

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: BILL HUEY, FILLMORE WILSON, EDDIE BELLO, EDDIE FAVA
STAFF PRESENT: FRANKIE PINTO, TORY PARISH



AGENDA
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-SMALL

February 10, 2022 4:30 P.M. "virtually via Zoom Webinar"

1. **Vote on temporary Chairperson**

MOTION: Bill Huey

MADE BY: FAVA SECOND: BELLO VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0

2. **8 Larnes Street - - TMS # 460-07-02-185** **BAR2022-000715**

Request partial demo of historic structure and repairs to front porch. Site visit 2/10/22 at 8:30 am.

Not Rated | Westside | c. 1930 | Historic Materials Demolition Purview

Owner: MAG Construction Services, LLC

Applicant: MAG Construction Services, LLC

MOTION: Final approval of demolition with Staff comments; retaining the roof, repair the windows.

MADE BY: BELLO SECOND: WILSON VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. The windows appear to be original wood and to have a 6-over-6 grid pattern, with the exception of one on the south side. These should be repaired rather than removed.

Meeting Notes:

- Generally okay with the removal of rear portion as proposed; framing appears to have been replaced and not historic.
- Roof should be saved and recoated.
- Windows and should be repaired if possible. Windows that can be repaired should be moved to front of house so that the impact of replacement windows from the street is lessened.

3. **540 King Street – TMS # 460-08-04-062** **BAR2020-000216**

Request mock-up panel review. Site visit 2/10/22 at 9:00 am.

New Construction | Cannonborough/Elliottborough | Old and Historic District

Owner: Vanderking 540, LLC

Applicant: Simons Young + associates, LLC

MOTION: Denial with Staff comments, except for #10; and Board comment.

MADE BY: BELLO SECOND: WILSON VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0

Board Comment:

- To allow applicant to provide two alternate sealant detail examples for the Board to review.

Staff Comments:

1. The color of the sealant at the stucco joints, while freshly applied, is much warmer than and will not blend into the stucco. It shall be tweaked to better harmonize with the stucco color.
2. There was no sealant placed around the window in the mock-up, but there was discussion of it being black to match the window. The sealant color around the window should be made to blend in with the brick and mortar colors. Then it should be held back just enough from the window to give a clean manufactured edge. This will provide a clean edge rather than a rough one that follows the masonry.
3. The window lintel should be painted the generalized brick/mortar color also.
4. Sill flashing at the window is missing and should be installed if part of the design.
5. Dog tooth at brick panel is missing.

- 6. Treatment at mortar joints is inconsistent on the panel with messier flush joints at the sill and at the lower portion of the brick wall and concave joints at the higher portion of the panel. Joints should be treated consistently.
- 7. Confirm stucco system. The STOA Powerwall system integrates a drainage channel plane behind the stucco and allows the stucco to act as the rain screen.
- 8. The stucco panel is smooth and even. However, the stucco work should be coordinated with the joint locations in order to eliminate any cold joint as evident at the lower portion of the stucco panel.
- 9. The stucco joints are a critical part of the design. In fact, they are most prominent at ground level where they mimic stonework. The stucco joints in the mock-up panel should demonstrate the joint at outside and inside corners. The joint in the mock-up panel should wrap the corner of the panel to demonstrate how these will appear.
- ~~10. The proposed colors for the door that is recessed into the stucco portion against King Street is approved for Brandywine SW7710 or Chalmers Cobblestone, Duron DCR020. The piazza ceiling was proposed in Piazza Blue on site, which is appropriate. Pewter Green SW6208 is approved for the storefront.~~
- 11. No weeps, brick control joints, or thru-wall flashing are evident on the mock-up panel. Staff will confirm the requirements that were part of this panel.

Meeting Notes:

- Board did not include Staff comment #10 because they did not think the proposal was complete in order to discuss colors. Brick has not been cleaned, no sealant, and no flashing to discuss.

4. **32 Ann Street - - TMS # 460-12-02-106** **BAR2022-000702**

Request new lighted sign to replace existing.
 Category 2 | Wraggborough | c. 1848 | Old and Historic District
 Owner: Charles Carmody
 Applicant: Studio A, Inc., Whitney Powers

MOTION: Final approval with Staff comments and with Board comment.

MADE BY: BELLO SECOND: FAVA VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST: 0

Board Comment:

- If possible, brightness should be calibrated

Staff Comments:

- 1. The use of neon is appropriate for the venue.

Meeting Notes:

- More friendly than neon, in favor of its usage where appropriate.

5. **11.5 St. Philip Street - - TMS # 457-04-03-112** **BAR2021-000678**

Request new construction of mixed use building utilizing existing remnant walls of previous structure.
 Not Rated | Harleston Village | c. 1915 | Old and Historic District
 Owner: Colin Colbert/ CKC Properties LLC
 Applicant: Ashley Jennings, AJ Architect

MOTION: Conceptual approval with Staff comments and Board comments.

MADE BY: FAVA SECOND: WILSON VOTE: FOR 3 AGAINST: 0

BELLO RECUSED

Staff Comments:

- 1. Per National Trust Preservation Brief #14: New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings: Preservation Concerns, which deals with “new additions and adjacent or related new construction,” “the focus on new additions is to ensure that they preserve the character of historic buildings.”... “Conversely, the treatment of the addition should not be so different that it becomes the primary focus.” While this project is essentially new construction, the new construction and the historic façade relate due to the physical connection.
- 2. The revised design is clean and simple, settling appropriately behind and within the framework of the existing structure. The two exterior patterns harmonize with each other

- and reflect the interior division. However, Board should deliberate whether these, including the bay and hooded window elements, compliment the historic structure.
- 3. The extended overhang at the front portion helps to embrace the original saved structure.
- 4. The window at the third floor facing St Philip Street is square, and this is atypical for Charleston proportions and is contradicted in our Policy Statement regarding Charleston Standards which calls for more vertical proportions. Additionally, it does not align with the center glazing panel beneath it at the second and first floors. This window can be a focal element, but it should be revised is size and shape and considered for harmonizing with he historic structure.
- 5. The roof access element is determined to be compliant with Zoning.
- 6. The glass brick/block on the north elevation should be further described for the preliminary submittal.
- 7. It is critical that the plane change between the split faced CMU and the channel gap siding be maintained as this reflects the relationship with the existing historic structure.

Board Comments:

- To restudy fenestration.
- Restudy the upper-level square window on the façade above the ruin, in order to balance with and appreciate the ruin.
- To provide a sample of exterior cladding material.

Meeting Notes:

- Board questions Staff comment #1 on whether or not it relates.
- Discussed structural support for ruin will require shoring within the framework of historic structure, but needs to be further along in design to engineer how support relates to new building.
- Applicant confirms a rooftop deck, not railing. Exaggerated cornice serves as rail.
- Discussed material representations. A little early for sample panel, but would like samples of materials. Critical to architectural design.
- Window on façade needs adjustment.

6. **56 Morris Street - - TMS # 460-12-01-086**

BAR2022-000716

Request conceptual review of alterations to historic structure and the addition of a second story.

Not Rated | Cannonborough-Elliotborough |c. | Old City District

Owner: 56 Morris, LLC

Applicant: Luke Jarrett, Synchronicity

MOTION: Conceptual approval with Staff and Board comments

MADE BY: BELLO SECOND: FAVA VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. While it is unusual to see an addition over an existing building, the proposed new portion contrasts with the existing building in material, texture, and color and is recessed. Architecturally, it harmonizes in style with the existing.
2. While the dark shade of the Sho Shugi Ban cladding compliments the dark anodized aluminum proposed for the storefront elements, it may feel overwhelming and heavy. This is mitigated at the Morris Street elevation because it is recessed considerably and lightened with a large portion of glazing. However, at the Felix Street façade, glazing is only applied for about half of the span of the new addition. Board should deliberate on the color and visual weight of the proposed Sho Shugi Ban material and its subordination to the existing.
3. Sho Shugi Ban is yet to be used widely in Charleston. It is a durable material. However, the char can fade with water and UV exposure. Proper maintenance and oiling are required to maintain a consistent appearance especially where wall portions receive inconsistent weathering due to eaves and overhangs.
4. The proposed simple awnings coordinate with the design, sufficiently focus on the access points, and do not distract from the building.
5. The Felix Street entry is a new entry and removes historic fabric. Its design causes it to be more prominent than the existing entries on Morris Street, the one to remain and the one to be altered into a service window. The building was once split north/south instead of east/west. We recommend minimizing the Felix Street entrance in favor of the historic opening.
6. The awning or overhang element at the second floor is very thick and has a heavy appearance. The height should be reduced.

7. This building was listed in the Green Book as a safe place for African-Americans prior to the Civil Rights Movement so additional care should be taken so as not to detract from this original building.

Board Comment:

- The Felix Street façade of the second-story addition is to be pushed back from the parapet of the original structure to lessen the impact, and to restudy openings to lessen overall impact.

Meeting Notes:

- Some Board members more in line with the comments of HCF. There are few representations to African American business left in this area and should be protected.
- Does not meet height, scale, and mass. Overwhelms this very simple historic structure.
- Commends the architect for considering the design and materials. Owners have a right to do something with the structure. Height, scale, and mass is appropriate for second-story structure at this location.
- The building will need some alterations in order for it to be usable. Do not want the building to sit there unused and deteriorate.
- Aerial perspective may be deceiving, gives incorrect appearance of overwhelming. At street level the upper level fades away, out of view, and reads as more anonymous.
- Appreciate that the request is for alterations instead of demolition, the existing building is being retained.
- Second-story element should be as subordinate as possible, should be recessed from the street. The original form should read as parapet all around.
- Should needs acknowledgement of the history of the existing building.
- It is a testament to the building that it's being used rather than left empty.
- What been done here is trying to be sensitive, the mass reads as too dominating over this pedestrian structure, therefore, it needs to be recessed from the Felix Street side so it becomes less imposing. Let original building have more dominance. Needs to be rethought in its mass and relationship to existing building.

7. **111 South Battery - - TMS # 457-11-02-083**

BAR2021-000625

Request conceptual approval for modifications including wholesale replacement of windows, and doors; reconstruction of front and side stair; enclosure and expansion of side porch; enclosure of eastern niche; and new construction of Juliette balconies and French door at rear.

Not Rated | Charlestowne | c. 1921 | Old and Historic District

Owner: Sunju Patel, The Montford Group

Applicant: Luda Sobchuk, SGA. Narmour Wright Design

MOTION: Conceptual approval with Staff comments with #4 amended to "to restudy the wall either in lower in height or with a knee wall."

MADE BY: FAVA SECOND: HUEY VOTE: FOR 3 AGAINST 0

BELLO RECUSED

Staff Comments:

1. Proposal includes rebuilding stairs to match existing. Cast stone and tile should be saved and restored.
2. Visibility of the east side alcove is very minimal. Staff is not concerned with the location of mechanical equipment in the alcove. However, the mechanical platform's connection to the historic house should be addressed and this addition shall be reversible.
3. Existing windows should be repaired. Any windows requiring replacement shall match existing, keeping the patterns and profiles of the existing.
4. A solid wall at the front of the property is not appropriate and out of context for this area. The majority of the properties on this street feature a knee wall with ironwork above. Per BAR policy, "Fences and walls should be appropriately scaled for their context so as to prevent a fortress-like appearance." This solid design would be incongruous with the street scape and should be omitted from the proposal.
5. In order to provide flood protection, flood protection on the house should be incorporated or flood panels should be incorporated similar to those at 5 East Battery. If a solid wall is to be used, the upper portion should not be solid to prevent the "fortress like appearance".

Meeting Notes:

- Agreed with Staff comments except 4 & 5. Recommend restudy of wall instead. Wall is higher than it needs to be it would be more appropriate if it was lowered and less fortress-like.

- Believe there are better ways to prevent flooding that building barricades around the house. A solid wall would be inappropriate and feel that knee wall with iron fencing incorporating flood panels would provide adequate protection.
- Board does not want the experience of viewing the architecture to be lost by a high, solid wall.

8. 55 Smith Street - - TMS # 457-03-02-107

BAR2022-000718

Request conceptual approval for modifications and expansion of piazza infill and simplification of non-original fenestration patterns.

Category 4 | Harleston Village | c. 1895 | Old and Historic District

Owner: Bess & Lee Ferry

Applicant: Erin Lanier, Julia Martin Architects

MOTION: Conceptual approval with Staff comments and Final details to Staff.


MADE BY: BELLO SECOND: FAVA VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST: 0

Staff Comments:

1. The proposal cleans up a variety of insensitive fenestration elements which were unoriginal and replaces a portion of the original piazza railing. These are balanced with the proposal for new enclosure which has little visibility from the public right-of-way and is treated with shutters.

Board Discussion:

- Believes the floorplan can be altered to further recess the alteration and lessen the visibility from the street.
- Feel that what's proposed is more appropriate and respectful than the existing conditions.
- Always struggle with enclosing a porch, but this is not very visible and the additional enclosure grounds the second floor and is more visually attractive. There is a trade off, and there are nice corrections. The improvements to the second floor enclosure are preferable.
- Do not think changes are to the detriment
- Obviously enclosing porches is something we try to avoid, but the changes are more aesthetically appealing.

 2.24.22

Bill Huey, temporary chairman

Frankie Pinto, Senior Preservation Planner

date