



**CITY OF CHARLESTON
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW - SMALL**

MEETING RESULTS

SEPTEMBER 8, 2022

4:30 P.M.

2 GEORGE STREET

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

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Pinto, Bennett, Gordineer

A. MINUTES

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM AUGUST 25, 2022 MEETING

APPROVED

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Approved.

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

B. APPLICATIONS

1. 56 Congress Street

TMS # 463-16-03-089 | BAR2022-000883

NS | North Central | c. 1920 | Historic Materials Demolition Purview

Request demolition of historic structure. Site visit 8:30 am.

Owner: 56 Congress LLC

Applicant: LaShaun Key, Key Design

APPROVED

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Approval of Demolition with Board Comments: 1) To consider new design in keeping with current form 2) Encourage salvaging materials.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Van Slambrook VOTE: FOR 3 AGAINST 2
Nay – Huey & Wilson

NOTES:

- HCF
 - Opposed
- PSC
 - Opposed
 - Only concerned with what is visible

- Architectural integrity and quality of what is there
- No issue with removal of non-historic but brick veneer might be what holds it together
- Features still there, just covered (chimney, eave line, etc.)
- No way to know what is under brick or condition that it is in
- Board
 - “Covered in saran wrap and aluminum foil and a bunch of other stuff”
 - “Demolished by a thousand cuts”

PREVIOUS Staff Observations 8.25.22:

1. *The adjacent 58 Congress is a sister house which has not been altered to the same extent.*
2. *The brick on the east side does not match that on the south and west.*
3. *The rear addition is less than 50 years old and so is not under BAR purview.*

PREVIOUS Staff Comments 8.25.22:

1. *While the siding has been changed to brick, the overall form of the structure has been retained*
2. *Exploratory demo could be used to determine if wood siding remains under the brick veneer, and to what extent.*
3. *Staff recommend following the repairs mentioned in the structural report to restore the building.*
4. *Demolition means the removal of an entire structure or a substantial portion of a structure visible from the public right-of-way or a substantial portion of features of a structure that are visible from the public rights-of-way that define its historic architectural character. The demolition of this structure would compromise the character of the neighborhood and change the overall historic landscape of the area.*

PREVIOUS Staff Recommendation 8.25.22: Denial

2. 194 Nassau Street

TMS # 459-05-01-060 | BAR2021-000499

Not Rated | East Side | c. 1900 | Historic Materials Demolition Purview

Requesting after the fact approval for demolition of historic structure.

Owner: Nathan Blackburn

Applicant: Paul Kime

APPROVED

WITHDRAWN

DENY

DEFERRED

MOTION: Denial of after-the-fact demolition. To match previous with staff comments and plans to Board within 30 days (elevation, windows on property line will adapt to Code), and Staff to provide timeline from building.

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

NOTES:

- Kevin Eberle
 - Plans should show historic building and match
 - Details incorrect details
 - Oppose demolition. Request entire reconstruction of previous.
- PSC

- Disappointed. Only recourse to deny and rebuild.
- HCF
 - Opposed

Staff Observations:

1. 3/30/2021: Permit Application for Demolition of damaged structure
2. 4/7/2021: Internal Note that the Application must go to the Board
3. 5/27/2021: Board of Architectural Review. Motion: Denial with Staff Comments, and Final Review by Staff
4. 8/25/2021: BAR approval for the repair and addition only, no demolition
5. 5/13/2022: SWO from Building – Exceeding Scope
6. 6/1/2022: Application for Permit for New Structure
7. 8/8/2022: General Property Hold

Staff Comments:

1. The application indicates the proposal to build a house identical to the house that was demolished. However, there are many elements which are not identical. The piazza screen should be recessed from the front plane of the house, not continuous and flush across the front, as seen in the current photos. It should also be reduced in height to match the original.
2. The house is being raised up much taller than previously and the foundation is CMU instead of piers, unlike the original.
 - a. What is the BFE? Does the house need to be raised this high?
3. The gable roof should be centered on the body of the house and the roof pitch should be steeper to match the historic house.
4. The front windows should be centered and equally spaced on the façade. Windows should match the proportions of the original house which were much more vertical.
5. The siding exposure should be wider to match the original, with a profile to match.
6. The original house had a gable vent which is not shown but should be included in the new plans.
7. The piazza appears to be narrower than the piazza on the original house.
8. The roof should be hand scrimped, standing seam metal in tinnens red.
9. There is no overhang to the eaves on the original house, along the gable or along the sides. The roof ended tightly at the exterior walls of the house.
10. The trim along the roof line does not match original.
11. Proposed lanterns are not appropriate for this house.
12. The proposed piazza door is not typical for this building type and should be revised to a solid four or six panel door.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of after the fact, reconstruct to match with staff comments, must submit revised plans within 30 days.

3. 119 – 121 Broad Street

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

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

Request conceptual approval for new two-story guest-house, pool, and pergola.

Owner: MCCURU Properties

Applicant: Neil Stevenson Architects

APPROVED

WITHDRAWN

~~DENY~~

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Conceptual approval with Board Conditions: 1) Carefully restudy proportions/details to be more classical but different from main house 2) Restudy vertical conditions, restore pedestal at base without increasing height 3) Study mechanical/equipment screening and sound proofing 4) Encourage location equipment in vault 5) Reduce impervious paving 6) Refine pergola design language to be in keeping with design language 7) Include DFE.

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

NOTES:

- Chuck Baker, representing the neighbors
 - Location of pool equipment would be better moved to other side of pool house. Is 20' from neighbor's house
 - Board has authority to move equipment to prevent livability issue. Should be considered further.
- Cary Agnew
 - Issue with size of the pool – should be reduced
 - Wants parking lot removed, half of area changed to grass
 - Roof line only slightly lowered, structure lowered by step
 - Floor joists too deep?
 - Concern about pool equipment and sound issues
- Teresa Smyth, Charleston Neighborhood Association
 - Request deferral for further review
- PSC
 - Plans don't meet requirements
 - Should be reduced to 1.5 stories
- Lawrence Wetzler – written comment
 - Parking too large
 - Building lowered in ground, not in height
 - Not reduced to 1.5 stories
 - Pool should be smaller, chemicals needed
- Neil Stevenson (response)
 - Pool is 2.5 times larger than others, but property is 2.5 times larger
 - Reluctant to move equipment next to house, detracts from house. Can buffer or shield
 - Client opposed to 1.5 stories
 - Depth of floor system - will include all ductwork etc.
- Board
 - Appreciate stucco on masonry
 - Details need refinement. H/S/M and general architectural direction ok
 - Reinstate pedestal base, flood issue if below DFE
 - Don't match balustrade of house, compliment
 - Study aerials, finesse, and details. Landmark spot
 - Need detailed, highly measured site plan.
 - Could one of pavilions be home for equipment. Maybe place underground in vault
 - Rendered plan shows landscaping would shield. Would help to know detail
 - Check turn radius into driveway/maneuverability
 - Soften parking area – materials
 - Would have preferred 1.5 story, but appreciate height reduction
 - Shear size of parking lot, is it required?
 - Change of material or green space

- Floor truss can be reduced
- Pergola could be lightened in design / height
- Structures on end of pergola, 3rd architectural vocabulary
 - Study a bit more, more garden-y less beach-y

PREVIOUS MOTION: Deferral with staff comments 1 - 6 with Board clarifications

BOARD Clarifications:

- (2) If it is to be stucco, must be stucco on masonry
- (3-4) Details more in keeping with property, reduce pool house to 1 ½ stories, restudy height to ensure compliance with ordinance
- (5-6) Reduction of overall height of pergola, and detailing of garden structure

PREVIOUS Staff Observations 8.11.22:

1. The drawing of the guest house appears to be flipped on the street scape (sheet A7).

PREVIOUS Staff Comments 8.11.22:

Guest-house:

1. Fenestration patterns should be simplified, currently it is very busy.
2. Are the new structures stucco on masonry or frame? The elevation says on masonry, section shows on frame. If it is stucco on frame the control joints should be shown.
3. On the east elevation the windows are out of scale for the building and appear to exceed floor to ceiling height in reference to the porch. Overall, the structure is very balanced and symmetrical with the exception of the east wall. Staff recommend mimicking the window size on the west elevation and matching the fenestration patterns.
4. No roof plan was included, staff is concerned about drainage on the flat roof over the porch.

Pergola:

5. Staff recommend restudying the architectural direction of the pergola. Details should be refined to be more classical, similar to the proposed guest house and existing main house, which are more high style.
6. Detailing the apertures on the front elevation with windowsills or trim would give a more classical direction.

PREVIOUS Staff Recommendation 8.11.22: Conceptual approval with staff comments and final review by staff

Staff Comments:

Pool house

1. Applicant has responded to previous comments related to fenestration, roof, and building materials.

Pergola

2. The width of the openings on the streetside elevation match the width of the openings on the poolside, but the proportions of those at the streetside could be improved by making them more vertical.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval with final review by staff

4. 9 Coming Street

TMS # 457-04-03-019 | BAR2022-000893

Not Rated | Harleston Village | c. 1901 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for new piazza screen, new two-story piazza, extension of second floor addition to ground, and new rear addition.

Owner: Josh & Dannon Heller

Applicant: Robbie Marty

APPROVED

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Conceptual approval with Staff Comment #1.

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

NOTES:

- No piazza on first floor is due to access for car
- HCF
 - Restores appearance of piazza
 - Rear addition should be differentiated
- PSC
 - Supportive. Concerned about piazza
 - Should differ. Corner board of current addition could remain
- Board
 - Dramatic improvement
 - Will have to apply for FEMA variance
 - Tree is diseased, will have to remove.
 - Condition is based on zoning approval of tree.
 - Agree with justification of no first-floor piazza.

Staff Comments:

1. New portions should differentiate from existing structure.
2. The projected portion should be limited to its existing width, but continue to the ground.
3. Rear addition should be subordinate to existing structure.
4. A piazza should be added to first floor.
5. Reduce the number of window-to-door changes in order to minimize the alterations to the historic structure. The window in the proposed laundry room on second floor should remain a window and the front door should stay in its current location.
6. The windows on the rear addition should be equally spaced.

Staff Recommendation: Restudy with staff comments

5. 161 Tradd Street

TMS # 457-11-04-029 | BAR2022-000891

Category 3 | Charlestowne | c. 1870 | Old and Historic District

Requesting conceptual approval for piazza enclosure on two stories.

Owner: Ross Miller

Applicant: Dennis Schumm

~~APPROVED~~

~~WITHDRAWN~~

DENY

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Denial as submitted with staff comments.

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

NOTES:

- PSC
 - Opposed to piazza infill. Current piazza is pristine.
 - Suggest addition at rear.
- HCF
 - Reference BAR policy on enclosures – no other alternatives
 - No site plan?
 - Challenges to retrofit but can be done
- Board
 - Board has resisted request to enclose piazzas
 - Rare to have two fully open piazzas
 - Would be open to enclosure behind columns/balustrade.
 - Rear of house – permission to get creation with non-historic portion, exceed footprint, etc.
 - Program can be achieved without enclosure.
 - Zoning Board can be understanding
 - Our ordinance doesn't allow this
 - Have acknowledged this in past
 - Given there had been historic enclosure – look into if reversible
- Can't get zoning approval, max lot coverage?

Staff Observations:

1. *Enclosing piazzas in whole, or in part, may result in irreversible damage to our architectural heritage.*
2. *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.*
3. *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.*

Staff Comments:

1. This house has a rear addition that was added in the 1990s, which includes the current family room (1st floor) and master bedroom (2nd floor). Accommodations for a new bathroom can and should be made off this addition to ensure the integrity of the historic house. Given the typical slope of most piazzas; extensive, nonreversible alterations may be required to make an accessible space.
2. The stair relocation has no impact on the piazza. The current staircase and master bath are swapping locations. This proposed creates an additional bathroom (for a total of 3) at the second floor. House already has two staircases, one of which is being altered to winder stairs. (Though this is not under BAR purview, winder stairs are not necessarily safer due to the minimum tread width.)
3. The proposed location for the new enclosure will cause the removal of an existing shutter. Any enclosure should join the wall of the existing house in between windows so that the shutters are impacted.
4. If the piazza is enclosed, it should be behind columns and balustrade so that these features can remain in place and changes are reversible, as it was previously and as required in the BAR policy.

Staff Recommendation: Denial with staff comments

6. 6 Montagu Street

TMS # 457-04-01-082 | BAR2022-000892

Category 2 | Harleston Village | c. 1803 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for alterations to historic house including rear addition.

Owner: Claron Robertson

Applicant: Simons Young + Associates

APPROVED

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Conceptual approval with Staff Comment #1 and Board Comment to complete the fanlight and provide more thorough detailing of drainage and potential restudy of siding.

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

NOTES:

- Rob Robertson
 - Lived on street for 40 years
 - Returning to single family
- Egress for attic?
- Dormer window on front clipped – will make full Georgian curve
- Studying roof condition on current addition, fit under original roof line
- HCF
 - Recommend approval
- David Jones, 8 Montagu
 - In support
- Tom Scott,
 - In support
- PSC
 - Appreciate light touch. Should clearly read history of mid-sections.
 - Soften transition.
 - Reduce height of screened porch
 - Overly busy – encourage simplification.
- Written Comments in favor
- Board
 - Concern about drainage
 - Let middle portion be more transitional
 - Shift porch away from corner? Parapet too tall
 - Change of siding very helpful
 - Concern about egress over dormer
 - Lower parapet
 - Windows change – reads like belong with screened porch instead of original house

Staff Observations:

1. The proposed addition is visible from Montagu Street and minimally visible from Coming Street.

Staff Comments:

1. The newly proposed extension and the new treatment to the original addition are differentiated through material usage and detailing. However, the addition should be subordinate to the existing. Lower the height of parapet at the rear wall as it is currently too tall.
2. Proportions of windows in infill are very awkward, while more vertical proportions are preferred this feel stretched.
3. This modern addition for such a historic house, staff questions if the architectural direction needs to be restudied.

Staff Recommendation: Defer for restudy with staff comments

7. **86 Murray Boulevard**

TMS # 457-11-01-005 | BAR2022-000878

NR | Charlestowne | c. 1941 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for new front windows changing proportions, new dormers on front, new doors at balcony, and new fenestration at third floor.

Owner: Colin Coletti and Clair Schwartz

Applicant: Julie O'Connor, American Vernacular Inc

APPROVED

WITHDRAWN

DENY

DEFERRED

MOTION: Denial of dormer enlargement. Approval of sidelights and elongation of windows on 1st and 2nd floor and of side elevations.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Huey

VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 1

Nay - Wilson

NOTES:

- PSC
 - Board previously moved to not change opening on front
- HCF
 - Enlargement of dormers inappropriate
 - Not comfortable supporting changing window size
- Board
 - No issue with sidelights for balcony door
 - Less issue with changing window size
 - More issue with large dormers
 - Windows were dictated by standard rather than classical proportions
 - Larger windows feel more appropriate, dormers have gotten top heavy
 - Original dormers are just better. Proposed crowd the pediment.
 - Dormers feel like they are falling off the roof.
- Replace all shutters to match? If replacing windows
- Total composition makes more sense

PREVIOUS MOTION 8.11.22: Deferral for restudy with Board Conditions

PREVIOUS BOARD CONDITION 8.11.22:

- *Clarification of effects flood zone to ground level*
- *Alterations on historic portions of building,*

- *Verify age and material of all windows and doors where changes are requested*

PREVIOUS Staff Observations 8.11.22:

1. *Narrow dormers are typical of that area of Murray Boulevard and are seen on several adjacent structures.*

PREVIOUS Staff Comments 8.11.22:

2. *The new dormers are better in proportion to the scale of the house.*
3. *Proposed balcony doors are very modern and should be restudied. If the purpose is for more light, a centered door with side lights would match the existing symmetry of the house.*
4. *The existing single window on the east elevations breaks the pattern of that wall. The proposed windows restore symmetry.*
5. *Staff has concerns with the proposed alterations to the ground floor fenestration. While the proposed windows are in keeping with the existing façade, this property is in an AE(12) flood zone so the proposed changes could cause issues with flooding.*
6. *Proportions of windows should not be changed.*

PREVIOUS Staff Recommendation 8.11.22: Conceptual approval with staff comments and final review by staff.

Staff Observations:

1. Previous window changes to fiberglass clad were not approved by the BAR.
2. Window and door survey has not been provided and age of materials has not been addressed.

Staff Comments:

1. Per previous Board motion, proportions on historic portions of building should not be altered.

Staff Recommendation: Per previous Board motion, deferral for restudy with staff and board comments

8. 89 & 89 ½ Wentworth Street

TMS # 457-04-03-002 | BAR2022-000861

Category 2 | Harleston Village | c. 1787 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for new masonry garden wall.

Owner: Mr. & Mrs. Ohanesian

Applicant: Jenny Bevan

APPROVED

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Final approval with Board Condition to submit stucco finish and color and to amend detail to show cells filled.

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

NOTES:

- Encourage to be solid filled so coursing doesn't show through

Staff Observations:

1. Wall will be minimally visible due to setback but is being reviewed by Board because of the category of the structure.

Staff Recommendation: Final approval

9. 79 Ashley Avenue

TMS # 457-03-03-194 | BAR2022-000887

Category 2 | Harleston Village | c. 1842 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for hardscape and lighting alterations.

Owner: Ronald Cain

Applicant: Julie Hensley

APPROVED

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Final approval with Board Condition any down lights have hood/shield to not shine in neighbor's windows.

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

NOTES:

- Existing brick \$6/ each and hard to find (cost not an issue – applicant)
- Sarah Euwing
 - 75 Ashley
 - Ask lights not to shine in windows

Staff Observations:

1. Hardscape elements are fitting.

Staff Comments:

1. Uplighting is generally reserved for specimen trees only.

Staff Recommendation: Final approval with staff comments

10. Revised BAR Sign Policy Statement (General)

APPROVED

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Approval.

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

11. New Bar Sign Policy Statement (Historic Corridor District)

APPROVED

~~WITHDRAWN~~

~~DENY~~

~~DEFERRED~~

MOTION: Approval.

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Huey

VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0
