

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: GLEN GARDNER, BILL HUEY, JULIA MARTIN, LINDSAY VANSLAMBROOK, FILLMORE WILSON.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: KIM HLAVIN, LINDA BENNETT



RESULTS

**BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-SMALL**

January 14, 2021

4:30 P.M.

“virtually via ZoomWebinar”

1. **5 Cedar Street - - TMS # 460-01-01-061** **APP. NO. 2101-14-1**

Requesting conceptual approval for additional height. (2.5 story height district)  
Not rated (East Central) New Construction Historic Materials  
Demo District Owner: Chamberlain Chestnut  
Applicant: Chamberlain Chestnut

DEFERRED BY STAFF

2. **23 Reid Street - - TMS # 459-09-03-030** **APP. NO. 2101-14-2**

Requesting conceptual approval for new construction of a single-family residence including additional floor-to-floor height.  
(East Side) New Construction Old City District  
Owner: Dawn Limberg  
Applicant: Clay Shackelford Architect

**MOTION: Denial for height, scale, mass, and for general architectural direction per staff comments and board comment to restudy the false sense of addition.**

**MADE BY: MARTIN SECOND: WILSON VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0**

Staff Comments:

1. Various elements in the zoning ordinance ensure proper and traditional proportions for building design. One of these measures is a height-to-width ratio of 2:1 in order to keep vertical and urban street rhythm. The proposal has a height-to-width ratio that out of scale with this requirement and should be adjusted.
2. Adding a masonry bay at the front of the piazza screen and including it as part of the masonry façade could improve the exaggerated proportions. Please restudy.
3. Staff do not support the additional height request, and there are no extenuating circumstances that would justify that request. Additionally, the reduction of height could help mitigate the proportion imbalance.
4. Disengage the rear third story roof massing from the roofline in order to read the full piazza.
5. The column orders are out of scale; the ground floor reads too thin, second floor too tall. The third floor is appropriate.
6. Reduce the front gable window to a 6-light single window.
7. Eliminate pediment on west elevation.
8. The garage door is inappropriate on the street. Garage doors on front elevations are prohibited as stated in the City of Charleston’s Design Guidelines for Elevating Historic Buildings, which also applies to new buildings.

Staff Recommendation: Denial for height, scale, massing, and general architectural direction.

3. **357 Grove Street - - TMS # 463-13-04-011** **APP. NO. 2101-14-3**

Requesting final approval for the removal of historic windows.

Category 4 (Wagner Terrace) c. 1947 Historic Materials Demo

District

Owner: Jill Montgomery  
Applicant: Jill Montgomery

**MOTION: Final approval for demolition of porch enclosure windows, and denial of demolition of house windows.**

**MADE BY: MARTIN SECOND: VANSLAMBROOK VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0**

Staff Comments:

1. This main body of the house has original or near-original wood windows that should be retained.
2. The porch was enclosed and windows were added prior to the survey in 2005, and can be replaced as they are not of original craftsmanship or era.

Staff Recommendation: Final approval of demolition of porch enclosure windows, denial of demolition of house windows.

---

4. **9 Marbel Lane - - TMS # 460-12-03-176** **APP. NO. 2101-14-4**

Requesting conceptual approval for modifications including enclosure of terrace, wholesale stucco removal and replacement with artisan cementitious siding.

Not rated (Radcliffeborough) c. 2007 Old City District

Owner: Casey Williams  
Applicant: David Rann

**MOTION: Conceptual approval with final review by staff, and board condition to differentiate siding or siding exposure at the volumes.**

**MADE BY: MARTIN SECOND: HUEY VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0**

Staff Comments:

1. The building should be differentiated from the surrounding neighbors, as originally designed and is successful as such. To enclose the porch and add a second story would duplicate designs of two of the neighbors and this quirky porch and distinction should be retained.
2. Although stucco is a preferred material it, a shiplap siding with a smooth finish would be a suitable alternative.

Staff Recommendation: Denial for enclosure and addition, approval for shiplap siding per staff comments and final review by staff.

---

5. **257 St. Philip Street - - TMS # 460-08-02-127** **APP. NO. 2101-14-5**

Requesting conceptual approval for new construction of a single-family residence.

(Cannonborough/Elliottborough) New Construction Old City District

Owner: Hunter Schimpf  
Applicant: AJ Architects

**MOTION: Conceptual approval with staff comments and final review by staff.**

**MADE BY: MARTIN SECOND: VANSLAMBROOK VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0**

Staff Comments:

1. The applicant followed BAR directive, and the proportions of the building have improved.
2. Windows still seem large, with shutters colliding. Not all windows need to meet egress; the porch might be utilized to have more traditional window sizes on the front.
3. Add dimensions to the drawings in the future, per submittal requirements.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual Approval with staff comments and final review by staff.

---

**6. 259 St. Philip Street - - TMS # 460-08-02-078 APP. NO. 2101-14-6**

Requesting conceptual approval for new construction of a single-family residence.  
(Cannonborough/Elliottborough) New Construction Old City District  
Owner: CKC Properties, LLC  
Applicant: AJ Architects

**MOTION: CA with staff comment 2, and Board comments to refine iron work design, to restudy differentiation of volumes, and clarify details at intersection of volumes**

**MADE BY: MARTIN SECOND: VANSLAMBROOK VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0**

Staff Comments:

1. The massing and volumes are overly complicated and should be simplified. They should relate and complement each other; specifically the north, east, and west elevations.
2. The roofline colliding into primary volume will cause awkward flashing detail.
3. Expressive ironwork calls for simplified walls.
4. Restudy the massing of the east elevation; volumetrically it reads as two rocket houses.
5. The height and scale is typical and appropriate for a street corner in a residential neighborhood.

Staff Recommendation: Denial for general architectural direction and massing, and staff comments noted.

---

**7. 11 Gadsden Street - - TMS # 457-03-03-078 APP. NO. 2101-14-7**

Requesting preliminary approval for the elevation of house 5'8" to meet FEMA requirements.  
Not Rated (Harleston Village) c.1941 Old and Historic District  
Owner: Laurie Kramer  
Applicant: Simons Young + Associates

**MOTION: Preliminary approval with staff comments and final review by staff.**

**MADE BY: HUEY SECOND: MARTIN VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0**

Staff Comments:

1. The rear addition expression has improved, although the fenestration would benefit from simplification and restudy of proportions.
2. The detailing on the front stair is one of the elements that will make this design successful or not—stair should be widened to the full bay.
3. Precedent examples of foundation work is helpful and we appreciate the extra research.

Staff Recommendation: Preliminary approval with staff comments and final review by staff

---

**8. 182 Tradd Street - - TMS # 457-07-04-019 APP. NO. 2101-14-8**

Requesting conceptual approval for modifications to rear including the installation of deck with shed roof, double glass doors with glass surround, chimney, and stairs.

Category 4 (Charlestowne) c. 1920 Old and Historic District

Owner: Gordon Maner  
Applicant: George Zourzoukis

**MOTION: Denial of rear deck for general architectural direction and deferral of front railing for restudy, with staff comments noted.**

**MADE BY: WILSON SECOND: HUEY VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0**

Staff Comments:

1. The proposal seems overwhelming and very suburban in nature; with the shed roof connecting to a stunted chimney and a large deck.
2. The railings do not respect the house, and should be simplified.
3. The openings should be a more modest, single entry door without additional glazing.

Staff Recommendation: Denial for General Architectural Direction, with staff comments noted.

---

**9. 44 Legare Street - - TMS # 457-12-04-093 APP. NO. 2101-14-9**

Requesting final approval for new vehicular iron gate and hardscaping.

Category 3 (Charlestowne) c. 1865 Old and Historic District

Owner: James and Laura Barnhart  
Applicant: Ables Landscapes

**MOTION: Approval of hardscape proposed, and denial of the gate for general architectural direction, and staff comments noted.**

**MADE BY: MARTIN SECOND: WILSON VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0**

Staff Comments:

1. The immediate context of the street is simple iron picket gates on brick or stucco coping walls.
2. The proposed gates are massive, and the weight of each leaf will likely require a welded steel tube frame to support it, which will alter the aesthetic.
3. Redesign the proposal to be more in keeping with the surrounding context, with more traditional proportions.
4. Future submittals should include a street elevation.

Staff Recommendation: Denial for general architectural direction, and staff comments noted.

---

**BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-SMALL**

January 14, 2021

Page | 5

**10. 43 -- 47 Broad Street -- TMS # 458-09-03-325 APP. NO. 2101-14-10**

Requesting conceptual approval of new louvered screening at roof to conceal existing mechanical system.

Category 2 (Charlestowne) c. 1855 Old and Historic District  
Owner: Vanderking 43 Broad, LLC  
Applicant: JFM Architects

**MOTION: Deferral with requirement of mock-up for Board review.**



**MADE BY: HUEY SECOND: VANSLAMBROOK VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0  
JM Recused.**

Staff Comments:

1. In general, screening is appropriate and requested to screen mechanical units.
2. Utmost care should be taken on this Category 2 building to ensure that it is the least visible location.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval with final review by staff.

---

	01-20-2021
Vice-Chairman, Glen Gardner	Date
	1-20-2021
BAR-S Administrator, Kim Hlavin	Date