



# CITY OF CHARLESTON BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SMALL

---

## MEETING RESULTS

**MAY 11, 2023**

**4:30 P.M.**

**2 GEORGE STREET**

---

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Van Slambrook, Martin, Huey, Wilson, Turner

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Pinto, Gordineer

---

### A. Minutes

#### 1. Review of Minutes from the April 27, 2023 Meeting

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Approval

MADE BY: Van Slambrook SECOND: Turner VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

---

### B. Applications

#### 1. 309 King Street

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

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

Request conceptual approval for storefront renovations.

Owner: Redline Property Partners - Andrew Webb

Applicant: Chipman Design Architecture

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral with Staff Comments: 1) Restudy front facade and embrace Art Deco character, 2) recess fenestration into front wall, 3) clarify materials proposed for 1<sup>st</sup> floor.

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

#### NOTES:

- HCF
- PSC – encourage research into Art Deco design, should be retained
- Board Discussion
  - Clarification, rear not visible
  - Clarification, doors are steel – not aluminum

- Art Deco may not be original but should be retained
  - Alterations more allowable on 1<sup>st</sup> floor
- Art Deco details now historic in own right
- Gus Constantine?
- Would like more relief/reveal in storefront
- Simplify ground floor

Staff Conditions:

1. Retain vertical recesses on center of front façade.
2. Since the building was constructed in the 1800's, the existing façade is not original and has been altered. Staff hasn't found any photographs of the building before alterations. For this reason, we know the rectangular window is not original. An arched window does seem more appropriate for an art deco façade.
3. Arched window should be recessed into the wall opening, especially since it is the main feature of the façade.
4. Signage to be revised and reviewed separately. As proposed, the logo exceeds the allowable height allowed in the sign band.
5. While lights on storefront design are not vertical, per Charleston tradition and BAR principles, the proportions seem to work with the façade design.
6. Gas sconce light will require encroachment approval. The design of the light is appropriate for the building.
7. After consultation with a preservation profession, clean the existing limestone panels.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual Approval and Board and Staff comments and Final Review By Staff

---

**2. 33 Poinsett Street**

**TMS # 463-12-03-029 | BAR2023-00113**

**NS | North Central | c. 1946 | Historic Materials Demolition Purview**

Request complete demolition of historic structure.

Owner: Orville Hayes & St Julian Pinckney

Applicant: Matthew Sotiroglou

Site visit 5/11/2023 at 8:30 a.m.

DECISION: DECISION

MOTION: Deferral

MADE BY: Van Slambrook SECOND: Huey VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

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

NOTES:

- No applicant present.

Staff comments:

1. The house was sealed which prevented accelerated deterioration.
2. The historic chimney and form are still present.
3. The framing is only exposed at the back corner because of a rotten piece of siding that exposes two framing members.
4. The siding is in good salvageable condition expect for at the rear corner.

1. Character defining features: 2 chimneys still existing
2. Any questions related to ownership of the masonry wall would be a civil matter. The survey shows the masonry wall to be fully on the property of 33 Poinsett. Second, the wall is not visible from the public right-of-way, so BAR does not have purview.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of demolition

---

### 3. 130 Fishburne Street

TMS # 460-04-03-061 | BAR2023-001114

Category 4 | Westside | c. 1915 | Historic Materials Demolition Purview

Request partial demolition of historic structure including second set of front steps and relocation of doors.

Owner: DJ & Lindsay VanSlambrook

Applicant: Julie O'Connor, American Vernacular

Site visit 5/11/2023 at 8:50 a.m.

DECISION: DECISION

MOTION: Approval of all except right hand doors on both floors.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Turner

VOTE: FOR: 3 AGAINST: 1

*Abstain – VanSlambrook*

*Opposed - Wilson*

NOTES:

- No public comment.
- Board Discussion
  - Comfortable with repositioning front doors.
  - Understand logic with eliminating stairs
  - Don't believe stairs (exterior) are original.
  - Not comfortable moving right doors
  - Original configuration, door would be on far right, walk right into interior stairs
  - Stair configuration probably original even if material isn't

Staff Observations:

1. Structure was constructed as a duplex, as was the neighboring building.

Staff comments:

1. The right front door is believed to be in its original location, while the left was recessed. There doesn't seem to be a functional reason outweighing keeping the right door in its original location. The left side entry has been relocated a couple of times, and BAR doesn't have purview at this time of the location of the left door. The second-floor left side door is also not historic.
2. The location of the windows on the side reflected the location of the one of the two duplex stairways. Relocating these is concerning, but the relocation of windows towards the rear is not.
3. Demolishing one of twin the stairways would alter the story of the property. Suggest instead keeping the stair and altering the hardscape to direct guests to the main entry.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of relocation of the right front door, the second-floor right side door, demolition of the stair, and relocation of the two windows close to the front.

Approval for relocation of the windows towards the rear, the relocation of the front left door, and relocation of the second left

---

**4. 34 Percy Street**

**TMS # 460-08-01-072 | BAR2023-001115**

**Category 4 | Cannonborough / Elliottborough | c. 1885 | Old City District**

Request partial demolition of historic structure including rear addition.

Owner: 34 Percy LLC

Applicant: Alison C Dawson, AIA

Site visit 5/11/2023 at 9:10 a.m.

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Approval of partial demolition.

MADE BY: Turner SECOND: Martin VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

- Don't think much original is remaining (addition)

Staff comments:

1. The rear addition has been added onto, made both wider and taller. The original one-story addition is documented from before 1944 and may have been original to the structure. However, it's been altered a great deal
2. Removing the enclosure at the second-floor piazza, the piazza stairs, the piazza concrete slab, the ashlar asphalt shingle siding, and the metal columns will benefit the project.
3. Because of the alternations, the only portion of the original historic addition that is visible is the left side wall foundation, which is not a substantial amount of that original form.
4. Drawing notes indicate the standing seam roof to be repaired and replaced. Applicant to confirm plan for patching this metal roof.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of partial demolition

---

**5. 34 Percy Street**

**TMS # 460-08-01-072 | BAR2023-001116**

**Category 4 | Cannonborough / Elliottborough | c. 1885 | Old City District**

Requesting conceptual approval for alterations to existing structure and new rear addition.

Owner: 34 Percy LLC

Applicant: Alison C Dawson, AIA

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Staff Comments 3, 4(first line only) and Board Comments 1) to eliminate the piazza screen at rear, 2) clarify proposed site plan, green space and mechanical, 3) reduce height of rear bay, 4) develop details as discussed.

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

NOTES:

- PSC – letter in support, suggest lightening roof massing of addition
- Board
  - Agree with PSC about roof massing
  - Encourage additional detailing: transom, railing, internal gutters
  - Clarify proposed green space, now just shows hardscape
  - Location of HVAC
  - Don't think canopy can be salvaged
  - Need to further develop details, etc. railing, gutters, downspout, scuppers
  - Appreciate saving the house
  - Piazza rail height very high
  - Piazza door needs refinement/ addition of sill perhaps
  - Need room for greenspace, narrow driveway, etc.

Staff comments:

1. Increase setback for new rear addition on west elevation, especially at the hyphen.
2. New addition should not be wider than main body of house, proposed extends as far as piazza on east elevation.
3. Revise the proposed piazza screen as this should be differentiated from the new rear addition to prevent creating a false sense of history.
4. Piazza screen door should include a hood. Recommend salvaging the existing hood.
5. Coordinate detailing at piazza screen door with conditions for slab removal.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments.

---

**6. 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 for rear addition.

Owner: Branko Damjanovic

Applicant: Branko Damjanovic

*Previous site visit 4/13/2023 at 8:30 a.m.*

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Approval of demolition.

MADE BY: Turner SECOND: Martin

VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

- No public comment.
- Board Questions:
  - Condition of roof. 5V extended over original house, not just on addition.
  - Round columns replaced with square? Graphic error?
- Board Discussion

- Not sure how much addition contributes in its current condition
- Not sure addition ever contributed to structure due to design/location
- Don't think will be missed

*PREVIOUS MOTION 4.13.23: 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.*

*PREVIOUS Staff Observations 4.13.23:*

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.*

*PREVIOUS Staff Comments 4.13.23:*

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

*PREVIOUS Staff Recommendation 4.13.23: Approval with Staff Comment.*

**Staff Observations:**

1. Structural report was not received in time for posting to the image overview. Received structural report today.
2. Staff research confirms that the addition was built between 1902 and 1928.

**Staff comments:**

1. The addition is historic, and could be over a hundred years of age.
2. While exterior modifications have been made, the addition retains its form.

**Staff Recommendation: Denial of demolition**

## **7. 640 King Street**

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

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

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

Owner: Branko Damjanovic

Applicant: Branko Damjanovic

**DECISION: DEFERRED**

**MOTION: Deferral with Board Conditions and Final Review by Staff.**

**MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Wilson VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0**

**NOTES:**

- No Public Comment
- Board Conditions
  - Clarify proposed site plan
  - Add missing details
  - Confirm retention of round columns

- Restudy location of piazza infill wall between columns
- Drawings sparse for preliminary; no notes or additional information. Additional information is needed before final. No details on roof and no notes on window repairs/replacement.
- No site information provided as requested at conceptual review.

*PREVIOUS MOTION 4.13.23: Conceptual Approval with Staff Comments and Board Comments to 1) bring piazza inboard of columns, 2) provide a comprehensive 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.*

*PREVIOUS Staff Observations 4.13.23:*

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.*

*PREVIOUS Staff Comments 4.13.23:*

1. *Shutters are appropriately sized for window openings and should have corresponding hardware for functioning shutters.*
2. *Staff suggest 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.*

*PREVIOUS Staff Recommendation 4.13.23: Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff Comments.*

Staff Observations:

1. Previous comments have been addressed.

Staff Recommendation: Preliminary Approval with final review by staff

## **8. 16 Murray Boulevard**

**TMS # 457-16-03-006 | BAR2022-001117**

**Not Surveyed | Charlestowne | c. 1997 | Old and Historic District**

**Request to elevate structure 2.8' above DFE and provide parking under structure.**

**Owner: Susan & Chris McHugh**

**Applicant: Thomas & Denzinger Architects**

**DECISION: DEFERRED**

**MOTION: Defer to reduce proposed height by a minimum of 1' and provide site plan/landscaping.**

**MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Wilson VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0**

**NOTES:**

- HCF – no opposition to raising, but not additional height for parking
- PSC – opposed
- Board Questions

- Floor height vs. DFE, depth of floor structure.
- Board Discussion
  - Confused on amount raised
    - Design flood and space for ductwork and floor structure
  - Latitude due to age of structure and zoning height district
  - Would prefer to see landscaping, other design elements to mitigate height change
  - Parking facing side street not as problematic
  - Ways to lower as much as possible
    - Would like to see diagrammatic study of proposal to remedy situation
  - Ways to deal with mechanical
  - Would be more comfortable with DFE + 2', requirement for new
  - Defer to reduced proposed height?
  - Site plan

Staff Observations:

1. Proposal is raising the structure above FEMA requirement.
2. Per BAR elevation guidelines, Garage doors on front elevations are prohibited.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of additional height

---

**9. 1108 King Street**

**TMS # 463-12-03-128 | BAR2023-001118**

**NS | North Central | c. pre-1955 | Historic Corridor District**

Requesting conceptual approval for mural.

Owner: France Bell

Applicant: Margo Keen

**DECISION: APPROVED**

**MOTION:** Approval of mural. Deferral of signage with Staff Comments and to coordinate with Staff.

**MADE BY:** Martin **SECOND:** Huey **VOTE: FOR:** 5 **AGAINST:** 0

**NOTES:**

- Written Comments read into record
- Board Discussion
  - Size – zoning
  - Extraneous information - policy

Staff Observations:

1. Staff cannot find any approval for the previous design.

Staff comments:

1. The text should be reduced to be less than 10% of the facade of the occupied space.
2. If the text is reduced, it can be reviewed as signage and the mosaic design can be reviewed separately as artwork.



3. Remove extraneous information above door.

Staff Recommendation: Denial as submitted

---

### 10. 257 A Rutledge Avenue

TMS # 460-07-04-005 | BAR2021-000466

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

Requesting to change roof material from approved standing seam to 5V.

Owner: Courtney Wegner

Applicant: Erika Harrison

DECISION: DENIED

MOTION: Denial with Board Comment – high quality asphalt shingles would be acceptable.

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

NOTES:

- Board Discussion
  - Concerns about detailing, hipped roof
    - Would prefer shingles to poorly detailed 5V
  - Would have exposed fasteners

Staff Observations:

1. 7.11.22 - Project approval received staff approval.
2. 4.4.23 - Enforcement site inspection, found to be using 5V instead of standing seam.

Staff comments:

1. Material is a downgrade from previously approved standing seam.

Staff Recommendation: Denial

---

### 11. 20 Bennett Street

TMS # 457-03-01-033 | BAR2023-001067

Category 4 | Harleston Village | c. 1940 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for renovation and addition to rear, and to raise existing house.

Owner: Bennett St LLC 20

Applicant: Patrick Orefice, Arwen Studio

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Board Comments, 1) clarify site plan/hardscape elements, 2) change front stair railing to iron, inboard of cheek walls, 3) eliminate “faux” piazza at rear and support cover over stair with brackets and shorten to not extend past back elevation and Final Review by Staff.

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

NOTES:

- Board Discussion
  - Would like bracketing over rear stair roof
  - Stairs to front and coping wall have made a huge difference
  - Gravel will need edging, paved apron. Further develop site plan
  - Front railing.

*PREVIOUS MOTION 3.23.23: Deferral with Staff Comments #1,3,4,7,8 and Board Comments: 1) not to exceed elevation required by FEMA 2) develop site plan 3) consider coping wall at front 4) reduce number of louvers and Board Recommendation that solids parts of foundation be stucco on masonry.*

*PREVIOUS Staff Observations 3.23.23:*

1. *Proposal is subordinate and differentiated from the existing.*

*PREVIOUS Staff comments 3.23.23:*

1. *BAR guidelines on raising historic structures notes that infill should not use horizontal louvers as this is “beachy” in appearance. Infill should be solid stucco or vertical louvers.*
- ~~2. *There is an inconsistency between louver infill and stuccoed emu at stairs.*~~
3. *Stairs should be oriented to the front if possible.*
4. *Proposed doors are not appropriate. Existing doors do not match drawings.*
- ~~5. *Proportions of stucco recess should be restudied, either by adding details or increasing the niche height.*~~
- ~~6. *Rear addition windows should be centered on walls. Currently the windows are too close to corners.*~~
7. *Setback for west elevation should be increased.*
8. *HVAC should be set back behind house.*

*PREVIOUS Staff Recommendation 3.23.23: Deferral for restudy*

Staff Observations:

1. Staff’s previous comment have been addressed.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval with final review by staff

**12. 107 Tradd Street**

**TMS # 457-16-01-004 | BAR2023-001119**

**NS | Charlestowne | c. 1973 | Old and Historic District**

Requesting to change existing stucco on frame to wood siding.

Owner: Jeff & Tina Alvino

Applicant: Beau Clowney Architects

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Final Approval.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Turner VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

- No Public Comment

Staff Observations:

1. Wood siding is a more traditional cladding material.
2. Stucco on frame has extensive deterioration causing damage to the building.

---

**13. 1 East Battery Street**

**TMS # 457-16-04-088 | BAR2023-001120**

**Category 2 | Charlestowne | c. 1850 | Old and Historic District**

Requesting to change material of door surrounds from metal to glass fiber reinforced concrete.

Owner: East Battery LLC

Applicant: Tim Sites, Artis Construction / Glenn Keyes, Architect

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Final Approval.

MADE BY: Huey SECOND: Martin VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 1

*Opposed - Wilson*

NOTES:

- PSC – more information is needed on material
- Board Questions
  - Were other materials considered, other metal
    - Will allow for masonry-to-masonry connection
- Board Discussion
  - Seeing a sample would be nice
  - Can replicate exactly, but will have masonry texture
  - Would prefer to see stay metal, though different metal would be used
  - Pervasive problem in city, would hate to see material disappear from City of Charleston
  - 20 oz lead coated copper would last 100 years. Keep historic details
  - Only because of location/exposure to elements

Staff Observations:

1. Item being reviewed by board because it is rated Category 2

Staff Recommendation: Final approval

---

**14. 10 Limehouse Street**

**TMS # 457-11-04-050 | BAR2023-001121**

**Category 2 | Charlestowne | c. 1859 | Old and Historic District**

Requesting conceptual approval for fenestration alteration to pool house and addition of pergola.

Owner: Meg & Jordan Phillips

Applicant: E E Fava Architects

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Final Approval.

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

NOTES:

- No Public Comment

Staff Observations:

1. Item being reviewed by board only because it is rated Category 2

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval with final review by staff

---

**15. 8 Trumbo Street**

**TMS # 457-12-01-012 | BAR2020-000255**

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

Request second one-year extension, previously approved 6.23.22.

Owner: Glenn Minkin & Marian Scalia

Applicant: Julia F Martin Architects

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Approval.

MADE BY: Van Slambrook SECOND: Huey VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 0  
*Abstain – Martin*

Staff Observations:

1. This is a vested right second year approval extension, requiring automatic Board approval if submitted in a timely manner, which is good for one year and may be renewed three more times in one-year increments, per Ordinance Section 54-962.

Staff Recommendation: Approval

---