



CITY OF CHARLESTON BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – LARGE

MEETING RESULTS

AUGUST 9, 2023

4:30 P.M.

2 GEORGE STREET

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Eddie Bello, Seaton Brown, John Robinson (Chair) Luda Sobchuk, Jay White

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

A. Minutes

1. Approval of Minutes from July 26, 2023 Meeting

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Approve as submitted.

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

B. Applications

1. 141 MEETING STREET

TMS #457-08-04-003 | BAR2023-001191

Category 1 (EB White Building) | N/A | Height District 4 & 6 | Old and Historic District

Requesting final approval for demolition of former bank teller drive thru building, repair shop/storage structure, and hyphen connecting to historic EB White Building.

Owner: Beemok

Applicant: David Burt / LS3P

NOTE: The Board convened at this address on Tuesday, August 8, 2023 at 4:00 p.m. for a site visit.

DECISION: APPROVED

MOTION: Final Approval with Staff condition.

MADE BY: Bello SECOND: Brown VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

STAFF ANALYSIS:

1. Today's preservation standards would discourage an addition to a rated historic building that is not subordinate to it. By subordinate, we typically refer to height, width, and overall mass. The building portions that connect to the EB White Building did not begin as additions but rather became a collection of connected buildings over

- time. The consolidation causes what appears to be an addition which prevents the EB White building, a category 1 building, from being articulated clearly.
2. A lack of structural deficiency is noted, demonstrating that the portions proposed for demolition may have useful life remaining.
 3. The largest portion proposed for demolition was the repair shop and storage. Upon examination, this building has been tremendously modified evidenced through a variety of brick types and brick patterns and infill brick patches from PTAC units and window removal. Additionally, the brick is reported to be post-1940s brick, indicating the exterior materials to not be the original materials and diluting historic integrity.
 4. There is no concern on demolishing the drive-through structure at the center of the property.
 5. As a reminder, the Ordinance encourages the Board to “consider, among other things, the historic, architectural and aesthetic features of such structure, the nature and character of the surrounding area, the historic or culturally important use of such structure and the importance to the city.”

STAFF CONDITION:

1. Salvage historic materials and work on local opportunities for reuse.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Upon weighing the factors for demolition, Staff is not opposed to the demolition of the drive-through structure and not opposed to the demolition of the attached buildings due a lack of integrity because of the modifications that have occurred.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Scope is similar to a proposal from 2018. Compelling argument.
- Surprised to learn of the age of the main portion. Changed so much; no integrity. Opportunity to restore the EB White Building.

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

2. 82 MARY STREET

TMS #460-12-02-096 | BAR2023-001167

Not Rated | Cannon-Elliottborough | c. 1888 | Height District 8 | Old and Historic District

Requesting approval to demolish all structures.

Owner: Bennett-Coleman LLC

Applicant: Tony Caraviello

NOTE: The Board convened at this address on Tuesday, August 8, 2023 at 4:30 p.m. for a site visit.

DECISION: DENY

MOTION: Deny the demolition with Board comments.

MADE BY: Brown SECOND: White

VOTE: FOR: 4 AGAINST: 0

J. Robinson recuses.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

1. The Board previously voted to approve demolition of all outbuildings on this property and to save the historic building against Mary Street.
2. As a reminder, the Ordinance encourages the Board to “consider, among other things, the historic, architectural and aesthetic features of such structure, the nature and character of the surrounding area, the historic or culturally important use of such structure and the importance to the city.”
3. The structural report is compelling and indicates that the building is not salvageable.

STAFF CONDITION:

1. Salvage any reusable, if any, historic materials, and work on local opportunities for reuse.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Upon weighing the factors for demolition, Staff is not opposed to the demolition of the structure because of its condition.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- What do we have left if we keep it? Applicant’s explanation that 20% might be salvaged is optimistic. Question is whether the form is critical. Do not think it’s strong enough if we are going to end up with a new building.
- Precedent for burned buildings to be preserved such as Bluestein Building and 363 King. Maintained facades, even if not the forms. Opportunity here for worthy investment to maintain the integrity of the neighborhood that has fallen last few decades. Significance that should be appreciated and acknowledged. In decay but could be salvaged into its current form.
- Board decided to save the 1888 gabled roof structure for many valid reasons that still stand. Denying a demolition request is not just an order to preserve the sticks and bricks but to preserve the form and the historic urban pattern of which this building is perhaps the last remaining piece. Form is valuable. History of site is valuable and represents pattern of development of the block. Charred husk can be reconstructed.
- Much of east wall is not original. Last kid on the block. Not sure how much of the charred building can be preserved. Leaning to preserve.
- Others made a convincing argument based on prior discussions. Convinced that form is important to the neighborhood.
- For clarity, Board is addressing the 1888 gabled house structure and not the shed additions to the west.

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

3. 10 WHARFSIDE STREET (CHARLESTON MARITIME CENTER)

TMS #459-00-00-169 | BAR2022-000926

New Construction | Height District 4 | c. 1997-1998 | Old and Historic District

Requesting review and approval of sample panels for renovations and addition at the Charleston Maritime Center for the South Carolina Aquarium Learning Lab.

Owner: Edmund Most / City of Charleston

Applicant: John Ciccarella Architect, LLC

Withdrawn By Staff

4. 29-35 GEORGE STREET & 84-88 SOCIETY STREET

TMS #457-04-04-007/008/010/012/025/113 | BAR2023-000749

New Construction | Height District 6 | Old and Historic District

Request preliminary approval for construction of two new buildings: Building A at George Street and Building B at Society Street to include a hotel and mixed-uses incorporating a portion of the existing building.

Owner: GS Acquisition LLC

Applicant: Tony Giuliani / Goff D'Antonio Associates

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: Defer with Board and Staff comments.

MADE BY: Brown SECOND: Sobchuk

VOTE: FOR: 3 AGAINST: 0

E. Belo and J. Robinson recuse.

STAFF CONDITIONS:

1. At Building A, the exterior materials shall wrap into the parking entry if visible from George Street.
2. At Building A, the southeast stair has been omitted, but the tower element remains and should be made more cohesive with the building. As proposed, it protrudes away from the face of and top of the building and is treated differently in material, and this seems unnecessary.
3. At Building A, the northeast and southwest stair enclosures are treated in a different color and material. However, the previous proposal integrated these with detailing that now has been omitted. As currently proposed, this, especially at the northeast stair, appears as a complete break. (page A24) Restudy, and if not visible, please share views to show otherwise.
4. At Building A, the center vertical pilaster at the stops abruptly at over the entry door with nothing to “catch” it. This should be reworked.
5. At the salvaged building facing Society Street, the new awnings appear to be placed very low. Applicant should confirm if this reflects the current installation height.
6. At Building B, several changes have occurred, and some require restudy.
 - a. Balconies have been omitted but are placed in a consistent manner.
 - b. Fenestration at the sixth floor has been revised which is a concerning as there is now a lack of consistency in the glazing proportions.
 - c. The addition of railings and mechanical screening muddy the composition. These revisions, like the fenestration, may not be visible from Society Street but a restudy should be considered and additional views should be provided, in addition to page A07 to show a lack of visibility.
 - d. The storefront entry and storefront system facing Society and on the west elevation now appear more suburban in nature and a restudy is recommended. Three bays have been omitted to the west but these may not be largely visible from the public right-of-way.

- e. Fenestration revisions to the east eliminate a large number of openings. However, the proposed composition appears consistent with the overall building.
7. At Building B, (page A37 and others), the arch-top windows are indicated to be white while others are indicated to be bronze or similar. Please confirm colors will be consistent.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Preliminary Approval with Board comments and Staff conditions.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Detail issues can be reworked. Not concerned about the number of windows changing, but could explore fireproof glazing if others are concerned. Agree with every staff comment. Hyphens look unfinished at Building A and need work, size specifically. Agree with staff recommendation.
- Questions related to the redesign and loss of significant number of windows. Applicant response that number was decreased because of proximity to property line. Completely different façade design than was approved at previous meeting. At hyphens also, previous renderings were more pleasing and better design. Would assume that architects understand the building code when beginning design and prior to presenting at a public meeting so all are informed. Needs restudy of items prior to preliminary presentation.
- Quite a journey for this project with first version vehemently denied but team returned with excellent proposal making a case study for how to recover from denial. Was a purity and rigor about the approved design that was found meritorious enough to grant extra height. And previously the extra height was almost not visible but this has changed and sixth floor, which appears as a penthouse, has been changed a lot for the worse such as reordering of the fenestration on the north façade which previously was simple and rigorous. Details have been stripped off. Much of the design detail that lent to merit has disappeared. Finding merit dissolving.

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

5. 35 & 37 PRIOLEAU STREET

TMS #458-09-02-007 | BAR2023-001081

Category 4 | French Quarter | Height District 3.5 | Old and Historic District

Request conceptual approval for rehabilitation of and addition to a three-story existing masonry building to include ground floor retail and eight residential units, with an addition of a rooftop amenity deck.

Owner: Prioleau Enterprises LLC

Applicant: James Plunkard / HP Architecture

DECISION: DEFERRED

MOTION: Defer including Board and Staff comments

MADE BY: White SECOND: Bello

VOTE: FOR: 5 AGAINST: 0

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Applicant is pursuing reconstruction of eastern portion to include rebuilding the gable roof and the third floor on the northern half and to pursue rehabilitation for the portion over the one-story warehouse on the west. The Secretary of Interior Standards identify both as treatment options for historic buildings. Reconstruction would return this building to its original form, even though it hasn't been in this form since the 1800's. Rehabilitation of the west portion should be differentiated, recessed, and subordinate to the historic building.

STAFF CONDITIONS:

1. Though it provides a convenient location for utilitarian equipment, carving out the existing and reconstructed gable portions conflicts with the scope of reconstruction. Additionally, the proposed adjacent rooftop penthouse form conflicts with and is incompatible with the gable and with the well. Visibility from the west and other viewsheds is of concern. Restudy the rooftop access and mechanical well.
2. The fenestration on the proposed addition at the west has order to it. However, it does not appear to be inspired by or complimentary of the existing building or the project's context. Restudy fenestration.
3. While the proposed material for the proposed addition at the west is differentiated from the existing and may accommodate clean contemporary styling against the historic masonry, plank boards are not typically used in long spans such as these in downtown, and this should be considered as this project moves to preliminary review.
4. It would be good to reduce the size of the roof "well" shown for mechanical. Depending on what type of system is used, there might be an opportunity to reduce the height of the easter wall of this void and bring structure perpendicular to the roof plane, allowing a reduction in the open roof area.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Deferral for massing related to roof access and general architectural direction related to the exterior of the new addition.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- Gable end engages the slope in odd fashion.
- Better tract with reconstruction of Prioleau Street façade and roof form. Standards for reconstruction are particular and character is affected by material, so must determine whether stucco will be on new façade. Proposed architectural character, on new addition can go in opposing directions. General architectural direction not evident in drawings. Agree with Staff comments and PSC commentary.
- Envelope of Prioleau Street portion is correct with exception of well that needs to minimize or be hidden from disrupting the gable. New construction on west side needs to be deferential to the historic building. Fenestration and cladding not developed enough for comments yet.
- Approach is right; In favor of roof gable and like that the addition is different. Gable end detailing is critical. End cap parapet walls, in which the sloped roof would die into, would look better, be more appropriate, and be easier to detail. Hardie plank is not appropriate in this part of town or on this project. Suggest roof

material of staggered metal panels or contemporary options that are also subtle. No issue with large windows but study lite cut, proportions, and how they break down while remaining contemporary.

- Study the regulating lines of the historic building.
- Suggest study of WB Clark, one of best at adapting language and ethos of modernism to historic Charleston, such as Middleton Inn.
- Pop-up element at roof will be very visible needs to be smaller. The work of careful reconstruction is negated by it. It needs another pass.
- Addition could benefit from more glazing and stronger glazing to allow for vertical wall portions. Cementitious could appear temporary here; more metal and glass could help. At amenity level, study engaging with the wall and glazing rather than just adding the horizontal rail element.
- Seems height, scale, and mass are ok, but issues relating to general architectural direction and some of the work is still conjectural. With reconstruction of an historic element, critical to get it right. Fenestration, cladding, and pop-up on new addition and work on gable at reconstruction.
- For next submittal, draw the endcaps so Board can clearly see what is stucco and what is brick. Seeing this clearly might inform some other decisions.
- Work on creating a rhythm to the new addition.

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

Board voted to approve on August 23, 2023

John E. Robinson, Chairperson

Date



08.23.2023

Tory J. Parish, BAR-L Administrator

Date