



CITY OF CHARLESTON

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – LARGE

MEETING RESULTS

JULY 26, 2023

4:30 P.M.

2 GEORGE STREET

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: John Robinson (Chair), Seaton Brown, James Meadors, Jay White (Recused from item 3), Eddie Bello (Alternate for items 2 & 3), Steve Ramos (Alternate for items 3 & 4)

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Tory Parish, Lawrence Courtney, Travis Galli

A. Minutes

1. Review of Minutes from the July 12, 2023 Meeting

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Approved as submitted.

MADE BY: White SECOND: Meadors VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 0

B. Applications

1. 529 KING STREET

TMS #460-12-02-081 | BAR2022-000960

New Construction | N/A | Height District 4 | Old and Historic District

Requesting approval of mockup sample panel.

Owner: 529 King Street OZ, LLC

Applicant: Dylan Towe / LS3P

NOTE: The Board convened at this address on Tuesday, July 25, 2023 at 4:30 p.m. for a site visit.

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Approved with Board and Staff conditions.

MADE BY: White SECOND: Brown VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 0

STAFF ANALYSIS:

This is one of the better mockups seen recently with only minor items to be addressed. Applicant explained on site that certain joints at the spring line of the window "hood" and at the window head centerline are to be eliminated resulting in a much smoother, cleaner

look along the facade. The change from metal panels to GFRP at the canopy above the storefronts is preferable, avoiding segmental joints at the curve, but the GFRP product itself needs to be evaluated for durability. The proposed entry mosaic is appropriate contextual detail and helps to bring more focus to the entry.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Flashing under windowsills should be minimized, hemmed and held vertical and flat against the surface below while maintaining a drip edge.
2. Sealant around windows at the brick wall should match the generalized brick/mortar blended color as should the lintel above.
3. Information/in-place examples of the GFRP need to be provided. As discussed previously, Staff's concern is less with GFRP and more with the specific product used and its durability.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval with Board and Staff conditions.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- High quality, partially because shop made. Comfortable with sealant colors proposed. Board has just enough experience with GFRP to understand it will be a maintenance item but is proposed in limited application.

2. 155 MEETING STREET

TMS #457-08-02-011, 012, 111, 112 | BAR2023-001112

New Construction | Harleston Village | Height District 3/5/6/7 | Old and Historic District

Requesting conceptual approval of new mixed-use development with 25' tall ground floor and a partial additional story based on architectural merit and context. The project contains a mix of hotel, residential, restaurant, and retail uses.

Owner: Pinnacle Mountain Holdings LLC

Applicant: Ian Mills / Morris Adjmi Architects

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Staff conditions and Board comments.

MADE BY: Robinson **SECOND:** White **VOTE:** FOR: 3 AGAINST: 2

E. Bello serves as Alternate Board Member.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

The applicant's submittal responds to Board comments by providing a physical model, by depicting additional views and perspectives from King Street, and by stepping down the portion of the massing directly against Horlbeck Alley, reflecting this on the north facade. Like the previous review, Staff has agreed that some Staff comments provided at the initial review in May can be incorporated into the preliminary design review. Similarly, the Staff comments are repeated from the previous review of June in order to be incorporated into the record as conditions of a conceptual approval, and these can be coordinated between conceptual and preliminary.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Continue to study the bridge element, especially how the members underneath which form the barrel vault coordinate with solid elements and fenestration occurring on the building at grade level. Continue to study how the bottom of the bridge element is articulated. Review shifting the spanning elements to make for four full bays with a half bay at the ends.
2. Applicant is strongly encouraged to work with neighboring property owners on design and coordination of extending the proposed pedestrian alley to Market Street.
3. The vertical posts at the top railing would benefit from being visually heavier to have the railing appear less fence-like. This can be incorporated at preliminary along with other agreed up items noted by Staff.
4. Balconies are now proposed at the seventh floor against Horlbeck in coordination with the increased height of the step back. This makes for a busy composition instead of clean massing at the top, and this is partially due to the proximity of these balconies to the sixth-floor cornice. Because these are visible from King and Meeting Streets, omit them to simplify and clean up the architecture.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Conceptual Approval with Staff Conditions and Board Comments.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Agree with Staff's comments and recommendation. High quality design carefully studied through three iterations of conceptual design. Sensitively massed and sited - large building broken down into composition of small footprints to fit into Charleston's fabric. Height is not the only metric and is often the least important as many buildings are taller that we recognize when walking past. Fantastic project. Much done to address community concerns and Board comments. Support conceptual approval with the eighth story.
- Echo previous. Excellent project and design. BAR charged with protecting historic districts and what is visible from and the impacts on the public rights-of-way. Impacts are at Horlbeck Alley and Meeting Street. Meeting Street massing is excellent. Previous concern over narrow Horlbeck has been addressed. Confident King Street will not be impacted and certainly not by the glass conservatory. Very much in support. Regarding railing comment for top, defer to the architects. No problem with the balconies on Horlbeck. Focus on street level experience.
- Bookends at Horlbeck may blend the rest of the project together but are not particularly attractive. What is seen looking down alleys is important, and slivers of the project will be visible all the way around the project – we must be conscious of those views.
- Good effort but not there. Not coming around to the public. 33 public comments with the majority in opposition. Grateful for the model; helps to understand project in the context of the block, neighbors, and city. Incredible massing and height that does not find neighbors in close proximity. Verticality is completely different at Charleston Place. Architecture at Meeting Street is beautiful. Not in favor of eighth partial floor for architectural merit. BAR has the opportunity to lower by one half story to make more appropriate in the context. GAD doing well, but H/S/M opportunity to do something great.

- Procedural asks of the applicant at last meeting which give us understanding of the project from King Street and other key locations. Model is very informative and was worthwhile exercise. Applicant has provided responses and now to question of whether conservatory is appropriate. General concern regarding volume of building in relation to others. Proportions of Charleston Place not seen unless in it or driving up to it and off main thoroughfares. Same for courthouse complex. Generally supportive. Other buildings along Horlbeck are hostile to experience, and project should not be held hostage because of this condition.
- First motion by Jay White: "conceptual approval including 25' ground floor and eighth story for architectural merit." Seconded by Bello. Motion failed 2 to 3.
- Cornices align along Horlbeck.

3. 74 PRESIDENT STREET

TMS #460-15-01-043 | BAR2022-000908

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

Requesting final approval for new construction of a six-story 94,000sf classroom and office building for MUSC College of Health Professions.

Owner: Medical University of South Carolina

Applicant: Margie Longshore / SMHa, Inc.

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Approval incorporating Board and Staff comments with details to Staff.

MADE BY: Robinson SECOND: Bello VOTE: FOR: 3 AGAINST: 2

J. White recuses; E. Bello and S. Ramos serve as Alternate Board Members.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

The Applicant has largely addressed comments and conditions from the last review. Two of the items that the Board spent more time on are the penthouse, because of its size, and the ground floor canopy at the southwest corner, which has now been eliminated. While the ground floor canopy gave a sense of entry location to the public right-of-way, there is no entry to the building at this corner.

At the north elevation, a solid portion of corrugated metal panel is proposed at the second level. This material is not indicated anywhere else on the building. However, it is a temporary condition to accommodate the bridge which will connect to the College of Medicine at 35 Bee Street.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. The penthouse size remains the same, and while a color change and detailing have been applied, it simply is not enough to reduce the visual impact of this large penthouse. Study the composition of the facades to include a raised parapet at the roof in order to reduce the exposed height of the penthouse, which currently is out of proportion with the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Deferral with Board and Staff conditions.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Can the restudy look at the way this is placed on the roof? Even if the footprint gets bigger but lower? Is out of balance in size. Can the footprint be redistributed?
- Can the penthouse mass be spread out to be lower? What other options were studied? Applicant explains that limitation is height and size of units - height of equipment with ductwork over top and pathways.
- Can equipment be placed horizontally? Applicant explains equipment is horizontal and tall and ductwork comes from the top.
- If penthouse footprint and height can't change, then what do we do to the outside to make it more acceptable?
- Was bulk of discussion at previous meeting. Board accepted form but asked for a restudy of the skin to improve without being prescriptive.
- Recall that discussion noted being careful about adding too much architectural detail to the penthouse and that if a color change would make this blend in or disappear, would be ok. Desire is to make it less impactful. Appears to be practical limitations for why this can't be reduced.
- Sometimes mechanical penthouses are sunk into the floor system below. Sometimes they appear as another floor.
- Procedurally Board asked for restudy of penthouse façade and didn't push back on the volume at last meeting. Great looking building but not great looking penthouse. Has improved simply through color and addition of joints. Including the penthouse exterior in the mock-up could be helpful as joints and metal panels can be minimal to invisible from the street and desire is for the to be seen to break up what would be a box. Also discussed the cantilever which appears thick. Maybe taper it to thin the blade. Might also minimize the visibility of the mechanical.

4. 657 KING STREET

TMS #460-04-04-090/91/92 | BAR2023-001165

New Construction | N/A | Height District 4 & 6 | Old and Historic District

Requesting conceptual approval for new four and five story mixed-use building to include 18 accommodations units over ground floor retail and surface parking.

Owner: Atlantic South Development

Applicant: Nick Galizia / Bello Garris Architects

DECISION: DECISION

MOTION: Conceptual Approval of height, scale, mass and general architectural direction with request for restudy that incorporates Board's comments and restudy for more harmonious elevations and with Board and Staff comments.

MADE BY: Ramos **SECOND:** Meadors **VOTE: FOR:** 4 **AGAINST:** 0

S. Brown absent for item. S. Ramos serves as Alternate Board Member.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

1. The site is at the far northern end of upper King Street south of the Septima Clark Parkway and, along with 677 King Street, should help establish the tone of the more urban and commercial environment while being differential to its immediate smaller neighbors to the south and west.

2. A three-story building has received BAR approval for the corner of King and Line Streets. If constructed, this will screen much of the view to the proposed from the King and Line Street intersection. The distance to the neighboring structures at the west mitigates the building's visual impact on them. The building's most impacted neighbors, from a massing standpoint, are 653 King Street because of the proximity of the proposed, and the two-story structures on Line Street because of the height of the proposed to be adjacent.
3. The east elevation is composed of several bays, each with a slight difference from neighboring bays but with an overall mostly cohesiveness. A hierarchy is set through those changes utilizing material changes, cornices, awning placement, brick detailing, a window grid change, and signage.
4. The storefronts at the center section of the King Street elevation blend harmoniously with the normal patterns along King Street.

STAFF CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Provide additional perspectives from Line Street and from the Septima Clark Parkway depicting the proposed building with the two-story structures on Line Street. It would be best to omit vegetation on these. Dimensions to adjacent structures will also help to better understand the impact on them. Lowering the five-story southwest portion, similar to the lowered southeast portion, would help alleviate concerns of the proposed looming over these historic lower structures.
2. While the King Street elevation is successful, the lighter colored exterior bays could take more cues from the brick bays. This comment could be applied overall to the building. There is consistency in how the brick masses are treated and how the stucco masses are treated individually. However, there could be more cohesiveness or alignment in their treatment; study to address.
3. Alternatively, the brick masses could be more dominant and the lighter stucco portions could be secondary; study to address. Perhaps this might address any perceived competition between them.
4. Provide more width and/or depth at the recess at the west elevation. As proposed, it is not enough to mitigate the tension that develops from the adjacent cornices.
5. Continue to study the inspiration images provided as the brick details are developed.
6. Continue to study the color palette. While this would be reviewed in a later submittal, it has already been considered and discussed with the Applicant because it relates to the harmony of the project parts. Staff finds that the contrast between the light and dark should be toned down.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:


Deferral for full understanding of massing related to adjacent historic structures.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- King Street façade very successful - H/S/M and deference to exemplars provided. Agree that some concerns might be at preliminary on this King Street façade in terms of detailing and fenestration. Related to GAD, it's ok to be more ambitious with façade at expressway. In terms of vehicle traffic, project will be seen more from I26 and expressway than from King Street. Ok to be more

ambitious here but not holding up H/S/M. Thoughtful project. Have questions for preliminary which might rely heavily on the exemplars provided.


- BG buildings often have a similar layering treatment. Highlighting precedent images because these too are from a timeframe that shows similar patterning. Differences on east are liked. Much is happening though, and brick color will accent this more. Contrast in materials is significant and will be interesting. Exterior is driven somewhat by the interior but handled successfully. Some confusion as to what elements are proud of adjacent portions and how these work together particularly visible on pages A26, A34, and A36.
- Agree with some of previous comments. Brick areas very handsome; Stucco not as handsome. Would prefer more brick on King Street. All portions here should have the same body material across the building. Façade treatment is part of the GAD. Would be improved if all brick but still differentiation as proposed. And cornice would be stronger if continuous. Presence at elevated highway thought of as secondary but is prominent. Understand desire to break up mass, but more logical and harmonious façade might be better. Transitioning materials at major hyphens seems more logical than what appears more random. Mixed on GAD but believe it will get there particularly based on the brick portions of the building.



John E. Robinson, Chairperson

Date

8/9/23



Tory J. Parish, BAR-L Administrator

Date

Aug. 9, 2023