

COMMUNITY APPEARANCE BOARD

Meeting Held on March 17, 2026

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Burt Shell, Mrs. Madden Freiberg, Mr. Peter Stevens, Mr. Doug Wendel, & Mr. John Kester

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Toby Avant

OTHERS PRESENT: Mrs. Clarissa Tindall & Mrs. Brittany Powell

- I. **Call to Order** “Notice of this meeting has been made in accordance with the South Carolina Code of Laws as Amended.”
- II. **Approval of Minutes for Meeting Held on January 20, 2026:** Mr. Burt Shell made a motion to approve the minutes for meeting held on January 20, 2026. Mrs. Madden Freiberg seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.
- III. **Public Input:** None
- IV. **Old Business:**
 - A) **CAB-2025-0010 Request: Lighting plan approval. Approval of final lighting plan for the City Hall project located at 420 S Hazard St. (TMS#: 05-0025-025-00-00) within the General Commercial (GC) Zoning District and the Urban Core Design Overlay District (UCOD).**

Staff Presentation: Mrs. Clarissa Tindall, Zoning Administrator for the City of Georgetown, presented the application for approval of the final exterior lighting plan for the new City Hall project located at 420 South Hazard Street. The property is owned by the City of Georgetown and is situated within the General Commercial Zoning District and the Urban Core Design Overlay District. The site is not located within a flood zone, and the proposed use is commercial. Applicable review standards included Section 2110 (Lighting) and all relevant provisions of the Urban Core Overlay District. Mr. Orlando Arteaga presented the final lighting plans on behalf of the City of Georgetown. Mr. Orlando Arteaga explained that the lighting package consists of wall-mounted wall-pack fixtures installed on the exterior of the main building, Building Two, and Building Three, which will serve as the new Council Chambers. In addition, one light pole is proposed to provide illumination for the parking area. Mr. Arteaga confirmed that a prior request from the Board to incorporate additional lighting at the rear of Building Three had been addressed and is reflected in the electrical plans. Mrs. Clarissa Tindall raised a question regarding whether the color temperature of the proposed parking lot light pole would match that of the wall-mounted exterior fixtures, emphasizing the importance of maintaining visual consistency across the site. Mr. Orlando Arteaga indicated that Ms. Heather Kakert, Architect of Record, is responsible for fixture

selection and ensuring consistency in color temperature. Discussion further clarified that Building Four is not included within the scope of the current lighting plan, as existing floodlighting along Kaminsky Street is considered sufficient for that structure. **Mr. Orlando Arteaga** also noted that all buildings on the site will receive new TPO roofing, with colors consistent across all structures and in accordance with previously approved roofing criteria. **Mr. Orlando Arteaga** also provided an update on the construction timeline for the City Hall project. **Mr. Orlando Arteaga** stated that the project is currently approximately two weeks behind schedule due to adverse weather conditions experienced in January and early February. Substantial completion is projected for the end of June, with a potential move-in date shortly after July 4th, pending completion of punch list items. **Mr. Orlando Arteaga** reported that window frames have been installed and that glass installation is expected within two to three weeks. Temporary plastic coverings remain in place, allowing interior drywall work to continue. **Mr. Orlando Arteaga** further noted that furniture has not yet been ordered and represents a significant upcoming budget item, with a proposal anticipated to be presented to City Council in April.

Public Input for this Application: None

Motion: Mrs. Madden Freiberg made a motion to approve as submitted, with the condition that the color temperature of the new parking lot light/street light lamp to match the color temperature of the wall-mounted exterior fixtures. Mr. Peter Stevens seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

V. Board Discussion:

A) Motion to authorize Chairman and Staff to issue COA's on behalf of the board for Meeting Held on January 20, 2026: Mr. Burt Shell made a to allow the chairman and secretary to issue COAs on behalf of the Board. Mr. Peter Stevens seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

B) Historic District Survey and Design Overlay Revision Process: The kickoff meeting will focus on the historic buildings district portion of the UDO work, beginning with a presentation on the contractor's approach to such projects. A full resurvey of the historic district will be conducted to update records completed around 2010, identifying contributing and non-contributing structures. Survey findings, along with staff feedback regarding guideline concerns and process inefficiencies, will help inform a comprehensive rewrite of the historic district regulations. Following the regulatory rewrite, a report will be drafted recommending zoning code changes to better support the intent and character of the historic district, covering both the historic district and the urban core overlay district. A technical review meeting will be held with staff including planning, building department inspectors, and, the main street coordinator, to discuss issues with current guideline interpretation and process gaps. Miscommunication between the planning and building departments regarding which properties in the

historic district are exempt from certain building codes was identified as a key issue requiring clarification. Demolition by neglect standards are being reviewed, with a proposed approach that maintains rigorous standards for private owners seeking demolition while relaxing them for city-initiated demolitions of structures deemed structurally unsound or dangerous.

- C) Heirs' Properties and Vacant or Deteriorating Structures:** **Mr. Burt Shell** raised the issue of heirs' properties within the City of Georgetown as an ongoing challenge affecting housing availability and community redevelopment, noting that similar situations are frequently addressed in Charleston. **Mrs. Clarissa Tindall** explained that heirs' properties present unique legal and logistical complications, as multiple parties must provide consent before any sale or corrective action can occur. The Board also acknowledged the broader concern of vacant lots and boarded-up structures throughout the City, noting that these issues may be more comprehensively addressed through the ongoing Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) revision process.
- D) Code Compliance and Enforcement - Price's Icehouse:** **Mr. Burt Shell** further raised concerns regarding code compliance at Price's Icehouse, stating that the property had reverted to prior violations, including the improper parking of tractor trailers, an unpainted fence, and the presence of 55-gallon drums on site. **Mrs. Clarissa Tindall** confirmed that, following discussion with staff, Code Enforcement Officer **Mr. Derek Harrelson**, had drafted a new letter of violation addressing these issues. Mrs. Tindall explained that current penalties for non-compliance within the overlay district are set at 25 percent of the project cost; however, this structure is difficult to enforce in cases where no active project is underway. She further noted that formal compliance inspection procedures for the design districts were established approximately one year prior, as no standardized process had previously existed. **Mrs. Clarissa Tindall** stated that she and the Code Enforcement Officer conduct regular site inspections to ensure that active projects are constructed in accordance with their approved Certificates of Appropriateness (COAs), with dated notes and photographic documentation compiled into compliance records. The Board requested periodic updates on compliance outcomes, and **Mrs. Clarissa Tindall** confirmed that completed Architectural Review Board compliance reports are already distributed, with a similar reporting approach to be implemented for Certificate of Appropriateness cases as applicable.
- E) Board Oversight of Landscaping and Demolition - Marshall Marine Example:** **Mr. Burt Shell** requested clarification regarding the removal of oak trees at the Marshall Marine property, located on a corner lot, and why such action did not require CAB approval. **Mrs. Clarissa Tindall** explained that the Board's jurisdiction extends to the establishment of landscaping but does not include the removal of trees, which is governed separately under the City's tree ordinance. **Mrs. Clarissa Tindall** noted that the City Hall project represented a unique circumstance in which the Board successfully advocated for the preservation of a tree, despite not being strictly

required under existing regulations. It was further confirmed that the demolition of a small structure on the Marshall Marine property did not require Board approval, as demolition activities fall outside of the Board's authority. **Mrs. Clarissa Tindall** advised that Marshall Marine is expected to return before the Board with a proposal for a new fence incorporating both wood and metal materials, which will require further discussion given that current guidelines address these materials separately.

- F) Application Review Process and Applicant Information:** **Mr. Burt Shell** expressed a preference for Board members to receive copies of the applicant-completed application forms in order to verify that applicants have exercised appropriate due diligence prior to appearing before the Board. **Mrs. Clarissa Tindall** explained that personal contact information was removed from publicly posted application materials after applicants began receiving fraudulent communications requesting payment for Certificates of Appropriateness, and such personal information is not subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). **Mrs. Clarissa Tindall** further noted that an updated application format has been finalized, wherein applicant-requested project information is included on a second page that can be shared with the Board, while the first page containing personal details is retained internally. She confirmed that agenda item descriptions are drafted to reflect the applicant's request and that all relevant supporting documentation is included within the Board packet to ensure comprehensive review.
- G) Continuing Education Requirements for Board Members:** **Mrs. Clarissa Tindall** reviewed continuing education requirements for Board members, stating that all members must complete a minimum of three continuing education credits annually, while newly appointed members, including **Mr. John Kester** and **Mr. Doug Wendel**, are required to complete six credits in their first year. **Mrs. Clarissa Tindall** advised that certificates of completion must be submitted using a designated form maintained by the City Clerk. She noted that training opportunities are available through organizations such as the American Institute of Certified Planners, although recent offerings have not been closely aligned with Board-specific responsibilities. **Mr. Burt Shell** confirmed that he had completed a Municipal Association of South Carolina (MASC) training that qualifies toward his annual requirement. **Mrs. Clarissa Tindall** stated that she would research and distribute additional relevant training opportunities to the Board.
- H) Agenda and Packet Distribution Platform Changes:** **Mrs. Clarissa Tindall** informed the Board that all agendas and meeting packets are being transitioned to the same digital platform utilized by City Council, allowing for consolidated access to meeting materials. She explained that the new system organizes packets into individual agenda items rather than a single multi-page document, improving navigation during meetings. **Mrs. Clarissa Tindall** further advised that tablets are proposed for Board use in the upcoming fiscal year, noting that the city expended approximately seven thousand dollars on printed packets in the previous year, excluding staff time. While

printed copies of large-format plans will continue to be provided, when necessary, full printed packets will no longer be distributed. Shared tablets will be preloaded with meeting materials to allow Board members to review agenda items and supported documents electronically.

- I) **Board Order and Certificate of Appropriateness Process Changes: Mrs. Clarissa Tindall** also outlined recent changes to the Board Order and Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) process. She explained that the prior DocuSign system was discontinued due to recurring Wi-Fi connectivity issues and inefficiencies, particularly during Architectural Review Board meetings involving multiple COAs. A revised two-page Board Order format has been implemented, with the first page including a statement confirming that the Board Order itself serves as the official Certificate of Appropriateness, thereby eliminating the need for a separate document. **Mrs. Clarissa Tindall** stated that handwritten notes recorded during meetings will be retyped by staff and replaced with a clean version the following day, while the original annotated version will be retained for internal records. The second page of the document is signed by all Board members and the secretary, and the finalized Board Order is distributed to the applicant and attached to the corresponding building permit. Annotated meeting packets, including staff notes, are scanned and archived to ensure accurate verification of Board decisions.
- J) **UDO Design Overlay Revision Timeline: Mrs. Clarissa Tindall** provided an update on the timeline for revisions to the UDO design overlay districts. She explained that while the design overlay updates were initially planned to proceed concurrently with the broader UDO consultant's work, certain prerequisite steps must be completed first, resulting in a delay. To ensure progress remains within the 18-month MEADORS contract timeframe, the consultant will proceed directly to the design overlay district revisions upon completion of Historic Buildings District article, rather than following the originally anticipated schedule. Board members were advised not to annotate or redline existing documents, as they will be fully replaced through the forthcoming revision process.

VI. **Adjournment:** With there being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned.

Submitted By:

Brittany Powell

Board Secretary