

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



MEETING RECORD
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

June 22, 2022 4:30 P.M. 2 George Street, Public Meeting Room

1. Approval of Minutes from May 25, 2022, Meeting

MOTION: Approve as amended

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

Board Comment:

- Regarding 838 Morrison (item 11), the Board recalls that James Meadors seconded the motion.

2. 411 Meeting Street - - TMS # 459-09-03-114 BAR2021-000481

Request final approval of mock-up panel.

New Construction | Cannon-Elliottborough | Height Districts 5 & 8 | Old and Historic District

Owner: Bennett-Meeting St LLC

Applicant: Alex Campbell / Rabun Architects

WITHDRAWN BY STAFF

3. 635 King Street - - TMS # 460-08-02-010 to 013/110/112/113/117 BAR2021-000636

Request conceptual approval for a mixed-use building with an additional half story along King Street through architectural merit and context. (Courier Square Phase 2, Building 1)

New Construction | Cannon-Elliottborough | Height Districts 4 & 7 | Old and Historic District

Owner: Ron Owens / Evening Post Publishing Co.

Applicant: Christian Sottile, AIA / Sottile & Sottile

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with approval of additional half story on basis on architectural merit including Board and Staff comments

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

Staff Comments:

1. The Applicant has, in their inimitable fashion, set about to comprehensively study the site and its context, both historical and more contemporary, and have arrived at a solution which, while solid and

functional, appears to incorporate elements of some caprice and fancy, resulting in a playful expression amid its more staid neighbors.

2. The proposal successfully presents a large, otherwise blocky mass as a singular expression building relying on separated, well-articulated vertical lower projected masses with a higher setback along King Street with varied elements and “pavilions” along the skyline to break up this overall blocky appearance. Additionally, each elevation and corner of the building responds to its context, location, and function while maintaining consistent design continuity.
3. Some of the forms appear foreign in their language, especially those of a Moorish flavor. Applicant has been asked to explain how these relate to Charleston.
4. The Applicant has been asked to ensure that the project has been properly vetted to avoid excessive value engineering at a later phase.

Staff Recommendation:

Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff Comments

Board Comments:

- Architectural merit and context definition read from Ordinance
- Community values, architectural detailing, and pedestrian experience represented. Feel comfortable with H/S/M but disclaimer note on every page causes concern that Board is reviewing a building for extra height that may not be fully vetted. Applicant discusses.
- Team has devoted time and cost to community engagement, and it is evident this has been applied to the design which has made an immediate impact on this project. The architectural solution is legitimate and free of superficiality of multiple pattern languages. Bona fide piece of architecture. Can support including the additional half story.
- Agree with colleagues. Most appropriate for Charleston, and Charleston deserves this. View from local, middle, and distant is considered and shows greater context. Agree with architectural merit. In reviewing skyline, from Interstate 26, may want to lower to consider view to Liberty but no doubt you have already considered.
- Interesting project. Approach to architectural delineation and details. Hopeful the craftsmen can be found locally to bring it to reality. In support. The half story may not even be perceived. Don't see an issue of the view from I26.
- Comfortable with H/S/M. Architectural merit is there to justify the extra half story. Exemplary design. Level of materials, finishes, and workmanship is best I've seen while on the Board. Should be model for others. Benefits the public realm. We have pushed hard on some projects to make them fit, but this one seems to get it all right. Concerned about value engineering but this can be handled later. Refreshing. Suggest Joseph Paxton's Crystal Palace and the old Charleston terminal which burned after WWII as additional precedent studies.

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

4. 578 Meeting Street - - TMS # 458-01-03-031

BAR2021-000560

Request conceptual approval for mixed-use building to include 225 market-rate residential apartment units, retail/live-work program at ground level, amenity program, and two-tier parking garage.

New Construction | East Side | Height Districts 3.5 & 5 | Historic Corridor District

Owner: Flournoy Development Group / Exchange Real Estate Holdings LLC

Applicant: Ross Kirby / Dynamik Design

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

5. 69 Morris Street / 21 Jasper Street - - TMS # 460-12-03-194 BAR2022-000821

Request conceptual approval for removal and replacement of existing stucco façade, existing door and window removal and replacement, terrace roof membrane replacement, replacement of Juliet balcony wood decking, removal and reinstallation of storm shutters.

c. 2007 | Not Rated | Radcliffeborough | Old City District

Owner: 69 Morris Street / 21 Jasper Street

Applicant: Alex W. Campbell / SKA Consulting Engineers

MOTION: Deferral incorporating Board and Staff comments with Final Review by Staff.

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Sobchuk

VOTE: FOR 5 / AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

1. This is fundamentally an in-kind repair of exterior cladding material, doors and windows and terrace membrane replacement, but applicant needs to clearly enumerate items in scope of work.
2. Of importance is how these alterations will affect existing thicknesses and profiles.
3. Staff has worked with applicant on several similar projects which have come before the Board and has no qualms about the applicant's ability to successfully execute this work.
4. This is a highly visible and prominent project for this neighborhood and Charleston and every effort should be made to ensure its success.
5. Side-by-side comparisons of existing profiles and materials with proposed should be shown for a clearer view of how the proposed compares to existing ie: existing windowsills are wood.
6. Windows should be recessed as far into the walls as possible.

Staff Recommendation:

Deferral for a clear enumeration of items in scope of work and restudy of window profiles and sill material with comparisons of other profiles, with Board and Staff Comments.

Board Comments:

- Board not surprised to see these types of repairs on newish buildings. Important to preserve the architectural profile of the building. Side-by-side comparisons are necessary. Understand why staff brought this to the Board, but do believe deferral is necessary and followed by Staff review
- An example of value engineer on a project. Much VE occurred on this project. Design is good and would like to preserve. Agree with Staff and with review going to Staff.
- Verifies Staff comfort in reviewing the remainder.

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

6. 1085 Morrison Drive - - TMS # 461-09-03-057 BAR2022-000822

Request conceptual approval for new outdoor dining shade structure.

c. 2011 | Height District 4 & 12 | East Central | Old City District

Owner: RCC Investors 1081 Morrison LLC

Applicant: Kevan Hoertdoerfer / Hoertdoerfer Architects

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Board comments and Staff comment #1.

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Sobchuk

VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 1

Staff Comment:

1. The architectural style of the shade structure is compatible with the existing building and provides a fun and inventive addition solution for covered outdoor dining.
- ~~2. The placement of the shade structure seems somewhat incompatible. The overall system, as proposed, has nice proportions and spacing and it is assumed that the spans and column locations are designed to work with table and seating spacing. However, the system should be shifted or adjusted so that the outer lines of columns are not placed directly in front of the glazing panels on the building.~~

Staff Recommendation:

Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff comments

Board Comments:

- Much resolution still to occur but great solution. Seems hopeful for a structurally monolithic system without expressed connections but engineering plates, clips, and connections will be everywhere. Placement is difficult to perceive and may be irreconcilable.
- Working as is.
- Don't see how it relates to or blends with the building at all.
- Half Mile North has been an experimental grab bag.

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

- 7. 320 Broad Street - - TMS # 457-07-01-029 BAR2022-000823**
 Request appeal of Staff denial regarding signage.
 c. 2020 | Harleston Village | Old and Historic District
 Owner: Jasper Development LLC
 Applicant: Brandon Hoffman / RSH Sign Group

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

- 8. 997 Morrison Drive - - TMS # 461-13-01-056 BAR2022-000795**
 Request appeal of Staff denial related to signage.
 c. 2021 | East Central | Historic Corridor District
 Owner: Charleston Tech Center
 Applicant: Andy Bonner / Signarama

MOTION: Denial of individually lighted tenant signage

MADE BY: White / SECOND: Meadors VOTE: FOR 4 / AGAINST 1

Staff Comments:

1. While a bit out of the ordinary, Applicant is using "blade" like signs for tenant signage which might in another part of the city on another building be right angle signs.
2. Due to the materials and fin elements of the building, this tenant signage is found to be compatible with the overall aesthetic of the building and has been approved as unlighted signage. Applicant is appealing Staff's Denial of internal illumination of the signage which would be done in a similar fashion to the monument sign approved by the Board at the last meeting.

3. Staff sees this area of the city evolving and finds that illuminated signage might not be inappropriate in this area if handled well, suggesting the parkway might be a potential line of demarcation related to illuminated tenant signage.
4. Variables include the type of illumination, and Staff does think that the “halo” type lighting is more subdued and advocates for an overall restrained approach to the lighting and its color and illuminance.

Staff Recommendation:

Denial based on Board direction on previously proposed individually illuminated tenant signage. If illumination of tenant signage is deemed appropriate at this location, we recommend Final Approval with Board and Staff comments and with Board and Staff to work with Applicant to establish appropriate color and illuminance.

Board Comments:

- Consistent with sign policy and discussions regarding it. Monument sign approval was appropriate. Blade signs should not be illuminated.
- A multi-tenant building so every tenant will expect at least this if approved. With street signage requirements, way-finding technologies, illumination of monument sign, and location of tenant in building, don't see reason must be lit.
- Four new streetlights being placed nearby at the height of the blade sign.
- Had policy debate over ambiguities on what applies. vote to support with staff having control over color and brightness of lighting.

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