

4. Lipped brick should be used at the lintels over the metal portions.
5. It is noted that the very dark sealant used between the stucco and metal elements needs to be lighter in color to better match the stucco color.
6. The joint at the bottom of stucco walls needs to be restudied to allow for moisture release with a cleaner joint. This can be explored further on the mock-up and reviewed with Staff.

Staff Recommendation:

Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff Comments with sealant and paint colors to be reviewed in the field with Staff.

Board Comment:

- Overall execution is quite nice. Appreciate Staff’s comment regarding scope and scale of the mock-up. Satisfied with Staff’s comments and recommendation.
- Provide a remedy for the exposed metal at the cut edges of the flashing throughout. Bracket supporting wire mesh has unpainted and painted bolts, nuts, washers – zinc or stainless steel. Confirm material.

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

-
- 3. 77 Washington Street - - TMS # 459-13-02-004** **BAR2022-000747**
Request final approval of demolition of existing single house structure.
Rated 4 | c. 1857-1869 | Old and Historic District
Owner: 518 East Bay, LLC
Applicant: Luda Sobchuk / SGA Narmour Wright Design

DEFERRED BY APPLICANT

-
- 4. 84 & 84.5 Society Street - - TMS # 457-04-04-025** **BAR2022-000748**
Request final approval for partial demolition of one-story building.
Not Rated | c. < 1955 | Old and Historic District
Owner: GS Acquisitions LLC
Applicant: Bittoni Architects / Goff D’Antonio Associates

NOTE: The Board convened at this address on Tuesday, March 8, 2022 at 4:00pm for a site visit.

MOTION: Approval of partial demolition as noted with Board and Staff comments.

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

Staff Comments:

1. The rear portion of the building proposed for demolition is unremarkable with no real character-defining features.
2. The plane at which demolition is proposed is demarcated by a marked change in brick and is a logical point for removal to the rear.

3. There is a brick projection to an adjacent property wall to the east which will bear further study to ascertain what occurs behind it along the length of the wall. Regardless, it is assumed that whatever new construction is to follow can be handled for any adjusted existing conditions.
4. Any materials which can be salvaged and reused should be.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval of partial demolition as noted with Board and Staff comments.

Board Comment:

- As noted by Staff in comment #3, there is a brick section that reaches out to the east that doesn't appear on the Sanborns or survey; an important detail and can be handled but shouldn't be overlooked.

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

-
- 5. 29-35 George Street, 306 King Street, 84-88 Society Street**
-- TMS # 457-04-04-007/008/017/025/113 **BAR2022-000749**
Request conceptual approval for construction of two new buildings: Building A at George Street and Building B at Society Street to include a hotel and mixed-uses incorporating a portion of the existing building.
Height District 6 | Old and Historic District
Owner: Category Company
Applicant: Bittoni Architects / Goff D'Antonio Associates

MOTION: Denial based on height, scale, and mass and general architectural direction for buildings A and B incorporating Board and Board and Staff comments.

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. The largely underground parking is a positive for the project.
2. The internal driveways are a positive for this project and will alleviate vehicular traffic on the streets.
3. Regarding height, a finding of architectural merit and context is required. Applicant is reminded that the Board has the authority to reduce the by-right height by a half story.
4. Applicant shall articulate the request for architectural merit and context. As a reminder, the Ordinance, per Section 54-306, article 17, defines architectural merit as "a project that reflects exemplary architectural and urban design, utilizes the highest level of materials and finishes and contributes to the public realm, as outlined in the Board of Architectural Review Principles."
5. Staff does not find additional parking to be a contribution to the public realm, in regard to a finding of architectural merit and context, as it necessitates additional volume to an already large building.
6. The application expresses there is a request for an additional floor via a finding of architectural merit and context on the Society Street building only. The George Street building appears as seven stories however, and there is nothing in the Ordinance related to story count as only being from the front elevation. The above-ground and visible

- portions of Building A consist of two stories of above-grade parking with five floors above it and a shallow liner building across most of the front at George Street. Staff finds that the lobby mass does not sufficiently disguise what is two stories of parking. However, the lobby mass in combination with elevation revisions to the parking portions could potentially disguise what is two floors.
7. Applicant's proposal requires a variance at the portion against George Street for a ground floor over 20' tall. BAR may grant up to 25' for the ground floor based on architectural merit and context.
 8. Regarding massing and scale, the cantilevering at Building B is a reverse in tectonics and is fundamentally unsympathetic and insensitive to its surroundings and to the proposed remnant element.
 9. The general architectural expression for the George Street building (Building A) is foreign to the block, and while it consists of an interesting interplay of horizontal and vertical elements, it's architectural language would be at odds with its surroundings. The general architectural direction for the Society Street building (Building B) of multiple expressions is likewise incompatible with its context.
 10. The lack of a perceptible human scale at the George Street first-floor is disconcerting.
 11. Context is to be considered as part of a finding for an additional floor based on architectural merit. The context consists of a broad range of building typologies varying in height from primarily three stories to the west and north with a similar street to street complex of five stories at mid-block and with a variety of buildings two to six stories in height adjacent and to the south. The predominate character of the surrounding buildings is of a more traditional nature exhibiting a higher surface to fenestration ratio with punched openings in heavier walls being the norm.

Staff Recommendation:

Denial for H/S/M and general architectural direction for Buildings A and B.

Board Comment:

- Understand that every application represents thousands of hours of work and thought and the Board appreciates this as well as what is at stake with major proposals such as this. Hearing Applicant state they that studied the patterns and precedents of Charleston, but it seems these have been used as a point of departure to a destination that now has very little to do with the built environment in Charleston. What comes from your studies and design appears to be two buildings that are very nearly antagonistic of historic architecture and urbanism of Charleston. Won't address request for additional height. Questioned why this is on the agenda as it is so far off the mark from what we would normally accept as a Board, in my opinion. The comments you have received from Staff are solid, and I agree with them entirely. Applicant has a right to appear before this Board, but based on what we've seen in this application, what's presented, and Staff comments, this deserves a denial, not as a punitive measure but so that the Applicant can be clear about what we expect. Doesn't deserve more critique than this.
- All said by previous Board Member is eloquent and right on the point. Don't feel that we are in a position to expand the review of this project at this time. Would support Staff comments and recommendation, public comments, and those of previous Board Member.
- Have no additional comment.
- Staff has mentioned some of the positive portions of the project with the underground parking. Two buildings could work here because there are two main elevations on George and Society Streets. Placing a plaza next to the existing building; but with everything above it, this seems overwhelming. The first massing might work if pushed back further but then adding what looks like another building mass on top or another building that

cantilevers is inappropriate. Applicant has shown contemporary examples, but these were either adjacent to a very large plaza or large and open spaces. Here there is a very different context, a very narrow street. While the main facades are not facing King Street, they will probably be visible from further away because of the height. Three facades of each building will be visible and will need attention. May be helpful to really look at streetscapes of Society and George on both sides and along with a model, look at the scale of buildings, windows, patterns, proportions to study how the new building will fit. Echo that you do not need to replicate historic Charleston with this project but if choosing contemporary architecture, it really needs to reflect the scale of the immediate context. Agree with Staff comments and recommendation.

- Adopt Staff comments, but adding some additional specificity. Don't think that parking adds to architectural merit and context and agree with comment that it volumizes a large building. Also have issues with human scale and massing. Reverse tectonics are not typical here, and this is jarring to see this reversal. Would echo comment #10 regarding human scale on George Street elevation. Building needs to be less alien in the context to existing buildings around it. At the street, the building should be pleasing and parts should not need to blend in or disappear as stated by Applicant. Adopting express comments of the Board, but in regards clearly to H/S/M and architectural merit, most alarmed by the reversed tectonics.
- Cantilevered portion on Society feels extremely uncomfortable. It doesn't help to open the courtyard. Also the architectural elements on this part are contradicting each other from bottom to top.
- A denial, should the Board pass that motion, means that we would be looking for a fundamentally different approach to the architectural solution for your program. Taking all of these comments and really starting from possibly an entirely blank slate. A denial means there is a fundamental problem with development proposal.

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

6. 269 King Street - - TMS # 457-08-01-047 BAR2022-000750

Request conceptual approval of ground floor exterior alterations.

Not Rated | c. < 1888 with 1930s façade work and 1999 storefront work |
Old and Historic District

Owner: 269 King Street LLC / Renew Urban

Applicant: Charles Kane / FORMVOID Studio

MOTION: Deferral with Final Staff Approval incorporating Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Sobchuk

VOTE: FOR 3 / AGAINST 2

Staff Observation:

1. The proposed work involves the modification of two doors in an existing storefront which is to remain in order to accommodate two tenants on the Ground Floor.

Staff Comments:

1. Drawings indicate the new doors, if not reusing the existing doors, will match the existing in material and profiles.

2. The material to infill the areas at demolished floor areas is not specified. Applicant is to work with Staff on an appropriate material for any exterior material change.

Staff Recommendation:

Final Approval with Board and Staff Comments with Final Review of "For Permit" drawings By Staff.

Board Comment:

- Still planning to use the main entry door and use the others as egress? Abandon the main entry? Applicant responds that the new doors are for life safety and main doors will remain.
- In opposition to the modifications to the storefront in order to create two tenant spaces.
- If we are deferring to the Efirid's façade, which were highly standardized across their stores, it is unclear what this looked like in the 1930s photo. Aware a challenging issue but would be opposed to the modification without clear evidence of what the façade looked like with the Efirid's renovation in the late 1920s or 1930s.
- The storefront that we are seeing is not historic. Issue is that modifications are proposed because the building's use is changing. City has recently encouraged occupancy of upper floors on King Street. Occupying those upper floors requires separate means of ingress and egress for those tenant spaces. Fitting doors in to the existing module of what is probably not an historic storefront is a sensitive approach. Comfortable with this, especially if storefront was modified in the 1990s.
- Not enough information here to know what is factual Agree with previous Board Member but not enough documentation to take a comfortable position yet. Could be a deferral for additional information.
- Agree with previous Board Member. If we know there were modifications and had documentation, would be more comfortable. Photos from the 1920s to the 1990s would help us know what and how extensive these modifications were.
- Staff has an architectural survey card from 1973 to share with Applicant.
- Such a small application to a not very old building. If fellow Board Members are uncomfortable approving this now, it is possible to defer it but send it to Staff to resolve.
- Documentation is important and must include.

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

-
7. **89-95 Cannon Street - - TMS # 460-14-02-008** **BAR2021-000767**
Request preliminary approval for construction of a new mixed-used building on Cannon Street with a variance request for the first-floor height and the construction of four rowhomes on Carrere Court.
Cannonborough-Elliottborough | Height District 2.5-3 | Old City District
Owner: Stephen Ramos / Cannon Row LLC
Applicant: Stephen Ramos

MOTION: Final Approval incorporating Board and Staff comments 2 and 3 with final Review By Staff of "For Permit" drawings and approval of increased first floor height as presented.

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

March 9, 2022

Page | 7

MADE BY: Wheeler / SECOND: White

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

Staff Observation:

1. The project has changed in primarily subtle ways and continue to improve.

Staff Comments:

1. The only thing Staff finds any issue with involves the clearly articulated base of the building along Cannon Street where it abruptly stops at the east and west side elevations. This may occur to accommodate what is occurring at the rear of the building but this may be better handled.
2. The alignment of and further articulation at the rowhouses is an improvement.
3. There are enough details to give a good sense of the project's composition and materiality.

Staff Recommendation:

Final Approval with Board and Staff comments with final Review By Staff of "For Permit" drawings.

Board Comment:

- Like the stucco on block, the height increase on the first floor, and the project overall. Plan to support its final approval tonight.
- Agree with previous Board Member. Raising the first-floor storefront while reducing the second and third floors works very well; a good exemplar for others dealing with this challenge. The wrapping or lack thereof at the storefront does not concern me especially in light of the images the Applicant has shared.
- Agree with previous comments.
- Agree with previous. The stucco is appropriate for this building. Height of first level is much improved. Like the turn of the storefront to the sides; appropriate and wrks well. In support.
- Agree with fellow Board Members.

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

8. 6 Prioleau Street - - TMS # 458-09-04-075

BAR2022-000751

Request conceptual approval for construction of two single-family buildings on a vacant lot governed by Factors Walk PUD.

French Quarter | Old and Historic District

Owner: Vanderking Capital

Applicant: Amber Aument

DEFERRED BY APPLICANT

9. 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: Conceptual Approval for the project with partial deferral for massing of the second through fifth floor projected area north of the motor court at King Street and for general architectural direction related to the scale of elements on the northern building on St. Philip Street, and incorporating other Board and Staff comments.

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

Staff Comments:

1. Regarding King Street, improvements include the alignment of the courtyard and cupola, relocation of the balconies, revision to respond to the street angle, simplification of the dormers, and employment of a single unified language and material palette. Staff suggests that the sixth and seventh floors might benefit by responding to the angles of the center portion instead.
2. The projected portions of the second through fifth floors towards King Street are not equal in depth in order for the south portion to accommodate the remnant building. These projections are equal in width and symmetrical in positioning around the motor court, and they should be made to match each other.
3. Shutters should be placed consistently, or Applicant should address the proposed placement.
4. At Spring Street, the proposed three-story building close to the street fits in much better with the existing streetscape. Additionally, the architectural direction is improved with the flat roof and the omission of the dormers and recessed balconies. The vehicular opening is large; however, it is set back from the street fully behind the smaller building and in reality, light will filter through the opening from the other side mitigating any concerns of it being cavernous. Provide appropriate landscaping and hardscaping to dress up the vehicular entry.
5. At St. Philip Street, the addition of storefront at the ground floor of the northern building is a positive. The transparency creates better engagement with the street and a good balance of surface and fenestration. While improved, there remains an issue of scale between the second-story windows and those on adjacent existing buildings. The shutters help, but this should be restudied even if reducing the window size requires the fenestration pattern to include additional windows.

Staff Recommendation:

Conceptual Approval for the project with partial deferral for massing of the second through fifth floor projected area north of the motor court at King Street and for general architectural direction related to the scale of elements on the northern building on St. Philip Street.

Board Comment:

- Many hours have been devoted to making this project and it has improved. Agree with Staff's comments and recommendation.
- Commend the Applicant for coming as far as they did on the King Street elevation in particular. The building is dramatically improved, and the Applicant paid attention to the Board's comments. When initially pitched as an axis from Columbus, there was much discussion about this being a marquis position. For this reason, I am ok with the monumental element in the middle as it is. Tremendously improved. Pays appropriate homage to the Orphan House without being a knock-off or replica. Agree with Staff comments regarding Sta. Philip Street and issue of scale with fenestration in relation to neighboring buildings.

- Thank the entire project team for their commitment to the project. Believe that the massing at the top of the center tower is still overwhelming.
- We've looked at this project several times, and every time we see improvements. This is a step forward. Façade at King Street is more urban and more appropriate for Charleston, but in agreement with PSC and previous Board Member that central tower is overwhelming; this needs more study. Agree with Staff on Spring and St. Philip Street comments. In support of Staff recommendation for each part of the project.
- Thank the Applicant for hearing previous Board and Staff comments and for simplifying the main building which makes it more authentic that it is treated the same on all sides. Some of the elements Staff has mentioned Spring and St. Philip could be studied at the preliminary level. At Spring Street, the first floor of the three-story building appears a bit squatty and could be studied. Agree with Staff comments.

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