

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



MEETING RECORD
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

April 27, 2022 4:30 P.M. virtually via Zoom Webinar

1. Approval of Minutes from March 23, 2022, Meeting

MOTION: Approval

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

2. 8 Charlotte Street - - TMS # 459-13-02-009 BAR2022-000772

Request final approval for demolition of existing one-story building, drive-through, and site elements including brick and iron fencing, wood fencing, and hardscape.

c. 1993 | Old and Historic District

Owner: 518 East Bay, LLC

Applicant: Hank Hofford, & Luda Sobchuk / SGA Narmour Wright Design

NOTE: The Board convened at this address on Tuesday, April 26, 2022, at 4:00pm for a site visit.

MOTION: For Final Approval

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Meadors VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 0
(Luda Sobchuk recuses.)

Staff Comments:

1. In reviewing the considerations for demolition review found in the Ordinance Section 54-240.b, Staff finds nothing that would elevate the structure and site elements on this property to be important enough to be saved from demolition or saved for the future project. The date of construction for the building and site elements and the auto-oriented function do not contribute to historic, cultural, or architectural importance.
2. Applicant might consider retaining the wood fence, due to its good condition, if useful.

Staff Recommendation:

Final Approval for Demolition

3. 547 Meeting Street - - TMS # 459-05-01-016

BAR2020-000207

Request final approval of mock-up panel.

New Construction | Height District 5 | Historic Corridor District

Owner: TMG 547 Meeting Street LLC

Applicant: Kyra Brower / LS3P

NOTE: The Board convened at this address on Tuesday, April 26, 2022, at 4:30pm for a site visit.

MOTION: Deferral incorporating Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 0
(Luda Sobchuk recuses.)

Staff Comments:

1. Sealant around dark windows at white painted brick should be white. Applicant discussed this prior to the meeting and agrees.
2. Additionally, sealant and metalwork at the metal portion of the mock-up will need to be cleaned and tightened. It is believed that this has been discussed by the Applicant prior to the meeting as well and they agree.
3. The Applicant requested the additional placement of GFRP on the mock-up as an alternative to the GFRC band at the second floor. While having some advantages in terms of handling, forming and placement, Staff still prefers the GFRC for its perceived increased durability.
4. It was discussed whether to paint the cast stone window sill to match the brick. There are various ways to think about this and Staff would like the Board's direction on this.
5. Modifications and corrections of the above items to the mock-up should take place and be approved prior to start of exterior work.

Staff Recommendation: Approval with Board and Staff Comments with Applicant to make Conditional Approval corrections required on the Mock-Up prior to exterior work on the building.

Board Comment:

- Board and Applicant confirm that second floor will be cast stone with material at fifth floor in question and local applications of FRP.
- Board has struggled with FRP over longevity; not conformable even at this height because it will age will receive no maintenance. GFRC is also a light product. Discourage painting the sills because this also would add to maintenance. Sealants identified. All metalwork to be tighter.
- Agree with previous Board member. Believe this should be denied so that it can be worked on as this is only opportunity. Attention to detail wasn't there.
- Add to previous, regarding procedural matter. The mock-up becomes our only guarantor and our best estimation of the finished product in terms for quality. While sympathetic to unique constraints like supply chain and staffing issues, this will be our best check of what the building will look like.

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



4. 678 King Street & 666 King Street - - TMS # 460-04-04-118/034 BAR2021-000672

Request conceptual approval for construction of a 55-unit affordable housing project.

New Construction | Westside | Height District 5 | Historic Corridor District

Owner: Robinson Villa / Lowline Housing Partners LLC

Applicant: Brian Fessler / McMillan Pazdan Smith Architecture

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Sobchuk

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. The newly proposed utilizes a different and more pronounced language at the ground floor, effectively giving the building a base, and a more pronounced and higher detailed cornice with some contemporary brick reveals. These revisions may help to soften the proposed bolder color palette.
2. The punched openings at the windows are shown as 8-inches in depth. As Board comment previously emphasized the importance of these deep reveals in light of the overall design intent, Board should consider if this depth will achieve the intention of punched openings. Eight inches is a minimum to be considered.
3. Staff is not opposed to a nontraditional accent color, especially on a building adjacent to the Lowline and Interstate 26. However, much scrutiny will be required for these accent shades in order to find balance between jarring and the additional context of historic homes. Staff is concerned about the depicted shade, and after contemplating whether limiting its use would help or harm the design, Staff recommends toning it down but will look for additional information in the preliminary submittal.
4. For final detailing, Staff recommends coordinating the openings at the ground floor with the brick reveal at the headers, if possible.

Staff Recommendation:

Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

Board Comment:

- Project has responded well to previous comments. The green does jump out, but color is difficult to assess on a screen. Will review this at mock-up.
- Would appreciate information to understand the view of the project from F and H Streets and the connectors from King Street. At a primary entrance to city. Been a challenge to make meaningful structures at prominently visible locations. The green is strong but look forward to seeing different colors.
- Developing nicely. Good massing and proportions. Not necessarily that it is a gateway. Too early to talk about colors; will view at mock-up. Otherwise agree with Staff comments.
- For conceptual review, it addresses the prior comments. May be helpful for color feedback at preliminary.

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

5. 275 Huger Street - - TMS # 463-16-04-054 BAR2022-000704

Request preliminary approval for construction of a 77-unit affordable housing apartment building with surface parking.

New Construction | East Central | Height District 4 | Historic Corridor District

Owner: City of Charleston Housing Authority

Applicant: Nicholas Galizia / Bello Garris Architects

MOTION: Preliminary Approval with Board and Staff comments with Final Review to Staff

MADE BY: Meadors / SECOND: Fava

VOTE: FOR 3 / AGAINST 0
(Luda Sobchuk & Jay White recuse.)

Staff Comments:

1. Planting strips are proposed at the north entry terraces (A100B) and within the boardwalk (A111A). To some degree, these reduce the overall width of the Huger Street entry but provide nicely integrated green space for the main elevation. Staff recommends added scrutiny and coordination between the architectural site plan and landscape plans to ensure a clear and distinct entry path from Huger Street.
2. Per previous Board motion and Staff comment, transitions of materials at horizontal locations should be offset in plane or meaningfully detailed. Concern remains regarding the transition from brick or siding at the fourth-floor north end (A906). Please confirm detail or visibility.
3. While not visible from the public ROW, at the ground floor at the intersection of the central corridor and the east entry (visible at A111B), Staff recommends pulling back the southern planting bed to respect what will mostly likely be the flow of foot traffic.

Staff Recommendation:

Preliminary Approval with Board and Staff comments (and FRBS)

Board Comment:

- Clarification regarding screening closure at opening under roof. Like the roof without breaks as had been discussed previously. With wood decks at the interior, sun doesn't get to them and cause deterioration. Great project, and great to see interior courtyard for affordable housing.
- Appreciate setting the building back, not building over parking, and activating the space. Considering length of building as intentional backdrop to Enston Homes.
- Applicant addressed all previous comments either by adopting them into the design or thoroughly considering and responding to them. Continue to see this as exemplary design for affordable housing.

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

6. 244 St. Philip Street - - TMS # 460-08-02-117/118/119/120/121 BAR2022-000612

Request conceptual approval for construction of a 50-unit apartment building.

New Construction | Cannonborough/Elliottborough | Height District 2.5-3 | Old City District

Owner: Ron Owens / Evening Post Industries Inc.

Applicant: Dylan Towe / LS3P

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

April 27, 2022

Page | 5

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

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

Staff Comments:

1. Staff finds the revised proposal to appropriately respond to previously incorporated Staff and Board comments. This includes revisions to simplify the roof massing, which was a sticking point. The overall composition has been simplified and unified.

Staff Recommendation:

Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

Board Comment:

- Appreciate continued effort, looks great.
- Simplicity and rationality of current proposal is very appreciated
- Moving to a central entry, consistency of shutters, narrowing the porches has made this complimentary to the neighborhood.
- The window pair above the entry could be more successful if separated which could aid the plan in that there is a demising wall behind.

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

7. 145 Calhoun Street - - TMS # 457-04-02-022 BAR2021-000545

Request conceptual (and preliminary) approval for minor addition to existing steel trellis.

Not Rated | c. 1955 | Old and Historic District

Owner: King and Calhoun LLC

Applicant: Kevan Hoertdoerfer

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

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

Staff Comments:

1. Previous motion of deferral was to allow for proper documentation and clarity to be incorporated into the drawings. Height dimensions have been included on page A301 of the newest submittal. However, Applicant still needs to express the location of all downspouts and to provide information on the durability and aging effects on the proposed polycarbonate material prior to or during preliminary review.

Staff Recommendation:

Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

Board Comment:

- Previous comments have been satisfied.
- Staff can handle materials issues and confident that comments will get resolved.

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

8. 151 Meeting Street - - TMS # 457-08-04-002 BAR2021-000580

Request preliminary approval for modifications to southeast corner of existing building including storefront/glazing, raised patio entrance ramp, and metal canopy.

Not Rated | c. 1981 | Old and Historic District

Owner: Tom Creasy / Lat Purser & Associates

Applicant: Clark Batchelder / Goff D'Antonio Associates

MOTION: Preliminary Approval with Staff comments

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Fava

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. Newest proposal is a change to a sliding glass wall system from the previously approved fixed storefront system in the expanded ground floor openings. The application does not depict the storefront system's appearance when closed, but in general, Staff is not opposed to a foldaway system. Unless required, the sliding glass system should fold away to the interior.
2. FDC signage should be closely coordinated in color to work with the building's exterior while adhering to fire marshal requirements. Applicant to determine if the existing FDC signage can simply be relocated or replaced with similar in-kind.
3. Tenant signage to be reviewed separately.
4. The very visible and new exhaust louvers at the south elevation shall be painted to match the adjacent wall material.
5. Bluestone currently exists for the primary entry to the building, and Staff is neutral to the proposed change at the restaurant entry.

Staff Recommendation:

Preliminary Approval with Board and Staff comments

Board Comment:

- Concerns regarding noise from the exhaust fans due to placement.
- Agree with Staff comments and recommendation.

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

9. 16 & 18 Iron Forge Alley (Foundry Aly lots 10&11) -- TMS # 459-05-04-245/246 BAR2021-000635

Request final approval for revision of previously approved foundation from CMU to framing and application of fiber cement siding instead of stucco.

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

Owner: East Village Gardens LLC

Applicant: Luke Jarrett / Synchronicity LLC

Applicant was not present; item withdrawn by Board.

10. Sign Policy Statement Restudy for Historic Corridor District / 997 Morrison Signage

Staff Comments:

1. Certain parts of the Historic Corridor District are experiencing significant new growth.
2. This growth is creating a rapid influx of proposed signage which is not directly addressed in the Sign Policy Statements. Most are asking for signage types which we would normally have to Deny based on the existing language of the General Sign Policy Statement.
3. Denial of these submittals may result in appeals possibly resulting in a number of these signage submittals coming before the Board on a regular basis.
4. The advent of new lighting technologies coupled with an evolving architectural language of in some of these areas can be compatible and appropriate but must be reviewed carefully on a case-by-case basis.
5. Overly bright, jarring, or garish colors or designs are to be strongly avoided with only signage which complements the building and its' context being allowed.
6. As an internal check, any illuminated signage should be reviewed and approved by the City Architect before an Approval is entered into the City's Data Management System by Staff.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval for amended language to the General Sign Policy Statement to include the Historic Corridor District and the allowance for additional types of signage and the illumination thereof, on a case-by-case basis.

Alternatively, if the Board Defers, Denies or fails to act on this Agenda item, the signage submittal for 997 Morrison Dr. (CTC) should be heard, as they have been waiting a long time for a decision on their signage request which would be Denied by Staff under the current General Sign Policy Statement.

Board Comment:

- BAR has many signage policy statements which are specific and focused on certain areas of town in order to protect the integrity of the historic district and fabric of Charleston. Not the case for Upper Morrison, Upper Meeting, Upper King. The signage section of the zoning already has constraints on size, type, number, illumination. And then there is proximity to DRB territory which has signage policies. Should BAR simply not have a signage policy north of Line and rely on the base zoning ordinance? Unusual to have lit signage on top of a building in Charleston but is a new building.
- Except for the old Coke plant sign, there are not many which can be seen from a distance, and this differentiates Charleston. Historically, Charleston had a tremendously and varied vocabulary of signage. Reservation in adopting something tonight is constitutional issues related to commercial speech - any broader implications that have to do with more than aesthetics? As a result of large buildings, we have blocked the view of the historic skyline. Blocking it and then having large corporate signs that don't differentiate us from other cities should be avoided. Suggest developing a policy or ordinance that does not add workload to Staff or bring sign applications individually to the Board. While this is a deliberating body, encourage a bright-line rule.
- Pinnacle example is advertising. No one would know how to get to that building by the sign. That is advertising.

- Want to avoid commercial homogeneity.
- Inherently different between vehicular level and human street level and what is visible to identify for wayfinding. On the peninsula, must consider that signage might be visible for 270 degrees.
- Would be best to review a few individual sign applications in the interim than to adopt a policy in haste. Suggest seeking national standard or preservation standard for the district which integrates new building signage with historic properties. Sign Policy Statement for Western End of Spring Street and Cannon Street Corridor might be a template.
- Regarding proposed policy statement changes, adding the proposed flexibility seems fine and would advocate for even more latitude. Concerned about case-by-case for staff. These edits are simple and clean and unobstructive.
- Case-by-case can be arbitrary. Should be tied down or be able to point to a standard.
- Regarding 997 Morrison, because it wasn't advertised on the agenda, it will need to be placed on next meeting.

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

John E. Robinson, Chairperson

date

Tory J. Parish, BAR-L Administrator

date