



CITY OF CHARLESTON BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SMALL

MEETING RESULTS

APRIL 13, 2023

4:30 P.M.

2 GEORGE STREET

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Van Slambrook, Wilson, Turner

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Bennett, Gordineer

A. Minutes

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

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Approval.

MADE BY: Van Slambrook SECOND: Wilson VOTE: FOR: 3 AGAINST: 0

B. Applications

1. 179 – 181 Fishburne Street

TMS # 460-07-02-175 | BAR2023-001084

Category 4 | Westside | c. pre-1902 | Historic Materials Demolition Purview

Request partial demolition of historic structure including portions roof.

Owner: Matt Campbell, Mike Levine

Applicant: AJ Architects

Site visit 3/23/2023 at 8:50 a.m.

DECISION: APPROVAL & DENIAL

MOTION: Approval of removal of brick veneer and returning of original pedimented portico and denial of demolition of roof and denial of elevation of structure above DFE plus 12".

MADE BY: Wilson SECOND: Turner VOTE: FOR: 3 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

- One Written Comment submitted.

- Audrey Lisbon (175 Fishburne): President of West Side Neighborhood Association
 - In agreement of demolition of rear addition. Proposed modifications of roofline should be denied. Significant history. Changing roof line goes against history / preservation. Deny request.
- Brittany Shafer & fiancé (178 Fishburne)
 - In opposition. Historic Church never used as a residence. Opposed to adding dormers. The proposal is grossly out of scale with current residences. Overdevelopment of neighborhood.
- Arthur Lawrence (210 Fishburne)
 - Born and raised in the neighborhood. Lots of history: first black cab stand at Ashley & Sumter; grocery store at Fishburne & Ashley. This church is the last remnant of the old neighborhood. Hope you deny this request. Save the historic church.
- Preservation Society of Charleston:
 - Appreciate the re-opening of the porch. Salvage as much historic material as possible.
- BT: Question: What is the purpose of the dormers? Answer: Light.
- FW: Really attractive small frame church under 1950's brick veneer and CMU rear addition. I don't have a problem with removing veneer and CMU addition. Have issue elevating above what is required for DFE. Really struggling with dormers. Dormers result in the loss of historic material
- BT: Struggling with dormers too. The dormers don't look bad, but they water down the historic form. A lot of positives: removal of brick veneer and CMU addition and reopening of portico. Keep it @ 1' (one foot) above DFE. Don't want to set a precedent.
- LVS: BAR-S wanted a plan to preserve the church when total demolition was denied. Once removed we have no review of what goes in its place. Not supportive of dormers. Don't want to set a precedent.
- FW: Would like to see a road forward.
 - Precedent, Loss of historic material, Dormers – not a fine feature on a church.
- Ashley Jennings (Applicant):
 - There's been a lot of discussion about its use which does not apply to BAR.
 - Porch was there originally on the Sanborn Maps.
 - Edisto Baptist Church is the closest example of a similar church.
 - Giving a new life to this building.

Staff Observations:

1. This is not an in-kind repair and therefore requires a Board level review.
2. The brick veneer was added in the 1960s and is therefore not original to the church.

Staff Comments:

1. The removal of the brick veneer, front porch infill, and exposed CMU rear addition can be supported by Staff.
2. The removal of the stained-glass windows is not ideal, but these may not be original to the wood-framed structure. The church congregation will keep these, and windows would be required to be operable to meet the needs of the intended program.
3. The previous proposed items are in keeping with a restoration plan which is one of the treatments for historic buildings outlined by the Secretary of the Interior. The proposal to remove portions of the roof for dormers is not in keeping with a restoration.

Furthermore, and more importantly, the simple, clean, uninterrupted gable roof form is a character-defining feature of this building. Removing portions of it to accommodate expansion would demolish the feature and remove a substantial amount of valuable historic fabric.

4. Typically, historic structures on the peninsula, when raised, are only raised 1ft above DFE.

Staff Recommendation: Denial with Staff Comments.

2. 640 King Street

TMS # 460-04-04-028 | BAR2023-001085

Category 3 | Cannonborough / Elliottborough | c. 1852 | Old and Historic District

Request partial demolition of historic structure.

Owner: Branko Damjanovic

Applicant: Branko Damjanovic

Site visit 3/23/2023 at 8:30 a.m.

DECISION: APPROVAL AND DEFERRAL

MOTION: Approval of demolition of all elements with deferral of demolition of rear addition to allow for additional staff research and Board suggestion to obtain a structural report.

MADE BY: Turner SECOND: Wilson VOTE: FOR: 3 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

- Board Discussion:
 - BT: Agree with all proposed demos, but question age of rear addition – the segmented roof is indicative to an earlier structure.
 - FW: Short paneled standing seam metal roof - continuous roof across that rear addition from Google earth. Uncertain as to the chronology of rear addition. Age is up in the air.

Staff Observations:

1. Previously approved for demolition in 2006.
2. Contextually, the area has changed significantly over time.
3. Removal of the CMU block at the front of the piazza is a positive return to the historic piazza.
4. Several campaigns of infill have occurred at the rear addition as seen in siding material changes.
5. The rear addition is not architecturally compatible with the house.
6. The three bay window is atypical.
7. Metal roof has not changed between historic and newer 1940s addition.

Staff Comments:

1. While considered historic based on the age of the addition, the overall consensus of the staff observations lends to no loss of an historically or architecturally significant addition.

Staff Recommendation: Approval with Staff Comment.

3. 640 King Street

TMS # 460-04-04-028 | BAR2023-001086

Category 3 | Cannonborough / Elliottborough | c. 1852 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for replacement of piazza screen, relocating exterior stairs, remove siding, and alterations to fenestration.

Owner: Branko Damjanovic

Applicant: Branko Damjanovic

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Staff Comments and Board Comments to 1) bring piazza inboard of columns, 2) provide a comprehensive sign package (hardscape and softscape), 3) provide proposed plans for fence at street, 4) restudy spacing of piazza columns, 5) center windows on second floor porch enclosure 6) introduce different siding on porch enclosure and introduce different siding for piazza screen wall, 7) restudy small windows on North side.

MADE BY: Turner SECOND: Wilson VOTE: FOR: 3 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

- **Public Comment:**
 - HCF: Grateful for much needed rehabilitation. Recommend approval.
 - PSC: More sensitive of enclosure. Utilize more glazing.
- **Board Discussion:**
 - FW: Extremely positive. Prominent, but abused structure.
 - Support coming back to the Board. Need a plan for windows being replaced / repaired.
 - BT: Need a Comprehensive Site Plan for hardscape / softscape. Need more information. Beautiful fence could be restored. Little gem of a building, especially the front elevation.
 - Restudy – fresh look at piazza column spacing. Awkward column spacing proposed.
 - Readjust columns to more pleasing composition.
 - Second floor enclosure – pull it in a little, and express columns.
 - Piazza screen – introduce different siding profile – typical of piazza screen.
 - Eliminate horizontal windows at northside.
 - Center windows in porch enclosure.
 - Introduce different siding profile for enclosure.

- Enclosure – bring inward of columns.

Staff Observations:

1. Restoration of historic balustrade at first floor is a positive restoration effort.
2. Appreciate columns on second floor infill to represent the infill process
3. East elevation proposed does not show front door from rear.
4. Standard size full windows more appropriate represent a historic window pattern with correspondence to the chimneys. The smaller windows are more inconsistently placed.

Staff Comments:

1. Shutters are appropriately sized for window openings and should have corresponding hardware for functioning shutters.
2. Staff suggest original research into the columns toward the rear of the porch to more accurately depict the historic arrangement and lend towards a more symmetrical approach.
3. Smaller fixed windows on the north elevation are not vertically oriented as per BAR Standards and should be restudied or omitted.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff Comments.

4. 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 with Board Comment that Final Review by Staff upon submission to staff of appropriate and complete drawings.

MADE BY: Turner SECOND: Wilson VOTE: FOR: 3 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

- **Public Comment:**
 - PSC: On the right track. The second floor above piazza should be fully opened. All replacement windows should match previous existing historic windows.
- **Board Discussion:**
 - FW: Would deny after-the-fact.
 - BT: Would agree with Fillmore. Numerous conflicts in drawings. Don't trust this. Need professional drawings to show exactly what is going back. Drawings are different from photos.

Staff Observations:

1. The applicant has met with staff to confirm details of repairs to original historic structure.

2. Prior comments have been addressed.

Staff Comments:

1. Please provide all material specification details in permitting.

Staff Recommendation: Approval with Staff Comment.

5. 170 President Street

TMS # 460-07-04-055 | BAR2023-001087

NS | Westside | c. pre-1920 | Old City District

After the fact request to replace roof, construct rear addition, replace windows.

Owner: Hernando Zambrano Guerrero

Applicant: Jeff D. Bolen

DECISION: DENIED

MOTION: Denial of after-the-fact approval. Application should return to the Board with full working drawings incorporating staff comments.

MADE BY: Turner SECOND: Wilson VOTE: FOR: 3 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

• Public Comment:

- HCF: Very concerned with loss of historic fabric & features. Request denial and replace with salvaged materials.
- PSC: Rear addition needs to be subordinate to house and chronological order of house restored.
- Arthur Lawrence: Applicant never came to West Side Neighborhood. Changed whole fabric of house. Learn a lesson by not coming to the Neighborhood – they do what they want and then ask for after-the-fact approval. Should be a harsh rule – put it back as it was and come to the Neighborhood Association. Start over from scratch.

• Board Discussion:

- FW: Roof form clearly changed. Includes overhang and elevation. Things left out of elevation drawings. On-site inspection of exactly what has been changed with window locations and dimensions. Denial of request.
- BT: Agree with Fillmore. More egregious than previous. Picked about. Roof torn off. Must come back to the Board.

Staff Observations:

1. No BAR review or Building Permit was completed prior to work beginning on the exterior.
2. Eave depth is larger than the previous roof system.
3. Windows have been replaced with vinyl.
4. The proposal includes an extension of non-original addition and original roof form.
5. The windows on the second floor of the front elevation were originally not equally spaced. The two windows on the right are off centered toward the south.

6. Verify window locations, and changes, if any. The windows as drawn in the submittal are not accurately depicted to the historic locations.
7. Shape of the vent on the front elevation is atypical.
8. Verify hipped roof, if any changes, on front elevation.

Staff Comments:

1. Roof structure including rafter system and sheathing is new and appears to be taller and pitched differently than previous historic structure. The distance between the windows and the frieze/cornice is larger in the proposed than the existing. The roof system should be studied to represent the historic structure as it also more closely resembled the adjacent structure.
2. Removal of the second-floor window on the south elevation should be eliminated as this is an original window opening contributing to the form.
3. Restudy masonry site wall as it is creating a fortress effect and out of character with the neighborhood. Drawings of proposed wall with details on construction, dimensions, and materials should be resubmitted.
4. The proposed shed roof extends out of the rear gable in the addition in a more suburban style. Staff requests to restudy interaction of these two features.
5. The dashed lines on the drawings denote the original termination of the structure at the rear. Additions to this area should be subordinate.

Staff Recommendation: Deferral with staff comments.

6. 76 Nassau Street

TMS # 459-05-04-171 | BAR2023-001088

Category 4 | Eastside | c. 1850s | Old City District

After the fact request to replace windows.

Owner: Haven Development Group 1, LLC

Applicant: Chase Lansing

DECISION: DENIED

MOTION: Denial.

MADE BY: Wilson SECOND: Turner VOTE: FOR: 3 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

- **Public Comment:**
 - PSC: Not supportive of the after-the-fact request. No information on previous windows. Vinyl is not an appropriate material for historic districts.
 - HCF: Unfortunate replacement (mistake?). Negative precedent if BAR approval vinyl windows. Respectfully request denial.
- **Board Discussion:**
 - BT: Don't think previous windows were historic; however, Vinyl windows are never approved in historic districts. Contractors get owners in trouble.
 - FW: Agree with Bill. The building is historic – c. 1939. Unlikely original windows and not likely historic, however, vinyl would not be approved under

any circumstances. Room for applicant to work with Staff for appropriate windows.

Staff Observations:

1. The Building Department placed a Stop Work Order as work was found to be conducted without a permit or BAR review.
2. While the Architectural Inventory Card state the building to date to the 1850s, Sanborn Maps place the structure as being constructed between 1902 and 1944.
3. Windows that are currently in the structure are vinyl.
4. Staff believe the windows were previously an industrial metal window.

Staff Comments:

1. Staff would consider a metal style window that would closely resemble other industrial structures in the City such as the Cigar Factory.

Staff Recommendation: Denial with Staff Comment.

7. 4 Trumbo Street

TMS # 457-12-01-010 | BAR2023-001089

Category 4 | Harleston Village | c. 1870 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval to elevate home above DFE, enclose portion of first floor porch, second floor addition, and new entry stair.

Owner: Charleston & Erica Missel

Applicant: Chatauk Studio, Jeremy Kruska

Deferred by staff prior to meeting

8. 235 Meeting Street

TMS # 457-08-01-012 | BAR2023-001090

Category 3 | c. pre 1884 | Old and Historic District

Request illuminated signage.

Owner: Sticky Charleston LLC

Applicant: Vivid Sign & Design Inc

DECISION: APPROVAL & DENIAL

MOTION: Approval of blade sign as submitted and application of sign lettering to be pin mounted letters. Denial of internally illuminated signage.

MADE BY: Turner SECOND: Wilson VOTE: FOR: 3 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

• Public Comment:

- Christina Dodd (42 Hasell Street) (HANA – Ansonborough)

- HANA opposes illuminated signage – having a lighted sign at foot of neighborhood is an affront to neighborhood. Deny request – This is a delicate neighborhood being attacked on all sides. We rely on the BAR to speak for us.
- Board Discussion:
 - BT: Fine with a right-angle sign. Internally illuminated is not appropriate. Suggest individually pin-mounted letters.

Staff Observations:

1. The proposed package does not detail electrical connections to façade for lighting.
2. Traditionally, the BAR has not supported cabinet signs.
3. As per the General BAR Sign Policy Statement, signage should not interfere with significant architectural features.

Staff Comments:

1. The cabinet style sign is too large and distracting from the architecture of the structure; the style of the sign should be restudied possibly through the letters being directly attached to the sign band.
2. Illumination is not necessary in this location as there is ambient light from the nearby streetscape.

Staff Recommendation: Denial for illumination and approval for sign lettering attached directly to façade and right-angle sign.

9. 511 King Street

TMS # 460-12-02-084 | BAR2023-001091

Category 4 | Radcliffeborough | c. 1888 - 1902 | Old and Historic District

Request approval for internally lit right-angle sign.

Owner: Ravenel Commercial Properties

Applicant: Knight Printing & Graphics

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Approval with Board Condition that sign face be designed as routed aluminum and only graphics and copy be illuminated.

MADE BY: Turner **SECOND:** Wilson **VOTE: FOR:** 3 **AGAINST:** 0

NOTES:

- Public Comment: None.
- Board Discussion:
 - BT: No problem with shape of sign. With a routed aluminum sign, the only illumination would be the outer band and the lettering. The proposed plastic face is more suburban.
 - FW: Bill's point is excellent. The round shape is fine - no problem with shape, or right angle or illuminated. Routed Aluminum is an excellent correction.
 - LVS: Agree.

Staff Observations:

1. The business had two sign types and were seeking a third type. The window graphics have recently been removed.

Staff Comments:

1. Staff recommend restudy of the shape of the sign to be more compatible with the architecture of the building if a right-angle sign is used.
2. Staff could support a sensitively approached illuminated façade sign.

Staff Recommendation: Denial.

10. 309 King Street

TMS # 457-04-04-097 | BAR2023-001092

NR | neighborhood | c. pre-1884 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for storefront renovations.

Owner: Redline Property Partners - Andrew Webb

Applicant: Chipman Design Architecture

Deferred by Staff

11. 32 S Battery Street

TMS # 457-16-02-058 | BAR2023-001093

Category 2 | Charlestowne | c. 1782 | Old and Historic District

Request approval to change roof material from terne metal to copper.

Owner: Jim & Augustine Smith

Applicant: Octavio Paredes, Roofing American Metal Enterprises

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Approval with Staff Comments.

MADE BY: Wilson SECOND: Turner VOTE: FOR: 3 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

- Public Comment: None.
- Board Discussion:
 - FW: Painted terne metal roofs are going away, but copper is a wonderful alternative.

Staff Observations:

1. Repairs to slate will be completed in kind and minimal with new slate.
2. The metal roof has far exceeded its material lifespan.
3. Visibility will be minimal and possibly of only one structure where the material will change.

Staff Comments:

1. Copper is a sustainable and high-quality material that will protect the historic structure.
2. Staff request material specification during permitting process.

Staff Recommendation: Final Approval with Staff Comments.

12. 80 S Battery Street

TMS # 457-11-02-037 | BAR2023-001094

NR | Charlestowne | c. 1953 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for proposed second story addition.

Owner: Guy Tarrant

Applicant: Sebastian von Marschall, LLC

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Conceptual approval with Staff Comments #1 and #3 and Board Comments: 1) to use true divided lite single pane wood windows in addition, 2) differentiate cornice of new addition from original structure and Final Review by Staff.

MADE BY: Wilson SECOND: Turner VOTE: FOR: 3 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

- Public Comment:
 - One Written Comment submitted.
- Board Discussion:
 - FW: We have approved several additions in this area over the past few years. This building has a very pronounced overhang; consider shrinking it a bit. Done very well.
 - BT: Agree. Make the cornice subordinate to the house.
 - LVS: No issue. Very tasteful

Staff Observations:

1. The cornice details align with the historic structure.
2. The materials are differentiated from the overall form of the structure but also compliments the materials of the front pediment.

Staff Comments:

1. Proposed addition is subordinate to original roof form. Staff would ask the Board to discuss subordination as proposed to the roof form or the overall structure itself.
2. Staff are concerned with the connection of a new roof system to a tile roof.
3. Additions are typically situated at the rear or more minimally visible from the public right-of-way. Staff would ask the Board to discuss window material with consideration to location and visibility.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff Comments

