

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: JOHN ROBINSON (Chairperson), JAMES MEADORS, LUDA SOBCHUK,
KARO WHEELER (Alternate), JAY WHITE
STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: TORY PARISH, LAWRENCE COURTNEY



MEETING RESULTS

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

January 12, 2022

4:30 P.M.

virtually via Zoom Webinar

1. 838 Morrison Drive - - TMS # 459-07-00-010 BAR2020-000171

Request final approval of mock-up of hardscape elements for new apartment project.

Historic Corridor District

Owner: Mike Schwarz / Woodfield Investments

Applicant: Brandon Lathrop / Seamon Whiteside

NOTE: The Board convened at this address on Tuesday, January 11, 2022 at 4:30pm for a site visit.

MOTION: Final Approval with Review of modifications and monitoring as required by Staff.

MADE BY: Wheeler / SECOND: White

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

Staff Observation:

Staff met on site with the Applicant to review the conditions. This is a very large project with many different types of landscaping and hardscaping elements.

Staff Comments (Items discussed with Applicant include):

1. The hardscape Mock Up had been cleaned extensively since the photos in the presentation were taken and it looked markedly better.
2. The joint at the base of the building between the building and bluestone border surround needs to be cleaned up and made more inconspicuous. It was discussed that it should be placed below the level of the bluestone and match its color in order to read more like a shadow line. Places in which a double expansion joint occur are inaccurate; there will only be the one at the building base.
3. The stained pervious concrete paving initially shown at the rear of the building has been significantly upgraded to pervious pavers.
4. The concrete and wood bench sample is acceptable with exposed edges to be eased more for occupant comfort. (Board comment that spacers would be metal.)
5. The sawcut at the upper walk along Morrison Drive is to be re-examined to be more pronounced. It was felt by Staff that the thin sawcuts at a fairly wide spacing would get lost in the walk.
6. The stop bar composed of contrasting pavers is nicely done.
7. It was discussed by Board Members and Applicant that a border strip should be placed between the wood board surfaces and adjacent paving to break up irregular joint locations. Applicant now proposes a 6" wide, flush concrete curb to help delineate and separate the different widths of the materials.

8. It was explained that the plantation mix was to be used less due to ADA concerns.

Staff Recommendation:

Final Approval with Review of modifications and monitoring as required by Staff.

Board Comment:

- At bench, spacers to be metal as discussed on-site.

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

2. 84 Broad Street - - TMS # 475-12-02-004 BAR2022-000703

Request conceptual approval for repairs to be designed for the exterior stucco façade, stucco coating, windows, below-grade waterproofing, and hurricane shutter anchors of the Charleston County Historic Courthouse and for the exterior stucco façade and stucco coating at the front stairs (south elevation) of the Charleston County Blake Tenements.

c. 1753 (Courthouse) & c. 1760 (Tenements) | Old and Historic District

Owner: Paul Wood / Charleston County Facilities

Applicant: Neal Frasier, P.E. / SKA Consulting Engineers

MOTION: Final Approval with Final Review of for Permit Drawings and monitoring as required by Staff.

MADE BY: Wheeler / SECOND: Sobchuk
(Jay White and James Meadors recuse.)

VOTE: FOR 3 / AGAINST

Staff Observation:

Staff met on site with the Applicant to review the conditions. Exploratory work has been reviewed, approved, and performed, and the proposal is a result of the findings.

Staff Comments:

1. The strategies and methods for repair are found to be acceptable.
2. The parties involved in this work have proven themselves to be sensitive and careful in dealing with the historic building fabric, thorough, and very capable of performing this sensitive work to these very important buildings.

Staff Recommendation:

Final Approval with Final Review of for Permit Drawings and monitoring as required by Staff.

Board Comments:

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

3. 275 Huger Street - - TMS # 463-16-04-054 BAR2022-000704

Request conceptual approval for new construction an 86-unit affordable housing apartment building with surface parking.

East Central | Height District 4 | Historic Corridor District

Owner: City of Charleston Housing Authority
Applicant: Nicholas Galizia / Bello Garris Architects

MOTION: Conceptual Approval incorporating Board and Staff comments excepting 1A.

MADE BY: Wheeler / SECOND: Sobchuk VOTE: FOR 3 / AGAINST 1
(Jay White recuses.)

Staff Observations:

The design takes cues from its context in material and color. While the Colin McK. Grant homes are of a smaller scale, the project will sit amongst several similarly sized projects that have been constructed in recent years with additional larger projects coming nearby to 578 and 584 Meeting Street. The project makes a nod to the Meeting Street monumental arch at the Grant Homes with the alignment of its east entry. What is usually a double-loaded corridor is pulled apart to create a communal space that can encourage interaction among neighbors and offer unique shaded exterior space. The exterior entries add a level of ownership. The materials (brick, steel, wood) are nicely mixed, and the deep overhangs and steel bracketing give a sense of play on what might otherwise be viewed as a very long façade.

Staff Comments:

1. Regarding the pilasters,
 - A. Raise the top of the pilasters to be even with the window headers at the third floor to provide additional order to the composition.
 - B. Deepen the pilasters to make them more pronounced on the long exterior facades.
 - C. Add a cap to the pilasters to better indicate load-bearing capacity.
2. Where material transitions occur horizontally, such as the brick and cementitious siding, which is visible at the fourth floor, offset in separate planes or detail in a meaningful way.
3. While not in BAR purview, we recognize that the building's orientation will limit direct sunlight to the courtyard to limited times of the day and therefore the landscaping in the communal courtyard should be carefully selected.
4. All exposed steel shall receive a high-performance coating.
5. Staff recommends a soft landscape buffer between the project and the Grant homes.
6. Because the open stairs are the primary vertical circulation of the project, Staff recommends that they be covered to protect the occupants in inclement weather. While this would require the enclosure of two portions of this courtyard, Staff believes this can be done in such a manner as to not detract from its openness.
7. For preliminary, confirm size, profile, and exposure of cementitious siding.
8. For preliminary, describe the sculptural wood element that spans the second through fourth floors at the north elevation.

Staff Recommendation:

Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments incorporated.

Board Comments:

- Interesting and successful. Pilasters at the right height and make the bracket size appropriate to help mitigate the height of the building. Agree with remaining pilaster comments. The façade facing Meeting Street is broken with the entry, but the roof is continuous. Would a break in the roof help with the overall massing? The canopy at Huger Street projects at all sides. Perhaps consider pulling it back at the courtyard for the courtyard entry to be more open.

- Very important project and great to see an elevated design for affordable housing. Agree with HCF and PSC comments. Site plan leaves enough space to buffer the categorized Grant Homes appropriately. Study breaking the roof at center would better emphasize the axis and the angle at the east portion. Agree with staff comments and recommendation though some are preliminary level. Design team can study pilasters. Great project.
- Thoughtful presentation. Not heavy; contrast with contemporary neighbors. Could be a model for other large-scale projects. Nice human scale.
- Carefully consider metal compatibilities of all the metal elements. The brackets look good but study how they will be flashed and if this will affect their aesthetic. Open framing of secondary roof looks good but also seems to be a habitat for birds so consider how that functions. A sun study would be beneficial. The roof opening is nice for light but the amount of water coming through doesn't seem to be offset by drying opportunities which leads to a livability concern. Rain will enter but sun exposure is limited for drying opportunities.

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

-
- 4. 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.
Cannonborough/Elliottborough | Height District 2.5-3 | Old City District
Owner: Cannon St Vacation Rentals LLC
Applicant: Ashley Jennings / AJ Architects

MOTION: Deferral to restudy the footprints of these two new buildings and the massing in relation to the historic structures with Board and Staff comments.

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Meadors VOTE: FOR 3 / AGAINST 1
(Luda Sobchuk recuses.)

Staff Comments:

1. At the new accessory structure at 122 Cannon, lower the pitch of the roof.
2. At the new accessory structure at 122 Cannon, Staff typically strongly discourages and does not permit the painting of brick as depicted. However, we find that on this contemporary application, the painting of the brick would make for a more harmonious composition.
3. At the new addition at 124 Cannon, use equally sized window sashes.
4. The Zoning Ordinance indicates that additional buildings and additions to buildings are to be subordinate to the height, scale, and mass of the primary building, unless waived for architectural merit and context or for existing lot conditions. We therefore recommend lowering the height and reducing the footprint of the new accessory structures and new addition. Also please include dimensions for floor heights in the follow-up submittal.
5. It appears that a rooftop terrace is planned for the proposed accessory structure at 124 Cannon Street, but no information is provided to confirm. Provide roof plans.
6. Indicate locations of pool and all other mechanical equipment and screening conditions on one site plan.

7. With the exception of one, solid masonry walls are not typical of this block of Cannon Street, and the proposed wall at the street edge should be eliminated in lieu of a low coping wall with wrought iron fencing above it. Please provide proposed dimensions for this element.

Staff Recommendation:

Deferral for H/S/M of accessory structures and for additional information, with Board and Staff Comment incorporated.

Board Comments:

- Felt there may be a subordination issue but might be the results of the slim documentation of this application; more views of the model especially from an eye-level view would be helpful and might answer some open questions such as those regarding the roof. Subordination is about the H/S/M and not the architecture which I am comfortable with; Board needs to determine if snipping these two rather significantly scaled accessory structures will have any net affect. These are two new houses on the backs of the lots rather than accessory structures, which may be the intent of the subordination clause.
- Restudy the entry stair as it feels heavy and look at whether the screen wall and door could be recessed into the porch which would reduce the heaviness. Also door is a little plain.
- No issue with the two new structures in the rear; a site section would help to see the relationship. Looks like the height is lower than the front structures. The stair screening element is interesting. No problem with flat roof. Sloped roof on 122.5 could be studied as it looks very steep and unusual in the context. A better view from the street and a site section would help to clarify.

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

-
- 5. 151 Meeting Street - - TMS # 457-08-04-002 BAR2021-000580**
Request preliminary approval for modifications to third and sixth floor window pattern on the east façade (Meeting Street) to open the façade for exterior loggia spaces.
Not Rated | c. 1981 | Old and Historic District
Owner: Tom Creasy / Lat Purser & Associates
Applicant: Clark Batchelder / Goff D'Antonio Associates

MOTION: Final Approval with Board and Staff comments with Final Review By Staff.

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Meadors VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

Staff Observation

While conceptual review included the new third and sixth floor loggias as well as the first floor changes at the southeast corner, the preliminary review is only for the work at the proposed third and sixth floor loggias.

Staff Comments:

1. A three-panel system has been proposed in lieu of the previously proposed four panel bi-fold system and in response to staff comments at the August 25, 2021 meeting, which harmonizes with the fenestration on the building. It should be noted that this is a tilting system.

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

January 12, 2022

Page | 6

- 2. Railing color and profile should be visually minimized.

Staff Recommendation:

Final Approval with Board and Staff comments with Final Review By Staff.

Board Comments:

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

6. 649 King Street - - TMS # 460-08-02-007/010 BAR2021-000609

Request conceptual approval for a 15-unit apartment building with ground floor retail.
 (Courier Square Phase 2, Building 2)

Cannonborough/Elliottborough | Height District 6 | Old and Historic District

Owner: Ron Owens / Evening Post Industries Inc.

Applicant: Dylan Towe / LS3P

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: Wheeler / SECOND: White

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comment:

- 1. Staff and Board comments which were related to the balustrade, east pediment, and rusticated base have been satisfactorily addressed. The corner tower design appears somewhat incomplete without a roof but could work if the top were better terminated with a more articulated cornice.

Staff Recommendation:

Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

Board Comments:

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

7. 609 King Street - - TMS # 460-08-02-015 BAR2021-000519

Request conceptual approval for new senior living building.

Cannonborough/Elliottborough | Height Districts 4 & 6 | Old and Historic District

Owner: Evening Post Publishing Co.

Applicant: Richard Gowe / LS3P

MOTION: In accordance with all staff recommendations as published on this agenda item and also incorporating Board and Staff comments.

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Sobchuk

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. Providing a prominent feature for the terminus of Columbus Street is a positive gesture. The H/S/M and general architectural direction of the King Street façade would be acceptable with some toning down, simplification, and refinement of the detailing. (page 30)
2. The intersection of the new building to the relocated old building will be critical and should be articulated in detail to fully understand the connection. (page 42) Option C as depicted on page 42 is not appropriate as it creates a false sense of history for the salvaged building.
3. Regarding the H/S/M at the buildings on St. Philip and Spring Streets, there is a disparity of scale with the newly proposed in the context of the old and historic, and the difference is jarring in some locations. Restudy the scale of the building elements, which are character-defining features in the context of the adjacent historic structures.
4. More specific to these buildings, regarding the Spring Street Building, attempting to adopt the language of a Charleston single house on a much larger mass is problematic. This is more evident with floors 4 through 6 which may overwhelm the adjacent houses. Consider a new direction for this building.
5. The first-floor height for the new building on Spring Street appears to be set by the vehicular opening. However, the first floor is very imposing to the adjacent smaller scaled existing house, and the juxtaposition of the new building to the adjacent structure is jarring. (pages 56-57b)
6. The elements on the Spring Street building, such as the dormers and columns appear to be quite large which causes concern over scale. These should be restudied. The proposed exterior material of siding also presents the challenge of how to scale to a larger form. (page 56b)
7. The exterior materials should wrap the interior of the vehicular entry of the new building on Spring Street.
8. The windows on the north and south facades of the Spring Street building need to be more vertically proportioned. (pages 58-59b)
9. The shed dormers on the Spring Street building appear unrelated to each other and too wide. (page 58b)
10. The King Street (brick) expression should conclude at an internal corner. Confirm this to wrap around and above the parking garage vehicular entry. Confirm this expression wraps the SW corner. (page 40-41)
11. The northernmost building on St. Philip Street, which is depicted in tan, again, appears to depict larger windows than necessary, especially in comparison to the existing house. Please confirm size of the windows and reduce if possible. (pages 66-67)
12. The porch bays on the north side of the tan building are more wide than tall and could benefit from being made more vertical in proportion. (page 68) Additionally, the plan seems to show that the outer porch bays project, but the elevations depict the center three bays projecting with a gable form above instead.
13. Regarding the southernmost new building on St. Philip Street, which is depicted in blue, here also, confirm and reduce the size of the windows as possible to harmonize with the adjacent existing buildings. (page 65)
14. Use consistency with shutters on the St. Philip Street building depicted in blue. (page 71)
15. The courtyard is nicely wrapped in a singular expression on all four sides. However, the challenge of multiple expressions is evident here. The center portion of the King Street expression, the area containing the tower, has two exterior languages, at the east and west, and for authenticity's sake should be one language with the tower centered. This might mean that the King Street expression is the dominant expression and mass, and the remainder are more secondary. This calls for a unification in the design in terms of the whole and a cohesiveness to unite the composition. (pages 71-72)

16. Regarding the west-facing and courtyard expression for the larger building that fronts King Street, the use of siding may be inappropriate for a building of this size. (page 74)
17. Continue to take cues from successful alleyways for development refinement of the alley space. The fountains or water features which anchor each end is successful.

Staff Recommendation:

Denial of H/S/M and general architectural direction for the Spring Street building, deferral for the St. Philip Street buildings for scale, and deferral for the larger King Street building to simplify the expressions and to resolve the lack of cohesiveness between the multiple expressions.

Board Comments:

- Uncommon to have so many Staff comments even on a project of this scale and significance, which is telling. Commend Staff for putting in the time in assisting this development team but it's unfortunate that it's here with so much to comment on. Agree with Staff comments. Appreciate the complexities of the program but what creates an architectural challenge on this project is that an architectural philosophy has been applied which the Board has been very resistant to since it was first presented. Agree with Staff recommendation.
- Agree with previous Board Member and the reviews, comments, and suggestions from PSC and HCF. A disparity exists at the King Street façade with the incorporation of the Art Deco building which we preserved. There is no sympathy to that building and the design needs to draw from this some especially with the images that show additions to historic projects showing really sympathetic renderings of the new toward the existing. The balconies and arches are not really King Street appropriate or very urban for that matter. The large arches at the balconies appear like garage openings. The Charleston Orphan House, used as a precedent, had a similar tower but the cupola is moved into the roof which helps to reduce the tower flatness and height. The dormers with the shutters on the mansard roof are unproportionate to the mansard roof. The dormers on the Orphan House were nicely proportioned, and the roof had a proper slope. Don't understand at the Spring Street portion why the balconies, balustrade and pediment are introduced. Keep studying.
- The proportions of all the precedent buildings are well developed and are peaceful and nothing is overwhelming. They have a flow about them and nothing is screaming out at. Struggling to apply what I see in the precedents to this project. Not sure which parts create the confusion, but the composition causes confusion.
- In agreement with fellow Board Members and Staff comments. The reason the Board approved the partial demolition of the existing building and required saving at least 25' is so it can be recognized as a building or volume. Problematic for only 12' to remain visible. The mass probably needs to move back so not to be a facadism but a better expression of the existing building. The public space at Columbus and the general massing at King works but the architectural expressions need restudy. The Charleston Orphan House had a very rhythmic and repetitive façade and the same proportions for windows. The proposed King Street façade is very busy with arches, recessed balconies, different window proportions and sizes, shutters, and a mansard roof. Because this is such a big building, simplification would help. At the King Street façade would be helpful to follow the property line or the massing needs to be pushed back.
- Would amplify some of previous Board Member comments related to the Charleston Orphan House which was a massive building. The tower concept is good and works well on the King Street elevation; like and support it. The King Street façade is the most successful or what is presented. The Orphan House precedent used symmetry, simpler massing, and the façade was rhythmic, straightforward, repetitive, and simpler. The H configuration is

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

January 12, 2022

Page | 9

fine. Would like to see restudy of the tower but like the concept. The problem for the remainder of the King Street façade is that it is too busy. Work on making it more rhythmic and symmetrical to the extent possible with the preserved building. The mansard roof is appropriate but tweak the dimensions. Simplify the fenestration by reducing the number of different window element types or sizes and making them simpler.

Board Comments:

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