

**OLD VILLAGE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MEETING NOTICE
June 11, 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, Louisa Montgomery and Ann Dove

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

II. Approval of Minutes HW/LM AIF

[May 14, 2018](#)

Ms. Wilson moved for approval of the May 14, 2018 minutes; seconded by Ms. Montgomery. All present voted in favor.

III. Public Comment & General Correspondence

Mr. Rutherford read the following letter into the record.

We, the neighbors of 107 Carr Street, are in full support of the O'Neill's removing all structures currently on the property. We also approve of the proposed construction prepared by Beau Clowney and his staff.

Name: Paul Langston Address: 103 Carr St
 Signature: [Signature] Date: 6/3/18

Name: Linda Jones Address: 310 Bank St
 Signature: [Signature] Date: June 3 2018

Name: Catherine Byrd Address: 304 Bank
 Signature: [Signature] Date: 6/3/18

Name: Freeman Barber Address: 324 Pitt St.
 Signature: FREEMAN BARBER Date: 6/5/18

Name: Ann DuPre' Address: 312 Pitt St.
 Signature: [Signature] Date: 6-10-18

IV. Consent Motions

Ms. Wilson made a motion to consent items #2, 115 Friend Street; and #5, 311 Venning Street; seconded by Ms. Rowe. All present voted in favor.

V. Business

STAFF REPORT

1. 107 Carr Street – Survey 6108 – (TMS 532-05-00-051) Applicant is seeking Conceptual Comment on new single-family home, attached accessory dwelling unit, and detached garage construction with demolition of existing single-family home and detached garage.

Mr. Rutherford reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

Ryan Smith and Beau Clowney of Beau Clowney Architects, presented on behalf of the homeowners. Mr. Smith stated that Town

Hall buildings were on this site in 1971 and relocated to the adjacent park. He said in 2010 the Old Village Historic Survey was conducted and for the second time, this building was passed over for historical significance. He said there are some historical pictures of this building being a double bay with a center door for two fire trucks; however, one bay is no longer in existence. He said there is no evidence of repair for the second bay which dictates that the entire front façade is conceived of new block. He said regarding demolition of this building, they feel there is no historical significance left and the opportunity has since passed to preserve it.

Mr. Hirshorn asked what the applicant's grounds for demolition are.

Mr. Smith stated that it would be item A, that the building and structure is determined not to have any historical significance.

Mr. Clowney stated that it is also no longer a commercial property, it is residential.

Ms. Wilson stated that she does not feel that it does not have historical relevance; however, it is not feasible to renovate, because it is hollow block and below flood. She believes it is an interesting structure as well as the history; however, she does not have an issue with the demolition.

Mr. Rutherford asked that the motion be made contingent upon final review.

Ms. Wilson made a motion that the demolition be approved at 107 Carr Street, contingent upon approval for the final design of the proposed residence; seconded by Ms. Dovre. All present voted in favor.

Mr. Clowney stated that it is a great lot and the choice to put the front elevation on Pitt Street was client-driven with the idea that they would enter from the rear, which is what is happening primarily at this time. He said there is also a magnolia tree on the Carr Street side that sits in the middle of the property which prompted them to think about wanting to do two one car garages that had some of the same

character. He said regarding the encroachment of the one large live oak tree, they would like to work with the Town on this and will set up a meeting with the arborist. He said they feel this area near the tree is a one-story piece and are minimally requesting to encroach on that area by a few feet with some type of cantilever footer or similar. They are hoping that they are able to do what is being proposed. In terms of the overall design site, they spent considerable time thinking about how to design the house with the bulk and mass in the middle of the property as opposed to being on one side or the other. Regarding the small piece that was designed on the front, granted they are within the 25-foot setback at 18 feet, they are not as far forward as the current garage is. They were drawing a line from the house on the corner of Bank and moving back to the house on the other side on Pitt Street and drawing a diagonal line which is where they place that street elevation. He stated that the house is approximately 3,500 square feet heated and they do have the 10% of porches that are required and feel what they are asking for is reasonable. He said the second story is also dormered so there is an effort there to accomplish something that is not overly tall. He said the house is really designed around the current trees on site and the sun orientation.

Mr. Smith stated that one additional item that staff presented, which was the encroachment on the side setback of the pool, was an oversight on their part and has been corrected. They are not intending for this to go over the setback.

Ms. Rowe asked what the lot coverage ratio is.

Mr. Rutherford stated that calculations showed 39.67%.

Ms. Rowe stated that it appears to be covering the entire lot.

Mr. Smith stated that the two-story piece will be on Pitt Street and there is a long one and one and a half story piece that runs along the property line parallel to Bank Street. He said on the Carr Street side there is a two-story portion of one of the garages that has an apartment piece on it. He said there is also a dog-trot screened porch

piece that connects the two-story garage piece to the house. He said that it is stretching from street to street, but it is a very narrow lot and this concept is much better than simply doing a big box house, especially in light of the way they wanted it to function by pulling into the back garden and moving into the house more easily. He said the whole idea for the second garage was utilitarian and the need for storage. He said if you look at the side elevation, there was an effort to spread it out across the site, but in a more traditional fashion. He said the living area of the house is focused on the garden as opposed to doing a boxed house.

Ms. Wilson stated that she loves the dog trot and that it addresses the space between the two houses that face Bank Street. She stated that she does not have an issue with the encroachment on Pitt Street, because they are getting into a denser area of the neighborhood. She said while she likes that they stepped down to Pitt Street, she wonders if some of the one story would be better served in the middle, which takes her back to the elevation A 2.4. She said if they draw in the house that is on the corner of Bank and Pitt Street it would look dwarfed, as they are already four feet taller. She stated that she does not know what their top plate is on the second floor and what the ceiling heights are but is wondering if the large piece is able to come down any or get shorter. She stated that she loves all the one story moves and loves that it lets the light and air go through towards Bank Street. She stated that she is concerned about the two-story piece relative to the neighbors and looming over that corner of Pitt and Bank. She said when they come back before the Commission to show those houses shadowed on A 2.4.

Mr. Clowney stated that they would outline their ceiling plate and the dimensions of the dormers to see if they are able to pull it down.

Ms. Wilson said it is a fairly long ridge in that elevation compared to the scale of everything else they are doing, and if it was truly internal to the lot, it may not matter as much; however, since there is so much visibility from Bank Street, she would ask that it get more attention

because she does appreciate the pavilions and the smaller pieces that are addressing the neighbors.

Ms. Montgomery stated that she thinks it is beautiful and loves how it all ties together on this very difficult lot. She said having the two smaller garages is very well thought out and what she would want if this were her lot.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that he would echo Ms. Wilson's comments on the scale of the two-story piece and how it will relate. He said there have been some examples of how it alters the streetscape if it is too big. He said at the final presentation he would like to request more detail.

Mr. Clowney asked to go to the rear elevation and stated that it is interesting how the house on the corner of Bank and Carr Streets has a high pitch and high ridge, but he is interested to see the elevation from Bank Street.

Ms. Wilson said Bank Street and the park, because people have a low distant view of this behind those houses.

2. [115 Friend Street](#) – Survey 6090 – (TMS 532-05-00-069) Applicant is seeking Final Review for relocating previously approved shed out of tree protection area.

[CONSENT MOTION]

3. [127 Chicco Lane](#) – (TMS 532-05-00-036) Applicant is seeking Final Review for new single-family home construction on a previously vacant lot.

Mr. Rutherford reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

Ryan Smith and Beau Clowney, Beau Clowney Architects representing the homeowners.

Mr. Smith stated that the BAR calculation increases approximately 159 square feet, which was due to the reconfiguring of the porches due to staff's comments in the initial meeting. He stated that other than this, the massing as a whole remains unchanged.

Mr. Clowney stated that listening to the Commission's comments at the previous meeting, their clients elected to rethink the porches on the harbor side and have pulled everything back so that all neighbors line up. He said that they did pull the guest bedroom on the street side closer to the street and the whole main porch on the main level changed orientation, once they began thinking about the pool and house to accommodate the concerns of the neighbor, pulling the pool over and changing the orientation of the porch.

Ruth Brennan, 121 Chicco Lane, is the homeowner on the right side facing the waterfront. She has been there for 21 years and said that her biggest concern is that this house is 5,400 square feet as opposed to her and her neighbor's house at 3,500 square feet. She feels it is too massive for that location. She stated that using the Critical line in order to get and achieve these numbers with this size of a house is not appropriate because the waterfront has marsh that comes up on that particular land mass and there is a flooding issue. She said the flooding issue extends almost 50 feet back beyond where the pool is actually proposed to go. She said there is a change in height from her house to the Gaskins' house and it decreases. She stated that the Gaskins' already experience a tremendous amount of flooding and there are pictures to demonstrate this. She stated that if you pull up the sketch on A.0.1 that indicates where the pool is going to be located, the pool will only be eight feet back from the corner of her house, so she will be looking at her neighbor's pool all the time, which will devalue her house tremendously and becomes an eyesore for the community. She said it is absolutely inappropriate and they could have put the pool anywhere where she was not looking at it. She said there are a number of design elements, but the persistence is remarkable, because the neighbors were trying to impress upon the new homeowner that the flooding is the biggest issue and it would be an engineering feat to even put in an inground pool. She added that all the pools in this community are inconspicuous along the waterfront. She said that there are a number of trees that go all along the side which create a buffer for the massing of this house and is concerned as they are

discussing only keeping one when there is another oak up front that should remain and a black gum tree in the middle that is on the property line, which she does not want removed. She said she has not seen any landscaping either.

Janice Gaskins, 131 Chicco Lane, stated that she is interested in the slide 11-24 because it indicates that the deck is going to be equal to the other houses on the other side, but on #12, there is clearly a porch out front. She asked if what is sticking out is an eight-foot porch. She said she is concerned with the flooding as well. She asked when this large home is built, where is all the water going to go.

Dr. Gaskins, 131 Chicco Lane stated that he grew up in North Charleston and has been around for a number of years. He said that he has some concern about the potential for two feet of fill, because if you look at the lots, most of them are level; however, if you bring in two feet of fill, the water will go on his lot.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that drainage does not fall under the purview of the Commission; however, the overall design is.

Ms. Brennan asked if there was consideration of a bulkhead that is not drawn in.

Ms. Wilson stated that this would be a decision made by DHEC (Department of Health and Environmental Control).

Ms. Dovre asked if the pool is being repositioned and if it is still visible to the neighbor; however, behind that area is a crucial flooding area, because the land slants. She asked if the elevation on the pool changed in height.

Mr. Clowney stated that the pool will be at a certain level and as it moves out, the ground would taper off.

Ms. Dovre said that there is already low ground critical flooding in that area, so was anything added.

Mr. Clowney stated that they know they have to take care of the drainage and by law, cannot drain to neighboring properties. He said

with Sheila Wertimer and the landscape architect, they would be doing a complete drainage plan for the entire site. He said in regard to the trees and the privacy along the edge, there are trees there already, but there is a pool and a hot tub on the adjacent property already, so they want privacy as well.

Ms. Wilson said there is a discrepancy in terms of whether it is the porch or the heated house.

Mr. Smith stated that everyone will be lined up.

Ms. Wilson asked about taking the pool out and submit with the landscape plan. She said there are pools on the harbor and while compliant with the 40% lot coverage, what they see people come back with is a great deal of pervious paving and there is still the loss of greenspace. She said without seeing the decking and how they are going to handle the landscape, she is unable to support the pool as submitted. She stated that the neighbors have a legitimate concern and she is unsure if the homeowners will do an infinity edge where there must be at least 18 inches of fall as the pool tapers out, or where the decking or the path to the pool are located. She stated that there are still a number of unanswered questions that she is certain Ms. Wertimer will address; however, not knowing what those are, she is not comfortable approving the pool.

Mr. Clowney stated that he would like to discuss this with his client; however, he would like to note that the house north is an "L" shaped house and has a great deal of open space between the bulk of their house and this proposed house. He said he knows that his clients would like to have a pool and if they were to remove the pool and submit it with a supplement application, he would like to ensure that they are not giving up the opportunity to have a pool.

Ms. Wilson stated that she is not saying "no" but needs to understand it more. She said while she respects the applicant's concerns, she would be more comfortable with the pool once she sees how it will be

handled. She added that the Commission is not technically allowed to vote on the landscaping.

Ms. Montgomery asked about the possibility of turning the pool 90 degrees so that it is not protruding out as far into the harbor.

Mr. Clowney stated that they have looked at several different options and one of the nice things they like about the one being proposed is that they pulled the edge of the pool all the way to the house so that it creates a nice shaded area. He said they hear the concerns and are taking into consideration the drainage, landscaping and all the obstacles; however, the homeowners do want a pool and have moved the house back considerably.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that it appears that the pool will be separate from the home application. He asked if there was any further discussion from Commission members regarding the scale and massing of the home relative to the rest of the homes. Mr. Hirshorn stated that 5,500 square feet versus the other 3,000 square foot neighbors' homes.

Mr. Clowney stated that the home is not 5,500 square feet and stated that it is 4,700 square feet. The 5,500 square feet includes the porches.

Ms. Wilson stated that there is a precedent for a larger home on the harbor and said a great deal of progress has been made from the previous submittals. She stated that the applicants have been sensitive to both Chicco Lane and the harbor and feels much effort and compromise have been made. She stated that she does not believe it is within the Commission's rights to mandate a smaller house. She stated that the Commission is not excited to see applicants push the limit and then come back again with pervious surfaces. She said it is maintaining the greenspace that is the base of the Old Village poché. She is hopeful this is in the landscape plan and stated that she is not voting against the pool but would like to see how it will be handled sensitively.

Ms. Wilson moved to approve the house at 127 Chicco Lane, with the provision that sheet A 0.1 is correct and honored and that no portion of the house or porch exceeds past 121 Chicco Lane and that the pool is excluded from approval until the Commission sees a complete drainage and landscape plan; seconded by Ms. Montgomery. All present voted in favor.

4. [200 Queen Street](#) – Survey 6091 – (TMS 532-05-00-025) Applicant is seeking Final Review of an addition for a single-family home.

Mr. Rutherford reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

Ken Spicer, Homeowner and Hans Altenbach, architect, stated that they addressed some of the cosmetic items that were stated at the last Commission meeting, as well as adjusted the height for the porch to the 8-foot plate height. He believes that they have satisfied all the concerns from the last meeting. He said there is a gable detail that was also integrated. He said one significant difference was a foundation adjustment. He said the piling condition was reviewed and it was suggested to cut them. He said the wear and tear over the years deteriorated them. He said they created a concrete footing system with masonry piers on top of them. He said there have been no other footprint changes made.

Ms. Dovre stated that she likes the adjustments that were made.

Ms. Rowe asked if the new pilings would change the height.

Mr. Altenbach responded in the negative.

Ms. Wilson stated that the plans still indicate piles and asked how they would be treated, as well as the plans for the new piers.

Mr. Altenbach stated that it would be masonry sixteen-inch square piers with stucco.

Ms. Wilson asked about the gable on the harborside that is located over the porch, as it is not accessible.

Mr. Altenbach said that it has a louvered detail and is not functional.

Ms. Wilson stated that other than this detail she said that they have done a great job. She said the last discussion regarding the doors on the harborside, they were either going to be big, all glass and modern or more classic proportions with muttons. She asked if it is the preference of the applicant to have all glass and modern.

Mr. Altenbach responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Wilson stated that this is a traditional scale French door, which would have a mutton or a panel, as opposed to something that is bigger and speaks to a more modern vocabulary and has the bigger glass. She asked about the size of the door openings.

Mr. Altenbach stated that they are a custom size 3'6" width and 8-0.

Ms. Montgomery stated that she has an issue with the gable on A.6 and asked what it's purpose is. She asked if two traditional dormers would be more attractive.

Mr. Altenbach stated that the roof sits out approximately four feet, so they are not able to split it and put a dormer on either side. He added that the massing is located at that area and allowed the shed roof on either side to terminate into it in a clean way. He said he was simply picking up on the 12 – 12 roof pitch that was on the rest of the house.

Ms. Wilson stated that it is adding height where it is not needed as there is no internal benefit to it and provides a tower appearance and is not appropriate on the harborside. She said she understands that the projection of the porch needs to be covered but asked if they would be willing to restudy this.

Dr. Spicer stated that his concern is that the neighbor next to him has an even bigger house.

Ms. Wilson stated that it is more the proportions of what is there. She said what they have has become a very lovely classic double porch and this stands out in an unusual way. She said it is the height and looks to be added on a three-foot knee wall and the whole thing looks as if it is sitting on the porch and adds height in an uncomfortable way.

Mr. Altenbach asked if it would help to have shed dormers on either side.

Ms. Wilson stated that she would rather see the roof quiet down and would be happy to have this one piece come back with a revision.

Mr. Altenbach asked if there was a function, would it change the Commission's perspective.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that the Commission is prepared to make a motion to approve the structure with this exception.

Ms. Wilson stated that it is similar to a widow's walk with a gable on it. She said if the gable were removed and had more of a parapet wall then it could go out. She said the way it is now with the gable tall and narrow is not desirable.

Mr. Hirshorn suggested accepting the approval for the majority of the structure and come back with any new ideas.

Mr. Altenbach asked if there would be support for having an open deck at that level.

Ms. Wilson stated that she would prefer a widow's walk knee wall as opposed to the gable, or something that is more continuous with the porch roof. She stated that the porch roof would be flat and what is louvered, would be a louvered rail without the gable. She said it is the gable that is not desirable.

Dr. Spicer said that this would add function and is a better idea. He said the original thought was that it may at some point become attic space. He said that they would consider this.

Ms. Wilson moved to approve the renovation of 200 Queen Street with the exception of the third story gable on the harborside; seconded by Ms. Rowe. All present voted in favor.

There was a brief discussion regarding the newest type of solar panels.

5. [311 Venning Street](#) – Survey 6187 – (TMS 532-01-00-264) Applicant is seeking Final Review of a half-story addition to an existing garage, stair relocation on the single-family home, and various site improvements.

[CONSENT MOTION]

6. [440 Whilden Street](#) – Historic 6176 – (TMS 532-01-00-120) Applicant is seeking Final Review for exterior revisions from previously approved plan due to a fire.

Mr. Rutherford reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

Beau Clowney and Ryan Smith of Beau Clowney Architects, stated that there have been very minimal changes from the approval submittals. He said regarding the zoning, they are waiting on a meeting with Kent Prause and are on the agenda in the event they are required to go before the Board of Zoning Appeals. He said what they are asking for is very little. He said that the small dormer on the left-hand side is being moved. He said they were preserving the roof in the previous design; however, since the roof is no longer there, they will be installing a new roof. He said the ridge will not change and the footprint of the building is exactly the same. He said the dormer to the left pulls forward towards the street slightly and on the backside, they have introduced a gable. He said the gable is what they have always wanted to do from the beginning with the design team, but in terms of preservation and wanting to keep the prior roof, they found that it was no longer feasible structurally and/or financially. He said they now have the opportunity to do this and like the design better. He said it will only be glass on that side and not stained glass.

Ms. Dove stated that she really likes the design.

Ms. Rowe agreed, as well as other Commission members.

Ms. Wilson moved to approve the revisions to the addition at 440 Whilden Street, St. Andrews Church; seconded by Ms. Montgomery. All present voted in favor.

7. [908 Pitt Street](#) —Survey 5969 – (TMS 532-13-00-058) Applicant is seeking Final Review for site landscaping and revisions to stairs.

Mr. Rutherford reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

Anton Roeger, homeowner, and David Tomblin, Landscape Architect. Mr. Tomblin stated that their current lot coverage is 35.8% which includes the pool deck and the building. He said both the driveway and garden entrance will be utilizing pervious systems. He stated that the concrete pavers will only be nine feet long with a planting strip in the middle, which provides for the two required parking spaces for the ADU (accessory dwelling unit), and then a small concrete paver area to flow over to the golf cart entry and over to the pool deck. He said there is a small garden element in the front of the main house using a plantation mix with floating bluestone. He stated that they are working with Stantec who provided the storm drain study, which will route back to their storm sceptor that is underground behind the ADU. He said they follow a classic garden style that wraps the front of the house with landscaping and introduces a nice greenspace in the back to maximize their green area.

Mr. Hirshorn asked if there was a revision on the staircase.

Mr. Tomblin stated that the revision was made in order to limit the walkways. He said the original design had a double staircase in the front. He said they turned the staircase on the ADU to the right in order to have it tie in closely to the two parking spaces to limit the amount of hardscape.

Ms. Rowe stated that she loves what has been done with the main house with the stairs. She stated that there appears to be a significant number of pavers in the driveway.

Ms. Wilson asked Mr. Juan if horizontal pool fencing is allowable.

Mr. Juan stated that it would depend on the spacing in between the horizontal spacing is what is regulated. He stated that if they were butt up, it would be acceptable, as long as it meets the minimum height.

Ms. Wilson stated that in some municipalities, horizontal pool fencing is not allowable, because it acts as a ladder and easy to climb. She stated that the paving is too much, although pervious. She said she

realizes it is pervious and it works great when water sits on it and percolates down; however, in a heavy rain with the grade of this lot, it is too much. She suggested stepping stones for the paths or more green runners in between the pavers. She feels it needs a reduction in the hardscape. She stated that there are also three different fences for one piece of property, which is too busy with the stucco and the brick. She would like the applicant to put more thought into this design.

Ms. Montgomery asked if there was grass in between the pavers.

Mr. Tomblin stated that the main driveway where it is not in the movement of a car turning or getting out of its parking space, they are attempting to introduce landscaping into the middle of the pavers. He said the small walkway in front of the ADU, they can reduce the landing, and have it simplified. He said they are limiting the width of this walk to four feet and could be reduced slightly. He said there could be minor adjustments to reduce the hardscape.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that one of the motivations is to maintain as much greenspace as possible for practical reasons. He said that this is an extensive amount of hardscaping. He said looking at the driveway, the two parking areas, the pathways, the section in between the parking pad and the main house with a different hardscape element, and then the path for the golf cart. He said these are all very practical; however, this extensive amount of hardscape is not what would be seen in the streetscape. He said there is a sizeable deck in the back, as well for the pool. He asked for the applicant to think about the primary element, such as the driveway and parking pads and reduce the other areas. He said there are some areas where the hardscaping can be eliminated, particularly the section that goes from the rear parking pad to the pool and golf cart area. He said the center section in between the main house and the guest cottage could be kept green and reduce the hardscaping.

Ms. Dovre stated that she agrees with the reduction of hardscaping, particularly for the golf cart area.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that it is practical to have golf cart areas; however, the Commission has been reluctant to allow hardscaping, particularly in lots that have sizeable coverage already.

Mr. Roeger stated that the middle parking pad is behind the ADU with the two parking spots. He said if it were one spot, would this be favorable. He said it is required to have one space for the ADU and two spaces for the main house. He asked if this eliminates the second space for the main house.

Ms. Wilson stated that there is significant hardscaping that is not associated with the vehicle parking but believes a reduction of one space behind the ADU would be advantageous. She said the design needs to be greener with hardscaping. Additionally, if the applicant is determined to have the stucco wall, she would need to see an elevation of this, not just in the abstract, but actually connected to the house. It is not obvious to her that this type of wall goes with the house. How is it tying into the corner board of the house? She said it is next to a pier and how this is working with a raised house is not obvious to her, so she would need to see something more convincing.

Mr. Roeger stated that he was attempting to keep the white picket fence with the ADU, and the privacy fence around the pool for protection. He said those two fences appear to be acceptable; however, the front stucco courtyard fence may not.

Ms. Wilson stated that she will not advise which fence to keep; however, having three different fences for what is effectively a compound property is too many. As for the stucco and brick fence, it is not obvious to her that it goes with the style of the home. She said the picket is very obvious, working in both the streetscape and how it relates to the ADU. She said the other two fences are not as obvious and too busy.

Mr. Tomblin stated that the third stucco wall was to try and enclose the garden area; however, they could treat it with the driveway and open it up.

Ms. Montgomery stated that the multitude of pavers will not be seen.

Ms. Wilson stated that they will be seen from the driveway and the neighbors will have porches overlooking this.

Mr. Roeger stated that most of the properties are garages facing his property and he overlooks a massive concrete driveway.

Ms. Wilson stated that her issue is that applicants put their houses in and do not think about accessing their vehicles and create a problem that they then bring to the Commission.

Mr. Roeger stated that the entire site plan was included in his original submittal.

Ms. Wilson stated that the Commission just requested two other applicants who are proposing their houses this evening to give more thought to their site plans. She said as a percentage of the lot, this is a great deal of hardscape, whether pervious or not.

Ms. Wilson made a motion to defer this item and request a study on the quantity of pavers and either the fence material or provide elevation of the house in conjunction with the fence wall; seconded by Ms. Rowe. All present voted in favor.

V. Staff Approvals

[None]

VI. Motion to Adjourn – 6:23 pm

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

There being no further business, meeting adjourned at 6:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Ashe

June 11, 2018