



CITY OF CHARLESTON
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW (BAR-L) RETREAT

Wednesday, June 15, 2022, at 3:00pm
City of Charleston Civic Design Center, 85 Calhoun Street

Members Present: Eddie Bello, Seaton Brown, Eddie Fava, James Meadors, John Robinson, Luda Sobchuk, and Jay White

Starr Present: Julia Copeland, Lawrence Courtney, Amanda Herring, and Tory Parish

Notes from Retreat:

1. **Role of BAR**
2. **BAR Governing Documents**
 - **Ordinance**
 - **Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties**
 - **Policy Statements**
 - **Principles**
3. **Ordinance**
 - **Levels of Review and Scope of each**
 - **Purview for BAR**
 - **Feedback / Concerns / Questions**
 - *Navigable waterways as public rights-of-way?*
 - *How do we want to see the Upper Peninsula developed?*
 - *Artwork as mural or signage and when is it historic?*
 - *North of Line demo-only*
 - *Structures which were reviewed by BAR/DRB but are less than 50 years old*
 - *How to mitigate the problematic massing and huge building footprints that ignore our historic pattern of development and to encourage/require a respect to the pattern of development that has existed for years.*
 - *"Level of quality of construction" as part of preliminary review – does this include what occurs behind the exterior material such as stucco-over-frame applications?*
4. **Board Members**
 - **Legal Training**
 - *Use buzzwords from the ordinance if building a record.*
 - *No "I feel" or "this feels" statements*
 - *Board may decide to vocalize disclosures at the beginning of a meeting if expecting contention*
 - *7 members instead of 5?*
 - *If not enough members to recuse and keep quorum, a member can abstain and not vote, but presence will count towards quorum*
 - *No reply-all to emails*
 - **Continuing Education Requirements**

- MASC training for Seaton
- Three hours training for Board members per year. Mandi can help with options.
- Professional licensures requirements also applicable.

5. Preparation for Meetings

- **Previous Meeting Information**
 - Don't include Board comment if not part of motion
 - Strike-through unadopted Staff comments
- **Timeline**

6. Meeting Protocol

- **Interactions and Dialog with Applicants**
 - Clean up by sticking to framework of meeting.
- **Board Members as Applicants**
 - Have someone else from development team present if possible.
 - If quorum is maintained and meeting is slim, don't sit in on meeting?
 - Board discussion settled on Board Member applicants presenting at the end of the meeting, and for the chairman's overview statements to indicate that a Board member will be presenting an application at the end of the meeting.
- **Motion Clarity, Board Comment, and Overall Direction**
 - Not every Board member is required to comment.
 - More specificity about what Board comment is rolled into the motion.
- **Partial Approvals / Split Motions**
 - As a means to give applicant clarity and movement. Is it confusing?
 - Helps material orders at preliminary, so ok.
 - Challenging at conceptual.
 - Would not want to stall a project. If city is pushing a project, a partial approval can balance.
- **Approval v. Deferral v. Denial**
 - In case of a deferral, what's wrong or needed with the application should be explained or described through comments.
 - BAR is a reactive body, but if the directions are measurable, an approval with conditions can be granted.
- **Time Limits on Applicants and Public**
 - Applicant time should lead with architect. Will help expedite meeting and save applicant time for the design presentation. Staff to guide applicant team.


7. Special Topics

- **Architectural Merit and Context Update**
 - Current conditions present a lack of clarity for applicants and gives the perception that a project not seeking a finding of merit can be lesser in its design, materials, and engagement with public realm.
 - After considering limiting options for extra height to only one of the other (merit or rezoning), Staff has settled on omitting ability to earn extra height through architectural merit and context.
 - Staff is working on ordinance revisions to reflect this. Will bring revisions to Board for comment and for the public to review and then to Council.
 - Additional parameters for earning extra height through rezoning will be defined and added.
 - If omitting fails through Council, will craft a policy statement to further define merit.
- **North of Line Street Policy Statement Update**
 - Report/outcome from CD committee
 - Considering legacy owners, household income, young families? Legality of means?
- **Sign Policy Statement**
 - King was lively with signage at one time.

- Case-by-case basis?
- Flexibilities for locally owned businesses?
- Signage for wayfinding rather than advertising.
- Compatibility with buildings.
- **Flood Log Receptor Placement Timeframe**
 - 7 days prior / 7 days post
- **Historic Materials Demolition Purview**
- **Charleston Rises & UP Zoning**
- **Mock-Ups**
 - See notes below regarding revisions to mock-up policy statement.
- **Future Policy Statements**
 - **Revise Mock-Up policy statement.**
 - To emphasize the mock-up is for workmanship review and standards. Omit statement that indicates materials are not approved until the mock-up is approved as this conflicts with the definition of preliminary review in the ordinance.
 - Important to remember this is one of the few guarantors of quality and workmanship.
 - Add a note about building these no bigger or expansive than necessary.
 - Getting back to a policy of material review during the preliminary review will aid in long lead time items.
 - Mock-ups to be complete at time of submittal for agenda. Applicant photos should clearly demonstrate a state of completeness.
 - Develop Denial policy statement. While the Board tradition and expectation is a new design in response to a denial at conceptual review, the ordinance does not define a denial as a directive to start over with a new design.
 - Develop policy statement for flood log receptors and panels indicating how early and how long these may be in place on the building. As discussed with Board, seven days prior to landfall of a named storm and seven days afterward.
 - Continue refinement on signage policy for Morrison Drive or Historic Corridor

8. Other

- **Submission File Sizes**
 - Staff to begin asking applicants to compress/flatten. These have become difficult to post for the public's viewing and cumbersome to render and review, due to size.
- **Final Approval v. FRBS or Final Review of for-permit drawings or Final Details to Staff**
 - A final review by Staff as part of the permitting process if preferred to confirm that permit drawings match previous Board approvals and to review how MEP components are integrated.
 - When final review is delegated to Staff, will go with "Final Review by Staff of for-permit drawings", and review to run simultaneously with permit process.
- **Vested Rights**
- **Staffing Updates**
 - Linda Bennett, Travis Galli, Isabella Gordineer, Tory Parish, Frankie Pinto


 John E. Robinson, Chairperson

7/27/22
 date


 Tory J. Parish, BAR-L Administrator

7/27/22
 date