

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MEETING HELD APRIL 6, 2026

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Kevin Jayroe, Ms. Lynn Robb, Ms. Debra Smalls, Mr. David Rice, Mr. Neil Lareau

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Dwayne Vernon, Ms. Ede Graves

OTHERS PRESENT: Mrs. Brittany Powell, Mrs. Clarissa Tindall, Mrs. Jennifer Boyer

- I. **Call to Order** “Notice of this meeting has been made in accordance with the South Carolina Code of Laws as Amended.”
- II. **Election of Officers:**
 - A) **Election of Chairman:** Mr. Neil Lareau made a motion to elect Mr. Kevin Jayroe as Chairman. Mr. David Rice seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.
 - B) **Election of Vice Chairman:** Mr. Neil Lareau made a motion to elect Mrs. Lynn Robb as Vice Chairwoman. Mr. David Rice seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.
- III. **Approval of Minutes for March 2, 2026, and March 10, 2026:**
 - A) Mrs. Lynn Robb made a motion to approve the minutes for March 2, 2026. Ms. Debra Smalls seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.
 - B) Mr. Neil Lareau made a motion to approve the minutes for March 10, 2026. Mrs. Lynn Robb seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.
- IV. **Public Input for Non-Agenda Items:** None
- V. **Agenda Amendment:** Mr. Kevin Jayroe made a motion to amend the agenda to add Board Discussion before Old Business. Mrs. Lynn Robb seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.
- VI. **Board Discussion:**
 - A) **Prefabricated Shed Discussion – 419 Queen Street:**

The Board engaged in an informal discussion regarding a resident’s inquiry about the potential approval of a prefabricated shed proposed for installation at 419 Queen Street. The resident sought preliminary guidance from the Board prior to submitting

Approved -- ARB Meeting Minutes; April 6, 2026

a formal application to the Architectural Review Board (ARB), specifically questioning whether a prefabricated structure constructed with ARB-compliant materials would be considered favorably despite existing ordinance restrictions. Board members referenced Section 2012.3, Item 15 of the applicable ordinance, which explicitly prohibits prefabricated carports and sheds. This provision prompted discussion as to whether compliance with approved materials could mitigate concerns associated with the prefabricated nature of the structure. While the ordinance language was acknowledged as a limiting factor, members explored how such standards have been interpreted in past cases. The Board noted that, historically, a primary consideration has been whether a structure is permanent in nature rather than temporary. In this context, members suggested that permanent anchoring—such as attachment to a concrete foundation—may serve as a distinguishing characteristic when evaluating similar requests. This distinction was discussed as a potential factor in determining whether a structure aligns with the intent of the ordinance, though no formal determination was made. Material compatibility was also discussed in detail. While the proposed wood siding and metal roofing were viewed as consistent with ARB standards, concerns were raised regarding the use of vinyl windows, which have typically been considered incompatible with the historic district guidelines. The Board emphasized the importance of material appropriateness in maintaining the architectural integrity of the area. Ultimately, the Board encouraged the residents to proceed with submitting a formal application to the ARB for full consideration. Members indicated that, based on the preliminary information provided, the proposed materials appear largely compliant; however, a complete application would allow for a thorough review. Additionally, the Board suggested that the distinction between prefabricated and stick-built construction methods be further evaluated in consultation with a contractor and discussed at the upcoming workshop to provide greater clarity on how such proposals may be assessed in the future.

VII. Old Business:

- A) **ARB-2026-0004 - Request: Fence. Request to establish a new 6 ft tall wood privacy fence on the south and west property lines for a residential property located at 932 Duke St. (TMS#: 05- 0027-096-00-00), within the R4 Zoning District and the HB Historic Buildings District**

Mrs. Clarissa Tindall, Zoning Administrator, presented the application to the board. The Board reviewed an application submitted by property owner **Mr. Dan Sherr** and his wife requested approval to install a six-foot-tall wooden privacy fence along the southern and western property lines of their residence located at 932 Duke Street. The applicants outlined several reasons for the request, including the need to deter unauthorized pedestrian traffic cutting through the property, provide a secure enclosure for their two dogs, and address ongoing concerns related to trespassing

and littering. Details of the proposed installation were presented, indicating that the fence would be set back approximately twenty-five (25) feet from the front property line. The proposed fence would be set back 25 feet from the front property line, with a section running perpendicular to the street and another running parallel, ensuring no encroachment on vision clearance. The Board acknowledged that the placement appeared to be consistent with applicable safety and zoning considerations. During the discussion, it was noted that an existing shadow box fence located along the King Street side of the property does not comply with current guidelines. The applicant clarified that this structure is not part of the current request and will be addressed separately through a future application. The Board accepted this clarification and limited its review to the fence proposal currently under consideration. With respect to materials and design, the proposed fence will be constructed of natural wood and finished either in a natural stain or painted white. The Board noted that no vinyl or other non-compliant materials were proposed, and members expressed general support for the use of traditional materials consistent with established guidelines.

Mr. Kevin Jayroe made a motion to approve the application in accordance with Guideline 2012.2, pertaining to fences, gates, and walls. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Lynn Robb; the motion passed unanimously by the Board.

- B) ARB-2026-0006 - Request: Repair, Fence. Request to revise original approval, modifying front porch stair design from brick to wood, front yard fence picket spacing from a 4" gap to a 3" gap, and extend previously approved shadowbox fence down the right side of the property, tapering down from 6 ft to 4 ft to meet side front gate for a residential property located at 318 St James St. (TMS#: 05-0030-130-00-00), within the R4 Zoning District and the HB Historic Buildings District**

Mrs. Clarissa Tindall, Zoning Administrator, presented the application to the board. The Board reviewed an application submitted by property owners, **Mr. Robert and Mrs. Kimberly Raspa**. The proposed revisions encompassed three modifications to the original approval, each arising from conditions encountered during construction and practical considerations related to safety and functionality. First, the applicants explained that the originally approved brick stair walls flanking the front porch steps had deteriorated beyond repair once construction commenced. As a result, they requested approval to replace the brick elements with wood steps accompanied by columns. The Board acknowledged the necessity of this change and discussed its compatibility with the character of the structure, noting that the revised design remained consistent with acceptable materials and aesthetic standards. Second, the applicants requested a modification to the spacing of the picket fence along the front yard, reducing the gap between pickets from four inches to three inches. This adjustment was proposed to prevent their small dog from escaping through the fence. The Board found this request to be reasonable and consistent with the intent

of the guidelines, as it did not significantly alter the overall appearance of the fence. Third, the applicants proposed extending the previously approved shadow box fence along the right side of the property. The extension would taper in height from six feet to four feet as it approaches and connects with the side gate. This modification was intended to replace an existing chain-link fence, which was described as hazardous due to improperly installed links that posed a safety concern. The Board reviewed the proposed fence height and configuration, confirming that the six-foot portion was permissible given its setback from the corner and the absence of any vision clearance conflicts. Following discussion, the Board determined that the requested revisions were appropriate and remained in compliance with the applicable guidelines.

Mr. David Rice made a motion to approve the revised application under Guidelines 2011.10 and 2012.2. The motion was seconded by Ms. Debra Smalls; the motion passed unanimously by the Board.

VIII. New Business:

- A) ARB-2026-0007 - Request: Alteration. Request for the alteration of a commercial structure to include removal of wood framed structures, replacement of decking and new handrails, construction of new balcony and stairs, and new windows and doors on Harborwalk side of structure, as well as the installation of new windows and repainting of the front facade for a commercial property located at 807 Front St. (TMS#: 05-0029-090-00-00), within the CC Zoning District and the HB Historic Buildings District.**

The Board reviewed an application submitted by **Mr. Bill Singleton** of Singleton Construction on behalf of Goat Island Maritime Incorporated for proposed alterations to the commercial property located at 807 Front Street, formerly known as the old fish house. The scope of work primarily focused on improvements to both the rear and front elevations of the structure, with an emphasis on structural integrity, functionality, and compatibility with the building's historic character. At the rear of the building, the proposal included removal of an existing wood-framed indoor-outdoor enclosure, which was determined to be in poor condition. The applicant proposed to retain and replace portions of the existing decking and joists where structurally feasible, while constructing a new balcony featuring decking and cable railings. Additionally, a new staircase was proposed to provide access to an upstairs studio apartment. The Board discussed the material selections and design elements, noting that the use of durable, high-quality materials and the introduction of modern railing systems appeared appropriate given the building's mixed historic and utilitarian character. For the front façade, the applicant proposed installing two new windows to replace existing plywood infill panels. The proposed windows would be Andersen wood-clad units, finished in white to match the painted exterior of the building.

Public Input: Kim Shell's documentation, including historical photographs provided by **Kim Shell**, indicated that the building historically featured multiple windows on the front elevation with a similar six-light configuration. The Board found this evidence persuasive in establishing that the proposed window installation would be consistent with the building's historic appearance and could be considered an in-kind restoration.

Additional modifications included the installation of new rear-facing windows and doors, which were proposed in a black finish to complement the exposed brick and align with the aesthetic of the black cable railings. The Board found this contrast appropriate for the rear elevation, where modern elements are less visually impactful on the public streetscape. During the review, it was noted that an existing electrical meter currently located within the building would need to be relocated to the exterior in accordance with City electric department requirements. The Board acknowledged this requirement and agreed that the placement of the electrical meter falls under the jurisdiction of the appropriate municipal authority rather than the Architectural Review Board and therefore would not be conditioned as part of ARB approval. The Board also addressed the removal of level trees on the property, noting that such activity is regulated by OCRM and is outside the purview of the ARB. As such, any approvals or permits required for tree removal would need to be obtained through the appropriate regulatory body.

Mr. Kevin Jayroe made a motion to approve the application under Guidelines 2014.1, 2014.2, 2014.3, 2014.6, 2014.7, 2014.8, 2014.10, 2014.11, 2017.1, 2017.201, 2017.202, 2017.203, and 2017.205. The motion was seconded by Mr. Neil Lareau; the motion passed unanimously by the Board, with the understanding that matters related to tree removal and electrical meter placement are deferred to the appropriate city and state agencies.

- B) ARB-2026-0008 - Request: Alteration/Repair. Request to repair rot, install new impact resistant metal clad glass windows for insurance compliance, and raise brick 8" for the front facade of a commercial property located at 920 Front St. (TMS#: 05-0026-162-00-00), within the CC Zoning District and the HB Historic Buildings District**

The Board reviewed an application submitted by **Mr. Sonny Burgoon of Diamond Collection International LLC** for repairs and alterations to the commercial property located at 920 Front Street. **Mr. Trevor Day** presented the application on behalf of **Mr. Sonny Burgoon**. The application was filed in response to a previously issued stop work order, and the proposed scope of work was presented for formal review and approval. During rot repair, the applicant reported that removal of plywood cladding from the front façade revealed original brick beneath the surface. The proposal included restoration of the exposed brick, with an additional modification to raise the brick façade by approximately eight (8) inches. The Board discussed this discovery and

the proposed restoration, noting that the exposure and rehabilitation of original materials is generally consistent with preservation goals and enhances the historic character of the structure. The applicant also proposed replacing the existing windows with new impact-resistant, metal-clad glass units. It was explained that this upgrade is required by the property's insurer due to the building's coastal location, with specifications mandating wind-load resistance of up to 150 miles per hour. Correspondence from the insurance provider was submitted into the record to substantiate this requirement. The proposed windows were described as being compatible in style and appearance with neighboring commercial storefronts along Front Street, and the Board found this consistency to be appropriate within the context of the district. The contractor, **Mr. Jeffrey Lee**, was also present to answer any questions. During discussion, a concern was raised regarding a letter issued by Keep Georgetown Beautiful, which had recommended façade improvements but did not reference Architectural Review Board requirements or historic district material standards. The Board noted the importance of ensuring that external organizations providing guidance on property improvements are aligned with ARB regulations and suggested that the newly appointed coordinator for Keep Georgetown Beautiful be briefed on applicable historic district standards to prevent future confusion. The Board further clarified that the 2017 guideline standards were not applicable to this property, as it is not located within the designated area on the south side of Front Street near the waterfront where those provisions apply.

Mr. Kevin Jayroe made a motion to accept documents, including emails from the insurance company, into the record. Mrs. Lynn Robb seconded the motion, the motion carried unanimously.

Mrs. Lynn Robb made a motion to approve the application under Guidelines 2014.1, 2014.6, 2014.10, and 2014.11, with no conditions. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Debra Smalls; the motion carried unanimously.

C) Approval of Revised 2026 Application Agenda:

A revision to the 2026 application agenda was presented to standardize submission deadlines 30 days in advance of each board meeting across all boards. The previous schedule had created hardships for applicants to the Community Appearance Board and Planning Commission, where gaps between submission deadlines and meeting dates stretched to 40 or 45 days. The change was described as having minimal impact on the ARB's existing schedule.

Mr. Kevin Jayroe made a motion to approve the revised application agenda for publication. Mrs. Lynn Robb seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously.

IX. Board Discussion:

A) Board Administrative Updates:

The Board received several administrative updates concerning procedural changes and compliance requirements. It was reported that agendas, meeting packets, and minutes for all boards have been successfully migrated to the CivicGov portal, consolidating these materials alongside City Council documents within a single, centralized platform. This transition is intended to improve accessibility and streamline document management across all boards and commissions. During this discussion, a concern was raised regarding a recent inquiry from a news media outlet suggesting that certain meetings had been cancelled due to issues with agenda postings. Staff clarified that this was a misunderstanding stemming from the ongoing transition to the CivicGov system, and that no meetings had been cancelled for that reason. The Board also discussed changes to the process for preparing and executing official board orders. It was noted that the use of DocuSign is being phased out in favor of a hybrid approach. Under the revised procedure, handwritten notes and edits will be recorded directly onto a standardized template during meetings, signed by Board members at that time, and subsequently transcribed into a finalized typed document at the office. Following discussion, a motion was made to authorize the Chairman and staff to incorporate handwritten revisions into the final typed board orders. The motion was seconded and approved by the Board. Additionally, the Board reviewed continuing education requirements, emphasizing that the current City Council is actively monitoring compliance. It was noted that newly appointed Board members are required to complete a minimum of six (6) hours of training through the Municipal Association of South Carolina (MASC), specifically the North American School of Conservation (NASC) program, which covers foundational topics in planning and zoning as mandated by state law. Members were reminded of the importance of maintaining compliance with these requirements.

B) In-Kind Repair and Replacement Policy Discussion:

The Board engaged in a broader policy discussion regarding in-kind repair and replacement standards, prompted by a concern involving a property on Cannon Street. In that case, a wall had reportedly been replaced using the same material as the original; however, the new construction method resulted in a solid barrier that impeded proper water drainage, ultimately causing flooding issues for adjacent properties. This example highlighted a limitation within current policy; wherein in-kind material replacement does not necessarily ensure equivalent construction methods or functional performance. Board members discussed the implications of this gap, noting that compliance based solely on material equivalency may be insufficient in certain cases. Attention was given to vinyl windows, which present a recurring challenge. While replacing vinyl windows with vinyl could be interpreted as an in-kind replacement, such materials are not permitted under current ARB

guidelines, even for new construction. This inconsistency underscores the need for clearer policy direction. In response, the Board considered the need to establish more defined thresholds to determine when in-kind replacements should require formal ARB review. This is especially relevant in cases involving materials or methods that do not align with current standards but may exist as legacy conditions. The goal of such clarification would be to ensure that both material compatibility and functional performance are appropriately evaluated. As a potential next step, the Board suggested consulting with a qualified contractor during an upcoming workshop to help define acceptable standards for in-kind replacement. This collaborative approach was viewed as a means to develop clearer guidance and ensure consistency in future decision-making.

X. Motion to authorize Chairman and Staff to type handwritten changes on the Orders of the Board:

A) The Board considered a proposed procedural change to improve efficiency in the preparation and execution of Board orders and Certificates of Appropriateness. Under the revised process, Board members will sign designated signature pages during the meeting while staff completed the written details by hand. The documents will subsequently be typed, and the signed signature pages will be attached to the finalized versions. This change eliminates the need for electronic signature platforms such as Docusign and is intended to streamline processing time. Staff clarified that Board orders serve the same functional purpose as Certificates of Appropriateness but are specifically required in the event of judicial review, as courts require Board orders for legal proceedings.

Mr. Neil Lareau made a motion to authorize the Chairman and staff to make handwritten entries on Board orders at the time of approval. Ms. Ede Graves seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

XI. Adjournment: with there being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned.

Submitted By:

Brittany Powell

Board Secretary