



# CITY OF CHARLESTON BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SMALL

---

## MEETING RESULTS

**OCTOBER 12, 2023**

**4:30 P.M.**

**2 GEORGE STREET**

---

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

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Frankie Pinto, Linda Bennett, Magalie Creech

---

### A. Minutes

#### 1. Review of Minutes from the September 28, 2023 Meeting

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Approve

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

---

### B. Applications

#### 1. 58 Saint Margaret Street

**TMS # 463-11-04-117 | BAR2023-001237**

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

Request demolition of both front and rear porches, all windows and doors, brick chimney, and portion of roof.

Owner: Abigail Walsh & Brendan Sweeney

Applicant: Clark-Glidewell

**Site visit on 10/12/23 at 8:30 a.m.**

DECISION: DEFERRED BY APPLICANT

---

#### 2. 124 Rutledge Avenue

**TMS # 457-03-02-125 | BAR2023-001238**

**Category 4 | Harleston Village | c. 1915 | Old and Historic District**

Request demolition of rear chimney.

Owner: Martin Liljebald

Applicant: Chris Chariker

**Site visit on 10/12/23 at 8:50 a.m.**

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Approval with staff conditions

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

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. The chimney is for a boiler room behind the house and not original to structure.
2. Although design of the chimney is interesting and dates to approximately 1960, it does block a historic window at the rear elevation.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Salvage brick for reuse.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with staff condition

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- No public comment

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Surprised it survived hurricane Hugo

---

**3. 32 Lenwood Boulevard**

**TMS # 457-16-03-030 | BAR2023-001239**

**NS | Charlestowne | c. 1942 | Old and Historic District**

Request complete demolition of house and shed.

Owner: Lenwood Lodge LLC

Applicant: Oliver Freundlich Design

**Site visit on 10/12/23 at 9:15 a.m.**

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: Defer to allow applicant to further investigate the history and evolution of the structure, and Board request to provide good faith indication of what might be proposed if demolition were granted

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

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. Staff have no objection to the removal of the shed.
2. Structure has minimal visibility due to vegetation, not structures. BAR cannot consider vegetation when reviewing visibility.
3. House is well built and has been maintained, per application.
4. While expanded since its initial construction, the house is a great representation of the early half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and represents the evolution of this part of the city.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of demolition of shed; denial of demolition of house

BOARD QUESTIONS:

- Which areas are slab on grade
- Flood zone AE(11), would have to raise 5.7' to BFE (additional height to DFE)

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Rhett Dunaway, 34 Lenwood

- Opposed to demo
- Learned about Friday night
- Owners bought (32) around 3 years ago
- Is subject to flooding
- Flooding has been better with changes to Battery wall
- Approximately 100 years old, should preserve. Demo is nuclear option
- (Owners) daughter lives behind, possibility for flood wall
- Problems existed at time of purchase
- Agreed with previous renovations (approximately 2014) to accommodate previous owners so they could stay in house
- Zach King, 30 Lenwood
  - Wife's family has owned (30 Lenwood) for 75 years, was originally a lumbermill
  - Own house is slab on grade, understand issues with flooding
  - No flooding occurred with hurricane Matthew, biggest flood since hurricane Hugo
  - Didn't fight (daughter's) pool and pool house. Regret not fighting
  - Concerned about loss of privacy
  - Object to demolition
- Kevin Eberle
  - Provided Sanborn and new article to staff
  - Applicant hasn't provided adequate history
  - Layers added over time, deserves careful attention
- PSC
  - Concerned with request, insufficient information about age and evolution of structure
- HCF
  - Insufficient information in application
  - Not opposed to demolition of modern additions
- Others in audience in opposition:
  - Mary Rivers, 2 Lenwood
  - Carol Kelly, 16 Gibbes
  - Lucie Maguire, 42 Gibbes
  - David Tylus, 3 Lowndes
  - Chris Wilson, 7 ½ Gibbes
  - Anne Keogh, 132 S Battery
  - Richard Thaler, 5 Tradd
- Written comment in opposition (6)

**APPLICANT RESPONSE:**

- Did not intentionally omit information
- Questions under what terms renovation/alterations could take place

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

- Bill Huey worked on house approximately 22 years ago. Provided some history. Central portion is most historic
- Suggest engaging local architectural historian
- doors are open to other radical possibilities
- partial demo (or full demo, depending on additional house history information) should include proposed diagrammatic

- discussion on difficulty of raising slab on grade
- important issue is flooding
- when buying historic house you are buying that historic house, not the house that you want
- further investigation and documentation regarding what parts of house are less valuable/historic
- most important portions can be saved and raised
- when keeping historic houses out of flood water the solutions should not be to knock them down
- probably 2 historic masses that should be retained, other portions may be superfluous

---

#### 4. 2 ½ Atlantic Street

**TMS # 457-16-04-068 | BAR2023-001240**

**NR | Charlestowne | c. 1985 | Old and Historic District**

Appeal of staff approval of fence.

Owner: Benjamin & Maura Watson

Applicant: Andrew Hargett

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Grant approval of appeal and revoke staff decision

MADE BY: Huey SECOND: Turner VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 1  
Opposed: Martin

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. 2/17/23 - Generator and stand were conditionally approved, with the condition of screening to match HVAC screening.
2. 4/17/23 - Staff received complaint about unscreened equipment, homeowner was in process of having screening designed.
3. Staff met with design professional multiple times to discuss screening iterations.
4. 9/26/23 - Fence enclosure was approved to meet that requirement.
5. 10/2/23 - Staff received appeal for fencing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

No recommendation, as this is an appeal of a Staff approval.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- HCF
  - Unfortunate location for installation
  - Visibility from Zig Zag Alley should get equal weight as visibility from Atlantic Street
  - Unfortunate that generators must be raised
  - request confirmation that stand is no higher than is required
  - suggest that a shed be constructed around stand instead
- PSC
  - Unfortunate failure of public process
  - Encourage home owner to work with staff for appropriate solution
- Sebastian von Marschall, designer
  - History of design process, meetings with neighbors

- Reasons for not extending wall
- Design possibilities of shed, impervious surface issue
- Precedents of screening in neighborhood
- Permit requirements, Coastal A flood zone
- Greg Finch, 0 Zig Zag Alley
  - Location and visibility of generator
  - Small unique alley
  - Encourage Board to come see generator and stand
- George Cogar, 3 Zig Zag Alley
  - Permits were not posted
  - References to cost, it is a \$3 million house
  - Haven't been included in process
  - Better solution to located in confines of back yard
  - This is poor solution, significance of Zig Zag
- Nora Matson, owner, 2 ½ Atlantic
  - Surprised by appeal, have shared planning with neighbors
  - Screening is condition of permit, decided with neighbors that additional screening would be better
  - Neighbors requested Sebastian von Marschall as designer
  - Paid for meetings between neighbors and designer
  - Began discussions within days of instillation (generator and stand)
- Darlene Shaw, 3 Zig Zag Alley
  - Began collaboration but broke down
  - Didn't know current proposal had been submitted until checking with City staff
  - Procedures not followed, placard
- Written comment in support of appeal (7)

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Questions if stand is build higher than needed
  - Believe it is possible to extend wall. Can build treated wood frame with stucco to mimic
  - Coastal A issues, breakaway
  - Would have suggested pushing HVAC back for stand placement
  - Bigger than needs to be. Area access clearance issues with generators
  - Screening taller than needed, until is not much higher than masonry wall, reduce screening
  - (Existing) lattice is not attractive, screening is more obtrusive than generator
  - Make as small as possible, required clearance
  - "Float" masonry wall on stainless steel lintel, pin in place
  - Stockade style with lattice not attractive
  - Eave line of garage so low, height of screening doesn't look good
  - Would rather have generator peek above screening
-

**5. 124 Rutledge Avenue**

**TMS # 457-03-02-125 | BAR2023-001243**

**Category 4 | Harleston Village | c. 1915 | Old and Historic District**

Request conceptual approval for dormer addition at rear elevation.

Owner: Martin Liljebald

Applicant: Chris Chariker

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Conceptual approval for dormers with Board condition and final review by staff of permit documents

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

BOARD CONDITIONS:

- Refine and clarify all proposed details

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. Dormer will change the roof line of existing house, is not visible from Rutledge, and will only be visible from Calhoun Street and from a distance.
2. Windows in the proposed addition appear to be casements that, while not specifically visible, offers differentiation from the existing house and will preserve the timeline of the evolution of this structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Conceptual approval with final review by staff of permit drawings

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- No public comment

BOARD COMMENTS:

- No issue with double hung windows
- Drawing issues, dormers should match
- Get dormer off hip, would read better, evolution of house
- Window specifications required for final review

---

**6. 59 Broad Street**

**TMS # 458-09-03-050 | BAR2023-001241**

**NR | Charlestowne | pre-1944 | Old and Historic District**

Requesting conceptual approval for reconstructing 3<sup>rd</sup> floor, adding new 1/2 story, and façade alterations.

Owner: Elizabeth Barnwell Banchik

Applicant: Dan Sweeney

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral for restudy with staff conditions

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

Recused: Martin

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. Age of third story unknown, believed to be a 1970s addition.
2. Staff recommended studying previous Board reviews of additions at 56 Morris and 35 Broad.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Proposal is too tall. The addition would make this building the tallest structure on the block. Staff recommend reducing height and pushing the addition to the rear.
2. Proposed detailing is very elaborate. Overly ornate detail gives a false sense of history and should be restudied.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Deferral for restudy

BOARD QUESTIONS:

- Windows on side allowed per code

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- HCF
  - Concern about 4 stories on Broad, important buildings on Broad are only 3 stories
  - Should read as 3 stories along street
  - Balconies should be simplified
  - Paired windows atypical
  - Recommend restudy of height, denial of roof deck
- PSC
  - Recommend continued study
  - Simplify to prevent false impression of history

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

- Believe building can handle forth story
- Simplification and good detailing

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Questions if able to set windows on top 2 floors deep in wall
  - Agree with staff and especially HCF comments
  - Balustrade distracting for height and detailing
  - Parapet of roof deck, simplifloed to wall
  - Simplify detailing, maybe modernize
  - Nice design stand alone, but adding floor and details erases existing building
  - Doesn't reflect architecture of existing building or architecture of street
  - Today would object to adding third story, but since is existing it can go back
  - Too ornate, but doesn't need scaled back to plain, can dress up a little
  - If want to add additional height could push addition to rear
-

**7. 68 Murray Boulevard**

**TMS # 457-11-02-061 | BAR2023-001244**

**NR | Charlestowne | c. 1951 | Old and Historic District**

Requesting conceptual approval for new one story covered porch at front and removal of side stairs and door at driveway.

Owner: Douglas Berlinsky

Applicant: Kate Campbell, Beau Clowney Architects

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Conceptual approval with final review by staff of permit drawings

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

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. The proposed addition of a front porch does not distract from the existing house. Many other houses along Murray Boulevard have requested and have received similar approvals from the BAR over the years. This porch is well designed and fits well on the house and in the neighborhood.
2. No dimensions have been provided on the floor plans, but an additional half bay is proposed to be added to the depth of the porch. This would create the challenge of matching brick to the existing.
3. Fence, pool, and pool house to be reviewed at staff, per BAR policy statement on Staff reviews.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Recommend limiting depth of proposed to that of existing porch.
2. While the atypical addition between dormers is complimentary to the structure. staff recommend windows remain in historic configuration since Board has previously denied altering the size and shape of dormers on Murray Boulevard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Conceptual approval with staff conditions and final review by staff of permit drawings

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- PSC
  - Concern about altering front dormer
- HCF
  - Concern about altering front dormer

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

- Planning new brick, as close as possible to existing
- Pulled back front porch depth in response to PSC

BOARD COMMENTS:

- No reservation about connecting dormers. Restudy per PSC comment about roof pitch. Original still reads, light touch
  - No issue with porch depth
  - Fence
    - Lot of piers/segments. Combine pedestrian gates to simplify
-



**8. 54 Church Street**

**TMS # 458-13-01-093 | BAR2023-001174**

**Category 4 | Charlestowne | c. 1880 | Old and Historic District**

Requesting stucco system changes.

Owner: Benjamin Mack

Applicant: Joseph Rubenstein

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: Deferral with Board conditions and final review by staff

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

BOARD CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

- Analyze and match existing bed mortar
- Use natural, Portland free, traditional stucco mix
- Consult with staff after sample removal of Portland (approximately 5' x 5' area) in inconspicuous location

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. Applicant to confirm if analysis been done on composition of the stucco.
2. Photos suggest that existing stucco can be removed without damage to historic brick.
3. Removal implies that stucco is not Portland cement as indicated.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. If approved, then the replacement stucco should be a three-part lime-based stucco system and not the proposed synthetic stucco. Synthetic stucco would be inappropriate for this house. staff would suggest that the stucco should be scored as it was in the drawing from the 1880's.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

With satisfactory evidence and confirmation of analysis of existing stucco, Staff recommends approval.

BOARD QUESTIONS:

- Why not traditional 3 part, lime stucco
  - Acrylic synthetic finish
  - Fiber reinforced
- Repoint
  - N or O mortar
  - Testing on bed mortar
- Will stucco come off with out damaging brick
  - Most is delaminating
- Elevation diagram showing dead/delaminated areas
  - 90%

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- HCF
  - Existing stucco needs to be removed
  - Recommend smooth, traditional stucco, not synthetic
- PSC
  - More information is needed

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

- Incorrect use of term synthetic. Portland/sand traditional stucco. Not synthetic

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Would prefer better understanding areas of delamination
- Bed mortar needs to match existing, needs testing
- Suspicious of Portland
- Can easily be tested, before approving want test results
- Think it needs to be lime based stucco
- Not enough information for definitive decision
- Synthetic not appropriate, can get smooth finish with lime based stucco
- Type N not appropriate for bed mortar, type O is closer
- If Portland and stucco, needs to be left alone. If really stuck will do less damage leaving alone
- Don't want to apply that thick of a coat
- If coming off needs to be traditional, Portland not used until 1880
- Prepackaged, premixed doesn't have Portland. Portland damages historic brick
- Test mortar by conservation lab
- Not strong feelings about scoring, false sense of history

---

**9. 4 Trapman Street**

**TMS # 457-12-01-027 | BAR2023-001245**

**Harleston Village | New | Old and Historic District**

Request conceptual approval for two new attached single-family residences.

Owner: 4 Trapman LLC

Applicant: Julie O'Connor, American Vernacular

DECISION: DENIED

MOTION: Denied for height, scale, and mass and general architectural direction

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

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. Historic house approved for demolition by Board 10/27/22.
2. Proposal overwhelms existing homes on street. The house this is replacing was a modest one and a half-story structure that fit the nature of the street.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Proposal reads as a large single-family structure. Staff suggest restudy to help this read as two attached structures, emphasizing the vertical proportion of each. This can be accomplished through the articulation of two separate units, similar to how the rear façade reads.
2. Garage doors should not face the street. Street-facing garage doors are out of character for this street.
3. Proposal is raised above DFE to allow for park under. Structure should be lowered, and the ground floor height reduced.
4. Faux shuttered window on side elevations should be removed as shutters aren't used on the side elevations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial for height, scale, and mass

**BOARD QUESTIONS:**

- Clarify pedestrian access
- Height required for FEMA, is it above DFE
- Detached vs attached
- Zoning doesn't allow detached, have to be attached

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- HFC
  - Concerned about scale. Trapman is characterized by low single family
  - Roof deck doesn't fit
  - Request denial of height, scale, mass and architectural direction
- PSC
  - This section of Trapman is very narrow, proposal is too tall
  - Foundation shouldn't be taller than necessary to meet DFE
  - Front facing garage is inappropriate
  - Recommend denial as submitted
- Written public comments in opposition (2)

**APPLICANT RESPONSE:**

- Don't think street facing garage doors inappropriate, reference Rainbow Row
- Don't think attached homes are out of character

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

- Handsome on its own, difficult accepting at current location
- Appreciate staff suggestion of having it read as separate structures
- Lose rooftop element/ parapet, it exacerbates height
- Give appearance of two separate buildings, maybe use hyphen
- Uncomfortable there is no front door/ pedestrian access
- Too detailed for street
- Should read as separate units, maybe no porch along front
- Maybe push garage up under structure
- Very tall, dominates streetscape, above DFE

---

**10.4 Trumbo Street**

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

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

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

Owner: Charleston & Erica Missel  
Applicant: Chatauk Studio, Jeremy Kruska

DECISION: DEFERRED BY STAFF

---

**11. 34 Percy Street**

**TMS # 460-08-01-072 | BAR2023-001116**

**Category 4 | Cannonborough / Elliottborough | c. 1885 | Old City District**

Requesting preliminary approval for alterations to existing structure and new rear addition.

Owner: 34 Percy LLC

Applicant: Alison C Dawson, AIA

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

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

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

BOARD CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

- Restudy piazza screen details
- Rotate piazza flooring

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. Applicant should confirm if previously proposed rear structure(34B) is no longer part of scope of project for Board's understanding and clarification of site plan.
2. As this is a preliminary review, applicant should confirm the materials for the pervious drive surface.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Hood at piazza screen should be wood, not cementations siding.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Preliminary approval with final review by staff of permit drawings

BOARD QUESTIONS:

- Plans reference wood and Truexterior on addition
- Second dwelling

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- No public comment

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Entry canopy doesn't show on elevations
  - Piazza flooring should rotate, be perpendicular
  - Detail refinement, entry canopy (hood), piazza steps,
-

## 12. 22 Meeting Street

**TMS # 457-16-04-009 | BAR2023-001246**

**Category 3 | Charlestowne | c. 1810 | Old and Historic District**

Requesting conceptual approval for fenestration alterations.

Owner: Tim & Gisela Anglim

Applicant: Artis Construction

DECISION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

MOTION: Approve option #1A, #3B, #4 not under purview

MADE BY: Martin SECOND: Turner VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 1  
Opposed: Wilson

### STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. Staff appreciate the removal of the storm door and attention to detail in the proposed replacement.
2. East elevation window is not visible and so not under BAR purview.
3. Request #2 has been withdrawn by the Applicant.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Conceptual approval with final review by staff of permit drawings

### PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Sandy Bennett, next door neighbor
  - Lived next door for 38 years
  - Removing appropriate windows to replace with inappropriate casement
- Katie \_\_\_\_, next door neighbor
  - Concerned about drawings
  - Addition most prominent part from Atlantic
  - New door doesn't reflect front door, details concerning

### APPLICANT RESPONSE:

- Happy to work with neighbors and staff

### BOARD COMMENTS:

- Discuss the visibility of request #3
  - Request #1 is original width, per photos. Should remain
    - #3 not very visible
    - #4 not visible
  - Would prefer flat top door
  - Not as much issue with double hung window, but should be double hung, not casement
  - #4 isn't visible, but should be more vertical
  - Keep to original opening width, discussion
-

**13. 197 King Street**

**TMS # 457-08-02-035 | BAR2023-001242**

**Category 4 | Harleston Village | pre-1884 | Old and Historic District**

Requesting conceptual approval for storefront alterations.

Owner: Andy Golden

Applicant: Evans and Schmidt Architects

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Final Approval

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

STAFF OBSERVATIONS:

1. Façade infill has been altered and the previous brick infill has been stuccoed over.
2. Proposed is within framework of existing granite entablature and columns.
3. The existing storefront is over 50 years of age and most likely considerably older.
4. The proposal compliments the existing building and is sympathetic to the historic storefronts of King Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Conceptual approval with final review by staff of permit drawings

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- No public comment

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Compliment proposal

---

**C. OTHER BUSINESS**

- 1. Discussion and Vote on Revisions to Rules and Procedure of the Board of Architectural Review related to meeting schedules.**

DECISION: WITHDRAWN BY STAFF

---

Motion to adjourn by Martin; seconded by Huey. (8:45 p.m.)

---