A meeting of the Board of Architectural Review – Large (BAR-L) was held on Wednesday, July 27, 2022 at 4:30 p.m. in the Public Meeting Room, 1st Floor, 2 George Street.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: John Robinson (Chair), Seaton Brown, James Meadors, Luda Sobchuk

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Tory Parish, Lawrence Courtney, Magalie Creech

The following applications were considered:

1. **July 13 Meeting Minutes**

   **MOTION:** Approval

   **MADE BY:** Meadors / **SECOND:** Brown  
   **VOTE:** FOR 4 / AGAINST 0

2. **122-124 Cannon Street - - TMS # 460-00-04-160 / 161   BAR2022-000705**

   Request conceptual approval for the renovation of two existing structures and the addition of two new residential structures at the rear of the property.

   **New Construction | Cannonborough/Elliottborough | Height Districts 2.5 | Old City District**

   **Owner:** Cannon St. Vacation Rentals LLC
   **Applicant:** Ashley Jennings / AJ Architects

   **MOTION:** Conceptual Approval incorporating Board and Staff comments.

   **MADE BY:** Brown / **SECOND:** Meadors  
   **VOTE:** FOR 3 / AGAINST 0

   (Luda Sobchuk recuses.)

   **Staff Comments:**
   1. While the footprints of the accessory structures decreased in size minimally, steps were taken to improve the massing of each to appear as smaller joined elements. This modifies the overall perception of the size of these structures as well as how they are discerned from the public right-of-way. For example, the gables on the structure behind 122 Cannon are similar in width to gables on any adjacent Charleston single house.
   2. The site wall at the front of 124 Cannon has been adjusted to be partially solid and partially transparent, with the solid portion helping to screen parking. Due to its setback from the sidewalk, Staff’s concern over the solid wall has been mitigated.

   **Staff Recommendations:**
   Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

   **Board Comment:**
• At 122 Cannon, can the existing wrought iron fencing be reused? At brick frieze, will gutters and downspouts be used, and what visual impact will they have? Understanding that it's not original, how old is the piazza stair which is proposed for removal? At the reverse board-and-batten siding, will a visible flashing line exist? At 124 Cannon, is the expectation that even with the solid wall, vehicles will be visible from the street?
• New structures are deferential and complimentary to the existing unlike before. Much improved conceptually.
• Appreciative of going above and beyond Staff requirements. More complimentary to the historic houses.
• Great project. Request more information on the fence, transoms, piazza stair, and flashing and gutter details at the appropriate time.

For full Board comments, please visit the City of Charleston’s YouTube Channel.

Request approval to substitute fiber cement lap siding 5/16” for 5/8” as originally approved Artisan Hardie is no longer available.
New Construction | PUD | Height Districts 2.5-3 | Old City District
Owner:   Southwind
Applicant:   Luke Jarrett / Synchronicity

MOTION: Deferral for restudy incorporating Board and Staff comments.

MADE BY: Brown / SECOND: Sobchuk  VOTE: FOR 3 / AGAINST 1

Staff Comments:
1. Staff is aware that the 5/8” cementitious siding is limited in supply due to the discontinuation by Hardie brand of their 5/8” Artisan line.
2. Iron Forge Alley is a privately maintained roadway, which should be understood in relation to visibility.
3. Due to the smaller building footprints, the horizontal span of the material would not be excessive which could prevent concern over of the material showing defects or having a wavy appearance.
4. Staff finds that reviewing an exception to our policy requiring 5/8” thick siding may be appropriate on a case-by-case basis during a time of short supply.
5. An alternatives to consider is the use of milled wood.
6. This project is in the Old City District. Staff and Board have maintained the requirement of 5/8” thick siding in these areas.

Staff Recommendations:
Denial

Board Comment:
• Precedent issue is not an issue for me. Don’t think the 5/16” is appropriate; should be 5/8”.
• Not a great deal of concern. Limited view from public right-of-way is a practical approach, and tis is interior to the block, albeit an exception to the standard.
• 5/16” appears plasticky. Would suggest changing profile or using wood. Could be closer to the 3/4” for better shadow lines. No matter the visibility, this is in a district with as established standard.
• Suggest deferring to next meeting so that applicant may do research on alternate profiles.

For full Board comments, please visit the City of Charleston’s YouTube Channel.
Executive Session

MOTION: To move into executive session to obtain legal guidance on proposed signage policy changes.
MADE BY: Brown / SECOND: Meadors VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 0

MOTION: To adjourn executive session. (6:58pm)
MADE BY: Brown / SECOND: Meadors VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 0

4. Sign Policy Statement Restudy

MOTION: Withdraw item #4
MADE BY: Brown / SECOND: Meadors VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 0

Adjournment

MOTION: Motion to adjourn meeting.
MADE BY: Sobchuk / SECOND: Meadors VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 0

________________________________________________________________________

John E. Robinson, Chairperson date

Tory J. Parish, BAR-L Administrator date