



CITY OF CHARLESTON BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SMALL

MEETING RESULTS

SEPTEMBER 28, 2023

4:30 P.M.

2 GEORGE STREET

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Wilson, Martin, Huey, Altman, Turner

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Frankie Pinto, Tory Parish

A. Minutes

1. Review of Minutes from the September 14, 2023 Meeting

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Approve

MADE BY: Turner SECOND: Huey VOTE: FOR: 3 AGAINST: 0
Recused: Martin and Altman

B. Applications

1. 1179 King Street

TMS # 463-08-03-046 | BAR2023-001222

NS | North Central | c. 1938 | Historic Corridor District

Request demolition of chimney.

Owner: Jerome Prezzy

Applicant: Jerome Prezzy

Site visit on 9/28/2023 at 8:30 a.m.

DECISION: DENIED

MOTION: Denial of demolition of chimney

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

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. Previously reviewed for new rear accessory structure.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. This uniquely constructed chimney is a, if not the most important, character-defining feature of this structure and should be repaired and retained.
2. However, the opportunity for the owner to propose and construct a porch could make the house function better.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of demolition.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- No public comment

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Only character defining feature, would hate to see go
- Water can be dealt with by a cricket, gutters, diverter
- Very unique chimney
- May be a way to keep chimney and add cover
- Cover over porch would make house more livable
- Chimney not contributing to quality of life

2. 59 Smith Street

TMS # 457-03-02-105 | BAR2023-001223

Category 3 | Harleston Village | c. 1818 | Old and Historic District

Request demolition of one-story, rear porch infill and one-story porch on historic house; and demolition of two-story addition to the carriage house.

Owner: Melissa Linton

Applicant: Neil Stevenson

Site visit on 9/28/2023 at 8:50 a.m.

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Approval of demolition of addition to kitchen house. Denial of demolition of main house with exception of stairs

MADE BY: Turner SECOND: Altman VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 0
Recused: Martin

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. The rear-wrapping piazza and infill on the primary building dates back to the earliest that this 1818 structure appears on Sanborn maps, 1902. The age of the rear portion is questionable though.
2. Water damage caused by current configuration.
3. The addition on the kitchen house appears after the 1955 Sanborn and may be dated to the 1960s.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Applicant to confirm what window changes are proposed on the south elevation and if this will require demolition into the walls. Demolition of a window and demolition for two wall openings appears in the drawings and are assumed to be part of the upcoming conceptual design submittal as well as alterations to a ground floor entry in the north side. The proposed window arrangement would improve the composition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial for demolition

BOARD QUESTIONS:

- Will there be window changes
 - Move door
 - Want to reuse window on infill
 - On kitchen want to reopen window, turn doors into windows
- Sheet 2.07/1.14 window changes south elevation
 - Previous change, remove one, reopen two
- Evolution of porch shown in Sanborns

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Written comment, opposed, read into record
- Phil Dufford, neighbor
 - Sanborns / piazzas
 - Opposed, too aggressive, heavy handed
- HCF
 - Important 1818 building, remarkably intact
 - Concerns about proposal
 - 1964 revisions not shared in submittal
 - Recommend denial, not opposed to removal of unoriginal rear stair
- PSC
 - Not concerned with kitchen house addition
 - No information on DaCosta alterations
 - Need clear documentation
 - Suggestions regarding hyphen

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

- Have to be compromises for modern day living
- Need handicap access to first and second floor, owner in wheelchair
- Elevator would have to go in historic house
- Proposal not out of character with rest of neighborhood

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Kitchen meets 50 year age for historic
- DaCosta involvement, but alterations interrupt true form, no issue
- Maybe “L” form grows to be two stories for alterations
- Current proposal too heavy handed
- Elevator in hallway as hyphen addition
- More information needed. Sanborns might be showing one story over base, but that doesn’t match adjacent house record
- No issue with 1960s addition to kitchen

3. 59 Smith Street

TMS # 457-03-02-105 | BAR2023-001224

Category 3 | Harleston Village | c. 1818 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for new rear addition and new rear ADU.

Owner: Melissa Linton
Applicant: Neil Stevenson

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: Denial of height, scale, and mass. Deferral for architectural direction with staff conditions

MADE BY: Huey SECOND: Altman VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 0
Recused: Martin

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

(all staff comments read at meeting, only those related to ADU are applicable)

1. While it utilizes a flat roof, the roof of the proposed addition appears to be as tall as the top plate of the historic 1818 house and therefore does not appear to be subordinate. Additionally, it is not recessed from the south façade, and it actually extends beyond the width of the historic house at the south. Restudy the height and mass.
2. The proposed accessory building is not subservient to the historic kitchen house. Restudy the height and mass.
3. Window, materials, and proportions of elements are difficult to determine based off the submitted drawings which appear to be scans of documents.
4. Applicant to describe that ground floor of the proposed accessory structure. Is it solid walls? Openings do not appear on the elevations.
5. Provide east (street-facing) elevation of the proposed accessory structure.
6. Staff strongly recommends providing imagery of the proposed accessory structure from the public right-of-way with the historic house and kitchen house for context from the north and south viewsheds against the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial for height, scale, mass; Deferral for architectural direction until more clearly understood.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- PSC
 - Concern about amount of massing
 - Design highly incompatible, should be subordinate, not detract from historic
 - Request denial
- David Hoffman, Pitt Street
 - Very pure street
 - Proposed is out of scale, not sympathetic
 - Adjacent has easement, will always be open
 - Doesn't fit site
- Neighbor, 57 Smith
 - Huge addition, takes up most of yard
 - Street hasn't been radically altered
- HCF
 - Scale should be reduced in deference to historic
 - Would be helpful to include BFE
 - BAR typically does not approve raising additionally for parking beneath
 - Request denial

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

- Details main house, trying to show as addition
- Will restudy

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Property is in flood zone AE(11), survey says elevation is 8.3'
- Missing east and west elevations of ADU
- Agree with comments on massing, can lower ground floor to required for flood zone
- Heavy handed addition
- ADU needs to come down to DFE. Ideally would come down to height of kitchen house
- ADU currently overwhelms, leaves kitchen house in a hole
- Drawings are minimal, general architectural direction is hard to determine

4. 15 Hampden Court

TMS # 459-09-02-063 | BAR2023-001225

New | East Side | Old City District

Request conceptual approval for new single-family residence.

Owner: Carlos Cardona

Applicant: Carlos Cardona

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral with staff conditions 1, 3, 4, & 5 and Board conditions 1 & 2

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

BOARD CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

- Provide streetscape
- Improve relationship to street

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Front elevation shows good vertical proportions and is a nice composition. However, the floor-to-floor dimensions do not mathematically match the finished floor elevations. Correct these so that Board can understand the accurate proportions of the proposal. These do affect the overall massing.
2. House should be pulled forward to match context of the street.
3. Provide access to front porch from street. All other houses in the context have a piazza door at the sidewalk.
4. The mix of hip roofing on the back and a gable at the front is odd. Applicant is encouraged to study an all gable roof for consistency and context. As a reminder the rear of the proposal will be visible because of the parking lot behind the property.
5. For preliminary, omit the 1x4 trim piece below the window on the elevations and window detail. The window should sit directly on the sill.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral for corrections to understand floor-to-floor proportions

BOARD QUESTIONS:

- Windows casement or double hung
 - Casement, Anderson

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Christina Butler, 6 Hampden
 - Happy there will be house in empty lot
 - Appreciate off street parking
 - House is smaller than it could be
- HCF
 - Doesn't fit character or streetscape
 - Pull forward to align with neighbors
 - Request deferral
- PCS
 - Doesn't meet requirements, no streetscape provided
 - Suggest pulling to street edge, more inline with neighbors

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

- Difficult to provide parking without creating shotgun house

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Missing information
- If porch was deeper and stairs came down in front it might balance better
- Should engage street better
- Maybe pursue side setback variance
- Need streetscape
- Agree with staff about roof, study all gable
- Right side windows uncomfortable, elevate fenestration
- Height, scale, mass good direction, resolution/refinement of details needs to happen
- Appreciate proposing 5/8" hardie
- Need true representation of detailing
- Relocate stair to front, elongate driveway mathematically closer to street

5. 4 Trumbo Street

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

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

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

Owner: Charleston & Erica Missel

Applicant: Chatauk Studio, Jeremy Kruska

DECISION: DEFERRED BY APPLICANT

6. 161 Tradd Street

TMS # 457-11-04-029 | BAR2023-001227

Category 3 | Charlestowne | c. 1870 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for fenestration alterations and rear addition.

Owner: Ross Miller and Jennifer Hoffman

Applicant: Sebastian von Marschall Architect, LLC

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Conceptual approval with final review by staff of permit documents

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

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. Staff appreciate the simplified, setback design of the addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Conceptual approval with final review by staff of permit drawings

BOARD QUESTIONS:

- East elevation shutters not on all windows
- Drafting error, three new windows, the headers drop

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- (3) written comments in support, read into record
- (1) written comment in opposition, received after deadline

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Appreciate good drawings
- Minor detail, the lock detail on shutters should be on inside
- Run roof detail, pull in to address

7. 1 Trapman Street

TMS # 457-12-01-025 | BAR2023-001201

Category 3 | Harleston Village | c. 1855 | Old and Historic District

Request demolition of rear addition.

Owner: Allie & Joe Brittain

Applicant: AJ Architects

Previous site visit on 8/24/2023 at 8:50 a.m.

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Approval of demolition

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

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. Existing addition is blocking features of historic house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- PSC
 - Can accomplish goals while retaining historic addition

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

- Received variance for setbacks
- Issue is how it relates to rear, would have to change relationship to floors

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Unusual form, fun
- Keep form, have tall ceiling
- Blocks back of main house
- Just because it is old doesn't mean it is good
- There should be cricket between house and addition

8. 1 Trapman Street

TMS # 457-12-01-025 | BAR2023-001214

Category 3 | Harleston Village | c. 1855 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for rear addition.

Owner: Allie & Joe Brittain

Applicant: AJ Architects

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Conceptual approval with Board condition and final review by staff

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

BOARD CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

- Restudy dormers

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. The proposed addition includes a gable placed unevenly over the structure. Staff recommends the gable be placed evenly through the addition may not be seen in its entirety. However, if the roof remains as proposed, the dormers should not be placed beyond the exterior wall beneath them.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Conceptual approval with staff conditions and final review by staff of permit documents

BOARD QUESTIONS:

- Drainage of mechanical, not resolved. Some kind of scupper

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- PSC
 - Tall blank wall, heavy roof, oversized dormers should be restudied
 - Use more traditional forms

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

- Lowered eave to address blank wall
- Can push dormers back

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Clever solution to difficult problem
- Scale of windows, should be narrower
- Eyebrow house solution, break blank wall
- Wall and dormers not very visible
- Dormers in relation to eave look heavy
- No issue with asymmetrical roof
- Dormers heavy, better if didn't come past plane of wall
- Appreciate stucco on CMU
- May be a compromise with dormers

9. 74 Radcliffe Street

TMS # 460-12-03-068 | BAR2023-001228

New | Radcliffeborough | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for new single-family residence.

Owner: Rachel & Lucas Boyd

Applicant: Rachel & Lucas Boyd

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Conceptual approval with final review by staff of permit documents

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

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. Front elevation depicts graceful vertical proportions with interesting brick detailing.
2. Transition from taller 76 & 78 Radcliffe to shorter 70 & 72 Radcliffe.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Restudy front window/doors., and consider adding a grid or detailing.
2. A Charleston tradition is the adaptation of buildings to its climate which has established the City's aesthetic identity and enhanced the sustainability of its building stock. A means of achieving this principle may be by the use of shade fenestration facing south and west, with elements such as roof overhangs, arcades, porches, awnings, loggias, balconies and piazzas.
3. Recommend that the dormer be on the west side to match the location on the adjacent building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Conceptual approval with staff conditions and final review by staff of permit documents

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- HCF
 - In support
- PSC
 - In support, creative interpretation

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

- Contemporary house, grid won't add anything
- No room for shade element, unnecessary with modern materials
- Dormer can't be moved

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Appreciate mitigating height with planters and window placement
- Appreciate good drawings
- Good details
- Façade will weather heavily without overhang or gutters

10. 263 Coming Street

TMS # 460-08-01-051 | BAR2023-001229

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

Request conceptual approval for new single-family residence at rear.

Owner: Bob Hines

Applicant: John Douglas Tucker, architect

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral for restudy of height, scale, and mass

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

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. Partially visible from Coming Street and from Line Street. Highly visible from Percy Street.
2. Differentiated from existing house.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Not subordinate to existing house.
 - a. Reduce overall height, maybe restudy as 2 ½ story.
 - b. Wider than existing house, reduce width
2. Staff suggest studying other cladding material than brick veneer.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral for restudy

BOARD QUESTIONS:

- Any thoughts on mechanical
- Fence/gate create issue with parking for 265B Coming

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- PSC
 - Respect Charleston development patterns
 - Not subordinate
 - Request denial
- HCF
 - Not subordinate, taller and wider
 - Interesting, has potential
 - Request deferral
- Cameron Glaws, 265B Coming & 34 Percy
 - Working out parking issue
 - From perspective can't see
 - Height, scale, mass is diminutive to 265B Coming
 - Porches not intrusive
 - Creative design, no issue with massing
- Bob Hines, owner
 - Neighboring house is more dominate than existing
 - Homage to carriage house
 - Prefer brick, but if that makes it too dominate can consider other materials
 - Not trying to build a big house, but can't make any smaller

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Perspective view would really help, right now is too tall and wide
 - Reads wider than 265B Coming currently
 - Issues is height, scale, and mass; not architectural direction
 - Concern about visibility from Percy
 - Studio space at base is causing the issue
 - Appreciate design, corporation of neighbors regarding parking
 - Typically want height more in line with cornice
 - Some concession of height needed, maybe not full floor redacted
 - Consider staff comment regarding 2 ½ story
 - Willing to look at height differently, with 265B
 - Houses in this group read as stand along, this reads as ancillary building
 - No objection to contemporary, but needs to take cues from historic, modern interpretation. Ways to ameliorate
 - Can't judge architectural direction until height, scale, and mass resolved
-

**11. 73 Spring Street (105 Smalls Alley) BAR2020-000240 (1 Smalls Alley - Commercial)
TMS # 460-08-03-056 | BAR2023-001230**

New | Cannonborough/Elliottborough | Old City District

Request conceptual/preliminary/final approval for new construction of two-story commercial building at rear of 73 Spring Street.

Previous final approval from 07.08.2020

Owner: Historic Smalls Alley
Applicant: John Douglas Tucker, architect

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Final approval

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

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. This item was previously approved by the Board and granted final review by staff. The final review by staff was approved 7/8/20 and was extended 6/9/22 which has since expired.
2. Since this is the previously approved project, staff have no additional comments.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Final approval

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- No public comment

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Items 11 – 14 approved by one motion

**12. 73 Spring Street (109 Smalls Alley) BAR2020-000240 (3 Smalls Alley)
TMS # 460-08-03-056 | BAR2023-001231**

New | Cannonborough/Elliottborough | Old City District

Request conceptual/preliminary/final approval for new construction of three-story dwelling at rear of 73 Spring Street.

Previous final approval from 007.08.2020.

Owner: Historic Smalls Alley
Applicant: John Douglas Tucker, architect

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Final approval

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

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. This item was previously approved by the Board and granted final review by staff. The final review by staff was approved 7/8/20 and was extended 6/9/22 which has since expired.
2. Since this is the previously approved project, staff have no additional comments.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Final approval

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- No public comment

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Items 11 – 14 approved by one motion
-

13. 73 Spring Street (110 Smalls Alley) BAR2020-000240 (2 Smalls Alley)

TMS # 460-08-03-056 | BAR2023-001232

New | Cannonborough/Elliottborough | Old City District

Request conceptual/preliminary/final approval for new construction of three-story dwelling at rear of 73 Spring Street.

Previous final approval from 07.08.2020.

Owner: Historic Smalls Alley

Applicant: John Douglas Tucker, architect

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Final approval

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

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. This item was previously approved by the Board and granted final review by staff. The final review by staff was approved 7/8/20 and was extended 6/9/22 which has since expired.
2. Since this is the previously approved project, staff have no additional comments.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Final approval

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- No public comment

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Items 11 – 14 approved by one motion
-

14. 73 Spring Street (95 Lewis Court) BAR2020-000240 (1 Lewis Court)

TMS # 460-08-03-056 | BAR2023-001233

New | Cannonborough/Elliottborough | Old City District

Request conceptual/preliminary/final approval for new construction of two-story dwelling at rear of 73 Spring Street.

Previous final approval from 07.08.2020.

Owner: Historic Smalls Alley

Applicant: John Douglas Tucker, architect

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Final approval

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

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. This item was previously approved by the Board and granted final review by staff. The final review by staff was approved 7/8/20 and was extended 6/9/22 which has since expired.
2. Since this is the previously approved project, staff have no additional comments.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Final approval

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- No public comment

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Items 11 – 14 approved by one motion

15. 27 Elliott Street

TMS # 458-09-03-192 | BAR2023-001234

NS | Charlestowne | c. 1940 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for second floor addition.

Owner: Sally & Brian Dougherty

Applicant: Laura F. Altman, LFA Architecture

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: MOTION: Conceptual approval with Board condition and final review by staff

MADE BY: Huey SECOND: Martin VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 0
Recused: Altman

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. Received special exception from Zoning 9/5/23.
2. Slightly visible from Bedons Alley (until 15 Bedons is completed).

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Differentiate siding from previous addition, slightly. This could be a different reveal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Conceptual approval with staff conditions and final review by staff of permit documents

BOARD QUESTIONS:

- Floor to ceiling height
- Was previous addition BAR approved
- Drainage, new roof
- New parapet needed?
 - Studied gable, not shed

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Written comment read into record
 - PSC – opposed
 - (3) neighbors – in favor

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Ceiling is as low as possible
- Really low slope with out parapet could be studied
- Roof options discussed
- Band instead of parapet
- TPO 1/4:12

16. Discussion of Rules and Procedure of the Board of Architectural Review related to meeting schedules.

Information session only, no vote taken.

Motion to adjourn by Huey; seconded by Turner. (p.m.)
