

McClellanville Architectural / Design Review Board

February 17th, 2026 — 7:00 PM

Town Hall

Meeting Minutes

The McClellanville Architectural Review Board/Design Review Board met on the noted date and time above. The date and time of the meeting was advertised in compliance with state law. Board members present included Eric Craig (Chair), Betty Hills, Leigh Scott, and Bob Dunn. Absent from the meeting was board member Ruthie Lacey. Town staff present included Eddie Bernard (Town Planner) and Jessie Thomas (Executive Assistant). Kathryn Basha (Zoning Administrator) joined the meeting virtually. Members of the public in attendance included Marci Roan-Polk, John Adam Freeze, John Warren and Nealie Floyd, Richard and Elizabeth Campsen, Faye and Kevin Shepherd, Russell Tyler, and Martha Sheridan.

The meeting was called to order by Eric Craig at 7:00 PM.

The Board reviewed the minutes from the January 20th 2026 meeting. Betty Hills made a motion to approve the minutes as written, and Leigh Scott seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved by the Board present.

Eric Craig moved to introduce the application for siding replacement at 845 Pinckney St. The referenced property is zoned Residential and located within both the Town's and National Register historic districts. It is a contributing structure constructed c. 1901. The applicant, Palmer McClellan, was not in attendance and was represented by Adam Freeze. Kathryn Basha reviewed her staff report noting that the applicant proposed to replace the existing, rotting weatherboard siding on the south façade and back of the house to match the siding that exists on the rest of the house. Per the Design Guidelines: "The style and lap dimensions of replacement siding should match that of the original. Substitute materials should match the original in appearance as closely as possible. New materials that are similar in character to traditional materials are acceptable for noncontributing buildings and new construction". In considering this request, staff requested specifications for the replacement siding and found that the applicant proposed using Hardie-plank boards. In addition to comparing specifications for the Hardiplank vs. the existing siding, further investigation was done to determine whether there is precedence for ARB approval to use new materials, such as Hardiplank, on contributing buildings and staff was unable to find one. As a result, staff was unable to do an administrative review and approval of this request and it was therefore sent to the Board. After some discussion, Bob Dunn made a motion to deny the application as submitted for the use of hardiplank on a contributing structure. The motion was seconded by Betty Hills, and the application was denied by a unanimous vote of the Board members present.

Eric Craig moved to introduce the application for 312 Lofton Ct requesting exterior changes to an application originally approved by the Board on October 15, 2024. The applicant is seeking

to build a rear addition in the same footprint where a deck is currently located. The property is zoned Residential within the Town's historic overlay district and is a non-contributing property. Eddie Bernard reviewed his staff report noting that siding on the addition would be a textured hardie board with battens to match the existing structure's T1-11 and battens. Eddie Bernard also noted the additional impervious area from the addition is still well within the allowable area. As proposed, the lot will have just under 2,000 SF of impervious area. Leigh Scott made a motion to approve the application as submitted which was seconded by Bob Dunn and unanimously approved by the Board present.

Eric Craig requested to change the order of the final two applications on the agenda with approval from the public. There were no objections and therefore, Eric Craig made a motion to introduce the application for 537 Pinckney St. This application is for the new construction of a single-family residence in the Residential Historic District. Eddie Bernard reviewed his staff report noting the submittal provides a stock set of plans with some changes being made to them which are not currently reflected in the drawings. Eddie Bernard confirmed the drawings would need to be cleaned up with those changes incorporated for a zoning permit. Eddie Bernard specifically noted several proposed changes to the drawings needed including accurate depiction of lower level, confirmation of all siding details, roof type and material details, several missing details pertaining to the basement space and an updated floor plan. Additionally, the plans need to be updated with clarifications on garage doors, shutters, porch columns, and handrails. Eddie Bernard continued to stress that staff will need complete and cohesive set of drawings showing exactly what was approved and being proposed. A single, final site plan will be needed which shows the location of existing trees and their critical root zones, the septic field with tank and line routing to house, the well location with line routing to house, driveway material(s) labeled, impervious surface calculations, setbacks, dimensions from house to each of the property lines, graphic and written scales, plan date and north arrow. Eddie Bernard said he questions the 20' dimension to turn into the garage and recommend the applicant review that as this is a tighter turning movement than regular parking lot dimensions. The rear steps on the site plan differ from those on the plan and should be made consistent. Architectural elevations with height dimensions showing among other height delineations, the upper ridge to design flood elevation and finished floor elevation are also needed. Coordination on the reuse of the current septic field, if being reused, will need to be provided to ensure it is sized for this house. If the existing well is to be reused, then the applicant would need to indicate this or whether a new one is being installed in which case a copy of the well permit will be needed. Eric Craig walked through some of the missing details with Russell Tyler who confirmed the lower level masonry would be 16" square stucco on concrete piers with wooden louvers between. The roof is planned to be shingled and there will not be a chimney. Russell Tyler confirmed there will be no rooms underneath the house as it below the flood plain and the handrails would be steel on the front of the house and wood on the back. Per the applicant, there will not be any garage doors. Eric Craig explained to the applicant that the plans look suitable conditionally, however updated final drawings and completed plans would be needed prior to final approval from the Board. Eric Craig made a motion to conditionally approve the

application under the condition that the applicant will return to the board with final plans addressing all missing details. Motion was seconded by Bob Dunn and unanimously approved by the board present.

Eric Craig moved to re-introduce the application for 618 Thomas Pinckney Ct. Eddie Bernard reviewed his staff report noting that this is the third submittal and the house remains largely unchanged from previous submittals with the exception of placement on the lot and subsequent changes to the drive. The current submission has the house pushed roughly 12' closer to Thomas Pinckney Court. Much of the prior conversations on the submittal pertained to the placement of the house on the lot in relation to other nearby houses and the section of the design guidelines under the Basic Standards section that reads "*The directional expression of new construction will be compatible with existing structures within the same streetscape*". At the January meeting, the Board did not approve the submittal based on the siting of the house. Eric Craig stated that the updated plans appeared to address many of the concerns raised at the previous ARB meeting. He then opened the floor to the public for comments. John Warren Floyd presented his position, noting that the current plans were submitted prior to additional discussions between the applicant and neighboring property owners. He requested that the Board postpone its decision until an updated application is submitted that reflects the outstanding items that were discussed with the applicant.

Elizabeth Campson also spoke in opposition of approval, noting that she has attended all three meetings and that, without drawings depicting all neighboring structures, it is difficult to fully evaluate the proposal. Kevin Shepherd, representing the applicant, responded to the suggestion of further postponement, noting that the application process has been ongoing since the initial submittal in November 2025 and expressed his preference that the Board move forward with a decision. Kevin Shepherd addressed the portions of the current submittal that he felt incorporated concessions on behalf of the neighbor's previous feedback and conversations. Eric Craig reiterated the mission of the Board and the importance of maintaining the character of the Village. Eric Craig expressed his belief that the new plans do improve the streetscape by moving the house forward and arguably meets the definition expressional direction in his opinion.

Bob Dunn had further questions regarding the engineering of the septic. The Shepherds confirmed the septic analysis is complete in their opinion and this is as far as they can place the house forward with their current septic permit. Bob Dunn referenced the photographs included in the original application that showed the house in relation to neighboring properties. He noted that they were not included in the current submittal, and he found it difficult to visualize the resulting streetscape without them. Kevin Shepherd explained that the plans referenced by Bob Dunn were rejected by the Board in January, so they submitted the documentation they felt was best for their current submittal based on the feedback given at the previous meeting. The Board continued to evaluate and publicly discuss the photos submitted. Bob Dunn asked the Shepherds if they would entertain moving the house another three or four feet, provided that the septic engineering options were formally confirmed. Kevin Shepherd stated that the plans

currently being reviewed by the Board already include where the applicants are willing to compromise.

Elizabeth Campsen reiterated her view that, based on the photographs included in the current submittal, it remains difficult to fully evaluate the proposed placement of the house.

Betty Hills made a motion to approve the application as submitted. No board member seconded the motion, so the motion did not pass. Kevin Shepherd asked for further clarification from the Board on how to meet their interpretation of directional expression so they can adjust their plans accordingly without continued delays. Kathryn Basha agreed to work with the applicant on updated illustrations and site layout and confirmed a special meeting can be called by the Chair with 24-hour notice. The Board agreed to schedule a special meeting to review updated illustrations. Eric Craig moved to postpone until the Board can view additional renderings of the home showing placement. Bob Dunn seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved by the Board present.

Eric Craig asked if there were any questions regarding how the Board plans to proceed. No further questions were asked from the public.

Bob Dunn motioned for the meeting to be adjourned which was seconded by Betty Hills and unanimously approved by the Board present.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:44 PM.

Respectfully submitted,



Jessica Thomas

Executive Assistant