



AGENDA

**BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-SMALL**

MARCH 24, 2022

4:30 P.M.

2 GEORGE STREET

1. **Approval of Minutes from March 10, 2022, Meeting**

MOTION: Approval

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

---

2. **63 Simons Street - - TMS # 463-15-02-031**

**BAR2022-000758**

Request demolition of historic structure. Site visit 3/24/22 at 8:30 am.

Not Rated | North Central | c. 1922 | Historic Materials Demolition Purview

Owner: HBSS Homes

Applicant: John Denke

MOTION: Denial of demolition.

MADE BY: Bello SECOND: Wilson VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. This is one of the last building types of this kind remaining on the streetscape and should be retained. Staff agrees with previous Staff comments from 2017.
2. Various character-defining features including original form, siding, and brick piers are extant and should be repaired and retained. BAR staff recommends a full renovation and a proper preservation plan to be submitted to the BAR (or BAR staff) for approval. The plan should include an engineering report and/or a conditions assessment that goes further than the report submitted to determine what historic fabric is viable.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of demolition.

BOARD NOTES:

- Agree with Staff; building is in rough shape but is salvageable and reasonable amount of historic fabric left.
  - In bad shape but not unrepairable; structural report talks about bringing it up to code, but most historic buildings don't meet code so that isn't part of what we consider and doesn't mean it should be torn down.
  - Could come back with selective demolition if there are parts that they feel need to be; but not wholesale demo.
- 

3. **5 Killians Street - - TMS # 460-07-01-018**

**BAR2022-000759**

Request demolition of historic structure. Site visit 3/24/22 at 8:50 am.

Not Rated | Westside | c. 1935 | Historic Materials Demolition Purview

Owner: New Holms St Baptist Church

Applicant: Thaddeus Miller

MOTION: Denial with encouragement for the applicant to explore other options

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

Staff Comments:

1. This building type is a Freedman's Cottage, which is a significant historic resource to Charleston that the BAR strives to retain. This particular style of housing reflects the culture and history of the City and its people.
2. The adjacent house to the south, 3 Killians, is also a Freedman's Cottage, along with several dotting Killians Street; therefore, losing 5 Killians would mean losing one more of

these significant resources. Nunan Street, directly south, features a consistent stretch of cottages which make these a significant portion of the context of the neighborhood.

- 3. It is unfortunate that the roof has caved in and has been left unattended to facilitate deterioration. Though much damage has occurred, the essential form still exists, as well as much of the wood siding, windows, and other exterior elements. Therefore, this significant Charleston building type should be restored and repaired to protect and reuse it.
- 4. In a rehabilitation scenario, a proper preservation plan shall be submitted to the BAR (or BAR Staff) for approval. The plan should include an engineering report that goes beyond the report submitted to determine what historic fabric is viable. A subjective report such as in the submittal with a "scale of one-to-ten" is insufficient.
- 5. The tax records approximate this building as built in 1935, but Freedman's Cottages were primarily constructed in the late 1800's. The 1902 Sanborn map shows a one-story dwelling in the location of 5 Killians, on what was then Holmes St.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of demolition with Staff comments noted.

BOARD NOTES:

- Agree with Staff; the form is special. Agree with HCF about that we could get behind selective demolition of some of the newer portions of the building or to the rear; but would want to see a clear preservation plan.
- Also willing to look at an assessment with a plan to remove the rear portion and to stabilize or rehabilitate the rest. Suggest partnering with the Housing Authority or another nonprofit to rehabilitate this for someone who needs a home; there are ways to look beyond the church and its member's checkbooks and turn this positive.
- Also thinking you could sell it to someone to renovate it; or renovate and rent to make money. Would not be as large of an undertaking as some other properties due to its small size.
- Needs a proper survey to determine different building stages and a plan for what could be saved and portions that maybe could be demolished.

4. **34 Percy Street - - TMS # 460-08-01-072** **BAR2022-000729**

Request demolition of historic structure. Site visit 3/24/22 at 9:10am.  
 Category 4 | Cannonborough/Elliottborough | c. 1885 | Old City District  
 Owner: William Fordham and Estate of James C Frayer  
 Applicant: Jonathan S Altman, Esq

MOTION: Denial of demolition

MADE BY: Bello SECOND: Wilson VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Observations: (from google street view, to be confirmed at site visit)

- 1. Wood siding is intact beneath ashlar pattern shingles.
- 2. Majority of windows are intact but boarded over.
- 3. Brick façade screen and second floor piazza railing not original to house.
- 4. Was built as a sister house to 32 Percy on the same lot.
- 5. While 32 Percy has been significantly infilled, it is remaining.

Staff Comments:

- 1. With its connection to 32 Percy, the removal of this structure would break up the paired sister houses and will reduce the significance of the other structure.
- 2. We recommend completing necessary repairs and weatherization of the building. This would include repairing the roof, installing missing or broken windows, removing vegetation and plywood on the façade, and any necessary repairs to shield the building from the elements.
- 3. In a rehabilitation scenario, a proper preservation plan shall be submitted to the BAR (or BAR staff) for approval. The plan should include an engineering report that goes beyond the report submitted to determine what historic fabric is viable. A subjective report such as in the submittal with a "scale of one-to-ten" is insufficient.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of demolition with Staff comments noted.

BOARD NOTES:

- Agree with Staff and preservation groups; many houses on the block were recently in the same condition and been successfully rehabilitated. Does not sound like the engineer accessed much of the interior and we don't feel confident it was his most detailed assessment.

- Board cannot take into account the messy ownership
- Typically agree with Mr. Rosen, but disagree here. Most of the building has been preserved under the 1960/1970s siding and is able to be saved.
- Building appears to be sound from exterior, true on foundation; could not support wholesale demolition.

---

5. **65 Barre Street - - TMS # 457-02-04-025** **BAR2022-000760**

Request demolition of historic structure. Site visit 3/24/22 at 9:30 am.  
Not Rated | Harleston Village | c. 1962 | Old and Historic District  
Owner: David Abdo  
Applicant: AJ Architects, Ashley Jennings

MOTION: Approval

MADE BY: Bello SECOND: Wilson VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Observations:

1. Ordinance section 54-240, paragraph b states, "In reviewing an application to demolish, or demolish in part, or remove, or alter the exterior architectural appearance of any existing structure, the Board of Architectural Review shall consider, among other things, the historic, architectural and aesthetic features of such structure, the nature and character of the surrounding areas, the historic or culturally important use of such structure and the importance to the city."

Staff Comments:

1. The National Park Service standard for buildings that are considered historic is 50 years or older. That currently being 1972, 65 Barre is within the guidelines for a structure that is considered historic and should be considered a part of our historic fabric.
2. The mid-century residential structures within Charleston represent post-WWII development and the expansive period of growth during this time. Ranch houses characterize the changing needs for American families, including the integrated garage.
3. This ranch house still retains some of its character-defining features such as brick exterior, an integrated chimney, and a dentiled cornice showing its Colonial Revival-style detailing.
4. While the age of the structure does make it historic fabric, the building does not orient itself to the public right-of-way. A large portion of what faces the public is a double wide garage door.
5. Halsey Street (just north of 65 Barre) at the time of construction continued across Barre Street, showing that the house would have originally been built oriented towards the street; later changed when Halsey Street was infilled between Halsey Blvd and Barre Street.
6. With the exception of a Craftsman bungalow, the context of the immediate neighborhood includes multi-level townhomes and houses.

Staff Recommendation: Approval

BOARD NOTES:

- Board feels it does not contribute to the historic fabric and should be demolished.

---

6. **56 Morris Street - - TMS # 460-12-01-086** **BAR2022-000716**

Request preliminary review of alterations to historic structure and the addition of a second story.  
Not Rated | Cannonborough-Elliottborough | Old City District  
Owner: 56 Morris, LLC  
Applicant: Luke Jarrett, Synchronicity

MOTION: Preliminary approval with Staff comments 2 & 3, and with a Board comment for restudy of the flood panels to be less intrusive.

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

Staff Observations:

1. Staff appreciates the reuse of the historic wrought iron window grates.
2. The adjustment in the second-floor façade helps to lighten the addition and minimize its impact.

Staff Comments:

1. While proposed awnings at the windows align with the awnings at the storefront, they are very high and shallow at the windows to be effective and appear disconnected from the windows. Staff recommend lowering.
2. The equipment screening on the roof should coordinate with the structure in either material or color.
3. The proposed Hydrodefense Flood Plank Face Jamb extends beyond the exterior wall face. While materials are reviewed at the preliminary review level, Applicant should describe depth, thickness and profile of these fins because these are part of the architectural language on this building.

Staff Recommendation: Preliminary approval with final review by staff.

BOARD NOTES:

- Has heard of issue with the proposed siding material; we cannot approve a material with a mandate that it be maintained regularly. Also have reservations about flood panel brackets. Ask to look into alternate ideas; could approve but would like to see this portion excluded from approval for alternatives to be looked into.
- Think it's a great material, you responded to Board comments; only concern is the flood panels. They will not look great and change the nature of what you're trying to do; there may be an alternate.
- Disagree with Staff comment #1; think it looks great and if people get wet isn't our purview.
- Suggests keeping the odd character of the paint band/changing elevations on the exterior; asks if the applicant would be willing to keep it.
- Made great progress; it's time for something to happen to this building, it may not be sensitive but it is appropriate and leaves a majority of the first story visible and usable.
- Appreciate the material, just want to make sure it will hold up properly; agree about the flood panels and needs to be restudied and handled by Staff.

**7. 138 & 140 Wentworth Street - - TMS # 457-03-04-052/ 457-03-04-051 BAR2022-000710**

Request final approval alterations to historic house, new side porch (house), 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: Preliminary approval for all items submitted with exception of a Board requirement to restudy roofing system for side porch to not engage the cornice on existing structure, and exclusion of the simulated vehicular gates from the approval; details and Final review to Staff.

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

Staff Observations:

1. Bath house stair has been restudied and relocated so it is not visible from public ROW.

Staff Comments:

1. Staff appreciate the balance of the additional pendant lights on the side porch and the retention of the engaged piazza floor.
2. Window replacement should better match the original size of the openings, must be single pane, true divided light, wood windows. Final approval to be determined by staff.

Staff Recommendation: Preliminary Approval with Final review by Staff.

BOARD NOTES:

- Opposed to bath house stair, not fully convinced that it is not visible from ROW and don't think this is the best most creative solution, not appropriate.
- A little concerned about the driveway gate; we're being sold on a garden lot, but why does it need this driveway gate; needs restudy for that open access, don't think the visual cues do justice to your plan (detailed nicely just don't agree with what they're doing to the design)

- If the gates are not active, but potentially active, if they ever became active that type of construction would not have a long life; it would sag. Agree on the stair on bath house, disappointed.
- Wood gates aren't up yet, so that portion of bath house should be currently visible
- Gates open onto a plant bed on their plan; so really it's a fence
- Issue with the gates is that they don't go anywhere, the wall is non-historic; could we propose a nice looking wall that matches surroundings
- Connect the garden property together so it feels all as one; so it's not a fence that looks like a gate; pedestrian gate would be appropriate but not an additional access
- Be careful with rounded steel with angles, maybe explore aluminum to get that angle
- Roof discussion of porch pergola; will be a lot simpler if you don't have an angle. Flashing over the cornice; looks like if they went straight across they would be underneath the corbel, missing it; slope is going to be tough, tie in will be tough. Make sure no historic fabric is damaged.
- Make the approval contingent on the bath house stair addition not being visible. Then if it is, they would be in violation.

**8. 66 Church Street - - TMS # 458-13-01-099 BAR2021-000489**

Request conceptual approval for piazza enclosure at rear.  
 Category 3 | Charlestowne | c. 1784 | Old and Historic District  
 Owner: Stanley Porter  
 Applicant: e e fava architects

MOTION: Conceptual approval with Final review by Staff, and a Board comment to delete the secondary column.

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

Staff Observations:

1. Staff appreciates that the enclosure has been set back as much as possible without sacrificing its program.
2. This piazza has been entirely rebuilt, and no original fabric remains.

Staff Comments:

1. With the enclosure set back as proposed now, it will be minimally visible from the public ROW.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual Approval with final review by staff.

BOARD NOTES:

- The provided photos are very helpful; to see how much of the piazza was previously enclosed; proves there is little to no original fabric; but yes, original form, and are very cautious of piazza enclosure. Comfortable with where this has landed.
- Previously, Board wasn't totally opposed with piazza enclosure, it was mostly with the visibility from ROW so it was asked to be recessed further; and the applicant has done that here.
- No issues except would recommend not adding the extra column, confuses things, let it be clean.
- We wanted to see the back corner of the house not engaged.

**9. 1 Henrietta Street - - TMS # 459-13-03-011 BAR2021-000637**

Request conceptual approval for elevation of building; renovation; and modifications building including historic storefront, removal of non-original rear element, and addition to the rear.  
 Not rated | Old and Historic District  
 Owner: Adam and Erin Witty  
 Applicant: e e fava architects

MOTION: Denial of raising the building and deferral of the other elements.

MADE BY: Bello SECOND: Fillmore VOTE: FOR 3 AGAINST 2: Huey & Van Slambrook

## Staff Comments:

Elevation of historic structure, the following Staff comments remain unchanged:

1. Proposing to elevate the building above DFE is discouraged as per the Policy Statement for Elevating Historic Buildings and has never been granted in a situation in excess of a few inches in order to respect the form, height, scale, and mass of historic streetscape context to the greatest possible extent.
2. The building is eligible for a FEMA variance which would eliminate the need for elevating at all. The first-floor commercial unit can be flood-proofed to be protected.
3. The Applicant states there is little historic fabric of the building remaining which is all the more reason to protect the integrity of this historic form, in context. The height, scale, mass, streetscape and form are some of the only remaining elements this building has, and they deserve to be retained.

## Rear Addition:

1. Staff appreciates the relocation of the addition to the rear of the structure, as well as the reduction of garage doors proposed.
2. While the hyphen helps distinguish the addition from the existing structure, the addition should be further studied to ensure it remains subordinate to the historic structure.
3. The large windows of the hyphen and addition overwhelm the historic structure; their size and proportions should be restudied.
4. While no historic photo is available at this time, and while the storefront system may be composed of replacement material, the proposal reduces the storefront on Henrietta in lieu of a small high window.
5. The solid wall proposed along Henrietta is not appropriate. Per BAR policy, "*Fences and walls should be appropriately scaled for their context so as to prevent a fortress-like appearance.*" If a solid wall is to be used, the height should be lowered or the upper portion should incorporate openings or penetrations to provide some relief.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of proposed elevation as submitted, deferral of addition to restudy with elevation.

## BOARD NOTES:

- Asked what is the need to raise it besides FEMA—is it really to add a top floor?
- Why not put more of the new square footage into the addition rather than raising the historic building
- It's rare that you have a wide open space next to the building you're working on, instead of raising it
- Asking, existing two floors would be elevated, and the existing storefront corner gets infilled, so what's the construction underneath? Masonry. Now the new first floor is below base flood and will have to be flood proofed anyway; applicant says this way you get a new foundation; tough to elevate a corner store, there haven't been guidelines written for that yet. (There are for elevating buildings, but not corner stores.)
- Only use can be commercial on first floor whether its raised or not; do think you can get a FEMA variance; the character of this building it is a two-story building and you're adding a story; would be fine with adding more height on Elizabeth.
- Proposal now is a significant change to what it is now, if it were all new construction it would be great. Like the hyphen proportions.
- Agree. Owners want more out of this than they can get. This is an unprecedented request, turning a two-story storefront into a three-story. Changing the material of existing first floor from wood to masonry, adding another floor, then taking the second floor to the third story. The Board does not read the supporting documents the applicant brought in the way they do (Standards). Do not think our ordinance/Standards allows us to approve a three-story building on this corner. I hope that moving forward, there is new construction option to get the things you're looking for. Do see a path that allows you to get there.
- This is adding a third story regardless of phrasing, find that difficult and goes against Secretary of Interior's guidelines (addition of story is discouraged, should be subordinate, recessed, etc.). Makes it pretend like it's been this way forever. Other ways to get additional square footage. Dramatically goes against what we are mandated to preserve.
- Raising structures out of flood. Can see both sides, very torn; both have logical reasonable concerns.
- If they do nothing it's still a corner store, if they put something next to it, it stays; it has to stay commercial so there's no scenario where it's not.
- It's tough because the proposal is a completely different animal from what's there now; that's why it's difficult. If this is the option we're looking at, we need to see a dividing line between floors 2-3 to show the difference.
- Needs to be raised from flood; but we want storefront to be retained

- Preservation is not a popularity contest; it's not about making it more attractive; we're losing Charleston, all the great funky old buildings—what's great about this building is it's a two-story storefront, period. There's better capability to get a FEMA variance or flood proof the bottom. Compromise would be to add more height somewhere else; take the cars out and get that square footage, etc.
- We've never seen a building raised where floor one didn't become floor two; this way floor one stays because it's public realm
- Make a taller building on Elizabeth street on the back half of this lot
- Just isn't realistic to say it's not precedent setting; what we do does set precedent, and gets more complex as we move forward in time. Even though it's unique, it does have the opportunity to set a precedent and makes things more complex in the future.
- Some Board members leaning towards allowing this because it won't set a precedent; shifting to feeling it's an elevation of a historic building.
- Huey motion for approval with no second.

10. **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.

Category 4 | Cannonborough-Elliotborough | Old City District

Owner: Tift Mitchell

Applicant: Andrew Gould

MOTION: Final approval

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

Staff Observations:

1. Staff appreciate the alterations and general direction of this submittal.
2. Applicant has received the nod that the existing live oak will be taken down due to its height over the roadway and that the relocated curb cut is permissible with SCDOT.
3. Applicant has begun TRC process.

Staff Comments:

1. Applicant has addressed the Staff Comments which were adopted into the Board's motion of January 27 with the exception of comments 7 and 8 which referenced the cast-iron and wood railings. Applicant has provided some precedent imagery for this item. However, only a few are from Charleston, and where used as ornately as the proposed, the railings are fully cast-iron or wood, not mixed, or are minimally visible from the public right-of-way. Staff recommends simplifying the railing to one material.
2. Wall piercings are not typical for the area, Staff recommends a solid wall.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval and Final review by Staff.

NOTES:

- Some Board members think the iron railing is appropriate
- Very eclectic neighborhood, almost anything goes if it's designed well.