

**OLD VILLAGE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
MEETING NOTICE  
April 9, 2018 at 5:00pm  
Town Hall Committee Meeting Room  
3<sup>rd</sup> 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

**ABSENT:** 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 Minutes**

*Ms. Wilson moved to approve the February 12, 2018 and March 12, 2018 minutes; seconded by Ms. Montgomery. All present voted in favor.*

**II. Public Comment & General Correspondence**

- a. [Review and vote on Staff recommendations for adding temporary handicap/ADA access to Staff Level Review List and Commission recommendation of removal of Guidelines for Site Features #4.](#)

*Ms. Wilson made a motion to move this item to the end of the agenda; seconded by Ms. Rowe. All present voted in favor.*

### III. BUSINESS

#### STAFF REPORT

*Ms. Wilson moved for consent motion on item #2, 10 Pierates Cruz; #4, 135 Toomer Lane; #5, 304 King Street; #6, 720 Pitt Street and #7, 202 Bank Street; seconded by Ms. Rowe. All present voted in favor.*

1. [221 Queen Street](#) – Survey 6097 – (TMS 532-05-00-029) Final Review for Installation of Hot Tub, fencing, and generator enclosure. Rev. 03.29.2018

Mr. Rutherford reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

**Larry Hudson**, 221 Queen Street, stated that he is the homeowner and submitted additional diagrams and photographs of the proposed project. He said that he believes they have addressed the items that were brought up at the last meeting.

Ms. Montgomery stated that she is still concerned that the Commission does not have a picture or diagram of the gate that leads off Queen Street.

Mr. Hudson stated that they have a carpenter that is going to design the gate in the same fashion of the pickets that are on the gate. He stated that they have pictures of the actual gate on Queen Street that was submitted. He said that the carpenter will be building a gate that will match the fence.

Ms. Montgomery asked about the height.

Mr. Hudson said that the height is 38 inches high and 49 inches wide.

Ms. Montgomery asked about the height of the present pickets and how much of a difference will it be.

Mr. Hudson stated that they are going to be exactly the same pickets that are on the existing fence. He said it would be the same height as the actual fence and will not be any different.

Ms. Montgomery asked if it would be the height of the post or the height of the last picket that rises up.

Mr. Hudson stated that the pickets that are closest to the post are the highest and descend and rise back up and this is how the fence will be. He said the highest picket will be next to the post and will form the same pattern that is on the picket fence.

Ms. Wilson said the fact that the Commission has so many questions indicates that it is unclear. She stated that this must be drawn to scale and with dimensions. She said in the picture, none of the pickets are the same height and taller than the fence. She said in her opinion, the lattice is not appropriate, so it would need to be something different and possibly goes with the fence. She said that perhaps it could use the vernacular of a shutter or something that is more in keeping with the house. She said you typically do not see lattice in anything.

Mr. Hudson stated that they have a house caddy-corner to theirs on the corner of Pitt Street and Friend Street and has no visual blockage with the pool.

Ms. Wilson stated that it is not a raised pool.

Mr. Hudson stated that his hot tub is on a slab and not raised.

Ms. Rowe stated that the hot tub will be raised,

Mr. Hudson stated that it will be screened by the decorative lattice that will be done by a carpenter.

Ms. Wilson stated that there are a number of projects that were completed in the Old Village that were done before there was a Commission.

Mr. Hudson stated that he does have pictures of similar types of lattice on his mobile phone.

Ms. Wilson stated that the Commission needs to have something in a document that is drawn to scale and dimension and something that when Mr. Juan does his inspections, that he has a data point to see what was approved.

Mr. Hudson reiterated that he has a skilled trim carpenter that will do the work and he has the diagrams and will do a turnkey job.

Ms. Wilson stated that the Commission cannot just take the word of the applicant for this and must have something drawn on paper, to scale with dimensions. She stated that she cannot support what has been submitted.

Mr. Hudson stated that he does not mean to argue; however, the dimensions he submitted are correct dimensions.

Ms. Wilson stated that the drawing does not even match with what was stated earlier. She advised Mr. Hudson that he said the gate would be the same height as the fence; however, in the drawing, it is higher.

Mr. Hudson said the Commission must realize that the posts that are on the sides of the entry of the gate actually project slightly higher than the actual gate.

Ms. Wilson stated that if Mr. Hudson would work with Mr. Pohlman or Mr. Rutherford in the Planning office, they will be able to show drawings that have been completed by other applicants for gates and fences that have been approved. She said that until the Commission receives a drawing that is to scale and dimension, this project cannot be approved.

Mr. Hudson stated that he would like the record to show that this is the third meeting that they have attended and the Commission has not been clear and this is a colossal waste of time for not only the Commission but for them as well.

Ms. Wilson stated that they have been very clear that the Commission is uncomfortable with this.

Mr. Hudson stated that he believes the Commission needs to be consistent and uncomfortable is not an accurate word.

Mr. Hirshorn said that this request is a tall ask to approve a raised hot tub that is visible from the right-of-way to begin with, which was their initial concern. He said that the Commission somewhat acquiesced albeit somewhat reluctantly to come up with a schematic where the

hot tub would be hidden from the right of way. He said that the Commission has requested twice now for an accurate to scale plan on how this hot tub, which the Commission is not in favor of, will be hidden completely from the right-of-way. He said if Mr. Hudson will review the other documents that the Commission receives with plans and to scale drawings, nothing on this application, including the pictures, is to scale. He is not opposed to hand drawings, but they must be to scale and accurate, particularly when it is an item that is as sensitive such as a hot tub, which this Commission has not approved in the past.

Mr. Hudson stated that any future dealings will be with his attorney and he will be suing if he does not receive approval. He said that they have made a genuine effort and will be using a skilled, finished carpenter and they have just as much interest in maintaining their property as the Commission does in protecting the public. He said when you have a pool right across the street that has no barrier whatsoever, this is not consistent with the standard that the Commission is putting on them.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that a raised hot tub and an inground pool are not similar.

Mr. Hudson stated that the hot tub has a furniture appearance.

Ms. Rowe stated that a hot tub is not commonly seen in a historic district.

Mr. Hudson stated that it will be completely visually screened with the picket gate that has been proposed. He said what the Commission is asking for is for them to go to an architect to draw something to scale and what they provide is not going to be anything different, other than something that is to scale, than what he has drawn today.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that this is what the Commission requires; something to scale.

Ms. Rowe stated that the Commission has stated that they will not approve the lattice.

Mr. Hudson stated that this is not practical.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that this is part of the requirements for applications.

Ms. Wilson stated that it is very clear and an absolute requirement for applications that things be drawn to scale and Mr. Hudson is not being held to a different standard than anyone else.

Mr. Hudson stated that he believes they are.

Ms. Wilson provided Mr. Hudson with an example of a project. She stated that this is what Mr. Hudson should be providing to the Commission.

Mr. Hudson stated that for the fence to be built that has not been built yet, a finished carpenter is not going to be able to draw something to scale, in his opinion, and he sees no reason why they should have to go to an architect.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that everyone who applies must submit plans that are drawn to scale. He said this is not unique, it is every application.

Mr. Hudson stated that they have done due diligence in coming to the Commission to seek approval when others have told them to just put the hot tub in. He said they tried to do it the right way. He said that they will be putting the hot tub in and will do the due diligence and will deal with the Commission after-the-fact.

Ms. Wilson stated that she is sorry Mr. Hudson feels this way.

Ms. Montgomery stated that she understands and can appreciate his frustration. She just heard that it is a wooden hot tub.

Mr. Hudson stated that it has a wood finish, just like a piece of furniture.

Ms. Montgomery stated that this is the first she knew of this. She envisioned a green fiberglass type of hot tub.

Mr. Hudson said it looks like a piece of furniture and from the road you would not be able to tell the difference between the hot tub and a table.

Ms. Montgomery stated that it would have been nice to have a picture.

Mr. Hudson stated that he submitted a picture at their first meeting with the Commission. He stated that it looks like a wood piece of furniture and the actual tub is recessed.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that the application is not complete.

Mr. Hudson stated that this will be their final visit to the Commission and if there are any problems it will be handled in court.

Ms. Wilson stated with all due respect, the threats are not helpful or constructive and if Mr. Hudson would refrain from that.

Mr. Hudson stated that they will not be back and will not waste the Commission's time or theirs, because it is obvious this is going in circles.

Ms. Wilson stated for the records that the gate is not approved.

Ms. Rowe stated that it is not unusual to come back before the Commission several times. She said her own house came back before the Commission six times.

Mr. Hudson stated that he does not know how his carpenter is going to be able to draw this diagram. He said that he is a finished carpenter and does high end carpentry work. He added that they are not going to do anything to diminish property values.

Ms. Wilson stated that this is not the point but appreciates his comments.

*Ms. Wilson moved to defer the application until the Commission has drawings to scale that accurately describe the project; seconded by Ms. Rowe. All present voted in favor.*

2. [10 Pierates Cruz](#) – Survey 6072– (TMS 532-09-00-018) Final Review for Expansion of Front Entryway, Hardscape Alterations, and Installation of On-street Parkingpad.

**[Consent Motion]**

3. [440 Whilden Street](#) – **HISTORIC 6176**– (TMS 532-01-00-120 & 532-01-00-119) Final Review for Signage.

Mr. Rutherford reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

**Jacqueline D’Amico**, Charleston Sign and Banner, stated that she was originally going to request four signs; however, they are going to only request three. She stated that all three signs are wood, with wood posts. She stated that they wanted to update the sign, because the current signs are more difficult to see. She said the church wanted the signs to be clearer for those attending services. She said only one sign will be installed in a new location and the other two signs are updates to older signs. She stated that the sign which indicates “Historic Church Ministry Center Office and Reception”, is the brand-new free-standing sign. She stated that it will be painted brown to match the older portion of the church. She stated in that same area, they will be adding a hanging directional right above the main entrance to make it clear that this is the entrance for contemporary worship, not the historical church area. She said the hardware will be done in oil rubbed bronze with a hanging wooden brown sign. She stated that the last sign will replace the parking sign on Whilden and Venning Streets.

Ms. Montgomery said the one that is being replaced on the corner of Whilden and Venning Streets is quaint, and the area is quaint. She said she would prefer to see something slightly more gothic. She stated that the two white posts on either side of the sign are visually intrusive. She asked if it had to have two posts, do they need to be white, is it possible to have only one post in the middle, and give the sign more charm.

Ms. D’Amico stated that they are attempting to make it cohesive, but still blend with the current, but not have to replace it again with the

future design of the church. She said they are attempting to keep the charm and the same materials. She asked if Ms. Montgomery's version of gothic included arches, because the church would like to remove them going forward. She said that the church is attempting to replace this.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that much of the new design and construction is more contemporary.

Ms. Montgomery stated that even with new construction it still has more of a charm. She said that she is not completely in agreement with it but knows it must be updated. She asked why have it done now, if the church does not want it to look too old fashioned in comparison to the new construction. She asked why not wait until the new construction is complete.

Ms. D'Amico stated that the current signage is confusing, so the church wanted to update some of the signs to make it easier to navigate.

Ms. Wilson said it is understated and clean and simple. She does agree with Ms. Montgomery on the double white posts. She asked Ms. D'Amico if the sign could be changed to a single post.

Ms. D'Amico stated that she would have to discuss this with the church but asked if the posts were painted brown would this be acceptable.

Ms. Wilson said either one white post or two brown posts. She stated that she does not have an issue with the graphics. She said it is clean, simple and tasteful and especially likes the hanging sign.

Ms. D'Amico added that the church has a new logo and this reflects that the logo is more modern. She said the gothic will not reflect well, so she is attempting to keep the signs as simple as possible. She asked to confirm that the Commission was agreeable with one white post or two brown posts for the signage.

Ms. Wilson stated that she likes the way Ms. D'Amico radius the corners on the one over the door, so if the other signs where similar on a single post, to soften it slightly, but keep the modern layout, it would be nice, transitional and clean.

Ms. D'Amico stated that she also likes the rounded corners and will discuss any changes with the church.

Ms. Wilson asked if Ms. D'Amico would prefer the Commission approve the signs, assuming the church likes the changes.

*Ms. Wilson moved to approve the three smaller signs for St. Andrews Church, all to have rounded corners and a single post; seconded by Ms. Rowe.*

Ms. Montgomery asked if the single post in the center will be brown, white or can it be stained so that it is not so jarring. She said there is nothing white there at the church now.

Ms. D'Amico stated that they can, but it would not compliment the text in the sign. She said the church wanted to make it brighter.

Ms. Wilson stated that it would get lost if it were brown on brown. She said it is similar to the old-fashioned street markers.

Ms. D'Amico stated that the sign is only four feet high, so it is small.

*All present voted in favor.*

4. [135 Toomer Lane](#) – (TMS 517-15-00-064) Final Review for Hardscape Alterations.

**[Consent Motion]**

5. [304 King Street](#) – HISTORIC 6125 – (TMS 532-01-00-041) Final Review for Installation of Handle Rail.

**[Consent Motion]**

6. [720 Pitt Street](#) – HISTORIC 5954 – (TMS 517-15-00-028) Final Review for Shutters and Handle Rails

**[Consent Motion]**

7. [202 Pitt Bank Street](#) – ~~HISTORIC 5940~~ Survey 6110 – (~~TMS 532-05-00-225~~) (TMS 532-05-00-225) Final Review for Installation of Retaining Wall. Rev. 03/29/2018

**[Consent Motion]**

8. [200 Queen Street](#) – Survey 6091– (TMS 532-05-00-025) ~~Final Review~~ Conceptual Review for Alterations and Additions. Rev. 03/29/2018

Mr. Rutherford reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

**Hans Altenbach**, representing the homeowners, stated that they did a reset on the plans for the house. He said a key difference is that they did away with the solar panels and opened up more opportunity to explore the design concept which was to step the roof massing back away from the neighbors on the south and east edge and bring it back up towards the north neighbor with their raised two-story house. He said going towards the harbor, they did raise it up and stepped it down to a lower roofed porch on the harbor side. He said that the general concept was to attempt to adjust the roof massing and break it up.

Ms. Wilson thanked Mr. Altenbach for his presentation, which is much easier to understand. She believes he has done a good job in trying to keep with the general concept of the existing house, while acquiring more living space. She stated that a tremendous amount of progress has been made. She stated that the porches being added have a low head height and want to ensure this is what they were attempting to accomplish. She said it is just a thought on the 7'5" beams on the east elevation to lift them slightly. She said although the house is not historic, they do have complete gables and what is being proposed are runoff gables, which you do not see in historic neighborhoods. She said you would typically see a complete gable and a corner board. She said even if an artificial corner board has to be put in to break the rooflines, so they have their own integrity. She said this condition exists in two areas. She said in general, she does like most of the window configurations. She said there is classic and appropriate. She said there are a few unique hopper windows that, if possible, suggests

they be avoided. She said they are likely in bathrooms on the north elevation. She said those types of little transom windows that are not really transoms associated with doors and windows.

Mr. Altenbach said it was in the shower of a bathroom and asked if Ms. Wilson preferred they be eliminated.

Ms. Wilson stated that what she would prefer is if the gable got a corner board and it was a complete gable, and then there are the two over two classic windows which makes for a well-proportioned façade, and then the transom window slips in and is not in keeping with the rest of the hard work. She also had a question about the French doors on the harbor side and asked if they were intended to be full light or will there be muttons or any type of wood panel.

Mr. Altenbach said that the French doors were meant to be full glass for the view.

Ms. Wilson asked if the porches will be screened.

Mr. Altenbach stated that it was not the intent and the homeowners would prefer not to have screens.

Ms. Wilson stated some homeowners do a big modern with sliders with no muttons; however, this home is in between, because there is the classic proportioned French door, but no muttons.

Mr. Altenbach stated that the homeowner wanted the large oversized modern slider and felt that it was not in keeping with front elevation, but if he could go back to that, he would prefer it.

Ms. Wilson said what is currently being proposed is in between big and modern and classic.

Ms. Rowe stated that she applauds what has been done and said it is much more attractive. She said that she is in favor of the windows all being the same across the new east elevation and the window in the middle appears out of place.

Ms. Wilson stated that this window does not bother her as much, because it appears to be a hyphen in between two gables, but understands what Ms. Rowe is referring to.

Mr. Altenbach stated that he was running into the roofline/barge rafter and proposed to slide it over slightly to the right and make it the same height. He said he did modify the very left gable, which is slightly smaller because of the size of the opening they had. He said it had to be narrower.

Ms. Wilson stated that it looks as if it could be centered in between the two gables and put in a slightly bigger window.

Ms. Rowe asked Commission members about the Bahama shutter on the north elevation. She asked Mr. Altenbach if it is a Bahama shutter.

Mr. Altenbach stated that it was; however, he ran into the roofline. He said they pulled it down to an eight-foot plate and he was unable to open the diaberbal shutters without hitting the eaves.

Ms. Wilson asked if they homeowners need the privacy for that space.

Mr. Altenbach responded in the affirmative and stated that it is a bathroom.

Ms. Wilson suggesting lifting the plate slightly when attempting to get the corner board back, depending how the rooflines interact at that point. She believes the preference of the Commission is not to have Bahama shutters, but have allowed them when there is no other solution for it.

Ms. Rowe asked if the small window at the top with the shutters on the west elevation was necessary.

Mr. Altenbach said that it does not and said a gable vent could be installed instead.

Ms. Montgomery suggested a wood triangular gable vent.

Ms. Wilson asked if the space was vaulted and if it was needed inside.

Mr. Altenbach said he was discussing it with the homeowners but has not come to a conclusion on that area. He felt that it would be nice to vault that area and turn it into a louvered opening.

Ms. Wilson stated that it was over unheated space and do not need a window there.

Mr. Altenbach asked about the head height on the porch, he said they were trying not to go too tall.

Ms. Wilson stated that she is not concerned about that. She said just the fact that a porch has been put there is what the Commission was looking for to acknowledge the street and step it down. She said she would not do anything less than an eight-foot column for bottom of beam at the minimum.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that the Commission will now address the item deferred at the beginning of the agenda.

**Review and vote on Staff recommendations for adding temporary handicap/ADA access to Staff Level Review List and Commission recommendation of removal of Guidelines for Site Features #4.**

*Ms. Wilson made a motion to approve the new guidelines for staff level review for historic and non-historic ADA structures; seconded by Ms. Montgomery. All present voted in favor.*

**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 5:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Ashe

April 9, 2018