



# CITY OF CHARLESTON BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SMALL

## MEETING RESULTS

**FEBRUARY 9, 2023**

**4:30 P.M.**

**2 GEORGE STREET**

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Gardner (Chair), Martin, Huey, Wilson, Altman

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Pinto, Gordineer

### A. MINUTES

#### 1. Review of Minutes from January 26, 2023 Meeting

**APPROVED**

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Approval.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Huey

VOTE: FOR 3 AGAINST 0  
*Abstain – Wilson & Altman*

### B. APPLICATIONS

#### 1. 37 New Street

TMS # 457-12-03-091 | BAR2023-001026

Category 2 | Charlestowne | c. 1865 | Old and Historic District

Request after the fact approval for removal of historic front façade and reconstruction with CMU.

Owner: Anne Thomas

Applicant: Morris Construction LLC

Site visit 2/9/23 at 8:50 a.m.

~~APPROVED~~

~~WITHDRAWN~~

**DENY**

**DEFERRED**

MOTION: Deferral of CMU, Denial of brick veneer as currently constructed with conditions.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Filmore

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0  
*Recused – Huey*

#### NOTES:

- Are contracting with UpSouth at HCF recommendation
- Board Questions

- How far does the block wall extend, what is the connection?
  - At water table
  - Per wall section
- Connection at corner
- Why reinforced CMU instead of rebuilding to match
  - Produced better wall, meet code
- PSC
  - Concerned with non-original construction method
  - Brick work doesn't match the rest of the house
  - Age of house 1850s, brick 1700s
  - Need more information – mortar analysis, detailed plans
- HCF
  - Not objecting to structural repair – defer brickwork
- Applicant response
  - Quality of work – will employ UpSouth to redo brickwork ~95% original brick has been retained
- Board Discussion
  - Would like to see additional detailed drawings
  - Concerned about rigid block wall tied into historic brick wall – structural issues, need more details
  - Mortar analysis
  - Existing brickwork unacceptable, not straight
  - Need test panel and clean sample
  - Photos of before work to document details
  - Board doesn't typically approve wholesale reconstruction – difficult to approve after the fact
  - May be a better wall per code, but could 3 wythe wall be rebuilt to not create a difficult condition
  - Concern about join and strick on back
  - Need justification for CMU wall
- Conditions
  - Engineer report including exploration of reconstruction vs prior construction
  - Mortar sample by qualified expert
  - Photos of previous
  - Staff approval of proposed mortar and joint prior to sample panel
  - Sample – 3-4' high, 6-7 courses, can be on building. Color needs to be close. Small color sample can be approved by staff

Staff Observations:

1. 8/22/22
  - a. Email from Russell Rosen to applicant regarding state of building
2. 8/23/2022
  - a. Applicant comes to permit center for repointing permit
  - b. BAR condition of permit is test sample of mortar prior to full scope commencing due to Category 2 rating of the building
3. 1/20/2023
  - a. Stop Work Order issued by Building Inspections Department
  - b. Voicemail received from Buz Morris regarding test panel at 37 New
  - c. Returned phone conversation with Buz did not indicate the extent of alterations to building, and focused on test patch issue and “confusion” of repointing permit with company staff
4. 1/23/2022
  - a. Site visit, visual inspection of façade revealed CMU block had been used to replace historic brick wall

- b. Phone conversation with Buz confirmed that the historic brick wall (unknown portion) of the building had been demolished and replaced with CMU and a reclaimed brick veneer

Staff Comments:

1. Provide drawings of previously existing front elevation, including details of window openings and trim elements.
2. Provide structural report for previous wall and new proposal.
3. Confirm retainment of existing windows.

Staff Recommendation: Deferral for additional information and documentation

---

**2. 133 Hester Street**

**TMS # 463-07-02-031 | BAR2023-001027**

**Category 4 | Wagener Terrace | c. 1938 | Historic Materials Demolition Purview**

Request demolition of front porch and chimney, and reconfiguration of fenestration.

Owner: Blake Miller

Applicant: b Studio Architecture

Site visit 2/9/23 at 8:30 a.m.

APPROVED

WITHDRAWN

**DENY**

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Denial of demolition of front porch, roof structure, shift of original window openings, removal of chimney. Work with staff to replace columns, porch floor, and siding.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Altman

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

NOTES:

- Board question about exploratory demolition to determine if window openings are original.
- HCF
  - o Although covered in vinyl, much of the fabric is intact
  - o Believe window openings are original
  - o Recommend denial
- PSC
  - o Agree with HCF, request denial
- Applicant Response – most homes in neighborhood have more generous porch. Columns not original. Missing a lot of character
- Board Discussion
  - o Believe fenestration is original
  - o Don't object to removal of metal columns, not original
  - o Zoning allowance to add at rear
  - o Would be a shame to lose chimney, defining feature
  - o Porch – defining feature, metal columns/railings may not be original but as a feature dominate this portion of neighborhood
  - o No objection to removal of vinyl
  - o Believe true chimney get priority to oil heater vent
  - o Front elevation composition appears original

Staff Observations:

1. The siding has been previously changed to vinyl and is not under BAR purview.

Staff Comments:

1. The front porch with its gable roof and the chimney are the few remaining character-defining feature and should be retained.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of demolition of porch form and chimney.

---

**3. 29 Legare Street**

**TMS # 457-11-04-105 | BAR2022-000977**

**Category 2 | Charlestowne | Main: c. 1835, Garage: pre-1944 | Old and Historic District**

Request conceptual approval for renovation and addition of a second story to existing garage.

Owner: Hillary Lamendola

Applicant: Glenn Keyes Architects

**Deferred by Staff**

---

**4. 18 Greenhill Street**

**TMS # 457-11-04-067 | BAR2022-000921**

**NS | Charlestowne | c. 1920 | Old and Historic District**

Request conceptual approval of two-story rear addition and one story covered porch.

Owner: Tiffany Philippe

Applicant: Neil Stevenson

**APPROVED**

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Conceptual approval with Staff Comment (Stucco not paint) and Board Comment to limit addition eave overhang so it doesn't protrude past existing house and encourage improvement of chimney cap condition.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Wilson

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

NOTES:

- PSC
  - o Suggest narrowing width of addition, increase reveal
- Board Discussion
  - o No issue with reveal
  - o Eave condition – shouldn't extend past existing house
  - o All CMU should be stucco
  - o Need proper chimney cap

*PREVIOUS MOTION 10.13.22: Deferral for restudy with Staff Comments and Board Comments: 1) front door location should remain in place, 2) refine detail of rear shed porch.*

*PREVIOUS Staff Comments 10.13.22:*

1. *The proposed addition should be subordinate to the historic structure. Staff suggest altering the roofline and stepping in the sides.*
2. *New alterations should be differentiated from the existing structure.*
3. *Front door should not be relocated.*

*PREVIOUS Staff Recommendation 10.13.22: Deferral for restudy with staff comments*

Staff Observations:

1. Previous board and staff comments have been addressed.

Staff Comments:

1. Exposed CMU should be painted or stuccoed.

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

---

**5. 610 Rutledge Avenue**

**TMS # 460-03-02-053 | BAR2022-000953**

**Category 4 | North Central | c. 1920 | Historic Corridor District**

Request preliminary approval for renovation to existing structure and rear addition, and renovation and rear addition to accessory structure at street.

Owner: Dfh South LLC

Applicant: b Studio Architecture

~~APPROVED~~

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

**DEFERRED**

MOTION: Deferral with Staff Comment and Board Comment to revisit Board Comment #2 from previous motion and introduce a hyphen element & Final Review by Staff.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Wilson

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

NOTES:

- Applicant: separation of structure through color
- Board
  - o Request explanation on how previous comments have been addressed, particularly Board Comment #2
- PSC
  - o Disagree with approval per BAR design requirements (H/S/M)
- Board Discussion
  - o Hyphen element – some type of roofline to differentiate
  - o Adhere to BAR principles
  - o Pull roof down and still have 9' floor
  - o Separate the 2 structures
  - o Offset larger building – good solution to difficult design problem
  - o (area) has gone rogue in the past
  - o Has to be additional space for practical use, pretty reasonable

*PREVIOUS MOTION 1.12.23: Conceptual Approval with Staff Comments 3,4,5,7 and Board Comments: 1) to generally simplify details at addition, 2) disengage Freedman's Cottage from new addition, 3) reduce eave overhang, 4) restudy cased opening on from elevation of addition.*

*PREVIOUS Staff Observations 1.12.23:*

1. Historic Corridor District.
2. Roof pitch has been altered and overall height has been reduced.

*PREVIOUS Staff Comments 1.12.23:*

1. Proposed addition still dominates existing Freedman's cottage.
2. Because of the location of the two-story addition being offset from the one-story structure, the two-story structure almost appears as a separate structure, allowing each portion to be read

*potentially as two buildings. Additionally, the intersection of these portions does not appear to be visible from Rutledge Avenue or from Strawberry Lane. Board should weigh-in on this approach to the challenge of adding onto a one-story structure.*

3. *Explain or omit the “moveable wall” at the storefront.*
4. *Confirm height of the pair of doors at the first-floor recess on the front of the two-story addition.*
5. *Suggest lengthening the proposed square windows to make more vertical per BAR principles.*
6. *If approved, lower the pitch on the gable end returns.*
7. *If approved, the addition uses a mix of trim details, and these should be consistent.*
8. *If approved, provide studies of lower roof pitch on proposed addition.*

*PREVIOUS Staff Recommendation 1.12.23: Conceptual approval with staff comments and final review by staff*

Staff Observations:

1. Details have been simplified.

Staff Comments:

1. Provide material information and details, including wall sections.
2. Remove label for new balcony that has been removed.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval with deferral for preliminary. Staff is comfortable finalizing the preliminary approval during a final review by staff.

**6. 2 President Place**

**TMS # 460-11-04-140 | BAR2023-001028**

**Category 4 | Cannonborough / Elliottborough | c. 1895 | Old City District**

Request conceptual approval for alterations to fenestration, steps, and awnings.

Owner: 120 President Street, LLC

Applicant: John Tucker, architect

**APPROVED**

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Final Review by Staff.

MADE BY: Huey SECOND: Martin

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

NOTES:

- Board Discussion
  - o No objection to not having brackets, maybe lower to rest on door
  - o Engage casing around entry doors or emphasize casing

Staff Observations:

1. Proposal brings order to chaos of the west elevation.

Staff Comments:

1. Staff recommend adding brackets to visually support the new entry awnings.
2. Provide height and material of the proposed retaining wall at the west and north.
3. Applicant to confirm status of large tree that appears to conflict with the site wall, gate, and leadwalk to President Street.

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

7. **213 Line Street**

**TMS # 460-07-04-113 | BAR2022-000972  
NS | Westside | c. 2018 | Old City District**

Request approval for 15 solar panels.

Owner: Sarah Williams

Applicant: Marc Jones

~~APPROVED~~

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

**DEFERRED**

MOTION: Deferral with Board Comment to refine arrangement of array to focus on east elevation, shifting panels to the south on the west elevation, relocate equipment to less visible location and Final Review by Staff.

MADE BY: Wilson SECOND: Martin

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

NOTES:

- Board Questions
  - o Panels should all be 4'x6', oriented landscape and horizontal
  - o Is there a way to organize more elegantly?
  - o Where is equipment? By electric meter
  - o Is there a less visible location (equipment)?
  - o Size of disconnect box? Combiner box?
  - o Concerns about visual, amount of equipment
- Board Discussion
  - o Make organization of array more consistent
  - o Relocate assembly for visibility
  - o Question if minimizing visibility could be done in design phase of other new construction
  - o Reduced visibility on black roof (shingle)
  - o Combine into single group per side

Staff Observations:

1. Per BAR policy, *Solar Collectors proposed to be installed on new construction shall be permitted, but the BAR shall have purview over the placement and size of such Solar Collectors for potential negative impact to the character of the neighborhood.*
2. The existing structure is new construction, completed in 2018.
3. Corner lot is owned by the City and will most likely remain vacant.
4. The vacant corner makes the roof and the proposed solar panels highly visible.
5. This corner is a gateway to the Old City District.
6. As proposed, all services for these solar panels are next to the electric meter at the front corner of the house and are very visible

Staff Comments:

1. The house is a newer contemporary design. The panels may not be detrimental to the clean and pure style of the house, but there is concern that the high level of visibility is detrimental to the character of the neighborhood including Harmon Field. Detrimental to character of the house. As this is a relatively newer project review type, Staff would benefit from further discussion by the Board on appropriate installation locations.

2. If approved, all conditions of the solar policy related to installation shall be incorporated.
3. If approved, mechanical services at the front corner of the home shall be screened.

Staff Recommendation: Denial

---

**8. 60 Calhoun Street**

**TMS # 459-13-03-044 | BAR2023-001029**

**Category 4 | Mazyck - Wraggborough | c. 1835 - 1852 | Old and Historic District**

Request conceptual approval to alter fenestration for new ADA entry.

Owner: 60 Calhoun St Associates, LLC

Applicant: John Sullivan, S.arch+studio

**APPROVED**

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Final Review by Staff.

MADE BY: Huey SECOND: Atlman

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

NOTES:

Staff Observations:

1. Alterations are minimally visible between structures.
2. While the work is considered to be a sensitive and minor alteration, Staff does not find the policy statement for staff review applicable.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval with final review by staff

---

**9. 8 Gadsden Street**

**TMS # 457-03-03-072 | BAR2023-001030**

**Category 3 | Harleston Village | c. 1880 | Old and Historic District**

Request conceptual approval for rear, screened porch addition.

Owner: Mark & Megan Waligora

Applicant: April Magill, Root Down Designs

**APPROVED**

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Staff Comments #1-3 and Final Review by Staff.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Altman

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

NOTES:

- Board Discussion
  - o Prefer darker color trim, etc.

Staff Observations:



1. Proposed addition is subordinate and differentiated from the existing house.
2. Screened porch addition is minimally visible.

Staff Comments:

1. Provide column width. Suggest thickening slightly.
2. Suggest centering the screen framing on the center of the column to give visual dimension to the columns.
3. Suggest extending the porch floor to make the skirt board sit just beyond the brick foundation piers.
4. Suggest painting the columns and screen framing white to coordinate with the house.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval with final review by staff

---

**10. 63 Legare Street**

**TMS # 457-12-02-036 | BAR2023-001031**

**NS | Harleston Village | c. 1900 | Old and Historic District**

Request approval to replace thirteen 6/6 windows with 2/2 wood, simulated divided lite, windows.

Owner: Mark Buono

Applicant: Palmetto Craftsmen Inc

~~APPROVED~~

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

**DEFERRED**

MOTION: Deferral for complete application, photos, and history.

MADE BY: Altman SECOND: Martin

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

NOTES:

- HCF
  - o SDL are inappropriate in historic districts
  - o Should be replaced with wood TDL windows, recommend denial
- PSC
  - o Agree with HCF; difficulty understand proposal. Should include window survey.
- Applicant Response
  - o Difficulty to see. Wood will rot.
- Need plan to determine what windows are (visible) in purview
- Were existing windows approved as SDL
- Need condition of existing.

Staff Observations

1. While 2/2 windows would match the rest of the house, this light pattern would not have been original to this house.
2. No documentation of the condition of the current windows was provided.

Staff Comments

1. Simulated divided light windows are inappropriate at this location and for this age of structure.

Staff Recommendation: Denial.

---

**11. 195 Tradd Street**

**TMS # 547-11-01-017 | BAR2023-001032**

**NS | Charlestowne | c. 1930 | Old and Historic District**

Request conceptual approval for fenestration alterations and porch addition.

Owner: Chris Costa

Applicant: Jodi Crosby

~~APPROVED~~

WITHDRAWN

~~DENY~~

DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral to clarify proposal and provide justification of proposed changes especially shutters, windows, and stairs with Staff Comment #3.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Wilson

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

NOTES:

- Read letter from neighbor
- Existing windows are single pane (1/1)
- Shutters over front door are bi-fold and operable
- Proposed wood stair- pressure treated and painted
- PSC
  - o Need more information; conjectural changes should not be supported
  - o SDL not appropriate
- HCF
  - o Agree with PSC
  - o Request deferral for restudy of windows and survey; oppose SDL
- Applicant questions – if replace to match, would a survey be needed
  - o In kind replacement review by staff but need documentation that can't be repaired
- Board Discussion
  - o Prairie style is speculative as are shutters
  - o Need additional information on stairs
  - o Visibility of proposed arch window
  - o Difficult house to put shutters on due to geometrics
- Owner Response
  - o Some proposed openings are original
  - o Doors that open to nowhere – would like to enclose; have salvaged brick from garage; will salvage from stairs

Staff Observations:

1. No historic information was provided.

Staff Comments:

1. Prairie style windows are inappropriate for this location and age structure.
2. Omit shutters on the center second-story window pair, as these should fit the windows.
3. Describe process for salvaging and reusing brick or color matching brick for headers at new openings and infill at closed openings.

Staff Recommendation: Deferral with denial of window grid pattern.

---