

**TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT, SOUTH CAROLINA
OLD VILLAGE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 11, 2019
MINUTES**

Green arrows  in minutes are hyperlinks to the recording

Attachment 1 - [Staff Report](#)

Present: Scott Hirshorn, Chair, Ann Dovre, Heather Wilson, Louisa Montgomery
Absent: Leigh Rowe
Staff: Austin Rutherford, Joe Juan, Jane Yager-Baumrind

Mr. Hirshorn called the meeting to order at 5:00pm.

I. Approval of Agenda

 *Ms. Montgomery moved for approve the agenda. Ms. Wilson second the motion. All in favor.*

II. Approval of Minutes [January 14, 2019](#)

 *Ms. Wilson moved for approval of the minutes. Ms. Montgomery second. All in favor.*

III. Correspondence

 Mr. Rutherford notified the Commission that the Transportation Department will have a presentation and request next month regarding design of required street signs.

IV. General Public Comment

 There being no public comment, Mr. Hirshorn continued with the agenda.

V. Consent Motions

 *Ms. Wilson moved for consent of the following applications:*

- [204 Pitt Street – Historic 5941/5941.01/5941.02](#) – (TMS 532-01-00-043)
Applicant is seeking Final Review for the replacement of sash packs around four windows.

- [115 Friend Street](#) – [Survey 6090/6090.01](#) – (TMS 532-05-00-069) Applicant is seeking Final Review for revisions to the site plan and front porch.
- [302 Pitt Street](#) – [Historic 5942](#) – (TMS 532-05-00-053) Applicant is seeking Final Review for the roof replacement on the Darby Building.

Ms. Montgomery seconded the motion. All in favor.

VI. Business

- A. [107 Bennett Street](#) – [Historic 6144](#) – (TMS 517-15-00-074) Applicant is seeking Final Review for pool and pool house.

 Mr. Rutherford reviewed staff comments with the Commission (attachment 1).

 Heather Wilson moved to defer this application to the next meeting since the applicant is not in attendance. Ms. Montgomery second. All in favor.

- B. [724 Pitt Street](#) – [Survey 5955](#) – (TMS 532-09-00-260) Applicant is seeking Final Review for the demolition of an existing home for the construction of a new single-family home.

 Ms. Wilson recused herself due to a conflict of interest.

Mr. Rutherford reviewed staff comments with the Commission (attachment 1).

Ms. Wilson noted that additions for the existing structure was previously approved with reduced setbacks.

Mr. Hirshorn noted that Ms. Wilson has recused herself and therefore, cannot provide comments.

Ms. Jaclyn Curtis, representing homeowners, reviewed the request with the Commission.

Ms. Laurie Raven asked if the property has been subdivided.

There being no comments, Mr. Hirshorn closed public comment.

Mr. Rutherford clarified that the property was subdivided in the 1970s.

Mr. Hirshorn asked if the home behind this property was still under construction. Mr. Rutherford answered in the affirmative and stated that it has not been completed.

Ms. Dovre asked about the height of the structure. Ms. Curtis stated that the main floor would be above the flood line. Mr. Rutherford answered it is allowed a maximum height of forty feet.

Mr. Hirshorn expressed concern regarding the encroachment and setback and suggested a better solution might be to move the home forward on the Pitt Street side so there is more room between the home and the adjacent garage.

Mr. Donald Bailey, homeowner, stated that he is not concerned with how close the home is proposed to the adjacent garage. He stated that there is a ditch behind the garage separating the two lots that would provide additional space between structures.

Ms. Dovre and Ms. Montgomery stated that they have no problem with the proximity of the structure to the adjacent garage.

 *Ms. Montgomery moved for approval of the request, including the reduction in setbacks as the garage would be facing Royall Avenue rather than a dwelling. Seconded by Ms. Dovre. All in favor.*

VII. Staff Approvals

a. 604 Pitt Street – Historic 5946/Survey 5946.01 - (TMS 532-05-00-044) Partial Roof Replacement on non-historic portions of structures.

 Mr. Rutherford reviewed staff approvals with the Commission and noted that the roof replacement was for the non-historic portion of the structure.

VIII. [Discussion on Demolition](#)

 Mr. Rutherford stated that Ms. Rowe asked for this discussion and reviewed the current ordinance on demolition with the Commission.

Ms. Wilson asked the reason for this discussion. Mr. Rutherford answered that this discussion stemmed from a question over the definition of a demolition related to a recent request. He stated that if desired, changes could be considered to the ordinances to clarify the definition. He stated that another option could be that a percentage could be considered as well. He stated that it is recommended that these changes be considered, particularly with non-conforming structures and to bring the requirements in line with other Commission ordinances.

The Commission discussed how changes could be accomplished so that the amount of demolition is provided.

There being no comments, Mr. Hirshorn closes the public comment.

The Commission agreed that staff should research if the checklist could be changed to require a demolition plan when renovations are proposed in the interim of looking at more substantial changes to the ordinances.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:40pm.

Submitted by,
Jane Yager-Baumrind