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<td>Below are my comments regarding item 5: 63 Columbus street I support the Early High College School academic concept and putting back to use a vacant building and site that can benefit the community and neighborhood but have reservation regarding its planning process and design. This is a great opportunity for students are first college generation who go back to their home school in other communities at end of school day via school buses. The proposed support building is a massive project (65000 sf) that will be primarily used by students and their families as well as staff from outside the neighborhood and Peninsula. Just as reminder only 15 students out 400 are from the Peninsula as a whole and even fewer are from the neighborhood itself. 1. The proposed Early College High School support building project is preserving only the front historic facade which was the minimum requested at the first and only neighborhood wide public meeting held by CCSD on December 9, 2021. 2. Monthly Public updates and neighborhood wide public meetings were promised at the conclusion of the December 9 meeting and followings comments sent to CCSD.</td>
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<td>63 columbus street</td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In fact the only following public forums were have the planning application on Thursday March, 2021 and BAR schematic design presentation scheduled for March 23, 2021. There was no monthly updates between December and March except for a single in March. Inline image 3. The proposed building and its program do not take advantage of the "early college" experience concept of a shared educational use with Trident Palmer Campus. While I understand that some program aspects are needed such as the gym/multipurpose room and science labs not offered on Trident Campus, it feels like the building is over programmed for an "auxiliary building" which results in a bigger building than needed especially for a small high school of no more that 400 students. Most of the classes (teachers) are based at Trident and students will spend a significant amount of their academic schedule on Trident campus across the street. The administration program/use in particular appears much larger than one needed for a very small high school. Also it is unclear how the daily crossing between campus will be managed, since we assume students and staff will cross several times a day to activities on both side. there should be an opportunity for streetscape treatment (gates fence, planting, sidewalks
enlargement at crossing etc) on either side as well traffic calming (road humps and change of street treatment) here to illustrate the relationship and safety of a daily on going relationship throughout the week. 4. The building design and massing do not take advantage of the site and its environment. Since the preservation of existing building has been reduced to the front facade skin on Columbus Street this should have freed the design team to explore a better way to take advantage of the site with a focus on preserving green space while accommodating program elements and parking on site. for instance the building could have been tighter/more compact and also go up with a third floor this would have gone a long way to preserve open space but also could be more gracious in volume/massing. While it might cost a bit more to go up the environmental benefit would be far greater. Also it might be better to differentiate the old from the new the proposed design appears to want to integrate rather than differentiate so the architectural result is blurry (a kind of neither nor) but it should offer a better architectural expression especially the facade facing Hampstead Square. 5. Parking lot, and interior car circulation as well as buses are a big issue. it is oversized. Trident campus where many
ECHS classes are taking place offers over 300 parking spaces of which only 45% is used daily including the entire current staff from ECHS and those teaching staff that are also Trident teachers. The campus parking has always been underused (except for 2 years during the great recession) While some additional parking might be needed to accommodate some of the use specific to the auxiliary building but it should not amount to 50+ parking spaces by far. Also the parking circulation includes a potential for 33 cars lining up that is not needed since most students (first time generation college) go back to heir home school vis buses.. Most schools on the peninsula dont offer parents off-street parking and line up and wait in the street. so the interior car line up is oversized and circulation should be simplified which will offer a possibility to preserve some of the existing green space as well. Regarding bus circulation. the current system is perfect buses are waiting around Conway park which is not bordered by housing and is surrounded with a wider street.bus waiting should remain there since the high school students (no younger kids) are moving across both campus and Columbus street anyway it should not be a big deal especially with a new crossings.
Re: 63 Columbus St. TMS#459-09-02-152/153/168. BAR2022-000762

My name is Steve Bailey, and I live at 38 Nassau St. in the Eastside. I am a big supporter of Early College High School and appreciate all Principal Denney and her students have accomplished. I fully support new and improved facilities for the school. It is good for the school and the neighborhood. I do think, however, that this BAR meeting is premature. CCSD held a community meeting on the ECHS proposal on Dec. 9 at Trident. By any measure, it was a very contentious meeting. There was considerable community pushback over plans to demolish Fraser Elementary. At the time it was stated there would be future community meetings. The "summary sheet" from the Dec. 9 meeting outlined the "next steps." "As the project progresses further into design, we will review and share additional information via future community meetings and monthly project updates that can be found on CCSD's Capital Programs webpage, "Project Status by District".
As far as I know there have been no community meetings and only monthly project update. (That “update,” from March, is difficult to find and provides no new information; it is just an example of checking a box.) I heard a rumor that CCSD may have met with the ECDC board, but that meeting (if it happened) was neither announced nor open to the wider community. CCSD has a long history of being a poor neighbor in the Eastside. I am happy to provide all the ugly particulars if you like. But suffice it to say that given the history, you would think CCSD would have gone out of its way to engage the community in this important project. You would be wrong. I believe the BAR would be wise to defer this meeting and send CCSD back to confer with the community as it should have done in the first place. A single one-hour community meeting is not sufficient for a project of this importance. That is not community engagement, that is box checking. If the board does move ahead tonight, I would offer three suggestions to CCSD and the BAR. 1. Aim high, aim for excellence. We
should stop talking about this as a “support building” for ECHS and talk about it for what it is: The most important new building in the Eastside in decades — particularly given its public use and its location in the heart of the neighborhood adjacent the city’s oldest public park. ECHS urges its students to aim high, to seek excellence. The school district and the BAR should demand the same in this new building. I hope you will do this when considering all issues in the building, big and small. For $30 million, the public has a right to demand a first-class facility; we will live with the results for decades.

2. Collaborate. ECHS is not just another high school, but one that has a partnership with a college, Trident Tech. In every case, ECHS and Trident should look for chances to collaborate. This would make both fiscal sense and will further the mission of the school. It would be good for both schools. Collaborate, collaborate, collaborate.

3. Parking and flooding. I have been general in my comments here, but I do have one specific suggestion: Most of that parking planned behind the building is not needed and is at odds with the Dutch Dialogues, which singled out
the flooding risks facing the Eastside. To add about 50 parking spaces and provide room for 33 cars for after-school pickup, CCSD proposes paving over a large green field behind the school. This parcel is in a designated flood zone, and the parking lot will only increase the risk. The parking is not needed and a prime example where ECHS and Trident could collaborate. The school doesn’t plan to add enrollment after the new building is completed. The school currently shares a 300-car parking lot with Trident Tech, and most classes will continue to be held at the college. According to a survey we conducted over four days in early December, fewer than 45 percent of the spots are used, leaving about 170 spaces available daily. (See parking survey attached.) There is no way a school that is adding no new students needs room for another 80 cars. Besides, adding parking is expensive: $5,000 to $10,000 per spot. Collaborate. I hope the BAR will send CCSD back to the community to discuss all the issues raised here tonight. Thank you for your time. —


Re: 63 Columbus St. TMS#459-09-02-152/153/168. BAR2022-000762

My name is Steve Bailey, and I live at 38 Nassau St. in the Eastside. I am a big supporter of Early College High School and appreciate all Principal Denney and her students have accomplished. I fully support new and improved facilities for the school. It is good for the school and the neighborhood. I do think, however, that this BAR meeting is premature. CCSD held a community meeting on the ECHS proposal on Dec. 9 at Trident. By any measure, it was a very contentious meeting. There was considerable community pushback over plans to demolish Fraser Elementary. At the time it was stated there would be future community meetings. The "summary

Notes: *
Two storage sheds could provide another 4 parking spots.

Survey conducted Dec. 6-9, 2021, 10-11 a.m. each day, by Steve Bailey and Beatrice Bernier.
sheet” from the Dec. 9 meeting outlined the “next steps.” “As the project progresses further into design, we will review and share additional information via future community meetings and monthly project updates that can be found on CCSD’s Capital Programs webpage, “Project Status by District”, “District 20”, “Current Projects” https://www.ccsdschools.com/Page/7325.” As far as I know there have been no community meetings and only on monthly project update. (That “update,” from March, is difficult to find and provides no new information; it is just an example of checking a box.) I heard a rumor that CCSD may have met with the ECDC board, but that meeting (if it happened) was neither announced nor open to the wider community. CCSD has a long history of being a poor neighbor in the Eastside. I am happy to provide all the ugly particulars if you like. But suffice it to say that given the history, you would think CCSD would have gone out of its way to engage the community in this important project. You would be wrong. I believe the BAR would be wise to defer this meeting and send CCSD back to confer with the
community as it should have done in the first place. A single one-hour community meeting is not sufficient for a project of this importance. That is not community engagement, that is box checking. If the board does move ahead tonight, I would offer three suggestions to CCSD and the BAR. 1. Aim high, aim for excellence. We should stop talking about this as a “support building” for ECHS and talk about it for what it is: The most important new building in the Eastside in decades — particularly given its public use and its location in the heart of the neighborhood adjacent the city’s oldest public park. ECHS urges its students to aim high, to seek excellence. The school district and the BAR should demand the same in this new building. I hope you will do this when considering all issues in the building, big and small. For $30 million, the public has a right to demand a first-class facility; we will live with the results for decades. 2. Collaborate. ECHS is not just another high school, but one that has a partnership with a college, Trident Tech. In every case, ECHS and Trident should look for chances to collaborate. This would make both fiscal sense and will further the mission of
the school. It would be good for both schools. Collaborate, collaborate, collaborate. 3. Parking and flooding. I have been general in my comments here, but I do have one specific suggestion: Most of that parking planned behind the building is not needed and is at odds with the Dutch Dialogues, which singled out the flooding risks facing the Eastside. To add about 50 parking spaces and provide room for 33 cars for after-school pickup, CCSD proposes paving over a large green field behind the school. This parcel is in a designated flood zone, and the parking lot will only increase the risk. The parking is not needed and a prime example where ECHS and Trident could collaborate. The school doesn’t plan to add enrollment after the new building is completed. The school currently shares a 300-car parking lot with Trident Tech, and most classes will continue to be held at the college. According to a survey we conducted over four days in early December, fewer than 45 percent of the spots are used, leaving about 170 spaces available daily. (See parking survey attached.) There is no way a school that is adding no new students needs room for another 80 cars. Besides,
adding parking is expensive: $5,000 to $10,000 per spot. Collaborate. I hope the BAR will send CCSD back to the community to discuss all the issues raised here tonight. Thank you for your time. — Trident/ECHS Parking Survey — Monday, Tuesday, Wed. Thurs. Average Parked cars. 133. 130. 137. 127 132 Empty spots. 168. 171. 166. 176. 170 % spots filled. 44%. 43%. 45%. 42%. 44% Handicapped. 10/0. 10/1. 10/0. 10/1 Motorcycle/ Moped. 19/0. 19/0. 19/1. 19/1 Notes: * Survey conducted Dec. 6-9, 2021, 10-11 a.m. each day, by Steve Bailey and Beatrice Bernier. * Two storage sheds could provide another 4 parking spots.

Below are my comments regarding item 6: 63 Columbus street (i also posted by mistake under item 5 so keep this one) I support the Early High College School academic concept and putting back to use a vacant building and site that can benefit the community and neighborhood but have reservation regarding its planning process and design. This is a great opportunity for students are first college generation who go back to their home school in other communities at end of school day via school buses. The
The proposed support building is a massive project (65000 sf) that will be primarily used by students and their families as well as staff from outside the neighborhood and Peninsula. Just as reminder only 15 students out 400 are from the Peninsula as a whole and even fewer are from the neighborhood itself. 1. The proposed Early College High School support building project is preserving only the front historic facade which was the minimum requested at the first and only neighborhood wide public meeting held by CCSD on December 9, 2021. 2. Monthly Public updates and neighborhood wide public meetings were promised at the conclusion of the December 9 meeting and followings comments sent to CCSD. In fact the only following public forums were have the planning application on Thursday March, 2021 and BAR schematic design presentation scheduled for March 23, 2021. There was no monthly updates between December and March except for a single in March. Inline image 3. The proposed building and its program do not take advantage of the “early college” experience concept of a shared educational use with Trident Palmer.
Campus. While I understand that some program aspects are needed such as the gym/multipurpose room and science labs not offered on Trident Campus, it feels like the building is over programmed for an “auxiliary building” which results in a bigger building than needed especially for a small high school of no more that 400 students. Most of the classes (teachers) are based at Trident and students will spend a significant amount of their academic schedule on Trident campus across the street. The administration program/use in particular seemed much larger that one needed fo a small high school. Also it is unclear how the daily crossing between campus will be managed, since we assume students and staff will cross several times a day to activities on both side. there should be an opportunity for streetscape treatment (gates fence, planting, sidewalks enlargement at crossing etc) on either side as well traffic calming ( road humps and change of street treatment) here to illustrate the relationship and safety of a daily on going relationship throughout the week. 4. The building design and its massing do not take advantage of the site
and its environment. Since the preservation of existing building has been reduced to the front facade skin on Columbus Street this should have freed the design team to explore a better way to take advantage of the site with a focus on preserving green space while accommodating program elements and parking on site. For instance the building could have been tighter/more compact and also go up with a third floor this would have gone a long way to preserve open space but also could be more gracious in volume/massing. While it might cost a bit more to go up the environmental benefit would be far greater. Also it might be better to differentiate the old/historic from the new the proposed design appears to want to integrate rather than differentiate, the architectural result is blurry (a kind of neither nor) but it should offer a better architectural expression especially the facade facing Hampstead Square. 5. Parking lot, interior car circulation as well as buses are a big issue. It is oversized. Trident campus where many ECHS classes are taking place offer over 300 parking spaces of which only 45% is used daily.
including the entire current staff from ECHS and those teaching staff that are also trident teachers. While some additional parking might be needed to accommodate some the use specific to the auxiliary building but this should not amount to 50+ spaces by far. Also the parking circulation includes a potential for 33 cars lining up that is not needed since most students (first time generation college) go back to heir home school vis buses. Most schools on the peninsula dont offer parents off-street parking and line up and wait in the street. so the interior car line up is oversized and circulation should be simplified which will offer a possibility to preserve some of the existing green space as well. Regarding bus circulation. the current system is perfect buses are waiting around Conway park which is not bordered by housing and a wider street. it should remain there since the high school students (no younger kids) are moving across both campus and Columbus street anyway it should not be a big deal especially with a new crossings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>comment</th>
<th>Christina</th>
<th>Butler</th>
<th>null</th>
<th>null</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Hampden Court</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>To the City of Charleston Board of Architectural Review Large, As a longtime Eastside resident and taxpayer, I am writing to express concern about the proposed demolition or partial demolition of the historic Wilmot Fraser campus on Columbus Street. While I support the Early College program at that location, I have two areas of concern. First, more study is needed on rehabilitating the existing building instead of removing and replacing it. It sets a terrible precedent that CCSD opted first for a demolition permit and have not even conducted a feasibility study for rehabilitation before beginning the permit application process. Fraser Elementary is in the historic district, and demolition should never be the first choice, especially for a culturally significant equalization school, of which there are few remaining in the city. Courtenay was rehabilitated as Charleston Progressive, so there is no reason not to at least consider a similar option for Fraser. Further, the seismic report for the building conducted by CCSD indicates the building is very salvageable. While the report is a decade old and the repair estimates need to be updated, said report</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
indicates it is not only possible to rehabilitate the existing building to current international code, but it appears to be less than a third the cost of the $30,000,000 that CCSD estimates for the new structure. The seismic report explicitly states, “although the existing building is incapable of resisting and earthquake of moderate magnitude, the structure’s significant number of CMU walls and current lack of use make it a good candidate for seismic rehabilitation.” The proposed new building is almost the same square footage as the current school and cafeteria, making a wasteful demolition and redevelopment even less appropriate. CCSD has not done their due diligence to properly study viable options to renovate the existing building, nor have they considered how a new building with considerable hardscaping will impact the surrounding neighborhood, to wit: I have concerns about the amount of parking and hardscaping to be installed behind the school along Drake Street. I know this is not necessarily in the purview of BAR Large, but since this large project is subject to many different levels of oversight, I fear a holistic view will not be
taken by CCSD so am expressing my concerns here. The site and neighborhood are known for flooding, and any hardscaping will exacerbate drainage issues. At the most recent community meeting, CCSD project managers expressed concerns that teachers might have to walk across the street from Trident, to which I offer the rebuttal—this is a city setting, in which employees and residents are fortunate to have any parking. Creating more in a flood area is ill advised, and walking across the street from the ample shared parking lot currently used by Early College to the new facility is not an undue hardship. In short, while I support the Early College concept, I believe more work needs to be done and more community outreach from CCSD about what the rezoning and new facility will truly entail, before the zoning request is granted. Thank you for your time,
Christina Butler