

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

- 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. 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.

- VI. 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.

- VII. 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.

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

IX. 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.

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

Submitted By:

Brittany Powell

Board Secretary