



CITY OF CHARLESTON

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SMALL

MEETING RESULTS

MARCH 9, 2023

4:30 P.M.

**2 GEORGE
STREET**

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Huey, Martin, Wilson, Bello, Fava

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Pinto, Gordineer

A. Minutes

1. Review of Minutes from the February 23, 2023 Meeting

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Approval.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Bello

VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 0

B. Applications

5. 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. Sample panel to be reviewed on site.

Owner: Anne Thomas

Applicant: Morris Construction LLC

Site visit 3/9/2023 at 9:10 a.m.

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Approval with resubmission of sample per Board Discussion to Staff.

MADE BY: Bello SECOND: Fava

VOTE: FOR: 3 AGAINST: 0

Recused: Bill Huey & Filmore Wilson

NOTES:

- Board Questions
 - Structure of wall

- Can remaining masonry be retained/restored?
- Public Comment
 - PSC
 - Don't feel previous motion terms have been met; no drawings
 - HCF
 - Pleased with mortar – request approval
- Applicant Response
 - Brick reconstruction not possible. Didn't consider
 - Block wall fastened to lath and plaster to retain galvanized ties
 - Can't tie CMU to sand-clay of existing wall; not currently tied
 - No detail or direction given to tie in.

PREVIOUS MOTION 2.9.23: Deferral of CMU, Denial of brick veneer as currently constructed with conditions.

Board Conditions

- *Engineer report including exploration of reconstruction vs prior construction*
- *Mortar sample (analysis) by qualified expert*
- *Photos of previous, including details of window openings and trim elements*
- *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*

PREVIOUS Staff Observations 2.9.23:

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*

PREVIOUS Staff Comments 2.9.23:

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.*

PREVIOUS Staff Recommendation 2.9.23: Deferral for additional information and documentation

Staff Observations:

1. Mortar joint sample was provided to staff.

Staff Comments:

1. Engineer report does not include exploration of reconstruction vs prior construction or detail of how the new CMU wall ties into the historic brick wall.
2. Staff has concerns about how the brick veneer is tied to the CMU wall and the sustainability of those ties.
3. Existing brick veneer should be removed and redone with correct, clean mortar joints. Old mortar should be cleaned off bricks before use in new veneer.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of sample, denial of current brick veneer installation.

1. **12 Humphrey Court**

TMS # 460-08-01-165 | BAR2022-000932

Category 4 | Cannonborough/Elliottborough | c. 1890 | Old City District

Request after the fact approval for alterations to piazza, siding, and windows.

Owner: MFI Properties

Applicant: Paul Kime

DECISION: DENIED

MOTION: Denial of after the fact with staff comments, submittal to be revised/resubmitted within 30 days and a Board comment to include previous, current, and proposed.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Fava

VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

- HCF
 - Concerned about the extent of removal
- PSC
 - Concern about the loss of character defining features: piazza, trim, windows, siding
- Board Discussion
 - Need clear drawings of what was existing and proposed.
 - Encouraged to hear applicant wants to restore
 - Any as built?
 - Difference between enclosed and screened porch
 - Provide previous approved drawings – create appropriate documentation

Staff Observations:

1. Permit was applied for, September 2021, but has not been approved or issued.
2. December 2021: Previous staff rejected the changing of siding to Hardie board and informed applicant it would require Board approval.

- a. The building application only covers interior work. No BAR application was ever attached to the permit for review.
3. December 2021: Applicant was informed that all exterior work on historic structures requires a BAR application, review, and approval for work to begin.
4. September 23, 2022: Inspection by BAR staff and identification of violations
5. October 5, 2022: Email to Applicant of violations and requirement to submit to the Board within 14 calendar days.
6. October 7, 2022: Meeting with Owner regarding the property.
7. October 12, 2022: Email of after-the-fact application received.

The following work has been done without BAR approval or any permits:

- a. Removal and replacement of wood windows with vinyl windows
- b. Removal of wood siding (under aluminum siding as seen in image provided),
- c. Removal of the wood front door,
- d. Removal of the historic transom,
- e. Removal of the hood over the front door
- f. Enclosure of the piazza.

Staff comments:

1. Applicant to submit revised elevations to match the previous structure and floor plans to reflect the exterior of the previous structure.
2. Windows to be replaced to match previous in size and materials; wood windows, true divided lite.
3. Wood siding to be replaced to match in dimension, and profile of previous structure.
4. Transom over front door to be replaced to match.
5. Front entry to be restored to match.
6. Piazza to be reopened to match previous, include parapet and roof slope. BAR policy severely restricts the enclosure of piazzas as they are character-defining features.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of after the fact, reconstruct to match with staff comments, must submit revised plans within 30 days.

2. **167 Grove Street**

TMS # 463-15-01-012 | BAR2023-001053

Category 4 | Wagener Terrace | c. 1935 | Historic Materials Demolition Purview

Request partial demolition of historic structure including roof.

Owner: Lauren Flatey

Applicant: Brian Crouch

Site visit 3/9/2023 at 8:30 a.m.

DECISION: DENIED

MOTION: Denial with Staff Comments.

MADE BY: Huey SECOND: Martin

VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

- Public Comment

- Valerie Perry – 231 Grove
 - Encouraged applicant to work with staff not to demo
- PSC
 - Doesn't include extent of roof to be demolished
- HCF
 - Recommend denial
- Applicant response
 - Difficult to add dormers due to roof structure
 - Love features of home – chimney, arches
- Board Discussion
 - Altering roofline would be detrimental to character of house
 - Encourage creative alteration to rear
 - Only have purview over demolition, removal of roof would severely alter character

Staff Observations:

1. Because the proposal does not include repair or replacement in-kind, this is a Board level review.

Staff Comments:

1. While the roof is finished in asphalt shingles, which do not carry historic or architectural value, the proposal removes the entirety of the roof massing. This is a substantial portion of the structure. This structure, much like those neighboring it, could be characterized as a Tudor revival, English cottage or simple one-story mass. Omitting this much of the roof mass would alter the character of this structure.
2. Per applicant discussion at the site visit, it sounds like more of the structure would be removed than just the roof. Staff would be opposed to this change.
3. Concerns exist for the chimney if the roof is removed/raised.
4. Staff could support alterations to rear portion of house.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of demolition as proposed.

3. **160 Church Street**

TMS # 458-05-03-094 | BAR2023-001039

NS | Old and Historic District | c. pre-1944 | Old and Historic District

Request partial demolition of structure including stucco columns and lintels.

Owner: Skipper Condon

Applicant: James Seabrook

Site visit 3/9/2023 at 8:50 a.m.

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral with Staff Comments and Board Comment to provide complete drawings and details (plans and elevations) and to show screening of mechanicals.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Huey

VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

- Board Question
 - Plan to screen mechanical?
- Applicant response
 - Discussion on retaining corner
- Board Discussion
 - Clarify proposal with drawings
 - Column shown in elevation doesn't exist on site
 - Come back to board as alteration

Staff Observations:

1. Corner element was constructed in 1990.

Staff Comments:

1. Proposal should include corner element, not just awning, in order to anchor the building and respond to the street edge, as it does now. In doing so, project could be reviewed as an alteration.
2. Provide screening of roof mechanical, as the current configuration does.

Staff Recommendation: Deferral for additional information.

4. **905 Ashley Avenue**

TMS # 463-11-03-030 | BAR2023-001036

Category 4 | Wagener Terrace | c. 1940 | Historic Materials Demolition Purview

Request partial demolition of historic structure, including portion of roof.

Owner: Timothy & Marissa Zwerner

Applicant: Amber Aument

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Approval of proposed demolition with the condition that the ridge be maintained for a distance of 30'1" from front gable.

MADE BY: Martin **SECOND:** Huey

VOTE: FOR: 4 **AGAINST:** 0

NOTES:

- PSC – integrity of form is a concern, preserve more of roof & limit dormers
- Applicant Response
 - Not in a National Register District or Eligible
- Board Discussion
 - Questions about use of more dormers
 - Comfortable with dormers, not with 2 story
 - Focus on demo only. Roof and non-original masonry
 - Case by case consideration

PREVIOUS MOTION 2.23.23: *Denial as submitted.*

Staff Observations:

1. *According to the ordinance, “demolition” is defined as the removal of an entire structure or a substantial portion of a structure visible from the public right-of-way of a substantial portion of features of a structure that are visible from the public right-of-way that define its historic architectural character, such as roofs, columns, balustrades, chimneys, siding, windows, doors, shutters, site walls, fences and other unique architectural features, which if lost, would compromise the historic architectural character of the structure.*
2. *Because the proposal does not include repair or replacement in-kind, this is a Board level review.*

PREVIOUS Staff Comments 2.23.23:

1. *While not ideal, demolition of the pair of windows on the south wall appears to be for a door pair, and Staff would not object to this alteration if it could be done within the width of the original paired windows.*
2. *While the roof is finished in asphalt shingles, which do not carry historic or architectural value, the proposal removes approximately 80% of the roof massing and approximately 30% of the existing south and north walls. This is a substantial portion of the structure. This structure, much like those neighboring it, could be characterized as a bungalow or simple one-story mass with an uncomplicated extended roof line. Omitting this much of the roof mass would alter the character of this structure.*
3. *Responding to Staff concern, Applicant has fielded the question of how much of the roof mass would be ok to demolish.*

PREVIOUS Staff Recommendation 2.23.23: Denial as proposed

Staff Observations:

1. Applicant has provided information that the brick veneer is not original to the structure and only the veneer is being removed from the walls.

Staff Comments:

1. While the roof is finished in asphalt shingles, which do not carry historic or architectural value, the proposal removes approximately 50% of the roof massing and approximately 30% of the existing south and north façades.
2. Staff feels that any alterations to the roof should be limited to smaller portions such as those for dormers.
3. While this is a more sensitive demolition request, staff has concerns about the large continuous portion of the roof being removed.
4. Other proposals where demolition has been restricted have been contributing structures to National Register districts.

Staff Recommendation: Approval

-
6. **135 Meeting Street – Gibbes Museum of Art**
TMS # 457-08-04-004 | BAR2023-001052
Category 2 | c. 1905 | Old and Historic District
Request installation of art sculpture at sidewalk level plaza.
Owner: Carolina Art Association
Applicant: Joe Schmidt / Evans & Schmidt

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Final Approval with Final Review by Staff.

MADE BY: Huey SECOND: Fava

VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

- No Public Comment
- Board Discussion
 - Appreciate thought in design

Staff Observation:

1. Each Board of Architecture has an agenda cap, or a maximum number of applications which can be reviewed. For this meeting cycle, Staff received more than allowable for BAR-L and less than the maximum for BAR-S.
2. Ordinance Section 54-233.a gives BAR-S the ability to review “minor modifications to projects over 10,000 square feet.”
3. Staff’s desire was for allow all submissions to be heard, and the Ordinance grants a bit of flexibility which can be applied in this case.
4. While this project is for a landscape element, the property is rated a Category 2 on the architectural survey. Policy requires that this project type on properties rated 1 or 2 be reviewed by the Board.

Staff Comments:

1. The sculpture’s height of 12’, minimal footprint, transparent nature, and position closer to the sidewalk than building facade keep it from dominating or detracting from the building façade.

Staff Recommendation: Final approval

7. **30 - 34 Race Street – Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Church**

TMS # 460-04-01-161 | BAR2021-000455

Category 1 | Westside | c. 1952 | Landmark Overlay District

Request final approval for the installation of aluminum metal fencing.

Owner: Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Church

Applicant: Brien Bethards / Aspen Fencing Company

DECISION: WITHDRAWN

NOTES: **Withdrawn by Applicant**

8. **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

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Staff Comments & Board Condition to restudy porch on west elevation and upgrade materials & Final Review by Staff.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Fava VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

- No Public Comment
- Board Discussion
 - Proposed porch on west side very suburban, suggest better detailing and perhaps skirting, upgrade materials.

PREVIOUS MOTION 2.9.23: Deferral to clarify proposal and provide justification of proposed changes especially shutters, windows, and stairs with Staff Comment #3.

PREVIOUS Staff Observations 2.9.23:

1. No historic information was provided.

PREVIOUS Staff Comments 2.9.23:

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.

PREVIOUS Staff Recommendation 2.9.23: Deferral with denial of window grid pattern.

Staff Observations:

1. Prairie style windows and shutters have been removed from scope.

Staff Comments:

1. Brick on site appears to be several different colors. Work with staff to ensure color match.
2. What is the extend of repointing to be done? Is a structural report warranted?

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval with final review by staff.

9. **72 Drake Street**

TMS # 459-06-04-033 | BAR2023-001002

New | East Side | Old City District

Request conceptual approval for two new single-family homes.

Owner: 72 Drake St, LLC

Applicant: Michael Brewer

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Preliminary Approval with Board Comments to restudy dormer trim (scale down), reduce porch overhang on Unit A, and Final Review by Staff.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Huey

VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

- PSC – in support
- No Public Comment
- Board Discussion
 - Gable trim on dormer appears same as on main roof – recommend scaling down
 - Suggest clipping eave overhang

PREVIOUS MOTION 1.12.23: Deferral with Staff Comments 1,4,6,8 and Board Comments: 1) to clarify details and materials and 2) to meet submittal requirements.

PREVIOUS Staff Comments 1.12.23:

1. *Roof seems very shallow; a steeper pitch would be better proportionally.*
2. *Dormer configuration appears incomplete, interaction with roof should be restudied. Perhaps revised the roof pitch might allow more of the dormer to pop out of the roof and seem more so complete.*
3. *At Building A, configuration of piazza screen seems to weigh down that side of the structure, recommend restudy. A second-floor piazza may help balance the configuration.*
4. *At Building A, Hood over piazza door or hood with taller door may break up space better than the proposed lantern.*
5. *At Building A, lower the pitch of the piazza roof and provide and provide a roof overhang. Additionally, once the roof pitch is lowered, raise the roof and porch beam slightly.*
6. *By preliminary, resize shutters to fit windows and provide shutter hardware.*
7. *By preliminary, provide a frieze board at the eave.*
8. *Building B seems lacking in detail. Recommend a bracketed awning at the door and a more substantial stoop.*

PREVIOUS Staff Recommendation 1.12.23: Deferral for restudy

Staff Observations:

1. Previous comments have been addressed.

Staff Recommendation: Preliminary approval with final review by staff

10. 165 Coming Street

TMS # 406-12-03-035 | BAR2022-000973

New | Radcliffeborough | Old City District

Request preliminary approval for new single-family residence.

Owner: Matt Anderson

Applicant: Ashley Jennings, AJ Architects

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Preliminary Approval with Board recommendation to remove brackets under cantilevered bay with Final Review by Staff.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Huey

VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

- PSC – do not feel Board comment on verticality of dormers had been addressed
- Board Discussion
 - Brackets on central bay feel thin, could be eliminated
 - Step (block) to keep grade off framing
 - Dormers very handsome

PREVIOUS MOTION 12.8.22: Conceptual Approval with Staff Comments 1,2, & 4.

PREVIOUS Staff Comments 12.8.22:

1. *Dormers feel heavy and the shed roofs are very flat. Staff recommend restudy to either reduce the size of the dormer windows or increase the pitch of the dormer roof.*
2. *Roof overhang should be reduced to decrease the dominance of the roof.*
3. *Confirm the operation of central tri-door panels at south elevation.*
4. *Revise window arrangement on the larger dormers. These should have a single piece of window trim between the windows. Omit the extraneous trim and wall sliver by bringing these windows closer together.*
5. *Revise the diagonal siding on dormer sides to be either horizontal or vertical.*

PREVIOUS Staff Recommendation 12.8.22: Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

Staff Observations:

1. Previous comments have been addressed.

Staff Recommendation: Preliminary approval with final review by staff

11. 265B Coming Street

TMS # 460-08-01-199 | BAR2023-001057

New | Cannonborough / Elliottborough | Old City District

Request conceptual approval for new single-family residence in rear.

Owner: Cameron Glaws

Applicant: Andrew Gould

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Staff Comments #1 & 2 and Board Comment to clarify site plan.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Huey

VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

- PSC – accessory structures should be subordinate and have linear site plan
- Applicant Response
 - Subordination in ordinance is only for existing subordinate
 - No common development pattern in Cannonborough-Elliottborough
 - Window in gambrel large to meet egress

- Parking can be off site per zoning
- Comments not in line with previous city architects re: gambrel roof
- Not trying to copy historic building
- Board Discussion
 - Could achieve egress with casement window
 - Confused about sequence/logistics, considering some things on site/off site but not others
 - Courtyard off property
 - Not bothered by gambrel
 - Window would look nice a little smaller
 - Proportions; slenderness of column to depth of entablature
 - Site plan issues, suggest foundation planting to anchor.

Staff Observations:

1. Project will eventually require TRC approval when property lines are abandoned.
2. “Anticipated future parking” area is only 7’ wide, parking require 9” of width.

Staff Comments:

1. Remove from site plan
 - a. “anticipated future house”
 - b. Anticipated future parking for 265B
 - c. Anticipated future egress
2. Paving and landscaping must be included by final review.
3. The gambrel roof form is concerning as it is not consistent with the neighborhood and in Charleston in general. There are examples in Charleston but the vast majority of them are masonry buildings with a parapet wall, and not wood frame. The stylistic details of the gambrel roof are unsuccessful here. Of the provided examples, only one is in Cannonborough-Elliottborough. Similarly, a similar proposal with gambrel roofs was denied at 56 Cannon which later was approved with hipped roofs.
4. Staff is appreciative of and supports slight variations between the proposed building and the new building under construction. These include the wrapping porch, column detail, railing detail.
5. By preliminary, thicken the columns slightly.
6. The proposed site plan is almost completely built out with either building, driveway, or parking and there is no greenspace, which is atypical of Cannonborough-Elliottborough neighborhood. No information is provided for the site plan, but it indicates an extensive amount of parking/ingress areas. Green spaces, even if intimate, need to be incorporated.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of gambrel roof, and deferral of height/scale/ mass until roof form is finalized.
