

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: JOHN ROBINSON (CHAIR), LUDA SOBCHUK, JAMES MEADORS,
LEON SCOTT, JAY WHITE (EDDIE BELLO AS ALTERNATE FOR 295 CALHOUN)
STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: TORY PARISH, LAWRENCE COURTNEY



MEETING RECORD
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

August 25, 2021 4:30 P.M. virtually via Zoom Webinar

1. **102 President Street - - TMS #460-11-04-023** **BAR2020-00376**
Request final approval for new construction of seven-story mixed-use student housing development.
(Cannon-Elliottborough) | Height District 5 | Old City District
Owner: Josh Fogle
Applicant: Tony Giuliani/Goff D'Antonio Associates

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

-
2. **151 Meeting Street - - TMS # 457-08-04-002** **BAR2021-000580**
Request conceptual approval for modifications to first floor loggia at SE corner and modifications to third and sixth floor window pattern at east façade.
Not Rated | (No Neighborhood District) | c. 1981 | Old and Historic District
Owner: Tom Creasy / Lat Purser & Associates
Applicant: Clark Batchelder / Goff D'Antonio Associates

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with Staff and Board Comments

MADE BY: Scott SECOND: White VOTE: FOR 4 AGAINST 1

Staff Observations:

1. The proposed enlarged openings match the fenestration at the second floor. Retrofitting the third and sixth floors with a loggia along Meeting Street adds an element of visual interest to this elevation and allows the occupants to engage with the exterior environment.
2. The 2017 Board of Architectural Review Principles include, "A Charleston tradition is the adaptation of buildings to its climate, which has established the City's aesthetic identity and enhanced the sustainability of its building stock." One could make the argument that the addition of these loggias on the east façade of the building is an exercise of adapting the building to the climate and location.
3. The 2017 Board of Architectural Review Principles include, "Street life on the sidewalk should be supported." The proposed changes at the SE corner of the first-floor help to activate the colonnade space at the street level.
4. The conceptual design for Gateway Walk Park has been shared with the Applicant and is included in the submittal. The park would be adjacent to the building on the south side on what is currently a surface parking lot. The park design was part of a project by the Civic Design Center to identify potential green spaces. It should be noted that the park has not been

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

August 25, 2021

Page | 2

funded, and the city does not have implementation plans at this time or even own the property. The project proposal has the ability to adapt whether or not the park comes to fruition.

Staff Comments:

1. Confirm the availability of a three-panel system instead of the four-panel bi-fold so that the panels would match the adjacent glazing panels, as the fenestration seems to be consistently sized all over the building. If not available, provide imagery of the four-panel bi-fold system when closed.

Staff Recommendation:

Conceptual Approval with Staff and Board and Staff comments.

Board Comments:

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

3. **250 Spring Street - - TMS # 460-10-02-004** **BAR2021-000562**

Request preliminary approval for renovation of existing hotel.

Not Rated | Westside | c. 1977 | Old City District

Owner: Spring Street Holdings, LLC

Applicant: Robert W. Ponder

MOTION: In Accordance with Staff Recommendation (Preliminary Approval with Board and Staff Comments and Final Review by Staff)

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

Staff Observations:

1. Some of the trim proposed in the conceptual design package has been removed in lieu of working with the existing trim patterns. Additionally, there has been a simplification of the proposed color palette.
2. The louvers for the VTAC units are proposed to be a color which matches the adjacent exterior wall.
3. Clarity has been provided as to the window size and mullion pattern.
4. Applicant has proposed the Sto-Powerwall system which has been approved for other projects under BAR-L purview. The texture is to be smooth. Applicant to provide samples.
5. Applicant is requesting preliminary review with final review by Staff.
6. Signage will be reviewed separately.

Staff Comments:

1. Through the photo on page 34, there appears to be a fourth color, a cream trim, slightly darker than the cream, tan, and pale yellow on the building currently. While the color blocking proposal was not approved at the conceptual review, we would recommend, if the building is going to be entirely repainted, a fresh color palette.
2. The windows are shown being placed flush with the exterior wall plane and should be recessed as much as possible. The 2017 Board of Architectural Review Principles includes, "the

achievement of a building with relief and the avoidance of the impression of cheap, paper-thin facades.”

3. Applicant to confirm if all windows being replaced, and if not, to confirm which will remain.

Staff Recommendation:

Preliminary Approval with Board and Staff Comments and Final Review by Staff of “For Permit” drawings.

Board Comments:

For Board comments, 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.

Cannon-Elliottborough | Height District 5/8 | Old and Historic District

Owner: Bennett-Meeting St LLC

Applicant: Joseph E. Rabun/Rabun Architects

MOTION: Preliminary Approval with Board and Staff Comments with Staff to work with the Applicant on minor color and material palette adjustments

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

Staff Observations:

1. The exterior changes such as the raised pediment, increased roof height or slope, precast detailing, and arched fenestration at the center of the hotel east elevation are well received.

Staff Comments:

1. Per review of the precast sample panel and discussion, additional window recess is possible. Board should determine minimum depth based on information from Applicant.
2. A change of exterior material at the smaller boutique hotel is encouraged in order to provide material richness and variety across this large project.
3. While the materials and colors are attractive, Staff has concern that the colors may be too homogeneous across the site and would encourage some additional differentiation between the buildings. For example, consider brown brick for the apartments, which would also harmonize with the Homewood Suites across Reid Street.
4. The joint width on the sample panel and depicted in the drawings on page AR-1 as 3/4” in width shall be reduced as much as possible. Applicant indicates this may be 1/2” or less. 3/8” would be ideal.
5. Windows should be set as deeply into the wall as possible. It appears that with the applied brick molding the windows may be recessed another inch or perhaps even a little more.
6. Appropriate shutter hardware is to be included.
7. It is understood that typical 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. 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:

Preliminary Approval with Board and Staff Comments with Staff to work with Applicant on minor color and material palette adjustments with Final Review by Staff of “for Permit” drawings.

Board Comments:

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

5. 295 Calhoun Street - - TMS # 457-02-02-001 BAR2021-000480

Request conceptual approval for new construction of mixed-use development and requesting one additional story based on architectural merit and context.

Harleston Village | Height District 7 | Old City District

Owner: SE Calhoun, LLC

Applicant: Davis Carter Scott/DCS Design

MOTION: Denial with Applicant’s Reconsideration of H/S/M and General Architecture Direction.

MADE BY: Bello **SECOND:** Sobchuck **VOTE: FOR** 5 **AGAINST** 0

(Jay White recuses; Eddie Bello serves as alternate.)

Staff Observations:

1. This building, though on a transitional site, is in the Medical District and while it should act as a bridge between this district and Harleston Village, it appropriately should fundamentally relate to the larger buildings of the Medical District. Applicant has been willing to work with Staff and the closest neighbors in Harleston village towards making recommended improvements. Staff recommends preserving the 8-story version over a 7-story version as it is only 7 feet taller and enables the project to add significantly more in contributions to the public realm.
2. The revision to the color palette is positive and is well received.
3. The removal of the four-story element along Halsey for an enlarged setback provides a greenspace.
4. The omission of the cantilevered portions on Calhoun Street elevation is positive and gives the building the visual support and base that it should have.
5. The stone base has been added and provides for a better pedestrian experience at the ground level.
6. Other improvements include pulling back the eighth floor at the lake side, reducing the overhang or cornice at the eighth floor around the building, simplifying the variety of windows, simplification of the corner entry, and the addition of balconies along Halsey.
7. The Calhoun Street elevation is the most successful with its tectonic hierarchy.

Staff Comments:

1. When viewed from most angles, the proposed building appears to have a square footprint with long facades extending in two directions. This gives the building a blocky perception and no semblance of narrow frontages. It is believed that much of the public outcry over this building’s H/S/M is derived from this. Staff finds the Calhoun Street and lake-facing elevations to be more successful with massing, hierarchy, and articulation. To mitigate the

massing, some relief or modulation is needed. This might be achieved with the incorporation of a break or hyphen language composed of metal and glass and placed roughly one-third of the distance from Calhoun. Alternatively, the addition of hierarchical elements on the park and Halsey Street elevations could mitigate some of the concerns, such as anchoring each end of these elevations and recessing the longer center portion.

2. Omit the curve at the second-floor pool deck in plan as it seems inconsistent with the sharp angles on the project.
3. At the recessed portion of the south elevation, the window pattern is different from other portions. These should be restudied. While this may be a good area for a differentiated fenestration pattern, there could be more consistency across spandrel panels and window proportions.

Staff Recommendation:

The Board voted to deny the conceptual design approval in April. Since then, the Applicant has addressed the items of concern which are outlined in the Staff Observations. However, they have not fully addressed the concern of H/S/M. Because of this omission, we believe this project should be deferred until further articulation techniques are employed. We therefore recommend Deferral of Conceptual Approval with Board and Staff Comments.

Board Comments:

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

6. 584 Meeting Street - - TMS # 459-01-03-045 BAR2021-000581

Request conceptual approval for new construction of a mixed-use apartment building.

East Side | Height District 5 | Historic Corridor District

Owner: Meeting Street Acquisitions, LLC

Applicant: Jeffrey Roberts/JJR Development, LLC

William Rodon Hornoff/2rz Architecture

MOTION: Conceptual Approval with particular direction to order and scale of the facades and improvements to the rhythm of the streetscapes and incorporating Staff Comments 1, 5, and 16.

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

Staff Observations:

1. The massing that is presented to Meeting Street is successful in that it consists of two narrow portions.
2. The proposed colors should provide variety in the project's context.
3. The corner glazing provides an interesting appearance that is appropriate for a contemporary styled building.

Staff Comments:

1. There is a lack of order to the elevations. For example, along the Meeting Street elevation, there are several different widths to the columns or solid portions at the grade level. At some locations, the width relates to fenestration above, and at others, it is unrelated to what occurs above.

2. Additionally, the base and upper four stories do not relate to each other in elevation. The portions with the applied porcelain panels do not correspond to other building components horizontally or vertically. While the intent may be a lack of order, these portions should relate to the base. The 2017 Board of Architectural Review Principles speak to a unified design and building harmony.
3. The ground floor composition contains an overabundance of glazing across a generally unbroken and minimally articulated façade. While the transparency along the street wall is commendable, Staff is concerned that some windows are likely to be covered at the interior.
4. The ground floor composition does not adequately give a base to the building. The overabundance of glazing does not provide a visual base which would be more evident through additional opaque surfaces.
5. Altering the ground level bays for better correlation with the higher elevation portions could include the addition of more solid surface which would help given the building the base that it needs.
6. The building composition should include a base, middle, and top. While the proportions of each on this proposal are different than on a traditional building, the middle portion, which is more evident on Meeting Street, disappears on the south and north elevations.
7. At Stuart Street, consider how the building might be broken into two masses or articulated differently. Even the ground floor is a 350' long flush facade.
8. The application of porcelain panels to create upper bays may need more dimension. This is achieved as the material turns and forms the side walls of the upper balconies. The framework of the upper balconies might be held back more to allow for these to be articulated as solids with depth. When these masses engage with ground floor brick, they are or are almost in the same plane. Consider how these will be articulated at all levels.
9. The 2017 Board of Architectural Review Principles state, "Street life on the sidewalk should be supported." While the ground level spaces are designated as retail, there is an awning at only one bay along Meeting Street for pedestrians. This principle is intended to be applied along the exterior of the project and not to the interior pedestrian street as indicated in the submission.
10. The 2017 BAR Principles also state, "A Charleston tradition is the adaptation of buildings to its climate which has established the City's aesthetic identity and enhanced the sustainability of its building stock." The exposed ground level western and southern glazing gives Staff concern about heat gain and, again, future efforts to mitigate this from the interior.
11. The proposed storefront system appears suburban. While the intent may be to have these openings appear as voids with light and delicate framing, the mullions and framing could relate to the fenestration at floors two through five, bringing harmony to the overall facade.
12. The 2017 BAR Principles state, "The use of detail provides points of visual interest to pedestrians and enhances the articulation of the human scale of a building." The ground level brick pattern gives an interesting texture. It is applied fully, with the exception of one small section, along Meeting Street, and at the column centers along Stuart Street. Confirm why these are treated differently while the rest of the ground floor design is the same on both streets. Confirm whether the protruding brick can be climbed.
13. The Nassau Street elevation is loaded with utilitarian uses – loading zone, garage entrance, parking, fire protection systems, and these uses are manifested as vehicle doors and louvers with a garish lime green accent. According to the elevation on page 20, any columns or pilasters at the base are recessed rather than placed in a way to visually support the mass above. This elevation should be further refined.
14. The Huger Street elevation includes a solid vertical mass used as a break between higher quality and lower quality materials as well as the highly visible north faces at the NE and NW corners. These masses would benefit from fenestration or visual interest. At the NE corner, consider the likely preservation of the house directly fronting Huger.
15. The vertical bars on the balconies seem superfluous unless designed to be a shading element.

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-LARGE

August 25, 2021

Page | 7

16. While it is commendable that the design team identified single houses as a dominant pattern in the neighborhood, this fabric is too far away to be considered in the design, nor is it adequately reflected in the design. Look for additionally design cues from the local context.

Staff Recommendation:

Deferral for general architectural direction

Board Comments:

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