



CITY OF CHARLESTON

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SMALL

PUBLIC COMMENT

APRIL 13, 2023

A meeting of the Board of Architectural Review – Small (BAR-S) will be held on **Thursday, April 13, 2023 at 4:30 p.m.** in the **Public Meeting Room, First Floor, 2 George Street.**

The following written comments will be provided to the board members 24 hours in advance of the meeting. The comments will also be acknowledged into the record and summarized. The public is encouraged to attend the meeting in person to speak in order for comments to be fully heard.

Application information is available at www.charleston-sc.gov/bar. Please check the website on the meeting date to view any withdrawn or deferred agenda items.

PUBLIC MEETING ACCOMMODATIONS:

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, people who need alternative formats, ASL (American Sign Language) Interpretation, or other accommodation, should please contact Janet Schumacher at 843-577-1389 or schumacherj@charleston-sc.gov three business days prior to the meeting.

For additional information, please contact:

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, PRESERVATION & SUSTAINABILITY
2 George Street, Suite 3100, Charleston, SC 29401 | 843-724-3781

B. APPLICATIONS

1. 179 – 181 Fishburne Street

TMS # 460-07-02-175 | BAR2023-001084

Category 4 | Westside | c. pre-1902 | Historic Materials Demolition Purview

Request partial demolition of historic structure including portions roof.

Owner: Matt Campbell, Mike Levine

Applicant: AJ Architects

Site visit 3/23/2023 at 8:50 a.m.

One (1) Comment Submitted:

- **Jeffrey Roberts, Broad St. Charleston, SC:**

Submitted Apr 9, 2023 11:28 AM

179-181 Fishburne St. I am writing this letter in strong opposition for the applicant's request for demolition of certain historic and protected roof elements on this property, but routinely support the demolition of the CMU block, mid-century, non-historic rear appendage. For some context, the Board may familiar with; my companies have developed a significant amount of projects in Westside for well over 2 decades; many on Fishburne Street and surrounds, having won many preservation awards from PSC and HCF as well. We currently own very large and substantial parcels nearby in the neighborhood, so there is a vested interest. Also, some years ago, I have looked at the subject property so I have considerable familiarity with it. I am sure the applicants are fine people, and we would never capriciously want to deny an owner's right to develop their property; but they should only do it sensibly. This project has had a

“tortured” path through boards and commissions thus far, and I note a skilled architect of fine reputation is now involved. However, the “residential conversion” of this historic church (that has never been used for residential use) would be highly out of context with neighborhood fabric and the existing homes that are relatively small in stature. The main body structure can not be demolished, and in its existing form and elevation can be “flood-proofed” to conform to FEMA guidelines, with a FEMA variance readily obtainable. We have done this successfully at the corner store at 237 Fishburne St., and it anchors the corner of President Street. While the applicant can apparently elevate this “by right” now and try to convert to residential use, the modification of the roof lines fall under BAR-S’s purview, and the Denial of this portion of the application is imperative to maintain a historic rhythm and context (please take note of that elevated, residential front porch on the front of a historic church- totally out of architectural and historic context of this area of Fishburne St.). Again, without the developer being disenfranchised, this historic property can be re-used and put back in the stream of commerce by merely changing the programming for it so it remains intact insofar as historic rhythm and context, and the denial and modification of the requested historic roofline is needed, They now have architectural talent on the team that may be able to do so, if they listen. I wish them well.

2. 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.

Owner: Branko Damjanovic

Applicant: Branko Damjanovic

Site visit 3/23/2023 at 8:30 a.m.

No comments received

3. 640 King Street

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

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

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

Owner: Branko Damjanovic

Applicant: Branko Damjanovic

No comments received

4. 12 Humphrey Court

TMS # 460-08-01-165 | BAR2022-000932

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

Request after the fact approval for alterations to piazza, siding, and windows.

Owner: MFI Properties

Applicant: Paul Kime

No comments received

5. 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

No comments received

6. 76 Nassau Street

TMS # 459-05-04-171 | BAR2023-001088

Category 4 | Eastside | c. 1850s | Old City District

After the fact request to replace windows.

Owner: Haven Development Group 1, LLC

Applicant: Chase Lansing

No comments received

7. 4 Trumbo Street

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

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

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

Owner: Charleston & Erica Missel

Applicant: Chatauk Studio, Jeremy Kruska

No comments received

8. 235 Meeting Street

TMS # 457-08-01-012 | BAR2023-001090

Category 3 | c. pre 1884 | Old and Historic District

Request illuminated signage.

Owner: Sticky Charleston LLC

Applicant: Vivid Sign & Design Inc

No comments received

9. 511 King Street

TMS # 460-12-02-084 | BAR2023-001091

Category 4 | Radcliffeborough | c. 1888 - 1902 | Old and Historic District

Request approval for internally lit right-angle sign.

Owner: Ravenel Commercial Properties

Applicant: Knight Printing & Graphics

No comments received

10. 309 King Street

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

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

Request conceptual approval for storefront renovations.

Owner: Redline Property Partners - Andrew Webb

Applicant: Chipman Design Architecture

No comments received

11. 32 S Battery Street

TMS # 457-16-02-058 | BAR2023-001093

Category 2 | Charlestowne | c. 1782 | Old and Historic District

Request approval to change roof material from terne metal to copper.

Owner: Jim & Augustine Smith

Applicant: Octavio Paredes, Roofing American Metal Enterprises

No comments received

12. 80 S Battery Street

TMS # 457-11-02-037 | BAR2023-001094

NR | Charlestowne | c. 1953 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for proposed second story addition.

Owner: Guy Tarrant

Applicant: Sebastian von Marschall, LLC

One (1) Comment Submitted:

- **Preservation Society of Charleston:**

Submitted to Staff

See attached letter

OTHER COMMENTS:

PJ Bremier, PO Box 412 Kentfield CA:

Submitted to Innovate Site on Apr. 12, 2023 12:54 PM

Please support the use of the Electric Carriage as an alternative to the horse-drawn carriage. I'm a regular visitor to Charleston and really would like tourists like me enjoy the city in comfort without seeing the sad horses, especially in the terrible heat. It's not a good look for Charleston.

PRESERVATION
ESTD SOCIETY 1920
of CHARLESTON

**Position Statement
Board of Architectural Review - Small
April 13, 2023**

80 South Battery

Dear Board Members:

The Preservation Society appreciates the applicant and owner meeting with us to discuss this proposal. Generally, additions to historic buildings should be as inconspicuous as possible, with minimal impact to historic, character-defining features and forms. Therefore, our preference is to see additions limited to locations where they do not interfere with primary elevations.

However, if the Board entertains this proposal, we ask that, at a minimum, the cornice detail at the eave line of the addition be better differentiated from the historic building to read more appropriately as new construction.

Thank you for considering our position in this matter.

Sincerely,



Anna-Catherine Carroll
Manager of Preservation Initiatives