

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 6, 2026

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Kevin Jayroe, Ms. Lynn Robb, Ms. Debra Smalls, Mr. Dwayne Vernon, Ms. Ede Graves, & Mr. Neil Lareau

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. David Rice

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. **Approval of Minutes for May 4, 2026:**
 - A) **Mrs. Lynn Robb made a motion to approve the minutes for May 4, 2026. Ms. Ede Graves seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.**
- III. **Public Input for Non-Agenda Items:** None
- IV. **Old Business:** None
- V. **New Business:**
 - A) **ARB-2026-0015 - Request: Revision. 607 Duke Street. TMS# 05-0030-079-00-00. Request to revise the previously approved porch renovations, to include elevating the porch roof to be same height as the main roof. The foundation, steps, roofing material, and roof pitch are to remain the same. Posts to be replaced in compliance with previously approved COA.**

Mrs. Jennifer Boyer presented the application to the Board. **The Owners are Sheila and Darrell Gardner. Mr. Darrell Gardner** presented a request to revise a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for porch renovations at 607 Duke Street, a property located within the R-4 zoning district and the Historic Buildings Overlay District. The original application was approved by the Architectural Review Board in March 2026. The proposed revision involved raising the porch roof so that it aligns with the height of the main roof's eaves and fascia boards while maintaining the previously approved design. **Mr. Darrell Gardner** explained that the foundation, steps, roof pitch, and roofing materials would remain unchanged from the approved plans. He further stated that the porch posts would be replaced in accordance with the previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness. The proposed modification would raise the porch roof only a few inches to create a level transition with the main structure, improving the overall appearance without altering the roof pitch or increasing the height beyond that of the primary roof.

During discussion, a Board member inquired whether the existing porch roof would be detached and raised or demolished and reconstructed. **Mr. Darrell Gardner** responded that the contractor would determine the most appropriate construction method while ensuring the finished project complied with the approved design. Staff advised that Section 2011.102 of the Historic Design Guidelines recommends that porches be maintained in their original configuration using original materials and architectural details. However, staff also noted that this standard carries less significance because the residence is classified as a non-contributing structure, having been constructed after 1932. **Mr. Darrell Gardner** further explained that the existing porch is not original to the home, as it had previously been damaged by a fallen tree and rebuilt. Board members confirmed that the proposed roofline would remain below the height of the primary roof and would align with the rear portion of the structure.

Public Input: None

Ms. Ede Graves made a motion was made to approve the revised application as presented, citing Section 2011 Standards for Residential Properties – Details, 2011.10 Porches, Columns, and Railings, 2011.1002 Standards of the Historic Design Guidelines. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kevin Jayroe, and upon a roll call vote, the application was approved unanimously.

- B) ARB-2026-0017 – Request: Demolition of an accessory structure, and construction of a new accessory structure with an ADU. 411 Highmarket St. TMS# 05-0030-200-00-00. Request to demolish the existing shed and construct a two-story detached garage with an accessory dwelling unit, to include improved parking and driveway areas.**

Mrs. Jennifer Boyer presented the application to the Board. **The Owners are Robert and Jennifer Dixon. Mrs. Lina Jimenez, architect,** was present on behalf of the owners. The Board considered an application requesting approval to demolish an existing accessory shed and construct a new two-story detached garage with an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) on the second floor, along with improvements to the existing parking and driveway areas, at 411 Highmarket Street. The property is located within the R-4 zoning district and the Historic Buildings Overlay District.

Public Input: Mrs. Jennifer Boyer reported that one written public comment had been received from the owner of 223 St. James Street. The correspondence expressed concerns that the proposed two-story structure would negatively affect the neighboring property's privacy by allowing views into the rear yard. The commenter also expressed frustration with perceived limitations on improving their own historic property while observing other properties receiving approval for modifications. The letter further noted that the commenter is a Black American, is disabled, is over 70

years of age, and has resided in a home that has remained in their family since 1933. The Board acknowledged receipt of the correspondence as part of the public record.

Mrs. Lina Jimenez stated the property as a narrow, deep lot with an existing gravel driveway terminating at the accessory shed proposed for demolition. The architect explained that the existing concrete slab would be retained and that the gravel driveway would be extended to the rear of the property, where the new detached garage and accessory dwelling unit would be constructed. The proposed design was intended to complement the existing residence by matching its exterior colors, trim, siding, brick detailing, and architectural style while recognizing that the new construction would remain distinguishable as a contemporary addition. In response to the concerns raised regarding privacy, the architect explained that the required egress windows on the left elevation face toward the adjoining property on St. James Street. The architect indicated that those windows could potentially be relocated to dormers, allowing the left elevation to become a blind wall; however, he stated that his preference was to proceed with the plans as submitted if no ordinance or design guideline required such a modification. Board members discussed the issue and noted that the City of Georgetown does not have regulations comparable to those found in some larger municipalities governing view corridors or privacy between neighboring properties. The Board further concluded that it did not have the authority to require design changes solely to address private views or sightlines between adjacent properties and that such matters were outside the Board's jurisdiction. During review of the architectural drawings, a Board member observed that the submitted plans depicted two-over-two window configurations, whereas the existing residence contains one-over-one windows. The architect agreed to revise the plans to reflect one-over-one windows so that the new structure would more accurately match the architectural character of the principal dwelling. Staff also confirmed that the residence is classified as a non-contributing structure due to its date of construction, thereby reducing the applicability of certain historic preservation standards.

Mrs. Lynn Robb made a motion was made to approve the application for demolition of the existing accessory structure and construction of a new detached garage with an accessory dwelling unit at 411 Highmarket Street, subject to the condition that all windows be revised to a one-over-one configuration in lieu of the two-over-two windows shown on the submitted plans. The motion cited compliance with Sections 2012.1, 2012.2, 2012.3, and 2020.1 of the Historic Design Guidelines. The motion was seconded by Ms. Debra Smalls. The motion was approved with Mr. Dwayne Vernon voting in opposition.

- C) ARB-2026-0018 – Request: Mechanical System. 914 Prince St. TMS# 05-0027-267-00-00. Request to install a generator on a concrete pad at the rear of the house.**

Mrs. Jennifer Boyer presented the application to the Board requesting approval to install a standby generator on a concrete pad at the rear of the residence located at 914 Prince Street. The property is located within the R-4 zoning district and the Historic Buildings Overlay District. Prior to discussion of the application, **Mrs. Lynn Robb** recused herself from the proceedings and abstained from voting, as the subject property is her residence. The application was presented by staff and **Mrs. Lynn Robb**. Staff explained that the proposed generator would be located within the center of the rear patio garden, which was determined to be the only location on the property that satisfied applicable zoning and installation requirements. The Board reviewed the proposed placement and noted that the generator would be fully screened from public view. Existing landscaping, including a camellia hedge adjacent to Duncan Memorial Presbyterian Church at the rear of the property, a detached garage along one side, mature Ficus screening, and an additional camellia hedge separating the property from the church parking lot, would effectively conceal the equipment from the public right-of-way. Staff further advised that the Unified Development Ordinance requires a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of mechanical equipment within the Historic Buildings Overlay District and noted that this was the first generator installation to come before the Architectural Review Board for consideration. Board members discussed whether similar mechanical equipment installations should continue to require full Board review or whether future applications could be handled administratively by staff. While no action was taken on the procedural discussion, members agreed that the issue should be considered during future ordinance revisions.

Public Input: None

Ms. Ede Graves made a motion to approve the application as presented, finding it consistent with Section 2011.8 of the Historic Design Guidelines governing mechanical systems. The motion was seconded by Mr. Neil Lareau, upon a roll call vote, was approved unanimously, with Ms. Robb abstaining due to her recusal.

- D) ARB-2026-0019 – Request: Construction of a new building addition and alteration of the existing carport. 222 Screven Street. TMS# 05-0030-160-00-00. Request to construct an addition to the existing home, to include a master suite, attached garage, and gallery area. The existing carport, either in whole or in part, may need to be demolished; however, it is the intent of the applicant to enclose the existing carport to create the master suite.**

Mrs. Jennifer Boyer presented an application requesting approval to construct a new building addition with alterations to the existing home at 222 Screven Street, including a master suite, an attached garage, and a gallery area. Staff clarified that while demolition of the carport had been listed as a possibility, the applicant's intention is to retain the carport and incorporate it into the master suite addition, and

the demolition listing was included only as a precaution. Staff also noted a technical error in the board packet where a Word-to-PDF conversion issue caused incorrect section numbers to appear, with 2001 appearing instead of 2020 and an erroneous reference to section 2009, though all listed material is correct. **The owners are Cannon & Marguerite Barr. John Marshall Williams** presented on behalf of the owners. He described the primary scope as enclosing the existing carport to create a master suite and adding an attached garage, with all work falling well within required setbacks and height requirements. Design intent was described as making the addition look as though it had always been part of the house, functioning and reading as one cohesive unit rather than separate detached parts. The roof pitch of the addition would provide sufficient space upstairs for an office, and the driveway would be a single access point from the street branching off to each garage door with a ribbon of landscaping in the center. A board member raised a concern about whether the garage facade appeared flush with the house facade in the elevation drawing, and the architect clarified that the existing house facade projects significantly beyond the garage facade when viewed in plan. Questions were raised about window styles, with the board noting that dormers on the addition may differ slightly from the main house windows, and the architect confirmed the intent to match windows on the main structure. Staff raised concern about the courtyard parking area shown on the drawings, referencing standard 2012.411, which states parking areas should only be on side and rear elevations and not in front yards, and sought clarification on whether the area between the two structures would be considered a side yard. The architect clarified that the area labeled as courtyard parking is an existing driveway and that the space between the knee walls and the house may ultimately be grass rather than paved surface. A board member raised the question of whether garage doors opening toward the street could encroach on the right of way, and staff confirmed the garage is set back sufficiently that even if doors swung outward, they would remain on private property. Board member **Mr. Dwayne Vernon** noted the garage is well behind the setback line and well behind the front facade of the existing house, describing the courtyard solution as a strong approach to adding onto a historic district property. **Mr. Dwayne Vernon** also raised the issue that the drawings appeared to show the entire front of the property paved with concrete, and the architect clarified that only a single vehicle entry from the curb was intended, with landscaping planned between the existing driveway and the new addition. A question was raised about whether roof overhangs must fall within setback lines, with Vernon noting a zoning officer had recently raised this issue on another project, and staff indicated this requirement appears to apply only in the R5 district and not R4 where this property is located. The board acknowledged that building permit review would catch any setback violations and that the ARB approval does not override building code requirements.

Public Input: None

Mr. Kevin Jayroe made a motion to approve the project as submitted, citing standards 2010.1, 2010.2, 2010.4, 2010.402, 2011.1, 2011.2, 2011.4, 2011.5, 2011.6, 2011.7, 2011.9, 2011.10, 2011.11, 2011.12, 2011.13, 2012.1, 2012.2, 2012.3, 2012.4, 2013.1, and 2020. Ms. Ede Graves seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously.

E) ARB-2026-0020 – Request: Addition and enclosure. 209 Cannon Street. TMS# 05-0030-180-00-00. Request to construct a breezeway, including a small bath, and enclosure of a rear deck.

The Board considered an application requesting approval for the construction of a breezeway with a small interior bathroom and the enclosure of an existing rear deck at 209 Cannon Street. The property is located within the R-4 zoning district and the Historic Buildings Overlay District. Prior to the presentation, **Chairman Mr. Kevin Jayroe** disclosed for the record that he had previously served as the real estate agent in the sale of the property but stated that he no longer has any financial interest or involvement with the property. **Ms. Barbara McIntosh, the property owner,** explained that the proposed project was intended to improve accessibility between the residence and the detached garage by creating a covered breezeway, allowing access without having to go outdoors during inclement weather. She further stated that the addition would include a small bathroom to provide convenient access to the existing hot tub located at the rear of the residence. The proposed addition was described as a modest structure measuring less than approximately ten feet by six feet and located between the main residence and the detached garage. The project also included the enclosure of the existing rear deck adjacent to the kitchen. During discussion, **Mr. Dwayne Vernon** raised concerns regarding the potential zoning implications of the proposed design. He noted that if the enclosed breezeway constituted conditioned living space and created a direct connection between the residence and the detached garage, the garage could potentially be reclassified as part of the principal structure, which could affect setback compliance. In response, **Ms. McIntosh** explained that the detached garage, measuring approximately 22 feet by 28 feet, is located near the rear of the property and that the proposed addition would be situated along the side of the residence adjacent to the front portion of the garage rather than near any property boundaries. Further discussion clarified that the proposed enclosed space would utilize the side wall of the residence and the side wall of the garage to create the bathroom enclosure but would remain attached to the residence rather than forming a fully enclosed conditioned connection to the garage. Board members expressed difficulty interpreting the proposed design based on the plans submitted and noted that one of the reference photographs included with the application did not depict the subject property. Members concluded that additional

information would be necessary to adequately evaluate the proposal. The Board requested that the applicant return with detailed engineered drawings, complete construction specifications, and architectural details identifying all proposed materials, including siding, windows, doors, and the manner in which the new construction would connect to the existing structures.

Public Input: None

Mr. Kevin Jayroe made a motion to continue the application for a period of ninety (90) days to allow the applicant sufficient time to engage an engineer and prepare revised plans. The Board noted that the applicant could return for consideration prior to the expiration of the 90-day period if the required information was completed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Neil Lareau, and, upon a roll call vote, was approved unanimously.

Staff was directed to issue a formal continuance letter and place the application on a future agenda once the revised plans had been submitted.

- F) ARB-2026-0022 – Request: Demolition of additions, modifications and repairs to the existing structure, new addition, and new construction of an accessory structure with a porch. 221 Cannon Street. TMS# 05-0030-178-00-00. Request to demolish a non-historic in-fill addition to the home, replace upper windows on the rear elevation, repair existing brick on the chimney, new one-story addition, extension of the roof and awning on the main structure, relocate existing electrical panel, and construct a new two-story detached structure – a garage and conditioned studio space – with a one-story covered porch and fireplace.**

Mrs. Jennifer Boyer presented an application for renovations and additions to the residence located at 221 Cannon Street, a property within the R-4 zoning district and the Historic Buildings Overlay District. The proposed project included demolition of non-historic rear infill additions, replacement of upper-level rear elevation windows, repair of the existing brick chimney, construction of a one-story rear addition with a roof extension, relocation of the electrical panel, and construction of a two-story detached accessory structure containing a golf cart garage, second-floor studio space, a covered porch, and an exterior fireplace. **Ms. Kate Campbell of Beau Clowney Architects presented the application on behalf of the property owners, Mrs. Rebecca Lammonds and Mr. Philip Lammonds. Ms. Kate Campbell** explained that the owners are committed to preserving the historic character of the home. She stated that the design philosophy focused on locating new construction to the rear of the historic structure, minimizing impacts to original historic fabric, and limiting alterations to areas previously modified by non-historic additions. Research conducted using Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps confirmed that the existing rear additions are not original to the residence. To illustrate the property's architectural

evolution, **Ms. Kate Campbell** presented Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps dating from 1894 through 1913. The maps documented the home's original two-room center hall configuration, subsequent one-story and two-story rear additions, and later alterations that resulted in the existing rear gable configuration. Based upon this research, the proposed demolition was limited to non-historic additions while preserving the original portions of the residence. **Ms. Kate Campbell** explained that the proposed additions were intentionally designed to remain subordinate to the historic dwelling in both mass and scale. The new rear addition was designed to resemble an enclosed porch, incorporating architectural details such as exposed rafters and chamfered columns that mirror the existing rear porch, which itself was designed to complement the original front porch. She further explained that two-over-two windows located on the non-historic rear addition would be replaced with six-over-six windows to better reflect the proportions and architectural character of the original structure. The proposed detached accessory structure was described as a two-story building containing a golf cart garage on the first floor and a music studio on the second floor. **Ms. Kate Campbell** clarified that the second-floor studio would not contain a bathroom or function as an accessory dwelling unit. Architectural details on the accessory structure were intentionally simplified versions of those found on the principal residence. She explained that six-over-one windows were proposed within the stair tower, while four-light casement windows were utilized in locations where double-hung windows would be impractical because of size or function. When a Board member questioned an apparent discrepancy between window types shown on different elevations, **Ms. Kate Campbell** clarified that the six-over-one units occur only within the stair enclosure and that the remaining windows were consistent with the proposed design. **Ms. Kate Campbell** further advised that the existing driveway would remain unchanged and that the detached garage was designed exclusively for golf cart storage rather than full-size vehicles; therefore, no additional driveway extending to the rear structure was proposed. She also noted that, after reviewing the previous agenda item concerning setbacks, she had researched the Unified Development Ordinance and found no provision requiring roof overhangs to remain within setback lines. She confirmed that the proposed detached garage would maintain a six-foot rear setback. During Board discussion, members questioned the lattice enclosure beneath the existing front balcony, noting that it appeared inconsistent with the historic character of the residence. **Ms. Kate Campbell** stated that the enclosure likely dates from the 1980s and expressed an interest in further investigating its removal as part of future restoration efforts. She also noted that historical research suggested the residence may have originally featured a two-story front porch, based on information contained within the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, which could help explain the building's current appearance and support future restoration of that feature. Staff further confirmed that the neighboring property owner immediately to the east, who would be the most directly affected by the

proposed improvements, had reviewed the plans and expressed support for the project.

Public Input: None

Mr. Kevin Jayroe made a motion to approve the application submitted, finding the proposal consistent with Sections 2010.1, 2010.2, 2010.4, 2010.402, 2011.1, 2011.2, 2011.3, 2011.4, 2011.5, 2011.7, 2011.10, 2011.11, 2011.12, 2011.13, 2012.3, and 2013.1 of the Historic Design Guidelines. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Lynn Robb, and, upon a roll call vote, the Board unanimously approved the application.

VI. Board Discussion:

- A) **September 2026 Meeting Rescheduling:** Staff reminded the Board that, by previous action taken in January 2026, the regularly scheduled September 7, 2026, Architectural Review Board meeting had been canceled in observance of the Labor Day holiday and that no alternate meeting date had been established. Staff explained that because the regular meeting had been formally canceled, any September meeting would need to be scheduled as a special meeting rather than as a regular meeting. Members discussed several possible dates while considering potential conflicts with the Community Appearance Board meeting scheduled for September 15 and the Planning Commission meeting scheduled for September 22. Following discussion, a motion was made to hold a special Architectural Review Board meeting on September 8, 2026, subject to the availability of meeting space. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.
- B) **Board Member Terms, Continuing Education, and Administrative Updates:** Staff informed the Board that all member term expiration dates had been verified and are now published on the City's website to improve transparency. Staff further advised that City Council has requested that board members wishing to continue serving after the expiration of their terms must submit a formal application to the City Clerk's Office rather than relying on informal notification. Staff noted that Architectural Review Board members are eligible to serve multiple consecutive terms, unlike members of certain other boards, including the Planning Commission and Community Appearance Board, which are subject to term limits.

Staff reviewed the continuing education requirements established under state law, explaining that each Board member must complete three (3) hours of approved training during each appointment year, measured by the member's appointment date rather than the calendar year. Members were advised that approved training providers are identified on the Municipal Association of South Carolina (MASC) website and that certificates of completion should be submitted to staff for forwarding to the City Clerk's Office. Staff also explained that, when a certificate is

unavailable, members may complete the state-authorized training verification form to document attendance.

Discussion also addressed the applicability of continuing education toward the Board's annual training requirement. Staff reported that discussions are ongoing with MASC to determine whether licensed professionals, such as architects and arborists, whose licensing requirements exceed the Board's three-hour annual requirement, may receive equivalent credit or an exemption. Staff noted that architects are currently recognized through the American Institute of Architects (AIA) on MASC's approved training list, while other professions, including arborists, are not presently included. MASC indicated that additional professions would be considered during its August meeting.

C) Board Discussion – Unified Development Ordinance Amendments and ARB Review Procedures

Staff initiated a discussion regarding potential amendments to the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), particularly those affecting the scope of Architectural Review Board review. Staff noted that the ordinance contains inconsistent provisions regarding signage, with one section indicating that signs are reviewed administratively by ARB staff while another does not specifically exempt signage from Board review. Members acknowledged that these inconsistencies, along with remnants of older ordinance language still appearing on the City's website, have created confusion regarding which applications require formal Board approval versus administrative review.

Using the generator application considered earlier in the meeting as an example, staff encouraged the Board to evaluate whether certain routine applications could be processed administratively rather than requiring formal Board review, thereby reducing unnecessary delays for applicants. Staff requested that Board members submit recommendations for ordinance revisions by email so that a comprehensive list of proposed amendments could be compiled for consideration during the ongoing UDO rewrite.

Staff further reported that the City's consultant, Meadors, Inc., is expected to provide an initial draft of the revised ordinance in the coming months. Rather than pursuing isolated ordinance amendments, staff recommended incorporating the Board's suggested revisions into the comprehensive rewrite to ensure consistency throughout the document. Staff outlined the anticipated review schedule, explaining that the Architectural Review Board would have the opportunity to review and comment on the draft before it goes to the Planning Commission, followed by City Council workshops and the required first and second readings. Staff emphasized that

the Board's participation early in the drafting process would provide the greatest opportunity to influence the final ordinance.

VII. 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.

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

Submitted By:

Brittany Powell

Board Secretary