

John Warren Floyd, et al v. Town of McClellanville, South Carolina Architectural/Design
Review Board

Case No.: 2026-CP-10-_____

**NOTICE OF APPEAL FROM DECISION OF TOWN OF MCCLELLANVILLE
ARCHITECTURAL/DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

EXHIBIT A

**McClellanville Architectural / Design Review Board
Special Meeting
McClellanville Town Hall
February 24, 2026 – 7:00PM
Minutes**

The McClellanville Architectural Review Board/Design Review Board met on the above noted date and time. The meeting was advertised in compliance with state law. Board members present included Eric Craig (Chair), Betty Hills, Leigh Scott, and Bob Dunn. Board member Ruthie Lacey was absent from the meeting. Town staff members present included Michelle McClellan, Town Administrator, and Jessie Thomas, Executive Assistant. Kathryn Basha, Zoning Administrator, joined virtually. Several members of the public also attended the meeting.

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

Eric Craig stated the purpose of the McClellanville Architectural Review Board is to ensure that the historic integrity of significant or contributing properties is preserved so that the integrity of the village's historic character is not compromised. At the previous meeting, the Board requested that the applicant for 618 Thomas Pinckney Ct provide additional documentation to more clearly illustrate the proposed change in location of the house. Eric Craig turned the floor over to Kathryn Basha to present the additional illustrations. Kathryn Basha reviewed the renderings submitted which depicted the proposed placement of the home from multiple vantage points that emphasized its relationship to the streetscape and alignment with adjacent structures. The Board then engaged in a public discussion regarding the illustrations.

Betty Hills asked the applicant if there had been any further conversations between the applicant and adjacent neighbors. Kevin Shepherd confirmed one email had been exchanged and there were no additional proposals for change between the two parties.

Elizabeth Campsen (650 Thomas Pinckney Ct) requested permission to make a public comment. Eric Craig approved and opened the floor requesting a 3-minute limit. Elizabeth Campsen questioned the extent of the proposed shift in the home's location, noting that the change does not appear as significant in person as it may appear on paper. She claimed that discrepancies in the measurements provided may have resulted in certain illustrations depicting the home as moving closer to the street when, in her view, the actual placement had not significantly changed. The Board publicly reviewed and discussed her concerns. In response, Eric Craig informed the board and public that if the plans were conditionally approved today, the lot would be surveyed, and the house would be required to be 14 ft from the critical line setback prior to the applicant moving forward with construction regardless of what is shown on other individual drawings.

Eric Craig asked the Board whether sufficient information had been provided to make a determination and, if not, what additional specific information would be necessary.

Kevin Shepherd added that when he is on site, he uses the front survey pins based on the Board's feedback of streetscape instead of the critical line setback. Leigh Scott requested to see which illustrations show the measurements from the survey pins which were then publicly reviewed.

Eric Craig offered the floor to John Warren Floyd (610 Thomas Pinckney Ct). John Warren Floyd presented his opinion that there are erroneous measurements in the applicant's illustrations that cause the house placement to be misleading. He presented his findings to the Board, which were publicly viewed and discussed. A copy of the materials presented have been added to the project file at Town Hall.

Joel Adrian informed the board that the applicant's drawings are made using CAD software (not GIS) and there is no error in the site plan submitted. He continued that other illustrations presented by John Warren Floyd are from GIS which are not as accurate and stressed that the site plan from the surveyor remains the accurate illustration.

Bob Dunn questioned the accuracy of the illustrations provided and expressed concern about making a determination. Eric Craig stressed the importance of looking at a surveyed plat for the most reliable measurements.

Bob Dunn requested clarification as to whether any additional shifts were proposed in addition to the forward movement. The applicant confirmed that no other changes were proposed.

The board continued to publicly deliberate the application and the presented materials.

The Board questioned when the site survey was completed which Joel Adrian confirmed August of 2025. Bob Dunn then inquired about the extent of the front overlap between the two houses (618 Thomas Pinckney Court and 610 Thomas Pinckney Court). The applicant, Joel Adrian, stated that the overlap measurements were approximately 27 feet at the stairs, 34 feet 9 inches at the front porch, and 34 feet at the front corner of the house.

The Board continued to deliberate on the details of the application with the applicants and members of the public.

Eric Craig asked the Board whether they felt they had sufficient information to make a decision on the application. He emphasized the need to consider the house in relation to the road in order to determine whether it meets the definition of an appropriate streetscape and noted that this information had been provided. Eric Craig further stated that any approval would be conditional upon submission of a current survey confirming the structure is 14 feet from the critical line setback. He again asked the Board if they felt they had enough information to proceed with a vote on the application.

The board continued to publicly deliberate the application with the applicant and members of the public.

Leigh Scott confirmed she felt she had enough information to vote on the application. Bob Dunn continued to express concern about the accuracy of the illustrations provided in order to discern the streetscape. Eric Craig asked Bob Dunn what was specifically needed from the applicant for him to feel prepared to vote.

Eric reinforced that the Board is not approving all of the drawings, they are here to determine if the positioning of the home meets their interpretation of proper streetscape.

After confirming that all Board members felt they had sufficient information to proceed, Eric Craig made a motion to approve the application as submitted. The motion was seconded by Betty Hills, with Leigh Scott in agreement. Bob Dunn voted "nay."

Eric Craig stressed to the applicant that this is a conditional approval and requested a drawing of the updated survey showing 14ft from critical line setback before beginning construction. Applicant agreed.

Eric Craig asked the public if they had any further questions. No further questions were asked.

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for March 17, 2026.

There being no further business, Bob Dunn made a motion to adjourn which was seconded by Leigh Scott. Meeting was adjourned at 9:21 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Jessica Thomas". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Jessica Thomas
Executive Assistant