



CITY OF CHARLESTON BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SMALL

MEETING RESULTS DRAFT

JANUARY 26, 2023

4:30 P.M.

2 GEORGE STREET

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: VanSlambrook, Huey, Gardner, Fava

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Pinto, Gordineer

A. MINUTES

1. Review of Minutes from January 12, 2023 Meeting

APPROVED

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Approval.

MADE BY: VanSlambrook SECOND: Gardner

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0

B. APPLICATIONS

1. 63 & 65 Barre Street

TMS # 452-02-04-025 & 457-02-04-082 | BAR2023-001021

New | Harleston Village | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for three new rowhouses.

Owner: 221 Ashley LLC

Applicant: Julie O'Connor - American Vernacular, Inc

APPROVED

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Staff Comments and Board revision of Staff Comment #1 to restudy, but not mandate squared opening.

MADE BY: Gardner SECOND: Huey

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0

NOTES:

- HCF
 - o Concern about HVAC location
 - o Reduce depth of roof deck, reduce rooftop partitions
- Board
 - o Arches are pinching the doorway too much need to gain importance
 - o Dividing walls and maybe more shaping than angle
 - o Parapet walls dominate façade
 - o Need lightening up while retaining privacy
 - o Porch infill – some restudy

Staff Observations:

1. Zoning has confirmed the proposal is in compliance with the PUD and is within the allowed height.

Staff Comments:

1. Staff has met with the Applicant and discussed a concern over the front entries, which is that the proposed arches screen the entries too much. Staff suggests omitting the arches in lieu of squared-off openings, centering a single-entry door with sidelights in the arches, and/or using a dark stained door system to make the entries more visible. Applicant is willing to study this concern.
2. Additionally, Staff and Applicant have discussed pulling back or angling the separation walls at the roof deck on the front of the building. These walls need to be scaled back or scaled down on the front of the building.
3. At the second-floor rear of the building, the design creates what appears as infill porches. Staff suggests revising the exterior siding at these locations to be a larger lap siding and to potentially include a recessed panel railing like above.
4. Staff suggest restudying the detailing of the roof deck panels.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval with staff comments with final review by staff

2. 63 Simons Street

TMS # 463-15-02-031 | BAR2022-000919

NS | North Central | post-1944 & pre-1958 | Historic Material Demolition Purview

Request preliminary approval for reconstruction as required by Board 10/13/22, following unapproved demolition of historic structure.

Owner: HBSS Homes LLC

Applicant: David Richards, Architect

APPROVED

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Preliminary approval with staff comments: #4 to be studied for accuracy, #5, #6 with Board comment to study angle of roof and Final Review by Staff.

MADE BY: Gardner SECOND: Huey

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0

NOTES:

- Salvaged front windows, enough siding for front façade
- No public comments
- Board
 - o Enough of a recipe from adjacent buildings, even though we don't know what it was originally
 - o Location of front steps
 - o No object to not having second door
 - o Our challenge is to put back what was illegally demolished but should consider what is appropriate.

PREVIOUS MOTION 12.8.22: Conceptual Approval with Staff Comments 1,3,4,5,6.

PREVIOUS Staff Comments 12.8.22:

1. *Previous house was a duplex with two front doors. The proposed is altering to a single-family house. The two front doors should be retained.*
2. *Columns should be altered to be a brick base with a tapered wood column above.*
3. *The door on the second floor porch should be left in its original location which was aligned with the door below (right duplex door).*
4. *On west elevation, the first set of windows closest to the porch should remain in place.*
5. *Front porch stairs have been shifted to the right, they should remain in their original location.*
6. *The angles of the proposed hipped porch roof do not match the previous and should be adjusted.*

PREVIOUS Staff Recommendation 12.8.22: Deferral with staff comments.

Staff Observations:

1. Lot bought in '44.
2. The 1958 directories list two people with two different last names, and does not indicate an A and B units.
3. Staff have not been able to determine if the structure was built as a duplex or later converted.

Staff Comments:

1. Previous Board Motion from December 8, 2022 adopted five staff comments, but these have not been incorporated.

Staff Recommendation: Because previous Board motion conditions have not been incorporated in the proposal, Staff is recommending deferral.

3. 12 Cannon Street

TMS # 460-08-04-067 | BAR2023-001011

Category 4 | Cannonborough/Elliottborough | c. 1870 | Old City District

Request conceptual approval for new rear addition and restoration of existing house.

Owner: Brahma, LLC

Applicant: Fredrick Whittle

~~APPROVED~~

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral with Staff Comments.

MADE BY: Huey SECOND: Gardner

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0

NOTES:

- Windows to be replaced as need ~50%
- PSC
 - o Request further subordination and differentiation
 - o Mechanical seems excessive. Should be reduced if possible
- HCF
 - o Little information on proposed work to historic structure
 - o Recommend deferral for restudy
- Applicant
 - o Willing to look at comments
- Board
 - o Staff site visit to: verify inventory of windows what can be replaced, verify age of addition, ability to be altered to act more as hyphen
 - o Agree with staff on siding, lower roof
 - o Correct notes on drawing set
 - o Mechanical screen shouldn't protrude vertically above pitch of roof
 - o Site plan should show how it functions, detail

Staff Observations:

1. Removal of trees must be approved by zoning.
2. Received special exception from zoning for addition.

Staff Comments:

1. Retain existing siding on the existing “hyphen”.
2. Lower roof on new addition to be subordinate to main body of house.
3. Differentiate addition from main body of house.
4. Siding and windows should be replaced on a case-by-case basis, depending on the condition of each.
5. What portion of chimneys of being “reworked?”
6. All features should be repaired rather than replaced wherever possible.

Staff Recommendation: Deferral with staff comments

4. 273 King Street

TMS # 457-08-01-115 | BAR2023-001012

Category 3 | c. 1840 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval to replace existing transoms and alter fenestration.

Owner: 269 King St LLC (King Wentworth HPR)

Applicant: Lucas Boyd, Boyd Architects

APPROVED

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Final Review by Staff.

MADE BY: Fava SECOND: Gardner

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0

NOTES:

- Currently occupied by clothing store and hotel
- PSC
 - o Proposal for transoms is positive, but encourage use of existing openings
- Board
 - o Clean, simple solution. Will improve streetscape
 - o Potential for awning given outswing doors, engineering approval will be required for outswing
 - o Could be slightly recessed

Staff Observations:

1. The proposed change is a sensitive alteration that respects the width of the existing opening. This is reasonable and reversible.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval with final review by staff

5. 100 King Street

TMS # 457-12-04-050 | BAR2022-000967

NS | Charlestowne | c. 1915 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for new guest house built within the existing ruins of previous garage.

Owner: Chris & Anna Minnetian

Applicant: Barbara Looney

~~APPROVED~~

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral with Board comment for partial retention of ruin walls (side/rear) and encourage applicant to revert aesthetics of original design with Final Review by Staff.

MADE BY: Huey SECOND: Fava

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0

NOTES:

- PSC
 - o Appreciate response. Request further study of interaction with ruins.
- Discussion of previous design
 - o Don't think garage is historic

- Maybe partial retention of ruins
 - Could be improved by removing garage doors
- Sacrifices architecture
- Applicant
 - Wouldn't like to put previous design within the ruins

PREVIOUS MOTION 10.13.22: Approval of all changes to Main House with Final Review by Staff; Deferral of guest house to allow applicant to consider ruin & incorporating into design.

PREVIOUS Staff Observations 10.13.22:

1. *Garage being demolished is minimally visible from public ROW. BAR Policy Statement allows staff to review the demolition of accessory structures on properties rated less than a category 1 or 2 which are minimally visible from the public ROW.*

PREVIOUS Staff comments 10.13.22:

1. *The front door is nicely detailed but misaligned with the first-floor fenestration. However, it should be noted that the front door is recessed and should be minimally visible*
2. *The proposed garage is subordinate to and architecturally compatible with the existing structure.*

PREVIOUS Staff Recommendation 10.13.22: Conceptual approval with Final Review by Staff

Staff Observations:

1. Board previous motion has been addressed.
2. The proposed garage is subordinate to and architecturally compatible with the existing structure.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval with Final Review by Staff

6. 35 Broad Street

TMS # 458-09-03-122 | BAR2023-001014

Category 3 | Charlestowne | c. 1792 | Old and Historic District

Request alterations to existing store.

Owner: 35 Broad Street LLC

Applicant: Rhett Morgan, Rhett Morgan Architects

APPROVED

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Staff comments and Board Comment to consider copper cladding on all sides at rear & Final Review by Staff.

MADE BY: Fava SECOND: Gardner

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0

NOTES:

- Will be seeking historic tac credits
- Not changing front dormer, graphic error
- PSC

- Positive project
- Suggest continued study of rear fenestration
- Board
 - Positive project, will need careful detailing of front façade
 - Side that is visible be look at in copper

Staff Observations:

1. Proposed front facade is reconstructing previous, historic storefront.
2. Rear addition will not be seen at same time as front façade
3. Proposed addition is differentiated and subordinate.
4. Compliments building adjacent to rear with copper roof.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval with final review by staff

7. 73 Pitt Street

TMS # 460-16-03-066 | BAR2023-001013

Category 2 | Radcliffeborough | c. 1840 | Old and Historic District

Request new knee wall with existing ironwork fencing, new metal vehicular gate, new entry steps, alterations to hardscapes and drive.

Owner: Evan & Jasmine Rose

Applicant: Ables Landscapes

APPROVED

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Final Approval with Board Condition to verify degree of reworking (ironwork) with Staff prior to permitting.

MADE BY: Gardner SECOND: Huey

VOTE: FOR 3 AGAINST 0
Recused - Fava

NOTES:

- PSC
 - Request more information on reason
- Board
 - Clarify age/scope of work on ironwork with staff

Staff Observations:

1. Proposed wall and ironwork are appropriate for location.
2. Proposed brick stairs coordinate with proposed wall.
3. Drive gates complement the existing pedestrian gate.
4. This project only required Board review due to category.

Staff Recommendation: Final approval

8. 40 Charlotte Street

TMS # 459-13-01-173 | BAR2023-001015

Category 2 | Garden District | c. 1831 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for new pool pump house.

Owner: Vickie Neighbor

Applicant: Vickie Neighbor

~~APPROVED~~

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral to clarify Staff Comments #1-3 and Board Comment to provide an accurate site plan for entire property & Final Review by Staff.

MADE BY: Gardner SECOND: Huey

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0

NOTES:

- Missing grand tree – zoning issue
- Applicant response
 - o Match to existing wall cmu, brick, stucco
 - o Pool is above grade 3'
- Board
 - o Need full site plan showing previous approvals
 - o Could staff include previous approval

Staff Observations:

1. The proposed changes are minimally visible and limited to portions of the structure that can be seen over the wall.

Staff Comments:

1. What are the materials and finish of the parapet wall?
2. Request additional elevations, including street view, if section 3 is not what is seen from street.
 - a. What exactly will we see from the street?
 - b. How thick is the ornamental wall and is there more than one?
3. What portion of the mechanical room can be seen above the wall?

Staff Recommendation: Deferral for additional information

9. 88 S Battery Street

TMS # 457-11-02-035 | BAR2023-001016

NR | Charlestowne | c. 1925 | Old and Historic District

Request solar panels.

Owner: John Crane

Applicant: Hunter Dockery

~~APPROVED~~

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral pending site visit by Staff.

MADE BY: Huey SECOND: Gardner

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0

NOTES:

- Roof is 3-4 years old
- HCF
 - o Existing roof not historic. Recommend pushing back the panels on the roof especially on the west side
- PSC
 - o Request continued study to reduce visibility
- Applicant
 - o Not viable if less than 22 panels
- Board
 - o Have tried to accommodate solar wherever possible
 - o Concerns about visibility

Staff Observations:

1. Per BAR policy, *Solar Collectors on proposed to be installed on Category 3 or 4 or non-rated historic properties within the Districts may be allowed some visibility from the public right of way, while not detracting from the historic character of the property, as determined by the BAR.*
2. The existing structure is not rated, but is in the Old and Historic District.
3. Placement of adjacent house makes roof and the proposed solar panels highly visible.
4. Roof does have a lower pitch and is currently dark shingles which may reduce visibility.
5. Staff has concerns that the proposed solar panels could be detrimental to character of the house and neighborhood.

Staff Comments:

1. Placement should be restricted to the rear of the house, behind the chimney.

Staff Recommendation: Final approval with staff comments.

10. 8 ½ Legare Street

TMS # 457-11-02-034 | BAR2023-000999

Category 2 | Charlestowne | c. 1857 | Old and Historic District

Request alterations to fenestration.

Owner: Wendy S. Kane

Applicant: Wendy S. Kane

Withdrawn by Staff

11. 7 Smith Street

TMS # 457-08-03-077 | BAR2023-001019

NS | Harleston Village | c. 1940 | Old and Historic District

Request replacement simulated divided light windows.

Owner: John & Elizabeth Rhoads

Applicant: Guv Gottshalk, Gottshalk Architecture

~~APPROVED~~

~~WITHDRAWN~~

DENY

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Denial as submitted. Board comment for staff site visit to determine age/condition and if repair is viable.

MADE BY: Huey SECOND: Fava

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0

NOTES:

- HCF
 - o SDL are inappropriate for structure, recommend denial
- PSC
 - o Sec. of Int. Standards: SDL inappropriate, should propose more appropriate replacement
- Applicant
 - o Questions criteria for replacement. Cites other houses with SDL
- Board
 - o Staff site visit to determine age if can be repaired
 - o Recommend interior storm windows/ for noise reduction - thermal pane
 - o Or exterior mount, single pane storm window

Staff Comments:

1. Simulated divided light windows are inappropriate at this located and for this age a structure.

Staff Recommendation: Denial

12. 41 Tradd Street

TMS # 458-13-01-011 | BAR2023-001020

Category 2 | Charlestowne | c. 1746 | Old City District

Request replacement of windows including change of mullion size.

Owner: David Klumpar

Applicant: George Martin

~~APPROVED~~

~~WITHDRAWN~~

DENY

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Denial as submitted with Board comment for gentle exploration for age of sashes and to meet with staff.

MADE BY: Gardner **SECOND:** Huey

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0

NOTES:

- 22 windows on house, 4 are thinner mullion 3/16”
- PSC
 - o Wasn’t sure which window and what size
 - o Sec. of Int. Standards – need justification for change
- HCF
 - o Need age of windows
 - o Sec. of Int. Standards re: in kind replacement/ justification
- Applicant
 - o Client wants windows to match
 - o Can research age of windows
 - o No rot, but don’t seal well, drafty
 - o Restoration glass
- Board
 - o Restore/reclaim existing without change
 - o Succession of history
 - o Gentle exploration of age
 - o No issue with contractor un-assembling to determine age
 - o Evolving history of house – mullions can be different.

Staff Observations:

1. As the structure was built in 1746, the proposed mullions are historically appropriate in size. But it is probable that the narrower mullions tell the story of a later alterations.
2. No historic documentation for the wider mullions has been found.

Staff Comments:

1. Possibly removing evidence of historic changes to the house that tell its story.

Staff Recommendation: Denial