in the affirmative.

VI. Staff Approvals

Mr. Rutherford stated that there were no staff approvals.

VII. Motion to Adjourn

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

There being no further business, meeting adjourned at 5:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Ashe
July 9, 2018