



# CITY OF CHARLESTON BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SMALL

---

## MEETING RESULTS

**JUNE 8, 2023**

**4:30 P.M.**

**2 GEORGE STREET**

---

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Van Slambrook (Chair), Bill Huey, Julia Martin, Bill Turner, Fillmore Wilson

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Linda Bennett, Tory Parish (virtually)

---

### A. Minutes

#### 1. Review of Minutes from the May 25, 2023 Meeting

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: To approve with an edit to agenda item #14, 199 Saint Philip Street, as the vote was 4 for and 1 against (Wilson).

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

---

### B. Applications

#### 1. 17 Alberta Avenue

**TMS # 463-11-03-099 | BAR2023-001128**

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

Requesting partial demolition of historic structure including front porch roof.

Owner: Nicholas Lewis Ranko

Applicant: Nicholas Lewis Ranko

**Site visit 6/8/2023 at 8:30 a.m.**

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Approval as submitted

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

#### STAFF CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS:

1. The front door hood is one of the few character-defining features on the structure.
2. The adjacent houses on this side of the block are similar in size, with similar fenestration and similar minimal front entry elements.
3. Houses in the neighborhood feature porches that have been altered over time, including the house directly across the street, as well as larger additive type porches, which may or may not be original.
4. The proposed reuse of the front steps is appreciated.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval for partial demolition to include front door hood and the relocation of the front steps.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Awning appears to be newer construction, not an issue with its removal. Regarding steps, not typical but could make an exception.
- Impressed by info from Sanborn maps which indicate this row of sister houses each with a porch on the west but each filled in over time. Simple but charming façade as-is. Could instead extend the awning and porch.
- Character-defining and consistent with neighboring but understand the desire for a more usable front entry.

---

2. **102½ Spring Street**

**TMS # 460-08-03-185 | BAR2023-001141**

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

Requesting complete demolition of historic structure.

Owner: Darlene P Jackson

Applicant: Darlene P Jackson

**Site visit 6/8/2023 at 8:50 a.m.**

DECISION: DENIED

MOTION: Denial of demolition of historic portion of the building and approval of demolition of the non-historic rear addition.

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

STAFF CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS:

1. The original house on the property addressed as 102 Spring was lost due to fire associated with Hurricane Matthew in 2016 after several years of neglect.
2. The immediate context on the north side of Spring Street, adjacent to the structure, displays change over time and includes the shared vacant lot, a shopping center building, and a townhome style apartment building.
3. Beyond the immediately adjacencies, exist many well-maintained Charleston singles which are intact and grace the south side of this block.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval for demolition based on condition and immediate context.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Addition age? 2008
- What has been done to protect the structure since the fire? Reattaching roofing.
- Lovely little building. Understand its poor condition but believe it's not beyond saving. End of structural report indicates that repairing would result in a higher cost than replacement, but this is not justification for demolition. Concerned about losing it because of fragmented remaining context. Not in favor of demo. Bathroom addition is not critical to keep.

- Agree. Interesting form. Great deal of historic building environment is gone this side of the street. Encourage saving. In rough shape, but most difficult issue is not termite or fire. Not in favor of total demolition but no objection to demo of bath.
- Agree. No issue on addition. Seen far worse get saved. As one of last pieces of history on the block, it's worth saving. Think it can be saved.
- Many valid points related to uniqueness of the building. Context on street would be gone if lost. Agree with other board members.
- Similarly, nearby #9 Rose Lane was in really bad shape and it being restored.

---

### 3. 71 Bull Street

**TMS # 457-03-02-099 | BAR2023-001142**

**NS | Harleston Village | c. 1880 | Old and Historic District**

Requesting partial demolition of historic structure including portions of west wall, roof of one-story portion, and removal of windows on west and east elevations.

Owner: J. Walker Layne, Jr. and Nicole Layne

Applicant: Nicole Dallaire Lee, Beau Clowney Architects

**Site visit 6/8/2023 at 9:10 a.m.**

DECISION: APPROVED/DENIED

MOTION: Denial of demolition of west wall, as proposed, and approval of other alterations as noted in Staff condition #1 for approval with Board comment omitting approval of the second floor piazza window demolition.

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

#### STAFF CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS:

1. The portions of this project which are being reviewed today are the demolition portions. The timeline and logistics for the proposed project require a BAR review prior to zoning. Then, the conceptual design will be reviewed at BAR.
2. The footprint of the structure is historic and nearly original with infill additions over time.

#### STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Demolition or removal of the horizontal window at the east wall does not cause concern. Demolition or removal of the three 1960s multi-pane windows at the west wall, the 1-over-1 window at the west wall, the non-historic porch infill material at the west wall second floor, and the door and steps at the west wall first floor do not cause concern and provide opportunity to clean up the composition of the very visible exterior by cleaning up older modifications.
2. Reuse of the 6-over-6 windows at the rear west wall is a positive, but the western wall is original to the footprint of the house and should be retained. Charleston's preservation standards state that "Additions and alterations to historic properties should be sympathetic to historic features and spatial relationships" and "should be clearly discernible from the old". Revise the demolition proposal to maintain or at minimum articulate the historic form.

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Denial of demolition of west wall, as proposed, and approval of other alterations as noted in Staff condition #1 for approval, incorporating Board comments.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- No issue with the removal of items at west and east with exception of rear 'L' and associated windows. This house has lost much of its form over the years due to the porch infills. The 'L' is about all that's left. It may not be original but it is certainly old enough to have gained significance over time. In favor of all with exception of west wall.
  - Aligned with previous board member and preservation groups. Could not consider demolition. Radically altering the roof line at rear is too much.
  - Agree; ok with all items except opposed to demolition of west wall at rear portion with associated windows and would not support removing the historic window at the second-floor frontward porch at this time. May consider with understanding of future plans.
  - Would consider reviewing demo and conceptual at the same time with approvals contingent on zoning.
- 

**4. 33 Poinsett Street**

**TMS # 463-12-03-029 | BAR2023-001113**

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

Request complete demolition of historic structure.

Owner: Orville Hayes & St Julian Pinckney

Applicant: Matthew Sotiropoulos

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

***Deferred by Applicant***

---

**5. 150 Cannon Street**

**TMS # 460-11-04-133 | BAR2023-001143**

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

Appeal of staff decision, denial of paint color, Duron – Evening Harbor (DCR 066).

Owner: Katie Strumpf & Charles Rackley

Applicant: Charles Rackley

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Approval

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

STAFF ANALYSIS AND CONTEXT:

1. This house is one of three sister houses.
2. The proposed paint color is intense for the streetscape. Ordinance Section 54-239 article d notes, "violent contrasts of materials or colors and intense or lurid colors" as "grounds for considering a design inappropriate and requiring denial or deferral".

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Denial of appeal.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Not concerned over the color, an especially dusty little stretch of Cannon which could benefit from a nice color. Don't find it lurid or violent. Just paint.
  - Tend to agree; it's just paint and is reversible. Almost a deep gray; neutral color.
  - For note, the referenced Gnome Building was not in BAR purview because of age, and therefore wasn't approved by BAR.
  - Appreciate sample, photo depicts the color differently.
- 

## 6. 78 Hagood Avenue

**TMS # 460-02-04-135 | BAR2022-000966**

**Category 4 | Hampton Park Terrace | c. 1917 | Historic Materials Demolition Purview**

Request demolition of portion of existing historic roof.

Owner: Shelia Harvey

Applicant: Joel Adrian, Coastal Creek Design

*Previous site visit 12/8/22 at 9:10 a.m.*

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Approval of removal of the rear portion of roof to extent shown on drawings with applicant's clarification that the rear framed corners of the existing home remain.

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

### STAFF ANALYSIS AND CONTEXT:

1. Roof is visible in entirety.
2. Property is designated as a Contributing Structure in the Hampton Park Terrace National Register District.
3. While the proposal has reduced the amount of roof to be demolished, maintaining the full and visible roof form will maintain and articulate the original structure. A more appropriate addition would extend from underneath the original roof form and intact roof.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Denial

### BOARD COMMENTS:

- Agree that hyphenation would be a more thoughtful approach and would be possible somehow. Regarding extent of our purview and other items we've approved, it is reasonable to approve. Small fraction of original roof and form. Don't want to be too sensitive because it is a nicer (metal) roof.
  - Can't consider anything but demolition and impact of demo request to historic fabric and form; can't consider architecture. A small amount - 32sf. We have approved larger rear portions for demolition for dormers, and this creates a dilemma. Based on proportion of roof and its location, find it difficult based on past decisions to deny this.
  - Poche on floor plan indicates that all of rear wall and rear corners will be removed and rebuilt – the entire back side of the house plus a portion of both sides. (Applicant indicates a graphic error.)
  - Minor portion.
-

**7. 67 Anson Street**

**TMS # 458-01-03-009 | BAR2023-001065**

**Category 2 | Ansonborough | c. 1836 | Old and Historic District**

Request conceptual approval for new addition to north of existing structure and modification of existing wall parapets.

Owner: St. Stephens Episcopal Church

Applicant: Glenn Keyes

**Deferred by Applicant**

**8. 6 Atlantic Street**

**TMS # 457-16-04-074 | BAR2023-001144**

**Category 2 | Charlestowne | c. 1830 | Old and Historic District**

Requesting approval for 6 patress plates to be added to front façade.

Owner: Douglas Balentine

Applicant: Aimee Monteverde

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Final Approval with Board comments not to present a false sense of history with aesthetic of new patress plates and Staff condition #2.

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

STAFF CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS:

1. Project is before the Board because the property is a category 2 on the architectural survey.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Typically, patress plates are placed in the floor system as shown (vertically) but between windows (horizontally). Provide clarity on the proposed placement directly underneath and above the windows or relocate if illustrated incorrectly.
2. Applicant is encouraged to work with Staff on a decorative plate or cover.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Final Approval with Board comments and Staff conditions.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Reasonable solution. Patress plates should not read as if they are 150 years old but should read like current installation. Would refer to engineer for placement.

**9. 265B Coming Street**

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

**New | Cannonborough / Elliottborough | Old City District**

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

Owner: Cameron Glaws

Applicant: Andrew Gould

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Final Approval of the residence and deferral of the site plan for refinement and detail.

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

STAFF CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS:

1. First and second floor framing have been constructed, and a stop work order was placed on June 2. It is understood that the applicant team misunderstood their approvals, as only a foundation permit was conditionally granted for work at this unit.
2. The drawings depict good detailing and quality materials. Additionally, the dormer detailing and porch column/beam arrangement are especially appreciated.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Preliminary Approval with Final Review by Staff of for-permit drawings.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Confusion as to what we are reviewing. Ready to see proposed development of property, but seeing no change. Not seeing a preliminary level site plan or site details. Placing a tree in the gravel parking space is not thought out, and indicating a community garden, but not including any information. Site is not ready.
- Agree; find building ready for final, but completely agree that hardscape and site plan are not ready.
- Needs development, further clarification, and refinement. Site plan must return with hardscape, materials, and maximizing green space.

---

**10. 11 Lowndes Street**

**TMS # 457-11-02-084 | BAR2023-001146**

**NS | Charlestowne | Old and Historic District**

Requesting conceptual approval for new two and a half single family home and renovation of existing historic garage.

Owner: Mitchell and Debra Sonkin

Applicant: Sebastian von Marschall Architect, LLC

as agent for John B. Murray Architects, llc, NYC

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral for massing simplification and revisions to front porch base and associated deferral on finding for architectural merit and context with Staff's comments.

MADE BY: Huey SECOND: Turner VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 0  
(*Julia Martin recuses.*)

STAFF CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS:

1. The massing for the new structure presents a symmetrical three-bay composition to the street with a wing that features additional fenestration. Staff finds this generally appropriate for the streetscape.
2. Access to the garage appears to be well screened from view but Applicant should provide additional views from the street for consideration and confirmation.

3. A recent ordinance amendment (2022-181) allows for two stories over the FEMA/freeboard first story.
4. Interpreting ordinance amendment 2022-181, the main floor is not permitted to be more than the design flood elevation, or in this case, 2' over BFE (for new construction). The extra 10" of height would not be permitted. "Notwithstanding Sec. 54-306 (S), new principal buildings within a VE or AE zone on the Flood Insurance Rate Map may have 2 stories over a first-floor structure that exceeds 6' in height, provided the first-floor elevation does not exceed the elevation required to meet FEMA and City freeboard requirements." However, zoning staff indicate that 10" could be considered in the realm of being at FEMA plus freeboard in order to give cushion to the requirement.
5. Per Ordinance section 54-306.A article 2, "The Board of Architectural Review may permit an additional half story...based on architectural merit and context". Therefore, a finding of architectural merit and context is required for the half story at the top.
6. Ordinance section 54-306 explains that " 'architectural merit' means a project reflects exemplary architectural and urban design, utilizes the highest level of materials and finishes, and contributes to the public realm, as outlined in the Board of Architectural Review Principles."

#### STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. The piers at grade level under the front porch lean a bit coastal rather than the property's context of downtown Charleston. More substantial piers or a more solid foundation wall would improve the elevation, especially since the windows at this level behind the piers are for a basement. Revise.
2. It is understood that the design flood elevation is two feet over the base flood elevation for new construction. The proposed places the first floor an additional 10 inches over DFE, and this should be reduced.
3. Alterations to the historic garage to add a rooftop monitor and glazing panels do not cause concern and will be minimally visible after construction of the house.
4. There are three different types of dormer projections through the hipped roof. Restudy to reduce the number of or to bring consistency to these forms.

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Deferral for massing simplification at roof and revisions to front porch base and associated deferral on finding for architectural merit and context.

#### BOARD COMMENTS:

- Nicely detailed house but the surrounding context is mostly simple colonials with some other styles mixed in. Proposal is too busy for the context; would like to see an overall simplification. Agree with staff comments regarding dormers and consistency. Concern with front configuration and how steps cut into porch would like to see pulled out and not under porch. Would rather see more organized rather than pulled out. Space below the front porch is typically for access or purpose so introducing a door, secondary type, might help. Or close it more, but needs study. Site plan development is also needed, especially at the front. Will be the largest structure in the immediate area and it's at a disadvantage because several streets come together here making for a large open space and much visibility. Am concerned with the height, scale, and mass.
- Good comments. The design has elements that go to higher sense of detail formality and other elements that just don't; an inconsistency in the detailing, almost a juxtaposition. Problematic that it is proposed with an extra ten niches, but



it is the overall massing that is troubling. May simply be roof form or detailing and articulation. Generally, the plan works on site, though it takes up all that it can. Massing needs to correspond to the site in a better way. Overly aggressive site plan is reflected in overly aggressive massing. Refinement in massing and consistency of detailing needed.

- Agree; detailing of house seems to be inconsistent and coming from many directions. Roof form needs simplification particularly in dormer types. Can come down some.

---

### 11. 42 Charlotte Street

**TMS # 459-13-01-174 | BAR2023-001147**

**New | Mazyck-Wraggborough | Old and Historic District**

Requesting conceptual approval for conservatory addition and preliminary approval for cupola for new duplex.

Owner: BAHive, LLC  
Applicant: John Paul Huguley

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Conceptual Approval for cupola and conservatory with Final Review by Staff and appreciate Applicant's willingness to cooperate with neighbor.

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

#### STAFF CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS:

1. Staff has worked with Applicant on final approval of the main structure. This was granted in August 2022 and did not include the conservatory or cupola, as these were deferred for study and a later review by the Board. Applicant has returned for review of these items.
2. Staff has reviewed with the Applicant massing studies of the proposed cupola.
3. Cupola roof shape is appropriate for the design of the structure.
4. Visibility of the cupola is limited to minimal.
5. The conservatory has been simplified. While elegant, it doesn't compete with the primary structure now.
6. The correct position of the cupola is per the north and south elevations with the window panel fully above the roof ridge.

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Conceptual Approval for Cupola and Conservatory.

#### BOARD COMMENTS:

- Sizing of cupola is very appropriate; proportioned and detailed well. Love the idea of functionality of it. Conservatory is handsome and is much more modest than previous version.

---

### 12. 66 South Street

**TMS # 459-09-03-049 | BAR2023-001148**

**Category 4 | East Side | c. 1885 | Old City District**

Requesting conceptual approval for rear two-story addition.

Owner: Colin Bumby

Applicant: John Douglas Tucker, architect  
**Withdrawn by Applicant**

---

**13. 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: APPROVED

MOTION: Preliminary Approval with Final Review by Staff of for-permit drawings with Staff's comments and conditions and a Board comment that the standing seam metal roof on front porch be historic dimensions.

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

STAFF CONTEXT AND ANALYSIS:

1. The application appears to address all previous Board and Staff concerns from the April 13 meeting.
2. Rear addition is visible from Bogard Street and Septima Clark Parkway.
3. The masonry wall is made to be more solid than previous. However, the height is reduced between the piers. Therefore overall, there is little change.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Thicken the columns at the proposed rear porch Elevation tags after #37 were left off the pages. In conjunction, provide piers beneath the porch floors for these.
2. For final, provide cut sheets and information for the replacement picture window, new windows, and hardscape pavers.
3. Add note to indicate roof pitch on the return portion at the gable end, page 26. This should be minimal, such as 3:12; or confirm through photographs.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Preliminary Approval with Final Review by Staff of for-permit drawings.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Satisfied with changes made. Agree with staff comments.
  - Front porch roof is labeled with a more commercial type dimension and of more historic style.
  - Standing seam metal roof on porch should conform to historic dimensions.
- 

**14. 102 Rutledge Avenue**

**TMS # 457-03-02-115 | BAR2023-001149**

**NS | Harleston Village | c. 1940 | Old and Historic District**

Requesting conceptual approval of dormer addition, exterior stairs, and extension of roof.

Owner: Ed Berlin

Applicant: Neil Stevenson

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral related to massing and to provide additional information.  
With staff comments and Board comment to restudy spiral stair

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

STAFF CONDITIONS IF APPROVED:

1. Revise the dormer to be narrower in order to prevent altering the roof slope at the existing front-facing roof plane and to not overwhelm the existing massing.
2. The existing roof slope appears to be 8:12 consistently with the proposed revision to the front hipped roof plane to 12:12. It is possible that the dormer may screen dissimilar roof slopes. However, Staff does not support this alternation, and additional modeling would be needed for study. Omit the change to the roof slope at the front roof plane, as this plane would be inconsistent with the remainder of the house. In addition, provide roof slope information and roof material for future review. Last, the slope at the porch roof planes are consistent with each other rather than dissimilar, as drawn. Update drawings to reflect.
3. While materials are finalized at preliminary, they do provide information on the general architectural direction. The renderings depict brick on the dormers. The elevations do not label proposed materials. Applicant to describe exterior of proposed dormers, including window type. Windows on house appear to be double-hung rather than casements as drawn. Please confirm for Board's understanding of overall composition.
4. Concern exists over necessary alterations to the chimney due to the presence of the proposed addition. Provide clarity on any building code implications to the appearance and height of the chimney due to the proposed roof slope change and addition.
5. The roof form extension at the rear of the house appears to be original. Altering this form in such a way goes against Charleston's preservation standards which states that "Additions and alterations to historic properties should be sympathetic to historic features and spatial relationships" and "should be clearly discernible from the old". Revise any addition at the rear to adhere to these standards.
6. Applicant to confirm existing roof material, if proposal is to remove all roof material, and proposed replacement materials.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Deferral related to massing and to provide additional information.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Stair well appears to be 8 feet in diameter. Is protruding past the side of the house. Not sure one can be manufactured this size. Smaller would pull it behind the house.
- Graphic hatches on roof hatches vary – what is intent? What is siding material for dormers? What is intention for roof of dormers.

---

Motion to adjourn by Bill Huey; seconded by Filmore Wilson. (7:46pm)

---