



# CITY OF CHARLESTON

## BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – LARGE

---

### MEETING RESULTS

**APRIL 12, 2023**

**4:30 P.M.**

**2 GEORGE STREET**

---

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Eddie Bello (Alternate), Seaton Brown, James Meadors (serving as Chair), Luda Sobchuk, Jay White

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Tory Parish, Lawrence Courtney, Linda Bennett

---

#### A. Minutes

##### 1. Review of Minutes from the March 22, 2023 Meeting

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: to Approve

MADE BY: Brown SECOND: White

VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

---

#### B. Applications

##### 2. 122 Beaufain Street

**TMS #457-03-03-001/211/212/213 | BAR2020-000123**

**New Construction | Harleston Village | Height District 3 | Old and Historic District**

Request final approval of mockup panel.

Owner: Accord Development Group

Applicant: Joe Schmidt / Evans & Schmidt

**Note: The Board convened on Tuesday, April 11, 2023, at 4:30 p.m. for a site visit.**

DECISION: DEFERRED BY STAFF

---

##### 3. 173 Ashley Avenue (MUSC MRE Building)

**TMS #460-15-01-043 | BAR2023-001082**

**Not Rated | Height District 85/125 | Old City District**

Request conceptual approval for expansion of a mechanical building on MUSC campus.

Owner: Medical University of South Carolina

Applicant: Michael S. Edwards / Liollo Architecture

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Final Approval and final details to Staff including Staff comments.

MADE BY: Bello SECOND: Sobchuk

VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 0  
*Jay White recuses.*

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. The proposed expansion extends the architectural language, patterns, materials, and finishes of the existing building which exceeded expectations for a mechanical services structure. The joint should be quiet but visible.
2. An overall clean-up and restoration of finishes on the existing building is advised when the expansion is constructed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Good design, the way it should be handled. Comfortable with final to staff.

**4. 41 (aka 35) Bee Street (MUSC College of Medicine)**

**TMS #460-15-01-043 | BAR2023-001083**

**New Construction | Height District 85/125 | Old City District**

Request conceptual approval for new construction of seven-story building for MUSC College of Medicine to include office and support spaces.

Owner: Medical University of South Carolina

Applicant: Michael S. Edwards / Liollo Architecture

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments including additional height.

MADE BY: Bello SECOND: Brown

VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 0  
*Jay White recuses.*

NOTES:

1. The proposed is comparable to the neighboring dental school in height and mass.
2. The proposed successfully blends the languages of the dental school and the new to-be-built College of Health Professions building on President Street as well as the colors that have been part of the identity of the MUSC campus.
3. A clear easily identifiable entry gives hierarchy to the Bee Street façade and reflects, while not mimicking, its neighbor, positioned in such a way to properly serve as a gateway to campus.
4. The façade openings give vertical proportions to the design, as guided by the BAR principles.

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. The contemporary language of the building offers contrast to the historic masonry wall, allowing to be showcased. Even so, alterations or disturbances to the wall shall be kept to a minimum, as proposed. Applicant should describe how other non-original

- openings to the wall were handled. For example, does the pier design allude to original openings or new openings?
2. Terra cotta and brick are traditional materials. However, on this building, they are placed and expressed in a very untraditional fashion. Because the building is clearly contemporary, Staff is comfortable with their proposed use and orientation, but seeks to understand how these materials will wrap corners and edges and into openings. It is also important to understand the offset between wall planes and fenestration. For a building of this size, 8" seems like a minimum.
  3. For preliminary, at the first floor, suggest offsets between the terra cotta and brick which appear to be in the same plane, such as facing the College of Health Professions.
  4. For preliminary, Applicant to describe the design of the vertical awning connector at the main entry canopy which consists of round elements. Is the round element used elsewhere, as part of the entry canopy or at the roof terraces, and are these visible?
  5. For preliminary, the ground floor at the east and west facades provides less interest. Continue to study how articulation at these areas would benefit the project and reduce the scale of the ground floor.
  6. For preliminary, suggest study of the detailing for how the terra cotta terminates into railing at the fourth-floor terrace over the main entry.
  7. Board is required to deny or approve the variance request for additional height at the ground floor. Per Ordinance section 54-306.6, the non-residential story maximum is 20', but the BAR may grant a waiver for up to 25' in height.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

- Minor but noticed where new openings are proposed for the wall, are there other openings where the pilaster has extended beyond the height of the wall? Applicant confirms. Design is strong and goes well with what's there; appreciate fenestration matches the rhythm elsewhere. Like the materials. For next time, study east façade (page 40) at the corner to give it some interest. Many will be walking here and it's a big blank wall. This east façade is the lesser cohesive. Agree with city comments regarding more planar change would be good. Appropriate height, scale, and mass.
  - Designing in context is great. A question related to materiality of brick and terra cotta for later at preliminary. Would like to see in the proposed in context with other buildings around it.
  - Really successful approach to fill out the street corner. MUSC has developed with different architectural languages and approaches. This may be the first proposal see a created assembly and identity for the campus. Elements are not mimicking each other but complimenting. Wall at entry but it's also really solid at the corner of President and Bee. Consider this corner also. Support Staff comments.
  - Drainage for decks to be internal? Application confirms. internal. Transitions for ramp access are hidden behind wall which is nicely done.
  - Other means than glass for these walls.
-

**5. 35 & 37 Prioleau Street**

**TMS #458-09-02-007 | BAR2023-001081**

**Category 4 | French Quarter | Height District 3.5 | Old and Historic District**

Request conceptual approval for rehabilitation of and addition to existing three-story masonry structure for ground level retail, eight condominiums, and a rooftop amenity.

Owner: Prioleau Enterprises LLC

Applicant: James Plunkard / HP Architecture

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: To Defer with Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: Brown SECOND: White

VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

NOTES:

1. Major alterations occurred to this building in 1886 and 1969.
2. The first was the loss of the third floor and adjoining gable roof on the northern half of the taller portion because of the 1886 earthquake.
3. The second big change occurred in 1968 or 1969 when the gable over the third floor at the southern half of the taller structure was removed. This is believed to be due to a rebuild of the third floor for structural reasons and for “a more pleasing arrangement from an architectural standpoint.” The brick cornice which appears at the rooflines above the second and third stories may have been added at this time.

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. The proposed is an intensive expansion of a building which has a complex history. At this time, the application is utilizing both reconstruction and rehabilitation techniques, both of which are outlined by the Secretary of the Interior as treatments for historic buildings. A reconstruction would be the seamless rebuilding of the third floor and gable roofs and could result in a cleaner composition. An adaptive reuse or rehabilitation could result in a more complex composition but would preserve the history of the building.
2. There are many elements within the proposed which we will look at individually before looking at the project as a whole.
  - a. **THIRD FLOOR AND ADJOINING GABLE AT NORTH:** The third floor at the northern half of the primary portion was lost in 1886, and the building’s appearance has been without it for almost 140 years. Reconstruction of a third floor with gable would make this building appear as it did for some of Charleston’s period of significance (1700-1941). However, for most of the lifetime of this building, it has been without the third floor at the north end, and a seamless reconstruction, as proposed, would eliminate a large part of the building’s history. As part of a rehabilitation, a third floor which is subordinate and differentiated could be studied. This would preserve the cornice line that is visible on the existing.
  - b. **GABLE OVER EXISTING THIRD FLOOR:** The gable was removed in the 1960s, not that long ago by Charleston standards. Replacing the gable over this portion could be appropriate.
  - c. **TWO-STORY ADDITION OVER ONE-STORY WAREHOUSES:** The warehouses were supporting structures for the main body, which is the taller portion facing Prioleau. There is opportunity here to accommodate some infill density in an area that consists of three- and four-story buildings. An addition that is subordinate and sympathetic to the two- and three-story form could work. The architectural

- language needs to be revised to differentiate from the existing. Perhaps something that is lighter in perception could work. Additional setback from the north and south ends would also benefit the project.
- d. DORMERS FACING PRIOLEAU STREET: As part of making the space in the gable roof form habitable, dormers could be added as long as their language is designed to reflect the new addition. However, these would be considered new character-defining elements and would not be appropriate for a reconstruction, as there is no evidence that they ever existed.
  - e. WEST DORMER TO NEW ROOF DECK: The size of the extended dormer at the west is overwhelming in size and should be reduced and minimized.
  - f. FENESTRATION AT SOUTH AND NORTH ELEVATIONS OF EXISTING: Restoring these facades to the previous appearance would provide interest and improvement.
3. Because of the program, a rehabilitation is the right direction, and Staff is supportive of an adaptive reuse that would allow the original forms to continue to be expressed. This would require the minimization of some areas and a creative differentiation to the new portions.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Deferral as proposed.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

- Appreciate thorough assessment. Rehab strategy is completely appropriate. Would only add that stacking new walls atop of old would be a real challenge.
- Two directions – compete restore and gain no dormers or let it be a new addition with clear difference. Concerned to see rebuilding an enclosed opening – open it up. Was open arches with big doors without small panes. Why not large glazing? Can get program in this but go one direction or the other. Hard to issue an approval on a very visible façade without knowledge of materials. Show existing and proposed on the same sheet, per requirement, is most helpful. Agree with previous board member and city; not quite ready but lots of opportunity.
- Restoration would be tough because what would the restoration be of? Not enough basis for it and overall, it doesn't look great. No examples of civic buildings or warehouses with these types of dormers. In support of the comments.
- Agree with colleagues.
- Sanborn maps shows three stories just after the earthquake but unclear if the roof extended over the north. Surprising to see a warehouse like this. Many questions; more research may be needed. Age is 1820s. Were these two separate structures? Or one built and second added to it? Substantial brick wall existing at the center – subsurface to roof with six windows. Windows at north are a different size. Seems that proposal picks from several different periods including your own to add dormers at the top. Agree with other comments.

---

**6. Iron Forge Alley, Lots 13 & 14 (Addresses: 22 & 24 Iron Forge Alley)**

**TMS # 459-05-04-248 / 249 | BAR2023-001033**

**New Construction | East Side | Height District 2.5 - 3 | Old City District**

Request preliminary approval for new construction of attached single-family residences.

Owner: Southwind  
Applicant: Luke Jarrett / Synchronicity

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Final Approval with final details to Staff with Board and Staff comments.

MADE BY: Bello SECOND: White

VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. The water table and apron below at the first-floor level has been removed. Aside from functional attributes, this is an important design element which helps to break up the larger flat planes. This is common to most residential architecture of this scale, and as it helps the building fit better into its context, it should be retained.
2. The two windows on the larger dormers on the south elevation would benefit from a third to better fill the dormer as was suggested and done with the smaller dormers on the north side.
3. The cladding noted as “5/8” MIN. THICK SMOOTH FACE F.C. LAP SIDING OR P.T. #1 KILN DRIED” should read as “Kiln dried after pressure treating or KDAPT.”
4. At the dormer on the north elevation, omit the narrow sliver of siding between the windows, pull the windows closer together, and use one shared 1x4 trim piece between them. Dormers should consist primarily of windows and trim pieces.
5. While lite size and proportion is consistent, recommend a grid using one vertical and one horizontal on the square windows at the north elevation. However, would defer to how other windows of this size and proportion are handled in the overall project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Final Approval with Board and Staff comments with Final Review by Staff of For Permit Drawings.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- At dormers, appears that windows can be added. Was requested at conceptual. Dormers shouldn't and generally don't have siding. Make the dormers smaller with three windows or have four windows trimmed out and would vote for the second option.
- Porch beam over the columns is too tall / heavy.
- Handsome design. Appreciate how its broken up. Well done. Lite cut at French doors should be more vertical to be consistent with the windows. Omit some horizontal muntins. From grade, the porch beam will look even taller than in elevation. Lower it. At portion between where using shiplap, at the window could use flush trim or a different type.
- Small number of details – would support final approval.
- At page A205, seems difficult to flash the vents that are immediately adjacent to the windows.

---

John E. Robinson, Chairperson

date

---

Tory J. Parish, BAR-L Administrator

date