

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: JOHN ROBINSON (CHAIR), LEON SCOTT, JAMES MEADORS,
LUDA SOBCHUK, JAY WHITE
STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: TORY PARISH, LAWRENCE COURTNEY



RESULTS

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

July 28, 2021

4:30 P.M.

virtually via Zoom Webinar

**1. 31 Laurens (previously 10 Society St) & 32 Laurens Street
-- TMS # 458-01-04-002 & 458-01-02-017 BAR2021-000492**

Request approval of mock-up panels.

Not Rated (None) Height District 56/30V Old City District

Owner: L&S Charleston Property Owner LLC

Applicant: Ted Risch/LS3P

MOTION: Approval of each of the three mock-up panels with Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: White

SECOND: Meadors

VOTE: FOR 5

AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

A. 10 Society Street Mock-Up

1. While GFRP is an acceptable material, there is a wide range of types and the specific product needs to be evaluated for durability. Submit individual samples for review.
2. The color at sealants around fenestration elements, control joints and lintels should better match the generalized brick/mortar blended color.
3. Need to see if the cellular weeps may be replaced by rope weeps to be less conspicuous.
4. Brick mortar joints need to be kept as uniform, level and plumb as possible.
5. Brick needs to be lipped at lintels for at least the lower two floors.
6. The underside of the balcony is not shown due to lack of working room. Unless simply finished concrete, this needs to be shown somewhere.
7. Welds at all metalwork needs to be ground smooth and painted. Outside corners at miters need to be straight, clean and smooth.
8. There is what appears to be corrosion beneath the upper toe-out channel above the glazed section. All metal parts are to be smooth and clean.
9. The spacing on the railing pickets should be tightened up a little. Although it might meet code, the spacing looks a bit wide.
10. The precast elements generally look pretty good if not a bit rough. These elements should be clean and smooth. We need to reiterate our typical notes for a really good QC/QA program to avoid dings and nicks incurred through handling, storage and placing.
11. Do the window sills have to have the large bulky piece at the bottom? This seems extraneous and a more traditional flatter sill with a hemmed edge over sill flashing which is set in mastic and painted the generalized brick/mortar blended color. Windows may need to be re-evaluated if not deemed high enough on the building to be easily seen.

12. The large precast window head needs to be lipped to help conceal the lintel and the cellular weeps at the bottom corners need to be avoided.
 13. The dryer vent needs to be painted to match a generalized brick/mortar blended color which needs to be pinned down for each brick-and-mortar wall type.
 14. All fixtures are to be electric and not gas.
 15. Sealant/mortar at precast coping needs to better match the coping color.
 16. Thru-wall flashing at the base of the walls need to be minimized, held tight against the wall and be painted to match the generalized brick/mortar blended color.
 17. Applicants should specifically identify any long lead time items requested for approval at this time.
- B. 31 Laurens Street Mock-Up:
1. The above items are incorporated where applicable.
 2. Sheet metal coping needs to show the elimination of the kicked-out drip with the bottom being held as tight against the wall as possible with a hemmed edge.
 3. The CIP balconies are to have smoother, cleaner edges.
 4. If the brick panel which is a proposed alternative to the brick on the wall, Staff prefers the brick at the panel, finding the panel a bit richer and heavier feeling.
 5. The dryer vent needs to be painted the generalized brick/mortar blended color.
 6. The cellular weeps at the projected brick window head should be rope weeps with lipped brick.
 7. The color at sealants around fenestration elements, control joints and lintels should better match the generalized brick/mortar blended color. The sealant where the canopy meets the wall needs to be the generalized brick/mortar blended color.
 8. Same notes regarding metalwork and railings as for 10 Society Street.
 9. The two colors noted on the railing are close, but staff prefers the darker color.
 10. It is understood that there are to be no exposed fasteners in any metal work.
 11. The canopy appears to have no good place to rest on the column capital. This needs to be restudied with a real breast or edge beam making the transition from canopy to column capital.
 12. While the tropical hardwood is very nice at the storefront below the canopy, the sill seems to project too much. The flashing at the base of this storefront needs to be painted to match the material at the walk.
 13. The sealant between the wood storefront and the dark material to the sides needs to match the color of this darker material.
 14. Applicant should specifically identify any long lead time items requested for approval at this time.
- C. 32 Laurens Street Mock-Up:
1. Board and Staff have reviewed this before.
 2. The above items are incorporated where applicable.
 3. The trim piece between the bay and wall is loose and will need to be restudied. Any sealant required at this joint should match the generalized brick/mortar blended color.
 4. Any light fixtures on this project should be electric and not gas.
 5. Flashing at the base of walls and storefront is to be painted to match the surface below.
 6. The area at the top of the bay exhibits exposed fasteners, kicked out drip edges and misaligned corner joints. This area needs to be restudied.
 7. Sealant joints at the porch are still generally too wide and need to be tightened up and kept more flush with the material profiles.

- 8. Sealant between the brick walls and porch components are to match the generalized brick/mortar blended color.
- 9. While GFRP is an acceptable material, there is a wide range of types and the specific product needs to be evaluated for durability. Submit individual samples for review. It is noted that this material on the porch has already been damaged.
- 10. Do the window sills have to have the large bulky piece at the bottom? This seems extraneous and a more traditional flatter sill with a hemmed edge over sill flashing which is set in mastic and painted the brick/mortar blended color. Windows may need to be re-evaluated.
- 11. Applicants should specifically identify any long lead time items requested for approval at this time.
- 12. Per Site Visit...

10 Society Street, 31 Laurens Street, and 32 Laurens Street Mock-Ups

Staff Recommendation:

While there may appear to be many items needing attention, Staff is confident that they can work with Applicant to address these items and recommends Approval with the above noted conditions to be worked out with Staff. If Staff and Applicant cannot resolve issues, a stop work order will be placed on the project and the Mock-Up will be brought back before the Board for resolution.

Board Comments:

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

2. 838 Morrison Drive - - TMS # 459-07-00-010 BAR2020-000171

Request approval of mock-up panel.

Not Rated (none) Historic Corridor District

Owner: Mike Schwarz/Woodfield Development

Applicant: Richard Kamakaris/Housing Studio

MOTION: Approval of Mock-up Panel with the incorporation of Staff and Board comments.

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

Staff Comments:

- 1. See related Notes on Item 1 of this Agenda for typical issues where applicable.
- 2. This bears some explanation as follows:
 - A. Staff had originally advocated against the closure brick. Applicant was very enthusiastic about closure brick and staff subsequently agreed for Applicant to show a portion for the two lower floors on the Mock-Up.
 - B. Initially, Applicant was a bit over-enthusiastic and placed these same brick high on the High Rise section of the Mock-Up. Staff objected to this reversal of tectonics.
 - C. Applicant was having issues with detailing and wished to simplify them. Staff advocated for this simplification, believing in part that this was anachronistic on a new contemporary styled building and simply muddled the language of the building, as well as some being too high on the building to effectively read.
 - D. Applicant has built a Supplemental Mock-Up showing the simplified detailing, an alternative closure brick per staff’s request and colors proposed.

- 3. Staff prefers the blade cut brick, although wire cut might be used at the top of the High Rise section. There is what appears to be corrosion beneath the upper toe-out channel above the glazed section. All metal parts are to be smooth and clean.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval with the clear differentiation of what Board and Staff have Approved, and Staff to work with Applicant on any unresolved issues. If Staff and Applicant cannot resolve issues, a stop work order will be placed on the project and the Mock-Up will be brought back before the Board for resolution.

Board Comments:

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

3. 578 Meeting Street - - TMS # 459-01-03-031 BAR2021-000560

Request Conceptual Approval for new Mixed-Use Structure with parking, incorporating a small remnant historic structure.

Not Rated (East Side) c. <1929 Historic Corridor District

Owner: Flournoy Development Group

Applicant: Ross Kirby/Dynamik Design

MOTION: To deny Conceptual Approval of this Application based on inappropriate incorporation of an existing structure, misappropriation of Board principles, and (specific to a request for extra height) a lack of architectural merit (exceptional architectural merit) warranting additional height and additionally incorporating Board and Staff comments.

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

(Luda Sobchuk recuses.)

Staff Observations:

- 1. Per Section 54-306.F, Height District 5, the BAR may permit an additional story based on architectural merit and context.
- 2. As taken from the Ordinance, Section 54-306-17, “Architectural Merit” means a project that reflects exemplary architectural and urban design, utilizes the highest level of materials and finishes and contributes to the public realm, as outlined in the Board of Architectural Review Principles.
- 3. While this is a conceptual level review, because a finding of architectural merit and context is being pursued, there are Staff comments which address the elements of architectural merit, and these might otherwise be handled at a preliminary review.

Staff Comments:

- 1. Consider embracing the asymmetry caused by the parameters on this site. The historic structure is not at the exact center of the buildable footprint, and the relationship of Meeting Street to this block is angled. The rhythm of five similarly sized alternating bays (ABABA) may be too forced or stagnant given these parameters. In doing so, consider how the mass at the NW corner might potentially be a stronger anchor via some play in the parapet height, for instance.

2. The proposed ratio of brick to stucco on this building is minimal, with the predominant material appearing to be stucco. Expand the use of higher quality materials on the building.
3. The architectural language based on the assembly of a base, exposed structural framework at the center, and top/cornice could be enhanced. While the style as proposed seems much like other contemporary projects in the vicinity, accentuating this vertically-prominent language might help the project to differentiate from those around it.
4. While the base along Meeting Street has been made more substantial, it may need additional consideration. The stone base at the grade level columns might be extended to wrap continuously along the recessed storefronts. Also, there is no base, of stone, brick, or stucco depicted at the stucco hyphens. This should be added or studied.
5. While the brick pilasters align with the brick columns beneath them, the windows seem to be floating in plane between the brick pilasters. There is an overall structural skeleton found in the red brick, but the fenestration seems to be unrelated. These should more closely relate.
6. Regarding fenestration, most windows are placed within the stucco portions, and no sill or header is proposed. Depending on the direction of the architecture, the addition of these items would give relief, texture, and visual interest to the façade as well as the opportunity to further impede water intrusion.
7. Regarding the 9 over 9 lite grid at the windows in the four-story portions, due to different window widths, the lites in this grid pattern can become too horizontal working against BAR's preferred vertical proportions. (BAR-0029)
8. The new building's engagement with the historic structure has improved in that the roof of the historic structure is being activated. However, there is concern about the usefulness of the covered structure as an open-air plaza. The saved historic structure should be incorporated into the grade level live-work units.
9. Confirm and explain the method for removing paint from the historic structure.
10. The project does not make a friendly gesture to the one- and two-story housing one block south or to the church at the SE corner of the block. While there is much variety of use and building size in the larger surrounding areas, the relationships with these properties should be more fully examined. Additionally, the placement of the Sky Lounge at the top of the south façade may be insensitive to the neighboring residential.
11. Continue to work on the parking garage facades to make this appear less like a parking garage and to de-emphasize the horizontal proportions.
12. The width of the spans between the brick pilasters varies around the building. While there is no desire to make the project rigid or boring, study how these spans can achieve more consistency with other spans on the same portion of massing.
13. The storefront grid at the north side of the NW corner and at the west side of NW corner should match. These should be symmetrical over the building corner. (BAR0032) Additionally consider how this element might be extended or enhanced with an appurtenance for interest.
14. Per 54-306.X, the height of a non-residential grade level floor shall be between 16' and 20' 16'. The proposal currently shows 10'-9" (BAR0034). Confirm a height variance is requested for the first floor.
15. Regarding a finding of architectural merit and context, the public outdoor spaces proposed on this project can be successfully activated. Continue to clarify the design of the public spaces with hardscaping and landscaping, refine the architectural and urban design based on the Board and Staff comments, and enhance the material palette for a finding of architectural merit and context.

Staff Recommendation:

Deferral for continued refinements based on Staff and Board comments.

Board Comments (for Applicant Notice of Denial):

- Project deserves flat denial based on three basic concepts:
 - Regis Milk façade was preserved for a reason not to be swallowed up but to conserve a significant contributor to the history and context of this section of Meeting Street. This proposal obliterates it, and public comments about the insensitivity towards it are spot on.
 - Most wholistic misappropriation of BAR principles. Applicant is misunderstanding and misapplying these – height proportions, materials, relationship to the street and public realm are missed. The building’s consumption of almost the entire block does not make it an urban project. The angle of the street is the only reason that it has a widening setback on Meeting.
 - No basis provided to meet architectural merit. Trying to meet the BAR principles is not merit for architectural merit.
- Sympathetic to this being a former industrial site and between neighborhoods.
- Public housing across the street is on the verge of getting some historic protections. Presbyterian Homes across the street and the church to the rear are swallowed by the scale of the proposal; appreciate the architect’s indication of trying to give deference to the church but more is in order as the church is shown to be in the shadow of this building, where it previously was not the case. No homage or nod to the things that are coherent in the neighborhood. Share previous concerns by Board.
- Also in agreement with previous comments including Board member comments. Was ok with the height had it been given some historical significance for the height, but it doesn’t. In agreement with the comment regarding “anywhere architecture”; could be put anywhere, but in the wrong place here.
- Inferior; the materials will need to be good on this.
- Commentary is not personal; tradition is radical candor to make sure Applicant understands what the city is asking for through the Board.

For additional clarity, please visit the City of Charleston’s YouTube Channel.

4. 411 Meeting Street - - TMS # 459-09-03-114 BAR2021-000481
 Request preliminary approval for new construction of mixed-use development.
 Not Rated (Cannon-Elliottborough) Height District 5/8 Old and Historic District
 Owner: Bennett-Meeting St LLC
 Applicant: Joseph E. Rabun/Rabun Architects

MOTION: Deferral on the specific criteria of material information, inconsistencies in the plans as presented, and also incorporating Board and Staff comments.

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

Staff Observations:

1. Although largely maintaining, and in some ways improving its elegant form, the cladding of the Hotel portion of this project has been significantly altered from what was specifically requested – brick – to a prefabricated precast multi-part system shown as Gatelite on three of the four primary buildings. This product is proposed for the Hotel, Condo Building and Boutique Hotel Building. The Apartment Building appears to use a more conventional brick rain screen cavity wall system. Any Board motion would need to specifically address the use of this precast material, concrete roof tiles at the Hotel, and the use of any gas lanterns.
2. While unfamiliar to Staff, and apparently fairly new to the marketplace, a quick web search indicates that this precast system is “a lightweight, resilient façade system that’s disrupting the industry.” The featured project in this presentation is, interestingly, a 14-story hotel on which Gate collaborated to “match surrounding historic masonry warehouse-style architecture in New Orleans.” This particular system appears to incorporate thin brick on a 2” precast concrete layer outboard of many components including a plane of unbroken rigid insulation, a typical storefront window system, fire stopping on a structural steel framework.
3. Details in this presentation package show this system being used with only a smooth precast skin in conjunction with precast concrete and GFRC forms for more articulated detailing, although a conversation with the Applicant indicated that these exteriors could be manipulated by varying panel sizes and shapes as well as color and texture.
4. These details are at present somewhat vague, with many of the elements which might cause them to be successful missing or not noted. Staff and the Board are called upon to fill in too many gaps, having to make assumptions at how the system is structurally supported, how water is drained off horizontal surfaces and to what degree the windows are set into the walls. Window recess appears to be only 2” with material at heads and sills unidentified. Windows simply need to be set more deeply into the wall.
5. Sheet metal flashing is shown in cases at sills and precast horizontal surfaces is excessive and should be minimized, set in mastic and held tight to the horizontal surface with a hemmed edge.
6. Thru-wall flashing is noted at some window heads while not noted on others. How this flashing is handled is a critical detail and will need to have a minimized profile held tight atop the wall to be visually inconspicuous.
7. The project’s Height, Scale and Mass are essentially the same as previously shown with underground parking continuing to be a big positive as are the large Plaza area and the project’s addressing of the Lowline. However, the General Architectural Direction is contrary to what was requested by Board and Staff. Ideally, the architectural expression of the four visually separate structures should be distinctive, further serving to help break up this large project into smaller pieces.
8. The roofing material at the boutique hotel was noted to be a hand-crimped standing seam roof.
9. A Board comment was to increase the depth and richness in the facades. While this has been done in some cases, in others, it is still lacking.

Staff Comments:

1. The use of this system is a departure from more traditional building methods or even the 8” thin-brick clad precast concrete panel systems used on the Jasper and is being used on the large 40 Line Street project. While this proposed system may hold some promise, there is not enough information on the details to explain how the system components may or may not work together to complete an assembly giving the desired results. Provide further clarification.

2. Although the essence of what is shown on 1/AR-57 may be parsed out, the detail lacks enough information and graphics in terms of varying line weights to make staff unsure of its success as depicted. Provide further clarification.
3. Although the detailing and materials on the brick veneer apartment building are more familiar, the avoidance of a lipped brick and the shallowness of how the windows are set into the walls are cause for concern even here.
4. The language of the two-story portion of the Hotel at the corner of Reid Street and Meeting Street as shown on 1/AR-61 with a brick cladding is different from the Hotel and more like the Apartments. Elevations on AR-25 and on AR-46 show limestone cladding. Please clarify.
5. A color on AR-28 shows a black color noted as Condo Roof while the Condo roof noted on AR-30 as well as elevations and renderings show green. Please clarify.
6. It is assumed that the “low towers” referred to on AR-62 are the three-story wings at meeting Street as noted on AR-63. Please confirm.
7. Exterior materials will need to wrap into the Entry/Exit areas of the underground parking with specialty paving and a ceiling to a distance of 25’-30’ or to a clear delineation point determined by interior elements.
8. Materials and color palettes, while showing the precast panel material as a pale green on our displays, do a good job of conveying this information. The “terra cotta look” tile roofing is concrete, for which, if approved by the Board, Staff will need product literature for review. The brick for the Apartment building appears to look a little too much like wire cut, but samples may prove otherwise. It is noted that gas lanterns are typically not allowed on new construction and would need to be specifically addressed by the Board.
9. While materials are well noted and color palettes displayed, Applicant should specifically identify any perceived long lead-time items for which they may be requesting Approvals at Final Submittal.

Staff Recommendation:

Deferral for the introduction of a primary material different from that requested in the previous Board Motion, and if Board agrees to its use, for the exploration of various finishing techniques to differentiate the buildings as well as to explore ways to increase façade depth and richness. The Board should additionally deliberate on the acceptance of the “terra cotta look” concrete roof tiles and the proposed gas lanterns.

Board Comments:

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