

**Board of Architectural Review Minutes  
Tuesday October 1st, 2019  
Town Hall Annex Building– Training Room**

**Members Present:**

Phil Dixon, Chairman  
Beth Huggins  
Tim Kennedy  
Jeff Bowers

**Staff Present:**

Becca Zimmerman, Planner II  
Jessi Shuler, Director of Planning

**Members Absent:**

David Price, Vice Chairman  
Rachel Burton  
Cecile Cothran

Items on the agenda:

---

**Old Business:**

1. **500 North Main Street-** Fence material and dumpster relocation (*B-3*)
2. **906 S. Main Street-** New construction of accessory cottage (*R-1*)

**New Business:**

1. **315 Sumter Avenue-** Window replacement, front porch renovation (*R-1*)
2. **138 Salisbury Drive-** Addition to side of house (*R-1*)
3. **113 East Richardson Avenue (Suite B)-** Mural on side of building (*B-3*)
4. **308 S. Magnolia Street-** Demolition of fire damaged cottage (*R-1*)
5. **206 Central Avenue-** Demolition & replacement of fellowship hall/church offices (*R-2*)
6. **608 Central Avenue-** New construction of (2) single-family residences (*R-1*)
7. **0 Gadsden Street-** New construction of a single-family residence (*R-1*)
8. **113 E. 6<sup>th</sup> South Street-** Installation of white picket fence (*R-1*)
9. **102 Central Avenue-** Installation outdoor seating for new business (*B-3*)
10. **111 S. Main Street-** Replacement of exterior rear doorway for new business (*B-3*)

**Miscellaneous:**

1. Design Guidelines-Update

---

Chairman Dixon opened the meeting at 6:00 PM and asked for consideration of the minutes from the August 6th, 2019 regularly scheduled meeting. Jeff Bowers moved to approve the minutes as submitted and Tim Kennedy seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**Old Business:**

500 N. Main Street (B-3) – No representatives were present for this project. Chairman Dixon moved to move the item to the next meeting. Mr. Bowers moved to approve the motion and, Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

906 S. Main Street (R-1) – Mr. Gardner explained to the board that he was present to request the renewal of his Certificate of Appropriateness. Chairman Dixon asked the applicant if there were any changes to the project from the plans that were originally approved. Mr. Gardner confirmed that nothing had changed. Mr. Bowers moved to approve the renewal of the COA, Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

## New Business:

315 Sumter Avenue (R-1) – Ms. Segelken presented her proposal to reposition the front porch columns to the top of the brick pillars on the front porch. She explained their position currently is causing damage to her front porch. Her second item is to replace two windows on the east side of the house with more appropriate two over two windows. Mr. Bowers requested to go over the porch renovation, to confirm that the columns will be centered, which Ms. Segelken confirmed. The board returned their focus to the window replacement. Mr. Kennedy inquired as to what material will be used for the window replacement. Ms. Segelken expressed her desire to use something historical and asked the board for suggestions. She also referenced the request to add a window on the south elevation above the kitchen sink, preferably with a two-over-two windows. Mr. Kennedy moved to approved the column relocation and window replacement with the comment that the mullions have to be simulated or true divided light, and that the trim around the windows matches the rest of the house with historic casing. Mr. Kennedy recommended the manufacturer Marvin. Ms. Higgins seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

138 Salisbury Drive (R-1) – Mr. Murray presented his client's proposal to do an addition to the master bathroom on the existing residence with all materials to be in kind with existing. Mr. Bowers moved to approve the project; Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

113 E. Richardson Avenue Unit B (B-3) – Ms. Bates presented an after-the-fact proposal of the mural that been completed by two local artists. The building is used for theater presentations and classes for students. The reason for the mural is to create signage for the building and create a fun atmosphere representative of Summerville, Charleston, and theater. The mural is not finished, and Ms. Bates explained that they wish to continue the mural around to the front of the building. Ms. Higgins voiced a concern that the design is not "downtown Summerville" and the colors are too bright. Ms. Bates explained that the design is meant to be more contemporary, and they put the mural up to dissuade graffiti as well. Ms. Higgins asked why the scenery depicts Charleston and not Summerville. Ms. Bates explained that they let the artist choose what to paint and that the mural is not complete. Ms. Higgins suggested something more subdued and stated the possibility to have "funky and modern" themes and make it cohesive. Mr. Bowers stated that because the mural is in an alleyway, it did not bother him as much, but he understood Ms. Higgins's concerns and confirmed that the colors were extremely bright. Chairman Dixon stated he was not aware that the applicant was planning on expanding what had already been completed, and explained they would need to come back to the board and provide information on the design in going forward with the mural. Ms. Higgins suggested that the applicant bring the artists together to create a blended design. Mr. Kennedy agreed and stated that the design was a little bold for Summerville, and did not provide a sense of place representative of Summerville. Ms. Bates stated that she would work with the artists on a revised concept and provide information on the expanded design with a more blended subject matter to present at the next BAR meeting.

308 S. Magnolia Street (R-1) – Mr. Olson presented his proposal to demolish a fire damaged cottage on his property. He confirmed it is not a historic building, and they plan on building the cottage back in the same location, with the same footprint. Chairman Dixon asked if there were any public comments on the demolition of the structure, which there were not. Ms. Higgins moved to approve the demolition; Mr. Bowers seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

206 Central Avenue (R-2) – Mr. D'Antonio presented the proposal to demolish the existing church fellowship hall built in the 1970s and rebuild a building of a slightly larger footprint to serve as a space for recreation, fellowship, a kitchen and offices for the church. Mr. D'Antonio explained that the trees on the corner of the property would be preserved. The new building will blend with the existing church buildings in terms of character, which is modern Gothic, as well as in materials and color. The cohesiveness of shape and form of the elevations facing Central Avenue will be maintained in the new construction. Mr. D'Antonio mentioned that they were thinking of using fiber cement siding for the new building. Ms. Higgins expressed great appreciation for the consistency of the

door/roof shapes and windows and inquired how to the new construction will tie into the main chapel. Mr. D'Antonio explained that they might create a central courtyard with a covered walkway, potentially. This would create a central focus, and campus feel to the property. Mr. D'Antonio went on to explain that they are planning on keeping the existing walkway from Central Avenue. Mr. Kennedy commented that the current elevation drawings were somewhat bland, but were acceptable for conceptual consideration with more detail to come at their preliminary submittal. Mr. Kennedy moved to grant conceptual approval; Mr. Bowers seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

608 Central Avenue (R-1) – Mr. Bailey presented the proposed subdivision of the existing lot on Central into two lots. A fire destroyed the home that previously stood on the property. Mr. Bailey explained that they intend to build two single-family residences and preserve as many trees as possible. Mr. Kennedy stated that he understood that this submittal was conceptual, and there would be more detail to come. Still, his biggest concern was that the house on the property on Central Avenue did not face Central Avenue. Mr. Kennedy stated that it is important for houses to face the street and that he did not mind that the rear lot did not face the street, but the front lot should. It was discussed that the home could still have a driveway coming off of the ingress/egress. Mr. Bowers agreed that the orientation could be changed, so the house faced Central Avenue, and even with wide side yards, the location on Central Avenue would still be attractive to a potential buyer. Mr. Bailey explained that to turn the house to face Central Avenue, they would need to use a different house design. Ms. Higgins stated she did not think that the way the house is currently shown on the lot would do Central Avenue justice, Mr. Kennedy agreed. Mr. Bailey concluded that he would work on a resubmittal.

0 Gadsden Street (R-1) -Mr. Sheldon presented the conceptual proposal for a new single-residence. Mr. Sheldon stated that the lot is a challenge because of significant low areas, and they would place the home on the higher end of the lot and design drainage to not negatively affect adjacent properties. Mr. Sheldon explained that they were looking to preserve the lot and trees as much as possible and that the side of the home would face the road. Mr. Sheldon explained that they want to maintain the natural screening of the lot as much as possible, so you wouldn't be able to see the home. Mr. Kennedy stated that he was less concerned about this house not facing the road because Gadsden Street is much smaller than Central Avenue, but was still a proponent of houses facing the street. Mr. Kennedy stated that the side elevation of the house almost looked like the front elevation of a home, except for the sliding glass door. Mr. Sheldon said that the sliding glass door was going to be removed from the design with something more appropriate and that they were still working on the design of the deck, as well as removing the large rear deck. Mr. Kennedy stated that some of the windows appeared to be too small. Ms. Higgins said that the lot itself is very beautiful. Mr. Kennedy noted that he was okay with the overall plan and that the house had a "cottage" feel and moved for conceptual approval. Mr. Bowers seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

113 E. 6th South Street (R-1) - Mr. Toohey presented his proposal to install a picket fence in his front yard similar to the fences on his surrounding neighbor's properties. Mr. Toohey explained that the fence would improve the property's curb appeal and keep his dog out of the street. Mr. Kennedy and Ms. Higgins discussed spacing of pickets and their concern that the spacing may be too wide, as well as their general approval of the installation of the fence. Ms. Higgins moved to approve the fence as submitted, Mr. Bowers seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

102 Central Avenue (B-3)-Ms. Sillard presented her proposal for a new outdoor seating area in front of her new business at 102 Central Avenue. Ms. Sillard explained that she would have a low trellis to hide trash cans from neighboring property and planter benches that will be custom made and will create a courtyard-like area for customers to enjoy. Ms. Higgins stated that she liked the idea of defining the front space. Ms. Sillard said she would come back for permanent signage. Ms. Higgins moved to approve the plans as described with custom benches, Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

111 S. Main Street (B-3)- Mr. Jarrett presented the proposal to replace a door for a means of egress on the rear of the building for a new pizza parlor restaurant. Mr. Jarrett explained that there is an existing double door with a metal grate that they would like to remove and replace with a solid smooth metal door and enclosing the doorway to the size of a single-entry door. Mr. Bowers moved to approve as presented, Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**Miscellaneous:**

Design Guidelines- Ms. Shuler went over the changes that Town Council wanted to the guidelines, which were minor wording/formatting requests. Ms. Shuler also went over options for replacing a picture in the guidelines with a more appropriate home, as the house pictured was actually built in 2003.

**Adjourn:**

Chairman Dixon moved to adjourn at 7:30pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Becca Zimmerman, Planner II

Date: 10/15/19

Approved: Philip G. Dixon, Chairman \_\_\_\_\_ Or,  
Dr. David Price, Vice Chairman \_\_\_\_\_