

COMMUNITY APPEARANCE BOARD

Meeting Held on April 21, 2026

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Mrs. Clarissa Tindall, Mrs. Brittany Powell, & 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. **Approval of Minutes for Meeting Held on March 17, 2026:** Mr. Peter Stevens made a motion to approve the minutes for meeting held on March 17, 2026. Mr. John Kester seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.
- III. **Public Input:** None
- IV. **Old Business:**

- A) **CAB-2025-0012 - Request: Fence. Request to revise previous approval regarding location and design of fence for commercial properties located at 507 Church St., and 527 Church St. (TMS#: 05-00030-017-00-00, TMS#: 05-0030-016-00-00), within the GC Zoning District and the Urban Core Design Overlay.**

Mrs. Clarissa Tindall, Zoning Administrator for the City of Georgetown, presented the application to the Board to revise a previously approved fence design for the commercial properties located at 507 and 527 Church Street. The proposed revisions included changes to the location and design of the fencing. Staff noted that both properties are owned by Altman Georgetown Properties LLC, and that proof of ownership had been submitted with the application. The properties are located within the General Commercial Zoning District, with a portion of one parcel also zoned High Density Residential (R-4), and both are situated within the Urban Core Design Overlay District and the Historic Buildings District. Staff explained that authority over alterations to the commercial portions of the properties rests with the Community Appearance Board. The properties are designated as Affordable Commercial on the City’s 2040 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map and are located within Flood Zone X, where no floodplain regulations affect the proposed fencing.

Mr. Doug Wendel made a motion to accept documents from the applicant to be entered into the record. Mr. John Kester seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously.

The applicant submitted two photographs into the record for consideration. Photograph A depicted a wooden fence located near a nearby church, while Photograph B showed an existing wooden fence on the subject property. The applicant explained that the original recommendation of the Board had been to install a wooden fence along the residential property line and stated that, after exploring alternative designs that combined aluminum and wood fencing, cost considerations had resulted in a return to the original wooden fence concept. The applicant further proposed installing a black rubber-coated chain link fence set approximately seventy-five feet back from Highway 17, noting that the fence would be screened from public view by boats stored on the property. The applicant stated that visibility on the site was important for security purposes due to recurring incidents that had required police involvement. During discussion, the Board reviewed the conditions of its previous approval and clarified that the prior motion had authorized a wooden fence along the Queen Street residential property line, a fence and gate not exceeding six feet in height, and a chain link gate only on Queen Street. Members noted that no approval had previously been granted for chain link fencing elsewhere on the property. Staff further advised that Section 2163 of the Unified Development Ordinance expressly prohibits chain link, barbed wire, and other inappropriate fence materials. The applicant argued that modern black rubber-coated chain link fencing is aesthetically superior to traditional chain link fencing and should be considered differently under current standards. Staff responded that a nearby chain link fence on City-owned property had been approved only as a temporary measure under a variance and was located within a different overlay district. Board members expressed concern that the submitted application materials did not depict the proposed chain link fence or identify the seventy-five-foot setback, making it difficult to adequately review the request prior to the meeting. Following discussion, a motion was made and seconded to approve a wooden fence along the residential property line and a vertical aluminum fence and gate to be placed elsewhere on the property at the applicant's discretion, without consideration of the additional documents introduced during the meeting. No public input.

Mrs. Madden Frieberg made a motion to approve CAB-2025-0012, disregarding documents entered into the record during the meeting, based on the findings that the properties are located at 507 and 527 Church Street within the General Commercial Zoning District and Urban Core Design Overlay District, and in accordance with Sections 2152 and 2163 of the UDO, Section 404.2, Sections 801, 803, 804, and 806, and Section 1102. Approval was granted subject to the following conditions: (1) installation of a wood fence along the Queen Street residential property line; and (2) installation of a vertical aluminum fence and gate at locations

selected by the applicant. The motion was seconded by Mr. Toby Avant. The motion passed by a vote of 6-0.

Board members also noted that revisions to the Commercial Corridor Design Overlay regulations are currently under consideration and encouraged the applicant to participate in future public input opportunities regarding acceptable fencing materials.

V. New Business:

- A) CAB-2026-0001 - Request: New Construction. Request to establish a new 2,500 sq ft accessory structure on the rear of a commercial structure and to maintain a 10 ft setback rather than a 15 ft rear buffer for a commercial property located at 802 Church St. (TMS#: 05-0027-025-00-00), within the GC Zoning District and the Urban Core Design Overlay**

Staff presented a request to construct a 2,500-square-foot accessory structure at the rear of the commercial property located at 802 Church Street. The property is owned by CGS Holdings LLC and is located within the General Commercial Zoning District and Urban Core Design Overlay District. Staff explained that a special exception had previously been granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals to allow the accessory structure to be used for short-term employee lodging and business-related purposes, and that the structure could not be converted to a short-term rental, group dwelling, or other primary use.

Mr. Dan Temple, the applicant, explained that he had acquired the accounting practice operating at the property and intended to use the proposed structure for temporary office space and employee lodging during visits to Georgetown and while renovations to the primary building were completed. Staff expressed concerns that the proposed design did not sufficiently complement the existing brick structure or reflect the architectural character encouraged by the City's design standards. Discussion followed regarding building proportions, materials, architectural details, and methods of improving compatibility with the existing structure and surrounding area. The applicant indicated a willingness to modify the design, including matching building colors, incorporating additional brick elements, and installing operable shutters. The Board also discussed a requested reduction of the required rear setback from fifteen feet to ten feet and concerns regarding the applicability of the City's development moratorium. The applicant presented documentation of communications with City staff predating the moratorium and argued that the request had been initiated before the moratorium took effect. Board members expressed concern that the applicant

may not have been adequately informed of the moratorium's implications and directed staff to seek further review from the City Attorney. No public input.

Mrs. Madden Frieberg made a motion approve the application subject to the following conditions: (1) building colors shall match between the existing and proposed structures; (2) additional brick elements shall be incorporated into the design to better complement the existing building; (3) operable architectural shutters shall be provided to match the existing structure; and (4) additional landscape buffer details shall be submitted. The motion also acknowledged the requested rear setback reduction from fifteen feet to ten feet. The Board reviewed the request under Sections 2149, 2153, 2159, 2163, and 404.2 of the Unified Development Ordinance. Mr. Douglas Wendel seconded the motion. Upon a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

- B) CAB-2026-0002 - Request: Sign. Request to establish two new signs on the front and side elevations of a commercial structure located at 407 Church St. (TMS#: 05-0030-038-00-00), within the GC Zoning District and the Urban Core Design Overlay.**

Staff presented a request for the installation of two new signs on the front and side elevations of the commercial structure located at 407 Church Street. The property is owned by Sandy Bannon Gorshaw LLC and is located within the General Commercial Zoning District, the Urban Core Design Overlay District, and the Historic Buildings District, with Community Appearance Board authority over exterior alterations. The applicant proposed two single-phase illuminated rectangular cabinet signs with routed faces, incorporating three division logos. The signs are to be installed above the existing T-Mobile signage on the building façade and are designed to be centered both horizontally and vertically on the structure. Staff confirmed that all applicable sign permit requirements were satisfied and that Board approval was the final step in the review process. No public input.

Mrs. Madden Frieberg made a motion to approve the application as submitted. The motion cited compliance with Unified Development Ordinance Sections 2152, 2164, and 404.2. Mr. Peter Stevens seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- VI. Approval of Revised 2026 Application Submission Deadline Schedule:** Staff presented a recommendation to revise the application submission deadline for the Community Appearance Board (CAB) to establish a 30-day cutoff prior to the meeting date, replacing the current shared submission deadline used across multiple boards. It was noted that the existing unified deadline had resulted in extended waiting periods for CAB applicants, with some submissions being received more than 45 days in advance due to the timing of CAB

meetings occurring in the third or fourth week of each month. Staff further explained that other boards, including the Architectural Review Board, Board of Zoning Appeals, and the Planning Commission, are subject to more stringent public notice requirements, including mailed notification to adjacent property owners, which limits flexibility for last-minute agenda additions, unlike CAB applications.

Following discussion, a motion was made and seconded to approve the revised 2026 application submission deadline schedule as presented. A roll call vote was conducted, and the motion passed unanimously.

VII. Board Discussion: Chain linked fence at Municipal Complex on Highmarket Street.

VIII. Motion to Authorize Chairman and Staff to Type Handwritten Changes on the Board Orders: Mr. Burt Shell made a motion to authorize staff and Chairman to type handwritten changes on the Board Orders. Mrs. Madden Frieberg seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

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

Submitted By:

Brittany Powell

Board Secretary

COMMUNITY APPEARANCE BOARD

Workshop Held on May 19, 2026

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Mrs. Brittany Powell & 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. **Board Discussion: Discussion of staff expectations, potential changes, and transitions, discussion of CAB application and the application process, discussion of April CAB's authority to grant variances, discussion of compliance and enforcement procedures, discussion of staff level approvals vs. CAB Certificates of Appropriateness, discussion of Meador's contract regarding the creation of a database, relative UDO updates, and architectural materials, discussion to create a database of visual conditions to assist the Applicant and the Board, discussion of April CAB applications, and updates on continuing education requirements and board member status.**

Staff Transition and Departmental Updates: Mrs. Jennifer Boyer informed the Board that Mrs. Clarissa Tindall is no longer employed with the City. She acknowledged Mrs. Tindall's longstanding role in attending CAB meetings and assisting with board operations alongside Mrs. Brittany Powell, who continues to serve as board secretary. Mrs. Boyer reported that the department is currently managing approximately four vacant positions. Until those positions are filled, Mrs. Boyer and Mrs. Powell will serve as the primary staff contacts for CAB-related matters. Board members were advised to direct all application-related questions and inquiries concerning overlay districts to Mrs. Boyer. Mrs. Powell will serve as an alternate point of contact when Mrs. Boyer is unavailable. Mrs. Boyer stated that application processing will continue without interruption. She noted that staff reports may undergo minor revisions over time to improve clarity and usability and encouraged Board members to provide feedback regarding the information included in future reports.

Board Communication and Sunshine Law Compliance: Mrs. Boyer reviewed Sunshine Law requirements and addressed concerns regarding communications occurring outside of public meetings. She explained that discussions among Board members about active applications outside of a properly noticed meeting may constitute a violation of Sunshine Law requirements. Board members were reminded that questions regarding applications, procedures, or agenda items should be directed to staff rather than shared with fellow Board members. Mrs. Boyer emphasized that email correspondence involving all Board members, particularly "reply all" responses concerning active cases, should be avoided.

Mrs. Boyer further explained that Sunshine Law restrictions apply not only to written communication but also to informal conversations between Board members regarding pending matters. A Board member acknowledged previously seeking guidance from another member on an application, which Mrs. Boyer identified as an example of communication that should not occur outside a public meeting. Going forward, Board members were instructed to respond directly to staff when questions arise and to refrain from copying the full Board on application-related communications. Mrs. Boyer clarified that any necessary communications to the entire Board should originate from staff. Mrs. Boyer noted that public boards are receiving increased scrutiny regarding compliance with Sunshine Laws and emphasized the importance of following established communication protocols to avoid any appearance of deliberation outside of a public meeting. No action was taken.

CAB Application Completeness and Intake Standards: Mrs. Jennifer Boyer presented the current CAB application and acknowledged that it, along with several other departmental applications, is due for revision and modernization. Board members discussed recurring issues involving incomplete applications being placed on meeting agendas. Concerns were raised regarding applications lacking required supporting materials such as setback information, paint color selections, material samples, surveys, and other documentation necessary for a thorough review. Board members noted that, in the past, incomplete applications have occasionally proceeded to the meeting stage, requiring the Board to obtain missing information through questioning during the hearing. It was expressed that this practice can create challenges for both applicants and Board members by placing applicants in the position of potentially receiving unfavorable action on an application that was not fully prepared for review. Mrs. Boyer agreed that application deficiencies should be identified and addressed during the staff review process prior to scheduling an application for Board consideration. She stated that revisions to the application and checklist would help clarify submission requirements and establish clearer standards for determining application completeness. A previous application involving a fence proposal was discussed as an example of how missing documentation, including survey information and setback details, can complicate the review process and limit the Board's ability to make informed decisions. The Board also discussed situations in which applicants attempt to substantially modify their proposed scope of work during a meeting. Mrs. Boyer stated that significant changes should require amendment of the application and resubmittal for consideration at a future meeting rather than being reviewed without adequate notice or documentation. Mrs. Boyer indicated that strengthening application requirements and submission checklists would provide staff with clearer authority to defer incomplete applications until all required materials have been received.

Board Authority and Scope of Review: The Board discussed the appeals process for CAB decisions. Mrs. Boyer confirmed that appeals of Board decisions are filed with Circuit

Court within thirty (30) days in accordance with Article 17, Section 1711 of the Unified Development Ordinance. She noted that portions of the ordinance governing appeals could benefit from clarification and may be addressed during future ordinance revisions. Discussion followed regarding the distinction between reviewing applications for compliance with adopted design standards and designing projects on behalf of applicants. Mrs. Boyer emphasized that the Board's role is to evaluate applications based on adopted guidelines and standards rather than to design projects or dictate specific design solutions. Board members discussed the extent to which recommendations may be offered during project reviews. It was noted that recommendations should be grounded in adopted design guidelines and architectural compatibility rather than individual aesthetic preferences. The Board acknowledged that where multiple materials or design options are expressly permitted by ordinance, the Board may not require an applicant to select one approved option over another solely based on preference. Mrs. Boyer confirmed that comments relating to compatibility with an established architectural style or compliance with adopted guidelines are appropriate considerations within the Board's review authority. The Board further discussed the value of maintaining a membership composed of individuals with diverse backgrounds and perspectives. Members noted that a variety of professional experiences and community viewpoints contributes to a balanced and effective review process.

Variance Authority and Proposed Ordinance Amendments: Mrs. Boyer informed the Board that she is preparing proposed text amendments to the Unified Development Ordinance for consideration by the Planning Commission. One proposed amendment would remove variance authority from the CAB. Mrs. Boyer explained that variances are zoning-related matters that require findings related to hardship and are more appropriately considered by a zoning board rather than an appearance review board. Board members generally agreed that variance requests fall outside the primary purpose and expertise of the CAB. Discussion also addressed the Board's authority when reviewing applications involving materials or design elements that are expressly permitted by ordinance. Mrs. Boyer clarified that when a proposed material or design feature is specifically authorized under the ordinance, the Board's review authority is limited to the standards established within the code and does not extend to requiring alternative approved materials based solely on individual preference. **No action was taken.**

Ordinance Clarity and the Main Corridor Overlay District (MCO)

Mrs. Jennifer Boyer discussed ongoing efforts to update and modernize the City's development ordinances. She noted that the consulting firm Maters & Associates has been engaged to conduct a comprehensive review and rewrite of the applicable ordinances, beginning with the Historic District and Architectural Review Board regulations before addressing the overlay district provisions administered by the CAB. Mrs. Boyer explained that one of the primary challenges within the current ordinance is

the presence of conflicting and unclear provisions, particularly within the Main Corridor Overlay District (MCOD). Discussion centered on uncertainty regarding which projects require review by the CAB and which may be approved administratively by the Zoning Administrator. Board members observed that portions of the ordinance appear to require a Certificate of Appropriateness for all work within the overlay district while simultaneously authorizing administrative approval of certain applications. Members agreed that clarification of the Board's role and review authority would be beneficial. The Board also discussed provisions related to renovation projects and concerns that portions of the ordinance could be interpreted as requiring entire buildings to be brought into compliance with current standards when only minor improvements are proposed. Mrs. Boyer noted that the ordinance contains language limiting compliance requirements to the specific scope of work being performed, which helps prevent unnecessary burdens on minor renovation projects. Discussion followed regarding possible restructuring of the ordinance to better distinguish between projects requiring Board review and those appropriate for administrative approval. Several members expressed support for focusing Board review on larger-scale projects, such as new construction and significant façade alterations, while allowing routine maintenance and minor improvements to be reviewed administratively. Members agreed that future ordinance revisions should provide clearer guidance regarding review thresholds, Board authority, and the distinction between administrative and Board-level approvals.

Compliance, Enforcement, and Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Follow-Through:

The Board discussed concerns regarding enforcement of approved Certificates of Appropriateness and the City's ability to ensure that completed projects are constructed in accordance with approved plans. Mrs. Boyer acknowledged that historically there has been limited follow-up after issuance of a COA and that enforcement responsibility has not always been clearly defined. Members expressed concern that projects occasionally deviate from approved plans during construction without an effective mechanism for review or correction. Several members cited past projects as examples where completed work differed substantially from plans presented to the Board. Members noted that such situations can undermine confidence in the review process and create frustration when approved conditions are not implemented. The Board discussed ongoing compliance challenges involving certain properties and acknowledged the difficulties associated with long-term enforcement efforts. Mrs. Boyer advised that Code Enforcement staff continue to work with property owners to address violations but noted that enforcement can be a lengthy process due to legal limitations and procedural requirements. Members explored potential enforcement tools and discussed whether additional mechanisms could be incorporated into future ordinance amendments to improve compliance with approved COA conditions. Reference was made to approaches utilized by other municipalities that more clearly tie project approvals to compliance with Board-imposed conditions. Board members emphasized the importance of clearly communicating applicant responsibilities

at the time of approval and establishing meaningful consequences for failure to comply with approved plans. Discussion concluded with general agreement that future ordinance revisions should establish clearer enforcement procedures and assign responsibility for monitoring approved projects throughout the permitting and construction process.

City-Wide Code Consistency and Enforcement: The Board discussed concerns regarding consistency in the application and enforcement of overlay district standards. Members referenced instances in which chain-link fencing had been denied within overlay districts while similar fencing appeared to exist on both public and private properties within the same areas. Concerns were expressed that inconsistent application of standards can create public perceptions of unfairness and undermine confidence in the review process. Mrs. Boyer acknowledged these concerns and emphasized that each application must be evaluated based on the applicable ordinance requirements. She noted that the existence of a potentially non-compliant installation does not establish a legal basis for approving similar future requests. Board members expressed a desire for the City to address any known non-compliant installations on municipal property in order to demonstrate consistency in enforcement. Discussion also included questions regarding privately installed fencing and whether such installations were subject to permitting requirements or active code enforcement review. Mrs. Boyer explained that certain fences may not require building permits based on height but may still be subject to overlay district regulations. She advised that staff would review the identified properties and determine whether additional enforcement action or review is warranted. The Board agreed that consistent enforcement of overlay district standards, regardless of property ownership, is important to maintaining public trust and preserving the integrity of the review process.

No action was taken.

Business Owner Relations and Public Perception: The Board discussed the importance of maintaining a fair and consistent review process while remaining mindful of the impact Board decisions have on local business owners and property investors. Members expressed concern that applicants who leave the review process feeling frustrated may develop negative perceptions of the Board and the City, potentially influencing future investment decisions and public perception within the business community. Discussion included reflection on previous applications that generated applicant dissatisfaction and the lessons that could be learned from those experiences. Board members acknowledged that some past situations may have benefited from clearer procedural direction and more decisive handling of application changes occurring during public meetings. It was also recognized that applicants share responsibility for complying with established requirements and obtaining approvals prior to commencing work. Mrs. Jennifer Boyer noted that some level of applicant frustration is inevitable in any regulatory process. However, she emphasized the importance of ensuring that all applicants are treated consistently and that Board expectations, procedures, and requirements are

communicated clearly throughout the review process. The Board generally agreed that fairness, transparency, and consistency are essential to maintaining positive relationships with applicants while preserving the integrity of the review process.

Staff-Level Approvals and the Role of the Zoning Administrator: The Board discussed the circumstances under which applications should be reviewed administratively versus requiring consideration by the CAB. Members questioned whether applications that clearly satisfy all applicable standards and design requirements should be required to proceed through the full Board review process. Discussion included examples of past applications where proposed improvements appeared to comply with all established requirements and generated little substantive discussion during Board review. Mrs. Boyer confirmed that the current ordinance provides the Zoning Administrator with authority to approve certain applications administratively. However, she noted that the ordinance does not clearly define the circumstances under which staff approval is appropriate versus when Board review is required. The Board expressed support for establishing clearer review thresholds through the upcoming ordinance rewrite. Members indicated that a framework distinguishing between major projects and routine improvements could improve efficiency while preserving Board oversight of significant development proposals. Discussion generally favored reserving Board review for new construction, substantial façade modifications, and other projects involving significant design considerations, while allowing minor or clearly compliant work to be reviewed administratively where authorized by ordinance.

Ordinance Rewrite Process: Mrs. Boyer provided an update on the ongoing ordinance rewrite effort being conducted by Maters & Associates. She explained that the consultant's work begins with the Historic District and Architectural Review Board regulations before progressing to the overlay district provisions administered by the CAB. Mrs. Boyer stated that a project kickoff meeting similar to the process utilized for the ARB is anticipated once work begins on the CAB-related ordinances. The Board discussed the benefits of the collaborative approach used during the ARB kickoff process, which included opportunities for staff, board members, stakeholders, and members of the public to identify concerns, priorities, and desired outcomes before drafting commenced. Mrs. Boyer indicated that a similar engagement process is expected for the CAB ordinance update and estimated that the initial discussions could occur later in the year, although no formal schedule has been established. Board members expressed a desire for the revised ordinance to reflect Georgetown's unique character while incorporating proven concepts and best practices from comparable communities where appropriate. Discussion also emphasized the importance of addressing enforcement provisions, review procedures, and overall ordinance clarity as part of the rewrite effort. Members agreed that broad stakeholder participation will be important to ensure that the revised ordinance is practical, enforceable, and reflective of community expectations.

Visual Reference Materials and Applicant Guidance: The Board discussed the development of visual reference materials intended to assist applicants, design professionals, and Board members in interpreting the City's design guidelines. Members noted that portions of the current ordinance contain subjective or vague descriptions that can be difficult for applicants to interpret consistently. To address this challenge, examples drawn from Georgetown's existing built environment are being compiled to illustrate design elements and architectural characteristics that align with the intent of the overlay district standards. The Board agreed that visual reference materials could serve as a valuable educational resource by helping applicants understand community expectations before investing time and resources in design preparation. Discussion also focused on the potential for such materials to improve application quality, reduce misunderstandings regarding design standards, and provide clearer guidance regarding what constitutes a complete and well-prepared submission. Mrs. Boyer suggested that the materials could eventually be incorporated into the application process as a supplemental resource while the broader ordinance rewrite remains underway. The Board expressed support for continued development of the visual reference materials as an informational tool to assist both applicants and Board members.

Tree Protection Ordinance and Interdepartmental Coordination: Mrs. Boyer provided an update regarding ongoing revisions to the City's tree protection regulations. She noted that the City's arborist has been working with staff to develop proposed updates and integrate the regulations into the Unified Development Ordinance. Discussion included the importance of obtaining technical expertise during the drafting process. A Board member with professional arboriculture experience offered to provide input and feedback on the proposed ordinance revisions. Mrs. Boyer welcomed the offer and indicated she would communicate the opportunity for professional review to the appropriate staff. Board members also discussed the value of coordination between City and County regulations to minimize potential conflicts and improve consistency for property owners and businesses operating within the community. The Board emphasized the importance of seeking input from a broad range of stakeholders during ordinance development to ensure that proposed regulations are practical, enforceable, and compatible with the needs of property owners, businesses, and City departments.

No action was taken.

III. Adjournment: With there being no further business to discuss, the workshop adjourned.

Submitted By:

Brittany Powell

Board Secretary