

**Architectural Review Board  
Minutes  
July 1, 2019**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Kevin Jayroe, Jerry Miller, Dwayne Vernon, Sally Gillespie, Lee Padgett, & Linda Abate'

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Debra Smalls

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Tracy Gibson & Debra Grant

- I. **Call to Order**
- II. **Approval of minutes for June 3, 2019 (regular meeting);** Mr. Miller made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted, with exception of VII; 1, this portion will be deferred until corrections are made and approved at the next monthly meeting, seconded by Mr. Padgett; the motion carried 6 to 0.  
**June 12, 2019 (special called meeting);** Mr. Padgett made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted, seconded by Mr. Jayroe; the motion carried 6 to 0.
- III. **Public Input: None**
- IV. **Old Business:**
  1. **Mr. Neil Lareau** is requesting the approval to replace windows at 202 Wood Street. **Tracy Gibson/City Staff** told the board that the applicant came before the board at the February 4<sup>th</sup> monthly meeting requesting approvals for new construction, additions, fencing, and window replacements. The Board asked for more information on the windows. The applicant is now asking to replace the windows that are beyond repair. **Mr. Krowka/Representative** said after some conversations with Mr. Lareau he would like to repair the windows in the original house and in any opening that does not have windows he would like to use Jeld-Win wood windows. In the new construction of the house the request is for Viwinco vinyl windows that have impact resistant glazing, and simulated divided lights, to differentiate the new addition from the original structure. The new windows will be 2 over 2. **Ms. Gillespie** said the guidelines state that the windows should be true divided, and should be compatible to the neighborhood. The house is on a corner lot and very prominent, and the new addition will be prominent, she feels 2 over 2 true divided light windows would be appropriate. **Mr. Krowka** said that would not be a problem. **Mr. Miller** asked if the house was contributing to the district, and said the guidelines strongly suggest that with any contributing structure repairs should be done before replacement is considered. **Mr. Krowka** said the vinyl windows would go in the new addition in hopes to differentiate the new addition from the original structure, by installing a different style and a different kind of window. **Mr. Miller** said the windows are not a way of distinguishing the original from the new addition, and he asked for the other Board members opinion. **Mr. Vernon** said a vinyl window would be distinguishing, and the guidelines did say other materials could be used for new additions, however wood windows always look better in a historic home. **Mr. Padgett** asked if the Board had previously approved simulated divided windows of the same style on Meeting Street. **Mr. Miller** said yes, they did approve windows of the same style previously. **Ms. Gillespie** said those previous approvals were not on the front of the house, but on the rear and were not readily seen. She read the guidelines, "New construction should reflect typical features of exiting historic homes". **Ms. Gillespie** said the Board has never approved anything but true divided light windows,

especially 2 over 2. **Mr. Miller** said he did not think that was true; he said maybe what she was recalling was under the old guidelines and not under the current Standards. **Ms. Gillespie** said typically in new construction the Board has not approved insulated glass that wasn't true divided. **Mr. Krowka** said it was not a problem to install the windows that the Board suggested.

**Public Input: None**

**Motion: Ms. Gillespie made a motion that the application be approved; the windows in the original structure be repaired, the new windows in the original and the new addition will be JELD-WEN true divided wood windows, 2 over 2, insulated glass; citing Design Standards for Residential Properties, page 92 (Background/compatible materials), page 102 (typical features), Chapter 3; Section 17.1; page 68 (Windows & Shutters), seconded by Mr. Vernon; the motion carried 5 to 1 (Mr. Padgett cast the downward vote).**

**V. New Business:**

- 1. Mr. Peter A. Olmstead** is requesting the approval to install a driveway and side gate at 723 Highmarket Street. **Tracy Gibson/City Staff** said the applicant is seeking the approval to install a driveway gate and a side yard gate on either side of the home. **Mr. Olmstead/Owner** said he has a dog that he needs to keep enclosed. The driveway gate is approximately 140 ft. from Highmarket Street, 3 ½ inches between the pickets, it will be installed at the back of the house, and will not be split panels, but a solid gate. The side gate will be a 5ft. pedestrian gate. The gates will be aluminum commercial grade.

**Public Input: None**

**Motion: Ms. Abate' made a motion to approve the application as submitted, citing Design Standards for Residential Properties, Chapter 4, Section 19.0; page 79 (Fences, Gates, & Walls), seconded by Mr. Vernon; the motion carried 6 to 0 by a roll call vote.**

- 2. Mr. Lloyd Benton Williams III** is requesting the approval to install fencing and a gate on his property at 1013 Duke St. **Tracy Gibson/City Staff** said the applicant is seeking the approval to install a privacy fence on the front and side of the property and a chain linked fence on the rear of the property. **Mr. Williams/Owner** said he would like to install a 4 ft., shadow box design, with 1 ft. of lattice on the top, and a gate, this will be installed on the front and the left side of the property. The rear yard will have a black chain linked fence installed, and the privacy fence will be black also. **Ms. Gillespie** had concerns about the distance of the fence from the sidewalk and the front fence being 4 ft. which is higher than the required 3ft. or transparent fence required by the codes for visual clearance. **Mr. Williams** said he is requesting a taller fence because he owns a large dog and he would jump the fence if it was under 4 ft. *(After further review it was determined that the fence should be at least 10 ft. from the street, not the sidewalk; and Mr. Williams was in compliance).* **Mr. Vernon** said the guidelines called for the front fencing being flat boards in a single row rather than shadowbox. **Ms. Gillespie** said there is a fence of similar design on Highmarket Street. **Mr. Vernon** asked the applicant if he would be opposed to the single row design. **Mr. Williams** said he did not oppose the design, he would rather have the shadow box design for the hurricane winds.

**Public Input: None**

**Motion: Mr. Padgett made a motion to approve the application as submitted, citing Design Standards for Residential Properties, Chapter 4; Section 19.0; page 79 (Fences, Gates, & Walls), seconded by Mr. Jayroe; the motion carried 5 to 1 by a roll call vote (Mr. Vernon cast the downward vote).**

3. **Mr. Joseph E. Scanlon** is requesting the approval to remove a 1 story addition and replace with a 2 story addition at 906 Prince Street. **Tracy Gibson/City Staff** said the application was withdrawn for more information as directed by the architect.
  
4. **Winyah Hospitality** is requesting the approval to demolish the existing building and construct a new 3 story building at 615 Front Street. **Tracy Gibson/City Staff** said the application is to demolish the existing Georgetown Times building and construct the Georgetown Hotel; a new three story, 70-room, 54360 sq. ft. boutique hotel. **Mr. Michael Walker/Tych & Walker Architects and Mr. Steve Ramos/Lead Architect**, told the board the existing Georgetown Times building will be demolished and the new boutique hotel will be constructed on that site and more compatible for Front Street (*A slide show was given of the transformation of the site*). The new building will have a waterfront entry, and a drop off will be on Queen Street, the parking will also be onsite. There will be three frontages, the Front Street entrance will be a strong presence. The front of the building will echo the store front design that is significant on Front Street. The goal is to have great views for the guests of the hotel from all frontages. The new building will be flood proofed along Front St and will meet all the flood elevation requirements. The original drawings did have some height issues and there might be a request for variance if needed. There will be a pool in the rear as well as an event area. (*The architects described the interior of the hotel during the presentation*) The materials of the exterior will be fiber cement siding for the main portion, brick/ stucco at the base, and wood panels around the storefront area. The windows will be aluminum clad/wood, high impact, non-operable, with simulated divided lights. The proposal is for a sign that would project off the side of the building. All the mechanicals will be on the roof. The mass of the proposed hotel will not be much more than the existing building. The ground breaking for the new construction should be the first of 2020. The city is working on some electrical work that will begin in the fall. **Mr. Vernon** asked about another structure on the plans. The architect said it was a building that will house the restrooms for the pool area and will be accessible for people coming off the marina, this building will have stucco walls and a metal roof. **Ms. Abate'** asked about the parking spaces. The architect said there would be approximately 93 parking spaces. **Ms. Gillespie** asked if the existing parking area was a pervious surface. **Mr. Michael Walker/Architect** said they intend to use pervious asphalt. **Mr. Vernon** asked for clarification of the details of the cornices, wall sections, and the final look after the completion; as well as the columns, the handrails; he said all those details need to be clarified because of the size of this project. **Mr. Walker** said this is as far as they could go at this point, however they don't have a problem with coming back with those requested details. **Mr. Vernon** asked about the louvers that were listed on the plans. The architect said that was indicating the architectural louvers for the mechanical system, and they will be aluminum. **Ms. Gillespie** asked about the muntins on the windows. The architect said the muntins will be on the outside of the windows. **Mr. Vernon** said he initially had concerns, however he now appreciates the design, he did suggest adding awnings. **Mr. Walker/Architect** said he had awnings on the drawings but could not get them to scale. **Mr. Vernon** asked that the light details be included with the submittal of the other details. The

architect said they were not shown on the drawings, however there will be lanterns on the street, pole lights like those on Front St. for the parking lots, as well as landscaping lights.

**Public Input:**

**Ms. Beth Stedman/Chamber of Commerce** said she was excited about the proposed new hotel, however did have a concern with the parking spaces, the chambers have many visitors and would hate to not be able to serve the 13,000 to 15,000 visitors that come to the visitor's center annually. They feel the need to have more parking spaces. Also there are underground tanks in the parking lot and wondered if the developers have taken this into consideration. **Mr. Walker** said the new parking lot has an egress and ingress so that should help with the issue of the tanks and there will be overflow parking on the streets, so that should help with the parking issues.

**Mr. Mark Stevens/Director of Tourism** said there are 3 full time staff members onsite daily and that would only leave 1 space for visitors.

**Board Discussion:** **Mr. Vernon** said he would like to see the demolition and the approval for the new construction go hand in hand, and wondered if the approval of the new construction shouldn't be a conditional approval based on the submittal of details at a later date. The reason for the demolition and the construction permit going hand in hand is because the guidelines state that the demolition should not begin before 60 days prior to construction, so if a demolition permit is issued and the project goes south, there will be a vacant lot in the district.

**Mr. Joe Keenan/Representative of Winyah Hospitality** said he didn't have a problem if the demolition permit has a time frame. **Mr. Miller** said what the board did not want another empty space in the historic district, if the building is demolished but the hotel doesn't get built because of an economic downturn. **Mr. Keenan** said that is not the intent of the buyers, they would not want to close on the property and move forward unless they have all financing in place. **Mr. Miller** asked if it would unreasonably tie the owner's hands if the demolition permit has a stipulation of 60 to 90 days prior to the commencement of the new construction, or at least until the financing is in place. **Mr. Keenan** said the timeline would probably be to have things in place by mid-November, the PSA closing should be at least 30 days after that, demolition would start before Christmas, and the construction would start the first of the year. **Mr. Miller** asked when the financing would be firm. **Mr. Keenan** said mid-October. **Mr. Miller** said he felt that the board could give an approval for the overall design; scale, mass, and location, the final details could be given at a later time. **Ms. Gillespie** asked if the approval should be conceptual. **Mr. Vernon** suggested a contingent approval, contingent on the submittal of the details and closing of the property. **Mr. Miller** suggested the approval of the general design elements as submitted with the applicant to come back with details for documentation. *(After much discussion the applicant and the Board came to an agreement)*

**Public Input:** A resident of the district had concerns on the parking and other issues that he felt should have been handled before this point. **Mr. Miller** said the applicant has been meeting with City Staff, this is the starting point of the application and the first public showing of the project.

**Motion:** Mr. Vernon made a motion for the final approval of the height, scale, and mass as presented, with the condition that the applicant submit the architectural details such as fascia, columns, railings, etc., also with the understanding that the demolition and building permit will be one in the same, and the demolition will take place within 60 to 90 days prior to the construction, noting that none of this will take place until closing and all financing is in place, citing Design Standards for Commercial Properties, Chapter 7; Section 42.0 page 141 (New Construction/Primary Buildings) and Chapter 11' Section 46.0; page 160 (Demolition), seconded by Mr. Padgett; the motion carried 6 to 0 by a roll call vote.

**VI. Board Discussion: None**

**VII. Adjournment:** With there being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

*Submitted By,*

*Debra Grant  
Board Secretary*