



CITY OF CHARLESTON

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SMALL

MEETING RESULTS

AUGUST 10, 2023

4:30 P.M.

2 GEORGE STREET

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

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Frankie Pinto, Linda Bennett

A. Minutes

1. Review of Minutes from the July 27, 2023 Meeting

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Approve

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

B. Applications

1. 42 Poinsett Street

TMS # 463-12-03-040 | BAR2023-001187

NS | North Central | c. 1925 | Historic Materials Demolition Purview

Request complete demolition of historic structure.

Owner: 42 Poinsett LLC

Applicant: John M Oakley

Site visit 8/10/2023 at 8:30 a.m.

DECISION: DENIED

MOTION: Denial with staff conditions

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

STAFF ANALYSIS:

1. Purchased by current owners June 2023.
2. While the porch has been removed, the structure is a vernacular cottage with many intact character defining features and should be retained.
3. This structure is a sister house to others on the street, including 38 Poinsett, which has been restored.
4. Existing house is on a very large lot, and staff encourage investigation into a rear addition to accomplish the proposed changes.

STAFF CONDITION:

1. Staff suggest consulting code-related property maintenance minimums and procedures for sealing and protecting this structure until ready for rehabilitation and to explore rear addition, if desired, for expansion.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial with staff condition

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- HCF
 - Opposed
- Candace Moorer, 31 Poinsett
 - Opposed
- Representative, neighbors (41, 37, 29 Poinsett?)
 - In support of project, whatever Board says needs to be done
- PSC
 - Should be preserved
 - Opposed

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

- More expensive to rehab than to rebuild

BOARD DISCUSSION:

- In line with staff and preservation groups
- Can't restrict what goes back, only restricted by what zoning allows
- Form is there
- Talk to zoning, maybe build second house on lot
- X flood zone, no need to raise, simplifies project

2. 45 Cooper Street

TMS # 459-06-01-025 | BAR2023-001188

Category 4 | East Side | c. 1880 | Historic Materials Demolition Purview

Request complete demolition of historic structure.

Owner: Sweetgrass Capital Partners LLC

Applicant: Zachary Bennett

Site visit 8/10/2023 at 8:50 a.m.

DECISION: DENIED

MOTION: Denial of demolition of 1902 footprint, deferral of demolition of rear extension to clarify with staff. With Board comment

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

BOARD COMMENTS/CONDITIONS:

- Board would approve of demo of more recent addition

STAFF ANALYSIS:

1. Purchased by current owners in October 2022.
2. Originally a two-story, five bay single house, similar to 43 Cooper; the piazza has been similarly modified to include brick veneer.
3. Currently aluminum siding on top of ashlar, asbestos shingles.

4. With its connection to 43 Cooper, the removal of this structure would eliminate one of the few remaining single houses on the street and will reduce the significance of the other structures.

STAFF CONDITION:

1. Staff suggest consulting code-related property maintenance minimums and procedures for sealing and protecting this structure until ready for rehabilitation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial with staff condition

BOARD QUESTIONS:

- Approximate floor level

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- HCF
 - Opposed
- PSC
 - Opposed

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

- Have restored other buildings on street, nothing can be done, no structure left

BOARD DISCUSSION:

- Would like to have retention of form
- Facing over 50% renovation
- Would be helpful to know how far needs to be raised
- Purview in this area very frustrating
- Form is there
- By denying demo, could require essentially repair 99% of structure
- Don't want applicant to think they have to keep termite ridden structure
- If rear portion to be removed would need inventory to indicate which portion

3. 708 Meeting Street

TMS # 461-13-01-007, 461-13-01-008 | BAR2023-001189

Category 4 | East Central | c. 1904 | Historic Corridor District

Request conceptual approval for replacement of existing windows, handicap ramp alterations, and HVAC screening.

Owner: Union Baptist Church, Jacki White

Applicant: Innova Architecture LLC

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Conceptual approval of handicap ramp, HVAC screen, and door replacement. Defer window replacement for graphic clarification and inventory, with Board comment and final review by staff

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

BOARD COMMENTS/CONDITIONS:

- Would approve stained glass as proposed;
 - SDL, clad windows at rear extension;
 - and TDL, wood windows at front.

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. Color panes of glass are a typical alteration in churches of this age. Staff encourage retention and reuse, even if not in present locations.
2. Current front door is residential in appearance and the proposed is more appropriate to the structure.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Applicant to confirm no changes to the roof are proposed. Existing is standing seam, but the drawings show shingle. Roof material should not be changed.
2. Provide cut sheet on doors and windows for permitting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Conceptual approval with Staff conditions and final review by staff

BOARD QUESTIONS:

- Are windows wood, clad, insulated?
- Any protection provided for stained glass
- Four windows in front to be clear, not part of sanctuary

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- PSC
 - Encourage compatible window types

BOARD DISCUSSION:

- Discussion of wood v. clad windows
- On back portion, not in sanctuary, there is room for discussion
- Small windows on front more concerned about
- Window survey / inventory
- Could agree to good quality metal clad, SDL windows at rear

4. 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: DENIED

MOTION: Denial as submitted

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

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. From BAR solar policy:
 - a. Solar Collectors on proposed to be installed on Category 3 or 4 or non-rated historic properties within the Districts may be allowed some visibility from the public right of way, while not detracting from the historic character of the property, as determined by the BAR.
 - b. Solar Collectors on historic properties should be located on rear roof slopes, behind architectural features or parapets, or other locations not visible (following the criteria for visibility listed above). Solar Collectors on Accessory Buildings shall be encouraged.
 - c. Significant, character-defining features, including, but not limited to, roof slopes, dormers, chimneys, windows, shutters, roof ridges, eaves, and other

architectural features, shall not be removed, damaged, altered or obstructed to accommodate Solar Collectors.

- d. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties shall be consulted when evaluating the installation of Solar Collectors on historic properties.
- e. Installation generally should not penetrate historic roofing materials due to the fragile nature of these materials. Custom details are required that are specific to each structure and application method. All alternative means should be explored before penetrating historic materials, including positioning panels on auxiliary structures, free-standing installations, and locating panels on secondary roof forms, all with restricted visibility from the public right of way.
- f. The Solar Collectors should be low-profile, or no more than 8" above the roof surface, and at a pitch consistent with the existing roof.
- g. The color of conduit and all attachment mechanisms for Solar Collectors shall be painted to be compatible with the existing material, including roof, siding, etc.
- h. The Solar Collectors shall be installed in a manner that is reversible.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Proposed solar panels are highly visible and will be incongruent with existing roof.
2. If Board wishes to approve, staff asks for a discussion on the clamps in order to prevent damage to the roof.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Katie Sailor, Huger Street
 - Opposed
- HCF
 - Concern about visibility
 - Suggest moving to back of dependency
 - Concern about attachment
 - Recommend deferral
- PSC
 - BAR solar policy regarding visibility
 - Mostly concerned with lower piazza roof
 - opposed

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

- Placement is to make most efficient
- At rear would only get sun until about noon

BOARD QUESTIONS / DISCUSSION:

- Roof is terne metal, how is it connected? Clamp may be rated but roof seam is not
 - No way to get around penetrating roof
 - Would love to see more solar in historic districts
 - Rear addition is more modern metal roof, would provide better connections
 - Perfect for solar, unfortunately couldn't be more visible
 - Disagree with written comment that solar is hideous
 - For time being, would recommend placing on rear house only
-

5. 134 Smith Street

TMS # 460-16-01-098 | BAR2023-001190

Category 4 | Radcliffeborough | c. 1895 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for new accessory dwelling at rear.

Owner: Cornelius Thomas

Applicant: Julie O'Connor, American Vernacular

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Conceptual approval with Board conditions and final review by staff

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

BOARD COMMENTS/CONDITIONS:

1. Lower overall height by minimum of 18"
2. Clarify / maximize greenspace

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. Proposal is nicely designed, architecturally complementary to existing structure.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Proposed accessory structure is not subordinate to existing, historic structure. Staff recommend reducing height where possible, such as:
 - a. Reducing ceiling heights to lower overall height
 - b. Changing roof pitch or form
2. Staff recommend removing flood vents from front of structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Defer for restudy to reduce overall height

BOARD QUESTIONS:

- Materials
 - SDL clad
 - Cementous siding
 - Stucco foundation
 - Metal roof?

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- No public comment

BOARD DISCUSSION:

- Height in comparison to rear portion of house
 - Nice design
 - Think it will be visible
 - There is some room to come down
 - Would like to see more green space
 - Architectural direction is fine
 - Too tall
 - Maybe lower to rear roofline of front house
 - Column diameters may need to shrink if height lowered
-

6. 309 King Street

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

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

Request conceptual approval for storefront renovations.

Owner: Redline Property Partners - Andrew Webb

Applicant: Chipman Design Architecture

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Conceptual approval with staff condition and Board comment

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Huey VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 0

Reduced: Linsday Van Slambrook

BOARD COMMENTS/CONDITIONS:

- Clarify depth conditions at arch, pilaster, & storefront

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. Business description on title page references a gathering space. Per Zoning, this property does not have late night use to operate after use midnight and zoning administrator does not support. Please consult with Zoning.
2. Material board provided.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Maximum height of letters on sign, UJ logo, should be reduced to be better proportioned in the sign band.
2. Windows should be further recessed per previous motion

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Preliminary approval with staff conditions, with final review by staff

BOARD QUESTIONS:

- Window depth
- Details on pilasters

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- PSC
 - Not supportive of arch window, should retain rectangular

BOARD DISCUSSION:

- Would like to see more depth, windows set back, give more visual interest
 - Appreciative where PSC coming from, but arch windows doesn't bother
 - Arch window needs to be further recessed
 - Pilaster detail
 - Proposed swatch for awning (material sample) is too saturated, should be as in proposal
 - How is recessed panel in pilaster achieved
 - Discussion if sign band is out of proportion
-

7. 128 Cannon Street

TMS # 460-11-04-158 | BAR2023-001192

Category 4 | Cannonborough / Elliottborough | c. 1840 | Old City District

Request conceptual approval to restore back of structure to duplex, reopen portion of piazza, add windows to rear mass, and restore transom over piazza door.

Owner: Renee Gaters

Applicant: Tyler A Smith Architects

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Conceptual approval with staff condition and final review by staff

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

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. Staff appreciate the proposal allowing the piazza to be reinstated and the removal of exterior, piazza stairs.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Staff recommend centering the proposed HVAC stand against the hyphen to help reduce visibility.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Conceptual approval with final review by staff of permit drawings

BOARD QUESTIONS:

- Site all gravel?
 - Would like to create outdoor seating space
- Received BZA variance for density

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- PSC
 - Encouraged by proposal

BOARD DISCUSSION:

- Reopening piazza always a good thing
- Staff comment regarding HVAC placement would help, maybe push back on building

8. 27 Limehouse Street

TMS # 457-11-02-012 | BAR2023-001193

NS | Charlestowne | c. 1915 | Old and Historic District

Requesting conceptual approval for one story addition to replace removed porch.

Owner: Jessica Cecil

Applicant: Beau Clowney Architects

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Conceptual approval with final review by staff

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

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. Previous staff and Board comments have been addressed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Preliminary approval with final review by staff of permit drawings

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- No public comment

BOARD DISCUSSION:

- Match brick for foundation?
 - Applicant is open to stucco

9. 14 Gadsden Street

TMS # 457-03-03-067 | BAR2023-001173

Category 3 | Harleston Village | c. 1830 | Old and Historic District

Requesting preliminary approval to elevate existing structure.

Owner: Cozy Development

Applicant: Michael Fisher

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Preliminary approval and final review by staff of permit drawings

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

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

2. Previous staff and Board comments have been addressed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Preliminary approval with final review by staff of permit drawings

BOARD QUESTIONS:

- Investigation of garden wall material?
 - Poured in place concrete, applicant thinks they can extend upward for new wall height

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- HCF easement – written comment provided supporting project

10. 102 Rutledge Avenue

TMS # 457-03-02-115 | BAR2023-001149

NS | Harleston Village | c. 1940 | Old and Historic District

Requesting conceptual approval of dormer addition, exterior stairs, and extension of roof.

Owner: Ed Berlin

Applicant: Neil Stevenson

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral for restudy of narrowing of dormers, with staff conditions and final review by staff

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

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. Roof material and existing windows are shown incorrectly.
2. There are discrepancies between plans and elevations related to roof pitch and dormers which could affect the width of the dormer.
3. Some previous staff comments do not appear to be addressed.
4. Staff continues to encourage narrowing the dormers.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Windows in the proposed dormers to be restudied for proportions that complement the house.
2. Omit shutters from proposed dormers.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral for restudy of dormer

BOARD QUESTIONS:

- Pitch of dormer?
 - 2:12
- Material?
 - TPO

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- PSC
 - Revision to rear roof is appreciated
 - Dormers not appropriate

BOARD DISCUSSION:

- New roof form is improved
- Discussion between wood v. hardie
- Headed in right direction
- Space that could be eliminated in attic
- Dormers very large, incongruous with house, need restudy

11. 438 King Street

TMS # 460-16-02-066 | BAR2023-001194

Category 3 | Mazyck - Wraggborough | c. 1872-1880 | Old and Historic District

Requesting conceptual approval for renovation and conversion of existing structure into small hotel with three story rear addition.

Owner: King Street Investments LLC

Applicant: Neil Stevenson

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral with staff observation and comments and Board condition

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

BOARD COMMENTS/CONDITIONS:

- Correct discrepancies

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. Project received a special exception from zoning on 11.1.22 for accommodations use, so entire project is under purview, regardless of visibility from public ROW.
2. 3D modeling would help better understand the visibility of the roof aperture.

3. There appears to be a discrepancy in drawings. The columns called out as wood and metal on different sheets. Are they being replaced?

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Need to better understand the extension over door on the east elevation. This change should be reversible.
2. On the 2nd floor, east elevation, the transom window should remain.
3. A four-story addition is not sympathetic or subordinate in height to existing structure and should be omitted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Restudy with staff comments

BOARD QUESTIONS:

- Column material?
 - Wood and remaining wood
- Intent to reduce stair tower
 - Plan to reduce to lower than existing structure
- Rear wall at property line
- Elevator going only to second floor?
 - Goes to third, details not decided

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- HCF
 - Written comment -addition shouldn't be taller than existing
- Fred Willis, neighborhood association
 - Concerned about height of addition
 - Easement across property, crosses parking lot
 - City involvement/Children's Museum
 - Would like to see issues worked out
- PSC
 - Should not be any engagement of addition with piazza
 - Minimize other impacts on historic structure
 - Provide reveal at addition

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

- Next submittal to reduce impact, discussion with preservation groups
- Height being reduced
- Several easements in parking lot, some dissolved, will research

BOARD DISCUSSION:

- Agree with staff comments and conditions
- Agree with PSC comment about reveal
- Lower parapet
- If no public access to roof, can be a hatch
- Move plantable space to outside of wall

Motion to adjourn by Huey; seconded by Wilson.
