

**OLD VILLAGE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MEETING NOTICE
August 13, 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 Dovre

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 to approve the August 13, 2018 agenda; seconded by Ms. Montgomery. All present voted in favor.

II. Approval of Minutes [July 9, 2018](#)

Ms. Montgomery stated that on page 11, Dr. Spicer indicated that the house at 200 Queen Street was destroyed by Hurricane Hugo. She stated that it was not destroyed.

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

III. Public Comment & General Correspondence

Brett Bennett, 131 Hibben Street, stated that he would like to call the Commission's attention to what he and others in his neighborhood are perceiving as an escalating parking problem. He stated that correspondence was sent to Commission members earlier today. He said he also serves on the Shem Creek Task Force and it has been a modest topic of conversation, as everyone is attempting to determine how to manage the activities and the capacity of Shem Creek. He stated that the challenge is the increase of commercial activity along Shem Creek as well as along Coleman Boulevard, and the need for parking. He said that the streets and thoroughfares throughout the Old Village are not curbed nor were they designed for accommodating a great deal of parking, in the rights of way. He said the patrons of the commercial businesses are taking advantage of the parking along the streets. He said that it has become a livability issue for many residents who live on Bennett Street, Live Oak Drive, Haddrell Street and others. He said that he is calling the Commission's attention to this. He does not believe it is expressly the purview of the Old Village Historic District Commission; however, given the purpose of the Commission, his view is that the Commission may be in a position to wield some influence and request the Town and/or the South Carolina Department of Transportation to weigh in on what potential solutions they may suggest. He stated that this is his request for support from the Commission in identifying solutions in one form or another. He added that he does not have recommended solutions; however, some of the ideas that have been discussed are some type of permit program and there may be others. He stated that there is an escalating problem that does not appear to be going away given how popular the Shem Creek and Coleman businesses are.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that it appears that issues have escalated since the construction of the large parking garage. He is not sure if patrons are not utilizing the garage or if there are simply excess demands. He stated that he is not sure what the Commission is able to do; however, this is an issue that is escalating and should be dealt with by the Town as Shem Creek becomes more populated.

Mr. Rutherford stated that when reviewing the pictures, only two of the eight photographs are within the confines of the Historic District.

Mr. Bennett stated that it is three or possibly four of the eight photographs that are within the Historic District. He said the reason for all the pictures is because the parking adjacent to the District influences parking inside the district.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that the Commission is happy to assist with the parking issues.

Mr. Rutherford stated that he would work with staff in terms of reaching out to the Transportation Department, because this deals with areas that are partly in the OVHD and other areas that are not.

Ms. Rowe stated that she constantly receives calls from residents in the OVHD who believe that this Commission does have purview. She stated that there are three Commission members who reside on Hibben Street, so they are well acquainted with this issue.

Ms. Montgomery stated that she has noticed that people are parking on Hibben Street and walking down Church Street to the restaurants. She said as traffic increases, it then becomes a safety issue.

Mr. Rutherford stated that he is aware that some of this is stemmed by the I'On Company's project at the corner of Hibben and Whilden Streets, and the parking on Patjens Lane. He said although the properties on Patjens Lane are in the Old Village, Patjens Lane itself is not. He said the same also goes for most of Whilden and Royall, with the exception of the area in front of the church.

Mr. Hirshorn thanked Mr. Bennett and said the Commission is here to help understand the issue and would welcome any suggestions on how to curb it.

IV. Consent Motions

[No consent motions]

V. Business

STAFF REPORT

1. 966 Pitt Street – Survey 5976 – (TMS 532-13-00-036)

Applicant is seeking Final Review on porch roof and window placement alterations from a previously approved new construction.

Mr. Rutherford reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

Ms. Rowe stated that the alterations look much better.

Ms. Rowe moved to approve the application for 966 Pitt Street on final review for porch roof and window placement by consent; seconded by Ms. Montgomery. All present voted in favor.

2. 210 Bennett Street – Historic 6149 – (TMS 532-01-00-065) Applicant is seeking Conceptual Comment for a home addition, demolishing an existing garage and replacing it with a new ADU/garage, and a pool.

Mr. Rutherford reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

Kate Campbell, Beau Clowney Architects, representing the homeowners, Jeff & Susan Davall, who are moving to Mount Pleasant full time and are from Maryland. She stated that the house was originally built in 1830. She stated that all the additions that are being proposed are one story in nature. She said there was an addition to the rear of the house that was done in 2007 and it can be seen where it notches below the vanity and the whole area was added on to the back of the house, two stories. She stated that they are extending the first floor living space to the rear to create a larger kitchen, living space and a master suite, along with an additional porch. She said the 16% of what they are adding on the rear is porch to make it more livable to the rear yard with the pool. She said alterations were made in 2014 and some of those will be removed based on the deck in the back. She stated that the homeowners have spoken to the most adjacent neighbors who are all in support.

Mr. Hirshorn asked if the garage that is being demolished is of historic nature.

Mr. Rutherford stated that he did not find the garage on any of the historic registers for the surveys.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that in the event an application is presented to demolish the garage, he asked that supporting documentation be presented so the Commission is certain that a historic structure is not being demolished. He said that all materials, windows, window designs and additions, will be scrutinized much more closely as this is a historic structure. He said when the application is submitted for final approval, please ensure all these items have been completed.

Ms. Montgomery stated that her main concern was whether the garage was historic or not. She said as long as the body of the historic home is protected, she believes it will be a vast improvement.

Ms. Rowe stated that the historic structure was lovely, but impossible to live in for a family. She commended Ms. Campbell for her design. She stated that the ADU appears very tall; however, since it is back, she believes it will be fine. She said the garage was not a historic structure. She stated that she agrees with Mr. Hirshorn's comments regarding the materials.

Mr. Rutherford stated that the garage was not even seen in the survey.

Ms. Campbell stated that based on satellite images, the garage appears between 1989 and 1994 on the google timeline.

Mr. Hirshorn asked Ms. Campbell to bring all this documentation.

Mr. Hirshorn asked if Mr. Lisi would be the contractor on this project.

Ms. Campbell responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that he does not have any documentation on materials and windows. He stated that this is an important historic structure on an important historic street. He said that Mr. Lisi is very knowledgeable and does great work.

Ms. Campbell stated that the only area they are touching is the back right corner where a guest suite will be added and on the front for part

of the master suite addition. She said those will be the only sections touching the historic material.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that the Commission is very particular on the ADU's (Accessory Dwelling Units) and asked for the structure to be as compliant as possible in order to save time and effort.

Ms. Dovre asked if the additional roof will use the same materials.

Ms. Campbell said that the roof on the porch will be metal, based on the slope. She said spot elevations are being made currently in order to have a better sense of what the heights are, which will dictate the overall height of the garage. She stated that the property does slope from front to back. She stated that they are open to putting in an apron at the front drive in order to keep the gravel from traveling.

VI. Staff Approvals

1. 510 Pitt Street – Survey 4231 - (TMS 532-05-00-045) Window replacements to match originals.

VII. Motion to Adjourn

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

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Ashe
August 13, 2018