



AGENDA

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-SMALL

March 10, 2022

4:30 P.M.

“virtually via Zoom Webinar”

1. **Approval of Minutes from February 24, 2022, Meeting**

MOTION: Approval

MADE BY: Bill SECOND: Julia VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

2. **34 Percy Street - - TMS # 460-08-01-072** **BAR2022-000729**

Request demolition of historic structure. Site visit 3/10/22 at 8:30 am.
Category 4 | Cannonborough/Elliottborough | c. 1885 | Old City District
Owner: William Fordham and Estate of James C Frayer
Applicant: Jonathan S Altman, Esq

DEFERRED BY APPLICANT

3. **540 King Street – TMS # 460-08-04-062** **BAR2020-000216**

Request mock-up panel review. Site visit 3/10/22 at 8:50 am.
New Construction | Cannonborough/Elliottborough | Old and Historic District
Owner: Vanderking 540, LLC
Applicant: Simons Young + associates, LLC

MOTION: Final approval for Mock-up panel with applicant to work with Staff on outstanding issues and Staff comments

MADE BY: Bill SECOND: Glen VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. The angle of the bricks in the dogtooth coursing should be consistent.
2. Of the sealant colors provided between the brick and fenestration elements, Staff prefers black to match the window. The generalized brick/mortar color represented at the top right of the window as it blends into the wall and provides a hard clean manufactured line at the window would be Staff’s secondary pick. This color should be used on the lintel above the window also. The bright white is inappropriate.
3. Of the sealant colors provided at stucco, the color on the mock does not match the tone of the stucco. Applicant to work with Staff to finalize.
4. Regarding proposed paint colors, the color depicted for Piazza Blue should be re-selected. Applicant to work with Staff to finalize selection and approval. As discussed on site, this color should be complimentary to the dark green storefront.

Staff Recommendation: Final approval of mock up panel with applicant to work with Staff on outstanding issues.

BOARD NOTES:

- Question on ceiling color; confirming what is presented is what was seen this morning on site (colors of paint and sealant must have been off from the damp weather on site)
- Have staff work with the applicant. All very close, just needs perfection of some details. Dogtooth on sample panel is not perfect, but it should be demanded it be perfect on the building. Echo that the piazza blue is too powder blue, and should become a more muted green/sage look perhaps.
- Consensus on site was for the darker color for the sealant at the window.

4. **37 State Street - - TMS # 458-09-01-102** **BAR2022-000745**

Requesting conceptual approval to replace 1958 addition, fenestration changes, and new side entry.

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-SMALL

March 10, 2022

Page | 2

Category 3 | French Quarter | c. 1859 | Old and Historic District
Owner: Vicki & Tom Rogers
Applicant: Whitney Powers, Studio A, Inc.

MOTION: Conceptual approval with Staff comment 1, and Board comments to restudy the detailing of the proposed fenestration at State Street, and that the rooftop structure is to be addressed separately.

MADE BY: Julia SECOND: Glen VOTE: FOR 3 _____ AGAINST 2 _____

Staff Comments:

1. The relocation of the door restores symmetry to the overall structure, reflecting the orientation of 35 State Street. The transom window is extremely tall in comparison to the door and the height should be reduced within the opening, either with a taller trim piece between, decorative trim, or visually like the window composition of 35 State Street.
2. While staff is not opposed to reopening earlier perforations in the front façade, the large floor to ceiling windows proposed are replicating the storefront windows that existed in the early 1900s and are not suited to the current use as a dwelling. The proposed windows are twice as large as the existing windows on the second and third floors and to those on the adjacent property. These proposed first-floor windows should be reduced in scale to be more compatible to the floors above and more in harmony with 35 State Street.
3. The large pane windows on the first floor of the rear addition are proportionally incongruous with the remaining house and are inappropriate in this location. The overall height should be reduced and the three bay pattern of the second and third floors should be replicated.

Staff Recommendation: Deferral for restudy with Staff comments.

BOARD NOTES:

- Clarified front windows are wood, and stucco will be on brick
- Clarified the doghouse; applicant says too early to tell, hoping for a monitor to filter light through the stair
- Some of the Board is comfortable with returning to large scale fenestration; the larger lintels could indicate a previously larger window size. Okay with the rear addition and high-quality materials.
- The rear addition is minimally visible. On the front, clearly been alteration over time, but caution—the larger you make the windows the more accessible they are to people from the street and people disturbing them (example of neighbors nearby). Caution to inviting more glass at the street level; but also not opposed to replacing the windows and door.
- The use is no longer commercial, so the windows should be more residential in nature. Disagrees with staff comment 3 about the windows on the addition; they provide differentiation which is not a bad thing.
- Unclear on dates of different fenestration/door rearrangements over time.
- Overall size of the windows may be speculative; have to be cautious about speculating when evidence is not clear about what's there. Looking at the patterns of fenestration on most of the buildings in the area; what's been presented seems atypical.
- Board is not worried about the relocation of the door.
- Some Board members have no problem to returning to larger window opening because of size of existing lintels that show the previous window openings were.
- Maybe it's the layout of the mullions that look more modern and feel off; not fully understanding the windows on the façade. Approval for addition in the rear, but deferral of restudying the façade.
- Sharp contrast to the windows immediately south

5. **376 Race Street - - TMS # 460-04-01-062**

BAR2022-000743

Requesting replacement of metal roof with shingles at rear cottage.
Not Rated | Westside | c. 1930 | Historic Materials Demolition Purview
Owner: Jonathan Karch
Applicant: Jonathan Karch

MOTION: Denial with Staff comments

MADE BY: Julia SECOND: Fillmore VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. Hand-crimped metal roofs are a character-defining feature of various historic houses and structures throughout the Peninsula.
2. The Policy Statement on Charleston Standards encourages property owners to retain and repair historic fabric rather than replace it. Furthermore, the policy states, "When deterioration is so severe that replacement is necessary, the new feature should match the old in design, color, textures, and where possible, materials."
3. The cottage is visible from the public right-of-way, and Staff recommends either repairing the existing roof or replacing it with a hand-crimped standing seam metal roof, so as to be replaced in like kind of this historic material.

Staff Recommendation: Denial with Staff Comments

NOTES:

- Roof probably should be replaced. Repairing would be futile, which is disappointing. So many of the roofs in this area have been lost, mostly to asphalt shingle. If this roof were lost would be very unfortunate.
- The only acceptable replacement would be a standing seam metal roof. Would not support a shingle roof but would support replacing in kind.
- Since we've redefined demolition in the upper peninsula, so we would want it replaced in kind; a metal hand crimped, not shingle. This roof is very visible on the property, and its significant.

6. **87½ Warren Street - - TMS # 460-16-01-100** **BAR2022-000744**

Requesting replacement of slate roof with standing seam metal.
 Category 4 | Radcliffeborough | c. 1905-1915 | Old and Historic District
 Owner: William Wilson
 Applicant: William Wilson

MOTION: Deferral to allow the applicant to seek evidence that the original roof material was not slate.

MADE BY: Julia SECOND: Fillmore VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. The applicant states that the existing slate roof is non-original to the structure. Staff has found no record of a roof replacement in the BAR files.
2. The failure is not substantiated by a structural report.
3. Slate is a significant roofing material within the historic districts and should be repaired and retained.

Staff Recommendation: Denial with Staff Comments

BOARD NOTES:

- Would like to know what was there originally
- Keep looking further, historic aerials online, old tax images, that could potentially help you if the roof was not slate prior to the 1980/90 replacement. The board cannot generally allow a replacement of a slate roof with another material, but if you can prove it was not originally slate, then they could entertain that.
- The material there is not original, but if it originally was slate it contributes to the historic fabric, and that's why we're reluctant to shift to something more unifying with adjacent structures.
- Open to reconsideration if evidence is provided. After Hugo, likely people would have replaced in kind not another material.

7. **26 Gibbes Street - - TMS # 457-11-04-125** **BAR2022-XXXXXX**

Requesting replacement of tile roof with standing seam copper.
 Not Rated | Charlestowne | c. 1898 | Old and Historic District
 Owner: Lucile Cogswell
 Applicant: Jordan Dickens

Withdrawn for Staff Review

8. **111 South Battery - - TMS # 457-11-02-083** **BAR2021-000625**

Request preliminary approval for modifications based on 2/10/22 conceptual approval and request conceptual approval of revised fence and wall.

Not Rated | Charlestowne | c. 1921 | Old and Historic District

Owner: Sunju Patel, The Montford Group

Applicant: Luda Sobchuk, SGA. Narmour Wright Design

MOTION: Preliminary approval with Staff comments 1,2 & 4 and Board comment to omit any literal letter from the ironwork design and to provide opening gate details to Staff and Final Review by Staff

MADE BY: Julia SECOND: Glen VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. Cast stone and tile at the front entry stair shall be saved, restored, and reused on this project, and this requirement shall be noted in the drawings.
2. The windows are only to be replaced on a case-by-case basis, and with Staff approval. This requirement shall be noted in the drawings.
3. The gate with initial is atypical for the streetscape. Revise to include a smaller initial on the pedestrian gate only, or a scroll detail on both pedestrian and driveway gate to be more appropriate.
4. Per BAR policy, metal fences are to be hot rolled steel or wrought iron with welded joints and concealed fasteners. Pre-manufactured aluminum fences are generally not acceptable for use in a historic district.

Staff Recommendation: Preliminary Approval with Staff comments and final review by Staff.

BOARD NOTES:

- Agree with staff and HCF that adding an arbitrary initial would not improve the property, and something else could age better.
- Discussed how they feel about a roll gate or a slider; rolled looks more industrial behind the columns, so swing gate is more appropriate.
- Swing would be more traditional or preferable; not sure if they're trying to squeeze two cars in there
- Did not see any technical information on the plans for the gate mechanism. Feels if we don't have that information they are not prepared to say if a rolling gate is okay or not, can defer that and review the design aspects only.

9. **92 Bogard and 4 Catfiddle - - TMS # 460-07-04-218, BAR2022-000746**
460-07-04-228

Request final approval for the new construction of two single-family residences as previously approved by BAR November 14, 2019, incorporating select refinements of materials and details.

New Construction | Cannonborough/Elliottborough | Old City District

Owner: Brenda Russell

Applicant: Julie O'Connor, American Vernacular

MOTION: Final approval

MADE BY: Julia SECOND: Glen VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Observations:

Revised items (all on West elevation):

1. Revised shutter design on ground floor.
2. Niche for gas meter on near rear corner.
3. Refinement of planter design over entrance, refinement of canopy hood over entrance.
4. On rear-most portion of the building, one second-story double-hung window was changed to French doors to match other proposed doors.
5. Add 8-foot parapet wall as separation between two properties.

Staff Comments:

1. The diagonal shutter design is not a typical pattern on residential shutters in this neighborhood. Staff recommends picking one consistent shutter design for the structure.
2. Staff is comfortable with the remaining revisions and their relation to the previously approved submittal.

Staff Recommendation: Final Approval with Staff Comments

BOARD NOTES:

- Agree with Staff.
- Do not have opposition to shutter details on Catfiddle specifically.

10. 40 Charlotte Street - - TMS # 459-13-01-103 BAR2022-000731

Request alteration of hardscape elements.
Category 2 | Mazyck-Wraggborough | Old and Historic District
Owner: Vickie & Pete Cox
Applicant: John Henry Tecklenburg

MOTION: Deferral for further clarification for detailing with Staff comments and Final Review by Staff

MADE BY: Julia **SECOND:** Bill **VOTE:** FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Observations:

1. The proposal includes the removal of a 2019 wall at the rear of the property which is not visible from the right-of-way.
2. The proposed serpentine wall will also not be visible.

Staff Comments:

1. Paving material is shown as installed with a permeable substrate, which is recommended for the historic district.
2. Regarding the reel feature which can provide a sustainable run-off water solution, Staff requests more information on this drainage feature, including its depth and structure. Applicant to confirm direction of water flow and output.
3. Applicant to confirm or to depict current location of rear porch stair.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval with Staff Comments

BOARD NOTES:

- Staff heading in the right direction with conceptually approving but a lot of detailed is needed; construction drawings because it's a Category 2 building. The drawing shows the reel going really close to the stairs and want to clarify if it's a safety hazard.
- Having a hard time discerning elements of the project. Appears to be an awkward intersection with the stairs and the garden. Providing details will make a big difference in understanding the total context.
- Defer to Staff and can come back if needed.

11. 460 King Street - - TMS # 460-12-02-034 BAR2022-000711

Request conceptual approval for modifications to storefront, fenestration, and façade.
Not Rated | Mazyck-Wraggborough | Old and Historic District
Owner: Mike Schuler, BS Number Three LLC
Applicant: Julia F Martin Architects, Erin Lanier

MOTION: Conceptual approval with Staff comments 1 & 4 pending zoning approval for sidewalk dining concept with Final Review by Staff

MADE BY: Bill **SECOND:** Fillmore **VOTE:** FOR 3 AGAINST 0

Staff Observations: (per zoning regarding sidewalk dining)

1. Street lights and bike stands will need to be located on the site plans. (per zoning regarding sidewalk dining)
2. Show a minimum of 8' of accessible sidewalk space between the back of the tree planting area and the proposed planter boxes. (per zoning regarding sidewalk dining)
3. The new storefront system is more complimentary to the structure's existing fenestration.

Staff Comments:

1. We have not been able to confirm the installation date of the broken tile at the entry. The proposal demolishes this surface. While a consistent surface with the public realm would be desirable, confirmation of the date of installation would deem this historic or not. Applicant to work with Staff on the date of installation and new material.
2. While staff understands the purpose of the awning over the seating area, typically an awning would be at the entry point. Omission of an awning at the entry exposes the entry and patrons to the element.

3. Alternatively, we suggest omitting the awning at King Street in order to unify and King Street and entry facades.
4. Neon sign and mural must be approved by the Board and should be submitted separately.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval with final review by staff (pending zoning approval of sidewalk dining).

BOARD NOTES:

- Awning clarification; would be awkward to marry two awning depths, the current awning is heavy and low and think it would be nice to have the awnings to be distinct.
 - Agree with some staff comments. Agree with #1, think the broken tile was there a long time. Don't agree with 2 or 3, think the awning differentiations compliment well. Support comments 1 and 4. And pending zoning issue for sidewalk dining.
 - Neutral on the awnings, separation in them doesn't bother because of the vertical neon sign
-