A meeting of the Board of Architectural Review-Small (BAR-S) will be held on Thursday, January 27, 2022 at 4:30 p.m., virtually via Zoom Webinar. Access the meeting online at: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84739934864. To access via phone, call 1 (312) 626-6799. Webinar ID# 847 3993 4864. Technical assistance line: (843) 577-1686. The meeting will be recorded and livestreamed to the City of Charleston BAR-S YouTube channel at https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCBofP1rUIhr3PnAGIY3w7a5Q/playlists.

Public Participation:
Comments must be received by 12:00 p.m., Wednesday, January 26, 2022 (day before meeting).
Requests to speak must be received by 12:00 p.m., Thursday, January 27, 2022 (day of meeting).
Written comments will be provided to the board 24 hours in advance of the meeting and will be acknowledged into the record and summarized. You are encouraged to sign up to speak if you would prefer for your full comments to be heard aloud.

Public Comment Instructions:
Use one of the following methods to submit written comments or sign up to speak at the meeting.
Please provide your name, address, telephone number, meeting date, and project number.
1. Complete the Citizen Participation form at http://innovate.charleston-sc.gov/; or
2. Call 843-724-3765; or
3. Mail comments to: Department of Planning, Preservation & Sustainability, 2 George St, Charleston, SC 29401.

The following applications will be considered. Information on the applications will be available at www.charleston-sc.gov/bar in advance of the meeting.

1. **29 Legare Street -- TMS # 457-11-04-105**
   Request final approval for new handrail at front steps.
   Category 2 | Charlestonne | c. 1835 | Old and Historic District
   Owner: Hillary Lamendola
   Applicant: Glenn Keyes Architects

   **MOTION:** Final approval with staff comments noted

**MADE BY:** Martin  **SECOND:** Gardner  **VOTE:** FOR 5  AGAINST 0

Board Notes:
- Tread detail shows support post in the bottom tread, questions if the stair will be drilled into.
- Preservation Society has approved the request per their easement.

Staff Observations:
1. This application is being brought to the Board as it is a request for an alteration to a Category 2 structure.

2. Other buildings along the streetscape feature iron handrails extending from the façade entrance.

3. Staff appreciates the volute detail at the terminus of the handrail as it relates to the detailing on the adjacent stairs.

Staff Comments:

1. The proposed design is simple and does not add additional anchoring to the existing structure. Being a handrail without balusters, it appears more modern or commercial, however, Staff generally agrees with the proposal.

2. The plans indicate an iron newel and bronze finials. The applicant needs to clarify if the volute detail will be brass as depicted, or iron or bronze. Three metal finishes would be too busy for a handrail of this scale.

Staff Recommendation: Final approval with Staff comments noted.

2. 171 E Bay Street -- TMS # 458-09-01-118

BAR2022-000709

Request appeal of staff denial for extraneous information on signage.

Not Rated | French Quarter | Old and Historic District
Owner: Parsell Enterprises
Applicant: Charleston Sign

MOTION: Final approval as submitted, limited to exact verbiage and size of what was submitted and staff review of any window signage.

MADE BY: Gardner SECOND: Martin VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Board Notes:

- Suggest to limit verbiage to text proposed to prevent extraneous
- Questions if window signage was approved, it wasn't.
- Signage packet needs to include any window signage.
- Would prefer if the tagline was included on the original sign instead attached separately.

Staff Comments:

1. Application is coming to the Board as an Appeal of BAR Staff conditional approval for the primary sign only, which was given due to the BAR Policy Statement for Signs that discourages against "extraneous information." Staff feels after further consideration that the name “Ruby Sunshine” and logo on the sign do not fully convey the type of business as a restaurant, and, therefore, the proposed razor sign would not be extraneous. It is simplistic in size, design, and verbiage. The overall dimension of the approved sign and the proposed razor sign together are within the ordinance allowance of 9 sqft.

2. The BAR Staff has seen significant turnover recently, and the current staff has conflicting opinions on what constitutes “extraneous information” on signage submittals. Staff wanted to bring this to the Board so that we might get your guidance and a general consensus on this issue moving forward.

Staff Recommendation: Final approval

3. 42 Charlotte Street -- TMS # 459-13-01-174

BAR2021-000451
Request preliminary approval for new construction of duplex.

New | Mazyck-Wraggborough | Old and Historic District
Owner: John Paul Huguley
Applicant: John Paul Huguley

MOTION: Conditional preliminary approval of main structure with staff comments noted, deferral of cupola and conservatory for restudy and simplification and refinement of connection of conservatory to primary structure.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Gardner VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 1
Wilson Against

Board Notes:
- Conservatory has internal steel frame, questions if the outer structure has wood frame.
- Questions material of conservatory roof.
- Agree with staff the cupola is not any simpler.
- More information is needed for preliminary.
- Need more information on roof form, needs to be carefully detailed. Would need to see a sample of solar film on roof sample, but we don't know what roof will be.
- If cupola and conservatory are added back in it can be brought back to the board. If staff is uncomfortable reviewing at staff it can be brought back to the board.

Previous Staff Comments 10/28/21:
1. In general, the massing of the project has not been radically altered. In an attempt to accomplish this, eliminate the cross gable entirely. This appears to be a change that would not hinder the overall function of the house but would have a large impact on the mass since this prominent volume directly faces the street.
2. Simplify the conservatory form and detailing as part of the previous Board motion. The massing, design, height, details and form should be restudied. It will be the most prominent part of the project and therefore should be reviewed the most carefully.
3. While we encourage the use of solar panels and solar film, the location for it should be located elsewhere and the awning should be eliminated.
4. Eliminate the wall for the planter bed which appears as a porch foundation, and in doing so, potentially, refine the egress wells with a simple cap.

Previous Recommendation 10/28/21:
Conditional Approval for Conceptual Design of the primary building incorporating Staff Comments, and Deferral on the conservatory for refinement and overall simplification, and a board comment to eliminate or restudy form and aesthetic of copula element.

Previous MOTION 10/28/21: Conditional Approval for conceptual design of the primary building incorporating staff comments, and deferral on the conservatory for refinement and overall simplification, and a Board comment to eliminate or restudy form and aesthetic of cupola element.

Staff Comments:
1. The massing was reduced and the cross-gable was eliminated on the south elevation facing the street; however, the overall massing of the structure was increased by adding a two-story projection to the north elevation. Although the overall massing was not decreased, there will be limited visibility of the north side so Staff is generally comfortable with the current massing.
2. The conservatory appears to have been restudied and slightly lowered in height and massing. However, the connection to the primary structure both in plan and roof is overly
complicated and needs to be worked out. The conservatory is now articulated as a separate entity, and the roof does not have the space to fully articulate—appearing off-balanced. Since the conservatory does not have Conceptual approval and still appears to need simplification, Staff recommends the removal of the conservatory portion from this proposal to be reconsidered at a later date, so that the primary portion of the structure and this project can move forward.

3. The awning between the first and second stories has been eliminated, now locating the solar film on the dormer shed roofs on the south elevation only. Staff recommends relocating the solar film to the north elevation so they are not visible from the street. The north-side dormer roofs are a shallow pitch so they may get as much sunlight as on the south side, or a comparable amount. Provide specifications and visual information on the solar film.

4. Addressing the Board comment of the previous motion: The Cupola has been altered from windows to louvers, however, the overall form has not been restudied. Size and scale of the cupola need to be clarified, as it does not appear consistent throughout the drawings—the proportions on the sections are different than the proportions on the elevations.

5. Need specific information on the lanterns and chandelier. Additional materials information is required for Preliminary approval, including window sills and headers, and material finishes.

Staff Recommendation: Deferral for removal of the conservatory, clarification of details, materials, and finishes, and addressing Staff comments.

4. 138 & 140 Wentworth Street - TMS # 457-03-04-052 / 457-03-04-051 BAR2022-000710

Request conceptual approval alterations to historic house and bathhouse, new side porch (house) and exterior stair (bathhouse), and the new construction of a pool house. Hardscaping alterations included as well.
Category 1 & 3 | Harleston Village | c. 1840 | Old and Historic District
Owner: Danny & Caitlin Randazzo
Applicant: Lucas & Rachel Boyd, Boyd Architects
Nate Dittman, Remark Landscape Architecture

MOTION: Deferral of west porch pergola and front door for restudy with staff comments 1 & 3. Deferral for bathhouse pending site visit by board. Conceptual approval for the other alterations to the house. Conceptual approval for garage and pool house. Conceptual approval of hardscaping.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Huey VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Board Notes:

- Questions what the material for bathhouse roof replacement. It hasn't been determined, but will be hand crimped.
- Board discussion on the purview of the bathhouse structure, which is limited due to the wall and angles of the house. East façade window and rear stair alterations are also not visible.
- There may be extenuating issues with the bathhouse.
- Agree with staff comment #1
- Ok with the depth of the porch if the elements are lightened.
- If new bathhouse stairs are visible from ROW, board is uncomfortable.
- Mineral paint shouldn't be detrimental to the brick.
• The bathhouse building is somewhat sacred.
• While some elements are not visible, there are very heavy handed suggestions for such a historic house, should be more sensitive.

Staff Comments:
1. A glass-panel replacement of the front door would not be appropriate to this high-style Greek Revival-style structure. A solid wood panel door would be more period appropriate.
2. At the west porch pergola, we appreciate the nod to the arches and the removal to above the arched windows, but it feels very industrial, prefab.
3. At the west porch pergola, the columns and beams feel very dark and heavy as opposed to the light, lacy, delicate style of the examples. The pergola has some curved brackets that are delicate, but they seem to “disappear” because of the heavy beams and columns. Adding piercing details or some type of relief to the columns would be preferred. Possibly change the roof type or angle to lighten the overall appearance.
4. The garage is a modern 1985 structure, however BAR typically discourages painting brick, even when not historic. We suggest a wash rather than a paint.
5. At the garage, the awnings feel less industrial than the pergola structure due to the curved brackets. Perhaps this aesthetic can be incorporated into the west porch pergola.
6. Only the second-story and roof of the bathhouse have limited visibility from the ROW. The hand-crimped metal roof replacement on the bathhouse is appropriate. Staff is agreeable with these changes.
7. While the pool house design is simple, clean, and nicely subdued against the existing buildings, we think that the overhang should be increased to better coordinate with other secondary buildings on the property.
8. Regarding the application of a climber vine system, Staff is concerned about the long-term effects of the vines growing directly on the brick.

Staff Recommendation:
Deferral of the west porch pergola and main house front door for restudy, conceptual approval for other alterations to the house and bathhouse, and conceptual approval with Board and Staff comments for the garage and pool house.

5. 48 Smith Street -- TMS # 457-03-04-095
Request preliminary approval for the reconstruction and renovation of burned single-family house.
Previously: Category 3 | Harleston Village | c. 1840s | Old and Historic District
Owner: David and Emily Schaible
Applicant: e e fava architects

MOTION: Final approval with staff comment #3.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Gardner VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0
Huey Recused

Board Notes:
• Questions if first floor needs to be raised to 2' above bfe. Per code, since it is attached to existing rear structure it only needs to be 1' above bfe.
• Staff notes that the request for final was overlooked and the project was advertised and recommended as preliminary since that is the next review step. Staff agrees there is enough information for final.
Previous Staff Comments 11/23/21:

1. It is very unfortunate to have lost this important historic building. While it has been deteriorating for many years, this is a stark reminder for the staff at the City of Charleston in particular the BAR, and livability that the policy and process for demolition by neglect must be addressed and that this type of deferred maintenance cannot be allowed to continue. There is a loss in historic fabric that the city cannot bring back, and a loss of revenue frankly, when homeowners are not held accountable.

2. That said, this is a new owner, and a new applicant and we are very pleased to see the spirit of the house being revived, and life being brought back into the neighborhood. Many interested stakeholders have put in great effort to get to where you are now and you are to be commended for your determination.

3. We feel that this building should be rebuilt in the same place to weave the new in with the existing rear additions that have survived the fire. That said, the foundation that exists should be preserved in situ and bolstered and rebuilt where necessary.

4. The property is in an X zone and does not require elevation to where it was previously (18' 9 3/4''), and certainly not to where proposed (21'9 ¾''). The building shall have a finished floor no higher than previously existing.

5. The fenestration of the building should be appropriate and cohesive. The ribbon window, and the large floor-to-ceiling windows will be visible from Smith and also from Wentworth. They are not appropriate and should be replaced.

6. Generally, modifications to historic openings are not recommended, but given the evidence of major evolution, simplifying the openings of the rear buildings is appropriate.

Previous Staff Recommendation 11/23/21: Deferral with staff comments.

Previous MOTION 11/23/21: Conceptual approval with staff comments 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6.

Staff Comments:

1. While the ribbon windows proposed for the west elevation have been eliminated, the ribbon windows on south façade (hyphen), which will be visible from Wentworth and from further south on Smith, have not been omitted and have been enlarged, reducing the space between the windows. The previous staff comments noted that this in an inappropriate window type. Staff feels that there is a large disparity between the scale of the large-paned, floor-to-ceiling windows and the adjacent historic windows.

2. The proposed windows are Marvin double-hung, insulated windows. BAR typically prefers single pane, true-divided light windows for historic structures.

3. Fence/gate comment

Staff Recommendation: Preliminary approval with Staff comments.

6. 114 Cannon Street /219 Ashley Ave - - TMS # 460-11-04-165 BAR2022-000713
Request conceptual approval for minor alterations to existing structure and the construction of two new dwellings.
4 | Cannonborough-Elliotborough | Old City District
Owner: Tift Mitchell
Applicant: Andrew Gould

MOTION: Defer for restudy and clarification of site plan with staff comments excluding #3, 5, 12 and 14

MADE BY: Huey SECOND: Martin VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Board Notes:
- Questions about the location of mechanical and trash can / dumpster locations.
- Parish interjection that the staff subordination comment means that the board should determine whether this should be viewed as infill or be subordinate.
- Rear dwellings can be read as separate lot on Ashley Ave.
• Agree with comment #4, 7-8, 13. Comment 5 not relevant. Indifferent to #9.
• Agree with wall comment.
• Concerns about locations for recycling, bicycles, grease trap, etc.
• Concerns about site plan, consider defer until project goes through TRC. Site plan for restaurant should be considered as well since that is being done by separate designer.

Staff Comments:
Overall
1. This project has only gone through sketch plan review with TRC, it has not gone through TRC Pre-App so the design is subject to change.
2. The juxtaposition of multiple railing styles is not harmonious. Styles that are more complimentary to one another would be preferred.
3. Both new dwellings should be subordinate to historic structure, they appear to be the same height. It's critical at this juncture to determine if subordination is needed or if these two new buildings are to be viewed as an infill project within their own right.

Unit B
4. The windows are very horizontal and are proportionally large, especially compared to historic structure. The hoods, while making the large openings seem less industrial, make the window feel even larger. Staff recommends that the hoods remain but the size of the windows are reduced.
5. Relating to Comment #3, if the Board determine that this building needs to be subordinate to the historic structure, then the hipped roof should be adjusted to accomplish subordination.
6. The dormer on the south façade feels too large on the narrow façade and should be reduced in width, consistent with Comment #4.
7. The cast-iron rail is overly decorative, very high style. This unit is replicating the style of a Charleston Single house, which typically do not feature iron railings on the second story. This type of intricate railing is historically a Victorian-era addition, such as the Juliette balconies along Rainbow Row, and are more appropriate in the French Quarter.
8. The combination of wood and iron railing on the piazza balustrade is not appropriate. When cast iron is used as a railing, it is typically both the column and balustrade.
9. The piazza doors have very large solid windows and should be more sympathetic to the doors of the historic structure or include some sort of muntin pattern.

Unit C
10. Detailing on the balcony bracket isn’t appropriate for downtown, a curve or more decorative element would be more suitable.
11. The balustrade pattern is more suburban in nature, straight pickets or turned balusters would be more appropriate. This pattern is very typical of the Lowcountry but not typical in downtown Charleston.
12. While we understand the balcony element for the parking constraints, the balcony appears to be mimicking a piazza, without the first level, which is atypical for Charleston. Balconies are typically much shallower, less predominate features.
13. There seems to be a combination of multiple stylistic elements such rafter tails and balcony bracket. Because of the style of the detailing, such as rafter tails and brackets, the classical style of the window grid may need to be restudied or reduced to 2/2.

Wall
14. Wall piercings are not typical for the area, Staff recommends a solid wall.

Staff Recommendation: Defer for restudy with Staff comments.