



CITY OF CHARLESTON BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SMALL

MEETING RESULTS

MAY 25, 2023

4:30 P.M.

2 GEORGE STREET

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Van Slambrook, Martin, Wilson, Turner, Altman

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Pinto, Gordineer

A. Minutes

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

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Approval with Corrections given to Staff.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Van Slambrook VOTE: FOR: 4
AGAINST: 0

Abstain – Altman

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 5/25/2023 at 8:30 a.m.

Deferred by Applicant

2. 58 Saint Margaret Street

TMS # 463-11-04-117 | BAR2023-001129

Category 4 | Wagener Terrace | c. 1950 | Historic Materials Demolition Purview

Requesting partial demolition of historic structure including windows, doors, front and rear porches, and portions of roof.

Owner: Abigail Walsh & Brendan Sweeney

Applicant: Robbie Marty

Site visit 5/25/2023 at 8:50 a.m.

DECISION: DENIED

MOTION: Denial as submitted.

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

NOTES:

- HCF: character defining features, suggest repair/replace in kind; request denial.
- PSC: fundamental features should remain intact, request denial.
- Response – Applicant
 - This building is not character defining of neighborhood or street
- Board Discussion
 - Proposed is very heavy handed.
 - Simple house, nothing wrong with simple
 - Front gable – strongest character defining feature
 - Would like number of wall cuts for doors reduced
 - No opposition to dormers
 - Would like deferred rather than denial to allow restudy
 - Does contribute to diversity of neighborhood
 - Windows are original, defining. If can't be restored, should replace to match.
 - Can do other things than remove entire roof, less heavy handed
 - Addition of porches not under purview
 - Addition of dormers – would be comfortable

Staff Observations:

1. Existing structure is a simple mass of 3 bays with minimal detailing.

Staff Comments:

1. Windows, door and surround, front gable form are all character defining features and should remain.
2. Staff has previously supported small portions of demolition at the roof for dormers.

Staff Recommendation: Denial with staff comments

3. 5 Glebe Street

TMS # 457-04-01-028 | BAR2021-000424

Category 2 | Harleston Village | c. 1847-8 | Old and Historic District

Requesting after the fact approval for alteration to front stair and handrails, side steps, alterations to front door.

Owner: Mt Zion AME Church

Applicant: Ardean Buggs, Acute Construction Group

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral of work on steps with Board requirement to resubmit design for front with changes in spirit of historic.

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

NOTES:

- PSC: previous proposal – Board requested hiring stone conservator; request denial
- HCF: request deferral.
- Response:
 - No opposed to replacing with brownstone
- Board Discussion
 - Platform was to change door swing to outward
 - Some change in treads would be required by code
 - Need to be brownstone
 - Same size as original with alterations for code compliance – make safe for congregation
 - Historical significance of building
 - Needs to be studied by architects
 - Understand need for landing, safety
 - Not opposed to encasing original if can't be restored
 - Question if brownstone veneer is possible, not necessarily blocks of brownstone.

PREVIOUS MOTION 1.28.21: Final approval of the ramp with staff condition number one; and deferral of front entry changes on existing materials and proposed finishes and details.

PREVIOUS Staff Comments 1.28.21:

1. *Specify wrought iron railings at both ramp and stair, steering away from any steel tube.*
2. ~~*Reuse the existing wrought iron rails where possible, and detail the new center rail at front to match existing scrollwork.*~~
3. ~~*Consult a stone conservator and implement investigation and preservation plan moving forward.*~~

PREVIOUS Staff Recommendation 1.28.21: Final approval with staff conditions.

PREVIOUS Board Discussion 1.28.21:

- *Add Expansion joint at wall.*
- *Not confident that the slabs can be safely removed*
- *Solid brownstone slabs are incredibly difficult to reuse. Lean on staff to approve/select situation.*

Staff Observations:

1. Existing brownstone steps have been encased in CMU and covered with dirt.
2. Provided drawings do not match the current conditions.
3. Lanterns on front facade have been changed since the stop work order was issued.
4. The existing brownstone stairs are original to the building.

Staff Comments:

1. Stairs should be restored to original condition. Coating should be removed wherever possible.
2. If existing stairs cannot be restored, stairs should be replaced with brownstone stairs of similar design.

Staff Recommendation: Denial with restoration of the brownstones steps within six months

4. **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

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral for restudy with Staff Comments and Board clarification on Staff Comment #5 not to exceed DRF of 12’.

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

NOTES:

- Written comment read into record
- HCF – reference BAR guidelines for raising historic and piazza enclosure policy. Request denial.
- PSC – “”. Foundation walls should be solid, not beachy louvers.
- Response
 - Height was related to precedent 8 Trumbo
- Board Discussion
 - One of 4 sister houses. Shouldn’t be altered to point it no longer relates to sisters
 - Piazza shouldn’t be enclosed any further. Precedents most likely would have occurred prior to BAR purview/creation of policy.
 - If enclosed, remaining piazza would be entirely occupied by stairs
 - Exterior stair should be relocated to rear if possible
 - Heavy handed
 - No opposed to second floor addition
 - Piazza screen would need to go higher
 - Currently has brick foundation, if raising, should incorporate brick to honor history, add texture
 - Bringing down to DFE of 12’ will reduce number of stairs
 - If push back slightly, would allow stair outside piazza.
 - Vertically extend existing infill
 - History of sister houses - 1 floor piazzas
 - Would be nice to not see back of stairs
 - This will influence any alteration of remaining sister houses

Staff Observations:

1. Received BZA-Z approval 5.2.23 for a reduction in rear and side setbacks for the proposed stairs.
2. Per BAR policy on piazza enclosure:
 - a. The Charleston piazza/porch is a building feature unique to, and closely identified with, the architectural history and urban character of the city.
 - b. This unique feature of the Charleston Single House should be preserved in order to retain the prevailing character of our vernacular architecture.
 - c. To enclose the piazza and incorporate it into the interior of a building eliminates this unique feature, and eliminate the use of the piazza as a transitioning space between the interior and its surrounding urban environment.
 - d. Enclosing piazzas in whole, or in part, may result in irreversible damage to our architectural heritage.
 - e. The necessity for the additional area which results from the enclosure must be sufficiently compelling and extreme that no other alternative could reasonably accomplish this purpose. The applicant must demonstrate through floor plans, elevations, and photographs that any other alternative solution shall result in unacceptable alterations to the historic fabric of the structure.

Staff Comments:

1. No drawings of bottom floor are provided so the purpose of this space is unknown.
2. Newly introduced roof angle over piazza is awkward and should be restudied.
3. Per BAR policy on piazza enclosure: The location of the piazza enclosure shall be to the rear of the piazza, be minimal in size, and not alter the conceptual relationship between the house and the piazza. Proposal should be restudied to reduce the amount of piazza enclosure and better follow BAR policy.
4. Per BAR guidelines on raising historic structures:
 - a. Buildings should not be moved to accommodate additions, parking, etc. Buildings should remain in their original location on the lot, unless doing so prevents the reasonable introduction of stairs.
 - b. Pier infill should be recessed, use louvers or custom lattice and not incorporate “beachy” style horizontal slats or stock lattice
5. Per the drawings BFE is 11’, proposed DFE is 13’, and house is being raised to 14’. DFE should be one foot above BFE for historic structure. Structure is proposed to be raised more than required by FEMA and more than BAR policy allows. Elevation to be kept to minimum required to mitigate disruption to the streetscape.

Staff Recommendation: Deferral for restudy with staff comments

5. 119 – 121 Broad Street

TMS # 457-12-04-009 | BAR2021-000663

Category 2 | Charlestowne | c. 1803 | Old and Historic District

Requesting final approval hardscape alterations.

Owner: MCCURU Properties

Applicant: Neil Stevenson Architects

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Conceptual Approval for site design.

MADE BY: Turner SECOND: Martin

VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

- Written comments read into record
- Concern about amount of parking/lighting
- Board Discussion
 - Proposed landscaping should help privacy/lighting concern – Italian cypress
 - Doesn't meet requirements for final, no details
 - This is more conceptual. Want to see details come back
 - There is no information on site lighting

PREVIOUS MOTION 11.10.22: Preliminary approval of pool house, pool, and pergola and equipment structure; deferral of landscape/hardscape plan with a Board Comment to further refine details of pergola with Final Review by Staff of structures not landscaping/hardscaping.

PREVIOUS Staff Observations 11.10.22:

1. *While not included in this packet, staff has been notified that an HVAC has been added to the roof of the historic house, outside of the enclosure built for this purpose. This unit will need to be moved within the equipment screen.*

PREVIOUS Staff comments 11.10.22:

1. *Restudy the design and materials for the proposed pool and HVAC equipment enclosure to better coordinate with the existing and proposed structures. While brick is proposed in the hardscape plan, this would be introducing a completely new material. Consider how the enclosure might coordinate and align with the pool house also.*
2. *Direction from the prior review was to reduce the amount of impervious for parking. The Applicant has revised the material to be pervious but not the amount. Staff believes the intent was to reduce the amount of hardscape, and if so, this directive has not been addressed.*

PREVIOUS Staff Recommendation 11.10.22: Deferral with staff comments

Staff Observations:

1. Hardscape elements have not been reduced per previous Board direction.
2. No dimensions were provided on drawings.

Staff Comments:

1. Applicant to confirm that turning radius at driveway near parking area is functional for a vehicles.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of hardscape based on previous Board direction to reduce amount of hardscape.

6. 18 Greenhill Street

TMS # 457-11-04-067 | BAR2022-000921

NS | Charlestowne | c. 1920 | Old and Historic District

Request preliminary approval of two-story rear addition and one story covered porch.

Owner: Tiffany Philippe

Applicant: Neil Stevenson

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Preliminary Approval with Board Comment to clarify proposed material including windows and chimney cap with Final Review by Staff.

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

NOTES:

- No public comment
- Board Discussion
 - Could both setbacks be 1' for addition
 - Cement siding should be 5/8" thickness

PREVIOUS MOTION 2.9.23: Conceptual approval with Staff Comment (Stucco not paint) and Board Comment to limit addition eave overhang so it doesn't protrude past existing house and encourage improvement of chimney cap condition.

PREVIOUS Staff Comments 2.9.23:

1. Exposed CMU should be painted or stuccoed.

PREVIOUS Staff Recommendation 2.9.23: Conceptual approval with staff comments final review by staff

Staff Observations:

1. Previous comments have been addressed.

Staff Recommendation: Final approval

7. 67 Anson Street

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

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

Requesting approval to repair structure with Holcim Mortamix Masonry Cement and apply Keim Silan water repellent.

Owner: St. Stephens Episcopal Church

Applicant: Kyle Taylor, Dwelling Concepts LLC

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral for additional information and sample, with staff comments and Final Review by Staff.

MADE BY: Altman **SECOND:** Wilson **VOTE: FOR:** 5 **AGAINST:** 0

NOTES:

- Board Questions
 - What is existing stucco – lime based
 - Proposed is Portland product
 - Plan to replace broken brick around cracks
 - Keim tinted or clear? Tint 1:20, lowest amount for warranty
 - Color to match existing stucco

- PSC
 - Concerned about proposed product
- HCF
 - Concerned about specification of product
- Applicant Response
 - Mason explained mortar proportions to make historic strength
 - Concern that mortar mix is too strong
 - If color mix should match historic mix
 - Clear – doesn't protect against UV and no warranted.

Staff Observations:

1. The Secretary of the Interior Standards recommends against applying paint or other coatings (such as stucco) to masonry that has been historically unpainted or uncoated.

Staff Comments:

1. If a coating is to be used, it should be clear and without sheen. A sample on a non-visible portion should be provided to staff.
2. Repairs should be historically appropriate mortar mix. Staff recommend completing a mortar analysis to determine a match.

Staff Recommendation: Deferral for additional information with staff comments.

8. 92 Smith Street

TMS # 457-03-02-069 | BAR2023-001131

Category 4 | Harleston Village | c. 1903 | Old and Historic District

Requesting approval for 16 solar panels and micro inverters.

Owner: Mike Faller

Applicant: Steven Schwartz, Hilton Head Solar

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: Defer until end – no applicant

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

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

NOTES:

- No Applicant.

9. 52 Laurens Street

TMS # 458-01-01-013 | BAR2023-001132

Category 2 | Ansonborough | c. pre-1888 | Old and Historic District

Requesting approval for new iron pedestrian gate.

Owner: Mary McCarthy

Applicant: Mary McCarthy

DECISION: DENIED

MOTION: Respectful denial.

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

NOTES:

- HCF – recommend deferral for restudy
- PSC – recommend restudy

Staff Comments:

1. The metal gate in wood picket fence is not appropriate as it is a combination of materials and would make for an atypical and inconsistent edge to the street.

Staff Recommendation: Denial

10. 29 State Street

TMS # 458-09-01-106 | BAR2023-001134

Category 3 | French Quarter | c. 1813 | Old and Historic District

Requesting conceptual approval for alteration to previously approved windows, altering lite pattern and size.

Owner: Peggy Andrews

Applicant: Olivia Brock, Torrance Mitchell

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral to allow for a site visit.

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

NOTES:

- Board Discussion
 - Trim size is common for age of structure
 - Large window has been modified, but matches window to right
 - If not original, then very early
 - Not enough evidence to justify change
 - If jam is original or early then sash size is appropriate

Staff Observations:

1. The window trim has pegs at the corners and is historic if not original to the structure.
2. There are no marks on stucco to indicate that the window size has been altered and reduced.

Staff Comments:

1. No historic documentation of the structure for change in lite pattern has been provided. If choosing to pursue, provide historical information related to the age of the existing window and lite pattern changes.

Staff Recommendation: Denial with staff conditions

11. 14 Colonial Drive

TMS # 457-122-03-009 | BAR2023-001135

Category 3 | Charlestowne | c. 1920 | Old and Historic District

Requesting conceptual approval for rear porch enclosure with second floor addition above, and alterations to front façade and fenestration.

Owner: Clay & Rachell Cowherd

Applicant: Tyler A Smyth Architects

Withdrawn by Applicant

12. 82 Murray Boulevard

TMS # 457-11-01-003 | BAR2023-001136

NS | Charlestowne | c. 1965 | Old and Historic District

Requesting approval to paint existing brick veneer.

Owner: 82 Murray Blvd Trust

Applicant: G.M. Wallace, Jr

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Approval of painting brick based upon condition of previous patchwork and inability to find suitable match.

MADE BY: Turner **SECOND:** Altman **VOTE: FOR:** 4 **AGAINST:** 0
Recuse - Martin

NOTES:

- PSC – Secretary of interior standards
- Board Discussion
 - With alterations it would be difficult to match

Staff Observations:

1. The Secretary of the Interior Standards recommends against painting masonry that has historically been unpainted or uncoated.

Staff Comments:

1. While we typically don't approve the painting of brick that is historically unpainted, the current brick is modern and mismatched. Based on the age of the structure, the brick would not be damaged by painting.

Staff Recommendation: Approval

13. 14 Logan Street

TMS # 457-1-04-117 | BAR2023-001137

Category 4 | Charlestowne | c. 1870 | Old and Historic District

Requesting conceptual approval for alteration to roof slope and fenestration at rear addition.

Owner: Buddy & Sandra Milton

Applicant: Amber Aument

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral for additional information on age of existing roof.

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

NOTES:

- HCF – concerned there’s not enough documentation to change roof form
- PSC – more documentation needed, selective demo?
- Board Discussion
 - Can see change in brick in chimney
 - Chimney lines up between windows, centered in structure, would be centered on ridge if originally had gable roof. Though not certain gable was original form.
 - Changes in piers
 - No hardie, as in soffit
 - Existing windows are likely original, encourage retaining
 - Eave form
 - Selective demo would confirm original roof line
 - If determine that rear parapet not original would encourage removal
 - Currently speculation, encourage more study/detective work to determine original form

Staff Observations:

1. Roof slope at the rear addition has been previously altered.
2. The fenestration pattern is original, and changes are visible from Logan Street.

Staff Comments:

1. Only one of the door to window changes would be visible from Logan Street.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval with final review by staff

14. 199 Saint Philip Street

TMS # 460-08-04-018 | BAR2023-001138

Category 4 | Cannonborough/Elliottborough | c. pre-1888 | Old City District

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

Owner: (prospective) Adam Young

Applicant: AJ Architects

DECISION: DECISION

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Board Condition to restudy site to maximize greenspace and clarify where trash/mechanical will be.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Altman

VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

- PSC – suggest studying ways to reduce mass
- Response
 - Front structure is very small
- Board Discussion
 - Nice design, simple
 - Need to increase greenspace, maybe edging detail contain gravel
 - Need to locate mechanical/trash on site
 - Struggling with architecture, differentiate but compatible.

Staff Observations:

1. Structure is differentiated from existing historic structure.

Staff Comments:

1. Proposed structure should be reduced in mass to be more subordinate to the historic structure.
2. Staff recommend changing the window in proposed hyphen to different lite pattern, maybe to a 2/2.

Staff Recommendation: Defer with staff comments

15. 155 King Street

TMS # 457-08-04-039 | BAR2023-001139

NR | Harleston Village | c. pre-1888 | Old and Historic District

Requesting conceptual approval for façade renovations and new rear addition.

Owner: King George Realty LLC

Applicant: Simons Young

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Staff Comment 1 & 2.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Turner

VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

- PSC – in support. Concern about including establishment date, simplify design language
- Board Discussion
 - Introduces sense of whimsy, no issue with orb
 - Would like to see details

Staff Observations:

1. Proportions of façade are improved from existing dimensions.
2. The proposed side elevation add rhythm through the addition of windows.

Staff Comments:

1. The proposed date plaque is inappropriate and shall be omitted as it creates a false sense of history.
2. The bays project into the sidewalk. Confirm with zoning and engineering regarding their location.
3. The stone orbs are out of context with the structure and neighborhood.
4. The faux pattern plates create a false sense of the history of the structure and should be omitted.

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